Research Article

Role of Workplace Communication Support in Job Satisfaction of Deaf Employees in Kochi

Dr. V.Sathiya[1] & Mrs. K.P.Simna[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Government Arts College, Dharmapuri (Deputed from Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu – 608002)
[2]Research Scholar, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu – 608 002

Abstract

Workplace communication is a crucial factor in enabling employees to understand job responsibilities, participate in organisational activities and maintain efficient relationships with supervisory personnel and co-workers. For deaf employees, communication accessibility barriers may occur when workplace work-related information is primarily delivered through verbal communication. The availability of appropriate communication support available can accordingly play a crucial role in workplace participation and job satisfaction. The present study examines the role of workplace communication support available in job satisfaction among deaf employees working in Kochi. The study adopts a descriptive research design and uses primary data collected through a structured questionnaire. A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed, of which 147 were collected. Among the collected questionnaires, 12 were rejected because they were not properly completed. Thus, 135 valid responses were considered for the final analysis. The study focuses on accessible written communication, visual work-related information, sign-language-related support whenever required, accessible meetings, digital communication and support from supervisory personnel and co-workers. Job satisfaction is considered the dependent variable. Appropriate statistical tools such as percentage analysis, mean, standard deviation, reliability analysis, correlation and regression can be applied to the valid responses.

Keywords: Deaf Employees, Workplace Communication Support, Job Satisfaction, Kochi, Inclusive workplace practices.

Introduction

Communication is essential for the efficient functioning of every organisation. Employees need communication to receive instructions, understand responsibilities, participate in meetings, exchange work-related information, receive feedback and maintain professional relationships. When communication is accessible, employees can participate more efficiently and perform their duties with greater confidence.

Deaf employees may experience difficulties when significant workplace work-related information is communicated primarily through spoken language. Meetings, training sessions, informal discussions, telephone communication and verbal instructions may create accessibility barriers when suitable alternatives are not delivered. Such accessibility barriers may affect participation, interaction and the overall workplace experience. Workplace communication support available refers to facilities and practices that enable employees with hearing disabilities to access and exchange work-related information. Written instructions, text messages, email, captions, visual notices, accessible digital communication, sign language interpretation when required, and supportive communication from supervisory personnel and co-workers are examples of such support.

Job satisfaction represents the extent to which employees feel positively about their job and work environment. It can be influenced by working conditions, supervision, recognition, relationships, fairness, development opportunities and organisational support. For deaf employees, accessible communication may be an essential component of an inclusive work environment.

Kochi is an essential employment and commercial centre in Kerala, with opportunities across healthcare, administration, education, retail, hospitality, services and other sectors. In such diverse workplaces, efficient communication accessibility can support the participation and inclusion of deaf employees. Accordingly, the present study focuses on deaf employees working in Kochi and examines the role of workplace communication support available in their job satisfaction.

Scope of the Study

The study focuses on deaf employees working in Kochi, Kerala. It examines workplace communication support available and job satisfaction among the respondents. The study covers communication involving supervisory personnel, co-workers, meetings, training programmes and digital communication. It provides insights into the importance of accessible workplace communication and inclusive employment practices for deaf employees in Kochi.

Statement of the Problem

Deaf employees may face communication accessibility barriers when workplace work-related information is delivered primarily through speech or when accessible alternatives are not consistently available. Difficulty in understanding instructions, participating in meetings, receiving feedback and interacting with colleagues may influence employees' workplace experience. Accordingly, it is significant to examine whether adequate workplace communication support available is associated with better job satisfaction among deaf employees working in Kochi.

Objectives of the Study

1. To assess the level of job satisfaction among deaf employees working in Kochi.
2. To examine the relationship between workplace communication support and job satisfaction.
3. To offer recommendations for improving communication accessibility and inclusive workplace practices for deaf employees in Kochi.

Research Methodology

Research Design

The study adopts a descriptive research design to describe workplace communication support available and job satisfaction and to examine the relationship between the two variables.

Study Area

The study was conducted among deaf employees working in different workplaces and employment sectors in Kochi, Kerala.

Population and Respondents

The study population consists of eligible deaf employees working in selected workplaces in Kochi. The final respondents are those who delivered usable and sufficiently completed questionnaires.

Sample Size and Data Collection

A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed. Of these, 147 questionnaires were collected. On scrutiny, 12 questionnaires were found to be inadequately completed and were rejected. The remaining 135 questionnaires were complete and usable and were included in the final analysis.

Sampling Technique

Purposive sampling may be reported where respondents were selected according to the eligibility criteria of the study. The researcher should retain the actual procedure followed during data collection.

Sources of Data

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire. Secondary work-related information may be obtained from verified academic and institutional sources related to deaf employees, workplace communication, disability inclusion and job satisfaction.

Statistical Tools

The collected data may be analysed using percentage analysis, mean, standard deviation, reliability analysis, correlation, regression and other appropriate statistical techniques. SPSS may be used for data processing and statistical analysis.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1 Age wise Distribution

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage
Below 25 years	51	37.78
25–34 years	42	31.11
35–44 years	24	17.78
45–54 years	11	8.15
55 years and above	7	5.19
Total	**135**	**100.00**

Source: Primary data

It is observed that the majority of the respondents (37.78 percent) are below 25 years, followed by 31.11 percent who are aged 25–34 years.

Table 2 Gender-wise of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	73	54.07
Female	62	45.93
Total	**135**	**100.00**

Source: Primary data

It is result that the majority of the respondents (54.07 percent) are male, while 45.93 percent are female.

Table No 3 Education qualification wise of respondents

Education	Frequency	Percentage
Higher Secondary	42	31.11
Diploma	34	25.19
Undergraduate Degree	11	8.15
Postgraduate Degree	27	20.00
Professional Qualification	11	8.15
Other	10	7.41
Total	**135**	**100.00**

Source: Primary data

It is observed that the majority of the respondents (31.11 percent) have completed Higher Secondary education, followed by 25.19 percent who have a Diploma.

Table 4 Marital status

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage
Married	56	41.48
Unmarried	79	58.52
Total	**135**	**100.00**

Source: Primary data

The analysis reveals that majority of the respondents (58.52 percent) are unmarried, while 41.48 percent are married.

Table No 5 Years of Work Experience

Years	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 1 year	59	43.70
1–3 years	22	16.30
4–6 years	27	20.00
7–10 years	22	16.30
Above 10 years	5	3.70
Total	**135**	**100.00**

Source: Primary data

It is observed that the majority of the respondents (43.70 percent) have less than 1 year of work experience, followed by 20.00 percent with 4–6 years of experience.

Table No 6 Employment Category

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage
Clinical / Healthcare Staff	13	9.63
Administrative Staff	30	22.22
Billing Staff	22	16.30
Laboratory / Diagnostic Staff	30	22.22
Pharmacy Staff	36	26.67
Housekeeping Staff	4	2.96
Total	**135**	**100.00**

Source: Primary data

The analysis reveals that majority of the respondents (26.67 percent) are Pharmacy Staff, followed by 22.22 percent each from Administrative Staff and Laboratory/Diagnostic Staff.

Table No 7 Availability of Communication Support available

Years	Frequency	Percentage
Written Communication	28	20.74
Sign Language	14	10.37
SMS / WhatsApp	31	22.96
Email	21	15.56
Visual Display / Notice	35	25.93
Others	6	4.44
Total	**135**	**100.00**

Source: Primary data

It is observed that the majority of the respondents (25.93 percent) have access to Visual Display / Notice, followed by 22.96 percent who use SMS / WhatsApp and 20.74 percent who use Written Communication.

Table 8 Workplace Communication Support

S. No.	Particular	SA	A	N	D	SDA	Total
1.	Crucial work-related information is delivered in written or visual form when required.	41	35	19	21	19	135
		30.37	25.93	14.07	15.56	14.07	100.00
2.	Captioning or text-based support is available when required.	10	35	42	17	31	135
		7.41	25.93	31.11	12.59	22.96	100.00
3.	My co-workers make reasonable efforts to communicate with me.	15	29	39	16	36	135
		11.11	21.48	28.89	11.85	26.67	100.00
4.	I can communicate efficiently with relevant administrative or HR personnel.	8	25	39	38	25	135
		5.93	18.52	28.89	28.15	18.52	100.00
5.	The organization provides an inclusive communication environment.	11	30	44	20	30	135
		8.15	22.22	32.59	14.81	22.22	100.00

Source: Primary data

It is observed that the majority of the respondents (30.37 percent) strongly agree that crucial work-related information is delivered in written or visual form when required. The majority (31.11percent) are neutral about the availability of captioning or text-based support when required. The majority (28.89 percent) are neutral about co-workers making reasonable efforts to communicate with them and about communicating efficiently with relevant administrative or HR personnel. The majority (32.59 percent) are neutral about the organisation providing an inclusive communication environment.

Table 9 Job Satisfaction

S. No.	Particular	SA	A	N	D	SDA	Total
1.	I am satisfied with my present job.	4	40	11	38	42	135
		2.96	29.63	8.15	28.15	31.11	100.00
2.	I am satisfied with my working conditions.	10	38	11	37	39	135
		7.41	28.89	8.15	27.41	28.15	100.00
3.	I feel comfortable in my workplace.	3	39	9	36	48	135
		2.22	28.89	6.67	26.67	35.56	100.00
4.	I am satisfied with the support delivered by my supervisor.	2	38	9	31	55	135
		1.48	28.15	6.67	22.96	40.74	100.00
5.	I have a good working relationship with my co-workers.	3	45	1	38	48	135
		2.22	33.33	0.74	28.15	35.56	100.00

Source: Primary data

The results indicate that majority of the respondents (31.11 percent) strongly disagree that they are satisfied with their present job. The majority (28.89 percent) agree regarding satisfaction with working conditions. The majority (35.56 percent) strongly disagree that they feel comfortable in their workplace. The majority (40.74 percent) strongly disagree with the support delivered by their supervisor. The majority (35.56 percent) strongly disagree that they have a good working relationship with their co-workers.

Table 10 ANOVA for Age and Workplace Communication Support

Particulars		N	Mean	S. D.	Std. Error	F	Sig
Crucial work-related information is delivered in written or visual form when required	Below 25 years						
	25–34 years	42	2.26	1.25	0.19		
	35–44 years	24	2.33	1.27	0.26		
	45–54 years	11	2.18	1.17	0.35		
	55 years and above	7	1.86	0.38	0.14		
	Total	**135**	**2.57**	**1.42**	**0.12**		
Captioning or text-based support is available when required.	Below 25 years	51	3.69	1.39	0.20	4.026	0.004*
	25–34 years	42	2.83	1.01	0.16		
	35–44 years	24	2.96	1.12	0.23		
	45–54 years	11	3.09	1.30	0.39		
	55 years and above	7	2.43	0.79	0.30		
	Total	**135**	**3.18**	**1.26**	**0.11**		
My co-workers make reasonable efforts to communicate with me.	Below 25 years	51	3.61	1.27	0.18	5.799	0.001*
	25–34 years	42	3.24	1.34	0.21		
	35–44 years	24	2.88	1.33	0.27		
	45–54 years	11	3.27	1.01	0.30		
	55 years and above	7	1.29	0.49	0.18		
	Total	**135**	**3.21**	**1.35**	**0.12**		
I can communicate efficiently with relevant administrative or HR personnel.	Below 25 years	51	3.59	1.00	0.14	5.811	0.001*
	25–34 years	42	3.33	1.16	0.18		
	35–44 years	24	3.21	1.10	0.23		
	45–54 years	11	3.73	1.27	0.38		
	55 years and above	7	1.57	0.53	0.20		
	Total	**135**	**3.35**	**1.15**	**0.10**		
The organisation provides an inclusive communication environment.	Below 25 years	51	3.53	1.14	0.16	5.747	0.001*
	25–34 years	42	3.31	1.30	0.20		
	35–44 years	24	2.83	1.17	0.24		
	45–54 years	11	3.27	1.01	0.30		
	55 years and above	7	1.43	0.53	0.20		
	Total	**135**	**3.21**	**1.25**	**0.11**		

Source: Compute from primary data * Sig@5% level

It is observed that there is a significant difference among the age groups regarding workplace communication support, as the significance values for all the statements are less than 0.05. The calculated F-values are 3.425,

4.026, 5.799, 5.811 and 5.747 respectively, with significance values of 0.011, 0.004, 0.001, 0.001 and 0.001. Hence, the workplace communication support available significantly differs based on the age of the respondents.

Table 11 ANOVA for education and Workplace Communication Support

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F	Sig.
Crucial work-related information is delivered in written or visual form when required	Higher Secondary						
	Diploma	34	2.59	1.48	0.25		
	Undergraduate Degree	11	4.27	1.27	0.38		
	Postgraduate Degree	27	2.26	1.35	0.26		
	Professional Qualification	11	2.91	1.30	0.39		
	Others	10	2.10	0.88	0.28		
	Total	**135**	**2.57**	**1.42**	**0.12**		
Captioning or text-based support is available when required.	Higher Secondary	42	3.05	1.15	0.18	3.706	.004*
	Diploma	34	3.29	1.34	0.23		
	Undergraduate Degree	11	4.55	1.04	0.31		
	Postgraduate Degree	27	3.00	1.00	0.19		
	Professional Qualification	11	2.64	1.36	0.41		
	Others	10	2.90	1.37	0.43		
	Total	**135**	**3.18**	**1.26**	**0.11**		
My co-workers make reasonable efforts to communicate with me.	Higher Secondary	42	3.14	1.39	0.21	2.428	.039*
	Diploma	34	3.09	1.26	0.22		
	Undergraduate Degree	11	4.45	1.04	0.31		
	Postgraduate Degree	27	3.26	1.53	0.30		
	Professional Qualification	11	3.00	1.10	0.33		
	Others	10	2.70	0.82	0.26		
	Total	**135**	**3.21**	**1.35**	**0.12**		
I can communicate efficiently with relevant administrative or HR personnel.	Higher Secondary	42	3.29	1.35	0.21	.915	.473
	Diploma	34	3.35	1.04	0.18		
	Undergraduate Degree	11	4.00	0.89	0.27		
	Postgraduate Degree	27	3.33	1.18	0.23		
	Professional Qualification	11	3.27	1.01	0.30		
	Others	10	3.00	0.94	0.30		
	Total	**135**	**3.35**	**1.15**	**0.10**		
The organisation provides an inclusive communication environment.	Higher Secondary	42	3.17	1.31	0.20	2.608	.028*
	Diploma	34	3.03	1.06	0.18		
	Undergraduate Degree	11	4.36	0.81	0.24		
	Postgraduate Degree	27	3.30	1.49	0.29		
	Professional Qualification	11	3.00	1.10	0.33		
	Others	10	2.70	0.82	0.26		
	Total	**135**	**3.21**	**1.25**	**0.11**		

Source: Compute from primary data

The results indicate that is a significant difference based on educational qualification regarding the provision of Crucial work-related information, availability of captioning or text-based support, co-workers' communication efforts, and an inclusive communication environment, as the significance values are 0.001, 0.004, 0.039 and 0.028 respectively, which are less than 0.05. The calculated F-values are 4.510, 3.706, 2.428 and 2.608 respectively. However, there is no significant difference in the ability to communicate efficiently with relevant administrative or HR personnel, as the significance value is 0.473, which is greater than 0.05, with an F-value of 0.915.

Table 12 Correlations for age and Workplace Communication Support

		Age	Communication Support
Age	Pearson Correlation	1	-.241
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.005*
	N	135	135
Communication Support	Pearson Correlation	-.241	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005*	
	N	135	135
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Source: Compute from primary data

The findings reveal that there is a negative and significant relationship between age and workplace communication support, with a Pearson correlation value of -0.241 and a significance value of 0.005. This indicates that as age increases, workplace communication support tends to decrease.

Table 13 KMO and Bartlett's Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.811
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1672.837
	df	45
	Sig.	0.000*

Source: Compute from primary data

The KMO value of 0.811 indicates good sampling adequacy for factor analysis. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 1672.837$, df = 45, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the variables are sufficiently correlated for factor analysis. Therefore, the data are suitable for factor analysis.

Recommendations

1. Crucial work-related information should be delivered through accessible written or visual communication.
2. Captions or text-based support should be delivered during meetings and training programmes whenever required.
3. Sign-language interpretation or suitable communication assistance should be made available according to individual employee requirements.
4. Supervisory personnel and co-workers should receive deaf-awareness and inclusive-communication training.
5. Digital workplace communication platforms should be made accessible to deaf employees.
6. Workplaces in Kochi should establish a clear procedure for employees to request communication support.
7. Communication accessibility should be incorporated into inclusive workplace practices and human-resource policies.
8. Employers should encourage two-way communication and provide opportunities for deaf employees to express their communication requirements.
9. Regular feedback may be collected from deaf employees to identify gaps in workplace communication accessibility.
10. Organisations should promote an inclusive work culture in which deaf employees can participate equally in meetings, training, teamwork and workplace activities.

Conclusion

The present study examines the role of workplace Communication support in job satisfaction among deaf employees working in Kochi. From the 200 questionnaires distributed, 147 were collected, 12 incomplete questionnaires were rejected and 135 valid responses were retained for analysis.

The findings indicate that workplace communication support available is an important aspect of an inclusive working environment for deaf employees. The statistical analysis also shows significant differences in several communication-support items across age and educational groups. The correlation analysis reveals a statistically significant negative relationship between age and workplace communication support available ($r = -0.241$, $p = 0.005$). In addition, the Chi-Square analysis indicates a significant association between educational qualification

and work experience, although the result should be interpreted cautiously because several cells have low expected frequencies.

Overall, accessible written and visual communication, captioning, digital communication, sign-language-related support whenever required, and supportive communication from supervisory personnel and co-workers can contribute to a more inclusive workplace environment. Workplaces in Kochi can strengthen the employment experience of deaf employees by adopting systematic communication-accessibility practices and incorporating them into inclusive workplace practices and human-resource policies.

Reference

1. World Health Organization (WHO). (2021). World Report on Hearing. Geneva: World Health Organization.
2. International Labour Organization (ILO). (2015). Disability and Work: Inclusion of People with Disabilities in the Workplace. International Labour Organization.
3. United Nations. (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). United Nations.
4. Punch, R., Hyde, M., & Power, D. (2007). Career and workplace experiences of Australian university graduates who are deaf or hard of hearing. Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 12(4), 504–517.
5. Foster, S., & MacLeod, J. (2003). Deaf people at work: Assessment of communication among deaf and hearing employees. Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education.
6. Jung, K. E., & Cho, S. (2020). Workplace experiences and employment-related challenges among deaf and hard-of-hearing employees. Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education.
7. Government of India. (2016). The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India.
8. Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India. Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DEPwD) — resources related to employment and inclusion of persons with disabilities.