



## RESEARCH ARTICLE

### GOAL ORIENTATION AND ITS IMPACT ON COMMUNICATION STYLES

**\*Dr. Anand, R.**

Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar – 608002

#### ARTICLE INFO

##### Article History:

Received 22<sup>nd</sup> June, 2017  
Received in revised form  
27<sup>th</sup> July, 2017  
Accepted 03<sup>rd</sup> August, 2017  
Published online 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2017

##### Key Words:

Goal Orientation,  
Communication and Executives.

**Copyright © 2017, Anand.** This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Citation: Dr. Anand, R. 2017.** "Goal orientation and its impact on Communication styles", *International Journal of Current Research*, 09, (09), 58237-58242.

#### ABSTRACT

Goal orientation refers to the goals individuals implicitly pursue while attempting to attain certain performance outcomes (Dweck and Leggett, 1988). Communication climate is the tone of interactions among individuals in a work environment, with tone reflecting not only the quality of those relationships but also the organization's effectiveness. The data for this study was collected through survey method. Executives those who are above 45 years of age were prefers neutral style of communication. Further details were discussed in this paper. Communication climate is the environment in which communication either thrives or languishes.

#### INTRODUCTION

Goal orientation refers to the goals individuals implicitly pursue while attempting to attain certain performance outcomes (Dweck and Leggett, 1988). Individuals who are high in performance avoidance orientation are avoiding demonstrations of incompetence and negative judgments, relative to others. Consequently, a performance-avoid goal is considered to be an avoidance form of motivation as it orients one towards the negative outcomes of avoiding negative judgments and demonstrating lack of ability. Individuals with a performance-approach goal orientation focus on gaining favorable judgments of their ability and competence relative to others. A performance-avoid goal orientation orients individuals towards the avoidance of demonstrating incompetence and negative judgments relative to others (Elliot and Harackiewicz, 1996; Rawsthorne and Elliot, 1999; VandeWalle, 1997). Learning goal orientation is to develop competence by acquiring new skills and mastering new situations. In dynamic organizational contexts, a good performance may elicit states such as feelings of security, pride, and satisfaction, whereas poor performance may generate dissatisfaction. Moreover, training and learning within an organization are of paramount importance for maintaining competitiveness in this context. Training should be based on individual learning, and therefore, in view of the fact that individuals should pursue learning, goal orientation is a key concept so that personal decision and the handling of the organizational culture will be taken into account within such organizations. Leaders should manage and support the types of behavior aimed at learning orientation. These include encouraging the proposal of aims or objectives for personal development, the search for opportunities for personal development, and the provision of feedback in order to improve performance.

Neither should we overlook the fact that the fear of making mistakes generated by situations of uncertainty is often the cause of resistance to change; that is, a barrier to organizational development. Communication climate is the tone of interactions among individuals in a work environment, with tone reflecting not only the quality of those relationships but also the organization's effectiveness. Communication climate is the environment in which communication either thrives or languishes. Once the individual have some awareness of their personal belief system and how it affects your communication, it is time to start thinking about the communication climates they encounter every day. Each time when individuals communicate with others, they experience a different communication climate which is made up of the tone, the mood, and the attitude of those people involved in the communication. The effectiveness of any communication may depend on the ability of the service coordinator to create a communication climate. Supportive climates encourage individuals (particularly subordinates), while defensive climates put individuals on guard, resulting in a defensive reaction to the words and tone of the speaker. A supportive climate is one that is nonjudgmental so the other person does not feel defensive by my communication. A defensive climate makes the other person feel self-protective.

**Review of Literature:** Kristy, Maher, and Motley (2007) explored the intersection between managers' learning strategies and their organizational leadership practices in a nonprofit context. Findings illustrate that effective learning from experience is significantly predictive of transformational leadership. Further, they revealed that frequent use of thinking and action learning strategies have positive and significant relationship to transformational leadership in nonprofit managers. Sachau (2007) studied the Herzberg's motivation – hygiene theory. The results revealed that managers should focus on increasing the intrinsic motivation and long-term satisfaction of the employees by providing the psychological growth opportunities. Usugami and Kyung-Yeol (2007) examined the similarities and

**\*Corresponding author: Dr. Anand, R.,**

Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration,  
Annamalai University, Annamalainagar – 608002.

differences in employee motivation management between Korean and Japanese executives of Japanese-affiliated companies in Korea, based on questionnaire surveys. The results revealed that both Korean and Japanese executives realize the importance of employee motivation management, and that Japanese executives have a stronger awareness of it than Korean executives. Both recognize it for the sake of high corporate performance, employee job satisfaction, and customer satisfaction. Cunningham (2006) explored the issue of "happiness" as a meaningful concept in organizational life. The findings of the study revealed that the concept of happiness is too narrow to be valuable to learning and development professionals. Davis (2006) developed a map to achieve employee and customer satisfaction and to align organizational processes for goal achievement for public sector organizations. The findings revealed that there is a direct link between the achievement of the organizational goal and the organization's ethics and values. Further, goal achievement reinforces the legitimacy of the values and ethics as the basis for organizational success. Hassan, Mustaffa, and Bahtiar (2009) establish and interpret the appropriate level of analysis based on the correlation between leader-member exchange quality, supervisory communication, and team-oriented commitment in a Malaysian organizational setting. The finding revealed that individual dyad relationships and communication correlates with team-oriented commitment at the group level. Saari and Talja (2009) analyzed how the motives and aims of top management and knowledge workers differ from each other. The results revealed that management and personnel of a research organization tend to interpret very differently: the tension between freedom and control, formation of research strategies, applicability of business management models to research organizations, and the meaning of structural changes. Madlock (2008) examined the influence of supervisor communicator competence and leadership style on employee job and communication satisfaction among 220 individuals. The results indicated a strong relationship between supervisors' communicator competence and their task and relational leadership styles, with supervisor communicator competence being a stronger predictor of employee job and communication satisfaction. Reilly (2008) explored the human resource development competencies that facilitate crisis communication from the organization development perspective. The findings revealed that human resource development methodologies in coping with crises and repertoire of techniques communication play a vital role in the communication. Snively and McNeill (2008) examined the interface between two key models of communication style: social style and communicator style among 852 individuals. The results revealed that the communications made are emotive, assertive, relaxed, and accurate. Furthermore, communication contains the self-image of the communicator.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study aims to examine the goal orientation and its impact on communication styles of executives. The study also considers the differences in the selected variable on the basis of age, length of service, number of dependents, and educational qualification of the executives.

### Objectives

- To compare the goal orientation and communication styles of executives with respect to their age, educational qualification, length of service, and number of dependents.
- To infer the relationship of goal orientation on communication styles of the executives.

**Research Methods:** Survey method is used in this study, which is descriptive and associational in nature. Executives of a public sector organization were selected and from 256 sample questionnaire were administered. This study is made using Goal Orientation Measure of Zweing and Webster and Communication Climate Inventory of Gibb. The data for this study was collected through survey method. The description, administration, and the psychometric properties of the tools are presented here.

## Goal Orientation Measure

**Description:** The Goal Orientation Measure of Zweing and Webster (2004a) is a self-report measure, which explored the different types of goal orientation. This measure consists of 21 statements from which I have utilized only 12 items for this study, which explore the different dimensions of goal orientation viz. performance approach, performance avoidance, and learning orientation. There are five response categories viz. "strongly disagree," "disagree," "neutral," "agree," and "strongly disagree."

The number of items in each dimension of the Goal Orientation Measure is given below:

Dimension of Goal Orientation	No. of items	Item numbers
Performance approach	4	1,2,3,4
Performance avoidance	4	5,6,7,8
Learning orientation	4	9,10,11,12

### The Goal Orientation Measure is presented in Section – D.

**Administration:** The executives were instructed as follows: "This measure consists of a number of statements which follow five response categories. Read each statement carefully and indicate your agreement or disagreement in the given five-point scale and by marking the corresponding number. There is no right or wrong answer and there is no time limit. Work rapidly and give your immediate response to each item."

### Scoring

The following scoring pattern was used to score the items:

Response	Score
Strongly disagree	1
Disagree	2
Neutral	3
Agree	4
Strongly agree	5

**Reliability:** Zweing and Webster (2004a) have established internal consistency reliability for the three scales. For the learning orientation, it is 0.85, for performance approach orientation it is 0.82, and for performance avoidance orientation it is 0.69. The test-retest reliability coefficients for the goal orientation scale are: learning orientation is 0.73, performance approach orientation is 0.84, and performance avoidance orientation is 0.78. These correlation coefficient values suggest that goal orientation is stable over time.

**Validity:** Zweing and Webster (2004a) ensured both content and construct validity. The convergent validity of the 3 scales is: learning orientation it is 0.87, for performance approach orientation it is 0.79, and for performance avoidance orientation it is 0.81. These convergent validity values reveal that the tool is highly valid.

## Communication Climate Inventory

**Description:** The Communication Climate Inventory by Gibb (1961) is used to measure the organization's communication. Communication climate is measured in two parts as defensive (six components) and supportive (six components) with 36 items. I have considered 2 components in each part such as evaluation and neutrality (Defensive) and provisionalism and spontaneity (Supportive). There are five response categories viz. "strongly agree," "agree," "uncertain," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." The numbers of items in each dimension of the communication climate inventory is given below:

Dimension of Communication Climate	No. of items	Item numbers
Evaluation	2	1,3
Neutrality	2	5,7
Provisionalism	2	2,4
Spontaneity	2	6,8

### Communication climate inventory is presented in Section – E.

**Administration:** The following instructions were given to the executives: “This inventory contains certain statements with five response categories. Read each statement carefully and indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement in the given five-point scale, by marking the corresponding number. There is no right or wrong answer and there is no time limit. Don’t think too much about an item and give your immediate response to each item.”

### Scoring

The following scoring pattern was used to score the items:

Response	Score
Strongly disagree	1
Disagree	2
Neutral	3
Agree	4
Strongly agree	5

**Reliability:** Gibb (1961) has established the reliability of the tool based on the internal consistency coefficient of the communication climate inventory. The average Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were high with an overall average of 0.76.

**Validity:** This tool possesses content validity and constructs validity. The criterion validity of the scale is 0.65 for the communication factors. Hence, it is concluded that communication climate inventory is highly valid.

### Data Analysis

#### HYPOTHESIS: 1

*“Executives differ in their goal orientation on the basis of age.”*

From Table - 1, it is found that the ‘t’ values are significant for performance-approach and performance-avoidance whereas it is not significant for learning orientation. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that the executives significantly differ in their goal orientation on the basis of age. From the above table it is found that the executives with more than 45 years of age have higher performance-approach and performance-avoidance. With a performance-approach goal, one seeks to demonstrate or prove competence in the presence of others. In contrast, people with a performance-avoidance goal orientation act to avoid negative evaluations. Individuals with strong performance-approach orientation try to utilize all the opportunities, develop knowledge and skills, and regulate themselves. Higher in performance-approach incorporates attributes like commitment, involvement, and responsibility etc., which will be growing with experience. OD is possible only through uniform motivation practices, and individual career grooming at all levels within the organization. The good motivational practices and goal orientation should be considered by the organization, and the management should show interest in establishing such systems in the organization with employees over a period of time. It is evident that the executives with higher age have better performance orientation. It is concluded that executives differ in the better performance approach and avoidance orientation on the basis of their age.

#### HYPOTHESIS: 2

*“Executives differ in their goal orientation with respect to the number of dependents in the family.”*

From Table - 2, it is observed that the ‘t’ values are significant for two goal orientation constructs and not significant for learning orientation. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that the executives with more number of dependents have significantly higher performance-avoidance orientation whereas executives with less

dependents have higher performance approach orientation. Executives with up to 2 dependents in the family have higher performance – approach orientation. It may be due to their level of commitment and attention paid in the family that makes them more focused in their approach. Executives with more dependents have higher performance – avoidance orientation. When the numbers of dependents are more one has to pay attention to which in turn will make the person feel uncomfortable. Also, due to fatigue, one has been tempted to avoid the task rather than approach. It is concluded that executives with more number of dependents in the family have higher performance avoidance and those with less dependents have higher performance approach orientation.

#### HYPOTHESIS: 3

*“Executives differ significantly in their goal orientation on the basis of their educational qualification.”*

From Table - 3, it is noticed that the ‘F’ values are not significant for the performance-approach and learning where as significant for performance-avoidance goal orientations. Hence, the hypothesis is not accepted. It is concluded that executives do not differ in their goal orientation on the basis of their goal efficient. However, the executives differ significantly in their performance-avoidance based on their educational qualification. It is observed from the table that executives with non-professional degrees have higher performance-avoidance orientation than the other educational groups. It may be due to their lack of understanding, application, and impact of the sustainability about the technical aspects of the organization. Goal orientation of executives is vital from time to time to bring out their potential and improve their efficiency. It is the duty of the management to identify the orientation needs of executives and adopt proper methods which will make them perform better. It is concluded that executives do not differ in their goal orientation; however, executives with non-professional degree have significant higher score in the performance – avoidance orientation.

#### HYPOTHESIS: 4

*“Executives differ significantly in their goal orientation on the basis of length of service.”*

From Table - 4, it is found that the ‘F’ values are significant for all the constructs of goal orientation. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that the executives differ significantly in their goal orientation based on the length of service in the organization. Executives with above 20 years of service in the organization have higher score in performance-approach. It may be due to their experience in handling different managerial issues arising on day to day affairs, which has made them to get exposure of the right approaches to solve the various situations in the organization. Executives with 11 to 20 years of service in the organization have higher score in performance-avoidance. Executives, who are higher in the performance-avoidance, may be due to the monotony towards work which exhibits that individuals are avoiding demonstrations of incompetence and negative judgments, relative to others. Also, the executives with up to 10 years of service in the organization have higher score in learning orientation. It may be due to the age factor as they are starting their career with lot of hopes and expectations which makes them to learn things in the organization to prove themselves. It is concluded that executives differ in their goal orientation on the basis of their years of service in the organization.

#### HYPOTHESIS: 5

*“Executives differ in their communication with respect to their age.”*

From Table - 5, it is found that the ‘t’ values are significant for defensive communication along with its sub scales whereas it is not significant for supportive communication. Hence, the hypothesis is partly accepted. It is concluded that the executives with more than 45 years of age have higher defensive communication than their counterparts.

**Table 1. Goal orientation of executives on the basis of their age**

Dimensions of Goal orientation	Age Group				t-value
	Up to 45 Years		Above 45 Years		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Performance - approach	15.01	2.09	15.80	2.53	2.66*
Performance - avoidance	10.50	2.47	11.55	3.98	2.41*
Learning	16.53	2.28	16.41	1.94	0.44 <sup>NS</sup>

N<sub>1</sub>= 108 \* - Significant at 0.05 level N<sub>2</sub>= 148 <sup>NS</sup> - Not Significant

**Table 2. Goal orientation of executives on the basis of their number of dependents**

Dimensions of Goal orientation	Number of Dependents				t-value
	Up to 2		More than 2		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Performance - approach	16.06	2.42	15.06	2.28	3.36*
Performance - avoidance	9.53	3.49	12.20	2.99	6.54*
Learning	16.50	2.22	16.44	2.00	0.22 <sup>NS</sup>

N<sub>1</sub>= 105 \* - Significant at 0.05 level N<sub>2</sub>= 151 <sup>NS</sup> - Not Significant

**Table 3. Goal orientation of executives with respect to their educational qualification**

Dimensions of Goal orientation	Educational qualification			F-Value	Scheffe –Post hoc
	1 Mean (S.D)	2 Mean (S.D)	3 Mean (S.D)		
Performance - approach	14.94 (2.44)	15.46 (2.64)	15.80 (2.04)	2.560 <sup>NS</sup>	---
Performance - avoidance	11.44 (2.40)	11.69 (4.07)	10.37 (3.29)	3.995*	2 Vs 1 Vs 3
Learning	16.45 (1.59)	16.31 (2.25)	16.60 (2.21)	0.473 <sup>NS</sup>	---

N<sub>1</sub>= 621. Technical diploma N<sub>2</sub>= 932. Non - Professional Degree N<sub>3</sub>= 101 3. Professional Degree \* - Significant at 0.05 level<sup>NS</sup> - Not Significant

**Table 4. Goal orientation of executives in accordance with their length of service**

Dimensions of Goal orientation	Length of Service			F-Value	Scheffe – Post hoc
	1 Mean (S.D)	2 Mean (S.D)	3 Mean (S.D)		
Performance - approach	14.65 (2.08)	15.62 (2.36)	15.75 (2.57)	3.650*	3 Vs 2 Vs 1
Performance - avoidance	9.52 (2.25)	11.56 (3.50)	11.25 (3.82)	6.647*	2 Vs 3 Vs 1
Learning	17.21 (2.15)	16.22 (2.04)	16.47 (2.05)	4.195*	1 Vs 3 Vs 2

N<sub>1</sub>= 481. Up to 10 years N<sub>2</sub>= 1482. 11 to 20 years N<sub>3</sub>= 60 3. Above 20 years \* - Significant at 0.05 level

**Table 5. Communication of executives on the basis of their age**

Dimensions of Communication	Age Group				t-value
	Up to 45 Years		Above 45 Years		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Evaluation	5.44	0.82	5.84	1.61	2.32*
Neutrality	5.75	1.30	6.34	1.62	3.15*
Defensive Communication	11.19	1.63	12.18	2.89	3.20*
Provisionalism	7.74	1.27	7.53	1.22	1.32 <sup>NS</sup>
Spontaneity	8.24	1.31	8.09	0.93	1.09 <sup>NS</sup>
Supportive Communication	15.98	2.41	15.62	1.60	1.43 <sup>NS</sup>

N<sub>1</sub>= 108 \* - Significant at 0.05 level N<sub>2</sub>= 148 <sup>NS</sup> - Not Significant

**Table 6. communication of executives on the basis of their number of dependents**

Dimensions of Communication	Number of Dependents				t-value
	Up to 2		More than 2		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Evaluation	5.30	1.31	5.93	1.32	3.72*
Neutrality	5.94	1.70	6.20	1.38	1.33 <sup>NS</sup>
Defensive Communication	11.25	2.57	12.13	2.37	2.82*
Provisionalism	7.68	1.53	7.58	1.00	0.59 <sup>NS</sup>
Spontaneity	8.32	1.17	8.03	1.05	2.08*
Supportive Communication	16.00	2.20	15.62	1.81	1.53 <sup>NS</sup>

N<sub>1</sub>= 105 \* - Significant at 0.05 level N<sub>2</sub>= 151 <sup>NS</sup> - Not Significant

**Table 7. Communication of executives with respect to their qualification**

Dimensions of Communication	Educational Qualification			F-Value	Scheffe – Post hoc
	1 Mean (S.D)	2 Mean (S.D)	3 Mean (S.D)		
Evaluation	5.73 (1.46)	5.59 (1.28)	5.71 (1.35)	0.260 <sup>NS</sup>	---
Neutrality	5.94 (1.68)	5.82 (1.54)	6.45 (1.33)	4.725*	3 Vs 1 Vs 2
Defensive Communication	11.66 (2.83)	11.41 (2.55)	12.16 (2.14)	2.298 <sup>NS</sup>	---
Provisionalism	7.47 (0.94)	7.41 (1.50)	7.92 (1.10)	4.706*	3 Vs 1 Vs 2
Spontaneity	8.10 (1.05)	8.06 (1.09)	8.27 (1.16)	0.913 <sup>NS</sup>	---
Supportive Communication	15.56 (1.78)	15.47 (2.03)	16.18 (2.02)	3.571*	3 Vs 1 Vs 2

N<sub>1</sub>= 621. Technical diploma N<sub>2</sub>= 932. Non - Professional Degree N<sub>3</sub>= 101 3. Professional Degree \* - Significant at 0.05 level<sup>NS</sup> - Not Significant

**Table 7. Communication of executives with respect to their qualification**

Dimensions of Communication	Educational Qualification			F-Value	Scheffe – Post hoc
	1 Mean (S.D)	2 Mean (S.D)	3 Mean (S.D)		
Evaluation	5.73 (1.46)	5.59 (1.28)	5.71 (1.35)	0.260 <sup>NS</sup>	---
Neutrality	5.94 (1.68)	5.82 (1.54)	6.45 (1.33)	4.725*	3 Vs 1 Vs 2
Defensive Communication	11.66 (2.83)	11.41 (2.55)	12.16 (2.14)	2.298 <sup>NS</sup>	---
Provisionalism	7.47 (0.94)	7.41 (1.50)	7.92 (1.10)	4.706*	3 Vs 1 Vs 2
Spontaneity	8.10 (1.05)	8.06 (1.09)	8.27 (1.16)	0.913 <sup>NS</sup>	---
Supportive Communication	15.56 (1.78)	15.47 (2.03)	16.18 (2.02)	3.571*	3 Vs 1 Vs 2

N<sub>1</sub>= 621. Technical diploma N<sub>2</sub>= 932. Non - Professional Degree N<sub>3</sub>= 101 3. Professional Degree \* - Significant at 0.05 level<sup>NS</sup> - Not Significant

**Table 8. communication of executives in accordance with their length of service**

Dimensions of Communication	Length of Service			F-Value	Scheffe – Post hoc
	1 Mean (S.D)	2 Mean (S.D)	3 Mean (S.D)		
Evaluation	5.08 (0.85)	5.82 (1.32)	5.77 (1.62)	5.873*	2 Vs 3 Vs 1
Neutrality	5.77 (1.26)	6.10 (1.55)	6.33 (1.59)	1.847 <sup>NS</sup>	---
Defensive Communication	10.85 (1.43)	11.93 (2.52)	12.10 (2.09)	4.177*	3 Vs 2 Vs 1
Provisionalism	8.29 (1.18)	7.44 (1.20)	7.53 (1.22)	9.279*	1 Vs 3 Vs 2
Spontaneity	8.92 (0.99)	7.98 (1.13)	7.97 (0.88)	15.677*	1 Vs 2 Vs 3
Supportive Communication	17.21 (1.90)	15.42 (2.00)	15.50 (1.48)	17.427*	1 Vs 3 Vs 2

N<sub>1</sub>= 481. Up to 10 years N<sub>2</sub>= 1482. 11 to 20 years N<sub>3</sub>= 60 3. Above 20 years \* - Significant at 0.05 level<sup>NS</sup> - Not Significant

**Table 9. Goal orientation and communication of executives: correlation analysis**

	CC-1	CC-2	CC-3	CC-4	CC-5	CC-6
GO-1	- 0.080	0.148*	- 0.238*	- 0.321*	- 0.067	0.047
GO-2	0.498*	0.311*	0.057	0.198*	- 0.121	0.460*
GO-3	- 0.018	- 0.125*	0.090	- 0.067	0.237*	- 0.086

CC-1: Evaluation CC-4: Provisionalism CC-2: Neutrality CC-5: Spontaneity CC-3: Supportive communication CC-6: Defensive communication  
\* - Significant at 0.05 level

Executives with more than 45 years have higher defensive communication with its sub dimensions viz. evaluation and neutrality. With growing age, they learn how to utilize their knowledge, exposure, and familiarity to defend them. Probably, the executives with lesser age may not learn this art. However, it is not healthy for the organization that their executives have higher preference for defensive communication. Hence, organizational development practices should focus on improving the supportive communication which would make the executives to deal with their sub-ordinates productivity and get things done. However, it is witnessed from the table that the executives do not differ in their supportive communication.

#### HYPOTHESIS: 6

*“Communication of executives is significantly influenced by the number of dependents in their family.”*

From Table - 6, it is observed that the ‘t’ values are not significant for few dimensions of communication. Hence, the hypothesis is partly accepted. It is concluded that the executives differ significantly in the evaluation, defensive communication, and spontaneity dimensions of communication on the basis of the number of dependents in their family. Executives with lesser dependents in their family have higher spontaneity skill. When the number of members is less in the family one may have more time to think and focus inwardly which in turn spontaneity, with more number of people in the family one can have more models, which may tempt an individual to imitate rather than introspect. With more number of people in the family, we get a standard or norms for evaluation. These would be the reasons that the executives with more number of dependents have higher evaluation as well as defensive communication. It is concluded that the executives with lesser dependents differ significantly in the evaluation and defensive communication whereas those with more number of dependents have higher score in the spontaneity dimensions of communication.

#### HYPOTHESIS: 7

*“Executives differ significantly in their communication on the basis of their qualification”.*

From Table - 7, it is noticed that the ‘F’ values are significant for three dimensions of communication. Hence, the hypothesis is partly accepted.

It is concluded that the executives differ significantly in neutrality, provisionalism, and supportive communication based on their qualification. Executives with professional degree have higher score in provisionalism, neutrality, and supportive communication. Higher in provisionalism and supportive communication may be due to the flexible nature and creative abilities of the executives in turn to explore ideas and even adopt new behaviour patterns to operate the systems. Whereas high in neutrality dimension of communication may be due to the nature of job performed by the professional degree holders. Because they deal with pressurized jobs and technical aspects that is comparatively highly pressurized job in the organization makes them to observe, and share the feelings of others. It is concluded that executives with professional degree do better in the neutrality, provisionalism, and defensive communication.

#### HYPOTHESIS: 8

*“Executives differ significantly in their communication on the basis of their length of service.”*

From Table - 8, it is found that the ‘F’ values are significant for the dimensions of communication. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that the executives significantly differ in their communication based on their length of service in the organization. Executives with up to 10 years of service in the organization have higher Mean score in supportive communication and its sub-scales (provisionalism and spontaneity). It may be due to the practice of organization culture, value independence, awareness about the personal biases, strive to respect the differences of others, and beliefs about the personal self and the professional self which make them to perceive the present communication in provisionalism, spontaneity, and supportive. It is good for the organization because the younger executives are comfortable with the communication system. Executives with 11 to 20 years of service in the organization have higher score in evaluation. The perception of the life experience and the communication of perception happened due to the position held by the executives in the organization that makes them to evaluate their communication. Executives with above 20 years of service in the organization have higher defensive communication. This is developed by the nature of coordinating various functional activities in the organization requiring lot of communication that gives them an opportunity to be good in defensive communications. However, this is not a good sign for the organization to defend their communications. It is concluded that executives differ in their communication based on the length of service in the organization.

**HYPOTHESIS: 9**

**“There is a significant relationship between goal orientation and communication of executives.”**

From Table - 9, it is observed that correlation coefficients are significant for more than half of the goal orientation constructs. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that goal orientation constructs have a significant relationship with the communication of executives. It is observed from the table that performance-approach has a positive relationship with neutrality, whereas negative relationship exists with provisionalism and supportive communication. Positive relationship with neutrality may be due to the executives' mental framework to interpret and respond to situations, circumstances, and events achievement that make them to have positive relationship. The negative relationship of performance-approach with provisionalism and supportive communication may be due to the failures in the conceptualization of mental framework to communicate and interact with others. Performance-avoidance has a positive relationship with evaluation, neutrality, provisionalism, and defensive communication. The performance-avoidance orientation may be due to grounding in self-regulation. This evokes the self protective attitudes that interfere with or preclude optimal task engagement. Finally, learning orientation has a positive relationship with spontaneity whereas negative relationship persists with neutrality. It may be due to the organizational environment which communicates beliefs about the learning opportunities in the organization which have the potential to impact executives' achievement, whereas negative relationship is due to the communication system or the perception of communication leads to negative beliefs. It is concluded that the goal orientation constructs of executives have relationship with the communication of executives.

**RESULTS**

1. Executives those who are more than 45 years of age, 11 to 20 years of experience and who have up to two dependents in the family where performance-approach orientation focused.
2. Executives those who are more than 45 years of age, non-professional degree holders, 11 to 20 years of experience and who have more than two dependents in the family where performance-avoidance orientation focused.
3. Learning orientation focus is demonstrated by the executives who have up to 10 years of experience.
4. Executives those who are above 45 years of age, 11 to 20 years of experience and those who have more than two dependents in their family where evaluate in their communication.
5. Executives those who are above 45 years of age and professional degree holders where neutral in their communication.
6. Executives those who are above 45 years of age, more than 20 years of experience and those who have more than two dependents in the family where defensive in their communication.
7. Executives those who are up to 10 years of experience and who have professional degree where provisionalism in their communication.
8. Executives those who are up to 10 years of experience and who have up to 2 numbers of dependents in their family where spontaneity in their communication.
9. Executives those are up to 10 years of experience and who have professional degree holders where supportive in their communication.
10. Goal orientation versus Communication – Correlational analysis.
  - The performance-approach orientation has a significant positive relationship with neutrality and negative relationship with provisionalism and supportive communication.
  - Performance-avoidance orientation has positive relationship with evaluation, neutrality, defensive communication and provisionalism.
  - Learning orientation has a significant positive relationship with spontaneity and negative relationship with neutrality.

**Conclusion**

The findings on relationship of goal orientation with communication of executives revealed that performance-approach orientation has a significant positive relationship with neutrality whereas it has negative relationship with the provisionalism and supportive communication. Performance-avoidance orientation has a significant positive relationship with most of the dimensions of communication. Learning orientation has a significant positive relationship with spontaneity and negative relationship with the neutrality. Executives are communicating on a broad spectrum of issues with a wide variety of individuals, and they solve problems throughout the day. Both these key processes have important consequences for the people they lead and the organization as a whole. For this, communication of goals and targets determine the performance or activity to be successful or unsuccessful. Learning attitude promotes them for continuous improvement and involvement, avoid miscommunication, and serve to increase the pleasure of everyone's experience. Goal orientation research has provided great insights into the learning, approach, and avoidance orientations realm of how they think and what they do each day.

**REFERENCES**

- Cunningham, I. 2006. The pursuit of happiness? A challenge. *Development and learning in organizations*, 20 (6), 4-6.
- Davis, P. J. 2006. In search of the common wealth: A Service-profit chain for the public sector. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 55 (2), 163-172.
- Dweck, C. S. and Leggett, E. L. 1988. A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95, 256-273.
- Elliot, A. J. and Harackiewicz, M. 1996. Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 461-475.
- Hassan, A. B., Mustaffa, C. S. and Bahtiar, M. 2009. LMX quality, supervisory communication and team-oriented commitment: A multilevel analysis approach. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 14 (1), 11-33.
- Kristy, T., Maher, J. K. and Motley, D. G. 2007. Learning strategies as predictors of transformational leadership: The case of nonprofit managers. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 28 (3), 269-287.
- Madlock, P. E. 2008. The link between leadership style, communicator competence, and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, 45 (1), 61-78.
- Rawsthorne, L. J. and Elliot, A. J. 1999. Achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 326-344.
- Reilly, A. H. 2008. The role of human resource development competencies in facilitating effective crisis communication. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 10 (3), 331-351.
- Saari, E. and Talja, H. 2009. Towards communication and learning based leadership: Observations in Finnish public research organizations. *The Learning Organization*, 16 (3), 251-260.
- Sachau, D. E. 2007. Resurrecting the motivation – hygiene theory: Herzberg and the positive psychology movement. *Human Resource Development Review*, 6, 377-393.
- Snavely, W. B. and McNeill, J. D. 2008. Communicator style and social style - testing a theoretical interface. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 14 (3), 219-232.
- Usugami, J. and Kyung-Yeol, P. 2007. Similarities and differences in employee motivation viewed by Korean and Japanese executives: Empirical study on employee motivation management of Japanese-affiliated companies in Korea. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17 (2), 280.
- Vande Walle, D. 1997. Development and validation of a work domain of goal orientation instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57, 995-1015.