

# Inter-Office Communications Analysis in the University of Eastern Philippines Inputs to Strengthening Administrative Communication

MA. Mercedes G. Sosa, DPA

Assistant Professor IV, Department of Languages and Communication, College of Arts and Communication  
University of Eastern Philippines, Catarman, Northern Samar

**Abstract:** *The study was an inter-office communications analysis in the University of Eastern Philippines Main Campus and its inputs to strengthening administrative communication. The study used the descriptive-analytical and evaluative research design. Specifically, it tried to: find out the content of communications sent to selected offices in UEP-Main Campus, as regards to nature, direction of communication, form, and purpose; analyze office communications in terms of clarity, conciseness, accuracy, organization, and mechanics; find out the communication barriers in the inter-office communications in the UEP-Main Campus; determine whether the communication is effective or ineffective based on the findings of the study; find out if there are significant differences in the inter-office communications among colleges and selected offices; and draw inputs to public administration. The study involved 11 offices of the University- the University Management Centre headed by the Office of the President, the Graduate School and nine (9) colleges of the University with the Offices of the Deans of all the nine (9) colleges and school. This study considered only the offices which issued Special Orders, Memoranda, and letters sent to different offices of the University. The date of the inter-office communications which pertained to the objectives of the study were tabulated, analyzed, and evaluated for the purpose of arriving at desired results. It made use of the frequency counts, percentages, mean, and ANOVA. Results of the study showed that by nature, memoranda, special orders and letters are common and inherent in offices as an interpersonal exchange of information and understanding. By direction, most communications are downward considering that they are memoranda and special orders which are usually issued by the head or manager of the office. While the inter-office communications were written in varied, most were intended to give orders and compliance, considering that they are special orders and memoranda coming from the offices of the President and the Deans. On analysis in the content of inter-office communications, all inter office-communications specially special orders, were very much clear which means that they consistently use direct expression of ideas; structures and vocabulary are simple and appropriate. Among the inter-office communications which were evaluated, special orders came out to be very much concise among the others which were also very much concise. Special orders had the highest level of accuracy compared to memoranda and letters which only came out to be much accurate. Special orders came out as very much organized among the three (3) types of inter-office communication. This means that they are highly organized with clear progression of ideas and well linked. It contains the what, why, when, where, and how information. The writing of special orders very much observed mechanics because it has standard form so with memoranda, but with letters, errors in capitalization, spelling, punctuation, spacing, wrong abbreviations, and apostrophe lowered its grand mean. On barriers of communication, there were more process barriers than semantic barriers. From the three types of inter-office communications, it can be inferred that special orders have the highest level of effectiveness. The Graduate School, the College of Law produced the most clear special orders.*

**Keywords:** Inter-Office Communication, Communication, Letters, Letter composition

## 1. Introduction

Effective management in public administration is unattainable in the absence of understanding office systems like communication management.

Communication in an organization is a vital element in the administration of public policies, programs, and projects or activities particularly in planning, directing, leading, decision making and management control. The issue of rationality, effectiveness, efficiency, and control in organizations comes in mismanagement of communications, particularly in handling office communication – the processing of the information, the channels, the medium, and the communicators involved. Issues of public concern and of organizational policies are put into written form. On matters of policy decisions, communications that are not made clear can cause confusion, misconceptions, disunity, and dissatisfaction.

Communicating ideas should not mislead, but rather it is getting one's meaning across writing. It is a reflection of the individual's cognition and must be a successful means of

relating to others and to people within the organization. It should lead the way to understanding and facilitate interactive situations. Communication then reflects an ability to perform task. If people in an organization cannot perform tasks such as simply writing a clear communication, then the concept of responsibility becomes an issue. According to Claude S. George, Jr. (1964) with Jose P. Leveriza (2006), one of the most immediate and costly results of poor organization is the breakdown of inter-organization communication, and the resulting loss of an integrated operating system. This is another issue despite the fact that lines of authority they said, provide ready-made channels of communication. The upward and downward directions are often used and should be used solely to pass directives downward and never as a means of communicating attitudes, and feelings upwards.

There are also problems of the downward communication despite clear, good, and sound policies and principles of management. The managers or executives should not overuse their downward channels (Leveriza, 2007). They should encourage the free flow of communication in the

organization, or better, the use of bottom-up communication to provide management with facts and data upon which decisions are based and are made. They are the needed feedback that management seeks (Kohn, 1977).

Channels of communication have an effect upon the performance and morale in an organization (Leveriza, 2007). Without a clear, concise communication, Calvin Sellers (2016) pointed out in his "The 5 Most Efficient Communication Methods" and mentioned that it is harder for everyone to do his/her jobs. As communication is an important tool in the workplace. He also said that it can also hinder collaboration and productivity.

Meanwhile, Weber's concept of formal rationality tells how organizations work which could be understood through the concepts of authority, bureaucracy, and officials. The most prevalent structure shown in the formal rationality perspective is the bureaucracy because it is characterized by rules, regulations, and authority to give commands and designate official duties. This is true in the directional type of communication where the top management has the authority to issue directives, orders, and instructions on the job details, procedures, and guidelines for strict compliance at the lower levels. Such official communications are official documents which the lower levels of management and the employees must read and be able to understand the information. If employees or subordinates do not read at all or read with displeasure, it creates a problem on feedback which results to decrease of administrative efficiency. This is the very nature of communication. It is a two-way process.

In a reading from Australian Research Center for Administrative Communication, a view is emphasized that administrative personnel often also experience the official linguistic style as burdensome. According to the issue that many find it difficult to grasp themselves what they are made to communicate. This is a barrier to communication – effective office communication.

Barriers, particularly language barriers on the content of information block a communication process. Forms of disturbances destroy meaning of messages. These are the encoding and the decoding errors, the none-standard use of figures and symbols, the errors in mechanics, form, and the style of language.

According to the Center for Administrative Communication on Administrative Language of the Australian Research Center, one high barrier is the style of language in administration. It is because it is viewed that administrative language is largely based on technical jargon. An example cited was on official documents which need to communicate facts and ruling reliably and must stand up to juridical scrutiny. As such, there is a great need for administrative communication, particularly inter-office communications to be correct, clear, concise, complete, and organized.

In this institution, the University of Eastern Philippines, it is the researcher's observation that there are still office communications that commit errors in their structure of statements, the syntax, accuracy in the use of words, and in

the completeness and conciseness of the information contained in the communications.

From these various points of perspectives on administrative communication, communicators have to be mindful of communication skills in writing their office communications to be able to convince political actors and the broader stakeholders of the merit of an organization or an institution. It is by these that the researcher was moved to conceptualize a study on evaluating and analyzing inter-office communications finding out end results to strengthen administrative communication in this institution.

In the University of Eastern Philippines, special orders and memoranda usually come from the Office of the President. Only four (4) come from the colleges. Special orders issued by a college usually partake the nature of a designation of a faculty as Department Chair or as Officer-in-charge in the college in the absence of the Dean. Letters come from different units and/or offices of the different colleges, and from offices of the Vice-Presidents.

## 2. Objectives of the Study

This proposed study aims generally to analyze the written office communications in the selected offices of the University of Eastern Philippines-Main Campus, as inputs to strengthening administrative communication.

Specifically, this study is aimed at (1) finding out the content of written communications sent to selected offices in UEP-Main Campus, as regards nature, direction of communication, form, purpose; (2) analyzing office communications in terms of clarity, conciseness, accuracy, organization, and mechanics, (3) finding out the communication barriers in the inter-office communications in the UEP-Main Campus; (4) determining whether the communication is effective or ineffective based on the findings of the study; (5) finding out if there are significant differences in the inter-office communications among colleges and selected offices; and (6) drawing inputs to administrative communication.

## 3. Methodology

This study was conducted at the University of Eastern Philippines (UEP) Main Campus. This is the only comprehensive State University in the Eastern Visayas Region. It is located in the Municipality of Catarman, Northern Samar. It has a land area of 394 hectares with 3 barangays and is 4 kilometers or 20 minutes away from the town proper.

Specifically, this study involved all the colleges in the university, the Center for Advanced Studies – Office of the Graduate School, the Office of the President, the Offices of the Vice Presidents, the Research Office, the Extension and Training Office, the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, the Human Resource Management Office, the Registrar's Office, and the Office of Student Affairs.

The descriptive-evaluative method of research was used to evaluate the content of the written inter-office as to clarity, conciseness, accuracy, organization, and mechanics.

The variables of this study composed of the input, process, and output variables.

### **Input Variable**

Inter-Office Communications in all Colleges, the Graduate School and the Office of the President in the UEP-Main Campus. The analysis of inter-office communications sent by identified offices in the study was determined by nature, direction, form, and purpose of the communication.

### **Process Variable**

Evaluative Analysis of the Inter-Office Communications. The analysis of the inter-office communications of all colleges and selected offices in the UEP-Main Campus pertains to the assessment on the office communication as regards clarity, conciseness, accuracy, organization, and mechanics.

### **Output Variable**

Strengthened Administrative Communication. This will be the output of this study to strengthen the effectiveness of the inter-office communication and management technique within the University of Eastern Philippines as an organization.

The object of analysis of this study included samples of inter-office communications from the University Management Centre headed by the Office of the President, the nine (9) colleges of the University, namely: the College of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Natural Resources (CAFNR), College of Arts and Communication (CAC), College of Business Administration (CBA), College of Education (COEd), College of Engineering (CE), College of Nursing and Allied Health Sciences (CNAHS), College of Science (CS), College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM), and the Graduate School. This was for a total of eleven (11) offices of the UEP-Main Campus.

In the University of Eastern Philippines, special orders and memoranda usually come from the Office of the President.

For data on the number of written inter-office communications, frequency counts, and percentages were used.

To analyze and interpret the facts from the gathered data, the indicators for the variables involved were subjected to scoring and interpretation using the 5-point Likert Scale and were treated using the weighted mean.

To find the significant difference and level of effectiveness, the F-test one-way ANOVA was used.

## **4. Findings**

### **Content of Written Communications**

It presents the content of written communications sent to offices in UEP main campus as to nature, direction, form, and purpose.

Only four (4) come from the colleges. Special orders issued by a college usually partakes the nature of a designation of a faculty as Department Chair or as Officer-in-charge in the college in the absence of the Dean. Letters come from different units and/or offices of the different colleges, and from offices of the Vice-Presidents.

The population of this study involved the University Management Centre headed by the Office of the President and the nine (9) colleges of the University: the College of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Natural Resources (CAFNR), College of Arts and Communication (CAC), College of Business Administration (CBA), College of Education (COEd), College of Engineering (CE), College of Nursing and Allied Health Sciences (CNAHS), College of Science (CS), College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM), and the Graduate School.

Written inter-office communications, namely: two (2) special order, two (2) memoranda, and two (2) letters, which are classified as outgoing from the above-mentioned offices during the school year 2016-2017 were included in this study.

There was complete enumeration of colleges and offices that issue special orders. The representative samples of written communications in the identified colleges were taken.

The study was limited only to offices that issue special orders and memoranda.

The research instrument used was partly structured by the researcher and the rubric was patterned from the Anderson's Analytic Scoring from Arthur Hughes' Testing for Language Teachers (UK: Cambridge Univ Press, 2003)

The instrument was composed of three (3) parts. The first part focused on the content of the written communications as regards to nature, direction, form, and purpose of the communication. The second part analyzes the inter-office communications in terms of clarity, conciseness, accuracy, organization, and mechanics. The third part dealt on the communication barriers of the inter-office communications in the UEP-Main Campus.

Special orders are office communication which are routinary issuances by the heads of offices most of which come from the Office of the President as they are usually creations of committees, designations as officers-in-charge (if coming from both Offices of The President and The Deans), designations as Deans (if coming from the Office of the President), and designations as Advisers of organizations in the different departmental units (if coming from the deans). These SOs indicate the effectivity and the duration of the designations.

Memoranda are office communications which are directives which usually are reminders, and policies most of which emanate from the Office of the President on the University-wide level, and some from the Deans or heads of offices of the different unit levels.

Letters are basic office communications which are in the form of request, inquiry, acknowledgement, complaint, and thanks.

#### **Nature of Communication**

Findings show that 22 or 33.33% were special orders, memoranda and letters, each in offices and colleges.

This shows that by nature, the memoranda, special orders and letters are identified inter-office communications as the objects of analysis in the evaluation.

#### **Direction**

Findings show that 43 or 65.55% were downward communications, consisting of special orders and memoranda; 22 or 33.33% were upward communications consisting mostly of letters and memoranda, one (1) or 1.52% was horizontal communication consisting of a letter.

By direction, most communications are downward considering that they are memoranda and special orders which are usually issued by the head or manager of the office.

#### **Form**

Findings show that 30 or 45.55% were semi-block; 20 or 30.30% were modified block; 13 or 19.20% were square-block; 3 or 4.55% were full block.

While the inter-office communications were written in varied, most were in semi-block form.

It means that the semi-block is the usually preferred form of writing as it is easy to write.

#### **Purpose**

Findings show that 21 or 31.85% were orders and compliances; 12 or 18.18% were requests and proposals; 11 or 16.67% were designations and directives; 8 or 12.12% were reminders; 6 or 9.10% were information/report; 2 or 3.03% were endorsements; one (1) or 1.51% was acknowledgement; one (1) or 1.51% was coordination; and 1 or 1.51% was letter of thanks. Most of the inter-office communications were intended to give orders and compliance, considering that they are special orders and memoranda coming from the offices of the President and the deans.

The findings particularly on special orders and memoranda are affirmed by Rogers and Rogers (1976) principle that communication is highly structured and generally can be said that the structure frames and guides communication flows. Findings on direction of communication are affirmed by Tendero's principle on administrative communication that communication flows on a direction, serves purpose and follows form. Leveriza also emphasized that channels of communication have an effect upon the performance and morale of the organization.

#### **Analysis of Inter-Office Communications**

It presents the analysis of office communications in terms of clarity, conciseness, accuracy, organization, and mechanics.

#### **Clarity**

The researcher and the two evaluators indicated that inter-office communication in the form of special orders were very much clear with a grand mean of 4.62; memoranda were very clear with a grand mean of 4.41; and letters are very much clear with a grand mean or 4.45.

It can be inferred that all inter-office communications especially special orders were very much clear which means that they consistently use specific direct expression of ideas; structures and vocabulary are simple and appropriate.

#### **Conciseness**

The researcher and the two evaluators assessed that special orders were very much concise with a grand mean of 4.30; letters were very much concise with a grand mean of 4.42. It can be inferred that among the inter-office communications which were evaluated, special orders came out to be very much concise among the others which were also very much concise.

#### **Accuracy**

Special orders were very much accurate with a grand mean of 4.25; followed by memoranda which are only much accurate.

Special orders were the highest level of accuracy compared to memoranda and letters which only came out to be much accurate because the process barriers and semantic barriers mostly occurred in memoranda and letters.

#### **Organization**

With a grand mean of 4.64, special orders were rated very much organized; memoranda, very much organized with a grand mean of 4.52 and letters, very much organized with a grand mean of 4.59. Special orders came out as very much organized among the 3 types of inter-office communication.

#### **Mechanics**

Mechanics in special orders was very much observed with a grand mean of 4.27; memoranda were very much observed with a grand mean of 4.21 and letters only much observed with a grand mean of 4.12.

#### **Barriers in Inter-Office Communications**

It presents the types of inter-office communication barriers in terms of process and semantic.

#### **Process Barriers**

As regards process barriers, table 1a shows that out of 27 identified barriers, comprising of four (4) memoranda, four (4) special orders, and 19 letters 10 or 30.0 percent were on capitalization, three (3) or 11 percent were on mechanics, one (1) or 3.7 percent was in spelling, seven (7) or 25.8 percent in punctuation and six (6) or 22.3 percent on diluted words.

#### **Semantic barriers**

On semantic barriers, there were 10 or 21.7 percent in redundancy which were found in three (3) in memoranda, 5 in special orders and 2 in letters.

There were 71 or 71.7 percent in the wrong use of words and 3 or 6.6 percent on the use of wrong articles.

### **Personal Barriers**

People tend to react in different ways to the same cause based on their personal experiences, habits, and interpretation abilities (Szilagui and Wallace, 1990, Organizational Behavior and Performance). These barriers did not reflect in the sample communication because this may only surface out of a personal interview asking the respondent as he/she had experienced communication situation where personal experiences and interpretation abilities may play part of the barrier.

### **Physical Barriers**

Lack of adequate time is another issue that would cause problem for effective communication. Time is always short and this fact leads to distorted communication: A great challenge when pressed for time would be to overlook formal communication channels (Szilagui and Wallace, 1990)

### **Level of Effectiveness of Inter-Office Communications**

Table 4 presents the level of effectiveness of inter-office communication in terms of clarity, conciseness, accuracy, organization, and mechanics were found to be very much effective with special orders having the highest grand mean of 4.47 and the memoranda and letters with the same grand means of 4.27.

Findings confirm Sidick (2012) that planning, organizing, leading, and controlling are not possible without written communication which is effective communication significant for managers.

A communication becomes effective when it is clear, concise, accurate, well-organized, and follows the rules in mechanics in writing.

### **Significant Difference in the Inter-Office Communications Among Colleges and Offices**

To test the significant difference in the inter-office communications among colleges and selected offices, the F-test one-way-ANOVA was used.

### **Special Orders**

Table 5.1 presents the result of the F-test analysis in terms of clarity, conciseness, accuracy, organization, and mechanics. In terms of clarity, the Graduate School and the College of Law got a perfect mean of 5.0, while the College of Agriculture having the lowest mean of 4.1.

The result revealed that in clarity, the computed F-value of 2.14 was greater than the critical value of 2.00. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the research hypothesis that there was a significant difference among the colleges and selected offices. Two offices had higher means when compared to a certain college which had the lowest means. This means that these two offices had observed clarity in their communication. There was also a significant difference among the different colleges and offices of the University in terms of conciseness, accuracy, organization, and mechanics as reflected in the F-values and F-critical values found in the ANOVA table.

### **Significant Difference**

There were significant differences in the inter-office communications particularly in the writing of special orders, letters, and memoranda. Colleges and offices differed in their levels of effectiveness. While some wrote very much clear special order, their performance/ratings were not consistently high in other indicators/qualities of a written communication. This means that they were not totally adept in writing inter-office communications as they excelled only in one or two qualities. This is one thing that is wanting among managers who have little knowledge and/or training in writing communications. This is one dark area in management that needs to be illuminated as this is at times taken for granted with the excuse that for as long as it is understood by the readers, there is no more need to observe the rules governing writing. The weakness may be attributed to the fact that some managers are not English majors. But it behooves upon any administrator/manager to be able to toe the line and exert effort in learning the duties and responsibilities which includes writing of effective inter-office communications.

Much remains to be done. So the researcher expects and hopes that this finding will serve as an eye-opener to administrators/managers for possible immediate remediation of their inadequacies especially along written communications. It can be inferred that the Graduate School and the College of Law produced the most clear special orders.

On accuracy the College of Law got the highest mean of 5.0. The College of Veterinary Medicine had the lowest mean of 3.5.

It is inferred that the college of Law wrote special orders that were very accurate.

On organization, the Graduate School, College of Education and College of Education all got a mean of 5.0 while the College of Science got the lowest mean of 4.1. The colleges who got the highest mean of 5.0 in organization are inferred to have very well-organized special orders.

Along mechanics the Office of the President and the College of Education both got a mean of 5.0 while the College of Law got a lower mean of 3.6. This indicates that the Office of the President and the College of Education had no errors in punctuation or spelling and used the technical style of writing and rules that govern the composition of S.O.

### **Memoranda**

Findings show that the Graduate School and the College of Education both got a grand mean of 5.0, while the College of Agriculture had the lowest mean of 3.8.

This infers that the Graduate School and the College of Education had written memoranda which were very much clear while the College of Agriculture had only much clear memoranda.

On conciseness, the College of Business Administration got a grand mean of 5.0 in this area while the College of Nursing, Engineering, and Agriculture have a mean of 3.6

only. The CBA stood out as having written very much concise memoranda while the CN, CE and CA were only much concise.

As regards accuracy, the College of Business Administration had a grand mean of 4.6 while the CVM had a grand mean of 3.3. This indicates that memoranda written by this college were very much accurate; the CVM wrote memoranda which were just averagely accurate.

On organization, the COED and the Office of the President got a grand mean of 5.0, while the colleges of Law and Nursing got a grand mean of 3.8. Those offices wrote very much organized memoranda but the COED and OP topped them all.

On mechanics, the COED and the CBA got a grand mean of 4.6, while the CL and the CN got a grand mean of 3.5. This indicates that these two colleges observed very much the mechanics of writing memoranda while CL and CN just observed moderately the mechanics.

#### Letters

The OP and the CL got a grand mean of 5.0 on clarity of their letters, while the CAC, CA, and CN only got a grand mean of 4.0. This means that they wrote letters that were very much clear. Colleges with lower rate mean that they wrote only letters that were much clear.

On conciseness, the GS and the CL got a grand mean of 5.0, while the CAC only got a grand mean of 3.5. It indicates that the GS and the CL wrote very much concise letters while the CAC was only much concrete. The business letter is easy to understand if it is clear. Completeness is one of the essentials of clearness. (Queri, 2008 and Vicente, et al., 1976)

As regards accuracy, only the Office of the President got a grand mean of 4.5. The CAC got only a mean of 2.8. The OP wrote very much accurate letters while the CAC wrote letters which were averagely accurate.

On organization, the OP, CL, and CE got a grand mean of 5.0; while the COED and CN got a grand mean of 4.1. Having a highest grand mean means that those offices had very much organized letters.

On mechanics, the OP and the CE got a grand mean of 4.6; while CAC got a grand mean of 3.3. The OP and the CE observed very much the mechanics of writing letters. It can be gleaned from the summary table that the offices and colleges had the highest ratings in the nature and qualities of the inter-office communications.

#### Inputs to Strengthening Administrative Communications

Considering the important role played by written communication in the administration of public offices, programs, and projects or activities specifically in planning, deciding, directing, and controlling, all of these issues are put in written form. But when they are not made clear, they can cause confusions, misconceptions, disunity and dissatisfaction.

For a manager to get his/her message across writing, a thorough knowledge of the style, rules and mechanics of a written communication is a must as they can lead to understanding and facilitative interaction between the manager and the people s/he manages. To avoid breakdown of inter-office communication as a result of poor management, an In-Service Training on Writing Inter-Office Communications must be conducted among managers and secretaries in the university with emphasis on the mechanics, barriers, and the elements where they are weak because they have little or no knowledge/awareness of them.

Experts in administrative communication can come to the rescue by printing a Resource Guide or module and Test Bank as useful aids and supplements in writing inter-office communications.

## **5. Conclusions and Implications**

By nature, memoranda, special orders and letters are common and inherent in offices as an interpersonal exchange of information and understanding. By direction most communications are downward considering that they are memoranda and special orders which are usually issued by the head or manager of the office. While the inter-office communications were written in varied, most were in semi-block form.

On purpose, most of the inter-office communications were intended to give orders and compliance, considering that they are special orders and memoranda coming from the offices of the President and the deans.

All inter-office communications especially special orders were very much clear which means they consistently use specific direct expression of ideas; structures and vocabulary are simple and appropriate. Among the inter-office communications which were evaluated, special orders came out to be very much concise among the others which were also very much concise.

Special orders was the highest level of accuracy compared to memoranda and letters which only came out to be much accurate.

Special orders came out as very much organized among the three (3) types of inter-office communication. This means that they are highly organized with clear progression of ideas, well-linked. It contains the what, why, when, where, and how information.

The writing of special orders had very much observed the mechanic because it has standard form so with memoranda but with letters, errors in capitalization, spelling, punctuation, spacing, wrong abbreviations, apostrophe lowered its grand.

On barriers of inter-office communications, there were more semantic barriers than process barriers. From the three types of inter-office communications, it can be inferred that special orders have the highest level of effectiveness. The Graduate School and the College of Law produced the most clear special orders. These three colleges were very concise in their SOs. The college of Law wrote special orders that

were very accurate. The colleges who got the highest mean of 5.0 in organization had very well-organized special orders.

This indicates that the Office of the President and the College of Education had no errors in punctuation or spelling and used the technical style of writing and rules that govern the composition of S.O. The Graduate School and the College of Education wrote memoranda which were very much clear while the College of Agriculture had only much clear memoranda. The CBA stood out as having written very much concise memoranda while the CN, CE and CA were only much concise. This indicates that memoranda written by this college was very much accurate; the CVM wrote memoranda which were just averagely accurate.

Those offices wrote very much organized memoranda but the COED and OP topped them all. This indicates that these two colleges observed very much the mechanics of writing memoranda while CL and CN just observed moderately the mechanics. This means that they wrote letters that were very much clear. Colleges with lower rates mean that they wrote only letters that were much clear. This indicates that the GS and the CL wrote very much concise letters while the CAC, only much concrete. The OP wrote very much accurate letters while the CAC wrote letters which were averagely accurate.

Having a highest grand mean means that those offices had very much organized letters. The OP and the CE observed very much the mechanics of writing letters.

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions are hereby drawn: Special orders and memoranda form integral part of inter-office communication. This implies that the special orders, memoranda, and letters can help managers and employees perform their jobs and responsibilities effectively. As pointed by Sidick effective communication is a building block of successful organization.

A majority of the direction of office communications are downward. Downward communication is essential for managers to be able to communicate and inform his/her employees of rules/policies for implementation and compliance.

Semi-block is the most common form used in the office communication. Most heads and employees find the semi0block as the most convenient and easy form of writing communications. They must have gotten used to it already.

Most of the inter-office communication in the University emanate from the managers. Inter-office communications which come from the head imply that it is intended to effect change and to influence action for the welfare of the organization.

Inter-office communications from the head office are clearly written like the special orders which have already a standard format. Inter-office communications which are clear are easily understood as they are complete in important details like the special orders.

Special orders are very much concisely written which means that they consistently avoid wordy phrases, redundancies, and repetitions of ideas so the content is understood more easily. This implies that special orders in UEP have the art of saying a thing in as few words as possible using direct statements, exacts words.

As to the facts given special orders are very much correct or accurate. They are very much correct/accurate as they conform to the standards. Unlike memoranda and letters which adhere to the style and purpose of the writer which are varied depending on the situations.

All types of inter-office communications are easy to organize with the special orders as the easiest to organize with the use of specific concrete words. This implies that the writers follow logical organization in writing special orders, memoranda, and letters.

More errors in mechanics are apparent in letter writing. It means that standard or accepted rules that govern the composition writing are not observed or followed. Errors in inter-office communications are committed because some writers do not know/observe the mechanics in letter writing. Less mistakes are expected in memoranda and special orders as they have standard format to follow.

Barriers do exist in inter-office communications. Inter-office communications cannot be effective if there are barriers as they interfere with the accurate terms – mission or reception of a message.

Communications that follow standard form are effective, as errors are very minimal if not totally eradicated. Effective communication is significant for managers in the organizations so as to perform the basic function of management.

The Graduate School and the College of Law have SOs that are easily understood. It implies that these offices use simple, exact language and words which are generally found in vocabulary of the reader.

The special orders in these colleges are not wordy and state the very message of the letter. This implies that special orders should be direct to the point and does not allow the read to read in between the lines.

They are aware of the rules in writing S.O.s that are accurate. It implies that their S.O.s are using words that can easily be understood.

It surely contains answers to the 5Wh and 1H in writing special orders. This means that those colleges consider all information needed for this particular writing to establish goodwill.

Easy reading is attained with the use of proper mechanics. This implies that colleges with high mean ratings have thorough knowledge on the mechanics in writing S.O.

Colleges and office differ in writing memoranda. Some are very good at it while others are just on the average. This implies that not all colleges and offices have the ability to write memoranda which are very much clear.

Only one of the colleges/offices wrote memoranda that avoided wordy phrases, redundancies, and repetition of content. This implies that the content of the CBA memoranda was understood more easily but those in the three colleges have errors in wordiness. This implies that the content of the CBA memoranda was understood more easily but those in the three colleges have errors in wordiness.

The CBA is consistent in using specific direct expression of ideas and their structures and vocabulary are simple and appropriate for a memorandum. Only one college is accurate in writing memoranda. The rest are only averagely accurate.

These offices have much organized memoranda. It implies that their memoranda are highly organized with clear progression of ideas. Few noticeable lapses are seen in punctuation and spelling. The COED and the CBA have working knowledge on the mechanics in writing memoranda compared to other colleges.

Their structures and vocabulary are simple and appropriate. These colleges are very good at writing clear letters. The content of their letters has no wordy phrases and redundancies so they are easy to understand. Only two colleges excel in writing very much concise letters.

The OP write letters that are direct to the point and the content is very much understood by the readers. The colleges are never very much accurate in writing letters. They are considered as educated nature letter writers. More colleges/offices are very good in writing very much organized letters. Their letters are well-linked and have clear progression of ideas. This is reflective of the kind of manager the office/college has.

## 6. Recommendations

In the light of the findings of this study and the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are hereby advanced:

- 1.1 Issuance of special orders, memoranda, and letters should be regularly maintained.
- 1.2 Managers must establish downward channels of communication through which information commands can flow.
- 1.3 Standard form of communication must be used in inter-office communication.
- 1.4 Issuance of memoranda, special orders must be done as frequent as possible for colleges and units to function internally and to keep posted with the events in the university. Employees may as well be encouraged to write the President about anything that will reward to better service and progress of the University.
- 2.1 Maintain the observance of clarity in inter-office communication.
- 2.2 Conciseness in writing inter-office communication must be consistently adhered to
- 2.3 To be safe in writing communication, follow a standard.

- 2.4 Use of a good outline to achieve orderly and logical structure in writing.
- 2.5 Written communications have to be reviewed and revised many times to ensure that the rules are followed for full comprehension of the ideas by the researcher.
3. Management awareness of these barriers is a good start to improve the communication process.
4. Managers of offices and deans of colleges should identify the communication needs of their employees for them to be able to conceptualize and develop strategies that will make them better if not effective in both written and oral communication.
5. Colleges/offices who have low means in clarity may take a look at the special orders of the Graduate School and the College which will serve as samples/models of how special orders are written.
6. Colleges which were rated low in conciseness should study/learn its indicators.
7. Colleges should adopt the message and language of the S.O. to the ideas and points of view of the reader.

## References

- [1] \_\_\_\_\_. (1998). The Pfeiffer Library. Volume 25. Second Edition. California, United States: Jossey Bass/Pfeiffer.
- [2] \_\_\_\_\_. (2012). Careers in Public Administration. Retrieved from <http://www.work.chron.com/careers-public-administration-4121.html> on February 3, 2017.
- [3] \_\_\_\_\_. (2012). Importance of Communication in Public Administration. Retrieved from <http://www.woman.thenest.com/importance-communication-public-administration-21640.html> on February 3, 2017.
- [4] \_\_\_\_\_. Theory-Based Approaches and Evaluation Concepts and Practices. Retrieved from [http://www.canada.ca/en/treasury\\_board\\_secretariat/services/audit\\_evaluation/centre\\_excellence\\_evaluation/theory-based-approaches-evaluation-concepts-practices.html](http://www.canada.ca/en/treasury_board_secretariat/services/audit_evaluation/centre_excellence_evaluation/theory-based-approaches-evaluation-concepts-practices.html) on February 3, 2017.
- [5] Aldag, R. J. and Brief, A. P. (1961). Managing Organizational Behavior. Minnesota, United States: West Publishing Company.
- [6] Anderson, John and Dale A. Level (1980). The Impact of Certain Types of Downward Communications on Job Performance. Journal of Business Communication.
- [7] Bell, Arthur H. and Smith, Dayle M. (1999). Management Communication. New York, USA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- [8] Armen, A. (2012). Quotes of Communication in Business. Retrieved from <http://www.anniearmen.com/2012/02/20/quotes-on-communication-in-business.html> on February 3, 2017.
- [9] Australian Research Center for Administrative Communication. (2013). Administrative Language as a Barrier. Sydney, Australia: Australian Research Center.
- [10] Berger, B. (2008). Employee/Organizational Communications. New York, United States: Spring Publishing House, Inc.
- [11] Bulkley, N. S. (2016). "Email and Output: Communication Effects on Productivity". Unpublished Dissertation, University of Michigan.



- [12] Day, D. V. and Lord, R. G. (1988). "Executive Leadership and Organizational Performance". Journal of Management. Volume 14.
- [13] Flippo, Edwin B. (1984). Personnel Management. Sixth Edition. New York, United States: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- [14] Follet, M. P. (1999). Freedom and Coordination. London, United Kingdom, Management Publications Trust.
- [15] Forster, E. M. (2006). "Written Communication". Retrieved from <http://www.rahulgladwin.com/noteblog/business/BC/types-of-business-communication-within-an-organization.php> on December 20, 2016.
- [16] Fulk, J. and Mani, S. (2006). "Distortion of Communication in Hierarchical Relationships". Communication Yearbook. Ninth edition. California, United States: ML McLaughlin and Sage Publications.
- [17] Gabriel, R. L. (2012). "Organizational Communication, Bridging the Gap Between Managers and Employees". A Thesis in Communication and Leadership Styles, Gonzaga University.
- [18] George, C. S. Jr. (1964). Management for Business and Industry. New Edition. New Jersey, United States: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- [19] Gosh, A. K. (2006). Effective Business Communication. Tenth Edition. New Jersey, United States: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- [20] Gupta, C. B. (2009). Management Theory and Practice. New India, India: Sultan Chad and Sons.
- [21] Hayase, L. K. T. (2009). Internal Communication in Organizations and Employee Engagement. University of Nevada, Las Vegas. *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. Paper 1176.
- [22] Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. (1980). Technical Writing. Revised Edition. Quezon City, Philippines: Ken Incorporated.
- [23] Igoy, J. I., et al. (2001). Enhancing Technical Writing Skills. Makati City, Philippines: Grandwater Publications and Research Corporation.
- [24] Johnson, J. D., Donohue, W. A., Atkin, C. K., and Johnson, S. (2001). "Communication, Involvement, and Perceived Innovativeness". Group and Organizational Management.
- [25] Kohn, M. (1977). Dynamic-Managing: Principles, Process, and Practice. California, United States: Cummings Publishing Company, Inc.
- [26] Kreitner, R. and Kinicki, A. (2007). Organizational Behavior. Seventh Edition. New York, United States: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- [27] Lau, B. James (1975). Behavior in Organization: An Experimental Approach. Homewood, Illinois: The Erwin Series in Management and the Behavioral Science. Richard D. Erwin
- [28] Leveriza, J. P. (2006). Human Behavior in Organization: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach. Mandaluyong City, Philippines: National Book Store Company.
- [29] McMaster, M. D. and Grinder, J. (1980). "The Art of Communicating". Administrative Management. Volume 41.
- [30] Mehra, S. (1979). "Who Controls the Medium". Development Communication Report. Number 28.
- [31] Montana, P. and Charnov, B. (1993). "Management: A Streamlined Course on Students and Business". New York, United States: Business Review Series. Retrieved from [http://www.ils.unc.edu/Daniel/405/Montana\\_II.pdf](http://www.ils.unc.edu/Daniel/405/Montana_II.pdf) on February 3, 2017.
- [32] Montana, P. J. and Charon, B. H. (2008). Management. Fourth Edition. New York, United States: Barron's Educational Series, Inc.
- [33] Mpunga, J. B. (2014). Exploring Barriers to Effective Communication in Public Institutions". A Dissertation in Human Resource Management, Mzumbe University.
- [34] Nem Singh, R. P. and Calixihan, J. A. (1992). English for College. Mandaluyong City, Philippines, National Bookstore, Inc.
- [35] Opperman, Y. (2007). "An Internal Communication Assessment of the George Municipality". University of South Africa, South Africa. *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. Paper 1761.
- [36] Paasivaara, M. (2015). "Communication Practices in Inter-Organizational Product Development". Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Helsinki University of Technology, Espoo, Finland. *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. Paper 2118.
- [37] Queri, A. R., et al. (2008). Good Business English. Malabon City, Philippines: JIMCY Publishing House.
- [38] Robbins, Stephen (1989). Organizational Behavior Concepts, Controversies and Applications. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. International Editions, a division of Simon and Schuster, Inc. Fourth ed.
- [39] Roberts, K. H. and O'Reilly, Charles A. III. (1974). "Measuring Organizational Communications". Journal of Applied Psychology. Volume 59, Number 3.
- [40] Sandagan, L. D. (2016). Reading and Writing Skills. Pasay City, Philippines: JFS Publishing Services.
- [41] Sidick, Y. M. (2012). Communication in Public Administration. New Jersey, United States: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- [42] Simpson, Richar L. (1958), Vertical and Horizontal Communication in Formal Organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
- [43] Suresh, Kalyani. (2003). Journalism and Mass Communications.
- [44] Szilagui, D. Anrew and Mare J. Wallace (1990). Organizational Behavior and Performance. Glenview; Illinois; Scott, Foresman and Co.
- [45] Sypher, B. D. and Zorn, T. E. Jr. (1986). "Communication-Related Abilities and Upward Mobility: A Longitudinal Investigation". Human Communication Research. New York, United States: Spring Publishing House, Inc.
- [46] Tenedero, A. P. (2000). "Administrative Communication". Theory and Practice of Public Administration in the Philippines. Metro Manila: FAFI.
- [47] Terrapin Adventures. (2012). Tips to Improve Office Communication. New Jersey, United States: Prentice Hall, Inc.

- [48] Tramp, G. (2017). Communication Helps Persuade Decision Makers to Enact Change and Disseminate Information. New Jersey, United States: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- [49] Vicente, Soria, and Mogol.(1986). Technical Writing. Manila, Philippines: Technology Supply, Inc.
- [50] Willyard, K. Theories of Rationality, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Control in Organization.Retrieved from <http://www.katewillyard.com/academic-blog/theories-of-rationality-effectiveness-efficiency-and-control-in-organization.html> on February 3, 2017.
- [51] Winnett, A. (2014). Vital Steps for Effective Communications.Retrieved from <http://www.hodu.com> on February 3, 2017.
- [52] Wood, Bandura, and Bailey.(1988). A Research Report Supported by University of New South Wales Research Board Grant and by Public Health Research Grant.MH-5162-25.

