

ADOPTION AND ADAPTATION OF COMMUNICATION AUDIT IN CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS

MONA GUPTA

Vivekananda Institute of Professional Studies (India)
mona.gupta@vips.edu

Abstract: Communication is the lifeline of every organization. A communication audit is an idea, a concept, tool or instrument used to diagnose strengths and weaknesses of the communication system of the organization. Corporate communications are the communication functions of an organization, actively involved in the decision-making process, and forming a strategy for handling internal and external communications. The following paper studies three objectives, first to understand the relevance of adoption of communication audit, second to analyze the reasons for adoption and rejection of communication audit, and lastly, to find out the adaptation of communication audit in corporate communications. Corporate communication managers were interviewed and the data was analyzed based on the adoption theory of Everett Rogers's Theory of Diffusion of Innovation. By analyzing the persuasive and decision making factors for adopting a communication audit, and finding out a list of adapted tools used in the department, there is a clear indication of the need for adoption of communication audit in the corporate communication department. Also, looking at the other ways used for analyzing communication, an adaptation of communication audits in some form has also been seen in the corporate communications of organizations.

Keywords: communication audit, corporate communications, diffusion of innovation, organizations, communication system.

INTRODUCTION

Corporate communication forms the basis of all the communication that goes within and outside the organization. As pointed out by Cees Van Riel, it is "an instrument of management by means of which all consciously used forms of internal and external communication are harmonized as effectively and efficiently as possible", with the aim of developing "a favourable basis for relationships with various stakeholder groups up-

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
2020, 2, DOI: 10.12893/gjcp.2020.2.7
Published online by "Globus et Locus" at <https://glocalismjournal.org>



Some rights reserved

on which the company is economically and socially dependent” (Van Riel 1995: 18).

Corporate Communication is a “specific way of thinking that pervades and shapes many different types of organizations” (Christensen, Cornelissen 2011: 385). It assists in comprehending “how communication organizes rather than the traditional focus on the organization of communication” in an organization (Christensen, Cornelissen 2011: 384). Corporate Communication thus studies the way communication messages are framed, what actions are required to reach out to the stakeholders, how to judge the reactions of these stakeholders, and developing pleasing organizational personality. It can be therefore seen the process of integrating “the total business message” (Van Riel 1995). This fits corporate communication as an important management function (Cornelissen 2008: 47) that indulge straight away into the matter of identity and legitimacy “especially when the claim of a definitive stakeholder are urgent, communication practitioners and other managers have a responsibility to give it a priority and attention”. Therefore, corporate communication cannot be just seen as a mere channel “through which organizations simply relay and amplify their self-perceptions, but as an active and constitutive force in the construction of organizations” (Christensen, Cornelissen 2011: 385), that provides a unified control of the function of organizational communication that demands involvement, engagement, active participation and delegation of responsibility at all the levels (Christensen, Torp, Firat 2005: 157).

This identifies corporate communication and organizational communication as “two sides of the same coin” (Christensen, Cornelissen 2011: 394). With these regular checks and balances become the necessity for a communication function to work effectively. Therefore, “to examine and evaluate an organization’s communication program; to reveal hurdles to effective communication, to reveal gaps in the communication process, and to provide suggestions for improvement”, communication audit is the best way to employ (Henderson 2005: 312).

Communication audit, as the term first used by Odiorne (Odiorne 1954: 235), calls it “an exploratory attempt to discover the accuracy and direction of communication within a

particular organization at a particular moment". It is defined as "a comprehensive and thorough study of communication philosophy, concepts, structure, flow, and practice within an organization" (Emmanuel 1985: 50).

According to Zwijze-Koning et al, "in spite of the number of publications on auditing of organizational communication, scholars paid little attention to the methodological strengths and limitations of the different data-collection techniques involved" (Zwijze-Koning, Jong 2007: 261). Even though the literature on communication audits is dominated by handbooks and case studies, still "empirical research on the reliability and validity of common communication audit techniques is limited" (Zwijze-Koning, Jong 2007: 262). Thus, there is scope for further work "to isolate and compare the contribution of individual audit techniques" (Zwijze-Koning, Jong 2007: 262) and that too with respect to the corporate communication department. This "can assist managers by providing them with knowledge of what is actually happening at the communication level, rather than what they thought or were told was happening" (Hurst 1991).

COMMUNICATION AUDIT IN CORPORATE COMMUNICATION: THE INDIAN CASE

There is no presence of any literature on the application of communication audits in the Indian corporate sector. Only one book on Corporate Communication by Jaishri Jethwaney (Jethwaney 2010) has mentioned the need and value of communication audits. But there is no such mention of any Indian case or anything specific to India is discussed in the content. But there is enough literature present from Netherlands (Zwijze-Koning, Jong 2007); Canada; from UK (Bateman, Wilson 2002); (Hogard, Ellis 2006); Portugal, (Carvalho 2013); from New Zealand (Jones 2002); from South Africa (Antonis 2009) and many others.

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

The organization varies in their ways to accept or adopt an innovation. Some are creators and learners known as innovators and many can be followers called imitators (Lewin, Greve 2005: 1551). It is thus important to analyze the factors like risk-taking abilities and an innovation generating higher performance (Schumpeter 1942), that coerce the organization to follow suit.

Roger's Diffusion of Innovation focuses on factors like risk-taking and the relative advantage of innovation which define the rate of adoption among similar actors (Rogers 1983; Lewin, Greve 2005: 1551). The institutional theory states that the imitation or to become isomorphic, the organizations should share the same environment (Di Maggio, Powell 1983: 147). Looking at the institutional factors like culture and the legal systems, there can be a variation in the organizational practices across countries (Rosenzweig, Singh 1991: 344). With the differences in the organizational environment, therefore, there is also a possibility that the imitation or the likeability and implementation of one practice may vary from country to country (Gooderham, Nordhaug, Ringdal 1999: 508).

The other factor which does not fit institutional theory into the context is legitimacy. The organization's structures and techniques do not change for a purpose but to justify the social context or to copy others. This is also true with the actors who do not rather innovate but succumbed to the "normatively prescribed or simple mimicking organizations they understand to be more successful" (Scott 1995; Munir 2019).

Rogers' theory of Diffusion of innovation has more to do with an individual contribution. His "theory building and research began with, and still primarily focuses on, diffusion and adoption by individuals rather than within organizations" (Lundblad 2003: 60). In order to analyze the prospect of change and to move from the "sociological focus" to the "more managerial orientation", it is therefore important to cater to the "perspective of a senior manager" (Hinings, Greenwood 2002: 413).

Innovation as described by the dictionary of Merriam-Webster is “the introduction of something new”. Here, that something new is the tool of communication audit for corporate communicators. But to perceive this as new, an individual’s reaction can be determined. But the idea doesn’t always have to be a new knowledge as people may know about the concept yet not developed any attitude towards it, “nor have adopted or rejected it” (Rogers 1983: 176). Straub explains the adoption as the process of “practicing the idea by the individual into their life” and diffusion as “the collective adoption process over time” (Straub 2009: 626).

The very aspect of defining an idea as new and innovative can be expressed “in terms of knowledge, persuasion, or a decision to adopt” (Rogers 2003: 12). Therefore, for any idea to be adopted, every innovation should be persuasive in terms of its advantage, adjustment, degree of its complexity, the scope for trial, and some obvious changes and observations within the set-up.

PERSUASIVE FACTORS

The attributes which define an idea as new and convincing are (Rogers 1983): *a*) Relative Advantage: the extent that an idea or a thought is seen better than the idea it succeeds. The level of relative preferred position might be determined in financial terms, however there are other additional fundamental segments that of social-esteemed contemplations, comfort, and satisfaction. It doesn’t make a much difference if an innovation has a lot of “objective” advantage. What makes a difference is whether an individual considers any innovation to be helpful. The better the apparent relative advantage of development, the higher its pace of appropriation would be; *b*) Compatibility: the extent to which an idea or innovation is seen as perfect with the existing standards, with the previous experiences as well as with the probable stakeholders. Any invention which is not compatible or consistent with the current standard will also be difficult to be accepted in any social system. Therefore, any new idea can only be implemented when

it is accepted and approved by the newly approved framework; *c*) Complexity: the extent to which an idea or a tool is regarded as complex to understand and implement. The complexity decides the degree of acceptance as the easily adaptable one is quickly grasped rather than the complex, which may be implemented gradually. Thus, a technological concept that is easier to understand can be implemented more easily than technologies that involve the acceptance of new knowledge and considerations; *d*) Trialability: the extent when creativity can get tested but with certain restrictions. According to Rogers, any innovation tried on an “installment basis is generally adopted more quickly than innovations that are not divisible” (Rogers 1983: 177). An invention that is capable of being tested is considered for adoption because there is a possibility to learn; *e*) Observability: the extent that the new idea may bring some results which seem visible in a system or an organization. If any progress is seen or expected out of that innovation, the better the chances of its acceptability. This exposure encourages peer discussion of a new concept, and look for information on innovation-assessment.

These attributes thus define the rate of adoption of any new idea into the system, the “relative speed with which an innovation is adopted by members of a social system” (Rogers 1983: 221).

ADOPTION-REJECTION

Any idea also undergoes a decision-making stage where the participants of the process engage themselves in contemplating the acceptance and rejection of the new knowledge: *a*) Adoption is the acceptance to use the innovation or any new knowledge in the best possible way and in the best possible manner; *b*) Rejection is an outright denial of the new idea based on the reasons mentioned above or maybe not found suitable according to the social system.

For a great many people, one approach to manage the unavoidable disarray about the impacts of inventiveness is to evaluate the most recent idea on a fractional premise. What’s

more, most people would not follow development without first endeavouring on a trial premise to evaluate its utility in their own circumstances. This preliminary trial is regularly some portion of the choice to embrace and is a method for diminishing the apparent multifaceted nature of development for the adopter. Developments that can be isolated for preliminary use are normally executed all the more quickly. A few people who look to develop will rather change to a choice on reception if the thought has probably some relative advantage. Note that the pattern of the acceptance-rejection cycle can lead to a dynamic procedure of any decision making.

Eveland further suggested two different types of rejection can be distinguished: “active rejection, which consists of considering adoption of the innovation (including even its trial) but then deciding not to adopt it. Passive rejection (also called non-adoption), which consists of never really considering use of the innovation” (Eveland 1979: 4).

CONSEQUENCES

Consequences are the changes with the adoption and rejection of the innovation. To cut the level of uncertainty in adopting new ideas, the individuals should be made aware of all the consequences by apprising them about their strengths and weaknesses. Everett Roger argued that the consequences should be graded as

desirable versus undesirable (functional or dysfunctional), direct versus indirect (immediate result or result of the immediate result) and expected versus unanticipated (recognized and planned or unintended) (Rogers 1983: 442-446).

OBJECTIVE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

Communication Audit since has not been found in any Indian literature and research papers clearly define the practice as new and innovative. Besides, there is also no scope of

‘imitation’, so the adoption of this tool is an organization’s internal decision or rather should be the decision of the adopter. The adopter can be the corporate communication manager who can be the innovator depends on the acceptance or rejection of the idea.

There can be many decision-making factors for adopting a tool like communication audit which is itself is so extensive and intricate. The two major players for any firm to adopt the innovative practices are: *a)* corporate communication executives who are the actual beneficiaries and are the agents for establishing the organization’s communication structure; *b)* the recognition and registration of the desired benefits from the practice (also as compared to the one already in use).

The objectives of the study are: *a)* RO1. To state the relevance of adopting a communication audit for corporate communications; *b)* RO2. To analyze the reasons for the adoption and rejection of communication audit in the corporate communication of an organization; *c)* RO3. To find out the adaptation of communication audit in corporate communications.

METHODOLOGY

Corporate communication professionals run the communication function of the organization while dealing with both the internal and external publics. To understand the gravity of the communication audit, the research assessed the opinions of corporate communication professionals on the need and requirements of communication audit in their department.

Research Settings

To evaluate the importance of communication audit in an organization, the corporate communication professionals are to be interviewed first. A qualitative approach was used by collecting data through in-depth interviews with corporate communication professionals. Forty-eight corporate communication professionals were interviewed. Data was collected

and analysis was done on the basis of Roger's theory mentioned above.

RO1. To understand the relevance of adopting a communication audit for corporate communication.

Communication audit has not seen any such exposure in Indian journals especially with respect to public relations and corporate communication. Many academic books though have referred about it but as far as the implementation is concerned no such literature is present anywhere. Thus, it is important first to understand whether corporate communication professionals find it important and advantageous for their department. The relevance will be analyzed with respect to its relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observation as suggested by Everett Roger's Diffusion of Innovation.

RO2. To analyze the reasons for the adoption and rejection of communication audit in the corporate communication of an organization.

With the level of knowledge of communication audit among the public relations and corporate communication professionals, it is also necessary to know the level of acceptance and rejection of the communication audit. To adjudge this, consequences will be studied based on three aspects as stated by Everett Rogers, "desirable versus undesirable (functional or dysfunctional), direct versus indirect (immediate result or result of the immediate result) and expected versus unanticipated (recognized and planned or unintended)" (Rogers 1983: 442-446).

RO3. To find out the adaptation of communication audit in corporate communications.

It is also significant to know if there is an adapted version of a communication audit has been used in the organization. This objective will help in finding out what other tools have been used in the organization for evaluating communication in or for the department of corporate communication.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

RO1. To understand the relevance of adopting a communication audit for corporate communication.

After in-depth interviews, the responses were recorded and segregated into five variables for understanding the tool of communication audit as innovative and relevant for adoption. All the responses are divided into different tables with one variable each.

Relative Advantage (tab. 1). It is the economic considerations as well as social acceptance with respect to the level of benefits and satisfaction derived in a system. Innovation can be preventive and incremental. Preventive is an idea that lowers the risk and incremental innovations deliver benefits.

Discussion. The idea of conducting a communication audit is found beneficial for evaluation. The respondents clearly stated the utility of the audit tool in finding gaps in stakeholder communication, uncovering strengths and weaknesses in relationships, is better than any other tools used especially in making the communication processes better and professional. It has also been seen as an initiative in auditing employee feelings and alignment with the organization.

The audit tool handles two-way communication, which if conducted regularly, can develop better public opinion and add to the growth and development of the organization.

Compatibility (tab. 2). Each invention affects attitudes, beliefs, principles and attitudes. When innovation is consistent with the needs of the individual, the chances of acceptance

Tab. 1. *Relative Advantage.*

<i>Relative Advantage</i>	<i>Responses</i>
The idea is better than the concept it supersedes in economic terms, social-prestigious considerations, comfort and satisfaction and beneficial.	<p>It is an important evaluation process for the Comms team to analyze gaps in stakeholder communications strategy and strengthen the key messaging of the Company.</p> <p>It is very important to uncover the strengths and weaknesses between management, employees, customers and other groups.</p> <p>A communications audit is a part of a yearly audit that is part of a larger audit of employee feelings and alignment with the organization.</p> <p>Important but costly.</p> <p>It is a good practice for an organization.</p> <p>Communication Audit is an important tool many companies today have adopted to make the communication processes better and professional, reduce the gaps between teams and top management. This process has played a crucial role in the overall development and growth of the company</p> <p>Audits are the basis of communications planning without doubt.</p> <p>It is a good tool to judge corporate communication effectiveness.</p> <p>The communication audit is essential for the improvement in networking and data handling for a two-way communication strategy.</p> <p>Poor communication always leads to dissatisfaction among employees/clients. Regular audits not only help the organization identify the loopholes but also assist in redefining the strategy based on public opinion.</p>

Tab. 2. *Compatibility.*

<i>Compatibility</i>	<i>Responses</i>
It is the extent to which innovation is viewed as compatible with current principles, past experience, and the desires of potential stakeholders.	<p>Can be adjudged with the Company policies, communication plans and required outcome for which audit is organized.</p> <p>The questionnaire is designed to elicit responses on how people feel and think about the organization. This includes queries on communication within the organization.</p> <p>It is important to know the perception of external audience about the company's visibility. This helps in strategizing and aligning communication with business goals.</p> <p>Team management is highly required for any kind of process. For communication audit, we can adopt many things but what should fit the best we have to review that.</p>

increases. An idea or innovation should also have some meaning and ability to be accepted by the adopter.

Discussion. Communication audit can be compatible if it involves the team itself in its formation so that the evaluation process will be in tune with the organization's communication plans and policies. This in turn may also help in knowing the perception of the external publics if each and every member of the team is involved actively at the beginning and during the process of the conduct of communication audit.

Complexity (tab. 3). It has a negative correlation with the acceptance rate. The unnecessary difficulty in a concept can be a significant barrier to its acceptance.

Discussion. The reason it is seen as difficult, is in terms of resistance from the people to be audited. The other complex factors pointed out were lack of experienced auditors, need for required training, slow process of adoption among some organizational set-ups, indifference among management, and most importantly resistance against strong feedback mechanism.

Trialability (tab. 4). There is positive correlation between trialability and rate of adoption. The higher the rate of trialability better the chances of acceptance. There are further possibilities of 'reinvention' where the idea may get developed into a new form. Increased re-invention can lead to a faster adoption of innovation which may lead to a changed or adjusted ability to implement it.

Discussion. Respondents felt the need for trialability. It should be devised along with auditors as per the organization's need and can be conducted either as per the designed processes of the auditors or by the senior experts of the organization. The professionals required its need in assessing the situation it should be conducted by a senior expert. Some suggested its trial at least once in a year, some for twice in a year, some on quarterly, others on a regular basis, few while planning an event. Respondents even felt that the audits should be done at the beginning of the financial year and reviewed at the end, with intermediate audit done every quarter, or maybe on regular basis as part of ISO audit. The implementation can be done internally to quantify emotions, or on the client's feedback to determine the level of deliverables.

Tab. 3. *Complexity*.

<i>Complexity</i>	<i>Responses</i>
The extent when the idea is seen as complex and intricate to comprehend and implement.	<p>Organizations to bring a structured framework and build a strong feedback mechanism.</p> <p>It's a practice which at first can face a bit of resistance from those about to be audited but a yearly audit of communication by seasoned auditors can, in fact, lead to the identification of gaps within its communication structure, messaging emanating from the function, and its efficacy.</p> <p>An organization serious about weeding out inefficiencies, can in fact do a periodic check (without calling it "audit" because the term can sometimes sound weighty to the public) through HR and based on the findings can look to address the gaps. The functional arrangements could be rejigged, those who need training could be sent for training, functional responsibilities for individual workers could be re-thought.</p> <p>It's a necessary tool to bridge the communication gap, but too difficult to implement in State-run PSUs like ours as everything moves very slow at Government in West Bengal</p> <p>It depends on the communication team open for evaluation.</p> <p>It depends on the management willing to go an extra mile by evaluating each campaign.</p> <p>Communication Audits are not taken seriously in the public sector. The management needs to be sensitized towards its significance. Once the management is convinced of the need and requirement of a communication audit, seriousness and earnest are invested in executing such an audit that can thereby help the organization in the long run.</p> <p>Adoption is an easy part in an organization but making the employees adapt to it is difficult.</p> <p>With time and resources being a constrain across organizations coupled with a lack of awareness regarding the importance of carrying out such an extensive process, Communications Audit has largely not featured as a part of a Company's calendar. The roadblock is a lack of awareness and the initial kick-starting of the evaluation system in tune with the communication plans of the Company.</p> <p>This is too much detailed</p>

Observability (tab. 5). According to Arlene Parisot, "role modelling (or peer observation) is a crucial driving factor for the acceptance and diffusion of technology" (Parisot, 1995: 44). Observability supports the acceptance or may lead to rejection of any idea if any benefit, reliability, or the level of testability can be seen and so the pace at which innovation can be adopted.

Tab. 4. *Trialability*.

<i>Trialability</i>	<i>Responses</i>
It is the extent a creativity can be tried but on a restricted basis.	Should be done on a regular basis or as a part of ISO audit.
The innovation can be tested on an installment basis.	It is required to assess the situation and device the right campaign.
An invention that is capable of being tested is considered for adoption because there is a possibility to learn.	It should be consistent and feedback should be critical.
	An absolute must and should be done once a year.
	A baseline is important along with auditors be open to designing the audit as per the needs of the organization rather than the set process that all audit firms come with.
	If devised well (rigorous process and appropriate questions) and tailor-made to the firm's need, such audits can empower the comms professionals profoundly.
	Communication audit should be done periodically to strategize properly.
	It should be periodic and be conducted by senior expert people. Client feedback is key that determines your level of deliverables.
	Can be done internally on a yearly basis just by quantifying the emotion expressed towards the company news and information.
	While organizing any kind of event we should plan a communication audit so that we can also review what things we can improve and fix for upcoming events.
	I believe that it should be done quarterly. It should be done on a regular basis.
	Should be carried out twice a year. First during January. Second one during December.
	An audit must be able to trace if the intended communication reached the target audience and if they are able to understand it as intended. The audits should be done at the beginning of the financial year and reviewed at the end, with intermediate audit done every quarter.

Discussions. Public relations and corporate communication professionals found its need to gauge the perception of a company amongst its key stakeholders. The audit must be premised on two assumptions - one, that people's opinions will be respected and protected. Two, people must see change after offering their feedback else the objective of an audit is defeated. It should be structured and be designed in a way that it can be adapted to changing communication requirements and business environment. The multinationals have figured out the way of

Tab. 5. *Observability.*

<i>Observability</i>	<i>Responses</i>
<p>The degree to which the effects of a new idea are apparent to others.</p> <p>To see the benefits of progress This exposure encourages peer discussion of a new concept, and look for information on innovation-assessment.</p>	<p>I think every organization does communication audits in some way or the other. However, nobody cares about the importance of it as such. There is also lack of awareness to measure it and it's not done formally in many places.</p> <p>A communication audit is primarily conducted to gauge the perception of a company amongst its key stakeholders. Hence the tools/approach that shall be used will depend on the purpose of the communications audit.</p> <p>While communication audits are very important for organizations, they must be premised on two assumptions - one, that people's opinions will be respected and protected. Two, people must see the change after offering their feedback. Otherwise, the objective of an audit is defeated.</p> <p>The exercise is extremely important to be adopted by every organization that aims to have a structured communication plan. Also, the audit should be designed in a way that it can be adapted to changing communication requirements and business environment.</p> <p>Most MNC's have figured out the way of doing professional communication audits. The rigour and due diligence are worth emulating.</p> <p>Quarterly evaluation of the communication plan helps in making course corrections where required, for the communication campaign to be effective.</p>

doing professional communication audits. Quarterly evaluation of the communication plan helps in making course corrections where required, for the communication campaign to be effective.

RO2. To analyze the reasons for adoption and rejection of communication audit in the corporate communication of an organization.

The responses are divided as per the aspects of adoption as when, why and how it should be adopted (tab. 6). Further what were the reasons for the rejection of communication audit (tab. 7). This is analyzed through Roger's grading variable of studying consequences.

Tab. 6. *Responses.*

<i>Adoption</i>
Continuous evaluation after every event
An audit (at least once a year or depending on requirement) should be conducted to measure the effectiveness of the communication; the audit should be conducted through independent agencies and in a professional manner.
The fact that it is one of the few companies where such a thing exists also acts as an impediment towards expanding the ambit of the audit. It is now treated as a routine activity with not much importance given to results. The only way to do is that external agencies should conduct audits. Also, during promotions, such audits must also be taken into account.
There should be refresher courses or workshops for Corporate Communications professionals conducted by academicians where all fears can be debunked and a common platform can be created for discussion of ways and challenges of communication audit.
It is mandatory.
The adoption/adaptation/implementation of communication audits in Indian businesses is still extremely weak leaving a huge scope for improvement.
At least 4 times in a year.
It's a good concept, and if implemented well, can be a good guiding light for PR planning and strategy.
It's required and helps in the long run.
It is a necessary step, needed and required.

Desirable versus Undesirable: that defines the functionality and dysfunctionality of the concept. Communication audit can support weak communication in Indian businesses. But the management does not appreciate the importance of the communication function for business growth. As suggested by Hargie and Tourish, “a key first step in the audit process is securing the support of senior management” (Hargie, Tourish 2000: 9). Respondents suggested refresher courses or workshops for Corporate Communications professionals conducted by academicians where all fears can be debunked and a common platform can be created for discussion of ways and challenges of communication audit. But the others found it unfortunately been a term which has found its place only in academic circle.

Tab. 7. *Rejection.*

<i>Rejection</i>	
<i>Active</i>	<i>Passive</i>
It's not formal. Those who do it are highly dependent on their own perception or observations and this lacks any specific parameters and proper methodology.	In my 8 years tenure in three companies, none did communication audit.
Communication audit had unfortunately been a term which has found its place only in the academic circle.	There no way to adopt a communication audit in the organization.
Communication function requires professionals with diverse experience and background (former journalists, public relations professionals, content writers, social media analysts, etc.) thus it is difficult to adopt.	Professionally it should not be given much importance. Though I've heard about Communication Audits, I've never seen one executed in my current job or previous jobs.
The management does not appreciate the importance of the communication function for business growth.	It is viewed as just another cost function.

Direct versus indirect (delayed or delayed result): as per the respondent's suggestions, it should be conducted four times in a year and can be a guiding light for planning and strategy but it is viewed as another cost function by many.

Expected versus unanticipated (recognized and planned or unintended): It can be conducted professionally through independent agencies to measure communication effectiveness but many professionals do not find it formal. According to some, those who conduct, are highly dependent on their own perception or observations and this lacks any specific parameters and proper methodology.

RQ 3. To find out the adaptation of communication audit in corporate communications.

With the above discussion, a communication audit is found relevant and significant for a corporate communication department. However, besides a regular communication pro-

cess, the professionals mentioned the adapted versions of analyzing communication used or can be used in their organization. Many respondents suggested alternative methods that can be used in their organization. The various methods used and suggested by the corporate communication managers are: *a)* personal Discussions, Social Media Response, Internal Communication Response and Strategy adoption as per required outcome; *b)* survey conducted with journalists and employees on TOM (Top-of-mind awareness) recall of the organization; *c)* formal and Informal conversations with key stakeholders; *d)* informal reviews conducted by the team which includes learning done on a monthly, quarterly, and annual basis; *e)* Informal dipstick surveys, social media mapping, twitter feeds and responses, a way to track if key messages, etc are landing in the way an organization wants it to land in the minds of its consumers and public; *f)* social media perception is one way of evaluation of external communication. Employee perception in a way internal campaigns are done, promotion, and publicity undertaken for the same is also an important parameter of evaluating a means of communication; *g)* evaluation of communication in an organization is done through questionnaires, personal feedback, and discussions. The frequency is based on the campaigns and crisis that the company faces from outside parties and internally as well; *h)* informal group meetings from the HR; *i)* given the nature of work, daily audits for regular work. Based on the different assignments the audit frequency varies.

What constitutes a world-class communication network often always uses simple and easily understood communication concept (Clampitt, Berk 1996: 15).

CONCLUSION

With the above discussions, there has been enough persuading factors for communication audit to be adopted by the corporate communication managers. The only reasons for the rejection are mainly lack of support from top-management plus the fear of its complexity and level of expertise it may re-

quire along with the cost-factor. However, the professionals have even given a list of alternatives adopted by the organization for evaluating communication but most of them have neither been institutionalized nor have been formal and drafted during their processes. Communication researchers have increasingly identified a crippling distance between theory and practice. Though the corporate communicators involved in the process do understand the idea and support the concept but still there is an adequate rejection. The communication managers are found agreeable to the process of evaluating communication in the organization and consequently to modifying their actions. It is despite, all the reasons for evaluating the communication, it is also conceivable that even the acceptance of communication audit still does not make it an applied knowledge until and unless there are explicit practices being seen in actual.

REFERENCES

- S. Massini, A.Y. Lewin, H. R. Greve (2005), *Innovators and imitators: Organizational reference groups and adoption of organizational routines*, in "Research Policy", 34, pp. 1550-1569.
- B. Bateman, F.C. Wilson (2002), *Team Effectiveness-Development of an audit questionnaire*, in "Journal of Management Development", 21, 3, pp. 215-221.
- A. Booth (1989), *The Communications Audit: A Useful Management Tool?*, in "Managerial Auditing Journal", pp. 13-16.
- J.M. Carvalho (2013), *The Crucial Role of Internal Communication Audit To Improve Internal And General Market Orientations*, in "European Scientific Journal", 9, 25, pp. 357-379.
- L.T. Christensen, J. Cornelissen (2011), *Bridging Corporate and Organizational Communication: Review, Development, and a Look to the Future*, in "Management Communication Quarterly", 25, 3, pp. 383-414.
- L. Christensen, S. Torp, F. Firat (2005), *Integrated Marketing Communication and Postmodernity: An odd couple?*, in "Corporate Communications an International Journal", 10, 2, pp. 156-167.
- P.G. Clampitt, L.R. Berk (1996), *Strategically communicating organizational change*, in "Journal of Communication Management", pp. 15-28.
- J. Cornelissen (2008), *Corporate communication: A guide to theory and practice* (London: Sage).
- P.J. Di Maggio, W.W. Powell (1983), *The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields*, in "American Sociological Review", pp. 147-160.
- M. Emmanuel (1985), *Auditing communication practices*, in C. Reuss, R. Desilvas (eds.), *In Inside organizational communication* (New York: Longman).



- J.D. Eveland (1979), *Issues in Using the Concept of Adoption of Innovations*, in "The Journal of Technology Transfer", pp. 1-13.
- P. Gooderham, O. Nordhaug, K. Ringdal (1999), *Institutional and Rational Determinants of Organizational Practices: Human Resource Management in European Firms*, in "Administrative Science Quarterly", 44, 3, pp. 507-531.
- J.E. Grunig (1992a), *Communication, public relations, and effective organizations: An overview of the book*, in J.E.Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management* (Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates).
- D.W. Guth, C. Marsh (2003), *Public Relations: a Values-Driven Approach* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon).
- O. Hargie, D. Tourish (2000), *Auditing Professional Practice*, in O. Hargie, D. Tourish (Eds.), *Handbook of Communication Audits for Organisations* (London: Routledge).
- J. Henderson (2005), *Evaluating public relations effectiveness in a health care setting: The Identification of communication assets and liabilities via a communication audit*, in "Journal of Health and Human Services Administration", 28, pp. 282-322.
- C. Hinings, R. Greenwood (2002), *Disconnects and consequences in organization theory?*, in "Administrative Science Quarterly", pp. 411-421.
- B. Hurst (1991), *The Handbook of Communication Skills* (London: Kogan Page).
- J. Jethwaney (2010), *Corporate Communication: Principles and Practice* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press).
- J.P. Lundblad (2003), *A Review and Critique of Rogers' Diffusion of Innovation Theory as it Applies to Organizations*, in "Organization Development Journal", 21, 4, pp. 50-64.
- K.A. Munir (2019), *Challenging Institutional Theory's Critical Credentials*, in "Organization Theory", 1(1).
- G.S. Odiome (1954), *An application of the Communications Audit*, in "Personnel Psychology", pp. 235-243.
- A. Parisot (1995), *Technology and teaching: the adoption and diffusion of technological innovations by a community college faculty* (Bozeman, MT: Montana State University).
- E.M. Rogers (1983), *Diffusion of Innovation* (New York: Macmillan).
- E.M. Rogers (2003), *Diffusion of Innovation (5th edition)* (New York: Macmillan).
- P.M. Rosenzweig, J. V. Singh (1991), *Organizational Environments and the Multinational Enterprise*, in "The Academy of Management Review", 16, pp. 340-361.
- R.D. Smith (2002), *Strategic Planning for Public Relations* (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc).
- J.K. Springston, R. W. Lariscy (2004), *Public Relations Effectiveness in Public*, in "Journal of Health and Human services administration", pp. 218-45.
- E. Straub (2009), *Understanding technology adoption: Theory and future directions for informal learning*, in "Review of Educational Research", 79, 2, pp. 625-649.
- J.A. Schumpeter (1976), *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy (3th edition)* (London: George Allen and Unwin).
- C.B. Van Riel (1995), *Principles of corporate communication* (London: Prentice-Hall).
- W.R. Scott (1995), *Institutions and organizations* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE).
- K. Zwijze-Koning, M. Jong (2007), *Evaluating the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire as a Communication Audit Tool*, in "Management Communication Quarterly", pp. 261-282.

