CHAPTER 1
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
Conceptual Framework

1.1 Introduction

In the contemporary scenario, when constrained resource-availability has posed progressive challenges for resource-allocation and resource-utilization, the world of profession has forced 'management' to assume a key role in achieving 'excellence through effectiveness'. As a result, now the organizational value-creation hinges itself on managerial performance which in turn bases itself on professional effectiveness.

The determinants of professional effectiveness can be categorized under organizational factors like processes, systems and culture and individual factors like core-skills and soft-skills. While core-skills will feature the likes of conceptual knowledge, technical skills and work exposure, soft-skills will feature the likes of communication skills, team-spirit, leadership, conflict-resolution and many others. While each one carries an avenue for detailed delving, the present study focuses only on studying the impact of 'Communication Skills' on 'Professional Effectiveness'.

'Communication', with its root in the Latin word 'Communis' which means 'to share', is one of the foundational pillars of our evolution. The history of humanity is a fascinating voyage driven by quest - the desire to know. This quest brought us from our cradle in Africa to all the places that we today inhabit. But what makes this journey even more interesting is that we are aware of every stage, every move of it. And this became possible because we humans also had another desire - desire to share.

It is difficult to imagine how first humans would have felt while defining their selves as standalone entities, without seeing oneself in interconnection with each other. The phase can neither be traced back to nor can be seen as more human than mere animal existence. Yet, when the humans would have organized themselves around their first means of
subsistence, it is safe to assume that the first seeds of society were sown. And thus the first need for ‘communication for sharing’.

With the advent of tools, the humans would have first organized their efforts around simple tasks of providing food, shelter and child-care; in reference to two naturally comparable variables - age and gender. Then, with agriculture would have come the concept of family and estates, and the concept of ‘communication for relating’.

Then the observation of someone’s ‘specialization of labor’ would have taken shape of craft, advances in tools & techniques would have heralded the term of workmanship and with construction of colonies, castles and cathedrals the basis of teamwork would have come. And all that would have formed the realization of ‘communication for working’.

From the roots of trading in barter to the development of currency leading to commerce and then the industrial revolution promoting the concept of organization, the thought of ‘communication for managing’ would have gathered attention.

So, ‘Communication’ with its pivotal role, has served the needs of human sharing, relating, organizing and managing in a way few other phenomena could. But this phenomenon just got even more important when it got stature of a skill. Skill is an ability acquired through deliberate, systematic, and sustained effort to carryout complex activities or job functions. So, in many ways, where knowledge leaves, skill picks up. It is the working-partner of knowledge that affects a work tangibly. There are various types of skills yet for the purpose of organizational activities they are often talked in terms of Hard-skills (technical or core skills) and Soft-skills (social or people skills).

Communication Skills are classified under the Soft Skills, and have taken one of the front-seats in the today’s scenario. The reasons are manifold. Organization is often seen as “Weaving people into a structure for a definite purpose”. So, as the diversity in people is increasing, structures are impacted by innovations and the purposes are challenged by priorities, communication skills are becoming the force that bind the organization.

Let’s bring our attention to the other coordinate now – Professional effectiveness.
Professional is a person who performs a specialized task, within a defined ethical & moral framework, to deliver value in return of a price. The history of work starts with the primary need for survival. Our ancestors spent much of their day in the iterative activity of searching food and shelter. The idea of work must have been an after-effect of settled society - starting with agriculture around 10,000 years ago in Mesopotamia; and for most of our history, work meant ‘at work in the field’. (Webb S. and Webb B., 1917)

But once a society reaches a certain level of sophistication, it finds it has need of specialists, skilled people such as blacksmiths, carpenters and tailors. So civilized society allowed certain skilled individuals to opt out of the business of producing food. Thus emerged the concept of ‘job’. As civilization grew, more sophisticated jobs came to fore – such as priests, doctors and lawyers. They needed formal training. So, after the concept of a full-time occupation, the first training school was established, the first local association was established, the codes of professional ethics were introduced and state licensing laws were established. This all gave way to the term ‘profession’ often defined as an occupation founded upon specialized educational training, for the purpose of supplying objective counsel and service to others, for a direct and definite compensation (Webb S. and Webb B., 1917).

Effectiveness is the degree to which objectives are achieved and the extent to which the targeted problems are solved. The word effective” stems from the Latin word effectivus, which means ‘creative or productive’ and surfaced in Middle English around 1300-1400 A.D. While featuring in the domains of Mathematics, Physics, Medicine and Computers, it made the most emphatic impact in the field of management. Often used in conjunction with its counterpart ‘Efficiency’, it formed the duo ‘Efficiency and Effectiveness’ which indubitably is the most frequently used term in management.

Peter F. Drucker deftly delved into it in his landmark book of 1960s ‘The Effective Executive’ but is most remembered for its most simplified representation in the words “Effectiveness is doing right things” (in difference with efficiency which in turn is doing things right). These words have since been ringing in the ears of management fraternity.
with varying degree of impact. But the representation is indeed valid because it also took the management into the paradigm shift of transition from the manufacturing-mindset (efficiency) to marketing mindset (effectiveness). So, efficiency was to deal with cost, effort and time, and effectiveness took care of results and quality of those results (here, it is important to remember that if efficiency is desired by the recipient of one’s work then the efficiency would have to be factored-in into the definition of effectiveness per se).

Thus, Professional Effectiveness is the most desirable behavioral-trait in the organization today – the basis of what we expect from an endeavor and an enterprise. This research aims ‘To study the impact of Communication Skills on Professional Effectiveness’ in the light of various components of communication and varying contexts of different industry-types, hierarchy-levels and functionalities.

1.2 Communication Skills:

It is evident that at all the steps of human evolution, communication has been there, catering to the growing need of human reach, for supporting the endeavors born out of his escalating aspirations. It is only felicitous that the word ‘Communis’ is also at the heart of ‘Community’. It can be classified into three types.

1.2.1 Nonverbal Communication:

Charles Darwin made the first attempts to scientifically study the nonverbal communication in his book The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals. He argued that all the mammals are capable of expressing emotions through their faces. His work was forwarded by Tomkins (1962) who propagated the Affect Theory by organizing the emotions into nine discrete categories and connecting each one with its typical expression or gesture.
While Tomkins worked more with the expressions, Rudolf Laban in his seminal work Kinetographie Laban (1926), introduced a notation system called Labanotation which although was meant for choreography, found application in the fields of nonverbal communication. The work of Laban was carried on by Warren Lamb in 1940s. He identified posture-gesture mergers and synthesized these to develop a solid framework MPA (Movement Pattern Analysis) which is considered to be a path breaking entry into the field of management consulting, especially in ascertaining one’s decision-making abilities.

But possibly the most important contribution in the field of nonverbal communication was made by an anthropologist named Ray Birdwhistell (1970). He, along with several other anthropologists like Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson, started filming people in social situations and analyzing them in terms of posture, gesture, stance, and movement. He argued that almost all the movements of the body are socially taught and thus have a meaning (that means they are not accidental).

He believed that these non-verbal forms of language (which he termed as *paralanguage*) have a grammar similar to that of the spoken language, devising a word "kineme" analogous to phoneme. (Knapp 1972). Birdwhistell estimated that "no more than 30 to 35 percent of the social meaning of a conversation or an interaction is carried by the words." He also estimated that we can make and recognize around 250,000 facial expressions.

Argyle et al (1970) put forward the hypothesis that whereas spoken language is normally used for communicating information about events external to the speakers, non-verbal codes are used to establish and maintain interpersonal relationships. He, in 1988, concluded that there are five primary functions of nonverbal bodily behavior in human communication:

- Express emotions
- Express interpersonal attitudes
- Accompany speech in managing cues of interaction
• Self-presentation of one's personality
• Rituals

Eventually, the four nonverbal communication bases came to be spatial, temporal, visual and vocal (Tubbs, 2009). Each relates to one or more forms of nonverbal communication. While ‘Kinesics - the study of movement’ became the most famous subcategory of nonverbal communication, ‘Paralanguage - the study of nonlinguistic voice communication (tone, pitch, pause, volume, thrust)’ got developed into the most utile one.

Moreover, R. Heslin outlined the loosely held theory of ‘use of touch’ into ‘Haptics - the study of use of touch’ and Edward T. Hall enriched the field with ‘Proxemics - the study of the use of space’. Furthermore, ‘Chronemics - the study of the use of time as a resource’ focused on the unique study of communication in the backdrop of culture and ‘use of appearance and artifacts’ also made its way into the league.

Yet, while studying the nonverbal communication, one of the most important insights came from González, Iris Grace who reminded that “To know a language and not the culture is to make a fluent fool of yourself”. Culture in this sense, includes all of the nonverbal communication, customs, thought, speech and artifacts that make a group of people unique. While most of the nonverbal communication is conveyed subconsciously, there are cultural similarities that enable us to understand the difference between what is being said and what is actually meant. But generalizing between nonverbal communication between cultures can be tricky since there are as many cultural differences in nonverbal communication as there are languages in the world. (Merriam-Webster, 2012). So, at the end of the day, the ‘context’ and ‘culture’ matter.

**Kinesics:**

**Body language** is an ability of human non-verbal communication, consisting of **gestures, postures and expressions**. People send and interpret such signals almost entirely
subconsciously that’s why it may provide clues to the attitude or state of mind of a person. It can also reveal a lot about your feelings and meaning to others and also how other others reveal their feelings toward you. It is also significant to communication and relationships, relevant to management and leadership in business and also in places where it can be observed by many people. It can also be relevant to personal relationships – as in dating, courtship, in family settings, and parenting.

It is believed that the human communication consists of 93 percent body language and paralinguistic cues, while only 7% of communication consists of words themselves (Borg, 2010). However, Albert Mehrabian, the researcher whose 1960s work is the source of these statistics states that it is applicable specifically in the communication of feelings and attitudes that the three elements (often abbreviated as the "3 Vs" for Verbal, Vocal & Visual) account in the 7%-38%-55% rule - words account for 7%, tone of voice accounts for 38%, and body language accounts for 55%.

Kinesics - the term was coined by Ray Birdwhistell, an anthropologist who wished to study how people communicate mainly through gestures, postures and expressions, and later popularized in 1960s by members of the counter-culture.

Gestures:

**Gesture** is a form of non-verbal communication in which visible bodily actions communicate particular messages (Kendon, 2004). Gestures play a major role in many aspects of human life because neurologically, Gestures are processed in the same areas of the brain as speech and sign language. It has been suggested that these parts of the brain originally supporting the pairing of gesture and meaning and then were adapted in human evolution "for the comparable pairing of sound and meaning as voluntary control over the vocal apparatus was established and spoken language evolved". Their common neurological basis also supports the idea that symbolic gesture and spoken language are two parts of a single fundamental semiotic system that underlies human communication. (Xu, Gannon, Emmorey, Smith & Braun, 2009)
Kendon (1982) maintains that gestures have been studied throughout the centuries from different view-points. During the Roman Empire, Quintilian studied how gesture may be used in rhetorical discourse, then in 1644 John Bulwer analyzed gestures and provided a guide on how to use gestures to increase eloquence and clarity for public speaking. Moreover, in 1832, Andrea De Jorio published an extensive account of gestural expression. Yet Ekman and Friesen (1969) in their seminal work on kinesics classify gestures into five categories: emblems, illustrators, affect displays, regulators and adaptors.

**Emblems** are non-verbal messages that have a verbal counterpart (for example, the ‘Victory sign’ or ‘OK sign’). They can have bewilderingly different meanings but because of their popularity, it is relatively easy to understand the counterpart.

**Illustrators** are used more consistently to illustrate what is being said (for example pointing to something that you are discussing about). It reinforces what you are saying. Again, the usage of illustrators is different from culture to culture. But, in business communication the illustrators are significant. They are more consistently used and are more subconsciously interpreted than emblematic movements.

**Affective Displays** are body, or more frequently facial, movements that display certain emotions. Although they convey universal emotional feelings, the degree and frequency with which affective displays are used across cultures is much less universal. Moreover, a lack of affective displays may well be understood as a lack of emotion, which is a wrong interpretation.

**Regulators** are signs that regulate, modulate and maintain the flow of speech during a conversation (for example, nodding or eye movements). Regulators are vital to the flow of information and thus a misinterpreted regulatory non-verbal sign may be highly confusing in international business communication.

**Adaptors** include postures and other movements (like moving in a chair) hailing from a low level of awareness. So they have always been considered crucial in understanding
what the other person is thinking. Still, this importance should not be overstated or oversimplified. They are also open to misinterpretations in different cultural contexts.

**Postures:**

*Posture* can provide significant information on nonverbal communication and emotional cues because studies have consistently shown that certain patterns of body movements are indicative of specific emotions. Posture can signal both the enduring characteristics of a person and his or her current emotions and attitudes. (Dael, Mortillaro, Scherer, 2011). Postures also communicate social standing, well-being, nature and temperament. Interpersonal attitudes are communicated through **Inclination of the body, Similarity, and Orientation of the body.**

Therefore, posture can be understood both contextually and independently of it. When it comes to *postures*, there are four general human postures: **standing, sitting, squatting, and lying down.** Within each of these postures there are many variations, and when combined with particular gestures or other nonverbal cues they can express many different meanings. (The Definitive Book of Body Language, 2004)

Postures are also differentiated in terms of closed and open. Closed posture often gives the impression of detachment, disinterest, and hostility. Research has also shown that these behaviors usually convey unpleasant feelings. However, open posture is often perceived as communicating a friendly and positive attitude. (Irene and Poole, 1993)

**Expressions:**

*Facial expressions* are the movements of facial muscles which convey the emotional state of a person. They have been a primary means of conveying social information between humans. Humans can adopt a facial expression voluntarily or involuntarily. Voluntary facial expressions are often socially conditioned and follow a
cortical route in the brain. Conversely, involuntary facial expressions are believed to be innate and follow a subcortical route in the brain (Rinn and William, 1984).

Facial recognition is often an emotional experience for the brain and the amygdala is highly involved in the recognition process. The universality hypothesis is the assumption that certain facial expressions are signals of specific emotions (happiness, sadness, anger, fear, surprise, and disgust) that are recognized by people everywhere, regardless of culture or language. Yet, this assumption is challenged by the studies which try to factor-in the contextual and cultural context to it (Ekman, Friesen & Ellsworth 1972).

**Vocalics:**

**Vocalics or Paralanguage** is the term used to refer to non-verbal elements of speech. It is the component that may modify or nuance meaning, or convey emotion through use of the elements viz. pitch, volume, thrust, punch, tone, rate, tempo, voice-quality and speaking-style. The study of paralanguage is known as paralinguistics. Paralanguage plays an important role in human speech communication. Paralinguistic cues like as loudness, rate, pitch, pitch contour etc.; all contribute to the emotive or attitudinal quality of speaking.

In the communication such as email, chat and instant messaging, where there is only text involved, paralinguistic elements can be displayed by emoticons, font and color choices, capitalization and the use of non-alphabetic or abstract characters. Still, paralanguage in written communication is limited in comparison with face-to-face oral conversation as emotional tone of voice, itself paralinguistic information, has been shown to affect the resolution of lexical ambiguity (Nygaard & Lunders, 2002).

**Proxemics:**

**Proxemics** is the branch of the study of nonverbal communication that can be defined as "the theories of human's use of space as a specialized elaboration of culture". Edward T.
Hall (1963), the cultural anthropologist had coined the term. Hall believed that proxemics is richly applicable in evaluating not only the way people interact with others in daily life, but also "the organization of space (layout) in their physical setup.

Swiss zoologist Heini Hediger had studied the same in animals. He distinguished between flight distance (run boundary), critical distance (attack boundary), personal distance (distance separating members of non-contact species), and social distance (intraspecies communication distance). Hall came up with the modified criteria for human interactions. In his work, he separated his theory into two overarching categories: **personal space** and **territory**. Personal space describes the immediate space surrounding a person, while territory refers to the area which a person defends.

There are four forms of human territory in proxemic theory. They are:

- **Public territory**: a place where one may freely enter
- **Interactional territory**: a place where people congregate informally
- **Home territory**: a place where people claim their individual territory
- **Body territory**: the space immediately surrounding us

These different levels of territory suggest ways for us to communicate and produce expectations of an apt behavior.

Body spacing and posture, according to Hall, are unintentional reactions to sensory fluctuations or shifts, such as subtle changes in the sound and pitch of a person's voice. Hall does not mean for these measurements to be strict guidelines that translate precisely to human behavior, but rather a system for gauging the effect of distance on communication and how the effect varies between cultures and other environmental factors.

- **Intimate distance** for embracing, touching or whispering
  - **Close phase** – less than 6 inches (15 cm)
  - **Far phase** – 6 to 18 inches (15 to 46 cm)
- **Personal distance** for interactions among good friends or family members
• Close phase – 1.5 to 2.5 feet (46 to 76 cm)
• Far phase – 2.5 to 4 feet (76 to 120 cm)

• Social distance for interactions among acquaintances
  • Close phase – 4 to 7 feet (1.2 to 2.1 m)
  • Far phase – 7 to 12 feet (2.1 to 3.7 m)

• Public distance used for public speaking
  • Close phase – 12 to 25 feet (3.7 to 7.6 m)
  • Far phase – 25 feet (7.6 m) or more.

Tactilics, or the study of touch in communication has also been one of the offshoots of Proxemics. As touch is the most nuanced and understated form of human expression so its role in communication is a significant one. Although it is an important part of the expression in personal and social space but in professional context it has to practiced with discretion to mark it politically correct.

Haptics:

Haptic communication is a form of nonverbal communication in which people communicate via touching. It is a component of nonverbal communication specially important in interpersonal relationships. There are six different kinds of "touch". These include: positive, playful, control, ritualistic, task-related and unintentional. (Remland, Jones & Brinkman, 1995)

It is important even in the professional context. Managers should know the effectiveness of using touch while communicating to subordinates, but need to be cautious and understand how touch can be perceived differently from intended. Working with others and using touch to communicate, a manager needs to be aware of each person's tolerance level.
It has been found through researches that a person in power is more likely to touch a subordinate, but the subordinate is not free to touch in kind. Touch is a powerful nonverbal communication tool and this different standard between a superior and subordinate can lead to confusion whether the touch is motivated by dominance or intimacy (Borisoff & Victor, 1989).

In his book, Walton says that touching is the ultimate expression of closeness or confidence between two people, but not seen often in business or formal relationships. Touching stresses how special the message is that is being sent by the initiator. (Walton, 1989)

Touch research conducted by Jones and Yarbrough (1985) revealed 18 different meanings of touch, grouped in seven types: Positive affect (emotion), playfulness, control, ritual, hybrid (mixed), task-related, and accidental touch. The amount of touching that occurs within a culture is also largely based on the relative high context or low context of the culture.

**Oculesics:**

Oculesics is the form of nonverbal communication which works through the transmission and reception of meaning between communicators without the use of words. It can include the environment, physical attributes, characteristics and behavior of the communicators. (Knapp, Mark & Haul, 2010)

(Reis, Harry & Sprecher, 2009) maintain that there are four aspects in oculesics:

- **Eye Contact:** directness and duration
- **Eye Movement:** eye-direction, changing focus and following objects
- **Pupil Dilation:** change in the size of the pupil
- **Gaze Direction:** communicating intense desire with the eye
Oculesics specifically plays an important role in nonverbal communication of emotions. In this context, Carroll Ellis Izard (1977) says that a complete definition of emotion must take into account all three of these aspects or components:

- Experience or conscious feeling of emotion,
- Processes that occur in the brain and nervous system
- Observable expressive patterns of emotion, particularly those on the face

This third component is where oculesics plays a role. Moreover, the study of Neurolinguistic Programming (NLP) establishes three main types of thinking: in terms of what you see, hear or feel; and according to this science, oculesics can show which type of thinking someone is using when they are communicating (Kurtus, 2004)

**Chronemics:**

Chronemics is the study of the use of time in nonverbal communication. The way that an individual would perceive and value time, structure our time and react to time is a powerful communication tool. Time perception plays a large role in the nonverbal communication process across the cultures. These perceptions include punctuality, willingness to wait, and interactions. The use of time can affect lifestyles, daily agendas, rate of speech, movements and listening.

The way different cultures perceive time can influence communication as well. Cultures are usually put into two time system categories: **Monochronic** and **Polychronic**.

Monochronic and polychronic time systems are two terms used to refer to time and its influence on society. A monochronic time system means that things are done one at a time and time is segmented into precise, small units. Under this system time is scheduled, arranged and managed. (Guerrero, DeVito & Hecht, 1999). A polychronic time system is a system where several things can be done at once, and a more fluid approach is taken to scheduling time. This system is much less focused on the preciseness of accounting for each and every moment. (Cohen, 1997).
As a result, we can also have Monochronic and Polychronic people. For monochronic, time is a precious resource not to be wasted or taken lightly; “time is tangible” and viewed as a commodity. It is money. They place a paramount value on schedules, tasks and “getting the job done.” These people are committed to regimented schedules and may view those who do not subscribe to the same perception of time as disrespectful. (Hall and Hall, 1990)

However, polychronic are deeply steeped in tradition and relationships rather than in tasks. They have no problem being “late” for an event if they are with family or friends, because the relationship is what really matters. As a result, polychronic people have a much less formal perception of time. They are not ruled by precise calendars and schedules.

Moreover, there are four basic psychological time orientations: Past, Time-line, Present and Future. Each orientation affects the structure, content, and urgency of communication (Burgoon, 1993). The past orientation has a hard time developing the notion of elapsed time and these individuals often confuse present and past happenings as all in the same. People oriented with time-line cognitivity are often detail oriented and think of everything in linear terms. These individuals also often have difficulty with comprehending multiple events at the same time. Individuals with a present orientation are mostly characterized as pleasure seekers who live for the moment and have a very low risk aversion. Those individuals who operate with future orientation are often thought of as being highly goal oriented and focused on the broad picture.

The use of time as a communicative channel can also be a powerful, yet subtle, force in face-to-face interactions like regulating, expressing intimacy, affect management and evoking emotions and facilitating services. It also affects the concepts of waiting time, talk time or work time. (Capella, 1985)
Objectics:

The study of clothing and other objects as a means of non-verbal communication is known as **artifacts** or **objectics**. Apart from clothes, jewelry, visible body art, hairstyles, and other political, social, and cultural symbols send messages to others. (Yammiyavar, Clemmensen, Kumar & Jyoti 2008)

Features like body piercings and tattoos communicate a lot about one’s attitude towards life. Hair also sends messages – their length, color, pattern, everything speaks about you. Jewelry like rings or pendants can also send messages about your relationship status or watches or cars can talk about monetary status. People’s religious or cultural symbols also speak about their faith.

The environment in which we interact also communicates volumes. It can be changed to fit our message just the way our gestures or tone of voice can be. The books on the coffee table, the magazines in waiting-room, the placement of flowers, a piece of mint chocolate, all send particular messages.

The placement of objects and furniture in a physical space also help create a climate - formal, distant, friendly, or intimate. Through it, the power-equations can be defined and modulated. Lighting, sounds, scent, all can facilitate communication.

1.2.2 Verbal Communication:

All animal species communicate, some in ways that are impressively proficient. But none achieve the precision and flexibility that characterizes human communication, a capacity due in large part to the uniquely human ability to use language (Deacon, 1997). One of the most influential contributions to the field of verbal communication was made by **Charles Hockett**. In his 1959 paper “Animal ‘Languages’ and Human Language.” and later in his 1960 Scientific American article “The Origin of Speech.”, he talked about 13
characteristics of human languages. But there were characteristics which form the most defining features of language that devise the base for Verbal communication. These characteristics are:

- **Semanticity**: This refers to the idea that specific signals can be matched with a specific meaning. The words or signs or symbols stand for other things (e.g., objects, actions, or concepts) and they evoke a mental representation of the objects that they symbolize.

- **Arbitrariness**: The symbols that stand for things have no inherent relationship with the thing they stand for (e.g., different languages actually have different symbols for the same thing).

- **Displacement**: Ability to communicate about things that are not present in time or space; spatially, temporally, or realistically.

- **Generativity**: Ability to come up with unlimited new phrases or sentences by combining the symbols/words in our vocabulary in new ways or in new orders.

There was another addition to it in the form of **Pragmatics** which is concerned with the role of context in the interpretation of meaning.

This ability of language to generate an unlimited number of meaningful novel messages that are not bound to the here and now, combined with the cognitive capacity to exploit these properties, allows human communication to be extraordinarily effective and versatile. Together, these features in more than one ways represented the basic building-blocks of language and verbal communication viz. Vocabulary, Grammar and Articulation.

So, it can be said that in human communication, people process information which is the mental representations or ideas, and the "modifications of the environment" are the uniquely human acoustic called language. But, precisely how is language used to convey information? There are many characterizations of the ways in which the language
functions as a medium for communication, but they are most representatively captured by four paradigms (Krauss and Fussell, 1996).

Each paradigm focuses on a different aspect of language use and together they attempt to give a complete description of the process. The four paradigms are: the Encoding-Decoding paradigm, the Intentionalist paradigm, the Perspective-Taking paradigm, and the Dialogic paradigm. (Fussell and Krauss, 1991).

- **Encoding-decoding:** Language is often described as a code that uses words, phrases and sentences to convey meanings. In this system, the mapping is one-to-one that maps signals onto meanings, and in all probability, for every signal there is only one meaning and for every meaning, there is only one signal. In other words, the Encoding-Decoding approach to language sees communication as a process in which speakers encode their ideas in words, phrases and sentences, and listeners decode these signals in order to recover the underlying ideas.

- **Communicative Intentions:** Viewing linguistic communication only as encoding and decoding doesn't appreciate the subtlety of the process by which people communicate through it. For this, we need to factor-in the role of the speaker's Communicative Intentions and how it impacts the comprehension. The same sentence can carry multiple possible interpretations and thus the ability of addressees to identify the intended meanings of so many utterances day in day out is truly commendable. This ability is the foundation of human communication. As Levinson said that the communication is a complex kind of intention that is achieved or satisfied just by being recognized. Hence, there is a lot of evidence to support an Intentionalist view of language use.

- **Perspective Taking:** As we establish that the receivers have considerable mental agility in deciphering speakers' communicative intentions, what is less clear is how they go about doing so. Identifying another's communicative intention is not always a straightforward matter, because people do not always perceive the world in the same way. This difficulty formulates the view of Perspective-Taking.
Whenever people communicate, they make implicit assumptions about what the other persons know, believe, feel and think. And to accommodate discrepancies in perspective, it is important to take each other's perspectives into account while formulating one's communication. It can get manifested in looking at the directions from the point-of-view of the person sitting opposite to you, or even about making sure that the concept of abstract nouns (like beauty) are emerging from the sameness of sensibility.

However, the content of another's point of view is not always obvious. And under time pressure or when preoccupied, adults may also behave like children who find it difficult to see the world separately from their point of view.

**Dialogic**: The lack of one's ability to fully appreciate others' perspectives might hurt the effectiveness of verbal communication considerably if it were not for the fact that communication is a collaborative process. This collaborative nature of communication constitutes the dialogic paradigm. In all the above paradigms, communication is seen as individual act of production and comprehension. But such communicative exchange would impose a heavy cognitive burden on the participants. And this renders communication far more complex because the person has to simultaneously conceptualize and formulate and the other person has to process and comprehend at the same time (Levelt, 1989).

Krauss puts it wonderfully as he says “Conversational speech is produced at a rate of about 2.5 words per second, often in noisy environments and with less-than-perfect articulation.” But, more often than not, this daunting task works well. And the reason is their attuning with each others' immediate knowledge and perspectives, which reduces the cognitive demands of production and consumption.

As Clark (1994) has observed, communication is a joint or collective action, and not individual events. In the Dialogic view, communicative exchange is sharing of "socially situated" meaning which gets derived from the particular circumstances of the interaction and individual contributions of the participants.
In all probability, the language must have evolved in the setting of in-person communication but humans have always tried to find ways to cross the limitations of time and space. The most important technological development in this context was the phonogramic representational system developed probably in Mesopotamia around 4000 years ago – writing. Writing stands to be an invention that has had vast influence on the way humans lived as individuals and society (Goody, 1977). It, combined with more recently invented technologies for recording, transmitting and reproducing signals, has brought wide-ranging potential consequences for the way human life is progressing.

But the question that arises is how people comprehend sentences as they read. There are a number of theories about the architecture and mechanisms of sentence processing. They are primarily concerned with two points:

a) What types of information contained in the sentence the reader can use to build meaning?

b) At what point in reading does that information become available to the reader?

In this purview, two approaches each with two schools of thoughts have come to fore regarding the architectural choices:

**Modular vs. Interactive**: Modular view believes that the syntactic analysis & creation takes place without input from semantic analysis or context-dependent information, which is processed separately. However, interactive view assumes that all available information is processed at the same time and can immediately influence the final analysis.

**Serial vs. Parallel**: Serial view assumes that we construct the most plausible interpretations first and attempt another only if the first one goes awry. Parallel view assumes the construction of multiple interpretations at the same time.

Drawing on different combinations of architectural choices, many influential models of human sentence processing have emerged, the most popular being the **Garden Path Model** (Rayner, Carlson and Frazier 1983). It proposes that a single parse is constructed
by a syntactic module. Contextual and semantic factors influence processing at a later stage and can induce re-analysis of the syntactic parse. (Re-analysis is costly and leads to an observable slowdown in reading).

But there is a very important case of ‘Ambiguity’ in sentence processing. Be it spoken or written communication, there can be lexical, structural, or semantic ambiguities. Instances of ambiguity can be classified as local or global ambiguities. While a sentence is globally ambiguous if it has two distinct interpretations, Local ambiguities persist only for a short amount of time as a sentence is heard or written and are resolved during the course of the utterance, so that the complete utterance has only one interpretation.

**Garden Path Model** addresses ambiguity with the help of two principles: *Late Closure and Minimal Attachment*. Late closure causes new words or phrases to be attached to the current clause; and Minimal attachment builds the simplest syntactic structure possible (one with the fewest phrasal nodes). But there is another model that deals with the ambiguity in a more holistic manner – **Constraint based Model**. It emphasizes that people make use of the vast amount of probabilistic information available in the linguistic signal and arrive at a particular interpretation over another during the comprehension of an ambiguous sentence by rapidly integrating these probabilistic constraints.

But that leaves many other questions in the offing. If emotions affect language, does language also shape emotions/thoughts? Do people speaking different languages also perceive the world differently? Do Hindi, English, Mandarin, Russian and Turkish speakers end up attending to, partitioning and remembering their experiences differently? (Boroditsky, 2009)

We do get a few answers in the field of **Linguistic Relativity** - the investigation of whether thought is shaped by language is most commonly associated with **Benjamin Lee Whorf**. He, by virtue of the linguistic diversity in the world, proposed that distinctions of each language enshrine unique ways of perceiving, analyzing and acting in the objectively similar situations (Whorf 1937).
In the recent years, with the supporting researches on the topic, it is being found that languages differ considerably in how they describe spatial relations, how they describe time, the extent to which they make a grammatical distinction between objects & substances and how names of objects are grouped into grammatical categories.

These studies not only show that speakers of different languages think differently but also suggest that linguistic processes are pervasive in most fundamental domains of thought (Boroditsky, 2009). Thus it is evident that ‘Thinking’ is a complex set of collaborations between linguistic and nonlinguistic representations and processes.

The next step to this genre was ‘Business Communication’. It can be defined as creation, adaptation and usage of language, symbols and signs, to conduct activities that satisfy human needs and wants by providing goods and services for private profit. Pretty obviously, the definition of business communication is definition of communication smartly adjunct to definition of business. But if an attempt is made to make distinctions still further then there are three broad categories under the purview of this term:

- **Internal-Operational Communication**: This includes all the communication that takes place inside the organization around the operational tasks (like manufacturing, providing service or sell goods). It includes horizontal (peer-to-peer), vertical (senior to junior; or vice versa) or diagonal (interdepartmental) communication.

- **External-Operational Communication**: This includes the work-related or task-oriented communication taking place with the agencies outside the organization viz. with public, customers, suppliers, dealers, distributors, government agencies etc.

- **Personal Communication**: Be it internally or externally, there are communication needs that go beyond just task or work. There are times when, even officially, one has to communicate to motivate, persuade, appease, appreciate, complain, regret, request, recommend, relate, refuse or for that matter just strike a rapport or connect. This is also a part of the business communication because it is an integral part of the process that produces professional results.
Business works on the concept of voluntary exchange, a mutually acceptable trading of possessions. But naturally, voluntary exchange requires communication so it is safe to assume that the business communication started with the first business transaction. It is even claimed that the alphabet must have been invented by accountants who needed record-keeping for the sake of business accounting.

During the 5th century BCE, people in Mediterranean basin began to develop rhetoric as a formal area of knowledge amidst rich network of commercial activity with written contracts and legal disputes regarding the business transactions. In following centuries, academia and business interacted pretty informally with many business letters today found to be influenced by the rhetoric practices of those times. During the colonial period, presence of trade schools is acknowledged in places like USA where the business education was imported from Europe which emphasized on accounting and penmanship.

Parallel to these developments, the classical academics, along with rhetoric spread throughout the portions crossing Atlantic. And also entered the new discipline ‘English’ whose department started taking the ‘communication related to trade’ under its wings. Around this period, the US businesses also started developing rapidly which pressed the educational system to enlarge its bouquet of offerings. In 1881, with the first management school at Wharton almost sealed the importance of business education on the horizon. While the individual contributors like Sherwin Cody and Dale Carnegie were popularizing Business English, the first collegiate course of business-writing started in 1902 at the University of Illinois.

Around this time, with growing acceptance in the circles of Commerce and awareness among the general public, some communication teachers formed a professional organization which later on took shape of Association for Business Communication (ABC). With such professional associations, the domain of Business Communication took shape of a discipline of sorts.
With time, business communication got some discrete characteristics which then became useful for giving it a distinct identity, separate from the English composition (which it usually gets confused with). Various researchers did seminal work to define some particular features:

- Attention to specific business-related genres (like reports, memos, letters etc.)
- Emphasis on content (writer's conclusions are more important than writer's thoughts)
- Directness in document-organization (united and emphatic from start-to-end)
- Prioritizing in presentation (highlighting, headings, layout & design for obvious coherence).
- Objectivity in sentence structuring (for consumption for result-oriented busy professionals)

**Communication Theories and Models:**

One of the earliest models of communication was postulated by the great Greek philosopher Aristotle. It was a simple and symmetrical model that includes five essential elements of communication viz. Speaker, Speech, Audience, Occasion and Effect. In a way, Aristotle was advising speaker to customize communication according to different occasions for different effects. Andal N. (2005) in his popular book "Communication Theories and Models" discusses the various seminal works in the history of communication:

Harold Lasswell gave a simple model of communication woven around focusing on each stage of “Who says What, in Which channel, to Whom, and, with What effect”. He saw communication linearly, as a transmission where effect was more important than the conveying of meaning. He defined effect as an observable and measurable change in the receiver caused by the elements involved in the process.
**Conceptual Framework**

Shannon & Weaver saw communication more in terms of an engineering model or a mathematical theory. Their work is one of the main seeds from which the communication studies have grown. The work got developed during the second world-war in the Bell Laboratories. This model presented communication as a process in which a message is sent by the source (sender) through transmission channel which reaches the destination (receiver) through a receiving channel. In the process, an element of noise was also included which played a role in the way message reached and was interpreted.

Bolton & Cleaver, contrary to earlier models, argued that strengthening the message is not the only thing that affects communication. They argue that every sender and receiver is different and every act of communication has to make allowances for this. The personality differences like background, social-standing, attitudes and familiarity with mode of communication etc. all affect the communication.

Wendell Johnson appreciates the role of context in communication. It sees all the stages of communication as interdependent and interrelated. It talks about a continuous process of events acting as stimuli, observer making organismic evaluations, impulses bringing arousal of feelings, feelings getting translated into words in accordance to individual’s unique language propensity, speaker’s utterances traveling through light or sound waves serving as the stimuli for the hearer, and the whole process being carried out at the other end.

Newcomb presents first of its kind model to introduce the role of communication in a social relationship. It saw communication’s role to be that of maintaining equilibrium within the social system. His approach described the communication process in terms of interpretative processes that occur within individuals rather than on transmission of information between them. It says that if A and B are people who are perceiving an object/person X in the external environment then A and B will be under pressure of communicating effectively until they reach a broad agreement on their attitude to X.
Schramm also talked about communication taking place between sender (s) and receiver (s) but he saw both sender and receiver as made up of three elements — encoder, decoder and interpreter. He also saw communication as passing through senders and receivers, affected by their interpretations, habits and abilities. Thus he says the most factor is ‘sender and receiver being in tune’. He introduced a term ‘field of experience’ which represents the accumulated experiencing and learning of an individual; and according to him it is important for the sender and receiver to have some intersection-area of their circles of ‘field of experience’ to have proper communication.

Gerbner also interpreted communication in the conventional sense but added a profound concept. He maintains that what we call message is a percept (the sender’s perception) and human perception is not a simple reception of stimuli, but is a process of interaction or negotiation. What happens is that we try to match the external stimuli with internal patterns of thoughts or concepts. When this match has been made, we have perceived something and have given meaning to it. So, this match is controlled by our culture, backdrop, mentality and thought-patterns. Thus, Gerbner basic model is this triangular relationship between event E, the percept of the event E1, and the statement about the event SE.

Westley & Maclean introduced a new element ‘C’ between the sender A and receiver B. They called this C as the editorial-communicating function. In other words, it is the process of deciding what and how to communicate. This gatekeeper is a conduit for messages rather than the source of messages per se. A feature of this model is its generality as it is applicable in situations ranging from interpersonal communication to mass-media communication. It also broadened and elaborated the feedback-concept; and suggested that messages may get transformed as they are transmitted from individual to individual.

Jacobson starts on a familiar linear base where an addresser is sending message to an addressee, but then introduces three new factors:
• He recognizes that message refers to something other than itself which he calls ‘context’.
• He talks about physical channel and psychological connection between the addresser and addressee which he calls ‘contact’.
• A shared meaning system by which the message is structured, which he calls ‘code’.

However, he was basically a linguist so his basic focus was on the meaning and function of management. He explains the six functions in the model:

• **Emotive:** It describes the relationship of the message to the addresser. This function takes prominence in messages like poetry.
• **Connative:** It refers to the effect of message on the addressee. This function takes prominence in messages like command or propaganda.
• **Referential:** This function concerns with the communication being true or factually accurate. This function takes prominence in messages with the need of more ‘reality orientation’ and objectivity in them.
• **Phatic:** This function is meant to keep the channels of communication open. It maintains the line of communication and confirms that the communication is really taking place.
• **Metalingual:** This function is about identifying the code that is being used. All messages have either an explicit or implicit metalingual function.
• **Poetic:** This is relationship of code to itself. In aesthetic/artistic communication, it is central.

**David Berlo** believed that human communication always has a purpose and our basic purpose in communication is to become an affecting agent, to affect others, our physical environment, and ourselves; in other words, to affect with an intent. He emphasized that interpretation of information is more important than the transmission of importance and that the meanings are in the people, not in words. In principle, he belonged to the Aristotelian model including the traditional elements of source, message, channel and receiver; but he also listed controlling factors for each of these basic components:
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- **Source:** Communication skills, Attitudes, Knowledge, Social system and Culture
- **Message:** Elements, Structure, Content, Treatment and Code
- **Channel:** Seeing, Hearing, Touching, Smelling and Tasting
- **Receiver:** Communication skills, Attitudes, Knowledge, Social system and Culture

**Watzlawick, Beavin & Jackson** provided a view of communication on the basis of psychiatric study and therapy in their work ‘Pragmatics of Human communication’. They portrayed communication as a process involving a give and take between individuals. They believed that communication is not something that occurs only when a source chooses intentionally to send messages. Rather, they asserted that because we are always behaving so ‘one cannot but communicate’.

### 1.2.3 Interpersonal Communication:

Interpersonal communication as a field is a relatively new entrant to the domain of communication. It was joined in 1970s by research in nonverbal communication, in 1990s by research in intercultural communication and in 1990s by research in family communication. Still, over the years, the definition of interpersonal communication emerged to be ‘It is the way that humans negotiate meanings, identity and relationships through person-to-person communication. (Baxter, 1988)

One major contribution to the field of interpersonal communication was made by a philosopher of communication named **Martin Buber** who argued that humans have two ways of communicating: “I-It” and “I-Thou”. In the “I-It”, at least one of the partners communicates in a way implying that the other person is a generic thing and in “I-Thou”, people who are involved recognize the contribution from the other person acknowledging his uniqueness. More importantly, he suggested five features that come to characterize interpersonal communication, distinguished from impersonal.
**Unique:** Each person is genetically and experientially unique so in terms of communication, the persons cannot be treated interchangeably.

**Unmeasurable:** Persons have their unique cognitive patterns which do not have a space-and-time existence so cannot be measured like physical characteristics (Brown 1971).

**Reflective:** Persons are aware not only about what is around them but also can be aware of their own awareness. Unlike objects and animals, persons can ask questions, introspect, imagine, wonder and examine.

**Responsive:** Persons, unlike objects, can respond rather than simply react. They have freedom to choose their attitude, customize their behavior and alter their actions according to their observation of the situation or preference for a particularly favorable outcome from it. This awareness can make a difference to the communication.

**Addressable:** It is the difference between ‘talking to’ and ‘talking with’. Persons, unlike objects, can address and recognize when we are addressed. They have the quality of being directed towards someone (Shotter 1993).

Thus, it is important to treat people as capable of responding and have to be ‘talked with’ rather than ‘talked to/at’. So, according to Buber, when persons communicate in ways that maximize these five features then the communication is interpersonal.

Interpersonal communication operates in 5 contexts: **Psychological:** Personalities, needs, aspirations, values, of the participants. **Relational:** The way participants are connected to each other. **Situational:** Circumstances and the state of affairs. **Environmental:** The physical apparatus (Location, noise, temperature, season, time etc.) **Cultural:** The behaviors and rules that apply to where you hail from.

Moreover, with more work in the area, broadly, the three broad approaches to interpersonal communication theories can be the ones that see interpersonal communication as:
a) Individually centered: This perspective is centered on understanding how individuals plan, produce, and process interpersonal communication messages. These theories envision communication as an individually centered cognitive activity. This work began with Gerald Miller and others who argued that interpersonal communication occurs when people make predictions about the other interactants based on perceiving the person as an individual rather than based on a social role (Miller, 1976). This school-of-thought focuses on mental representations that influence how people interpret information and how they behave. (Berger, 2005)

b) Interaction centered: The central focus of this perspective is on understanding interpersonal communication as a message or a joint action behaviorally enacted between persons. This perspective moves the focus from individuals’ dispositions or cognitive states to the contents, forms and functions of messages and the behavioral interaction between the parties. It is more interested in the ways our understandings, meanings, norms, roles and rules are worked out interactively in communication. (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005, p. 45)

c) Relationship centered: This perspective focuses on understanding the role of communication in developing, sustaining and terminating social and personal relationships. This perspective takes inputs from fields like psychology, communication, sociology and family studies. It focuses on messages within relationships that influence those relationships. (Guerrero, Andersen & Affifi, 2001)

a) Individually-centered Theories:

Action Assembly Theory maintains that people have thousands of action-features stored in memory. They get activated and assembled when they are relevant to our ongoing activities. It brought the angle of examining temporal properties of message behavior. It says that in addition to content of what people say, all of us should also focus on the
intuitive understanding that we have of the temporal properties (like when a person pauses for a long time before responding to a question). Such behaviors have both social-significance and they also provide an inlet into the person’s psyche. (Greene, 1994)

**Attribution Theory** talks about the fact that one of the basic human characteristics is to give explanation or causality of every event that takes place. This is called attribution. Theory says that every comment or action that a person makes is subject to attributional analysis by self and others. The outcome of this analysis has potentially significant implications for the nature of how one responds to another’s actions. For instance, if an aggressive act is attributed to controllable or intentional causes then the response of reprimand is more likely, whereas uncontrollable or unintentional causes are more likely to lead to sympathy (Weiner, 1986).

**Constructivism Theory** views humans as agents who interpret experiences and act on the basis of these interpretations. People are active sense-makers who construe the world through varied interpretive schemes. Some of these originate in genetically based structures, others come from individual experience, and many more are inherited from the social group through language and other shared symbol systems. These primary cognitive structures through which we interpret events are called ‘Personal Constructs’ and these are to be taken into account while communicating and relating with the other person. (Kelly, 1955).

**Goals-Plans-Action Theory of Message Production** views message production as a three-step sequence. Goals are the first step. They are future state of affairs that an individual is committed to achieving. Goals motivate plans that are cognitive representations of the behaviors that are intended to enable goal attainment. Actions are the behaviors enacted in an effort to realize a goal. So, it sees all human behavior as purposeful behavior and attempts to how their intentions constitute valid explanations of their actions. (Dillard, 1997)
Imagined Interaction Theory says that it is common to anticipate meetings with people that we know we are going to interact with. Furthermore, after seeing people, we sometimes relive the encounter in our minds as we reflect on what was said or how we could have said things differently. These examples reflect internal talk. So, Imagined Interactions are a process of social cognition in which individuals imagine and therefore indirectly experience themselves in anticipated or past communicative encounters with others. Our expectancies for interpersonal communication encounters emanate from these IIs and thus they can help form relational schemata for how individuals will perform in a variety of roles. (Honeycutt, 2003)

Planning Theory of Communication maintains that people use language not for the sake of using it but to achieve goals. Language is used to achieve such goals as persuading, informing, problem solving, entertaining etc. So language (communication) is an instrument in the hands of the people. (Clark, 1994). The theory seeks to explain how individuals arrive at an understanding of each other’s goal-oriented actions and how individuals produce actions that enable them to attain their everyday goals. So, theory’s aim is to become aware of one’s mental plans that influence communication.

Relational Framing Theory explains how people organize interpersonal messages to support inferences about the relationship that exists between communicators. According to it, people make sense of relational messages by interpreting them as indicators of either dominance-submissiveness or affiliation-disaffiliation. Theory views them as functional frames that help people process social messages, resolve ambiguities and draw relational inferences. (Dillard & Solomon, 2005)

Uncertainty Management Theory states that when it comes to uncertainty, individuals form both cognitive and emotional thoughts and that these thoughts are integrated in complex ways. It argues that individuals form two psychological orientations:
Probabilistic and evaluative. Probabilistic refers to one’s expectation about what the world is and will be, whereas, evaluative orientation represents as idea about what the world should be and whether the world is good or bad. The integration part of the theory says that the probabilities and values are often intertwined. Theory considers that individuals create, shape, clarify, obscure, challenge and transform these orientations through interaction (communication) with others. (Babrow, 1995)

**Uncertainty Reduction Theory** developed by Charles Berger, was one of the first theories indigenous to the domain of interpersonal communication. It seeks to explain how we communicate when we are unsure about our surroundings. The theory identifies two role of communication within interpersonal situations. First, we seek to predict and explain communication. Second, communication provides us required information to predict and explain. Hence, this theory proposes that communication can be both a cause and effect of the uncertainty. It believed that because some degree of ambiguity is always present within social interaction, individuals find ways to produce messages under conditions of uncertainty. They do it by three strategies: 1) Seeking information 2) Planning 3) Hedging (Berger et al., 1989)

**b) Interaction-centered Theories**

**Action-Implicative Discourse Analysis Theory**’s basic assumption is that most communicative practices (practices in which talking is central to what people are doing) are shaped by interactional dilemmas. In academic discussions, for instance, graduate students and faculty members want to appear intelligent but do not want to be seen as self-aggrandized and out to show off. As a result of the dilemmas that are part of virtually all ‘communicative practices’, a normative proposal about how participants ought to act needs to be weighed. AIDA, with its interest in the problems, conversational strategies and normative ideals of conduct, is a useful guide for observation, enabling study of interpersonal practices that have been overlooked and ignored (Tracy & Baratz, 1993).
**Communication Accommodation Theory** works in the context that people can vary their communicative styles and strategies in ways that reflect their differing personalities and temperaments, roles and relationships, and social identities. The verbal and nonverbal outcomes selected have significant social meanings and such differences in interpersonal communicative styles are abundant, varying by ethnicity, occupational status, gender, age and so on.

In this theory, accommodation is a process concerned with how people can both reduce and magnify communicative differences between people in interactions. Accommodation is considered as one of the main routes to achieving the former – and it does so by enhancing interpersonal similarities and thereby reducing uncertainties about the other. The effect of converging toward or approximating another has been shown to increase liking for the converger, enabling him or her to be seen as more competent and credible. (Aune & Kikuchi, 1993)

**Conversation Analysis Theory**, originated by Harvey Sacks with Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, is grounded in the view that social interaction is an autonomous, self-contained domain of human conduct that is of central importance to the social world. Its primary aim is to lay out the basic sense-making practices and regularities of interaction that form the basis of everyday communication, in both informal and professional settings.

Conversation Analysis Theory has three mail features. 1) It relies on the understanding that “talk is action”. It believes that talk is used by communicators to do things. 2) It says that “action is structured”, consisting of collections of stable practices and 3) “Action is logically organized”. So, Conversation Analysis Theory regards communication as a publicly available constructive process, rather than as a vehicle for message transmission.
or meaning-making. It is seen as the central resource for the enactment of all aspects of the social life. (Sacks, 1984)

**Expectancy Violations Theory** seeks to explain and predict how communicators assess behavior that deviates from expectation and how they respond communicatively to such violations. The theory focuses heavily on nonverbal aspects of interaction but has been used to analyze a range of communication behaviors and contexts. Expectancy Violations Theory talks about it in context of some aspects:

- **Expectancies**: Expectancy in the communication sense denotes an enduring pattern of anticipated behavior. Expectancy Violations Theory proposes that our expectations are influenced by three key factors: 1) Communicator 2) Relationship and 3) Context in which the interaction occurs.

- **Violation valence**: Expectancy Violations Theory proposes that when someone violates our expectations, we are forced to make sense of what is happening, and thus we shift our focus a bit to try to figure out the behavior means. So, when an expectancy violation occurs, arousal is heightened. Heightened arousal initiates cognitive appraisals related to a) the meaning of the violation and b) the evaluation of the positive or negative value of the violation, which is called violation valence.

- **Communicator reward value**: People possess characteristics that influence the extent to which we find interacting with them rewarding. So, Expectancy Violations Theory suggests that assessments of these positive or negative attributes moderate our evaluations of violation, particularly when the meaning of violation is open to interpretation. (Burgoon, 1993)

**Interaction Adaptation Theory** was developed by Burgoon, Stern and Dillman. It builds on many of the principles of Expectancy Violations Theory and focuses on the behavioral responses in interactions. It proceeds from the assumption that adaptation in
interaction forms the foundation of our relationships with one another and that adaptation is communicative, signaling both interactants and observers about the nature of the relationship between communicators. Adaptation refers to nonrandom patterns of behavior that occur in response to the interaction behavior of another. These patterns are often described in terms of whether the response reflects a matching behavior of a partner (reciprocity) or the behavior attempts to offset for the behavior of the partner (compensation).

Interaction Adaptation Theory also talks about the factors that influence our initial interaction in a situation that are referred to as Requirements, Expectations and Desires (RED). The relative importance of each RED factor may vary depending on the situation. Thus, it also talks about another factor called Interaction Position (IP), which is the composite of RED factors, defined as the net assessment of what is needed, anticipated and preferred as the dyadic interaction pattern in a situation (Burgoon et al., 1995).

**Face Theory** was the contribution of Erving Goffman. He believed that no matter what unique characteristics people may have in their psychological identity, all people have a social self, a public image – the 'face'. The theory helps us understand two important aspects of interaction: a) Why and how people construct their public images, and b) the strategies people use to maintain or restore their own or others' images if those images are lost or threatened.

This perspective belonged to Symbolic Interactionism. He further believed that even the 'private self' is to a large degree a symbolic construction. When it comes to communication, Goffman (1959) distinguished the concept of message from the broader construct of communication. He stated that the proper study of interaction is not the individual and his psychology, but rather the syntactical relations among the acts of different persons mutually present to one another.
Information Manipulation Theory maintains that thinking of communication as a simple dichotomy is comforting. Messages exchanged between communicators are presumed to fall into one of the two categories: “truth” or “lie”. We often think of deception as the antonym of truth but the truth about deception is more complicated. In everyday interactions, people rarely either tell the truth or a lie. Instead, they manipulate the information they share with people in complex and subtle ways (McCornack, 1992).

Philosopher H. P. Grice calls that what we follow is ‘Cooperative Principle’ (CP) “Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged”. He specified four maxims that together constitute what is required to fulfill CP.

1. **Quantity Maxim**, that relates to expectations regarding the amount of information that should be presented.
2. **Quality Maxim**, that relates to expectations regarding truthfulness.
3. **Relation Maxim**, that relates to people presenting messages relevant to the preceding discourse.
4. **Manner Maxim**, which relates to “relating not to what is said, but rather to how what is said is to be said”.

There can also be complex combinations where they can mix and match CP and all the four maxims to manipulate the message (McCornack, 1992).

Interpersonal deception Theory again conceptualizes communication as a joint creation of sender and receiver, as interactive, evolving and achieving several aims simultaneously. It brings attention to the goal-directed nature of communication and that people are not simply reactive organisms. Conversational behavior is influenced by a host of cognitive and behavioral factors – goals, expectations, and knowledge of the partner; interpretations and evaluations of conversational behavior; social skills; the
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conversational context; and the relationship. It says that it is cognitively demanding to engage in conversation, and the demands can escalate when one decides to deceive or suspect deceit. These demands ebb and flow based on the messages, conversational goals, and clarity of meaning. (Ekman & Friesen, 1969).

**Narrative Theories** states that throughout the course of living everyday events, people tell stories about them. People build and communicate their relationships, cultures and identities, in part, through the stories they tell. Thus, narratives and storytelling are consequential sites for theorizing interpersonal communication. They lead to certain outcomes or accomplish general and particular functions such as communicating identity, coping with loss, and predicting psychological health and relational qualities. Thus narrative theorizing has the potential to help us understand how people communicatively construct their individual and relational identities, make sense of the world and their interpersonal interactions, restore unproductive concepts of self and others, and explain relational qualities and outcomes such as satisfaction and well-being (Koenig Kellas & Trees, 2006).

**Politeness theory** is a rational model. It directs our attention to how features of language are interpreted in social contexts and explains why we see recurring patterns of language structure, use and inference. It suggests that in order to abstain from offending people, we tend to use indirect ways of putting our assertions politely. It is to save our social identity—the face from FTA (face threatening action). It talks about the five possible ways to behave in FTA:

1. **Bald on Record strategy**: Coming straight to the point
2. **Positive Face Redress**: Playing up the solidarity of rapport between the parties
3. **Negative Face Redress**: Mitigating face threat by being respectful
4. **Off-record: Saying indirectly**: may be through a third-party reference
5. **Withhold commenting**: Not saying anything
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Three features of social situations shape what politeness strategy will be most appropriate: Power, Distance and Rank (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

**Speech Codes Theory** says that whenever people engage in interpersonal communication, there are traces of culture woven into their messages. This happens in the form of speech codes. Speech codes are historically situated and socially constructed systems of words, meanings, premises, and rules that people use as a resource to talk about, interpret, and shape communicative conduct. This theory provides an understanding of interpersonal communication by first providing a perspective on a feature of interpersonal communication in all societies and cultures, and second by providing an approach to discerning cultural traces wherever they appear in particular instances of interpersonal communication and to interpreting the meaning and force of those instances for the people who produce and experience them. (Philipsen, 2003)

c) Relationship-centered Theories

**Affection Exchange Theory** is a scientific theory that explains why human beings communicate affection and with what consequences. It defines affectionate communication as encompassing those behaviors that encode feelings of fondness and intense positive regard, and are generally decoded as such by their intended receivers. It talks about the tripartite model of affectionate behavior: 1) Verbal: Using affectionate words 2) Nonverbal (Direct): Using affectionate behavior 3) Nonverbal (indirect): Using actions, gestures of social or material support showing affection. It also conceives that affectionate communication as a behavior is affected by both socially constructed and evolutionarily derived influences. It reckons that such communication has effect on the quality of the relationship and also the health and well-being of the individuals in the relationships. (Floyd & Mormon, 1998)

**Attachment Theory** explains the interrelationship between people’s experiences, attachment styles, communication and relationship-quality. The relationship between attachment and communication is explained through five principles:
1. Early interaction with caregivers leads to level of security, which sets the stage for personality development and later attachments

2. Working models of self and others combine to create an attachment-style (One of the four – Secure, Dismissive, Preoccupied and Fearful)

3. People with different attachment styles vary in terms of perceptions, emotional experiences, and communication, all of which influence the quality of one’s relationships.

4. Although attachment-styles are relatively stable, they can be modified

5. Attachment style can vary as a function of relationship type and relational partner

Attachment Theory sees communication playing four roles in the attachment process: Cause of the attachment style, Consequence of the attachment style, Mediator of attachment and relationship quality and Reinforcing of attachment style. (Bowlby, 1969)

**Communication Privacy Management Theory** deals with the complexity of privacy management, decisions we make, the way we think about privacy and how we cope with privacy infractions. Communication Privacy Management Theory views disclosure as the process of revealing private information, yet always in relationship to concealing private information. Since they are in dialectical tension with each other, the way revealing and concealing takes place is through a management system. Communication Privacy Management Theory is organized around six major principles. The first three are “Assumption Maxims” and the next three are “Interaction Maxims”. They are: 1) Public-Private Dialectical tension 2) Conceptualization of private information 3) Privacy rules 4) Shared boundaries 5) Boundary coordination 6) Boundary turbulence. Through these concepts, the base of interpersonal communication in this context is established (Petronio, 2002).

In **Relational Communication Theory**, Relational communication perspective views relationships as being enacted and formed through the relational members’ communication processes, and, in turn, view the nature of the relationship produced as
influencing the ongoing communication between the members. Relational communication conceptualizes communication as a social process through which people interrelate with others, mutually create social realities, and form relationships as well as self-identities. It establishes the primacy of communication as a formative and constructive process. It is not seen as a singular event or something done to another person, rather as a process of engaging with another person in an ongoing stream of dialogue. In other words, it exists between people, not lie within them. (Watzlawick, Beavin & Jackson, 1967)

Relational Dialectics Theory is a theory of the meaning-making between relationship parties that emerges from the interplay of competing discourses. Relational Dialectics Theory focuses on the struggles in meaning – the discursive tensions – that frequent interpersonal communication. However, the position of the theory is not that competing discourses are negative. Instead, they are the heart of the meaning-making enterprise. Relational Dialectics Theory claims that such discursive tensions are both inevitable and necessary. So the theory bases itself on three central propositions:

1. Meanings emerge from the struggle of different, often opposing, discourses.
2. Interpenetration of discourses is both synchronic and diachronic.
3. Interpenetration of competing discourses constitutes social reality

So, Relational Dialectics Theory positions communication as constitutive of the social world and not merely representational of an objective world that precedes communication. (Bakhtin, 1984)

Stage Theories of Relationship Development attempts to describe how people initiate, escalate and dissolve relationships; and explain how and why interpersonal communication changes as relationships move from distantness to closeness and perhaps back again. The contribution of Knapp and Vangelisti is possibly the most influential of
all such theories. They developed a staircase model that had total ten stages. The five stages of coming together were:

- Initiating: Opening channels of communication and initial contact
- Experimenting: Getting to know each other better by moving from superficial to more personal communication
- Intensifying: Acknowledging the unique and special nature of their relational connection
- Integrating: Becoming a single entity figuratively
- Bonding: Formalizing the relationship through social recognition etc.

The five stages of going apart were:

- Differentiating: Separating themselves from the coupled entity and focusing on their uniqueness
- Circumscribing: Engaging in less frequent and less personal interaction
- Stagnating: Communicating negative feelings nonverbally and imagining interactions
- Avoiding: Attempting to increase physical and psychological space to prepare themselves for life without each other.
- Termination: Ending the relationship actually.

The theory not only saw communication as a mechanism through which relationships develop but also as marker for the movement through stages (Knapp & Vangelisti, 2005)

**Social Exchange Theories** share basic assumption that social behavior is a series of exchanges. Individuals attempt to maximize their rewards and minimize their costs. When individuals receive rewards from others, they feel a sense of obligation. Embedded within these assumptions are two main concepts: Self-interests and Interdependence. Self-interests drive individuals to act in accordance with perceptions and projections of
rewards and costs associated with an exchange, or potential exchange, of resources. Interdependence refers to the extent to which one person’s outcomes depend on another person’s outcomes. Communication serves social exchange in two ways a) It is means through which bargaining about the exchange occurs. B) Communication can at times itself be the resource to be exchanged. (Sprecher, 1998)

Within Social Information Processing Theory, communication symbols are frequently interchangeable, communication is a process and relationships are developmental. Functional interchangeability of symbols means that Social Information Processing Theory assumes that there are many ways to express social characteristics, emotions and interpersonal attitudes. When nonverbal cues are unavailable for such expressions, individuals can find other ways to render the same connotation through word content, style, frequency and length of messages, and other CMC based behavior.

Social Information Processing Theory is a process theory in the sense that it views interpersonal meanings as accumulating iteratively – that is, in association with a buildup of information over a series of communicative interactions in order to build a psychological model of one’s online partners. At first glance, this view may seem at odds with the functional interchangeability view. After all, if a person can achieve the same thing using words as by using gestures, why does he or she need many exchanges to transfer meanings? ‘Social Information Processing’ view is that some information channels (such as face-to-face) transmit many types of symbols quickly, whereas other channels move fewer types of symbols slowly. The symbols that CMC carries move slowly and need more exchanges to accrue functional utility (Walther, 1992).

1.3 Professional Effectiveness:

When it comes to the conventional literature of management, the term ‘Professional Effectiveness’ doesn’t come across as a copybook term defined in a discrete manner. Save for a few new-age articles on internet (not in serious management-writings found on
the online resources) which attempt to describe it in a generic manner, its usage seems to be done in a loose and scattered way. So, as a matter of fact, the two terms that come closest to 'professional effectiveness' are executive effectiveness and managerial effectiveness. While former was coined by Peter F. Drucker, the latter has been a popular term for researchers across the world.

Managerial Effectiveness:

Reddin (1981) defined it as the extent to which manager achieved the output requirements of his position. In other words, it is not about 'who he is' but 'what he does'. This resolves a pretty important confusion often caused between two words – Impact and Effect. So, we can say that while the word 'impact' is used in the sense of 'influence', the word 'effect' is used in the sense of 'result'. Effect often refers to the result or the consequence of an action. Impact on the other hand does not indicate a consequence but only implies the influence of an action.

Campbell (1970) goes a step further. He defines managerial effectiveness less in terms of 'what he does' and more in terms of 'what he achieves'. However, people like Whetten (1989) also talk about it in terms of behavioral attitudes such as ability to respond effectively in spite of incompatible and mutually-conflicting role-expectations.

Drucker (1974) sees managerial effectiveness as the basis of organizational success. He, in his 1967 work, enumerated three tasks and five operations for a manager’s effectiveness. The tasks being: A) Outlining the organizational-mission B) Making the work productive and C) Managing the social impact and Operations being: a) Setting objectives b) Organizing resources c) Motivating communicatively d) Measuring performance and e) Developing people. However, apart from these concepts, the most seminal piece of his thought was that the manager's effectiveness can be best measured through the effectiveness of his subordinates.

Luthans & Davis (1979) saw managerial effectiveness more in context of 'Self Management' and opined that only then the teams and organizations can be managed. So,
they propounded three prerequisites for managers a) Being a proactive agent to change b) Being a stimulator to cognitive processes & controller of responsive consequences and c) Being consciously aware of achievement of the desired outcome.

Pareek (1987) related a manager’s managerial effectiveness with his role efficacy. He, in his important work on ‘Role Efficacy Scale’, talks about 10 aspects crucial for enhanced role-efficacy viz. Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Confrontation, Centrality, Influence, Personal Growth, Inter-role linkage, Helping relationships and Super-ordination. He grouped these ten under three dimensions: Role Making, Role Centring & Role Linking.

Hersey & Blanchard (1977) and other researchers opined that the effectiveness results from a combination of personal attributes and dimensions of the manager’s job in meeting the demands of the situations and requirements of organization. They found that for this, a manager has to be able to recognize his weaknesses and overcome them, and recognize his strengths and learn to capitalize upon them.

Page et al (2003) observed that there have been three perspectives on managerial effectiveness:

- **Traditional/Conventional perspective**: It looks at managerial effectiveness in terms of goal-setting and achievement, at both individual and organizational level.

- **Strategic perspective**: Its emphasis is upon identifying and supporting a set of core-competencies of the organization to sustain a competitive advantage.

- **Competency-based perspective**: It focuses on the development of individual competencies to weather the circumstantial challenges.

Campbell (1970) proposed a person-process-product model of managerial effectiveness. The person refers to the manager’s characteristic traits & abilities, product refers to the organizational results and process refers to the manager’s on-the-job conduct & actions. All the three components need to be understood for managerial effectiveness but it was
believed that eventually it depends on identifying the behavior and action connected most strongly to the accomplishment of goals, and to focus on them.

Gilbert et al (1995) contested that most of the theories on managerial effectiveness are not able to explain the relationship between managerial effectiveness and organizational effectiveness. Thus it relates to the earlier efforts which have been made to measure organizational effectiveness in terms of clear behavioral-dimensions like flexibility, resourcefulness, growth, productivity, communication, stability, cohesion etc. (Scott et al, 1981)

Rao et al (1989) stated that qualities like personal efficacy, role efficacy, risk-taking, openness to feedback, learning from experiences, tolerance of ambiguity and interpersonal trusts are the characteristics of effective managers.

Michigan studies in 1946 revealed five major dimensions of supervisor’s effectiveness: his definition of his role, his orientation towards work-groups, closeness of his supervision, his group relationships and the type of supervision he receives. Eventually effectiveness is considered to be a function of causal and intervening variables. Causal variable are those factors that influence the course of development, results or accomplishments within the organization; and intervening variables represent the current condition of the internal state of the organization.

Hersey & Blanchard (1977) developed a tri-dimensional leader effectiveness model. They added to Reddin’s 3-D model of managerial effectiveness an ‘effectiveness dimension’ in addition to the already-existing task & relationship behavior dimensions. Their tri-dimensional model integrates the concepts of leadership style with situational demands of a specific environment. When the style of a leader is appropriate to a given situation, it is termed effective; otherwise it is rendered ineffective.

Langford (1979) identified four broad groups as criteria for managerial effectiveness:
Conceptual Framework

- **Manager’s self**: Motivation, role-perception, coping stress, seniority and compensation
- **Manager’s work**: Decision making, problem solving, innovation and time-management
- **Manager’s relationships**: Relations with seniors, juniors & peer; conflict handling
- **Manager as part of organization**: organization’s maintenance, technical & financial control

Dhar et al (2005), in the similar school-of-thought, states that the managerial effectiveness consists of three dimensions:

- **Functional Effectiveness**: how a manager carries out overall management-functions
- **Interpersonal Effectiveness**: how a manager rallies people around resources to get outputs.
- **Personal Effectiveness**: how much he knows what he wants to do and maneuvers to achieve.

Ghiselli (1971) found that effective managers exhibit personality traits like higher intelligence, self-assurance, better supervision, high need for occupational achievement, decisiveness, need for self-development and low need for security. He described it as a set of skills – like communication skills, human relations skills, need for advancement, resistance to stress and high tolerance for uncertainty – which are required to excel managerially. Bass (1990) looked at managerial effectiveness in terms of manager with high level of energy, stress tolerance, integrity, emotional maturity and self confidence.

Reeves (1994) talks about effectiveness in reference to the findings of Malcolm Leary and his associates. They claim that there are three areas of effectiveness: input effectiveness, process effectiveness and output effectiveness. All three put together is a holistic and integrated approach towards the term. As a subsequent thought, Reddin (1988) talked about the two ways to obtain it: First, the enhancement of knowledge and
skills through policies and training; and second, the development of values and principles through wisdom and education.

Perrow (1970), in this respect, identified three specific skills required in a manager to be effective viz. power skills, collaborative skills and change-skills. There were also attempts made to relate management effectiveness with the leadership style of a manager. It is believed that a successful manager can be characterized neither as a strong leader nor a permissive one. In fact, he attempts to accurately assess the forces that determine what his most appropriate behavior at any given time should be.

Mintzberg (1994) talks about managerial effectiveness in yet another context. He maintains that the effective managers successfully manage by evoking actions on part of others in three ways:

- **By information:** Collection, dissemination and communication of information.
- **Through people:** Leading individuals, groups and units by developing systems, designing structures and imposing directives.
- **Via linking:** Exerting influence by intervention or action internally by handling projects and problems and externally by doing deals and negotiating.

In this context, Pickett (2000) stated the traits of effective managers as embracing change, creating power, promoting coaching, expanding job-definitions, creating expertise, driving out fear, keeping balance, maintaining a sense of continuity, demonstrating emotional maturity and exhibiting and instilling readiness to foster an entrepreneurial environment.

The aim of the theories of organization and management is primarily to gain practical knowledge and thus in most of them effectiveness evidently lies at the heart of the matter (Lewin & Minton, 1986). But effectiveness is still an elusive concept. Difficulty pertains to definitions, levels of analysis, criteria for measurement, and predictors for effectiveness (Goodman et al, 1983). Due to this inherent complexity, there hasn’t been a universal theory of effectiveness.
Reddin maintained that to be effective, a manager must possess three basic skills:

- **Situational sensitivity**: Skills to read a situation.
- **Situational management**: Skill to change a situation
- **Style flexibility**: Skill to customize one’s response to a variety of situations.

While Raudsepp (1987) reported that there is enough evidence to support a direct link between creative thinking and effectiveness, Chakraborty (1987) emphasized that each manager can be compared to an energy processor and so managerial effectiveness should be judged by the proficiency attained in processing energy in the psychological sense, and the extent to which the manager can deploy brain in processing energy contributively.

For some management jobs, it is still possible to identify some quantitative factors indicating managerial effectiveness. They can be:

- Meeting deadlines
- Accuracy; in terms of number of recorded errors being within the tolerance limits
- Number of complaints received
- Adherence to quality standards; amount of scrap or waste material
- Keeping within agreed cost or budgetary limits
- Productivity

But, given the nature of these points inclined primarily towards the manufacturing industries and bordering on the concept of efficiency, this is a list, at best, far from being holistically applicable.

Bhargava M. (1993) states that Managerial jobs can be grouped into eight basic types: Contact man (liaison & figure-head), Political manager (spokesman and negotiator), Entrepreneur (visionary and initiator), Insider (resource-allocator), Real-time manager (disturbance-handler), Team manager (leadership roles), Expert manager (monitor and reference-person) and New manager (coordination).
In an effort to make the abstract notion of effectiveness somewhat more tangible and measurable, several researchers have attempted to identify the salient features associate with the construct. Although a wide array of criteria has been employed, the most widely used ones are:

- Adaptability
- Productivity
- Job-satisfaction
- Profitability
- Resource-acquisition

These variables have been alternatively regarded as the measures of effectiveness or facilitators/intervening-variables that enhance the likelihood that effectiveness will result. In spite of many studies, unfortunately, there is little agreement among investigators concerning which criteria represent useful and valid indicators of effectiveness. In fact, in seventeen investigations that attempted to identify evaluation criteria, only one (adaptability-flexibility) was mentioned in more than half the models (Steers, 1975).

There are some problems that hamper the commonality in the measurement-attempts. They are:

- Evaluation criteria are often unstable
- Different criteria are relevant for different time-perspective (short-term vs. long-term)
- Multiple criteria often conflict with one another
- Some criteria are not applicable to certain types of organizations (or industries)
- A few criteria may be difficult to measure accurately (e.g., adaptability)
Executive Effectiveness:

In his landmark book ‘The Effective Executive’ first published in 1967, Peter F. Drucker came up with the concept of Executive Effectiveness. It was different from managerial effectiveness in its very texture.

First he goes on to explain ‘who is executive?’ According to him, every knowledge-worker, whose contribution materially affects the capacity of the organization to perform and to obtain results, is an executive. He famously said that “Most managers are executive, but all executives need not be managers” because knowledge organizations need both ‘managers’ and ‘individual professional contributors’ in positions of responsibility, decision-making and authority.

To endorse his thought, he quotes remark of a young American Infantry captain in the Vietnam jungles – “In a Guerrilla war, every man is an ‘Executive’.” On the contrary, he also talks about the managers who do not qualify as executives because although they are superiors to other people but still do not seriously affect the ability of the organization to perform; bereft of the accountability for the direction, content, quality or methods of the work.

Then he focuses his attention on the ‘Effectiveness’. He says that as a term, it was a late entrant to the world of management literature because of one obvious reason – the ‘efficiency’ had the centre-stage. There was a specific pretext to this. Effectiveness as a virtue relates more to the knowledge-workers and for a better half of the last century there were no more than a handful of these around.

They were few because in the administrative-centralized setup, few people of that quality were needed and that too only at the top. And for that not-so-sizable chunk, organizations could rely on the supply of a few naturally-talented people. On the other hand, manual work was everywhere needed and that too in abundance. Moreover, for that sort of a work, a defined and discrete output was apparent, that could be judged in terms of quantity and clear measures of quality.
However, then the large knowledge-organization became a central reality where the center of gravity shifted towards the knowledge-workers. With this, the relevance and thus the importance of effectiveness surged.

Another misnomer that existed for quite some time was that the knowledge-workers are needed only at the top. But in the changed reality of the workplace, even in the most humdrum organizations, there were so many people who had to make decisions of significant and irreversible impact. These decisions were of the same kind as the decisions of the top management. Moreover, the nature of work was also getting similar although at different scales. Even the most junior of managers need to plan, organize, integrate, motivate and measure just the way a president needs to.

Drucker, although believes that every knowledge-worker has to do a strategic job in his orbit, doesn’t support the unreasonable expectations from executives of being universal experts. In turn, he maintains that organizations need to learn to work with people who at best excel in one set of abilities and are likely to have modest abilities in others. So, he recommends that if one cannot increase the supply of a resource, one must increase its yield. And it is possible only through increasing effectiveness for better results.

To be effective is the job of the executive. Irrespective of the domain in which he operates, he is expected to get the right things done. Yet the men of high effectiveness are proverbially ‘conspicuous by their absence’. It is almost clichéd to see people with excellent knowledge, intelligence and imagination rendered ineffectual because all these strengths require effectiveness to convert them into results. He maintains that increasing effectiveness may well be the only area where we can hope significantly to raise the level of performance, achievement and satisfaction for executives.

Drucker then talks about four ‘Executive Realities’ that both demand effectiveness from him and make effectiveness exceedingly difficult to achieve:

1. The executive’s time tends to belong to everybody else.
2. Executives are forced to stay entangled in operational cobweb (which are governed by the flow of events) unless he takes deliberate actions to come out of them.

3. The executive’s work depends on others’ work. So he is effective only if other people make use of what he contributes.

4. The executive is within the organization. So although all the results of the organization are on the outside, he sees the outside only through the thick and distorting lenses of organizational boundaries.

An executive may be an excellent man but he is certain to waste his knowledge & ability and throw away what little effectiveness he could have achieved because of these four executive realities. Thus if an organization wants effectiveness then it has to enable an executive to work on ‘what is truly-important’ – that is on contribution and results.

He further debates that as we acknowledge that effectiveness is crucial, the key question that surfaces is “Can it be learnt?” Before he answers, he raises another question “What does it consist of?” Is it knowledge? Skill? Or Practice?

He reckons that effectiveness is not a gift people are born with; similar to a singer, painter or composer. He says that more than anything, effectiveness is a habit; a complex of practices, and practices can be learned. All that is needed is pursuit of acquiring them by practicing relentlessly until they become unthinking, conditional reflexes bordering on becoming the ingrained habits.

He inferentially asserts that there are five practices or habits of the mind that have to be acquired to gain executive effectiveness. They are:

- Effective executives know where their time goes. They work systematically at managing the time that can be brought under their control.
- Effective executives focus on outward contribution. They gear their efforts to results rather than to work, let alone the tools and the techniques.
• Effective executives do not start out with the things they cannot do, they focus on what they can do. Thus, rather than building on weaknesses, they build on strengths - their own strengths and those of their colleagues, superiors and subordinates.

• Effective executives focus on few major areas where the superior performance will produce outstanding results. They do first things first.

• Effective executives make effective decisions – a few, fundamental decisions by taking the right steps in the right sequence; rather than making many fast decisions but wrong.

So we can say that Professional Effectiveness is at the intersection of Executive Effectiveness and Managerial Effectiveness. As in the contemporary setting of work and within much-celebrated conception of professionalism, we have professionals working right from the lowest levels in the hierarchy to the highest echelons of the pyramid, so Professional Effectiveness is a more commensurate and encompassing concept & term. While it takes the fiercely ‘individual perspective’ of executive effectiveness, it also incorporates the more ‘holistic nature’ of managerial effectiveness.

Thus, we can reach an operational concept of professional effectiveness as “It is the ability to manage both tasks as well as relationships. It includes both core-skills and soft-skills. Moreover, it means ability to successfully deal with all the aspects of one’s current responsibilities at workplace while still being progressive in approach. It covers one’s contributiveness both as an individual and as a member of the team and the organization”.