



Enhancing University Administration and Communication Channels in Ghana: Keys to Higher Education Success

Michael B. Adusei Poku

C. K. Tedam University of Technology & Applied Sciences, Navrongo

Corresponding Author : Michael B. Adusei Poku, E-mail : micky15151@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
<p>Received: 2023-02-20 Accepted: 2023-04-07 Volume: 3 Issue: 1 DOI: https://doi.org/10.53754/civilofficium.v3i1.393</p>	<p>This study investigates the administration and communication channels in Ghanaian universities, employing a qualitative research approach with a case study methodology, aiming to identify how administrative structures and communication effectiveness impact university goals; the findings reveal that strong, well-structured communication channels significantly enhance both academic performance and administrative efficiency, leading to the conclusion that improved communication practices are crucial for the overall success of university operations in Ghana.</p>
<p>KEYWORDS Administration, Channel, Communication, Education, University</p>	

1. INTRODUCTION

Universities in Ghana play a crucial role in achieving national development, cultivating cultured citizens, and promoting basic research. They transmit knowledge and train human minds. However, the attainment of these goals is often hindered by existing administrative structures, which can impact the operational effectiveness and academic performance of universities.[1]

In an ideal scenario, university administration should create an environment conducive to teaching and research. Effective administrative structures provide conditions that allow universities to flourish in teaching and research, whereas poor administration can undermine these aspects. One key characteristic of successful universities is having effective communication channels. Good academic performance consists of a series of interconnected processes that result in effective academic output.[2]

Several previous studies have highlighted the importance of effective communication channels in universities. University administration and communication channels play a crucial role in academic environments. Research across different countries highlights the importance of diverse communication methods in universities. These include formal channels like academic boards and newsletters, as well as informal ones such as social activities and mentoring.[3]. Effective communication systems contribute to a collaborative work environment and enhance academic productivity.[4] However, studies in Kenya and Ghana reveal that many universities rely on traditional communication methods like memos and notice boards, recommending the adoption of modern channels such as email for improved efficiency.[5] In Nigeria, universities are seen as vital for national development and cultural promotion, emphasizing the need for effective administration and communication to achieve these goals.[6] Overall, these studies underscore the significance of diverse and efficient communication channels in university management and academic success.

However, there are still shortcomings in the administrative and communication systems in many Ghanaian universities. The complex organizational structures, participatory decision-making, centralization of authority, and high levels of formalization can hinder the flow of effective communication. Often, communication between the governing council and faculty is mediated solely through the vice-chancellor, which, while efficient, is not always effective in enhancing mutual understanding. Furthermore, the lack of response from administrators when staff members convey information or problems can obstruct upward communication flow.

This research introduces a novel approach by combining organizational communication theories, transaction cost analysis, and relational contracting theory to provide a comprehensive picture of communication and information flows within university organizations. By examining the frequency, directionality, and formality of communication flows, this study aims to identify factors influencing opportunistic behavior and communication satisfaction. The objective of this study is to evaluate the administrative structures and communication channels in Ghanaian universities and their impact on achieving university goals. By identifying weaknesses in the existing system and offering recommendations for improvement, this research aims to enhance the operational effectiveness of universities.

This research is important because universities play a key role in national development through education and research. Ensuring effective communication channels within universities is essential for achieving educational and operational goals. This study will provide valuable insights for policymakers and university administrators in designing and implementing better administrative structures and communication channels, ultimately improving the academic and operational performance of universities in Ghana.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

University Administration

University administration encompasses the employees responsible for maintaining and supervising the various operations within the institution. This includes tasks such as planning, organizing, directing, controlling, and evaluating the activities of major units within the university. Effective administration is crucial for the success of universities as it provides the conditions necessary for teaching and research to thrive. The structure of university administration can vary greatly, from highly centralized systems where decisions are made by a few key individuals, to more decentralized systems where decision-making is distributed across various departments and units. The effectiveness of these administrative structures significantly impacts the university's ability to achieve its goals and objectives.[7]

Communication Channels

Communication channels are the means through which information is transmitted within an organization. In universities, these channels are essential for the coordination and execution of various functions. Effective communication channels ensure that information flows smoothly between different levels of the organization, from the governing council to the administration and faculty, and among peers. Channels can be formal, such as official meetings, emails, and reports, or informal, such as casual conversations and social media interactions. The quality of these communication channels affects the overall effectiveness of the organization, as they facilitate the exchange of ideas, feedback, and critical information necessary for decision-making and problem-solving.[8]

Education Success

Education success in universities is measured by the quality of teaching and research output. This success is heavily dependent on the administrative structures and communication channels in place. Effective administration and clear communication pathways contribute to a conducive learning environment, where faculty and students can engage in meaningful academic activities. Conversely, poor administration and ineffective communication can lead to misunderstandings, conflicts, and a decline in academic performance. The goal of university education is to develop well-rounded individuals who are equipped with the knowledge and skills needed to contribute to society. Achieving this goal requires a collaborative effort from all members of the university, supported by strong administrative and communication frameworks.[9]

The Role of Effective Communication in University Administration

Effective communication is a critical component of university administration. It ensures that all members of the university community are informed about policies, procedures, and changes that affect their roles and responsibilities. Good communication practices promote transparency and trust, which are essential for fostering a positive organizational culture. In the context of universities, effective communication involves not only the dissemination of information but also active listening and feedback mechanisms. This allows administrators to understand the needs and concerns of faculty, staff, and students, and to address them promptly and appropriately. The success of university administration thus relies heavily on the establishment of robust communication channels that facilitate open and honest dialogue.[10]

Challenges in University Communication Channels

Despite the importance of effective communication, many universities face challenges in maintaining efficient communication channels. Factors such as organizational complexity, bureaucratic procedures, and hierarchical structures can impede the flow of information. In some cases, communication is further hindered by a lack of responsiveness from administrators, which can lead to frustration and disengagement among staff and students. Additionally, the rapid advancement of technology and the increasing reliance on digital communication tools present both opportunities and challenges for universities. While these tools can enhance communication efficiency, they also require ongoing adaptation and management to ensure they are used effectively.[11]

Strategies for Improving Communication in Universities

To improve communication in universities, it is essential to adopt a multifaceted approach that addresses both structural and cultural aspects. This includes streamlining administrative processes, reducing unnecessary bureaucracy, and fostering a culture of openness and collaboration. Implementing regular training programs on effective communication skills for administrators and staff can also help to enhance overall communication quality. Additionally, leveraging technology to create more interactive and user-friendly communication platforms can facilitate better information exchange. By prioritizing effective communication, universities can create a more supportive and dynamic environment that enhances both teaching and research outcomes, ultimately contributing to the success of the institution.[12]

3. METHOD

This research employs a qualitative approach to explore the administration of universities and the effectiveness of communication channels within these institutions in Ghana. The qualitative method is chosen to gain in-depth insights into the complex dynamics and nuances of university administration and communication practices.[13] The primary sources of data include interviews with university administrators, faculty members, and students, as well as analysis of institutional documents such as policy manuals, meeting minutes, and organizational charts. Additionally, observations of administrative meetings and communication processes within the universities provide supplementary data. This approach allows for a comprehensive understanding of the various factors influencing communication effectiveness in university administration.[14]

The study focuses on three major public universities in Ghana, selected based on their size, diversity of programs, and administrative structures. Data collection spans a period of six months, from January to June 2024, ensuring that both regular and peak academic periods are covered. The data analysis involves coding and categorizing the collected data to identify recurring themes and patterns. This thematic analysis helps to uncover the strengths and weaknesses of current communication channels and administrative practices. By triangulating data from different sources, the study aims to provide robust and reliable findings that can inform improvements in university administration and communication strategies in Ghanaian universities.

4. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Communication channels are essential means through which people within an organization interact and exchange information. Careful consideration must be given to selecting appropriate channels for various tasks, as using inappropriate channels can lead to misunderstandings and negative consequences. For conveying complex messages, richer channels that allow for interactive communication are crucial to ensure clarity and understanding.[15]

These channels of communication can flow vertically from superiors to subordinates or horizontally among colleagues at the same hierarchical level. Organizations typically employ several types of communication channels: verbal, written, and non-verbal. Verbal communication involves spoken interactions in daily activities, often without a formal record unless documented in meetings or presentations.[16] On the other hand, written communication includes any form of written correspondence

such as letters, memos, and official notices. It allows for careful thought and editing before sending, making it a more formal means of communication suitable for policies, manuals, and announcements.[17]

Non-verbal communication, meanwhile, conveys messages through body language and facial expressions, expressing emotions like happiness, satisfaction, anger, worry, or fear. In the context of university administration, effective communication channels should encompass face-to-face interactions, group discussions, and organizational-level exchanges.[18]

Face-to-face communication is particularly valuable within universities as it allows for personal interaction and bidirectional flow of information. It enhances administrators' speaking, writing, and presentation skills while fostering rapport and trust. In-person interactions also enable the interpretation of non-verbal cues that might be missed in written communication. These interactions can occur in various settings such as speeches, team meetings, focus groups, and informal gatherings like brown bag lunches or social events.[19][20]

In the intricate landscape of university communication, both formal and informal channels play pivotal roles in facilitating effective information exchange and organizational cohesion. At the group level, within university settings, communication is instrumental for sharing information, discussing issues, solving problems, and building consensus among teams and employee groups. This level of communication fosters collaboration and synergy, enabling departments and units to align their efforts towards common goals and objectives. It empowers individuals within teams to contribute their perspectives and expertise, thereby enhancing decision-making processes and problem-solving capabilities.[21]

Conversely, at the organizational level, communication serves to convey the overarching vision, mission, policies, and strategic initiatives of the university. This communication typically follows a hierarchical cascade approach, where top-level administrators disseminate information downwards to their respective staff members. This structured approach ensures alignment with institutional goals and fosters a unified organizational culture. By articulating clear directives and objectives, formal communication channels such as circulars, board meetings, staff meetings, and departmental sessions uphold organizational integrity and enforce compliance with established policies and procedures.[22]

In contrast to formal channels, informal communication channels in universities emerge organically outside the formal hierarchical structures depicted in organizational charts. These informal channels, including casual gatherings like brown bag lunches, informal meetings with university leaders, and town hall sessions, serve as important conduits for fostering camaraderie, building trust, and facilitating open exchanges of information. They contribute to a relaxed and inclusive organizational climate where employees feel valued and connected beyond their immediate work responsibilities. This informal communication plays a critical role in complementing formal channels by addressing interpersonal dynamics and promoting social cohesion within the university community.[23]

Moreover, the advent of new technologies has revolutionized communication practices within universities, offering diverse platforms for both formal and informal interactions. Technologies such as email, social media platforms, blogs, podcasts, and video conferencing facilitate real-time communication and information sharing across different organizational levels and geographical locations. These tools enhance the speed and efficiency of communication, enabling administrators to reach wider audiences and engage stakeholders in interactive dialogues. However, while technology enhances accessibility and connectivity, its implementation requires careful consideration of data security, information governance, and the digital literacy skills of university staff and students.[24]

Furthermore, the role of university administrators in communication cannot be overstated. Administrators spend significant proportions of their time listening, writing, speaking, and reading, underscoring the multifaceted nature of their communication responsibilities. Effective listening, in particular, emerges as a cornerstone skill for administrators, essential for fostering employee morale, resolving conflicts, and nurturing collaborative relationships within the university community. Nonetheless, challenges persist, as many administrators may lack formal training in listening skills, highlighting the need for professional development initiatives that prioritize communication competence among university leaders.[25]

In conclusion, navigating the complex web of communication channels in universities demands a strategic approach that balances formal structures with informal interactions and leverages technological advancements to enhance connectivity and collaboration. By understanding the preferences of their audience, the complexity of their messages, and the dynamics of

organizational culture, university administrators can optimize communication channels to foster an inclusive and responsive environment that supports academic excellence and institutional success.[26]

University organizational structures should ideally support communication in four directions: downward, upward, horizontal, and vertical. Downward communication involves transmitting information from higher to lower levels within the university hierarchy, including directives, job instructions, policies, performance feedback, and socialization efforts.[27]

Upward communication, on the other hand, allows staff members to convey feedback, suggestions for improvement, performance reports, grievances, and financial information to higher-level administrators. Effective upward communication is crucial for fostering morale and ensuring that leadership is informed about organizational challenges and employee perceptions.[28]

Horizontal communication facilitates coordination and collaboration across departments or units within the university. This includes intra-departmental problem-solving, inter-departmental coordination for joint projects, and specialist advice to line departments. Horizontal communication channels are vital for enhancing organizational efficiency and ensuring cohesive efforts across diverse university functions.[29]

Vertical communication encompasses both downward and upward flows within the organizational hierarchy, while diagonal or omnidirectional communication occurs between employees at different levels and functions. Evolving university structures and technological advancements continually reshape communication dynamics, creating new opportunities and challenges for effective communication flow.[30]

External communication channels in universities involve interactions with stakeholders outside the organization, including other administrators, parents, government officials, community residents, and the media. These channels include websites, internet platforms, personal dialogues, events, seminars, media engagements, newsletters, direct mail, advertising, physical campus environments, and signage. Formal departments like public relations offices often manage these external communications to ensure consistent and effective messaging to external stakeholders.[31]

By understanding and optimizing these various communication channels, university administrators can enhance organizational effectiveness, promote a positive work environment, and foster meaningful interactions among all stakeholders within and outside the institution.

5. CONCLUSION

This study underscores the crucial role of communication channels within university administration, emphasizing both formal and informal channels alongside the integration of modern technologies. Effective communication channels such as face-to-face interactions, group communication, and horizontal communication are pivotal in enhancing employee engagement, reducing information barriers, and facilitating interdepartmental collaboration. The adoption of new technologies also presents promising avenues for improving organizational communication efficiency, though challenges related to information governance and security need careful consideration.

The strength of this study lies in its comprehensive analysis of various communication channels relevant to university administrators, coupled with a clear exposition of technology's role in this context. However, the study may benefit from a deeper exploration of the psychological impacts of different communication channels on employee satisfaction and team effectiveness. Furthermore, future research could expand by delving into cultural or environmental factors influencing communication preferences within university settings, thereby enriching our understanding of communication dynamics. By addressing these aspects, future efforts can better enhance communication practices in university environments, fostering a more collaborative and efficient work culture.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Modic and J. Suklan, "Multidimensional experience and performance of highly skilled administrative staff: Evidence from a technology transfer office," *Res. Policy*, vol. 51, no. 10, p. 104562, 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2022.104562>.
- [2] Y. Shen, "Harmonious passion and academic achievement in higher education: The mediating influence of exploratory

- and exploitative learning strategies,” *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 9, p. e29943, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29943>.
- [3] B. Uslu, “The components of communication systems in universities: their influence on academic work life,” *Tert. Educ. Manag.*, vol. 24, pp. 34–48, 2018, [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:149195189>
- [4] K. Di, R. Xu, Z. Liu, and R. Liu, “How do enterprises’ green collaborative innovation network locations affect their green total factor productivity? Empirical analysis based on social network analysis,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 438, p. 140766, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.140766>.
- [5] L. Mamuli, S. Mutsotso, and D. Namasaka, “The influence of communication channels on management practices in Kenyan public universities,” 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:220700442>
- [6] K. M. Badau, “Administration of universities and channels of communication in Nigeria,” *Open Access J.*, vol. 2, 2018, [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:189115383>
- [7] A. Bond, J. Pope, A. Morrison-Saunders, and F. Retief, “Exploring the relationship between context and effectiveness in impact assessment,” *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.*, vol. 97, p. 106901, 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2022.106901>.
- [8] W. Yang, L. Zhang, J. Shi, and R. Lin, “New consensus reaching process with minimum adjustment and feedback mechanism for large-scale group decision making problems under social trust networks,” *Eng. Appl. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 133, p. 108230, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2024.108230>.
- [9] J. Risien, K. Hoke, M. Storksdieck, C. Davis, and E. Klein, “A dynamic framework for making sense of partnerships between universities and informal education providers,” *Eval. Program Plann.*, vol. 100, p. 102328, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2023.102328>.
- [10] L. DeCaporale-Ryan, A. Warren, and A. M. Steffen, “7.25 - Interprofessional Teams and Psychology,” G. J. G. B. T.-C. C. P. (Second E. Asmundson, Ed., Oxford: Elsevier, 2022, pp. 385–401. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818697-8.00025-X>.
- [11] T. G. Mai, M. Nguyen, A. Ghobakhlou, W. Q. Yan, B. Chhun, and H. Nguyen, “Decoding a decade: The evolution of artificial intelligence in security, communication, and maintenance within the construction industry,” *Autom. Constr.*, vol. 165, p. 105522, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2024.105522>.
- [12] S. O. Baboolal and V. S. Singaram, “Implementation and Impact of an Adapted Digital Perioperative Competency-Building Tool to Enhance Teaching, Learning And Feedback in Postgraduate Competency-Based Medical Education,” *J. Surg. Educ.*, vol. 81, no. 5, pp. 722–740, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsurg.2024.01.015>.
- [13] R. M. Silverman and K. Patterson, *Qualitative research methods for community development*. Routledge, 2021.
- [14] J. S. O’Rourke, *Management communication: A case analysis approach*. Routledge, 2019.
- [15] Z. Altinay and N. Williams, “Visuals as a method of coastal environmental communication,” *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, vol. 178, p. 104809, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2019.05.011>.
- [16] S. F. Ely, J. R. Gill, J. Hayes, and J. Lucas, “Chapter 16 - Communication,” S. F. Ely and J. R. B. T.-P. of F. P. Gill, Eds., Academic Press, 2023, pp. 413–443. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-91796-4.00021-0>.
- [17] S. S. Gill *et al.*, “Modern computing: Vision and challenges,” *Telemat. Informatics Reports*, vol. 13, p. 100116, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teler.2024.100116>.
- [18] P. Chuenchum, C. Meneesrikum, C. Teerapanuchaikul, and A. Sriariyawat, “Community participation and effective water management: A study on water user organizations (WUOs) in Thailand,” *World Dev. Perspect.*, vol. 34, p. 100589, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wdp.2024.100589>.
- [19] O. Tuomainen, S. Rosen, L. Taschenberger, and V. Hazan, “The effects of informational and energetic/modulation masking on the efficiency and ease of speech communication across the lifespan,” *Speech Commun.*, vol. 162, p. 103101, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.specom.2024.103101>.
- [20] Y. Zhou and M. Papi, “The role of future L2 selves in L2 speech development: A longitudinal study in an instructional setting,” *System*, vol. 119, p. 103156, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103156>.
- [21] C. Maraveas, D. Konar, D. K. Michopoulos, K. G. Arvanitis, and K. P. Peppas, “Harnessing quantum computing for smart agriculture: Empowering sustainable crop management and yield optimization,” *Comput. Electron. Agric.*, vol. 218, p.

- 108680, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2024.108680>.
- [22] H. P. Tsai and D. R. Compeau, "Understanding and measuring formal communication quality for technology implementation: A test during the anticipation stage," *J. Strateg. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 30, no. 3, p. 101669, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2021.101669>.
- [23] I. Maya-Jariego *et al.*, "Teachers' personal network analysis reveals two types of pioneers in educational digitalization: Formal and informal intermediaries at schools," *Comput. Educ. Open*, vol. 4, p. 100137, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2023.100137>.
- [24] A. M. McCarthy, D. Maor, A. McConney, and C. Cavanaugh, "Digital transformation in education: Critical components for leaders of system change," *Soc. Sci. Humanit. Open*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 100479, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100479>.
- [25] V. Aryadoust, A. Zakaria, and Y. Jia, "Investigating the affordances of OpenAI's large language model in developing listening assessments," *Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 6, p. 100204, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100204>.
- [26] A. Sahin, G. Imamoglu, M. Murat, and E. Ayyildiz, "A holistic decision-making approach to assessing service quality in higher education institutions," *Socioecon. Plann. Sci.*, vol. 92, p. 101812, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2024.101812>.
- [27] "119th Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, Boston, Massachusetts, July 21-25, 2018," *Am. J. Pharm. Educ.*, vol. 82, no. 5, p. 7158, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7158>.
- [28] L. Geiger, C. P. Mastley, M. Thomas, and E. Rangel, "Academic libraries and DEI initiatives: A quantitative study of employee satisfaction," *J. Acad. Librariansh.*, vol. 49, no. 1, p. 102627, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2022.102627>.
- [29] J. Huang, J. Baptista, and S. Newell, "Communicational ambidexterity as a new capability to manage social media communication within organizations," *J. Strateg. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 49–64, 2015, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2015.03.002>.
- [30] S. E. Bibri, J. Huang, S. K. Jagatheesaperumal, and J. Krogstie, "The synergistic interplay of artificial intelligence and digital twin in environmentally planning sustainable smart cities: A comprehensive systematic review," *Environ. Sci. Ecotechnology*, vol. 20, p. 100433, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ese.2024.100433>.
- [31] T. G. Page, L. W. Capizzo, and T. Penning, "A case for the plausibility of public relations licensing: The carrot of privileged communication," *Public Relat. Rev.*, vol. 50, no. 1, p. 102408, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2023.102408>.



© 2021 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).