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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to test the homogeneity-heterogeneity taxonomy of intercultural communication developed by L.E. Sarbaugh. This taxonomy suggests that the homogeneity of participants on the variables of World View, Code Systems, Knowing and Accepting and Perceived Relation and Intent in a communication interaction contributes to successful communication. The taxonomy also seeks to predict communication efficiency based on the extent of homogeneity-heterogeneity of the participants.

To do so, dyads from The Raj Quartet were selected and their interactions were analyzed.

It was found that Sarbaugh's schema held good for about forty percent of the cases. It was therefore ascertained that other factors apart from the variables mentioned in the schema influence the efficiency of a communication interaction.
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PREFACE

The motivation for this study arose from my personal experiences in intercultural communication as an international student in Canada.

My interest in this area was further stimulated by a course in Intercultural Communications taught by Dr. King.

India is a country known for its cultural diversity. However, since coming to Canada, I have been struck by the multi-cultural atmosphere here, in terms of the representation of different nationalities. My life has been enriched by interactions with people from various countries. I have been fascinated by the similarities and differences in cultures. I was especially struck by the effort one needs to make in order to successfully communicate with others. I have also been impressed with the technological developments that have resulted in better contact among the nations of the world. Hence, my desire to study the factors that contribute towards making an intercultural communication transaction successful.

The Raj was chosen as the period for study because it is an intercultural setting and an important time in the history of my country. It also holds especial significance for me, since my maternal grandfather was one of the few Indians who was allowed to rise to a high position in Colonial India. Furthermore, India today, still carries vestiges of British influence in many areas.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The technological developments of the twentieth century have rendered the different countries of the world more accessible to each other. Due to the development of better transport, satellite and telecommunication systems and the rapid expansion of multinational business enterprises, one lives in a "global village" wherein contact and interaction with members of different nationalities and cultures is a reality. Communication is an integral feature of the life of a human being. Furthermore, human beings by nature are social. Thus, intercultural communication is of prime importance in enabling one to interact and communicate successfully and efficiently with members of cultures other than one's own. This study, which concentrates on the efficiency of communication (i.e., the extent of successful communication as opposed to communication fraught with misunderstandings) among participants in an intercultural setting is of relevance in today's world.

The colonial situation is a phenomenon in world history which brings together into a special relationship, members of two different races and peoples of differing traditions, cultures, customs and social organizations (Maunier 1949, Vol. 1:4-6). It therefore presents a unique opportunity for the study of intercultural communication. The era of
British rule in India which constitutes an important chapter in the history of both nations, also provides one with just such a suitable occasion to observe, study and analyze the patterns of interactions and communication between the members of the two cultures.

1.1 PURPOSE

The prime purpose of this study is to apply L.E. Sarbaugh’s heterogeneity-homogeneity schema to the analysis of the efficiency of communication between the British and the Indians during the British Raj in India. According to Sarbaugh (1988:6,13,39), the extent of successful communication among participants is dependent on the extent to which they share similar cultural values. He has developed a taxonomy to assess the extent of similarity and dissimilarity of participants in a communication transaction, and therefore their levels of "interculturalness"/"intraculturalness," which in turn predicts the success or efficiency of their interaction. This schema is applied to the interactions of the Indians and the British during the final years (1942-1947) of the Raj as portrayed in the literature of that period, in order to test the accuracy of the schema predictions.

Singer (1987:156) points out that while in the larger context distinct cultures and nationalities interact, it is actually the individual members who comprise the groups who
interact and communicate in the name of the group and as its representatives, rather than the group per se. Hence, this study concentrates on interpersonal interaction and communication.

Literature, primarily fiction set in the colonial era of India is the main source of information, since this period provided a major subject for a tremendous amount of fictional material. Besides this, fiction was the principal representation of India for the vast majority of the British population in England. This study uses four novels of Paul Scott, collectively known as The Raj Quartet, as the chief source of information. Since Scott was in India during the last few years of the Raj, he had firsthand experience of the prevailing attitudes and social atmosphere of the period. Furthermore, he does not use India merely as a backdrop for his characters, but examines in depth the interpersonal relations between the Indians and the British.¹

1.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

This section provides an historical backdrop to give the necessary context to the study.

The history of India is replete with invasions and conquests from the beginning of recorded history. These include the Persian invasion of North West India in 518 B.C., the campaign of Alexander the Great in 326 B.C., and the Mongol invasion under Genghis Khan in 1221 A.D.
(Manorama 1991:478-479). This series of intrusions finally culminated in the establishment of British supremacy in India.

The rule of the British in India was unique, in that it saw the establishment of colonialism. In contrast to the "Moghuls who were ... becoming Indianised, and had ceased to regard themselves as strangers, and had no home but India" (Reynolds 1946:5), the British (around the eighteenth century) remained aloof and isolated from contact with the Indians, and constructed for themselves "Anglo-India."

The discovery of a new sea-route to India in 1598 A.D opened the way for the Portuguese, Dutch and eventually the British to enter India for the purposes of trade and commerce. The first known Englishman to set foot on Indian soil was Father Stevens, a Jesuit priest in 1579 A.D. So enthused was he by the possibility that "here in India was a fine market for English trade" (quoted in Kincaid 1938:1-2), that his observation served as a catalyst for four British "merchant adventurers" to set sail for India in 1583.

In 1599, "divers [sic] merchants made application to the Lord of Council for permission to send ships and as many pinnaces to India" (Reynolds 1946:3). This resulted in the "The Chapter of Incorporation of the East India Company by the name of the Governor and Company of Merchants of London trading to the East Indies" (Singh 1988:28). Thus, in 1600 the East India Company, or "John Company" as it was commonly called, came into being, by means of which the British were
able to gain a firm foothold in India. It is interesting to note that one of the founders of the East India Company was among the four "merchant adventurers" who sailed to India in 1583. As Macaulay (quoted in Reynolds 1946:14) observed:

Scarceley any man, however sagacious, would have thought it possible that a trading company separated from India by 15,000 miles of sea and possessing only a few acres for the purpose of commerce would in less than a hundred years spread its empire from Cape Comorin to the eternal snows of the Himalayas.

The East India Company obtained a charter from the Moghul ruler Jehangir to establish a trading centre in India. The British soon established commercial and military centres in Madras, Bombay and Calcutta. However, the beginning of British supremacy was established in 1764 at the battle of Buxar between the British and the Nawabs of Oudh, Bengal and the Emperor Shah Alam. Edwardes (1967:22) points out that:

Buxar was the real foundation battle of British dominion in India. As a result of the battle, the Company ceased to be a company of merchants and became a formidable political force.

Masani (1962:20) further points out that:

...by the end of 1803, the Company's sway extended over the whole of India. The Indian princes had been reduced to the status of vassals and the threat of French domination in the East had receded.

Having defeated the native powers, and established themselves as a political force, the British were now firmly entrenched in India. Along with this permanence came a change in attitudes towards the Indians (Edwardes 1969:10).
In addition to its trading and commercial activities, the East India Company also provided licenses to those who were interested in "enlightening or reforming Indians" (Edwardes 1969:12). This resulted in the introduction of reforms by the Governors-General to abolish child marriage, sati² and thugges³. The British soon regarded the Hindu religion as a "barbaric, pagan creed, beneath contempt ... Indians only had to look around them to see the British interfering at every level of life" (Edwardes 1967:150). He also notes (1969: 21), that "the religion of the British did nothing to promote racial harmony, on the contrary, it menaced the beliefs of the Hindu and Muslim alike." Consequently, in 1806 and 1824 there were revolts by the Indians in the British Army due to attempts by the British to persuade the sepoys to trim their beards, and to dissuade them from wearing caste marks on their foreheads. It should be borne in mind that most of the sepoys were high caste Rajputs and Brahmins, and it was difficult for them to "reconcile allegiance to their masters with loyalty to caste and creed, and not a few of them dreaded the loss of caste involved in complying with some of the new army regulations" (Ibid). Masani (1967:41-42) states, that "beneficial and justifiable though the reforms were, their introduction in such rapid succession gave rise to a general feeling of uneasiness and insecurity" on the part of the Indians.

The turning point came in 1857 when new rifles were
introduced, the loading of which entailed biting a greased cartridge. Soon rumors abounded that the grease used was either cow's fat or pig's fat. There was an uproar, as it entailed a defilement of Hindus and Muslims. The sepoys rebelled. The British retaliated by putting the rebels in irons and summarily discharging them from the army. This was followed by a period marked by hate, vicious atrocities and bloodshed both by the British and the Indians.

The British, however, subdued the Sepoy Mutiny. The result was the transfer of power from Company rule to Crown rule in 1858, and the age of Imperial India was ushered in. Reynolds (1969:93) notes that:

The "liquidation"... of the revolt of 1857 left the British in undisputed mastery of the entire country ... With the assumption of direct authority by the Crown in 1858, an era begins of complete despotism such as the Moghuls themselves might have envied.

Allen (1977:11) further observes that:

The self confidence of the British in India had never been higher. They saw this as a golden age and themselves as agents of Western enlightenment. By contrast, the self-confidence of the Indians was at its lowest.

British rule in India lasted for almost a century after the disastrous Mutiny. By 1900, the presence of the British in India was no longer welcome. The resentment against foreign rule that lay simmering after the Mutiny, soon came to the fore in the nationalist movement. By 1919, the refusal of the British to allow educated Indians into positions of leadership and government, along with the
banning of Indians from social clubs compounded the desire of Indians to see the British leave the country. In 1919, the British Government decided to accept the Rowlatt Act, which gave the Government total power to arrest anyone without "any cause shown" (Gopal 1967:300). This resulted in country-wide demonstrations and prayer meetings by the protesting Indians. At one such gathering in Amritsar, General Dyer opened fire on some 20,000 people, resulting in the Jallianwala Bagh massacre (Gopal 1967:306). This only served to intensify the anti-British riots and nationalistic activities. Eventually, the Indian National Congress (started in 1885), accepted Gandhiji's Non-cooperation Movement in 1920. This movement called for Indians to gradually boycott anything that the British Government had instituted, including schools, courts of law, and Government functions (Gopal 1967:320). This was followed by the Civil Disobedience Movement which lasted till 1934 and the Quit India Movement in 1942. Finally, in 1947, independence was granted to India, and India became a democratic republic.

1.3 RELATIONS BETWEEN THE BRITISH AND INDIANS

This section provides an overview of the general climate of "Anglo-India." It focuses on the attitudes of the British towards the Indians, the extent of social interaction and the hierarchical segmentation of society, in order to facilitate the reader's understanding of the
interpersonal and social relations of the characters in The Raj Quartet.

The initial period of Company rule in India was characterized by cordial relations and extensive interactions between the British and the Indians. This was a period when the British had just gained a foothold in India, and "though often critical of what they saw, they were careful not to allow their feelings to influence their actions in case it aroused opposition which they might not be able to resist" (Edwardes 1967:32).

The men who came out to India were conversant with the vernacular languages, and mixed freely with the Indians. They respected Indian customs and made an effort to engage in social contact with the Indians. There were very few British women who came out to India due to the poor conditions and the expense entailed in making the trip. Many of the men took Indian mistresses and wives. Kincaid (1938:51) points out that "these were so common that there was no social stigma attached to them." In fact, the Board of Directors of the Company decided to "induce by all means our soldiers to marry with the native women because it will be impossible for ordinary young (British) women to pay their passage (to India)" (Ibid).

The British were benevolent and did not interfere much with the Indians. Tandon (1968:12-13, 30), writing from the Indian perspective, points out that the Indians were initially fearful of the newcomers. However, "fear soon
gave way to curiosity. What were the Angrezi log⁵ up to? Their ideas were quite unlike those of rulers in the past."

He further states that the British officials were unassuming. They moved about freely among the Indians, and had an excellent mastery of the local language. "They had an insatiable curiosity of our customs and habits, and seemed never to tire of getting to know us. Their manners were strange but kindly and considerate, seldom hectoring or bullying" (Ibid). In contrast to the attitudes held by the Indians towards British rule during the latter stages of the Raj, the Indian did not begrudge the British this special position as ruler (Ibid).

However, around the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, these attitudes began to change and the bonhomie that characterized Indo-Anglian relations soon evaporated.

This change in attitudes occurred around the time the British began to consolidate their position in India and emerge as a power to be reckoned with. Edwardes (1967:32-33) points out that the change in attitudes and social relations occurred in the administration of Lord Cornwallis whose policies excluded Indians from positions in Government due to his conviction that "every native of Hindustan was corrupt" (Ibid). British society followed the example of its leader and began to withdraw from associations with the Indians. This was further compounded by Lord Wellesley's strong attitudes of racial superiority.
The hardening of attitudes between two races and the estrangement between the Indians and the British which was initiated during the rule of Cornwallis, was further strengthened during Wellesley's time (Misra 1987:15-16).

Thus, Captain Williamson (quoted in Kincaid 1938:118) noted that by 1818 "Europeans had very little connexion [sic] with natives of either religion."

Apart from official policy and attitudes, another factor for the increasing reserve of the British towards the Indians, was the increase in the number of British women who came to India. The English woman in India never really fully adapted to India, but attempted to create for herself and her family a little England in India, and so bring a touch of "home" away from home. Allen (1975:184) notes that the "convention-ridden memsahibs tended to build up a kind of 'little-England' protectively around their husbands."

Continuing in this vein, he further observes that:

By her mere presence, the memsahib placed a new barrier between her sahib and the land, while the sahibs themselves—who had once called themselves 'Indians' and had Indianised in a variety of ways that ranged from taking native wives or bibis to wearing pyjamas and smoking hubble-bubble pipes—now drew upon themselves, reinforcing their own identity as "Anglo-Indians" (Allen 1977:14).

Besides this development, there was an increase in the number of British who came to India, either as new recruits for the army or the I.C.S. or in an attempt to seek their fortunes in commerce or merely to perpetuate the family tradition of service to the Crown overseas (Ibid). British society began to expand, and soon "took on a life and
character of its own ... The English society in the principal towns and stations was now able to supply all that was needed ... They were able to construct a fortress into which to retire after the unavoidable engagement with the natives" (Edwardes 1967: 34). Children were now sent "home" (to England) since they were "in the gravest moral danger from birth and would grow up influenced by heathens" (Edwardes 1969: 40), were they to stay on in India.

During the initial stages of Company rule, missionaries were not allowed to enter India. This prohibition, however, was later relaxed in 1813. The coming of the missionaries resulted in a growing contempt for the "heathen" customs and religions. This influence convinced the British in India that "it would hardly be worth while to make any attempt at a close relationship with such a barbarous people" (Ibid). Thus, the British soon became endowed with a sense of mission to enlighten and uplift the "benighted heathen", and embarked on a campaign of social reform which included, as mentioned earlier the abolition of sati, child marriage, thuggee and female infanticide. This was a contributory factor to the Mutiny of 1857.

The Mutiny marked a turning point in Anglo-Indian relations. The British were now the undisputed masters of the country, while the Indians were no longer considered trustworthy. Racial antagonism and hatred which had been held in check by both sides, were now given full expression. The result was the establishment of a permanent barrier
between the two races and wounds that never healed. It now
gave rise to open racial superiority and antagonism on the
part of the British towards India and all things Indian. It
resulted in

...a heightened sense of moral righteousness which at
its worst produced the bully and the racist, the types
who habitually called all Indians "nigger" (later
"wogs") and mocked and disparaged all things Indian

The estrangement between the races that had begun after the
British began to consolidate their political position in
India merely intensified after the Mutiny, and soon the vast
gulf which separated the two races was characterized by a
lack of desire to bridge the gulf.

The major attitude that the British now held regarding
the Indians was one of condescension. Bishop Heber (quoted
in Edwardes 1969:19) noted that "the old, free and
unselfconscious relationships between Indians and British
were rapidly disappearing. The English had an exclusive,
intolerable spirit which made them wherever they went a
caste by themselves, disliking all their neighbors and being
disliked by them." In fact, Lord Auckland's sister, Emily
Eden, notes that when they dined at the home of a leading
Indian, "much of Calcutta society did not approve of their
Governor General hobnobbing with the natives" (Edwardes
1969:41). The British reaction to Indians was marked by a
lack of desire to see them. Thus developed the common adage
"the less one sees of the Indians, the better" (Edwardes
British attitudes towards the Indians was more marked by repugnance than by sympathy (Mason 1954, Vol. 2:257). The Indians were regarded as a people in need of discipline with a firm hand and the British felt divinely appointed to fulfill this task.

British society in India was divided into "hermetically sealed compartments" (Edwardes 1969:17). Heading the social stratification were the members of the exclusive Indian Civil Service. This was followed by the military and the police services. The middle class was comprised of businessmen and traders. The lower classes were made up of Eurasians, missionaries and the domiciled British. As Rao (1988:112) points out, "to preserve their solidarity, the British drew lines and circles, devised intricate and complex patterns of rigid behavior to conform to the code of the Raj, and erected a network of barriers to keep out the Indian whose land and resources they were enjoying."

Anglo-India as a rule did not favor British-Indian liaisons. In fact, E.S. Humphries (cited in Allen, 1975:185) describes an incident wherein an English soldier decided to marry an Indian lady. When he insisted on this route despite the warnings of his superiors, he was transferred to another part of the country. However, the lower classes of British society in India which were spurned by the upper classes did carry on liaisons with the Eurasians who lived in a "no-man's-land", neither accepted
by the British nor the Indians. An alliance of an Englishwoman and an Indian man, however, was strictly taboo.

The most common and frequent of British interactions with the Indians was with their servants. But even these interactions were marked by contempt on the part of the British. Edwardes (1969:40) observed that "a servant's slightest fault was often visited with blows and such abuse as no respectable man will bear, very often too for no other fault than that of not understanding what the master has said who has given his directions in some unintelligible stuff from ignorance of the language." Memsahibs barely tolerated the "natives", including their own servants. In this context, Ackerley (1932:24-25) recounts an incident wherein Mrs. Montgomery, unheeding her servants warnings, nearly trod on a krait:

"Then the servant did something without precedent in India--he touched me! He put his hand on my shoulder and pulled me back. If he hadn't, I should have undoubtedly been killed, but I didn't like it all the same, and got rid of him soon after."

Terence Milligan, reminiscing about his childhood in India remarks, that even while playing with the servants, "I never thought of anything else except the Indians being inferior. I was born to believe that we were the top people" (quoted in Allen 1975: 13).

At a higher level, the Governors-General and the civil servants interacted with the Maharajahs "with much pomp and ceremony. It was a meeting of superficialities" (Edwardes
1969: 20). Mrs. Norie remembers "You didn't mix with the Indians at all ... You mixed with a very high up family perhaps, but you didn't really bother about the Indians" (quoted in Allen 1975:200).

This segregation was evident even in the layout of residential areas, where the British lived in the cantonment, away from the "black town" which was inhabited by the Indians. There was therefore hardly any social interaction between the two races and this continued till the end of the Raj. Relations between the British and the Indians during the last few years prior to independence did not change much, rather the British followed the example of their predecessors and kept away from the Indians. Tandon, writing about conditions that prevailed in the decade prior to independence, (1968:197) comments that "the English newcomers were not the pioneering type of 50 years ago." They had less contact with the Indians, and kept to themselves and their ways.

Indians were discriminated against both socially and in the work arena. The new class of educated Indians who were conversant with the ideals of equality and freedom now posed a threat to the British. Edwardes (1969: 20) further notes that the attitudes of the British "towards their native subordinates oscillated between the poles of indifference and abuse. Little or no encouragement was given to those who worked well and hard." Hence as Tandon notes (1968:199):
Indian engineers even the ablest in the department never got beyond a point. Somehow, when they came near to the top post of Chief Engineer, something was found fundamentally lacking. In the race for the top, only the English seemed to win ... through the frustrating process of knocking out each Indian contestant.

In the social arena, Indians were not permitted to become members of clubs. It was often observed that the only way an Indian could enter a club was as a servant (Tandon, 1975:29). Abbas, a noted Indian film producer (1977:213), remembers that special permission had to be obtained for his entry into the Yacht Club at Bombay.

Menon, India's ambassador to China notes that discrimination pervaded all aspects of life. The Indians in the army were not granted the King's commission, but "an inferior variety, i.e., the Viceroy's Commission. Even in missionary institutions, Indians held lower appointments" (1965:41-42). He notes that at the Madras Christian College, the Englishmen held the positions of professor, while Indians were relegated to the posts of either tutors or lecturers.

Even Indians who held high positions in the British Raj were not immune to discrimination. Menon cites an incident (1965:45) where Sir Sankaran Narayan, a high ranking Indian who, despite being the principal speaker at a function was not permitted into the hall because he did not have a pass, while "dozens of Englishmen went in without having been asked to show one."
In the area of travel, Indians were as a rule not permitted to travel first class. Tandon (1971:47-48) comments that:

The Europeans travelled first class, and usually did not let Indians in even if there were vacant seats... An average Indian would look hard elsewhere before he had the courage to enter a compartment occupied by Europeans and never if there were army officers. The better placed the Indian, the less he dared, for fear of a snub or the remote but possible chance of being physically thrown out.

John Morris (cited in Allen, 1975:199) remembers boarding a train in Bombay and discovering that his travelling companion was an Indian. "Affected by the ruling class in India," he demanded that the station-master "eject" the Indian from the compartment. One of the rules of etiquette for the Indian man was that he, "with all self-respect to himself, should not enter into a compartment reserved for Europeans." Justification for this lay in the fact that although he had "acquired the habits and manners of the European," he should have the "courage to show he was not ashamed of being an Indian" and should identify himself "with the race to which he belongs" (Ibid). Irene Edwards (cited in Allen, 1975: 184-185) observes that there were benches and waiting rooms marked "Indians only" and "Europeans only."

In fact, there were instances when if an Englishman encountered an Indian riding along a mountain path, the Indian was expected to dismount. "Similarly, an Indian carrying an open umbrella was supposed to shut it" (Allen,
1975:199). If a British soldier was observed talking to an Indian, he was termed "white nigger" (Ibid.).

Steegman (1939:45), an Englishman who visited India, was advised that "it is a stupid thing getting mixed up with Indians. You'll be doing yourself no good." Thus, Anand (1953:39) notes that the:

Fear of the Englishman in the minds of us Indians ingrained through generations of kicks and pricks is more obsessive than the fear of an Indian official. The Englishman in India had always remained in his role as the superior white Sahib, an unknown quantity. He was silent, remote, non-human and his behavior in any situation was unpredictable, being unalienably mixed up with the hauteur of authority. Also, he was for us, the symbol of unlimited power of the Sarkar. 7

The norms of Anglo-India did not favor the social mixing of the two races. They were founded upon the premise that the British were superior beings, and the Indians were inferior. The British were divinely appointed by God to rule over the "benighted heathen."

Nehru, towards the end of the Raj, further commented:

What a great gulf divided the two races, and how they distrusted and disliked each other! But more than the distrust and the dislike was the ignorance of each other, and because of this, each side was a little afraid of each other and was constantly on its guard in the other's presence. To each, the other appeared as a sour-looking, unamiable creature, and neither realized that there was a decency and kindliness behind the mask (1946:3).

This chapter sought to contextualize the study historically for the reader by showing the gradual estrangement between the British and the Indians which reached its height in the last few decades of the Raj. It
is against this background that the events of The Raj Quartet must be understood.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter elucidates the major reasons for the use of fiction as the chief source of information for this study. It also provides an overview of previous relevant studies that have used fiction to study the colonial situation in India. Finally, the chapter ends with a synopsis of The Raj Quartet.

2.1 RATIONALE BEHIND THE USE OF FICTION

The British-India encounter provided a fascinating subject for fiction, and even to this day there is an enormous amount of fiction dealing with this topic. Furthermore, during the British Raj, fiction was the one of the principal means of acquiring information on India, her people, customs and culture for the British population in England. Thus, "for the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first part of this one, British fiction on India was responsible for the representation of the country, that for the Western world has become a reality" (Singh 1988:5). Greenberger (1969:1) adds that "fiction is one of the major sources of information the public receives ... probably, the major source of ideas concerning India came from fiction set in the country."
The importance of fiction lies in the fact that it "reveals much that would have never been allowed to intrude into the formality of memoirs, where the authors were usually striking attitudes rather than disclosing realities" (Edwardes 1969:xi). Moreover, literature to a great extent influenced a number of the British who came to India. This is corroborated by George MacMunn, a British army officer in India, who admitted that Kipling's books "inspired him once for all with that romance of the East" (quoted in Greenberger 1969:2). In a similar vein, Philip Mason, a Civil Service member recounted that Kipling's stories gave him "a romantic desire" to go to India (in Allen, 1975:24).

If one views literature as a form of art, then as Raymond Williams (1958:130) points out:

An essential hypothesis in the development of the idea of culture is that the art of a period is closely and necessarily related to the generally prevalent way of life and further that in consequence, aesthetic, moral and social judgements are closely inter-related.

We may therefore assume that Anglo-Indian fiction would reveal and represent the prevailing attitudes of the period. Literature, including fiction, is frequently used by anthropologists to obtain information regarding different cultures in cross-cultural comparison. This proceeds on the rationale that:

Both literature and anthropology record the activities of the human race as do history and philosophy. Man himself is the subject of anthropology, whereas literature is a body of writing about man... Literature
presents human character and activities through the subjective perspective of other men (Aldridge 1989:41). Stewart (1989:97), emphasizing the importance of fiction in Third World societies, points out in his study, The Literary Work as Cultural Document: A Caribbean Case the fact that:

In Third World societies, which face the task of re-shaping themselves in the post-colonial world, and where social science (except economics) is not a well developed tradition, the literary text still carries much of the responsibility for presenting reliable examinations of society.

Cultural anthropology, a subfield of anthropology, is concerned with the study of societal patterns such as family, kinship, sex and marriage patterns (Aldridge 1989:43-44). Literature serves as a major source of information in this area. In an attempt to illustrate its usefulness, Aldridge (1989:53-57) quotes the example of David Plath, who combined contemporary Japanese fiction and information derived from interviews with Japanese women, to "illustrate and explain family relationships and the process of individual maturation in contemporary Japan." Thus, this study uses literature on the rationale that the patterns of social interaction that existed during the Raj were reflected in the fiction of that period. In this context, Joan Rockwell (1974:3) opines that fiction and society are closely interconnected. Fiction provides one with a picture of history and society as it was lived and experienced by the people of that era. "There seems to be some relationship between society and fiction which is definite enough for fictional characters to be regularly used as
prototypes of social roles and social attitudes" (Rockwell 1974:3). Apart from this, Nadine Gordimer, an eminent South African novelist states that the novel presents "history from the inside," i.e., as the subjective, lived experience of individuals of that era. "It is in fiction that individual and social narratives are given visible and public voice" (Clingman 1986:1). Thus fiction provides one with a deeper insight into life as it existed at that period of time. Rockwell (1974:87) further adds "the novel has the reputation for realism, it presents life as it is and the individual as themselves." Moreover, fiction concerns itself with the personal relationships on which this study concentrates. Berger (1977: 1) states that "it is the great novelists above all who give us our social history."

From the foregoing comments, one could conclude that fiction illuminates in greater detail the patterns of social interaction that existed between the Indians and the British. Thus literature and history "interact and illuminate each other. Often literature, though less objective and more emotional, is a better guide to the spirit of the times" (Islam 1979:14). The studies mentioned in the literature review all agree that the prevailing British attitudes were well reflected in the fiction of that period. Furthermore, the main medium of communication at that time, (apart from the spoken word, of which we have no record), was the written word.
2.2 REVIEW OF STUDIES

This section provides a brief overview of some studies that use fiction set in colonial India to assess the prevailing attitudes and social atmosphere of that period. These studies therefore proceed on the rationale that fiction reflects the attitudes and social relations of the period it was written in.

The Raj in Fiction, by Udayon Misra (1987) uses Anglo-Indian fiction to assess the attitudes the British held concerning India. The four major Anglo-Indian works of the period that he analyzes are Hockley's Pandurang Hari or the Memoirs of a Hindoo (1826), Taylor's Confessions of a Thug (1839), W.D. Arnold's Oakfield, (1854) and Prichard's The Chronicles of Budgepore (1870). He uses these sources to trace the development of British attitudes over a fifty year period, i.e., from 1820 to 1870. Thus, one can ascertain the changes in attitudes from the initial "Conservative" one where the British respected "established norms of the Indian people," moved freely among them and did not interfere, to the Evangelical and Utilitarian attitude which motivated reform of Indian society and eventually to the "Liberal Imperial" attitude which was marked by a growing sense of racial superiority on the part of the British.

Another study that deals with the projection of prevailing British attitudes into popular fiction is Shamshul Islam's Chronicles of the Raj (1979). Islam,
however, limits his study of attitudes to imperialism. Thus, he concentrates on the works of Kipling, E.M Forster, E.J. Thompson, G. Orwell and J. Masters. He divides the period of Imperialism into two phases: the Kipling era, which was the highly imperialistic period and the post-Kipling era or the "Era of Doubt," where the idea of imperialism was threatened by growing nationalistic activities by the Indians. He is concerned not only with the imperialist attitudes of the authors in their works, but with the study of their fiction as a literary reaction to this decline in imperialism.

Other studies use British-Indian fiction to examine the portrayal of India, Indians and Indo-British relations. One of the foremost of these is Greenberger's *The British Image of India: A Study in the Literature of Imperialism* (1969). Greenberger surveys the period 1880-1960 by dividing it into the Era of Confidence 1880-1910, the Era of Doubt 1990-1935 and the Era of Melancholy 1935-1960. He then analyzes the British self-image and the portrayal of Indians and British-Indian relations for the first two of these periods. He points out that in the Era of Confidence, there were hardly any relations between the Indians and the British. Moreover British attitudes to the Indians were characterized by a paternalistic condescension. The fiction of the second period was characterized by increasing agitation by Indians against British rule. There was a desire on the part of Indians to be treated as equals by the British. However, as
is characteristic of the previous period, there was a lack of any but the most superficial Indo-British relations. In the third period, Greenberger concentrates more on the fate of the Eurasian and the difficulty the British had in believing that their time in India was actually over. Greenberger does not concentrate on British-Indian relationships at all during this time.

Rashna Singh (1988) in *The Imperishable Empire: A Study of British Fiction on India* and Bhullar Singh's *India: Myth and Reality--The Images of India in the fiction of English Writers* (1985) both deal with the stereotypic portrayal of India and Indians in British-Indian fiction.

The preceding studies use fiction as a means of gaining an insight into the attitudes and social relations between Indians and British. The approach of this study is different, however, since it concentrates only on The Raj Quartet by Paul Scott, which is set in the pre-independence period. Fiction is used to assess the efficiency of intercultural communication through the application of Sarbaugh's heterogeneity-homogeneity taxonomy.

2.3 SCOTT AND THE RAJ QUARTET

Paul Scott's *The Raj Quartet* has been selected as the main source of intercultural communication information for this study. *The Raj Quartet* comprises *The Jewel in the Crown*, *The Day of the Scorpion*, *The Towers of Silence* and *A
Division of the Spoils, (which will be referred to as Volumes 1, 2, 3 and 4 hereafter).

Scott, a twentieth century novelist deals with Indo-British relations during 1942-1947, a crucial period in pre-Independent India. The Quartet has been described as a "masterpiece of British and world literature... because of its intense moral tone and humanistic interpretation of interpersonal, intercultural relations" (Rao 1980:9,16). This particular work has received much acclaim in literary circles and was made into a television series by the B.B.C. Rao (1980:10) states that The Quartet is a study in history, race and class and literature (1980:10,64).

Scott served with the British army in India from 1943-1946. He revisited India in 1964, 1969 and 1972 (Rao, 1980:11,15-17). Thus, he had first hand experience of the atmosphere prevailing in the country during the few years before and after independence.

This was an important period, as it signified the end of the rule by a power that had held sway in India for over almost two centuries. It was therefore a turbulent period in Indian history for both the British and the Indians. The British were no longer welcome in the country, there was increased unrest and agitation against British rule along with the rise of nationalism. The atmosphere was one of tension and uncertainty, and the British were no longer the confident, undisputed masters of India.
Scott situates the opening of the Quartet against the historical backdrop of the "seditious preaching" of Mr. Gandhi and his "open invitation to the Japanese to come and help him rid India of the British," since the Japanese had already proved themselves by defeating the British army in Burma (Vol. 1:1-2). This resulted in increased nationalistic fervor and unprecedented anti-British violence throughout the country.

Scott focuses on two such incidents, which shocked and outraged his fictional British community in India and which form the foundation for the entire Quartet. The first incident occurred on August 9th, 1942, when a mob blocked the car of the superintendent of the Protestant Mission schools, Miss Edwina Crane. They attacked the Indian school teacher who was accompanying her which resulted in his death (Vol. 3:60-61).

However, this was overshadowed by "the rape of the English girl in the Bibighar Gardens" the same night (Vol. 1:61). It is this incident that forms the major story line which underlies the four novels. Scott comments in the opening of The Jewel in the Crown that it is "the story of a rape, of the events that led up to it and followed it and of the place in which it happened" (Vol. 1:1). Thus, this study focuses on this incident and the major characters involved in it. The dyads that are analyzed are drawn from this incident.
The main characters involved in this episode are Daphne Manners, the victim (and niece of Sir Henry Manners, onetime Governor of the province), Hari Kumar, the alleged suspect and Ronald Merrick, the District Superintendent of Police. Besides these, the other significant characters are Lady Chatterjee and Sister Ludmila. Minor characters who interact with Hari and Daphne are Colin and Stubbs.

Lady Chatterjee, a Rajput, and wife of the late Sir Nello Chatterjee who founded the Mayapore Technical College, was the "doyenne of official Indian society in Mayapore" (Vol. 4:370). Her house (the MacGregor House), was "the one place where English and Indians came together as equals, or at least without too much caution on the part of the Indians or too much embarrassment on the part of the English" (Vol. 1:33). She was a close friend of Lady and Sir Henry Manners and remained so until the death of Lady Manners in 1948 (Vol. 1:73). It was with Lady Chatterjee that Daphne stayed while she was in Mayapore. Despite Lady Chatterjee's social standing in Anglo-India, she comments that she was not allowed into the club, "not even as a guest ... The Deputy Commissioner himself couldn't have got me past the door" (Vol. 1:82). Lady Chatterjee first met Daphne at Rawalpindi, when she was visiting Lady Manners. Daphne was born in the Punjab, as her father served with the I.M.S. However, when she was still a baby, they returned to England (Vol. 1:90). Daphne returned to India after the death of her parents and brother. She stayed in Rawalpindi for a
while with Lady Manners, and then came to Mayapore where she volunteered at the local hospital.

Hari Kumar, or Harry Coomer, as he was known in England, was born into an orthodox Hindu family of rich landowners in India. However, when he was two years old (1922), his father took him to England where he lived till his father's death in 1938. Kumar's father Duleep was disheartened by the fact that despite their social standing and wealth in India, "the callowest white-skinned boy doing his first year in the covenanted civil service could snub them..." (Vol. 1:203). He therefore believed that "power lay in this magical combination of knowledge, manner and race" (Ibid). He was of the opinion that "for an Indian Indian, there simply isn't any future in an Anglo-Indian world" (Vol. 1:216). He was convinced that the only breed of Indians who could succeed in British India were Indians who would be "as English, if not more English" than the British themselves ... To learn the secret of the Englishness of the English he realized that you had to grow up among them" (Ibid). This was the dream and future he coveted for his only son. In the pursuance of this goal, Hari Kumar was brought up in an English environment as far as possible and to be English "in character, manner, attitude and language" (Vol. 2:287). Duleep deliberately kept to the background during Hari's British life to enable him to cultivate British friends without the embarrassment of having an Indian father (Vol. 1:227). Duleep saw to it
that Hari was given "the best English education and background that money could buy" (Ibid). Hari became the first Indian at Chillingborough.\textsuperscript{9} That Duleep was successful, is evidenced from the fact that when Hari was once asked the difference between dharma and karma, he replied that he did not know and had no recollection of India whatsoever (Vol. 4:341). While in England, his closest friend and confidant was Colin Lindsey. Hari spent most of his time with the Lindsey family who soon became like his own family.

However, Hari's dreams for a bright future of a university education and a possible career in the I.C.S, were shattered when his father committed suicide due to bankruptcy. Hari returned rather ignominiously to India when his father's sister Shalini borrowed money from her brother-in-law\textsuperscript{10} to pay for his ticket to India.

Hari Kumar, a brown-skinned Englishman was a "hopeless combination" in British India (Vol. 2:323). His "link with England ... snapped with shocking abruptness ... the moment he stepped off the ship in Bombay" (Vol. 4: 360). He was transported to a life that was alien to him, that of "a tight, closed, pseudo-orthodox Hindu society" (Vol. 1:234). Made to live in "black town," which to him was on the wrong side of the river, away from the civil lines and the cantonment, Hari was now divorced from the life and people he was familiar and comfortable with ... that of the British. Hari found himself in a quandary. He did not fit
in with the Indians, whom he considered "they," nor did the British accept him. In fact they ignored him, leading him to conclude that he was "invisible" to them (Vol. 4:363).

He tried to gain employment at an Indo-British company, but due to an unfortunate incident with Stubbs, a manager, he was unsuccessful. He eventually gained employment at the Mayapore Gazette due to his command over the English language. Hari was now in an even more difficult predicament. As a reporter for the Gazette, he was expected to cover social engagements such as cricket matches and flower shows. On such occasions, he would come into contact with Britishers who would comment on his English accent and then disbelievingly stare at him since a "Chillingborough man didn't end up as a tuppenny-ha'penny reporter on a fifth-rate English paper" (Vol. 4:366). Kumar did not fit into the mould of the average Englishman's conception of an Anglicized Indian. He did not speak "babu English," but spoke it in the idiom and accent of an upper class Englishman. Through the person of Hari, Scott lays bare the basic issue in colonial India: the matter of the colour of one's skin. Rao (1988:113) observes that "colour was the one and only certainty the Englishman could hold on to as his badge of superiority ... colour became the determining factor in the system of the Raj in India."

Sister Ludmila, who was of European origin, befriended both Hari and Daphne. She was in charge of the Sanctuary and "fed the hungry, ministered to the sick, and cleansed
and comforted those who for want of her nightly scavenging
would have died in the street" (Vol. 1:115). It was at the
Sanctuary that Daphne and Hari would frequently meet, since
it was the only place they could meet away from curious
looks and gossip. It was at the Sanctuary too, that Merrick
first saw Hari and arrested him.

Ronald Merrick held the position of District
Superintendent of Police at Mayapore. He was a bachelor and
had once proposed to Daphne who, however, turned him down.
Merrick came from an ordinary family. He admitted that
"although his father had done well enough, he was still only
a grammar school boy and his grandparents had been pretty
humble sort of people" (Vol. 1: 102). Hari spoke English
that was "better accented" than his own. This marked him
down in Merrick's book (Vol. 1: 148). To add fuel to the
fire, Hari now was friendly with Daphne. Merrick, in fact
warned Daphne against her "association with Hari" (Vol. 1:
369; Vol. 2: 231-232). To Merrick, Hari was the worst kind
of Anglicized Indian, who "couldn't take what it involved to
be just another Westernized Indian boy in a place like
Mayapore" (Vol. 2:240). Merrick believed that Hari was "out
for revenge ... because back in India he couldn't pretend to
be English any longer" (Vol. 1: 241-242). Merrick, in fact
had kept Hari under surveillance ever since their first
encounter at the Sanctuary, and especially since Hari and
Daphne started seeing each other (Vol. 4: 349-350). Hari
was to Merrick the epitome of all Merrick desired to obtain
and achieve, but could not attain due to his average background. Kumar basically posed a threat to Merrick's superiority, since even though he was a member of the subject race, he had been exposed to all the advantages of a member of the ruling class while in England. Scott remarks, that:

Merrick, English-born and English-bred, but a man whose country's social and economic structure had denied him advantages which Kumar had initially enjoyed ... place Merrick at home, in England, and Harry Coomer abroad in England, and it is Coomer on whom the historian's eye lovingly falls ... In England, it is Merrick who is invisible (Vol. 4: 369).

The Bibighar Gardens episode

Hari met Daphne at Lady Chatterjee's house. Thereafter Daphne pursued a friendship with Hari. This was a friendship she began in a "conscious frame of mind" (Vol. 1:384). She was the first English person in India to talk to him without "either condescension or self-consciousness" (Vol. 4:371). She soon "shocked the ladies of the cantonment by her attachment" to Hari (Vol. 1:299). She violated one of the most rigid norms of Anglo-India by entering into a friendship that was strictly taboo ... that of a white woman and a black man.

The first time Daphne and Hari met was at a cocktail party that Lady Chatterjee had hosted (Vol. 1: 371). Later, Daphne saw Hari at the War Week Exhibition which he was covering for the Mayapore Gazette. Daphne went up to him
despite the social norms and spent a few minutes conversing with him (Vol. 1: 378). A few weeks later, Daphne invited him for dinner and was in turn invited to Hari's for dinner. They used to meet frequently at the Sanctuary, where Sister Ludmila would let them "sit in her office or in her room" (Vol. 1: 401) and the Bibighar Gardens, since that was the "only place in Mayapore where they could be together and be utterly natural with each other" (Vol. 1: 383), though even there, "there was the feeling that we were having to hide ourselves away from the inquisitive, the amused and the disapproving" (Ibid).

On one occasion they decided to go out for supper, but Hari was not permitted into the first floor of the restaurant because he was an Indian. They had to sit downstairs and Daphne was subjected to "the stage whisper comments of the people going to the room above, and the curious, uncomfortable stares of the British..." (Ibid). On another occasion they went to the bazaar together, braving the disapproving, curious and "unpleasant stares" (Vol. 1: 404). On Daphne's request, Hari took her to visit the Tirupati temple. It was after this visit that they quarreled.

A few weeks later, Daphne asked Hari to meet her at the Sanctuary. Daphne waited there for him until dusk, but there was no sign of Hari. Eventually she decided to stop at the Bibighar on the way home, since she had "a strong impression of Hari in the Bibighar, sitting in the pavilion
alone, not expecting me, but thinking of me, wondering whether I would turn up" (Vol. 1: 422). That night, at the Bibighar Gardens, Daphne and Hari became lovers. Later, five to six men bound Hari's hands, legs and mouth and assaulted Daphne. After this shock, Daphne stumbled back to the MacGregor House, after extracting a solemn promise from Hari that "he would say nothing" (Vol. 1:426) about their meeting, since it would prove disastrous for him to admit being in her company that fateful night.

Soon after, Hari was apprehended by Ronald Merrick as the prime suspect involved in "leading a criminal assault by several Indians on an English girl called Daphne Manners" (Vol. 4:343). A few of his friends were also arrested by Merrick as partners in the crime against Daphne. In an attempt to create evidence against Hari, Merrick planted Daphne's bicycle near Hari's house.

At the informal inquiry that took place, Daphne denied meeting Kumar that night (in an attempt to protect him), and adamantly asserted that the men who had been arrested in connection with the assault were the wrong men.

Merrick, however, imprisoned and later tortured them, Hari in particular. Merrick believed that Hari had led Daphne on, eventually arranging a rendezvous at the Bibighar Gardens, where he met her with a "gang of toughs" who raped her (Vol. 1:158). He took Hari's silence as "dumb insolence" (Vol. 2: 234) and evidence of his complicity in the plot. Merrick was fully convinced that Kumar was at
fault. Sister Ludmila commented that "he had long ago chosen Hari Kumar ... as a victim" (Vol. 1:150). In fact, right till the end, Merrick remained convinced of Hari's guilt and complicity in the affair and stated that he would believe so right till his dying day (Vol. 4: 231). Merrick eventually managed to imprison Hari on the grounds of complicity in politically subversive activities, since the "evidence in the matter of the criminal assault was insufficient" (Vol. 4:351).

In May 1944, the Governor ordered a "private examination" into the "wrongful imprisonment" of Kumar on the request of Lady Manners and also as a result of the pleas of Shalini, Hari's aunt (Vol. 4:352; Vol. 2:269-272). The enquiry was conducted by Captain Nigel Rowan, who had once asked Kumar the difference between karma and dharma at Chillingborough. As a result of the enquiry, the story of Hari's torture at the hands of Merrick came to light and Hari was eventually released. Daphne died in childbirth of peritonitis, and the child was brought up by Lady Chatterjee upon the death of Lady Manners.

The Bibighar affair forms the major story line of The Raj Quartet. The genius of Scott lies in his ability to portray the same incident from numerous perspectives. The Jewel in the Crown presents the entire incident through the viewpoints of Daphne, Lady Chatterjee and Sister Ludmila. The official version which the British community subscribed to is brought out through the memoirs of Brigadier Reid who
headed the brigade at that particular period. The version of the torture that the men and Hari endured and the fact that they were arrested on false evidence is presented through the "deposition" of Vidyasagar.12

In The Day of the Scorpion, the incident is presented to us from Hari’s perspective in the course of the "private examination" into his wrongful imprisonment. Pandit Baba who at one time gave Hari lessons in Hindi, also presents the incident from his point of view. Merrick is given the opportunity to proffer his view of the incident and his role in it during a conversation with Count Bronowsky. The Towers of Silence carries a newspaper report of the incident. Finally, A Division of the Spoils presents the incident from the point of view of Merrick and Captain Rowan. Merrick’s perspective is presented again in the form of the official documents and reports he had filed as District Superintendent of Police. Thus, the underlying theme of the entire Quartet is the Bibighar affair, which marked "that period of violent confrontation between the raj and the population" (Vol. 4:344). Consequently:

The main theme of the Quartet, the rape of Daphne in the Bibighar Gardens is ... ever present, sometimes aggressively conspicuous, other times hovering in the background, but always in the wings, alert, ready to make its presence felt. It haunts people and places. It is viewed from different perspectives (Rao, 1980:75).

Thus, though there are a number of other characters, more than 350, who appear throughout The Raj Quartet, this
study focuses on the Bibighar episode and those involved in it.
CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study works within the theoretical framework of intercultural communication propounded by L. E. Sarbaugh.

Porter and Samovar (1988:15) state that "intercultural communication occurs whenever a message producer is a member of one culture and the message receiver is a member of another." According to Sarbaugh (1988:6), intercultural communication occurs not only when members of two distinct nationalities interact with each other, but also when individuals of the same nationality who belong to different sub-cultural groups interact with one another. This study focuses primarily on intercultural communication occurring between members of two distinct nationalities.

Singer (1987:2) states that every individual is culturally unique in that he/she is a member of a constellation of groups which are unique to him/her. Interpersonal and intracultural communication therefore incorporate within them the elements of intercultural communication. Moreover, as mentioned in the introduction, it is not the group per se that communicates, but the members who comprise the group (Singer 1987: 156). Hence, this study focuses on the interpersonal relationships that existed between the Indians and the British as individual members of two distinct cultural groups.
It is generally accepted by social psychologists that one's perceptions direct one's interactions. The first step in interaction is the formation of an impression of the other, or a perception of the other (Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey, 1962:4-5; Giffin & Patton, 1976:56). This perception is then interpreted within the individual's cultural frame of reference and it is this interpretation of the perception that directs further interaction. Consequently, in interpersonal behavior events, each participant's behavior is the function of the other's behavior, i.e., each participant's behavior forms the stimulus for the other participant's response, which in turn serves as the stimulus for ensuing behavior. "The actions of each are in reference to the other. The actions of each are at once a result of and a cause of the actions of the other" (Krech, et al. 1962:4). Furthermore, one's actions and reactions to the behavior of the other depend on one's perceptions of the other's behavior. The response of the other depends on his interpretation of the initial behavior. This interpretation occurs within the context of one's cultural framework. Every culture has its own conception of what is considered appropriate or inappropriate behavior, its own meanings for symbols, events and objects, and its own normative beliefs, stereotypes and attitudes which the individual internalizes by virtue of belonging to that particular culture. "It is these cultural frames that
bestow the unique meaning and differentiated response they produce" (Barnlund, quoted in Porter & Samovar 1988:7).

It would follow then, that members of the same culture would possess similar cultural perspectives, while those of different cultures would possess different perspectives unique to their own cultures. Each individual participant in a communication transaction therefore brings to the encounter, his own cultural frame of reference or "cultural baggage." This produces complications and difficulties when the interaction is between participants who have two different cultural frames of reference, since "each behavioral cue may suggest one type of forthcoming behavior to one participant and another type of forthcoming behavior to another participant" (Sarbaugh 1988:9-11). This could result in either misunderstandings or in extreme cases, lack of further attempts at communication.

Members of the same culture share an overall similar cultural framework for the interpretation of their perceptions. When there is a transaction between members of two different cultures, their interpretations of the same situation will differ as a result of their differing cultural frames of reference. Barnlund (in Samovar & Porter 1987:9) observes that understanding in interpersonal relationship, depends to a great extent on the similarity of perceptions, communication patterns and belief systems of the participants. Sarbaugh states that the extent of homogeneity-heterogeneity between the members involved in a
communication encounter/transaction will determine the interculturalness or intraculturalness of the encounter. He therefore states, "the more homogeneous the participants, the more similar the perceptions and interpretations; the more heterogeneous the participants, the more dissimilar the perceptions and interpretations" (Sarbaugh 1988:13). Taking this a step further, we come to the essential proposition of his theory, that the greater the similarity or homogeneity of the participants in the cultural framework, the fewer the difficulties encountered in the communication process, and the greater the heterogeneity between the participants, the greater the problems in the interaction.

Sarbaugh has isolated four variables: World View, Code Systems, Knowing and Accepting and Perceived Relationship and Intent, which he claims will reveal differences among individuals of different cultural backgrounds and so enable one to assess the extent of homogeneity-heterogeneity of the participants and thereby the extent of what he terms the "interculturalness" of the encounter. This in turn would determine the ease or difficulty of the communication transaction. He further proposes a taxonomy based on dyads:

Combinations of the various values of the variables will produce categories of communication situations. These categories will emphasize the different degrees of similarity and dissimilarity of the participants. This will provide the base for ranking levels of heterogeneity and homogeneity of the participants. (Sarbaugh 1988:47).
World View:

This refers to the individual's beliefs about "the nature of life (NL), the purpose of life (PL) and the relation of man to the cosmos" (RMC) (Sarbaugh 1988:15). WV1 (i.e., NL1-PL1-RMC1) refers to participants who hold similar world views, and WV2 (i.e., NL2-PL2-RMC2) refers to participants with dissimilar views.

Code Systems:

This variable is concerned with the verbal and nonverbal codes from which the individual derives meaning. Cultures differ with regard to the meanings ascribed to nonverbal and verbal codes. A crucial factor in verbal communication is language. One of the overt differences between various cultures, is that each culture possesses its own unique language through which it transmits its beliefs and values. "Language is a central influence on culture and one of the most highly charged symbols of a culture and a nation" (Condon & Youssef 1988:169). Difficulties in encoding and decoding a message are encountered in an intercultural interaction situation when the participants are unaware of each other's language. Furthermore, translation is often problematic, due to lack of equivalence in the vocabulary of different languages.
Nonverbal codes are equally essential to the communicative process. Moreover, they have cultural significance in that they have meanings unique to each culture. These are areas in which mistakes are most easily made as they form a part of implicit culture and are not that easily discernible and understood. The differences of coding systems in different cultures would imply that similar experiences or objects would be categorized in a different manner and have different meanings in various cultures. Therefore, "the extent to which there is a consensual, similar or conflicting meaning elicited will depend on the extent to which participants have shared similar experiences in relation to the code and cultural situation" (Sarbaugh 1988:34).

Sarbaugh states that for successful intercultural communication to occur, knowledge of the coding systems of both cultures is necessary in that it would provide an awareness of the nuances and the subtleties of meanings. This would enable the participants to choose those codes which would approximate as closely as possible the intended meaning (Sarbaugh 1988:13-17, 34-37).

He further puts forward combinations of knowledge of the codes that could exist in an intercultural communication encounter:

1) Both participants share a common coding system (CS1). This is the most homogeneous of communication encounters and according to Sarbaugh's schema, the one least
likely to encounter communication difficulties and breakdowns.

2) The participants do not share a similar code. One participant is conversant with a code with which the other participant is not conversant (CS3). This is the most heterogeneous of communication encounters and the most prone to problems.

3) One participant is conversant with two codes, code ‘a’ and code ‘b’, while the other participant is conversant only with one code, code ‘b’; and vice-versa (CS2).

4) Both participants know and share two codes. (This is similar to 1 and is also denoted as CS1.)

Normative Beliefs and Overt Behavior:

This refers to norms or beliefs held by members of a culture that guide behavior regarding what is appropriate and inappropriate. It refers to expressions of what "one must do, ought to do, is allowed to do, ought not to do, and must not do ... These are injunctions about how one is expected to communicate as well as how one is expected to perform or not perform other behaviors" (Sarbaugh 1988:51).

This variable incorporates taboos, i.e., behavior patterns that are totally unacceptable in a particular culture. Another component considered here are the values of a culture which "are broad and fundamental norms which are generally shared by a group and serve to guide,
integrate and channel the organized activities of its members and are expressed in terms of role expectations and overt behavior" (Sarbaugh 1988:16). An extremely important point to bear in mind in this context is that "the extent to which differences in values of the participants will be a barrier to communication will depend on whether they share a value which holds that one ought to tolerate and adapt to differences in persons with whom one is involved in a transaction" (Sarbaugh 1988:39).

Another aspect considered here concerns role expectations or the appropriate behavior associated with the social position of an individual. These are extremely important in intercultural communication, since they direct the behavior of the members and are easily violated by members of another culture.

Thus, participants in a transaction who are members of different cultures with different normative beliefs will respond differently to the same stimuli in the communication and interaction process.

Sarbaugh therefore points out the importance of being aware of these norms, i.e., knowing and accepting them. Knowing and accepting the values of the other culture would lead to homogeneity among the participants and thereby greater ease in the communication process, while lack of knowledge and acceptance of the normative system would result in heterogeneity and more difficulties in the communication encounter.
Sarbaugh suggests three categories of knowing and accepting that could occur in a communication transaction:

1) KA1 is the most homogeneous level, where we have the awareness of and willingness to accept the differences in the other. There are three possibilities here:

   a) KA*KA Both the participants know and accept the belief systems of the other.

   b) KA* KA One participant knows and accepts the other’s beliefs, while the other does not know, but accepts those of the first.

   c) KA*KA Neither participant knows the belief structure of the other, but both acknowledge the differences and are willing to accept them.

2) KA2 forms the intermediate level of knowing and accepting, where we find differing levels of heterogeneity which do pose difficulties in interaction but are not unsurmountable ones.

   a) KA*KA Both participants know, but while one accepts, the other does not.

   b) KA*KA One participant knows the other’s belief structure, but does not accept it. The other participant does not know the belief systems, yet accepts it.

   c) KĀ*KĀ Both participants know each other’s normative systems, neither accepts it.
3) KA3 forms the most heterogeneous set of combinations in this scale and presents the combinations that are most liable to lead to communication breakdowns and failure.

   a) KA*KA One participant neither knows nor accepts the other participant’s belief systems, while the other knows and accepts those of the first.

   b) KA*KA One participant neither knows nor accepts, while the other does not know, but accepts.

   c) KA*KA One of the participants neither knows nor accepts, while the other knows but does not accept.

   d) KA*KA Both participants neither know nor accept. This is the most difficult of communication encounters and most prone to breakdown.

Perceived Relationships

According to Sarbaugh, the basis for the perception of the relationship depends on the individual’s knowledge of and "general orientation" to the group and the individual member with whom he is interacting. It is in this respect that stereotypes and attitudes come into play. "Stereotypes are a generalization of characteristics or motives to a group of people" (Aronson 1988:233). Stereotypes can be positive (favorable) or negative (unfavorable). Interactions based on stereotypes especially negative ones
are problematic. (As indicated in Chapter 1, the attitudes governing British-Indian relations were those of racial superiority and condescension.) However, perceptions of the relationship can change in the course of the interaction.

Perceived relationships incorporate:

1) Positive or negative feelings that the participants hold regarding each other. This contributes to the extent of mutual trust, suspicion, eagerness or hesitancy regarding the relationship. Extremely positive feelings are termed F1, while strongly negative feelings are F2.

2) "The extent to which they believe their individual goals are compatible and mutually shared with each other, (G1) or are incompatible and possibly conflicting (G2)" (Sarbaugh 1988:30). The former is a cooperative relationship, and the latter a competitive one.

3) "The extent to which they believe the relationship is hierarchical/complementary (H2) or equal/symmetrical (H1)" (Ibid). Taken together, F1-G1-H1 refers to a relationship characterized by mutually positive feelings, similar goals and an egalitarian relationship, i.e., a cooperative relationship and one which is conducive to effective communication. A heterogeneous and competitive relationship would be characterized by negative feelings, conflicting goals and a superior-subordinate relationship, i.e., F2-G2-H2, which would be least desirable for effective communication.
Moreover, one's perception of the relationship, will dictate one's expectations of the relationship, eg., in a F1-G1-H1 relationship, the participants will expect friendliness and helpfulness, while in a F2-G2-H2 relationship they will expect hostility, and antagonism.

Perceived Intent:

The perceived intent of the participants regarding the communication interaction directs the outcome of the interaction. According to Sarbaugh, the intent includes: sharing, helping (I1); ignoring or avoiding (I2); disrupting, dominating and injuring (I3). If the intent is perceived as sharing or helping, there will be a greater tendency for positive feelings regarding each other and this could contribute to a successful encounter. If the perceived intent is to ignore or disrupt the transaction, dominate or injure, there is a tendency for less success in the communication encounter. Sarbaugh states that the "intent of the participants is more likely to be known among members of the same culture than in an intercultural setting" (1988.:34).

In order to simplify the variables for use in the taxonomy, Sarbaugh combines the variables of perceived intent and relationship and denotes them as "PRI." Therefore, PRI1 refers to a relationship which is perceived as "friendly, cooperative, and symmetrical, wherein the
intent is one of sharing and helping" (1988:54-55). A relationship that is perceived as hostile, competitive, wherein the intent is to dominate, disrupt or injure is categorized as PRI2.

Sarbaugh (1988:49-50) further provides four levels in this variable, based on the number of dimensions that are in a state that facilitate the sharing of information, i.e., the extent of homogeneity on the dimensions of feelings, goals, intent, and the hierarchical-symmetrical dimensions, as indicated by 1 or 2. Level 1 and 2 are conducive for sharing information and account for a score of 1 on the variable PRI, while level 3 and 4 account for a score of 2.

\[ \text{Level 1: F1-G1-H1-I1} \]
\[ \text{Level 2: F1-G1-H2-I1; F1-G2-H1-I1; F2-G1-H1-I1; F1-G2-H1-3; F2-G1-H1-I3.} \]
\[ \text{Level 3: F2-G1-H2-I1; F2-G1-H2-I2; F2-G1-H2-I3; F2-G2-H1-3; F1-G2-H2-I3} \]
\[ \text{Level 4: F2-G2-H2-I2; F2-G2-H2-I3.} \]

Thus, the variables world view, codes systems, normative systems and beliefs and perceived relationship and intent are those with respect to which cultures differ and these variables help to assess the extent of the interculturalness of the participants.

He further states:

Communication efficiency will be at the highest end of the continuum when direct channels are used by dyads of participants who perceive the relationship with the other as symmetrical, encompassing mutually positive
feelings towards the other, and involving mutually shared and compatible goals; and the intent of the other is perceived as one of helping; having similar views of the nature of life, purpose of life and the relation of man to the cosmos; who know and accept the other's normative patterns of beliefs and overt behaviors; and who share a common code system (Sarbaugh 1988:47).

Through the application of Sarbaugh's theory, it can be ascertained that the British and Indians had totally different world views and normative systems. Through further application of this, we will be able to assess the extent to which they knew and accepted each other's normative systems, and the perceived relationships and intent they had with regard to each other.

Scores on Sarbaugh's Schema and the Related Prediction of Communication Efficiency

According to Sarbaugh's schema, the most homogeneous score is 4, where the participants score 1 on all the variables. This falls within level 1 of the schema, and predicts a highly efficient communication transaction. A score of 5 which falls within level 2 of the schema indicates a fairly homogeneous situation with a good chance of communication efficiency. Scores of 6 and 7, fall within levels 3 and 4 respectively of the schema, and denote a "relatively homogeneous situation" (Sarbaugh 1988:59), and therefore predict average communication efficiency. Scores of 8 and 9, fall within levels 5 and 6 which are
heterogeneous situations, and predict that "the communication efficiency will decline" (Sarbaugh 1988:63). The most heterogeneous score is 10, which falls within level 7 of the schema, which predicts a highly inefficient communication transaction.

This chapter has explained the variables of the homogeneity-heterogeneity schema. This schema is used to analyze the efficiency of intercultural communication between the Indians and the British in colonial India.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the methodology employed in this analysis and the manner in which the dyads were chosen for analysis. This is followed by a discussion of the coding (i.e., the assignment of scores to each dyadic interaction on Sarbaugh's schema and the efficiency measure).

4.1 MEASUREMENT

The purpose of this study is to apply Sarbaugh's schema to the analysis of the efficiency of intercultural communication in India. Thus, the research question focuses on his basic proposition, i.e., does the homogeneity of participants in a communication encounter contribute to greater efficiency in a communication encounter?

Sarbaugh's schema, however, does not incorporate within it a measure of success or efficiency of a communication transaction. Thus, an independent measure which is an adaptation of the principle of coorientation developed and tested by R.D. Laing, A.R. Lee and H. Phillipson (1963), is used. Success or efficiency in an encounter is measured in terms of the concepts of agreement and understanding, i.e., in terms of whether the participants agree or disagree on the issue, and the extent of understanding that exists between the participants.
4.1.1 THE MEASURE OF COMMUNICATION EFFICIENCY

Laing et al., (1963: 55-57) distinguish between direct perspectives and metaperspectives. Direct perspectives refer to the manner in which the participants in an interaction view the situation or issue in question. The metaperspective refers to one participant's view of the other participant's view of the issue, i.e., the other participant's direct perspective.

If participants 'A' and 'B' are interacting with each other, and X stands for the issue involved, then participant A's view of X and participant B's view of X are their direct perspectives of the situation. Participant A's view of B's view of X refers to participant A's metaperspective. Similarly, participant B's view of A's view of X is participant B's metaperspective.

**Direct perspective:**
A -> X = A's view of X
B -> X = B's view of X

**Metaperspective:**
A -> B -> X = A's view of B's view of X
B -> A -> X = B's view of A's view of X

According to Laing et al. (p 63), agreement occurs when the participants in a transaction share the same direct perspective on the issue in question. In other words, they both have similar direct perspectives or see the issue in
the same light. When their views on the same issue differs, there exists disagreement.

**Agreement:**

A \(\rightarrow\) X = X \(\leftarrow\) B

**Disagreement:**

A \(\rightarrow\) X \(\neq\) X \(\leftarrow\) B

Laing et al. further state that understanding occurs when "one person is aware of the other's point of view. It can be defined as the conjunction between the metaperspective of one person and the direct perspective of the other on the same issue" (pp 29, 61-62). In other words when A's view of B's view of X (i.e., A's metaperspective) is similar to B's view of X (i.e., B's direct perspective) or when B's view of A's view of X (i.e., B's metaperspective) is similar to A's direct perspective, there is understanding between A and B, even though their direct perspectives may differ.

There is misunderstanding when disjunction exists between one participant's metaperspective and the other participant's direct perspective on the same issue. Thus, when A's view of B's view of X is different from B's view of X; or when B's view of A's view of X differs from A's view of X, misunderstanding occurs.

**Understanding:**

A \(\rightarrow\) B \(\rightarrow\) X = X \(\leftarrow\) B

B \(\rightarrow\) A \(\rightarrow\) X = X \(\leftarrow\) A
Misunderstanding:
A → B → X = X ← B
B → A → X ≠ X ← A

This differs from perceived relationship and intent in that while PRI refers to the perception of the intent and relationship of the participants in the interactions, metaperspectives refer to the perceptions of the participants with regard to the other’s view of the situation. It refers to the ability of the participants to correctly apprehend the other participant’s view of the issue.

Agreement is denoted as A+, while A− signifies disagreement. Understanding is represented by U+, while U− signifies misunderstanding.

The following are the possible combinations of agreement/disagreement and understanding/misunderstanding that can exist as measures of communication success in dyadic interaction. The number indicates the level of communication efficiency on the measure.

1) A+, U+, U+ Both the participants agree and understand each other. This is the most successful communication transaction.

2) A−, U+, U+ Both participants disagree on the issue, but both of them understand each other’s view point and this is considered good communication efficiency or success.

3) A+, U+, U− Both participants agree on the issue, but while one participant understands the other, the other
participant does not. This is fair or average communication success.

4) A-, U+, U- The participants disagree, and while one participant understands the other’s point of view, the other does not. This defines average communication success.

5) A+, U-, U- Both participants agree on the issue, but misunderstand each other, which is an inefficient communication transaction.

6) A-, U-, U- Both participants disagree on the issue, and neither understands the other’s viewpoint and is the least successful communication transaction.

4.1.2 APPLICATION OF SARBAUGH’S SCHEMA

With regard to the independent variable of “code systems”, Sarbaugh provides four levels of homogeneity-heterogeneity depending on the knowledge of the coding systems of the participants. In this study, several decisions had to be made. Hindi was a second language for many of the British. For the most part, they acquired a working knowledge of the language. From the information available, Daphne, Stubbs, Colin, Merrick and Sister Ludmila had a working knowledge of Hindi. Hari, too, only started learning Hindi after he came to India, thus it was a second language for him too. Lady Chatterjee and Shalini were fluent in Hindi, since it was their mother tongue though Lady Chatterjee often affected that she felt more at home with English. In order to maintain consistency in the
coding of this variable, the main basis for decisions about this variable is based on whether English was a first or second language for the characters. In the cases of Hari, Daphne, Colin, Merrick, Sister Ludmila and Stubbs, Hindi is considered their second language and English their first. For Lady Chatterjee and Shalini, Hindi is their mother tongue while English is their second language. Thus, when there was a difference in the mother tongue of the participants in an interaction, the variable "code systems" was coded as '2'.

With regard to the variable "World View," certain difficulties were encountered in the coding due to lack of information regarding the exact attitude of the characters towards the nature of human beings and their relation to the cosmos. In order to overcome this and maintain consistency in the coding of this variable, those who had a British background were considered to share similar values on this variable. In the cases of Shalini and Lady Chatterjee, it was explicitly stated that they were Hindu. They therefore differed on this variable with regard to the British characters they interacted with. In the case of Hari, it was clearly evident that he did not hold to Hindu beliefs.
4.2 CHOICE OF DYADS

There are more than 350 characters, both major and
minor, featured in the course of the four novels. However,
this study focuses only on the major characters in the
Bibighar Gardens incident, and their interactions with each
other and other characters of significance.

As pointed out in Chapter II, The Raj Quartet is built
around the assault on Daphne Manners at the Bibighar
Gardens. This study therefore focuses on the characters who
play a major role in this incident and are directly involved
in it. Major characters were defined as those characters
who were crucial to the story line and around whom the story
revolves. Thus, the major characters involved in the
Bibighar Gardens episode were Hari Kumar, Daphne and
Merrick. Apart from them, other characters of significance
who interacted with these three characters in the course of
the events leading up to this encounter were Shalini, Lady
Chatterjee, Colin and Sister Ludmila.13 Thus the
interaction of the major characters with each other includes
both inter- and intracultural interactions. In keeping with
the cross-cultural focus of this study, the cross-cultural
interactions of the major characters are analyzed including
at times their interactions with other minor characters in
the novel.

Table 1 shows the characters that interact with each
other and the dyads that are studied. These are: Hari and
Daphne (H-D), Hari and Colin (H-C), Hari and Merrick (H-M),
Hari and Lady Chatterjee (H-LC), Hari and Stubbs (H-St),
Hari and Sister Ludmila (H-SL), Hari and Shalini (H-Sh);
Daphne and Merrick (D-M), Daphne and Lady Chatterjee (D-LC),
Daphne and Sister Ludmila (D-SL), Daphne and Shalini (D-Sh);
Sister Ludmila and Merrick (M-SL); Merrick and Lady
Chatterjee (M-LC).

The interactions are studied over a period of time in
order to obtain information for the variables in the schema.
In certain cases, where the scores on the schema and
interaction change significantly (for better or worse), the
interactions are studied individually. Thus a total of 13
dyads are studied in 19 interactions.

Table 1: INTERACTION OF DYADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hari</th>
<th>Daphne</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>Merrick</th>
<th>Stubbs</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>Colin</th>
<th>Shalini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

`*` indicates interaction, while `-' indicates no interaction.
4.3 CODING

This section elucidates the manner in which the scores were accorded to the dyads on Sarbaugh’s schema and Laing’s measure. Before each dyadic interaction is examined, a brief introduction to the interaction is provided. These coding decisions are summarized in tabular form in Table 2 at the end of this chapter.

4.3.1 HARI AND MERRICK

The interactions between Hari and Merrick have been grouped into two sets. The first consists of their first meeting at the Sanctuary and the second comprises their encounter after the assault of Daphne Manners at the Bibighar Gardens.

Hari and Merrick’s first interaction (H-M1): occurred the morning after Sister Ludmila found Hari in a drunken stupor and brought him to the Sanctuary to recover. Merrick had come to search the premises for a man engaged in subversive activities who had escaped from jail. Merrick spotted Hari standing by the pump and went up to question him. He initially questioned Hari in Hindi and allowed the sub-inspector who was accompanying him to continue questioning Hari in Hindi despite Hari’s assertion that he did not understand the language. Merrick then took Hari into "custody ... on no charge" (Vol. 1:134-136). Merrick did
not clearly state the reason for Hari's subsequent arrest. Hari was released the same day, although Merrick put him down on his list of suspects engaged in subversive activities (Vol. 2:232).

Applying Sarbaugh's schema, with regard to World View, Hari and Merrick score 1, indicating similar world views. Hari and Merrick both share similar world views in that both were brought up in England according to British norms and beliefs. Hari was brought up to be more British than Indian. With regard to Code Systems, 2 indicates that both of them shared a common code system, English. Merrick, however, knew Hindi as a second language (he began questioning Hari in Hindi), while Hari did not know the language yet. In fact, he commented to Merrick that he did not understand "Indian" (Vol. 1:134).

With regard to the variable Knowing and Accepting, their interaction is characterized as KA*KA. Hari was familiar with the norms of British society in India. Although this was their first meeting, Hari knew the normative structure Merrick was operating within, though he did not accept it. Hari could not reconcile himself to the fact that in India he was ostracized from British society due to the norms of Anglo-India. Thus Hari knew but did not accept these norms (KA). Merrick, on the other hand, did not know Hari nor his background. He was therefore unaware of the normative structure and beliefs that Hari was familiar with and so could not accept them (KA). Thus, they
score 3, which is the most heterogeneous level for this variable.

Regarding the variable Perceived Relationship and Intent, the relationship was perceived as hierarchical by both Hari and Merrick. Merrick, by virtue of his position as Deputy Superintendent of Police and as a member of the ruling class, was according to the prevailing rules of the time on a higher footing than Hari. Moreover, Merrick used the familiar "tum" to address Hari, which was his way of establishing a hierarchical relationship and was perceived by both men even though Hari did not accept it. Hari's comment that Merrick spoke to him as if he "was a lump of dirt" (Vol. 2:308-309) shows that Merrick had a superior attitude that Hari did not accept. Hari perceived Merrick's intent as one of domination and harm to him, since Merrick took Hari in for questioning without clearly stating the reason for the arrest. This is evident from Hari's comment: "It wasn't clear to me why the District Superintendent had me forcibly taken from the Sanctuary, thrown into a truck, driven to the kotwali and then pushed into a room there" (Ibid). Hari initially ignored Merrick and his subsequent refusal to fully answer questions was perceived by Merrick as "dumb insolence" on the part of Hari, disrupting Merrick's course of duty and his goal to obtain information regarding the whereabouts of the escaped prisoner. They had negative feelings towards each other and conflicting goals; the intent was perceived as domination,
harm and ignoring; and the relationship was perceived as hierarchical. Their relationship could be denoted as F2-G2-H2-I3. Thus they rate 2 with regard to PRI, which, according to Sarbaugh, is the most heterogeneous level in this variable. Their overall score of 8 falls in level 5 of Sarbaugh's schema, indicating heterogeneity among the participants, and so predicting inefficient communication.

With respect to communication efficiency, the basic issue involved here is Hari's arrest by Merrick for further questioning at the police station. From Merrick's direct perspective, this was a necessary measure. He saw Hari as a potential suspect who, if he could not throw light on the prisoner's whereabouts, could nevertheless very well be involved in political activities. As a police officer, it was his duty to thoroughly investigate every lead he got. Hari's direct perspective, on the other hand, was that he was innocent and had done nothing to warrant an arrest. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, he was unsure of the reasons for his arrest. Thus, Hari and Merrick had different direct perspectives on the same issue: they disagreed (A-).

At the metalevel, Hari thought that Merrick had overstepped his duty by arresting him on grounds that were unclear to him. He felt that Merrick's "course of duty didn't automatically give him permission to treat me like a lump of dirt" (Vol. 1:309). Hari further felt that Merrick had no reasons whatsoever for his arrest, and he "went under protest" (Vol. 1:136).
Merrick, on the other hand, felt that Hari was giving himself airs, and "thought he was too good to answer the questions of a mere district superintendent of police" (Vol. 2:232). Thus, there was a disjunction between Merrick's metaperspective and Hari's direct perspective on the one hand (U-); and Hari's metaperspective and Merrick's direct perspective on the other hand (U-). Both participants misunderstood each other, resulting in a situation of disagreement and misunderstanding (A-, U-, U-), which falls in level 6 and is the least successful of communication encounters.

Sarbaugh's schema: WV= 1, CS= 2, KA= 3, PRI= 2;
Total= 8, level 5.


The second interaction of Hari and Merrick (H-M2): occurred after the assault of Daphne Manners at Bibighar. Merrick arrested Hari in connection with the assault. As pointed out in Chapter II, Merrick believed that Hari engineered the entire episode.

As before, Hari and Merrick score 1 with regard to World View. Their score for the variable Code Systems is 1, indicating that both were conversant with English and Hindi. Hari had by now acquired a working knowledge of Hindi (Vol. 1:247). They now share two coding systems and therefore score 1 on this variable. Their score on the variable knowing and accepting is 2 (KA*KA). Merrick by now, had acquainted himself with Hari's background, but did not
accept the fact that Hari was brought up according to a similar set of normative beliefs that he himself had. He considered Hari "a tin pot reporter on the local gazette" who "gave himself airs because he'd been brought up expensively in England" (Vol. 2:232) (KA). Hari still knew but did not accept the norms of Anglo India (KA). For the variable PRI, both had negative feelings towards each other, and perceived each other with the intent to dominate and harm. Their relationship (F2-G2-H2-I3) rates a 2 on the schema. Thus, their overall score on Sarbaugh's schema is 6 and is at the third level of the schema predicting average communication success.

Regarding communication efficiency, the issue here concerns the assault on Daphne Manners. Merrick’s direct perspective was that Hari was the person responsible for the situation. Merrick believed that Daphne was infatuated with Hari, who led her on and eventually arranged for a rendezvous at the Bibighar gardens, where "he was waiting for her with his friends" (Vol. 2:233).

Hari, on the other hand, was innocent of the assault. Though he had met Daphne at the Gardens, it was a chance meeting without prearrangement. Hari’s direct perspective was, therefore, that he had nothing to do with the assault on Daphne and was not responsible at all. Thus, their direct perspectives were not in conjunction: they disagreed on the issue (A-).
At the metalevel, Merrick was convinced that Hari was responsible, as evidenced by his statement: "I knew it was Kumar’s work" (Vol.2: 242). Brigadier Reid\textsuperscript{16} recollected that Merrick was convinced of the guilt of the men he had arrested, particularly that of Kumar (Vol. 1:301). Merrick felt that Hari’s refusal to admit to his guilt was due to fear. He told Hari "... you’re afraid. You’re so scared you’re trying to convince yourself the whole business is an illusion" (Vol. 2:365). Thus, Merrick’s metaperspective involved seeing Hari as guilty and attributed his refusal to admit to his guilt to fear.

Hari, on the other hand, realized that Merrick was fully convinced of his guilt in the case. Hari states that "the conviction never left him. I was guilty" (\textit{Ibid}). Hari further realized that Merrick disliked him because he had the advantages of an upper class education in Britain which Merrick had been deprived of due to his humble origins (Vol.2:359). This dislike was further aggravated by the fact that Daphne, who had spurned his proposal of marriage, was now in love with Hari. Thus, Hari understood Merrick in that he realized that Merrick was convinced of his guilt and was trying to prove it. Hari’s metaperspective and Merrick’s direct perspective are similar (\textit{U+}). Merrick on the other hand did not understand Hari in that his metaperspective was not similar to Hari’s direct perspective (\textit{U-}). Therefore, through the application of the success measure, it can be ascertained that while Hari and Merrick
disagreed on the issue, Hari understood Merrick, but Merrick did not understand Hari (A-, U+, U-). This is at level 4 and is an interaction of average efficiency.

Sarbaugh's schema: WV= 1, CS= 1, KA= 2, PRI=2, Total=6, level 3.


4.3.2 HARI AND COLIN

The interaction between Hari and Colin is divided into three phases. The first phase took place in England, where they were schoolmates and close friends. The second phase occurred when Hari was forced to return to India due to financial pressures, and their interaction occurred primarily through letters. The third phase occurred in India when Colin was posted there as a result of a military commission. The analysis of their interaction focuses on the first and third stages, as these were crucial to their relationship. Moreover, they entailed direct, face-to-face contact of the participants. Sarbaugh's schema does not consider in depth the possibility of interposed channels in the communication transaction. Thus, the second phase is not considered.

Interaction in England (E-C1): Hari and Colin were schoolmates and good friends. Hari spent most of his vacation with Colin, and considered Colin's family "home".
Both Hari and Colin shared the same World View. Though Hari was Indian by birth, his father brought him up to be English in every way. In fact, Hari mentioned that he did not know anything of the "peculiarities of India and her customs" (Vol. 4:341). They score 1 for this variable. With regard to Code Systems, they both shared the coding system of English, resulting in a score of 1. Both knew and accepted each others normative beliefs (KA*KA), i.e., a score of 1. Both of them were friendly, shared the same goals and their intent was to help, resulting in a score of 1 for PRI. In fact, Colin wanted Hari to stay with his family, when Hari's father passed away. Hari commented that the Lindsey's home was "more home to him than his father's house" (Vol. 1:202). Thus the total score on Sarbaugh's schema adds up to 4, falling in level 1 and predicting highly efficient communication.

For the application of the success measure, the matter in question was their friendship. Both of them agreed, in that they both valued their friendship. Hari saw Colin as wanting to be his friend and helping him no matter what the problem. Colin viewed Hari as a good friend with whom he wanted to continue being friends with. There is a situation of agreement and understanding on the part of both participants (A+, U+, U+), which is the most efficient of communication encounters.

Sarbaugh's schema: WV=1, CS=1, KA=1, PRI=1; Total=4, level 1.
Laing’s measure: A+, U+, U+, level 1.

Interaction in India (H-C2): Four years after Hari left England, Colin was posted to India on a military commission. Colin was initially stationed at Meerut, and expressed the desire to meet Hari sometime. Hari was “wildly exhilarated.” However, Colin’s second letter to Hari noted that the chances of their meeting were remote due to the distance. Eventually, in the third and final letter Colin never mentioned the possibility of their meeting at all (Vol.1:268-269). Later, when Colin’s regiment moved to Mayapore, Hari’s “home town,” Colin did not contact Hari. Hari realized that Colin’s regiment was in town only when he saw the regimental uniform of the soldiers in the Cantonment. Hari fully expected Colin to send him a letter suggesting they meet, but soon “resigned himself to the inevitable.” Their last interaction took place at the maidan (a field) at a function that Hari was covering for his newspaper. Hari and Colin came face to face with each other, but Colin ignored him completely confirming Hari’s conclusion that he had become “invisible to all white people” (Ibid). In fact, Colin had applied for a transfer as soon as he heard that he would be posted in Mayapore (Vol. 4: 368).

The scores for World View and Code Systems is 1 each. For both of them, Hindi was a second language, and English their first. They therefore had similar code systems. They score 2 for the variable Knowing and Accepting
(KA*KA). While Hari knew that the norms of Anglo-Indian society did not favour the social mixing of Indians and British, he did not accept it (KA). Colin, on the other hand, knew and accepted these norms (KA), as evidenced by his lack of desire to meet Hari after the first few months of his commission in India. On the variable PRI, they score 2. Though Hari still maintained positive feelings towards Colin, Colin ignored Hari twice when they met face-to-face. Their relationship was now on a hierarchical footing wherein Colin was considered superior to Hari as part of the ruling class. The score (F1-G2-H2-I3) was 2. The total score now on Sarbaugh’s schema is 6, (level 3) which predicts average communication efficiency.

For the success score, the basic issue is their friendship. Hari’s direct perspective was that their friendship was strong enough to overcome the barriers of Anglo-Indian norms and Colin would still regard him as a friend. Though Hari realized it would not be possible, he still clung to his hopes of their friendship continuing. Colin, on the other hand, had no doubt in his mind that their friendship could not survive. "He saw nothing so clearly as the embarrassment that would follow the attempt to renew an old acquaintance in such very different circumstances" (Ibid). He could no longer accept Hari as a friend and on the same level. He was protecting himself from the "consequences of having a friend who was no longer socially acceptable and who might turn out to be a pest, the
sort of Indian who as the raj often said, would try to take advantage" (Ibid). There was a lack of conjunction of their direct perspectives indicating disagreement (A−).

At the metalevel, Hari realized that the norms of Anglo-Indian society had victimized their friendship. He realized that Colin could no longer be seen with him as a friend. In fact, there was no place for them to meet without causing consternation (Vol. 1:267-269). In all the instances when Colin did not try to contact him in India, and even in the last encounter, Hari excused Colin's behavior saying "It's not his fault... how could India do this?" Hari realized that there now existed a wide gulf between the two of them, due to the difference in their skin colour, and that this gulf had increased to the "point of no bridging at all, because the wish to bridge it (on the part of Colin)18 had gone" (Vol. 1:268). Colin, on the other hand, felt that Hari would understand the constraints placed on him, and realize that they could not remain friends. To him, having Hari as a friend was an embarrassment and he felt that Hari would realize the predicament he was in, and accept it.

Thus, Hari understood Colin: there is a conjunction between Colin's direct perspective and Hari's metaperspective (U+). However, Colin did not understand Hari (U−). This is a situation of disagreement (A−), and understanding and misunderstanding (U+, U−), i.e., level 4, indicating average communication efficiency.
Sarbaugh's schema: WV=1, CS=1, KA=2, PRI=2; Total= 6, level 3.

4.3.3 HARI AND SISTER LUDMILA (H-SL)

Hari and Sister Ludmila interacted frequently. Their first encounter took place when Sister Ludmila found Hari in a drunken stupor (the day Colin ignored him, Hari went out and got drunk with a few Indian friends),¹⁹ and brought him back to the Sanctuary to recover. The next day Hari was arrested by Merrick and Sister Ludmila intervened on Hari's behalf when the Sub-Inspector tried to use physical force against him. She also informed his uncle and Lady Chatterjee who knew a judge²⁰ to get Hari released.

After this, Hari used to visit Sister Ludmila often. Later, when Hari and Daphne started seeing each other, the Sanctuary became the one spot (other than the Bibighar Gardens) where they could meet and be away from the curious stares of the people. Sister Ludmila notes that they visited her several times together (Vol. 1:142). Since the interaction of Sister Ludmila and Hari took place quite frequently, their interaction is analyzed on an overall basis.

With regard to the variable World View, the score is 1 since both Hari and Sister Ludmila were brought up in Europe according to European standards and normative beliefs. On
the variable Code Systems they score 2 which indicates that they shared the same code system of English, but Sister Ludmila was also conversant with eastern European languages (Vol. 1:115). As far as the variable Knowing and Accepting is concerned, both of them knew and accepted the other's normative systems and beliefs KA*KA, resulting in a score of 1. Neither Hari nor Sister Ludmila accepted the normative system of British India. They were both aware of each other's views on this issue and accepted them. On the variable PRI, they both perceived the other as friends, thus involving positive feelings towards each other. Sister Ludmila notes that "young Kumar and I had become friends. I felt he was mine and I was his" (Vol. 1:152). That Hari was friendly with her is apparent from his frequent visits with Daphne and alone, and the fact that he confided in her concerning Colin and the test of their friendship in India (F1) (Vol. 1: 152, 267-268, 270-272). Their relationship was not perceived as hierarchical but rather as egalitarian. They were on an equal footing (H1), in spite of the fact that Sister Ludmila was European. The perceived intent was one of helping and sharing (I1), as is apparent from the fact that Sister Ludmila brought Hari back when he was drunk and prayed for him that night (Vol. 1:1:8). Hari himself helped her and confided in her. Once he met her on her way to the pharmacy and carried her purchases back to the Sanctuary for her (Vol. 1: 152). Thus their relationship can be characterized as F1-G1-H1-I1, resulting in an overall
score of 1 for the variable Perceived Relationship and Intent. Thus, the overall score is 5 which falls within level 2 of Sarbaugh's schema, predicting a highly efficient communication transaction.

Concerning communication efficiency, the issue involved in their interaction is twofold: Hari's friendship with Daphne and the problems he encountered in adjusting to life in India. Hari's first encounter with Sister Ludmila came after his realization that his friendship with Colin could not survive in India. He believed he was "invisible to white people." Sister Ludmila realized that Hari was facing these problems of adjustment, accepted him and tried to help him (Vol. 1:128-129).

At the metalevel, Hari realized that Sister Ludmila saw his problems in adjusting (as evidenced by his drunkenness and the fact that she took him in) and tried to help him out and did not frown upon his friendship with Daphne. "She saw nothing wrong in their being together" (Vol. 1:401). Thus, both of them agreed on the issues and they understood each other's point of view, (A+, U+, U+), which is a highly efficient communication interaction (level 1).

Sarbaugh's schema: WV= 1, CS= 2, KA= 1, PRI=1, Total=5, level 2.

4.3.4 HARI AND LADY CHATTERJEE (H-LC):

Hari and Lady Chatterjee did not interact very frequently. Hence their interactions are analyzed as one general interaction. Lady Chatterjee first heard of Hari\textsuperscript{21} when he was arrested and taken in for questioning the first time. Lady Chatterjee tried to help him get out of custody by enlisting the help of a judge and a lawyer who were her friends\textsuperscript{22} (Vol. 1:110-111). It was after this that she invited him to a party at her house because her "curiosity was aroused" (\textit{Ibid}). It was here that Hari first met Daphne. He met Lady Chatterjee on his subsequent visits to the MacGregor House to spend time with Daphne (Vol. 1:389).

With regard to the variable World View, Hari and Lady Chatterjee score 2, indicating different world views. This was due to the fact that Lady Chatterjee was a Rajput who held to Hindu beliefs and was "contemptuous of the laziness of western religions" (Vol. 1:69). Hari, however, as pointed out earlier, was brought up according to British views and did not have a clue about India and Hindu religious mores.

They score 2 with regard to Code Systems, since they shared a common coding system of English. However, since Lady Chatterjee’s mother tongue was Hindi, she had more than a working knowledge of it compared to Hari, who had just started learning the language.
Lady Chatterjee knew that Hari was born and brought up in England and that he "spoke like an English boy. Acted like one. Thought like one" (Vol. 1:111). However, she did not accept the fact that in India he still held to this normative structure that was essentially British, since it did not hold good in colonial India. As pointed out in Chapter II, Lady Chatterjee was fully aware of her social position in Anglo-India and accepted it. Hari also, was aware of the normative structure of Anglo-India within which Lady Chatterjee was operating and did not accept it. He was resentful of the fact that it had taken so long for "the privileged section of Indian society to notice him" (Vol. 4:371). Thus, though they were aware of each other's normative structure, they did not accept it, resulting in KAKA, which scores 2 on the schema. With regard to PRI, the intent was perceived as trying to help (II), while their feelings towards each other were not negative, but more tinged with curiosity. Hari was grateful that Lady Chatterjee had tried to help him, and she wanted to meet him (F1). They perceived each other on a symmetrical basis, not a hierarchical one (H1), resulting in a F1-G1-H1-II relationship, which scores 1. On the whole, they score 7 on Sarbaugh's schema, which falls in level 4 for which average communication success is predicted.

With regard to communication efficiency, the main issue involved in their relationship was the friendship between Daphne and Hari. At the direct perspective level, Lady
Chatterjee had her "reservations" regarding this relationship (Vol. 1:111). Hari, on the other hand, felt that a friendship with Daphne was desirable, as this was the first time since coming to India that he was treated on an equal footing by a member of the ruling class. Moreover, Daphne was someone he could share things with, someone who had a similar upbringing (Vol. 1:387). He therefore continued his friendship with Daphne. Hari and Lady Chatterjee had different direct perspectives on the issue, and disagreed (A-).

At the metalevel, Hari realized that Lady Chatterjee had reservations regarding his relationship with Daphne, as can be evidenced by his statement "it worried her when Miss Manners was so friendly towards me" (Vol. 2:299). However, he attributed her anxiety to the fact that "even someone like Lady Chatterjee was incapable of accepting immediately that a white girl could treat an India like a man. She probably thought I might take advantage of Miss Manners" (Vol 2:300-301). Thus, he felt that Lady Chatterjee was afraid that Daphne would break the taboo of Anglo-India, by pursuing a friendship with an Indian. Lady Chatterjee, on the other hand, felt that Hari might not reciprocate Daphne's feelings, resulting in Daphne being hurt (Vol. 1:111). Her main concern was to protect Daphne from being possibly heartbroken if Hari did not reciprocate her feelings. Moreover, as will be discussed in Chapter V, her hesitancy was also due to Hari himself. He did not show
much gratitude to her, nor did he "thank her enough" for helping him (Vol. 2: 301). To her, Hari was trying to prove his Englishness by going out with Daphne. Thus, there is a disjunction between her metaperspective and Hari’s direct perspective (U-); and a conjunction between Hari’s metaperspective and Lady Chatterjee’s direct perspective (U+). This is a situation of disagreement and understanding on the part of one participant and misunderstanding on the part of the other which is an interaction of average communication efficiency (A-, U+, U-; level 4).

Sarbaugh’s schema: WV=2, CS=2, KA= 2, PRI= 1, Total=7, level 4.

Laing’s measure: A-, U+, U-, level 1.

4.3.5 DAPHNE AND LADY CHATTERJEE

Daphne and Lady Chatterjee interacted with each other very frequently, since Daphne was Lady Chatterjee’s house guest, and Lady Chatterjee opened her home to Daphne for her stay at Mayapore. For the purposes of analysis, their interaction is analyzed on an overall basis.

Daphne and Lady Chatterjee score 2 with regard to World View, which is the most heterogeneous score for this variable. Lady Chatterjee was of Rajput origin and though she had acquired the veneer of the West, at heart she remained a Hindu (Vol. 1:69). Thus, her world view differed from that of Daphne. Daphne and Lady Chatterjee shared a
common Code System of English, but Lady Chatterjee was conversant with Hindi which results in a score of 2. (Though Daphne was familiar with Hindi, it was a second language for her and she was not as fluent in it as Lady Chatterjee was). As far as the variable Knowing and Accepting is concerned, both knew and accepted each other’s normative systems and beliefs (KAKA). Thus they scored 1, which is a highly homogeneous score. With regard to perceived relationship and intent, their relationship is an F1-G1-H1-I1 one, where both of them perceived each other as friendly -- in fact Daphne used to affectionately call Lady Chatterjee "Auntie" (Vol. 1:90)), had compatible goals, and an egalitarian relationship, where their intent was to help and share. They therefore score 1 on this variable which indicates high homogeneity. Their total score is 6 on Sarbaugh’s schema, which falls within level 3 and predicts an efficient communication transaction.

Regarding communication efficiency, the basic issue in question here is Daphne’s friendship with Hari. Daphne’s direct perspective was that there was nothing wrong with her friendship with Hari. She was aware that she was breaking the norms of Anglo-Indian society, and that her friendship with Hari was considered taboo. However that did not deter her. Lady Chatterjee, on the other hand, did not look favorably on Daphne and Hari’s friendship. She was "worried,...because she couldn’t be sure whether he felt the same way about her" (Vol. 1:111). Thus their direct
perspectives are not in conjunction with each other: they disagreed (A-).

At the metalevel, Daphne realized that Lady Chatterjee was apprehensive and had reservations about her friendship with Hari (Vol. 1: 373). Daphne understood Lady Chatterjee, in that there is a conjunction between Daphne's metaperspective and Lady Chatterjee's direct perspective (U+). Lady Chatterjee knew that Daphne was aware of her reservations. However, she felt that Daphne was going into this relationship heedless of the repercussions that would ensue. Thus, there is a disjunction between Lady Chatterjee's metaperspective and Daphne's direct perspective (U-). This results in a situation of disagreement and misunderstanding on the part of one participant, and understanding on the part of the other (level 3), and indicates average efficiency.

After the Bibighar Gardens episode, the scores for Daphne and Lady Chatterjee remain the same as above, even though the issue in question is new, viz., the assault on Daphne. Lady Chatterjee's direct perspective was that Hari was the person responsible. Her first question as Daphne stumbled in was "Was it Hari?" (Vol. 1:429). She also told Merrick that Hari was involved in the incident (Vol. 1:430). Daphne on the other hand knew that Hari was not responsible for the assault on her. Thus, they disagreed on the issue (A-).
At the metalevel, Lady Chatterjee thought that Daphne was lying about Hari’s complicity in the assault in order to protect him. Daphne at the metalevel felt that Lady Chatterjee held Hari responsible for the assault and realized that Lady Chatterjee did not believe her. Thus, there is a conjunction between Lady Chatterjee’s direct perspective and Daphne’s metaperspective (U+), indicating that Daphne understood Lady Chatterjee. There is a disjunction in Lady Chatterjee’s metaperspective and Daphne’s direct perspective, indicating that Lady Chatterjee did not understand Daphne (U−). Thus, the changed issue does not alter the situation of disagreement and understanding and misunderstanding (A−, U−, U+), which is level 4 of the efficiency schema and is an indication of average efficiency.

Sarbaugh’s schema: WV=2, CS=2, KA=1, PRI=1; Total= 6, level 3.


4.3.6 HARI AND DAPHNE

Hari and Daphne interacted a considerable number of times as pointed out in Chapter II. For the purposes of analysis, their interactions will be analyzed in two phases: before and after the Bibighar Gardens episode.
Their first set of interactions comprises their interactions till their visit to the Tirupati temple (explained earlier in Chapter II).

Hari and Daphne’s first interaction (H-D1): Hari and Daphne were both raised according to the same normative set of beliefs and outlook (Vol. 1:387), thus they score 1 with regard to World View, indicating a high degree of similarity with regard to this variable. Both of them shared the same code system of English. Both of them were about equally familiar with Hindi as a second language, they therefore score 1 (Vol. 1:391).

With regard to the variable Knowing and Accepting, Hari knew the norms of British society in India, but did not accept them. However, he soon realized that in her interactions, Daphne did not conform to the norms of Anglo-Indian society. He therefore accepted her normative structure (KA). Daphne initially did not know Hari’s background and his normative structure, but she accepted them. Later, when she got to know him better, she was aware of the normative structure he was operating within and she accepted it(KA). The score for this variable is 1 (KA*KA).

As far as Perceived Relationship and Intent are concerned, Hari and Daphne perceived each other as having fairly positive feelings towards each other. Daphne treated Hari as an equal, in Hari’s view, she treated him like a man (Vol. 2: 300). It came as a surprise to Hari that a “white person would treat him as an equal” (Vol. 1:301). Each
perceived the others intent as one of sharing and helping. This results in a Fl-Gl-H1-I1 relationship and they score 1 on this variable. Thus, they score a total of 4 on Sarbaugh’s schema, which falls within level 1, predicting very efficient communication.

Regarding communication efficiency, the issue involved here is the friendship between Daphne and Hari. It was a relationship that was considered taboo in Anglo-India, on the grounds that a "dark-skinned man touching a white skinned woman diminishes her" (Vol. 2:263). Both Hari and Daphne agreed that this relationship was something they both wanted to pursue. They agreed on this issue (A+).

On the metalevel, Hari thought Daphne was pursuing this relationship out of pity for him. Daphne, on the other hand felt that he was merely amusing himself and that going out with her gave him a sense of pride. Thus, they misunderstood each other (U-, U-). This situation of agreement and misunderstanding (A+, U-, U-), falls in level 5 and is an inefficient communication transaction.

Sarbaugh’s schema: WV=1, CS=1, KA=1, PRI=1, Total=4, level 1.
Laing’s schema: A+, U-, U-, level 5.

Hari and Daphne’s second interaction (H-D2) took place the night of the Bibighar episode. Daphne went to the Gardens hoping to see Hari there. The variables on Sarbaugh’s schema have not changed from the earlier interaction. The total score on Sarbaugh’s schema remains
4, falling within level 1 and indicating an excellent possibility of communication efficiency.

Applying the efficiency measure, the major issue in question here concerned the continuance of their relationship, which both Hari and Daphne at the direct level wanted to continue. They were therefore in agreement (A+). At the metalevel, both of them realized that their relationship was important to them, and that they were in love. There was a conjunction of metaperspectives and direct perspectives, resulting in a situation of agreement and understanding (A+, U+, U+) is the most efficient of communication transactions falling at level 1.

Sarbaugh's schema: WV=1, CS=1, KA=1, PRI=1, Total= 4, level 1.


4.3.7 HARI AND STUBBS (H-St)

Hari and Stubbs interacted only once, but the encounter is significant and therefore analyzed.

Hari applied for a job at British-Indian Electrical. After the first few preliminary interviews, he stood a good chance of getting the job. Despite his lack of knowledge in this field, the company was interested in him since "his English public school education didn't count for nothing... It didn't matter to them that he had no qualifications"
(Vol. 1:246). However, in the interview with the managing director, Stubbs, Hari encountered a few difficulties.

With regard to the variables on Sarbaugh’s schema, Hari and Stubbs score 1 where World View is concerned, since, as mentioned earlier, Hari was more British than Indian. They score 1 with regard to Code Systems. (Both were conversant with English and their knowledge of Hindi was the same). As far as Knowing and Accepting is concerned, they score 2 (KA*KA). This is because Hari knew the normative structure of British India within which Stubbs was operating, but did not accept it (KA). Stubbs similarly was aware of Hari’s background and his normative structure, but did not accept it (KA). With regard to the variable PRI, their relationship can be denoted as F2-G2-H2-I3, thus resulting in a score of 2. Their relationship was perceived by them as hierarchical, one in which the intent was to harm and it was characterized by negative feelings. Their score Sarbaugh’s schema is 6, which falls within level 3 of the schema, and predicts an average chance of communication success.

The main issue in question here was Hari’s application for a job in British-Indian Electrical. Hari essentially had no training in this area, but after the first few preliminary interviews, he was given to understand by the senior managing director\(^{23}\) that there was a strong possibility that he would get the job. However, when he came to the final interview with Stubbs, the matter changed. At the direct perspective level Stubbs felt that Hari was
not suited for the post, due to his inexperience and lack of knowledge in the area. Hari, on the other hand, was given to understand by the managing director that his inexperience was not a major issue, felt that he had a strong chance of gaining employment (Vol. 1:248). Thus, their direct perspectives on the issue are not in conjunction, indicating disagreement on the issue in question (A-).

At the metalevel, Stubbs resented Hari's "sullen and uncooperative manner" (Vol. 2:292). He thought that Hari was confident of getting the job due to his Chillingborough education. Although an Englishman, Stubbs did not have access to the education that Hari had enjoyed in England, and he resented the fact that here was an Indian who spoke English with an accent better than his own (Vol. 1:246). He resented Hari's "public school voice and manner" (Vol. 4: 362). He told Hari that he disliked "bolshie black laddies on this side of the business" (Vol.1: 249). On the other hand, Hari had admitted his technical inadequacy, and had mentioned his willingness to undergo training. However, Stubbs ignored this and asked Hari a series of technical questions, to which Hari confessed ignorance. Hari's metaperspective was that he was being treated unfairly by Stubbs. He mentioned that he could not understand why "Stubbs was allowed to call the tune" (Vol. 1:249). He thought that Stubbs gave him a hard time because he had refused to call Stubbs "Sir," thereby acknowledging the
hierarchical position of the ruling class. There is therefore a disjunction between Hari’s direct perspective and the metaperspective of Stubbs (U-), and Hari’s metaperspective and Stubbs’ direct perspective (U-), resulting in misunderstanding on the part of both participants. This falls within level 6 of Laing’s measure, which predicts the most inefficient communication transaction.

Sarbaugh’s schema: WV=1, CS=1, KA=2, PRI=2; Total= 6, level 3.


4.3.8 DAPHNE AND SHALINI (D-Sh)

Daphne and Shalini interacted a few times as a result of Daphne’s friendship with Hari. Their interactions are analyzed in two phases, before and after the Bibighar Gardens incident.

Daphne and Shalini’s first interaction (D-Sh1): Daphne’s first meeting with Shalini took place when Daphne was invited to Hari’s house for supper. With regard to the variable World View, they score 2, indicating the existence of differing world views. This is because Shalini came from an orthodox Hindu family, while Daphne was brought up according to the British belief systems. They score 2 with regard to Code Systems. Daphne’s knowledge of Hindi was limited while Shalini was more fluent in it. Their common
language was English, which was a fluent second language for Shalini but Daphne’s mother tongue. Daphne in fact commented that "Aunt Shalini ... spoke very good English" (Vol. 1:390). As far as the variable Knowing and Accepting is concerned, they score 1, since both of them knew and accepted each other’s normative systems (KA*KA). Both Daphne and Shalini perceived the other as friendly, with the intent to share and help, and their relationship was complementary rather than hierarchical. The resulting F1-G1-H1-I1 relationship scores 1 for the variable PRI. Their total score on Sarbaugh’s schema is 6, which falls within level 3, indicating an average chance of communication efficiency.

Concerning the efficiency of this interaction, the issue in question here was Hari’s friendship with Daphne. Daphne valued this friendship, and it was something she pursued despite the disapproval of British society. Shalini did not disapprove of this friendship and seemed pleased that Hari had someone who understood him. Thus, there is a conjunction of direct perspectives, resulting in agreement (A+).

At the metalevel, Daphne thought that Shalini did not oppose her friendship with Hari despite the fact that it was against the norms of Anglo-India. Similarly, Shalini, on the other hand felt that Daphne was aware that she did not disapprove of the relationship. Thus, there is a conjunction between Daphne’s direct perspective and
Shalini’s metaperspective, and Shalini’s direct perspective and Daphne’s metaperspective, resulting in understanding on the part of both participants (A+, U+, U+). This falls in level 1, indicating a highly efficient communication.

Sarbaugh’s schema: WV=2, CS=2, KA=1, PRI=1; Total 6, level 3.

Laing’s schema: A+, U+, U+, level 1.

Daphne and Shalini’s second interaction (D-SH2): took place after the incident at the Gardens. Daphne went to visit Shalini before she left for Rawalpindi but Shalini refused to see her (Vol. 1:151, 396). As before, they score 2 with regard to World View and Code Systems; and 1 with regard to Knowing and Accepting (KA*KA). However, with regard to the variable PRI, they now score 2. The relationship is now an P2-G2-H1-I2 relationship, wherein Shalini had negative feelings towards Daphne and ignored her. Daphne’s feelings towards Shalini were now marked more with ambivalence and hesitancy. Her main goal of visiting Shalini was to gain information regarding Hari’s whereabouts. Shalini however refused to see her; thus, they had incompatible goals. Their overall score on Sarbaugh’s schema is 7 (level 3) and predicts average communication efficiency.

With regard to efficiency, the main issue concerned here is the alleged assault of Daphne by Hari. The direct perspective of Daphne was that she knew that Hari was not responsible for leading the assault. Shalini also did not
believe that Hari was at fault or involved in this incident. They had the same direct perspective on the issue and hence agreed (A+).

At the metalevel, Shalini seemed to hold Daphne responsible for Hari’s arrest. She considered Daphne’s friendship with Hari the main reason for the entire episode. She commented to a friend that this incident had destroyed Hari forever in the opinion of the British and it was all "because of the girl" (Vol. 4:394). At the metalevel, Daphne thought that Shalini would realize that she had tried to protect Hari. Daphne felt that Hari had would pretend that he had not been to the Gardens at all, that they had never met, and that he "would persuade Aunt Shalini to swear he had been at home" (Vol. 1:392). She did not think that he would be arrested and thought that Shalini would understand this. There is a disjunction between Daphne’s metaperspective and Shalini’s direct perspective; (U-), and Shalini’s metaperspective and Daphne’s direct perspective (U-). This situation is one of agreement and misunderstanding (A+, U-, U-; level 5), and is an inefficient communication transaction.

Sarbaugh’s schema: WV=2, CS=2, KA=1, PRI=2, Total= 7, level 4.

Laing’s schema: A+, U-, U-, level 5.
4.3.9 HARI AND SHALINI (H-SH)

Hari and Shalini interacted with each other very frequently, since Hari lived with his aunt. They score 2 with regard to World View, indicating different world views. As pointed out earlier, Hari was brought up to be completely British, while Shalini was Hindu. They score 2 with regard to Code Systems. Though they shared a common language of English, Shalini was more fluent in Hindi than Hari, as it was her mother tongue. Since this interaction is analyzed over a period of time, Hari and Shalini gradually came to know and accept each other’s normative system and beliefs (KA*KA), resulting in a score of 1. As far as PRI is concerned, they perceived their relationship as one which was complementary (H1), where the intent was to help and share (I1), especially since Shalini had sent Hari a ticket to return to India upon his father’s death and since then had cared for him. It was a relationship characterized by positive feelings towards each other (F1). They therefore score 1 on this variable. Their total score on Sarbaugh’s schema is 6, which falls within level 3, predicting a very good chance of communication success.

The application of Laing’s schema allows the success of their communication encounter to be ascertained. The basic issue involved here involves Hari’s problems in adjusting to India. At the direct level, Hari was unhappy in India. It
was a culture and land that was totally alien to him. To him England was still "home." Shalini realized that Hari was having difficulties in adjusting to India, and that he missed "home" and was unhappy. They had the same perspective on this issue, and therefore agreed. At the metalevel, Shalini concluded eventually that Hari could only understand the English and would never really be able to fully accept and adjust to life in India (Vol. 4:394). She accepted this. Hari realized that Shalini knew that he was unhappy and faced problems in adjusting to India. He realized that she genuinely cared for him, and in her own way was trying to ease the shock of entry into Indian society (Vol. 1: 251). Thus, they understood each other. This results in a situation of agreement and understanding (A+, U+, U+), which is the most efficient level of communication transactions (level 1).

Sarbaugh's schema: WV=2, CS= 2, KA=1, PRI= 1, Total=6, level 3.

Laing's schema: A+, U+, U+; level 1.

4.3.10 DAPHNE AND SISTER LUDMILA (D-SL)

Daphne and Sister Ludmila interacted quite a few times. Daphne and Hari used to visit the Sanctuary frequently, since that was the only place they could meet without being stared at and evoking comments by Anglo-Indian society. Daphne also visited the Sanctuary alone. She used to
volunteer at the Sanctuary and occasionally took fruit to Sister Ludmila. She even offered to help financially (Vol. 1:142).

They score 1 with regard to World View, since both were brought up according to European beliefs. They shared the same Code System of English, but Sister Ludmila had other coding systems (eastern European languages) with which Daphne was not conversant (Vol. 1:115). They therefore score 2 on this variable. With regard to the variable Knowing and Accepting, they score 1, since they both knew and accepted the other’s normative system and belief (KA*KA). They perceived each other as friendly, with an intent to help and share, and their relationship was perceived as complementary by both of them. This results in an Fl-Gl-Hl-I1 relationship, which scores 1 on the variable PRI. This dyad has a total score of 5 on Sarbaugh’s schema, which falls in level 2, indicating an excellent chance of communication success.

Applying the efficiency measure here, the main issue at stake was Daphne’s friendship with Hari. Daphne, at the direct perspective level, saw nothing wrong with pursuing this friendship and neither did Sister Ludmila (Vol. 1:401). There is a conjunction in their direct perspectives, indicating agreement on the issue (A+).

At the metalevel, Daphne realized that Sister Ludmila accepted her relationship with Hari and in her own way was trying to help them, by providing them with a place to meet.
Even after the Bibighar Gardens incident and the ensuing enquiry, Daphne realized that Sister Ludmila still accepted her and did not frown upon her association with Hari. Sister Ludmila saw that Daphne knew that she supported them. Thus there is a conjunction between the metaperspective of Daphne and the direct perspective of Sister Ludmila (A+) and a conjunction between Daphne's direct perspective and Sister Ludmila's metaperspective (U+), indicating that they understood each other. This situation of agreement and understanding on the part of both participants is the most efficient of communication encounters (level 1).

Sarbaugh's schema: WV= 1, CS=2, KA= 1, PRI= 1, Total= 5, level 2.


4.3.11 MERRICK AND SISTER LUDMILA (M-SL)

The interaction between Merrick and Sister Ludmila is analyzed in two phases. Though Sister Ludmila had seen Merrick a few times earlier on (Vol. 1:130), their first real interaction occurred when Merrick came to the Sanctuary to search for a suspect. This was the first time Merrick and Hari met.

Merrick and Sister Ludmila's first interaction (M-SL1): Sister Ludmila and Merrick score 1 with regard to World View, indicating similar world views. Though they shared the same code systems of English, there were other languages
with which Ludmila was conversant with, but Merrick was not. Therefore they score 2 on the variable Code Systems. With regard to Knowing and Accepting, they score 2. Sister Ludmila knew and accepted the normative system of British India within which Merrick operated (KA). Though aware of Sister Ludmila’s non-conformist normative systems, Merrick did not accept it (KA) (Vol. 1:129). With regard to the variable PRI, their relationship can be categorized as F2-G2-H2-I2. Sister Ludmila and Merrick perceived each other in a hierarchical relationship (H2), wherein Merrick was on a higher footing by virtue of his position as Deputy Commissioner of Police. His manner was authoritative. They had incompatible goals (G2). Merrick came to search the premises for a suspect, while Sister Ludmila had no one hiding there. Furthermore, when she interfered in Hari’s arrest, she was impeding Merrick’s duty. They had fairly negative feelings (F2) towards the other. Sister Ludmila disliked Merrick and described him as a person with whom there was “nothing straightforward” (Ibid). Sister Ludmila perceived Merrick’s intent as one of domination (I3), and later as one of deliberate injury to Hari. Merrick, on the other hand, perceived Sister Ludmila’s intent as a subtle lack of desire to cooperate fully with him, despite her “unprotesting acquiescence” (Vol. 1:130). This results in a score of 2 on this variable, indicating a high level of heterogeneity. The total score on Sarbaugh’s schema for
this dyad is 7, which falls within level 4, predicting an average communication success.

Applying the efficiency measure, the issue involved was Hari’s arrest. To Merrick, the Sanctuary was a possible place where the suspect might seek refuge. He regarded Hari as someone who might be able to shed light on the whereabouts of the suspect. Moreover, Hari’s unwillingness to provide information concerning himself aroused Merrick’s suspicions. Sister Ludmila did not know who Hari was since she had found him drunk on the road and brought him to Sanctuary for the night. She felt that while Merrick was within rights to question Hari, there was no need to arrest him. Sister Ludmila thought Merrick was unjust in his treatment of Hari. She felt that Merrick arrested him solely because Hari seemed so much more English than Merrick himself, and "this counted against him in Merrick’s book" (Vol. 1:136-137). There was therefore a situation of disagreement (A-).

At the metalevel, Merrick believed he was well within his rights to arrest Hari. He felt Sister Ludmila was interfering in the issue, especially when she protested against the Sub-Inspector hitting Hari. To Merrick, Sister Ludmila had no right to protect Hari, nor question Merrick regarding his treatment of "suspects." There was a disjunction between the metaperspective of Merrick and the direct perspective of Sister Ludmila, and the direct perspective of Merrick and the metaperspective of Sister
Ludmila, resulting in misunderstanding between the participants. The participants disagreed and misunderstand each other (A-, U-, U-). This is the least efficient of communication encounters, and falls in level 6.

Sarbaugh’s schema: \( WV=1, \ CS=2, \ KA=2, \ PRI=2, \ Total=7 \), level 4.


Merrick and Sister Ludmila’s second interaction (M-SL2) occurred on the night of the Bibighar episode when Merrick was looking for Daphne. As before, they score 1 with regard to World View and 2 for Code Systems, and Knowing and Accepting. Their relationship can be denoted as P2-G1-H2-I1, resulting in a score of 2 for the variable PRI. The relationship was hierarchical (H2), due to Merrick’s official position, and because he was operating in an official capacity. They perceived each other with the intent to help, and had similar goals (discovering Daphne’s whereabouts). They score a total of 7 on the schema, which falls in level 4, indicating average communication efficiency.

In the application of Laing’s score, the major issue of concern was Daphne’s whereabouts and safety. Both Sister Ludmila and Merrick were concerned about her safety on a night when anti-British violence was at its height. They therefore agreed on the issue in question (A+). At the metalevel, Sister Ludmila realized that Merrick came to find out information about Daphne not merely acting in an
official capacity, but also out of concern for her. Merrick too, realized Sister Ludmila was concerned about Daphne and was not withholding any information from him. They understood each other, resulting in a situation of agreement and understanding on the part of both the participants (A+, U+, U+). This falls in level 1, and is the most efficient level of communication.

Sarbaugh’s schema: \( WV=1, \ CS=2, \ KA=2, \ PRI=2, \ Total=7 \), level 4.

Laing’s schema: A+, U+, U+, level 1.

4.3.12 MERRICK AND LADY CHATTERJEE (M-LC)

Merrick and Lady Chatterjee interacted on a social basis. Merrick was invited to Lady Chatterjee’s for a few parties. Merrick and Lady Chatterjee score 2 with regard to World View. Merrick held to the values and beliefs that were essentially British, while Lady Chatterjee subscribed to the Hindu system of beliefs. They score 2 with regard to Code Systems: though they shared the common coding system of English, Hindi was Lady Chatterjee’s mother tongue, while it was Merrick’s second language. They score 1 with regard to Knowing and Accepting (\( KA*KA \)), since both of them knew and accepted the other’s normative systems. They perceived each other in a hierarchical relationship (E2), with Merrick on a higher footing, due to his membership in the ruling class. They had fairly positive feelings towards each other (F1),
and the intent was perceived as sharing (I1). Thus, their relationship can be characterized as F1-G1-H2-I1, which results in a score of 1 for the variable PRI. Their total score on Sarbaugh’s schema is 6, which falls within level 3 and indicates a good chance of communication efficiency.

The main issue of concern is the assault on Daphne at the Bibighar Gardens. Merrick was convinced that Hari was somehow involved in this incident. His first question to Lady Chatterjee was, "Is she with Hari Kumar?" (Vol. 1:109). Lady Chatterjee also felt that Hari had something to do with the entire event. In fact when Daphne stumbled in, Lady Chatterjee asked her if it was Hari she had been with (Vol. 1:429). Merrick and Lady Chatterjee agreed on the issue in question (A+).

At the metalevel Lady Chatterjee realized that Merrick was concerned about Daphne’s whereabouts, and felt that Kumar had something to do with her being out so late. Lady Chatterjee felt that Daphne had met Kumar that night, and "there was no doubt in my mind, nor in Mr. Merrick’s" about this (Vol. 1:111). At the metalevel Merrick felt that Lady Chatterjee "suspected" Kumar (Vol. 2:243). Thus, there exists a conjunction between Merrick’s direct perspective and Lady Chatterjee’s metaperspective and Merrick’s metaperspective and Lady Chatterjee’s direct perspective. This indicates that they understood each other. There exists a situation of understanding and agreement on the
part of both participants (A+, U+, U+), which is the most
efficient of communication encounters in Laing’s measure.

Sarbaugh’s schema: Wv= 2, CS=2, KA=1, PRI= 1, Total=6.
level 3.

Laing’s schema: A+, U+, U+, level 1.

4.3.13 DAPHNE AND MERRICK (D-M)

The interactions of Daphne and Merrick are analyzed in
two phases: i.e., before and after the Bibighar affair.
Daphne and Merrick interacted fairly frequently with each
other. They first met at a dinner party at Lady
Chatterjee’s. Daphne later visited Merrick twice at his
house. Merrick began to take an interest in Daphne only
after he noticed her go up and talk to Hari at the War Week
exhibition (Vol. 1:396). Merrick often used to send his car
to provide Daphne with transportation after she finished her
work at the hospital.

Daphne and Merrick’s first interaction (D-M1) They
score 1 with regard to World View, indicating similar belief
systems, since both of them were brought up according to
British beliefs. Both Daphne and Merrick shared a common
code system of English. They also knew Hindi as a second
language and therefore score 1 with regard to Code Systems.
They knew each other’s normative systems,
but did not accept it (KA*KA), and score 2 as far as this
variable is concerned. Merrick did not accept Daphne’s non-
conformist ways, and she did not accept his strict adherence to the norms of British India. They had positive feelings towards each other (Vol. 1:100). They perceived each other as friendly, with the intent to help, and their relationship was a complementary one. However, their goals were not compatible. This results in a F1-G2-H1-I1 relationship, which scores 1 with regard to the variable PRI. Their total score of 5 falls within level 2 of Sarbaugh's schema and predicts average communication success.

The main issue of concern here is Daphne's friendship with Hari. To Daphne, there was nothing wrong with this friendship. Merrick, on the other hand, did not approve of this friendship, and even warned Daphne about her "association" with Hari. This resulted in disagreement on the issue (A=).

Daphne thought that Merrick was rigidly holding to the norms of Anglo-India, which frowned upon a "white girl, black man association." She commented to Merrick, that she didn't care what colour people were, and she would choose her own friends. Merrick retaliated by saying that "colour ... does matter. It's basic. It matters like hell" (Vol. 1:407). Daphne also felt that Merrick was jealous, since she had turned down his proposal of marriage. Merrick on the other hand felt that Daphne was duped by Hari. He thought that Hari had struck up a friendship with Daphne in order to bolster his ego, and to use Daphne. There is a disjunction between Merrick's direct perspective and
Daphne's metaperspective, and Daphne's direct perspective and Merrick's metaperspective. Thus, Merrick and Daphne disagreed on the issue, and misunderstood each other (A-, U-, U-), which is the most inefficient of communication encounters.

Sarbaugh's schema: WV=1, CS=1, KA=2, PRI=1, Total=5, level 2.


Merrick and Daphne's second interaction (D-M2) occurred after the Bibighar episode. As before, Merrick and Daphne score 1 with regard to World View and 1 for Code Systems. Merrick knew that Daphne had broken a taboo of Anglo-India by her relationship with Hari, but did not accept this (KA). Daphne knew and did not accept Merrick's normative beliefs (KA). Thus, they score 2 with regard to Knowing and Accepting. They perceived each other in a hierarchical relationship (H2), as Merrick was now operating as District Superintendent of Police and not as a friend. To Merrick, Daphne's reluctance to divulge the course of events of the evening was disrupting his course of duty. Daphne, on the other hand, saw Merrick as intent on dominating and hurting Hari (I3). They also perceived each other with fairly negative feelings. Their relationship can be categorized as F2-G2-H2-I3, resulting in a score of 2 for the variable PRI. The total of 6 falls within level 3 of Sarbaugh's schema, predicting only average communication success.
The issue in question here is the assault on Daphne at the Bibighar Gardens. At the direct perspective level, Merrick regarded Hari as the person responsible for the assault. Daphne, however, knew that Hari was innocent. They disagreed on the issue in question (A−).

At the metalevel, Merrick felt that Daphne was protecting Hari, hence her statements that she had not seen Hari since their visit to the temple. To Daphne, Merrick was deliberately singling Hari out as the responsible for this incident, because Merrick "already had his eye on Hari" (Vol. 1:396). There is therefore a disjunction between Daphne's direct perspective and Merrick's metaperspective, resulting in misunderstanding on the part of Merrick (U−). However, there is a conjunction between Merrick's metaperspective and Daphne's direct perspective, resulting in understanding on the part of Daphne (U+). The ensuing situation falls within level 4 of Laing's measure, indicating an average communication efficiency.

Sarbaugh's schema: WV=1, CS=1, KA=2, PRI=2, Total=6, level 3.


In conclusion, the coding information and decisions discussed above furnish the basis for the analysis which follows. The results of the coding have been summarized in Table 2 which shows a considerable range of values for both schema, and some unexpected outcomes.
Table 2 Dyads scores on Sarbaugh's and Laing's schemata:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyads</th>
<th>WV</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>PRI</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-M1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>U-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td>F2-G2-H2-I3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-M2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td>F2-G2-H2-I3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-D1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>U-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td>F1-G1-H2-I1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-D2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td>F1-G1-H1-I1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td>F1-G1-H1-I1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td>F2-G2-H2-I3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-LC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td>F1-G1-H1-I1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>U-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td>F2-G2-H2-I3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-SH1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td>F1-G1-H1-I1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-SH2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>U-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td>F1-G2-H1-I3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-Sh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td>F1-G1-H1-I1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyads</th>
<th>WV</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>PRI</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-SL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td></td>
<td>F1-G1-H1-I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-SL1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>U-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td></td>
<td>F2-G1-H2-I3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-SL2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td></td>
<td>F2-G1-H2-I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-LC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td></td>
<td>F1-G1-H2-I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-LC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td></td>
<td>F1-G1-H1-I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-M1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>U-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td></td>
<td>F1-G2-H1-I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-M2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td></td>
<td>F2-G2-H2-I3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-SL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>U+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA*KA</td>
<td></td>
<td>F1-G1-H1-I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
ANALYSIS

This study concerns itself with the question of whether the homogeneity of participants in a communication encounter contributes to greater communication efficiency, and conversely, whether the heterogeneity of the participants contributes to inefficient and unsuccessful communication. It is therefore concerned with the extent to which Sarbaugh's schema successfully predicts the outcome of a communication encounter.

An adaptation of the principle of Coorientation developed by Laing et al., is used as an independent measure of the levels of communication efficiency.

Table 3 is a simpler version of Table 2 and summarizes the homogeneity-heterogeneity scores and the communication efficiency scores of the dyads. Figure 1 is a graphic representation of these scores. The scores on Sarbaugh's schema are plotted along the 'x' axis and Laing's scores are plotted on the 'y' axis. If the hypothesis holds, then there will be a line sloping upwards from left to right. If the relationship is perfect, all the cases should lie on this line.

From this graph it can be ascertained that eight of the interactions fall directly along this line, indicating that they support the hypothesis. However, eleven dyads do not fall on the line, but are scattered over the graph. Of
these eleven cases, four lie close to the line, i.e., only one unit away from the line in either direction. Though these cases do not completely support the hypothesis, they do not display drastic divergence. The seven cases that show substantial divergence and therefore do not support the hypothesis at all, are the cases of Hari and Stubbs (H-St), Daphne and Merrick 1 (D-M1), Daphne and Shalini 1 (D-Sh1), Hari and Shalini (H-Sh), Merrick and Lady Chatterjee (M-LC), Merrick and Sister Ludmila 2 (M-SL2), and Hari and Daphne 1 (H-D1). Of these, the last is the worst in terms of the hypothesis.

For purposes of analysis, the cases were divided into three categories. Table 3 lists the scores of the dyads on Sarbaugh’s and Laing’s schemata according to the three categories. Category I consists of those dyads which hold to the hypothesis completely, thereby showing that Sarbaugh’s schema does accurately predict communication efficiency. These are the cases that fall along the line in the graph. Category II consists of those cases which display a communication efficiency better than predicted by Sarbaugh’s schema. These are the cases that fall into the lower right hand section of the graph, below the line. Category III consists of those dyads which have a communication efficiency much worse than predicted by
Table 3 Dyads scores on Sarbaugh’s and Laing’s schemata by category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyads</th>
<th>Sarbaugh</th>
<th></th>
<th>Laing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari-Daphne 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari-Colin 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari-Merrick 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari-Colin 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne-Lady Chatterjee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne-Merrick 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne - Shalini 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari-Merrick 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne-S. Ludmila</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari-S. Ludmila</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari-Shalini</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne-Shalini 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrick-L. Chatterjee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrick-S. Ludmila 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari-Lady Chatterjee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrick-S. Ludmila 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari-Stubbs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne - Merrick 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari-Daphne 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1: The Relationship between Homogeneity (Sarbaugh's schema) and Communication Efficiency (Laing's schema)
Sarbaugh's homogeneity-heterogeneity schema, and consist of the cases that lie above the line in the graph.

These categories can also be viewed from a different point of view, i.e., the closeness of the dyads from the line in Figure 1. In this view, there are eight cases of perfect prediction (i.e., the cases that fall directly on the line) in Category I. Next, there are four cases, three from Category II (H-LC, D-SL, H-SL), and one from Category III (M-SL1) that are close to the line, being only one unit away. These are not perfect predictions. Finally, there are seven cases where the hypothesis fails totally as indicated by their distance away from the line (i.e., more than one unit off). Four are from Category II (H-SH, D-Sh1, M-LC, M-SL2) and the other three are from Category III (H-St, D-M1, H-D1).

In the latter two categories, the dyads have been arranged in the order of those that are more in keeping with hypothesis to those that are most divergent and are discussed in this order too. The interactions that are in keeping with the hypothesis will be analyzed first (i.e., Category I), followed by an analysis of those that are contradictory (Categories II and III).

Category I

Out of the eight cases in this category, two dyads obtained a score of 4 on Sarbaugh's schema, which indicated
high homogeneity on all variables (level 1), which in turn predicted a highly efficient communication transaction. Through the application of Laing’s schema, it was ascertained that both the dyads had a situation of agreement and understanding by both the participants (A+, U+, U+), which falls in level 1 of the measure and indicates the most efficient of communication encounters. These results are in keeping with Sarbaugh’s basic proposition that a highly homogeneous score should yield high communication efficiency. In these two interactions, there was perfect understanding between the participants. This was due to their ability to see things from the other’s perspective and to work in order to communicate successfully.

Both these interactions involved Hari and were cross-cultural in terms of nationality, but intracultural in terms of outlook, normative structure and thought pattern. Hari was essentially British in terms of his upbringing and outlook. He was brought up to be British in thought and speech. Thus, he was raised in a totally British environment, with British nannies and governesses. He went to a British school and his father kept in the background in an attempt to ensure that Hari would be totally British in speech, manner and thought patterns. He had no recollection of India, nor of her customs and religion (Vol. 1:227; Vol. 2:287; Vol. 4:341). However, when he returned to India, he was considered Indian in terms of nationality and race, especially with regard to the colour of his skin, by both
British and Indian society. In both of the dyads discussed here, the issues of nationality and one's skin colour were not a problem at all.

As pointed out earlier, Hari and Colin were extremely good friends while they were in Britain. Hari in fact commented that their friendship had outgrown the initial morbid "curiosity of the colours of the skin" (Vol. 1: 261). They accepted each other as they were, without prejudice or any worry about their race. In the case of Hari and Daphne 2, their successful interaction is explained by the fact that they were in love.

Four of the dyadic interactions had average scores on both Sarbaugh's and Laing's measures. Of these, three (H-M2, H-C2, D-LC) were intercultural with regard to nationality, and the cases involving Hari (i.e., H-M2, H-C2) were intracultural in terms of outlook. Of these four cases, in two of them (H-M2, H-C2), the main cause for only average communication efficiency was the issue of race and the views of colonial India on this matter. The interactions of Daphne and Lady Chatterjee were not so much related to this matter (though it was a subtly related factor), but had more to do with their views on the issue of concern. This average efficient interaction of Daphne and Lady Chatterjee also reveals that the issue in question and the consequent misunderstandings concerning the reactions of the other participants with regard to the issue adversely influences efficient communication. Daphne and Lady
Chatterjee disagreed on the issue of Daphne’s friendship with Hari. However, the fact that there was misunderstanding on the part of Lady Chatterjee caused the inefficient interaction. Daphne could see Lady Chatterjee’s point of view, but Lady Chatterjee did not understand Daphne. She misperceived Daphne’s stand on the issue causing an inefficient communication interaction.

Daphne and Merrick’s average interaction is again related to their respective views of race in colonial India, the issue of concern, the taboos of colonial India, Hari himself and personal feelings.

The matter of race did not pose a problem for Daphne and Shalini’s second interaction. Their average interaction can be attributed to the issue of concern and misperceptions of the other’s views on the situation. As mentioned in Chapter IV, the main issue around which this interaction revolved concerned Hari and his alleged complicity in the assault on Daphne. Shalini and Daphne wrongly perceived each other’s views on the situation, resulting in an inefficient communication encounter, as was predicted by their heterogeneity. The first interaction of Hari and Merrick can be attributed to colonial India and its racist policies.

Though Hari and Colin were good friends in England and corresponded regularly with each other, when Colin came to India, their friendship did not survive. It is interesting to note that their earlier interaction which was extremely
successful was now an interaction with only average communication efficiency. This can be explained in terms of colonial India which is elucidated in detail a little later in this chapter. However, Sarbaugh's schema has predicted this average interaction which was borne out by the efficiency score.

The second interaction of Daphne and Shalini fell within level 4 of Sarbaugh's schema, and predicted a low average efficiency of communication. Their score on the efficiency schema indicates that they had an inefficient interaction. This can be attributed to the main issue that they were meeting about, i.e., the issue of concern and will be discussed in detail later in this chapter. The first interaction of Bari and Merrick, received a heterogeneous score on Sarbaugh's schema, and the efficiency score showed an inefficient interaction. Thus, Sarbaugh's schema which predicts low communication efficiency, with high heterogeneity was confirmed in this case. The last two interactions in this category were cross-cultural in terms of nationality. All the above cases hold to the hypothesis with regard to homogeneity and heterogeneity.

Category II

The cases of Category II are those in which the predictions of Sarbaugh's schema have not been fully held
to, in that the communication efficiency was better than predicted.

The interactions of Daphne and Sister Ludmila and Hari and Sister Ludmila score 5 on Sarbaugh’s schema (level 2), predicting efficient communication. However, their scores on Laing’s measure indicate that highly efficient communication transactions took place. In terms of closeness to the line, these two cases are only one unit off. The efficiency score is better than expected as the dyads fall to the right hand side of the graph, below the line. Of these two, the interaction of Hari and Sister Ludmila was intercultural in terms of nationality, but intracultural with regard to outlook and normative patterns. Though this was an intercultural interaction, the different nationalities of the participants posed no problem. This, coupled with the fact that Sister Ludmila accepted Hari as a person, for who he was, along with the fact that she was someone who could relate to him, helped in making this an efficient interaction. The interaction of Daphne and Sister Ludmila was intracultural in terms of both these factors. Their successful interaction can be explained in terms of their acceptance of each other. Sister Ludmila never questioned Daphne and Hari’s friendship, not even after the Bibighar episode. She merely accepted her, and supported her.

Three interactions score 6 (level 3 of Sarbaugh’s schema), predicting an average chance of communication
success. The corresponding efficiency scores of 1 indicate that each had a highly efficient communication interaction. Merrick and Sister Ludmila’s second interaction is the most interesting in this category, with an average prediction on Sarbaugh’s schema, yet being a highly efficient communication encounter.

The main characteristics of the above six dyads was that both participants agreed on the issue of concern and each understood the other’s point of view. These three interactions were all cross-cultural in terms of outlook, but of them, two were intracultural in terms of nationality.

The success in the cases of Hari and Shalini can be explained by the fact that both of them made an effort to understand each other, despite the differences in outlook, in an attempt to bridge the gap. As pointed out earlier, Hari was British in every way, except the colour of his skin. He experienced difficulties in trying to adjust to life in colonial India, where he was totally isolated from the people he was most comfortable with (British), and made to live in an orthodox Hindu family. Despite the fact that he considered the Indians as “they,” he was neither accepted by British society nor by the Indians. Shalini, however, did not reprimand Hari for his inability to adjust to life in India. She never made him feel bad that he was initially unable to get a job, despite the Indian norm that the man support the family. Shalini often went without things herself in an attempt to give Hari more money. Besides
this, she once commented that since Hari was miserable in India, she too was unhappy (Vol. 1:177). This empathy and the fact that she went out of her way to make Hari feel worthwhile and loved contributed to an efficient communication transaction. Hari soon realized that she did care for him, and he for her (Vol. 1:251). Thus, the success of this dyad could be attributed to their willingness to make the other feel at ease and cared for. Hari admitted that at first it was difficult for him to show Shalini affection (Ibid) but, Shalini still kept reaching out to him, and showing him she still cared. Although they had different ways of showing that they cared (Hari mentioned that he was used to the more "effusively, openly and warmly expressed" affection of Mrs. Lindsey, Colin’s mother), he soon realized that though Shalini did not express her affection the same ways, she did sincerely care (Ibid). They were therefore willing to cross the barriers of cultural difference and to try to put aside their different expectations, and together try to make this relationship work. Despite being an intercultural encounter in terms of outlook, it was a successful one.

The first interaction of Daphne and Shalini, despite being an intercultural interaction was extremely efficient. To this dyad nationality was not a problem at all even though they were in colonial India. Their success can be understood by the fact that Daphne and Shalini accepted each other as they were. They respected each other’s cultural
norms and background and made an effort to put the other at ease through a display of appropriate behavior in terms of the other's culture. Shalini greeted Daphne with a handshake, while Daphne greeted Shalini with a namaste (Vol. 1:390). Furthermore, since Daphne was aware that Shalini, being an orthodox Hindu, would not smoke or drink, she purposed not to indulge in any such behavior that might offend Shalini. On the other hand, Shalini allowed Daphne to smoke and drink. Daphne commented on Shalini's tolerance to any "taste that was distasteful to her own" (Vol. 1:393). Thus, they were willing to bridge cultural barriers in order to achieve efficient communication. They showed each other that they did not look down upon the other's cultural norms. Even though they themselves might not hold to them, they tolerated them. (This might seem similar to Sarbaugh's variable of knowing and accepting, where the participants know and accept each other's normative structures. However, it goes a step further, in that they do not merely know and accept the norms, but try to adhere to them as far as possible, in order to successfully communicate. It is related to the extent of respect for each other, and their desire for successful communication.)

The efficient communication of Merrick and Lady Chatterjee can be explained in terms of their similar viewpoints on the issue of concern. Both of them disliked Hari (he was a threat to both of them as explained later in detail). They both believed that he was at fault in the
Bibighar Gardens episode. Moreover, Merrick and Lady Chatterjee respected each other's positions and conformed to the norms of Anglo-Indian society. They knew their place in this society and did not need to impress each other by their social status. Both of them kept the places assigned to them by the rules of colonial India. Their "mutual recognition of privilege and power" (Vol. 2:259) and agreement on the situation and understanding on this matter contributed to efficient communication.

Hari and Lady Chatterjee score in the lower average efficiency level of Sarbaugh's schema. However, they had an average efficient communication encounter. Here, Hari was not merely a threat to the British, but also to the Indians, not just the average Indian, but those who moved in the upper echelons of Anglo-Indian society. To them, he had "acquired the power of the white man" (Mannoni 1964: 158). Hari was totally assimilated into British society in England and was an alien to the Indians. He was Indian in so far as nationality and the colour of the skin is concerned. He was neither understood nor accepted by the Indians, as pointed out by Mannoni in a discussion of a similar situation (Ibid). Even Lady Chatterjee, who was extremely westernized, often thought that Hari was carrying things a bit too far by being so English. This made Hari feel uncomfortable when Lady Chatterjee was around. Moreover, the issue of concern was his friendship with Daphne. Lady Chatterjee was hesitant and uneasy about this, as she did
not want Daphne to get hurt if Hari did not reciprocate. Her underlying reason was that it would cause a taboo to be broken. Hari understood her feelings on this issue, as he thought that Lady Chatterjee did not approve of the white girl-black man relationship. In fact he commented that even a person as educated as Lady Chatterjee could not accept that Daphne, "a white girl could treat an Indian like a man" (Vol. 2: 300-301). This interaction was of average efficiency because one participant was able to assess correctly the other’s reactions to the situation.

Merrick and Sister Ludmila’s second interaction is the most interesting case here. Despite a prediction of average efficiency, they had a highly efficient communication encounter. This is an interesting case in which the participants put aside personal feelings in order to help Daphne, who was important to both of them.

The participants in Category II respected each other and their outlooks, and made an effort to understand each other. Race was not a problem in their interactions with each other. Moreover the issue in question and their reactions to it, and their ability to see the others perspective also played a major role in contributing to higher than expected communication efficiency in this category.
Category III

The cases that fall into Category III are those where communication is worse than predicted. Of the four cases in this category, two (M-SL1; H-St) had scores that fell into level 3 and 4 respectively of Sarbaugh’s schema. This predicted average efficiency of communication. However, the application of the efficiency measure showed that the actual outcome of the communication encounter was one of disagreement and misunderstanding on the part of both participants (A-, U-, U-), which is the most inefficient of communication encounters. Of these two interactions, one was intercultural in terms of nationality, the other was intracultural.

Daphne and Merrick’s first interaction fell in level 2 of Sarbaugh’s schema, predicting efficient communication. However, their interaction was a highly inefficient one (level 6 on Laing’s measure). Despite being intracultural, this interaction was inefficient.

The most divergent case in terms of the hypothesis is Hari and Daphne’s first interaction, with a score of 4 on Sarbaugh’s schema. This was a case of high homogeneity (level 1), therefore predicting high communication efficiency. The actual outcome of this encounter was a situation of disagreement and misunderstanding on the part of both participants (level 6 of Laing’s schema) and is a highly inefficient interaction. This is totally
contradictory to the hypothesis. The main feature of the interactions of the cases in this category was that though an efficient outcome was predicted, the interactions were inefficient.

A major reason that would account for these inefficient communication encounters was the situational factor of colonial India. Colonial India was founded upon the doctrine of imperialism, wherein the British as members of the ruling class saw themselves appointed to rule and provide the benefits of civilization to the "natives." This gave rise to the Kiplingesque vision of the "white man's burden" of caring for the "benighted heathen." The British believed that the Indian was childlike and needed the firm hand of a paternalistic figure for discipline and development. This resulted in the prevailing atmosphere of man-baap\textsuperscript{26} in Colonial India. The British were firmly convinced of their superiority over the Indian. Moreover, as pointed out earlier in Chapter II, colonial India had its own norms which were basically designed to keep the Indian in a subservient place as a member of the subject class. The western-educated and the Anglicized Indian posed a threat to the superiority of the British in India. There were rigid rules restricting the social interaction of the two races, especially with regard to Indian men and British women.

The inefficient communication transaction of Bari and Stubbs can be attributed to colonial India. Stubbs came
from an average background and was deprived of the facilities that were available to Hari while he was in England. Hari was in the eyes of Stubbs a constant reminder of all he desired to be, yet could not attain. Stubbs could not reconcile himself to the fact that Hari, a member of an "inferior" race, had all the advantages of upper class background in none other than England and was in fact in many ways better than himself. This, combined with the fact that he saw the "race before the man," resulted in a negative attitude towards Hari and inefficient communication. In India, Stubbs was in a position of authority and could use it to vent his frustrations on Hari the "brown-skinned Englishman." Thus, as Mannoni (1964:120) points out, "the 'inferior being' always serves as a scapegoat; our own evil intentions can be projected on to him." Hari on the other hand did not accept the subservient position accorded to him, nor did he react in the manner deemed appropriate for an Indian. There was a lack of the will to understand each other (Mannoni 1964:34), which combined with the situational factor of colonial India caused inefficient communication.

The colonial situation was a subtle factor in the inefficient interaction of Daphne and Merrick 1 and Hari and Daphne 1. While the colonial situation explained the inefficient interaction of Hari and Stubbs, this factor alone is insufficient in explaining the inefficient
communication encountered in the first interactions of Daphne and Merrick, Merrick and Sister, and Hari and Daphne. The first interaction of Daphne and Merrick brings to light the interplay of numerous factors which are related to the colonial situation as well as the individual feelings of the participants that contributed to inefficient communication.

Merrick and Daphne disagreed on the issue of her friendship with Hari. Merrick disapproved of it vehemently and warned her against this relationship. This was not merely because he was an adamant adherent to the imperialist and racist doctrines of the Raj, but also because he was jealous that Hari had managed to win Daphne’s affections when he, an Englishman had been rejected by her. To him, “colour was basic.” He was a firm believer that a black man would "diminish" a white girl (Vol. 2:263). Daphne’s statement that colour did not matter, and that she accepted people as they were in terms of who they were, not in terms of their skin colour (Vol. 2:260; Vol. 1:407), irked him even more since it was in reference to Hari whom he disliked intensely. Thus, their inefficient interaction was the result of a number of factors. Hari and Daphne’s first interaction and inefficient communication can also be explained by the fact that they were operating within the precincts of colonial India, along with its taboos and restrictions upon the social mixing of the two races. This fact and its influence on the issue at the center of their
concerns were together responsible for inefficient communication.

As pointed out in Chapter II, colonial India considered the relationship between an Indian man and a British girl a taboo relationship. Furthermore, the norms of Anglo-India did not look favorably upon the social interaction of the two races, least of all the two sexes. This caused a hesitancy on the part of Hari to enter into a friendship with Daphne. Hari, as someone who did not fit into either Indian society nor Anglo-Indian society, was consequently in a "no-man's-land." He was unsure how to react to Daphne in this particular situation. He himself admitted to Rowan and Gopal that he found it difficult to accept that he was being treated like an equal by a white person and of the opposite sex at that. He was being treated without "artificiality ... just as if we'd been back home" (Vol. 2: 300).

Moreover, though they agreed on the issue of their friendship, they attributed to each other different reasons for the pursuance of this relationship. As pointed out in the coding section, Hari thought she was being friendly out of pity, especially after the debacle with Merrick. In a way he thought she was making fun of him (Ibid). Daphne, on the other hand, thought that Hari was going out with her as a means of clinging to his Englishness, and in order to prove something to himself. Thus, there was misunderstanding which lowered the efficiency of the interaction.
Merrick and Sister Ludmila's inefficient interaction can not be explained in terms of the colonial situation in India. They disagreed on the issue in question. Sister Ludmila thought that Merrick was being overbearing in his treatment of Hari. To her, Merrick had no right to treat Hari so harshly merely because he seemed to have taken an initial dislike to Hari and was therefore determined to find him guilty of something. Merrick on the other hand thought that Sister Ludmila was interfering in an affair that was of no concern to her. He also did not respect her nor her position as head of the Sanctuary, because of which she did not want any unpleasantness on her property. Moreover, she had brought Kumar in to recover, and therefore felt a certain responsibility towards him. This situation was further compounded by Sister Ludmila's dislike for Merrick. Their inefficient communication can be explained in terms of dislike, lack of respect and disagreement and misunderstanding on the issue.

Comparative analysis

While a general statement can be made that the colonial situation contributed to the inefficient interactions, and distorted the issues of concern, there are instances of successful interaction among British and Indians (Hari and Daphne 2, Hari and Sister Ludmila, Merrick and Lady Chatterjee).
While a general statement could be made that nationality along with the colonial situation caused a problem in communication efficiency, for six of the dyads in Category II, this was not an issue.

The colonial situation explains a few of the inefficient interactions. However, though all the dyads were operating within the precincts of Colonial India, there were instances of successful communication interaction in Category I and more so in Category II where the main characteristic of the cases were that the outcome of their interaction was more successful than predicted by Sarbaugh’s scores. This brings to the fore the fact that factors other than the situational factor and the variables on the schema may contribute to efficient or inefficient interaction.

The efficient interactions in Category II can be attributed to the willingness of the participants to successfully communicate. Hari, though Indian by nationality, was British in his view, outlook and way of life. It was extremely difficult for him to adjust to life in India, especially that of an orthodox Hindu family. However, he made an effort to appreciate his aunt and to understand her. Shalini, on the other hand, found it difficult to understand Hari who was so totally British. She was aware of his problems in adjusting, and tried to help and understand him. Both of them were able to see things from the other’s perspective, to help, and to
understand each other. This was a major factor in contributing to their efficient communication.

Daphne and Shalini’s first interaction was essentially an intercultural interaction in terms of nationality and outlook. In this interaction, one can observe the working of another important factor in easing communication and contributing to communication efficiency, namely, the acceptance of each other without prejudice and negative stereotyping. Daphne and Shalini understood each other, and respected the views and outlook of the other, which contributed to efficient communication interaction. This can also be seen in the interaction of Merrick and Lady Chatterjee, who respected each other, and each others positions.

An important factor in communication efficiency is the issue in question. In certain cases the issue of concern was more important than in others. This was because the issue of white girl-black man was an extremely sensitive one, and it was distorted in colonial India. The merely average efficient interaction of Daphne and Lady Chatterjee can be attributed to this factor as can the inefficient interaction of Sister Ludmila and Merrick 1.

Conversely, the efficient interactions of the dyads in Category II can also be attributed to the main issue in question and the participants’ ability to correctly perceive each others reactions, and to understand the issue from the other’s perspective.
Another factor that influences the outcome of a communication interaction is the extent of respect that the participants have for each other. The interaction of Sister Ludmila and Merrick 1 was characterized by lack of respect for the other (as explained earlier). This lack of respect also explains the inefficient interactions of Hari and Stubbs as well as that of Hari and Merrick. Conversely, it helps to explain the successful interactions of the cases in Category II.

Another factor that plays a relevant role in efficient communication are the individual characteristics of each participant. All the cases were operating within Colonial India, and were thus subject to normative structure of Anglo-India. However, in the cases of Hari and Colin 2, and Hari and Daphne 2, it can be seen that Daphne was willing to risk social disapproval in order to communicate efficiently. (Moreover, here was a case of love conquering all.) Colin, on the other hand, was unwilling to go to the same extent. Thus, communication efficiency is dependent on the extent to which the individuals involved are willing to go to attain it. Yet, Daphne seemed to have the desire in her interactions with Shalini and Hari to make the communication successful.

The extent to which the individuals are willing to respect or tolerate (if not accept) the differences in the normative structure of the others, also contributes to communication efficiency. In the cases in Category II, the
dyads were willing to accept differences in each other's cultures and try to prevent those differences from interfering in successful communication. They were aware of cultural differences, yet willing to make the effort to bridge them.

The other important factor was the manner in which people perceived each other, i.e., whether they perceived each other primarily as people as in the case of Daphne and Snalini, or in terms of race and skin colour, which resulted in the presence of negative stereotyping and perceptions of the other participants as in the cases of Hari and Merrick, and Hari and Stubbs.

If one considers "intraculturalness" of outlook a factor in contributing to efficient interactions, the interactions of H-C2, H-M1, D-M2, M-SL1, H-St, D-M1, and H-D1 were intracultural in terms of outlook, but were inefficient. On the other hand, intercultural interactions of dyads that had different outlooks yet worked were H-Sh, D-Sh, M-LC, H-LC. Though similarity of outlook contributes significantly to efficiency, this was not true in seven cases.

The cases of Hari and Merrick 1, Hari and Colin 2, Hari and Stubbs and Hari and Daphne 1 clearly show that race (in colonial India) was often the major issue in their interaction and a cause of inefficient or average efficiency. The cases of Daphne and Lady Chatterjee, Daphne and Merrick (1 and 2), show that race (working within the
context of colonial India) was the underlying factor in their inefficient interactions. These cases also indicate that other factors such as the depth of personal feeling such as likes, dislikes, jealousy (as in the case of Merrick) influence interactions and might distort the issues of concern, resulting in inefficient interactions. Conversely, the second interaction of Merrick and Sister Ludmila (2), is a prime example that if people can put aside personal feelings, however strong they might be in order to co-operate on a matter of extreme importance to them (in this case Daphne’s safety), they can achieve efficient communication.

It has been pointed out earlier that some of the average and inefficient interactions can be related to the colonial situation and its views on race. Yet, there are exceptions, as can be seen from the interaction of Merrick and Lady Chatterjee. Though it was cross-cultural in terms of nationality, and involved the interaction of an adamant adherent to the racist policies of colonial India and an Indian, it was successful. It was successful due to the fact that both of them kept to their roles and social position assigned to them in society. There was no over-reaching, nor resentment of these normative structures.

One major fact, is that understanding or the ability to recognize the other’s point of view contributed greatly to efficient communication as measured by Laing’s measure. This can be seen from the dyads in Category II, where there
was perfect understanding by both of them. In the case of Hari and Lady Chatterjee, Hari’s ability to see things from Lady Chatterjee’s point of view also contributed to this interaction having a high average efficiency as opposed to a low average as predicted by the schema.

With regard to the "issue of concern" that also contributed to problems in communication efficiency, the issues that posed a problem were extremely sensitive ones in colonial India. The major issue that ran throughout the course of this study was Hari and Daphne’s friendship which was taboo in colonial India. Thus, the colonial context distorted certain issues, rendering them more sensitive than others.

To sum up, of the nineteen cases of dyads, eight showed that the schema accurately predicted the outcome of the communication despite the situational factor of colonial India. In another four, the level of communication success was close to that predicted by Sarbaugh. However, for remaining seven cases, the schema did not accurately predict the outcome. Thus, as pointed out earlier in this chapter, the homogeneity and heterogeneity of the participants alone does not determine communication success or inefficiency.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The major aim of this study was to test the ability of Sarbaugh's homogeneity-heterogeneity schema in predicting communication efficiency. It also sought to determine whether the homogeneity or heterogeneity of participants in a communication encounter had any bearing on the outcome of the encounter in terms of its efficiency or inefficiency.

The period selected for study was the last few years before independence (1939-1947) in colonial India and the schema was applied to fiction. Chapter I provided a historical and social background to situate the context of the study. Chapter II argued that literature could be used as the source of information in this study since fiction reflects the prevailing attitudes of the period of time in which it was written. It also provided a review of previous studies and a synopsis of The Raj Quartet. Chapter III described Sarbaugh's schema, while Chapter IV outlined the methodology and coding. Chapter V analyzed interactions of the dyads.

It was found that out of the nineteen cases studied, eight actually held to the hypothesis. In these cases the schema did predict communication efficiency accurately. An additional four cases were close to the prediction. However, the other seven divergent cases showed that there
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were other factors that influenced the actual outcome of the communication transaction.

6.1 OTHER FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE COMMUNICATION EFFICIENCY

Several other factors may influence the outcome of communication interactions. One is the situational factor, which in this case was colonial India. Its policies of racial superiority of the British and the related assumption that the Indian was inferior influenced the efficiency of communication in an adverse manner; five of the less than efficient interactions were directly related to this factor, while three were indirectly related to it.

Another factor that influenced efficiency of communication was found to be the "issue of concern," i.e., the matter which is crucial to the participant's interaction. Laing's measure brought to the fore that the manner in which participants reacted to the issue and the extent to which they were able to perceive the issue from the other's perspective contributed to efficient communication. In cases that would have been inefficient, understanding on the part of one participant contributed to raising the success of the communication to a level of average efficiency. An associated facet to this would be the will of the participants to understand each other. I think that in Merrick and Hari's interactions, Merrick in reality did not actually want to understand Hari. The cases
of Category II where communication efficiency was better than predicted, showed that perfect understanding by both participants resulted in highly successful communication.

This brings to the fore the fact that certain matters can be sensitive issues in different cultures, and therefore may serve as potential barriers to efficient communication. The ability of the participants to recognize this and to see the other’s point helped enhance the efficiency of the interaction.

Another important factor was the ability of participants to accept the other as a person and not only in terms of race, i.e., the extent to which participants respected and accepted each other as individual human beings. The desire for efficient communication and the effort participants were willing to expend contributed to successful communication.

Personal feelings tended to influence efficiency too as in the cases of Hari-Merrick and Daphne-Merrick. Interactions governed by feelings, including jealousy or dislike could result in an overemphasis of the faults of the other.

An important factor was the extent to which participants were aware of cultural differences, and the extent to which they tolerated them. This does not merely mean acceptance of the other’s cultural norms, but involves an awareness of cultural differences along with a mutual desire to overcome whatever obstacles they might pose to
successful communication. It includes adhering to these norms and refraining from behavior that could be offensive in terms of the other's culture. It also entails trying not to evaluate things in terms of one's own cultural frame of reference (which is extremely difficult to accomplish).

Efforts to assimilate the other culture contribute to communication efficiency. The British tried to isolate themselves in the latter stages of the Raj, and therefore did not make efforts to adapt. The few who did try, were often condemned for "going native." However, the case of Shalini and Daphne shows that an attempt to adapt culturally, enhances communication efficiency.

6.2 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY RELATED TO THE SCHEMA

One of the drawbacks of the study was the schema itself. The variable "Perceived Relationship and Intent" considers mutual perceptions of feelings which do not allow for rating and analyzing the individual reactions of participants towards each other, but merely of mutual reactions. Moreover, in this variable, Sarbaugh measures the dimensions of feelings, intent, hierarchical-complementary relationship and goals. Thus, he basically tries to measure four dimensions in one overall variable. This does not facilitate accurate measurement, as it is difficult to assess each of these dimensions and collapse it into one variable. Furthermore, in this particular study,
the dimension of hierarchical-symmetrical relationship was important. In this case, it involved British India, and its norms and hierarchical division of society. However, Hari could not relate to the power structure of colonial India, and some of his problems were related to this. Grouping this dimension with the three others on the variable of PRI, could possibly have resulted in measurement error in the study.

Sarbaugh mentions the influence of stereotypes in perception, but does not clearly explain or consider the extent of this influence on the communication efficiency of an interaction. Neither does he provide for this factor to be considered in his schema. Sarbaugh emphasizes the extent of knowing and accepting each other’s normative structure. However, mere knowledge of the normative structure of participants is insufficient. What really matters is the extent of acceptance and toleration of the norms of the other’s culture, but this is not measured by the schema.

With regard to code systems, though Sarbaugh mentions the existence of nonverbal codes and acknowledges their importance in the communication process, he does not take this into consideration in the levels of measurement of this variable.

The schema rates the variables in integer categories. Therefore, the scores do not allow for in-between scores which makes assessment difficult. For example, the second interaction of Daphne and Shalini, involved feelings that
were neither positive nor totally negative, but more ambivalent. Daphne was more apprehensive and diffident towards Shalini, wondering how she would be received.

6.3 OTHER LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study had additional drawbacks. One of the main problems faced was measurement error. It was difficult to obtain complete information with regard to the variable of world view (as pointed out in Chapter IV). This could also be due to the fact that it was applied to fiction, and it was difficult to go beyond the information was provided in the book. Moreover, coding was done by one person, resulting in the absence of inter-coder reliability.

There were more dyads that could have been studied, such as Hari and Vidyasagar, Hari and Judge Menen, Daphne and Judge Menen, Hari and Laxminarayan. But due to lack of data for all the variables, this could not be carried out.

Another factor that could have contributed greatly to the success measure would have been the incorporation of the meta-metaperspective of the participants. This would have provided an insight into the extent to which the participants in the interaction felt they were understood or not, as well as their awareness of being understood or misunderstood. The efficiency measure too, did not allow for partial understanding and misunderstanding, but had to
be coded dichotomously as either understanding or misunderstanding.

6.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

One of the foremost concerns would be to revise the schema in order to better operationalize the variables of World View. The schema should also take into account the need for individuality of the participants in an interaction as well as individual feelings, not only mutuality. Breaking up of the variable PRI would enable more precision in measurement. Sarbaugh (1988:135) in his conclusion raises the question of which variable exerts the greatest influence on communication efficiency. In my analysis, knowing and accepting of norms, seems to have the greatest effect, followed by PRI.

Further research could be done in this area by applying the schema to other novels dealing with colonial India in the same period of time. A comparative study of the efficiency of communication in the various periods of the Raj could also be attempted. An interesting study would be to apply this schema to historical sources such as memoirs and autobiographies.

Further research could also be carried out along the lines of this study with regard to the colonial experience of countries other than India. More attention could be given to the influence of attitudes (including prejudice and
stereotypes) in directing interaction, along with its effect on communication efficiency. A possibility would be the inclusion of this in the schema.

The schema does consider differences in thought patterns of people in different cultures. For example, Indians are considered to be more inductive than Americans who are considered to be deductive (Copeland & Griggs 1985:152-153). An awareness of this would help reduce frustrations encountered in intercultural communication.

6.5 IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

As pointed out in the Introduction, there is an increasing amount of intercultural interaction in the world today. This study is of relevance in helping understand the factors that contribute towards successful intercultural communication.

It also has relevance for day-to-day interpersonal interactions, in that the extent to which the participants are willing to accept each other without reservations and with respect for the other can ensure successful communication. Thus, it brings to the fore the need to respect and tolerate the views of others, as well as to accept them as individuals, i.e., as who they are and not what they represent.

In conclusion I would like to offer the eloquent words
of Copeland & Griggs (1985:212)

The foundation for successful interaction with people anywhere in the world is sincere respect for and interest in others. You are likely to do well ... if you can show through your words, body language and actions that you have empathy, are considerate of people’s needs and feelings, are interested in their point of view, and are respectful of their ways.
END NOTES

1 The term "Anglo-India" is used in its original sense, i.e., to signify British society in India. "Eurasian" is used to refer to the offspring of alliances between the British and the Indians.

2 The practise of Hindu wives immolating themselves on the funeral pyre of their husbands.

3 The robbing and murdering of people in the name of the Hindu goddess Kali.

4 Note: The words in the brackets are my own.

5 I.e., the English people.

6 The Indian Civil Service.

7 The government.

8 The Indian Medical Service.

9 An expensive English public school.

10 Romesh Chand Sen.

11 Vidyasagar who used to work at the Gazette, and a few other Indian boys.

12 Vidyasagar worked at the Gazette, but was asked to leave, in order to create a position for Hari. However, Vidyasagar did not harbor any animosity towards Hari, and in fact, befriended him.

13 Romesh Chand Sen, Srinivasan, Brigadier Reid, Judge Menen, White, Colin, Laxminarayan and Vidyasagar were other characters who also interacted with Hari, Daphne and Merrick, but had to be left out of the analysis due to lack of information for all the variables.

14 The familiar use of the second person pronoun in Hindi.

15 I.e., the police station.

16 Brigadier Reid was the army commandant of Mayapore.

17 In fact they were standing so close to each other, that Hari could observe his "features,... expression,... mannerisms..." so he knew without a doubt that this was really Colin (Vol. 1:272).
The words in the bracket are my own.

I.e., with Vidyasagar who used to work at the Gazette and his friends.

I.e., Judge Menen.

Lady Chatterjee heard of Hari through Anna Klaus, a doctor who volunteered at the Sanctuary.

I.e., Judge Menen and Srinivasan the lawyer.

Knight, who was a fellow Chillingburian.

The "issue of concern" refers to the matter which is crucial to the interaction of the participants in an interaction. Laing's measure accounts for agreement and understanding on the issue that is the main concern of the interacting participants. This has been found to be a crucial factor in the communication efficiency of the participants.

A traditional Indian mode of greeting.

I.e., parents.

I.e., in terms of the closeness of the dyads to the line in Figure 1 (being only 1 unit off). The Pearson's Correlation Coefficient for the graph is 0.57; the variance explained is 0.33 and the level of significance is 0.01.
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