

# Interpersonal Behavioural Profile Analysis of some Knowledge Workers as a prelude to their Motivation: An Exploratory Study

T. Thomas

## Abstract

*There are several theories relating to interpersonal behaviour namely general motivational theories, omnibus theories of personality, two dimensional and three dimensional theories of interpersonal behaviour. The three dimensional theories of interpersonal behaviour spearheaded by William Schutz proposes that human behaviour takes place in three dimensions namely inclusion, control and affection. Each of these was bidirectionally classified into expressed and wanted behavior, which forms the basis for the FIRO-B instrument, which was further revised as FIRO element B instrument. This study uses the FIRO element B instrument to bring out the interpersonal relations characteristics of four categories knowledge workers viz., school teachers, college teachers, doctors and defense officers. Twelve interpersonal relationship dimensions of four categories of knowledge workers have been brought out and compared. The study has revealed many interesting aspects of interpersonal factors for the four professions.*

**Keywords:** *Interpersonal behaviour, Interpersonal relations, motivation, knowledge workers, FIRO B*

## Introduction

Managers carry out their job functions by interacting with others: superiors, subordinates, peers, suppliers, and customers. On the basis of several empirical studies on the manager's job, Mintzberg (1975) reported that managers spent most (78 per cent) of their time in relating to people, face-to-face, over the telephone or through written communications. Stewart (1967) found that "even in those few moments when managers are alone, they are frequently interrupted by people". All these interactions constitute the realm of interpersonal relations in management. These interpersonal interactions have been found to influence organisational functioning, directly or indirectly (e.g., Gabarro, 1976; Pestonjee, 1992; Rao, 1987). Srilata (1988), for example, found that personality characteristics and the interpersonal behavioral style of the supervisor contributed to the subordinate's experience of organisational stress. Organisational stress was found to be negatively associated with organisational effectiveness

(Khanna, 1985). Rao and Selvan (1992) found that both managers as well as subordinates, in their independent responses to the question of what in their opinion contributed to managerial effective-ness, indicated 'interpersonal relationships' as the most important factor. Their study also reports that, in response to the question of what suggestions they would give for improvement of their manager's effectiveness, the two top-ranking (and highly inter-connected) suggestions by the subordinates were: 'improve communications' and 'improve interpersonal relationships'. The authors of the above study proposed that interpersonal skills be imparted to managers through various training programmes. But, what exactly are these skills? What are the components or determinants of interpersonal behaviour? There is a gap to be filled here. The determinants of interpersonal behaviour must be identified if the recommended training is to take off effectively. Before we get into that, we shall first take a look at the available literature on the subject.

## Review of Literature

The available literature on the subject of our interest, namely, interpersonal behaviour, may be classified into four broad categories: general motivational theories of human behaviour, omnibus theories of personality, two-dimensional theories of interpersonal relations, and a three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behaviour. Salient points from each of these categories of literature are briefly discussed in the following sub-sections.

### Interpersonal Attractiveness

Interpersonal attractiveness refers to the degree to which we are drawn toward another person. People are drawn to some people, but are repulsed by others. This is the phenomenon of interpersonal attraction. Live credibility, interpersonal attractiveness in multi-dimensional. There are three dimensions: Physical, social, and task (McCroskey & McCain, 1974). All of these forms of interpersonal attraction may be related. However, each has a unique component which may function separately from the other two.

### Interpersonal Attractiveness

Interpersonal attractiveness refers to the degree to which we are drawn toward another person. People are drawn to some people, but are repulsed by others. This is the phenomenon of interpersonal attraction. Live credibility, interpersonal attractiveness is multi-dimensional. There are three dimensions: Physical, social, and task (McCroskey & McCain, 1974). All of these forms of interpersonal attraction may be related. However, each has a unique component which may function separately from the other two.

### Attractiveness-Physical, Social and Task

Whenever attractiveness is mentioned, most people think of physical attractiveness first. And, indeed, this is the dimension of attractiveness which typically has the most impact on initial human relationships. In fact,

it may determine whether there is any human relationship at all.

The social dimension of attractiveness represents the degree to which a person is seen as one with whom other people would like to spend time at a social level. A socially attractive person is one with whom we would like to go get a cup of coffee, have lunch, or get together outside the work environment. We might invite this person to our home. This type of attractiveness is not based on physical appearances, but rather how friendly and likeable the person is perceived to be. If we find someone socially attractive, it is likely that we will desire a relationship with them that continues for an extended period.

Task Attractiveness is the one that is most relevant in the organizational context. We see people who we believe (or know) to be easy and pleasant to work with, to be task attractive. Also contributing to perceptions of task attractiveness on the part of achievement oriented workers is competence in performing work-related tasks, a willingness to share responsibility and workload, a commitment to successfully completing tasks, and a willingness to engage in goal-directed communication. Of course, not everyone is highly interested in work. Some employees find people who are lazy and shiftless to be task attractive-since they do not want to work either.

### Task-focused Interpersonal Citizenship Behavior

A model hypothesizing relationship quality and relationship context as antecedents of two complementary forms of interpersonal citizenship behavior (ICB) was tested. Measures with coworkers as the frame of reference were used to collect data from 273 individuals working in 2 service-oriented organizations. As hypothesized, variables reflecting relationship quality were associated with person-focused ICB, as mediated by empathic concern. Also as hypothesized, a relationship context variable, network centrality, exhibited a direct relationship with task-focused ICB. Unexpectedly, network

centrality was directly associated with person-focused ICB and empathic concern was associated with task-focused ICB. The results are discussed, and implications for research and practice are offered. [Journal of Applied Psychology 2002 Apr;87(2):255-67\_ Settoon RP, Mossholder KW].

### **Other Interpersonal Perceptions**

In Organizations we have many more Interpersonal Perceptions, but we shall discuss briefly the following three: Composure, extraversion, sociability.

#### **Composure**

Composure has to do with self-control. Self-control can be illustrated as whether one's emotions are in his/her control or do they express inappropriate or extreme emotions. There is a continuum on which one shall be perceived. In an organization, an associate would like to be seen right in the middle on this one. A person would like to be perceived as 'cool'- in control of things, on top of it all -composed.

#### **Extraversion**

Extraversion is one of the basic temperaments which all people share. It is related to many individual personality variables. It exists on a continuum, which ranges from 'extraversion' on one end or 'introversion' on the other. Most importantly, it has a strong genetic basis (Beatty, McCroskey, & Heisel, 1998). While our experiences and education can shape our expression of this temperament to some extent, it is not likely that we can change our orientation to a major degree. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with being either extroverted. However, in most organizations it is advantageous to be seen as at least moderately extroverted.

#### **Sociability**

When people are seen as likable, friendly, and pleasant they normally are perceived as sociable. Sociable people have a manner which invited others to initiate communication with them. Mostly, habits of

a person comes under consideration in this regard. [Organizational Communication for Survival; making work, work \_ Virginia P.Richmond; 85-8 & 91-2].

### **Interpersonal Concepts in Motivational Theories**

Most people like to compete against others, at least if they think they have a chance of winning. As we limit our study to interpersonal relations, we shall briefly study the Achievement Motivation. Why do some people try harder than others? In their scientific attempt to answer the question, psychologists (e.g., Koestner & Weinberger; McClelland, 1989) have theorised that human behaviour is motivated or that it is triggered by some inner drives, which are based on certain needs. Interpersonal behaviour, being a subset of behaviour, can be viewed as founded on certain needs too. If interpersonal behaviour, as discussed above, is an essential part of managerial work and if needs are the fundamental basis of behaviour, then a knowledge of the specific needs that influence the interpersonal behaviour of managers can help us understand one very important aspect of managerial effectiveness.

The need for achievement is a striving for accomplishment and excellence (Koestner & Weinberger; McClelland, 1989). Usually when people describe themselves as having a strong achievement motivation, they refer to an extrinsic motivation. They are drawn by the rewards they have been receiving or expect to receive. People also have a second, more intrinsic kind of motivation for achievement. People with this intrinsic need for achievement take pleasure in accomplishing goals for their own sake.

#### **Need for Achievement and Setting Goals**

People with a strong need for achievement prefer to set goals that are high but realistic. Given such a goal, they will work as hard as possible. In contrast, people with a low need for achievement or a strong fear of failure prefer goals that are either easy to achieve or

so difficult that they provide a ready excuse for failure. Most people prefer the difficult goal but not impossible goal, especially people with a strong need for achievement (Atkinson & Birch, 1978). People with a strong need for achievement try much harder in a competitive situation when they expect to be evaluated (Nygard, 1982). Almost any feedback increased the efforts of people with a high need for achievement and lowers the efforts of those with a low need for achievement (Matsui, Okada, & Kakuyama, 1982)[intro. to Psychology (567\_kalat]

Some of the needs that influence human behaviour are biological, some emotional, and some social in nature. The most popular classification of human needs categorizes them into five groups: physiological, security, love & belongingness, status, and self-actualization needs (Maslow, 1954). A reclassification by Alderfer (1969) reduced Maslow's five categories into three and called them Existence, Relatedness and Growth needs. According to McClelland, human behaviour in organizational settings is motivated by the need for achievement, the need for power and the need for affiliation. When one tries to understand those very interpersonal aspects of human behaviour in a systematic way, these theories do not help much, for they fall short of addressing the interpersonal behaviour domain, directly and adequately. The concepts of love & belongingness and relatedness, apart from classifying certain behaviours and inferring to their corresponding motivational constructs, do little else in operationalising them and, much less, in terms of providing a conceptual framework or model of interpersonal behaviour. McClelland's concepts of achievement, affiliation and power, though operationalised to an extent and found useful in studying certain important facets of managerial work (McClelland, 1976), do not present a specific framework of interpersonal behaviour, either.

While his concept of nAff (need for affiliation) does obviously refer to interpersonal aspects, his Power, which allegedly refers to some other aspect, actually covers a good deal of what characterises interpersonal behaviour. When he defines Power as the urge to have impact on others, he is certainly referring to a basis of interpersonal behaviour. How about Ach (the need for achievement)? One could argue that achievement in society has to have certain interpersonal nuance, because one's achievement has to be recognized by at least one other person who matters and, thus, certain interpersonal interaction is involved. But such an argument would be going too far. Accepting the concept of Ach, therefore, to be distinct from the other two needs of nAff and Power, one would not consider McClelland's as a theory of interpersonal relations. It is not an integrated conceptual framework for understanding the interpersonal phenomenon.

### Interpersonal Cohesiveness

Over the years, most studies of cohesiveness have focused on its simple relation to group task performance (for reviews, see, Seashore, 1954; Guzzo & Shea, 1992; Mullen & Cooper, 1994). Similar to the elusive job satisfaction-performance relation, early researchers believed that there should be a robust positive relation between group cohesiveness (defined in terms of mutual attraction of members) and performance. Literature reviews and meta-analyses (Guzzo & Shea, 1992; Mullen & Cooper, 1994) have subsequently dispelled the universality of this finding, though it is still widely believed outside the scientific community that group members must like each other in order to perform effectively.

In the past decade the distinction between task and interpersonal cohesiveness has received increased attention due to the research of Zaccaro and colleagues (Zaccaro & Lowe, 1986; Zaccaro & McCoy, 1988). Their conceptualization and measures more

clearly differentiate these two dimensions from each other. They define task cohesiveness as the group's commitment to the task, whereas interpersonal cohesiveness refers to the interpersonal attraction group members have for one another. Task cohesiveness, as the term implies, has more to do with task motivation, whereas interpersonal cohesiveness captures the original view that cohesive groups are composed of members who like each other and feel as though they belong to the group.

While some measures of cohesiveness have included items that assess both task and interpersonal cohesiveness, most research on cohesiveness has defined it in terms of interpersonal attraction among members of the group, or the extent to which members feel as though they are part of a group (Craig & Kelly, 1999; Mullen & Cooper, 1994). Consistent with this conceptualization, experimental manipulations have attempted to increase interpersonal cohesiveness by creating feelings of interpersonal attraction. Based on the interpersonal attraction research, one of the most successful means of doing this is by fostering perceptions of similarity within the group (Byrne, Clore, & Worschel, 1966). Our manipulation of interpersonal cohesiveness used this approach. For this study, we examined interpersonal cohesiveness because of our interest in the interpersonal processes evoked by the two interventions. We also wanted to focus on a fundamental characteristic that distinguishes one group from another. Consistent with reviews and meta-analyses (Guzzo & Shea, 1992; Mullen & Cooper, 1994), we are not expecting to find a positive main effect of cohesiveness on group performance. Instead, we propose that cohesiveness may impact the relative effectiveness of strategic interventions. [Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes Vol. 87, No. 1, January, pp. 29, 2002] [Zaccaro, S. J., & Lowe, C. A. (1988).

Cohesiveness and performance on an additive task; Evidence for multidimensionality. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 128, 547-558. Zaccaro, S. J., & McCoy, M. C. (1988). The effects of task and interpersonal cohesiveness on performance of a disjunctive group task. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 18, 837-851] Just as the concept of Johari Window, when used in a feedback context, can help in understanding some aspects of interpersonal behaviour, the concepts of relatedness, love & belongingness and nAff, contained in the above-cited motivational theories are useful, but too segmental and, hence, inadequate to address the domain of interpersonal behaviour in a comprehensive manner.

### **Personality Theories and Interpersonal Relations**

All personality theories would necessarily have something to say about interpersonal relations, for the latter is an integral part of the total personality. By virtue of their being concerned with the entire system of human personality, these theories stop short of details in regard to any one of its subsystems. And yet, it is useful to take a cursory look at the various interpersonal aspects, which some of these theories emphasised. Freud seems to have emphasised the emotional-attachment aspect, by attributing almost all of the libidinal cathexis to sex and affection. Of the three libidinal types of persons (Narcissistic, Obsessional and Erotic), the erotic seems to be the most interpersonal. According to Adler, the individual personality is a constant strive toward overcoming the feelings of inferiority that arise in everyone right at the initial experience with the world and continue to accompany one's life; he proposed the 'will to power', with which one can overcome the feelings of inferiority. Jung emphasised introversion and extroversion as the characteristic modes, in which the 'life energy' of a person expresses itself. From (1947) referred to three types of 'interpersonal relatedness': 'Withdrawal- destructiveness',

`symbiotic' and `love'; he emphasised the love aspect as the most successful form of interpersonal relatedness.

Horney (1945) held that the human being, in his/her struggle to come to terms with the environment, develops three basic behavioural trends of moving away from, moving against and moving toward people.

Horney's is an interpersonal theory of personality. Her concept of 'moving against people', obviously an interpersonal dimension, captures the negative use of interpersonal power and leaves out the positive aspect of power and influence in the interpersonal context. The other two concepts of 'moving away from' and 'moving toward' are but two sides of one and the same dimension of sociability. Here again, love & affection seems to have received greater emphasis than other aspects of interpersonal relations. Berne's (1964) theory of Transactional Analysis is quite conspicuously addressed to the domain of interpersonal behaviour. According to this theory, the individual human being is interminably in need of strokes, to acquire which s/he transacts with other humans. A stroke, broadly, is an act of acknowledging or rejecting the presence of another person; a transaction is essentially an exchange of strokes, positive and negative. The individual is conceptualized in this theory as an amalgam of three selves or states of being or ego states, called the Parent, the Adult and the Child, any one of which may dominate the individual's transactions with others. Depending on the way a child is received and treated and the way the child interprets its early experiences, the child takes a certain basic psychological position about him/herself as well as about others. This existential or life position gradually firms up into any of the following four hues: I am OK; you are OK, I am not OK; you are OK, I am OK; you are not OK, or I am not OK; you are not OK. This

life position, once formed, becomes — to use a computer term — the individual's operating system, from which emanate one's day-to-day transactions. Thence forward, one's life experiences are both influenced by and interpreted in the light of one's life position. On the basis of the extracts of these interpreted experiences, the person writes his/her own psychological script that the person feels urged to live his/her life by. Transactions are thus a result of the three ego states, combined with a particular psychological life position, acting out the script in search of strokes. Depending on the within-person and between-person combination of ego states, life positions and scripts, the transactions may be complementary, crossed, or ulterior, giving rise to positive, negative or ambivalent feelings, respectively. By becoming aware of one's script and life position, it is possible for one to change the operating system (the life position) and edit (or even rewrite) the script. Then by consciously choosing to engage a particular ego state in a given situation, using a positive life position (the I-am-ok: you-are-ok operating system) and acting out a suitably edited (or rewritten) script, the individual can acquire (and provide others with) the necessary positive strokes to enjoy a fulfilling existence on earth. While this theory has acquired popularity among people, it does not seem to have attracted the attention of behavioural scientists, interested in empirical studies. In its concept of need (for strokes), this theory shares common grounds with the need-based motivational theories, but the concept is much less differentiated, encompassing a host of dimensions: accepting, rejecting, loving, hating, greeting, praising, scolding, criticizing, yelling, etc., despite the differences in their structural and emotional content, are all strokes. Despite such complexities at the scientific level, Transactional Analysis has acquired great popularity among the public, probably

because it offers explanations for almost any and every aspect of every-day life in an easy-to-understand language. If the latter quality of the theory is a strength and the cause of its popularity, this very strength is its weakness in stimulating scientific enquiry. A mega-theory that attempts to explain everything can hardly guide scientific investigation of anything specific. Having taken a cursory look at the various interpersonal dimensions, emphasized in some personality theories, we now turn to theories that are directly addressed to the specific domain of interpersonal behaviour.

### **Two-dimensional Theories of Interpersonal Behaviour**

The origin of formal studies in the domain of interpersonal behaviour has been traced to a doctoral dissertation by Freedman in 1950. Freedman conceptualised interpersonal behaviour as composed of two intersecting dimensions of love-hate (represented on the horizontal line) and dominate-submit (represented on the vertical line). Within this framework, it was proposed that cases of interpersonal behaviour could be placed in specific segments within any of the quadrants, depending on the kind and degree of the dimension reflected by a particular behaviour (Leary, et al., 1951).

Later studies of interpersonal behaviour were found to conform closely to this Freedman-Leary conceptual model, except for certain terminological modifications to suit the specific social contexts being studied (Wiggins, 1982). In a parent-child context, for example, Schaefer (1959) substituted accepting-rejecting for love-hate and control-autonomy for dominate-submit; Becker (1964) proposed dimensions of warmth-hostility and restrictive-permissive; Raphael-Leff (1983) preferred to use regulating-facilitating in place of dominate-submit. Birtchnell (1987) classified interpersonal behaviour along attachment-detachment and directiveness-

receptiveness dimensions. The essential features of the theory in all these studies, however, remained the same: the four characteristics or tendencies of love, hate, domination and submission (or their variants) forming the four nodal points of two intersecting dimensions in such a way that samples of interpersonal behaviour could be arranged in a continuous circle (known as the interpersonal circle) running through the four nodes.

Benjamin (1974), in her structural analysis of social behaviour (SASB), took Leary's horizontal dimension of love-hate (she termed it affiliation) and Schaefer's vertical dimension of dominate-emancipate (termed interdependence), but created three separate two-dimensional 'surfaces'. The first surface was considered 'active in nature' and was called parentlike; it was concerned with doing things to or for another person. The second surface was considered 'reactive' and was called childlike; it was concerned with what is done to or for the self. The third surface was considered to represent introjections of others' treatment of the individual and was concerned with one's attitudes and forms of behaviour towards oneself. Measures were also developed in the form of questionnaires based on the SASB model to measure interpersonal attitudes.

Unlike the general motivational theories of human behaviour and the theories of personality that we discussed earlier, the two-dimensional theories, based on the Freedman-Leary model, were specifically addressed to the structure of interpersonal behaviour. However, statistical analyses were found to yield unsatisfactory results regarding the circumplexity or the internal consistency of the scales used (Paddock & Nowicki, 1986). In this process, the theory seems to have suffered more than benefited, for, as Birtchnell (1990) observes, 'the successive changes ... have been dictated by the requirements of the circumplex hypothesis and not by a respect for the nature and meaning of the two

principal dimensions. There remains a great deal about the theory which requires clarification and modification. (The successive changes in the theory) appear to have diverted attention from the principal objectives of a two-dimensional theory' (p. 1199). Besides, it may be recalled that the origin of this theory was in the context and service of psychiatry and its ultimate objective was to classify psychiatric disorders in interpersonal terms (Sullivan, 1953; Leary, 1957).

### **Three-dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behaviour**

Schutz (1958; 1960), on the basis of the research he had done in the navy for the purpose of composing navy groups that would work and be productive together, proposed a three dimensional theory of interpersonal behaviour. In his initial formulation of the theory, he postulated three dimensions to account for all interpersonal phenomena, operative and distinguishable at the behavioural and the feeling levels. On the level of behaviour he called the dimensions Inclusion, Control, and Affection; their counterparts on the level of feelings were called Significance, Competence, and Loveability. He identified two facets of each of the dimensions: the expressed facet (what one does to another or others, similar to Benjamin's parentlike surface) and the wanted facet (similar to Benjamin's childlike surface). He also developed instruments to measure these two facets of each of the three dimensions.

Schutz called his theory FIRO (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation). His instrument to measure the three dimensions on the behavioural level was named FIRO-B and the one for the feelings level was named FIRO-F. While updating the theory in the early 1980's, Schutz (1982) introduced certain changes in some aspects of the theory and,

correspondingly, also in the instruments. These revisions are discussed in the following paragraphs. In the first version of the FIRO theory, the three fundamental dimensions of interpersonal behaviour were said to be Inclusion, Control, and Affection. But, 'after many years of experience in using the FIRO instruments', says Schutz, 'it became clear that Affection was not parallel to the other two concepts of Inclusion and Control. Affection, as a concept, is more related to feeling than to behaviour. Accordingly, Affection now is identified by its essential behavioral ingredient, Openness' (Schutz 1982, page 4).

As regards the manifestations of interpersonal behaviour, the earlier version had referred to Expressed and Wanted facets. But, to quote Schutz again, 'careful analysis has revealed that these expressed and wanted aspects are not the ends of the same continuum. Expressed behavior is the opposite of that which is received, whereas behavior that is Wanted is the opposite of behavior that is actual or, more accurately, perceived' (Schutz 1982, page 4). The measuring instruments were then suitably modified to reflect the changes in the theory. After the revision, the final version of the FIRO theory states that there are three central and Unidimensional needs that affect the behaviour of people in any interpersonal relationship. They are inclusion (the need to socialise, to be in the company of or in contact with, people), control (the need to influence, make decisions, direct, have power over, have impact on), and openness (the need to share one's inner thoughts and feelings). Corresponding to these three interpersonal behavioural needs are three needs that affect the feelings of people in interaction: Significance (the need to feel worthwhile, important, meaningful), competence, (the need to feel strong, Intelligent, capable) and Likability (the need



to feel one is good, attractive, likable). Inclusion at the behavioural level corresponds to Significance at the feeling level; Control corresponds to Competence and Openness, to Likability. People vary in the degree to which these needs are expressed and fulfilled. According to this theory, the three need dimensions of Inclusion, Control and Openness are universal, necessary and sufficient to account for any interpersonal relationship. Each of these dimensions is bi-directional: the expressed direction indicates behaviour proceeding from the initiating or the focal person to another (the target person or persons) and the received direction indicates behaviour proceeding reversely from the other(s) to the focal person. The three dimensions also have a 'bi-temporal' orientation: the perceived temporality refers to what is seen as happening at present and the wanted refers to what the person wants to have happen.

### **Evolutionism and Interpersonal Behaviour**

Another way of looking at interpersonal behaviour (i.e., yet another map of the territory) has been proposed by Gilbert (1989), who holds that interpersonal behaviour has evolved in parallel with the evolution of the nervous system. In this evolutionist outlook, human interpersonal behaviour would be understood as an elaboration of the simpler interactive behaviour of lower animals. Lower animals may not love and hate, but they do demonstrate behaviours or reactions in relation to proximity with one another of the kind. Pursuing this idea, Birtchnell (1990) proposed that the traditional terms of love-hate and dominate-submit be replaced with closeness-distance and upperness-lowerness, respectively, for the reason that the latter terms are generic enough to account for the phenomenon both in human beings and in lower animals and that they are less emotive and value-laden than the earlier terms. One

could, however, argue that the terms upper and lower are not after all as value-free as suggested, because 'upper' is clearly preferable to 'lower' in many cultures, including India. By comparison, the FIRO dimensions of Inclusion and Control, proposed by Schutz (1958; 1960), are just as generic and, perhaps, also more free from the deficiencies of being emotive or value-laden. In addition, the third FIRO dimension of Openness captures something that belongs specifically to the human species—perfectly compatible with the overall evolutionist perspective and, particularly, with the differentiation principle that operates in the origin of species: man is animal plus!

### **Brief Comparison of the Theories**

Despite the apparent variety, evident in the different conceptions of interpersonal behaviour that we have scanned above, one would not fail to notice (in the theories that were specifically concerned with the interpersonal phenomenon) the remarkable consistency of the underlying concepts as well as of the basic structure of the conceptual framework sired by Leary and Freedman in the initial days of interpersonal theory. The differences, apart from semantics, have been more in terms of the coverage, complexity, neatness and operationalisation than in the substance of the various theories. Of all the theoretical developments (conceptual maps), browsed through in the previous paragraphs, Benjamin's SASB (Structural Analysis of Social Behaviour) and Schutz's FIRO (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation) seem to present well differentiated systems as well as operationalised concepts, compared to the others. A closer look at these two conceptualisations bring to notice certain striking similarities and differences in them. The dimension of affiliation (Freedman's love-hate) in SASB is very nearly the same as Inclusion in the FIRO framework; interdependence in the former represents what Control does in the latter. The FIRO

dimension of Openness does not have a parallel in SASB, although some shades of it may be embedded in or encompassed by the latter's 'affiliation' dimension; it was for this reason that, in the previous sentence, I said 'very nearly the same as', when comparing the two concepts. Similarly, FIRO's facets of Expressed and Received parallel SASB's definitions of Parent-like and Childlike surfaces, respectively. But, while the FIRO theory, additionally, distinguishes between the actual and the ideal by the Perceived and the Wanted aspects of one's interpersonal behaviour, SASB does not address this aspect at all.

### **Interpersonal Influence**

**Conformity:** Conformity means maintaining or changing one's behavior to match the behavior or expectations of others. The pressure to conform sometimes exerts an overwhelming normative influence. Conformity can also serve information functions, especially when we are not quite sure what we are seeing or hearing. One example is an illusion known as the autokinetic effect: If you sit in a darkened room and stare at a small, stationary point of light, the point will eventually seem to move, partly because of small involuntary eye movements that we all make all the time. Early research suggested that people are most likely to conform their opinions in ambiguous situations that make it difficult for people to be sure of their own judgment (Sherif, 1935). Solomon Asch (1951, 1956) carried out a now-famous series of experiments. He found that the amount of conforming influence depended on the size of the opposing majority. In a series of studies, he varied the number of confederates who gave incorrect answers from 1 to 15. He found that people conformed to a group of 3 or 4 just as readily as they did to a larger group. However, a participant conformed much less if he or she had an 'ally.' [Intro. to Psychology (567\_kalat)]

### **Measures of Interpersonal Needs**

Various measures of interpersonal behaviour have been used in the past, each representing the particular theoretical model from which the measures were derived. Although behavioural observations (Raush et al., 1959), rating scales (Lorr & McNair, 1965), and verbal content analysis (Terrill & Terrill, 1965) have been employed occasionally, the self-report device has been the main instrument in the assessment of interpersonal behaviour (Golding & Knudson, 1975). Several variables, such as abasement, affiliation, aggression, dominance, nurturance, social cognition, and succourance, have often been measured by various modes of measurement as important markers of interpersonal behaviour. In an attempt to test the convergent validity of these measures, by using a multivariable-multimethod design to analyse the data, three major dimensions were isolated, 'which were found to bear close relationships to Schutz's' FIRO factors (Golding & Knudson, 1975, page 442).

Consequent on the revision of his theory, Schutz revised the instrument, too: the FIRO-B was cleansed of the feeling variable (Affection) and was modified to measure the three interpersonal behavioural dimensions alone. The directionality of behaviour was also addressed more clearly by introducing the concept of Received and contrasting it with the Expressed. The revised concept of Wanted, contrasted with that of Perceived, added to the potential utility of the instrument for training and development purposes.

### **Empirical Studies**

Empirical studies of the three interpersonal needs, which, according to the FIRO theory, are the bases of interpersonal behaviour and which can be assessed by Element-B (the revised instrument), would certainly help fill the void currently faced in designing appropriate interpersonal-skill training

programmes, the need for which has been pointed out by Rao (1992) and others. If the fundamental interpersonal needs of managers were clearly identified, the trainers would be in a position to do the job of their calling more effectively than in the absence of such knowledge.

There have been several studies abroad, again using the (old) FIRO-B instrument, investigating the postulate of compatibility, which refers to the goodness of fit between the need configuration of the individuals in a given relationship. The better the fit, the more likely the achievement of the goal of the relationship. A number of studies have confirmed such a relationship against criteria such as task performance (Eisenthal, 1961; Schutz, 1958), student achievement (Hutcherson, 1963) and learning climate (Powers, 1965). Compatibility among members of a therapy group was found to be positively related to cohesion in the group (Yalom & Rand, 1966) and therapeutic success (Sapolsky, 1965; Gross, 1959). It was also found that experimenters could verbally condition the subjects much better when the experimenter-subject compatibility was high (Sapolsky, 1960). FIRO compatibility of couples and their courtship progress have been found to be positively correlated (Kerckhoff & Davis, 1962). When tested in a context which emphasized rational and non-personal processes, however, the postulate of compatibility failed to hold (Underwood & Krafft, 1973). All these studies investigated the compatibility of interpersonal needs and its impact on, or relationship to, performance and other goal criteria. Checking such relationships are important, but to be able to do so, one must identify the interpersonal needs themselves first.

Bakken and Romig (1992) used the FIRO-B instrument to identify the interpersonal needs of middle adolescents and found that males ranked Expressed Control highest and

Wanted Affection lowest, while females ranked the same variables the reverse way. Muthayya (1989) assessed the interpersonal orientations of the IAS (Indian Administrative Service) and IFS (Indian Forest Service) officers. He found that the IAS officers socialised (Expressed Inclusion score = 5.03; SD: 1.99) more than the IFS officers (EI score = 4.50; SD: 2.10), but neither group would much like people to socialise with them (Wanted Inclusion score for the IAS was a low 1.86 with an sd. of 2.56 and for the IFS it was 1.77 with an SD of 2.94). The reverse was found to be the case in respect of Affection: the Forest officers expressed more Affection (EA=4.68; SD: 2.75) than did the IAS officers (EA=2.77; SD: 2.45). The groups did not differ on the Control dimension.

Roy (1992), as part of his attempt to assess the success of a multiple skill scheme that had been introduced in a pharmaceutical company, studied the interpersonal needs of the employees in the company's Production, Engineering and Administration departments. He, too, used the FIRO-B (the old) instrument. He found that all the three departments scored highest on Expressed Inclusion (EI) and much lower in their Wanted Inclusion (WI). Wanted Affection (WA) was found to be low in all the three departments,

Administration scoring the lowest. Expressed Affection (EA) showed a similar low trend, but the production people were relatively high compared to the others. The study did not discuss the Control dimension. Commenting on its discovery that the WI was lower than the EI in all the groups, the study called the finding 'paradoxical'.

The 'wanted' scores obtained in the above studies are indeed difficult to interpret, for what they represent are not well differentiated from the received behaviour. It is not possible to say whether the score referred to what the respondents actually

received from others or what they wanted others to demonstrate towards them. It was the recognition of such lack of clarity or differentiation, besides the Affection-vs-Openness controversy, that had led to the revision in the theory, which has starkly been left unheeded by these studies.

The findings of the FIRO studies that are available and reported above are all limited, at least on three counts. One with regard to the populations studied, the other to the samples and the third to the theory itself. The Indian studies on FIRO have hardly touched the managerial population; none at all in the cooperative sector. Even of the three populations (IAS, IFS and employees of a pharmaceutical company) that were covered in the above-cited Indian studies, the size of one of the samples was just 22.

The most important of the shortcomings is that these studies have been subject to the limitations of the earlier version of the theory as well as of the instrument, on discussed earlier. \*Although the FIRO-B instrument has been used widely for a large number of purposes, it was not designed as a general purpose instrument. Several years ago, after revising the FIRO theory underlying the instrument based on over 20 years' experience with the instrument and related activities, the author revised the FIRO-B extensively, so extensively it was given a new name, Element B. The new instrument is much stronger both theoretically and psychometrically while at the same time retaining the simplicity and shortness of the original. In addition, two new instruments based on the same theory were designed, developed, and tested. They measure feelings (Element F) and self-concept (Element S). All three instruments have, over the past 10 years, been used primarily as training instruments. When given in conjunction with other methods, they have been used for improving self-awareness, teamwork, morale, and productivity in such

organizations as Procter & Gamble, AT&T, NASA, Amdahl Corporation, the Swedish Army, and about 100 companies in Japan. Included is a comment on scales anchored both logically, using methods such as facet design and Unidimensional scaling, and empirically, such as the 'big five.' {Psychol Rep 1992 Jun; 70(3 Pt 1):915-37}.

### **Who is a Knowledge Worker?**

Knowledge worker, a term coined by Peter Drucker in 1959, is one who works primarily with information or one who develops and uses knowledge in the workplace.

According to Robert D. Austin of Harvard Business School (Managing Knowledge Workers: Evolving Practices and Trends, <http://nextwave.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/2002/04/25/5>), there are two main principles of knowledge-worker management.

These are,

1. Emphasize collaboration and professionalism; de-emphasize incentive schemes and performance measures. Play up knowledge workers' natural tendencies to be committed to their work and its overall objectives, and
2. Emphasize iterative work structures rather than linear, sequential ones. Don't over plan. Alternate between unstructured individual experiences and structured integration of individual work.

Peter Drucker Says, 'Managing Knowledge Means Managing Oneself'! The historic shift to self-management offers organizations four ways to best develop and motivate knowledge workers. They are

1. Know people's strengths.
2. Place them where they can make the greatest contributions.
3. Treat them as associates and
4. Expose them to challenges.

## Background for the Study

Having seen some of the special characteristics of knowledge workers as above, the author undertook an empirical study on the interpersonal needs profile of four different types of Knowledge Workers viz. School Teachers, College Teachers, Doctors, and Defense Officers. Before proceeding with the details, it would be worthwhile to briefly go through the theoretical aspects of the instrument used for data collection viz. 'FIRO Element - B'

### What is Interpersonal Behaviour?

Human beings engage themselves in various interpersonal interactions like Inclusion, Control and Openness throughout their life. We interact with others at home, in the office, in the playground, in the club, in all modes of transport, while communicating, at the shop, in the cinema theatre, at the hospital etc., - the list is endless. Further, it is rightly said that man is a superior type of social animal; we are all elements of various societies; we do not exist in isolation.

Man, being inquisitive and innovative has always been eager to invent, test and validate theories, which explain his behaviour in the interpersonal arena. Thus many behavioral scientists have propounded various Two-dimensional and Three-dimensional theories of Interpersonal Behaviour.

### Two - Dimensional Theories

Freedman being a pioneer in this aspect proposed in 1950 that interpersonal behaviour can be identified as belonging to any quadrant formed by two intersecting lines of Love-Hate (horizontal) and Dominant - Submit (vertical). Several models were proposed by subsequent authors, but the essence of the models were more or less the same. Thus some of the dimensions proposed are Warmth - Hostility, Restrictive - Permissive, Regulating - Facilitating,

Attachment - Detachment and Directiveness - Receiptness etc. Even though these theories threw some light on certain aspects of interpersonal behaviour, they were not fully adequate for understanding or explaining the complex aspects of behaviour. Further much difficulty was faced in data collection and analysis, as they were not amenable to statistical techniques.

### Three - Dimensional Theories

Three-dimensional theories of interpersonal behaviour were spearheaded by William Schutz (1958, 1960). He proposed that human behaviour take place in three dimensions namely Inclusion, Control and Affection. Each of these was bidirectionally classified into 'Expressed' and 'Wanted' behaviour. Thus he developed the FIRO - B instrument for measuring the interpersonal behaviour which comprises 54 questions, 9 each of which measures the parameters Expressed Inclusion, Expressed Control, Expressed Affection, Wanted Inclusion, Wanted Control and Wanted Affection.

Examples of statements, which measure the above parameters, are given below: -

- a. Expressed Inclusion = I include people.
- b. Wanted Inclusion = I want people to include me.
- c. Expressed Control = I control people.
- d. Wanted Control = I want people to control me.
- e. Expressed Affection = I have close relationships.
- f. Wanted Affection = I want close relationships.

As experience was gained the world over in the use of FIRO-B as an instrument of behavioural research, Schutz (1982) himself discovered some of its limitations. The first revelation was that affection is much different from inclusion and control as a measure of behaviour since it manifests more at the

'feeling' level rather than at the 'behaviour' level. Hence he substituted it with 'openness' as the behavioural equivalent. He also found that 'Expressed' and 'Wanted' are not really the opposites in the some behavioural dimension. 'Expressed' is the opposite of 'Received' and 'Wanted' is the opposite of 'Actual' or 'Perceived'. With the incorporation of these changes he developed what is called "FIRO ELEMENT – B Instrument", containing 108 questions measuring the following 12 dimensions:-

- a. Perceived Expressed Inclusion (PEI) = I include people.
- b. Wanted Expressed Inclusion (WEI) = I want to include people.
- c. Perceived Received Inclusion (PRI) = People include me.
- d. Wanted Received Inclusion (WRI) = I want people to include me.
- e. Perceived Expressed Control (PEC) = I control people.
- f. Wanted Expressed Control (WEC) = I want to control people.
- g. Perceived Received Control (PRC) = People control me.
- h. Wanted Received Control (WRC) = I want people to control me.
- i. Received Expressed Openness (PEO) = I am open with people.
- j. Wanted Expressed Openness (WEO) = I want to be open with people.
- k. Perceived Received Openness (PRO) = People are open with me.
- l. Wanted Received Openness (WRO) = I want people to be open with me.

### The Investigation

It is well known that the main determinant of our behaviour is heredity and environment. Out of these two the influence of environment in moulding our behaviour is shown to be of

higher significance. Again, our professional environment wields a much larger influence on our behaviour. With this in view, four professions were chosen for this study namely School Teachers (Profession=1), College Teachers (Profession=2), Doctors (Profession=3) and Defense Officers (Profession=4). These professions were chosen for the study based on the assumed similarity between 1 & 2 and differences amongst (1&2) with 3 and (1&2) with 4, with reference to interpersonal dimensions.

### Objective of the Study

The objective of this investigation was to gain insight into the interpersonal relations' characteristics of Knowledge Workers belonging to four different professions. More specifically it is intended

- a. To find out the interpersonal relationships dimensions of PEI, WEI, PRI, WRI, PEC, WEC, PRC, WRC, PEO, WEO, PRO and WRO for the four chosen professions,
- b. To carry out multiple comparison of Interpersonal Factors between various professions, and
- c. To compare the complementary 'Perceived' and 'Wanted' factors - i.e. PEI & WEI, PRI & WRI, PEC & WEC, PRC & WRC, PEO & WEO and PRO & WRO for each profession.

### Research Methodology and Data Collection

The FIRO Element – B questionnaire (See Appendix) was explained to volunteers belonging to the same profession. Subsequently, the instrument was provided to them with the request for filling up the column 'The way it is'. It was particularly emphasized that there is no right or wrong answer and that the answers are purely a matter of personal choice. After this, they were asked to fill up 'The way it should be' without looking at their initial scores. A few participants were not comfortable to mark their scores thinking that they were parting with their private and purely personal

information. Such participants were allowed to fill in the questionnaires completely anonymously without any data, which might even remotely identify them. Some others wanted to create an artificial congruence for the scores of 'The way it is' and 'The way it should be'. Such respondents were assured that congruence is an exception and not a rule.

A few participants did not fill in the questionnaires. Their viewpoint was respected and they were allowed to opt out of the study. Some others preferred to fill the questionnaires at home. However, the recovery of filled in papers from this group was very low at around 50%. In the end, we collected completely filled in material from 41 School Teachers, 45 College Teachers, 42 Doctors and 46 Defense Personnel, starting with 65, 75, 82 and 55 respectively.

## **Analysis and Results**

The data was analyzed using SPSS package and the results are given below:

### **Descriptives**

Table (1) gives Mean and Standard Deviation for Interpersonal Relationship variables for all the four different professions. The 95% confidence level for Mean as indicated by Lower Bound and Upper Bound are also given in the table.

The following are the findings:

#### **PEI (I include people)**

The Mean value for this variable for the three professions namely School teachers, College teachers, Doctors and Defense Officers ranged between 4.24 and 4.43. The Mean for defense personnel was higher at 5.22.

#### **(b) WEI (I want to include people)**

In this case the Mean value for civilians ranged between 4.49 and 4.64 with that for defense personnel higher at 5.37.

#### **(c) PRI (People include me)**

The value was between 2.29 and 3.11 for the first three professions. It was marginally higher at 3.83 for defense.

#### **(d) WRI (I want people to include me)**

The range of the Means for the first three professions was between 3.19 and 3.34. The other group had a Mean at 4.22.

#### **(e) PEC (I control people)**

It was between 3.22 and 3.93 for the first three professions followed by a higher value of 4.61 for the fourth group.

#### **(f) WEC (I want to control people)**

The first three professions exhibited values between 3.78 and 4.07 with 4.98 for the last.

#### **(g) PRC (People control me)**

It was between 5.93 and 6.91 in the first three cases followed interestingly by a lower value of 4.74 for the last profession.

#### **(h) WRC (I want people to control me)**

All four groups had similar Means between 5.12 to 5.82.

#### **(i) PEO (I am open with people)**

The Means did not vary much between the samples and they were between 3.48 for the doctors and 4.37 for defense personnel with the other professions lying in between.

#### **(j) WEO (I want to be open with people)**

The range for the Mean was between 3.50 for the doctors and 4.35 for the defense staff with others in between.

#### **(k) PRO (People are open with me)**

The Means ranged between 3.38 to 4.26.

#### **(l) WRO (I want people to be open with me)**

College teachers exhibited the lowest Mean of 3.62 and Defense personnel the highest value of 4.76.

If we classify the FIRO scores of 0, 1, 2, 3 as 'Low'; 4, 5, 6 as 'Middle'; and 7, 8, 9 as 'High', most of the Means fall in the middle range with very few spillovers on either side.

## ANOVA

Table (2) gives the ANOVA for all the twelve interpersonal factors. It may be seen that there is significant difference between groups for PEI, PRI, PEC, PRC and WRC. It may further be noted that in case of PRC and WRC there is significant difference between groups at 99% confidence level.

## Multiple Comparisons

Table (3) gives Multiple Comparisons of Interpersonal Factors between various professions using Tukey HSD Method. The following are the findings with reference to the interpersonal factors:

- a. PEI: - There is significant difference between School Teachers and Defense Personnel and also between College Teachers and Defense Personnel.
- b. WEI: - There is no significant difference between any pairs of professions.
- c. PRI: - There is significant difference between School Teachers and Defense Personnel in this case.
- d. WRI: - There is no significant difference between any two professions.
- e. PEC: - There is a significant difference between School Teachers and Defense Personnel in this case.
- f. WEC: - No differences observed.
- g. PRC: - Defense Personnel exhibited significant difference with every other profession.
- h. WRC: - Here Defense Officers were different from School Teachers and College Teachers.
- i. PEO: - No significant difference.
- j. WEO: - No differences observed.
- k. PRO: - No differences found.

- l. WRO: - No significant differences in any case.

## Paired Sample t-tests for Expressed and Wanted parameters by Professions 1 to 4

The next analysis was checking the 'balance' between 'Expressed' and 'Wanted' factors. This was done by Paired Sample t-tests as given in table numbers (4) through (7), for School Teachers, College Teachers, Doctors and Defense Officers respectively. In case of School Teachers, there is significant difference between PEC and WEC at 95% confidence level. However in case of PRI & WRI and PRC & WRC the difference is significant at 99% confidence level.

In case of College Teachers the only pair exhibiting significant difference is PRC & WRC. It is interesting to note that the significance level is 99.9%. The pairs of significance in case of Doctors are PRO & WRO at 95% and PRC & WRC at 99%. In case of Defense Officers PRO & WRO is significantly different at 95% and PRC & WRC at 99%.

## Interpretations and Conclusions

### Mean value of Interpersonal Factors and their Relevance

- a. PEI: As we have already discussed this reflects the aspect of behaviour 'I include people'. The Mean ranged between 4.24 and 5.22, which indicates 'Medium' propensity for inclusion for all the four professions. We find further that there is a significant difference between the value of 4.24 for School Teachers and 5.22 for Defense. Significant difference is also observed between College Teachers with 4.27 and Defense Personnel with 5.22. This may be due to the fact that there is more emphasis on teamwork in case of Defense as against independent responsibility in case of Teachers or Doctors.



- b. WEI (I want to include people): - The Mean scores here are again 'Medium' ranging between 4.49 to 4.64 for the first three professions followed by 5.37 for Defense Personnel. However the Mean differences are not significant.
- c. PRI (People include me): - The Means ranged between 2.29 to 3.83. The Mean difference of 2.29 for School Teachers and 3.83 for Defense were significantly different. This means that Defense Personnel feel that they are being included to a much higher degree than School Teachers who feel that they are left out.
- d. WRI (I want people to include me): - The desire for inclusion was low between 3.19 and 3.34 for the civilians as against 4.22 for Defense Officers. There is no significant difference in this factor between any of the professions.
- e. PEC (I control people): - This was between 3.22 for School Teachers and 4.61 for Defense Officers. There was significant difference between School Teachers and Defense Officers at 95% confidence level. It was presumed that Defense Officers would be exercising a much higher degree of control than the other professions. This assumption has been proved wrong except as indicated above. The controls exercised by the various professions are between 'low' and 'medium' indicating a propensity for non-autocratic approach.
- f. WEC (I want to control people): - The Means are between 3.78 and 4.98 i.e. in the medium range. There was no significant difference between any two professions.
- g. PRC (People control me): - The value for this factor was on the higher side with 6.41, 6.60, 5.93 and 4.74 for School Teachers, College Teachers, Doctors and Defense respectively. There is significant difference between Defense Officers and every other profession. The significantly lower value in case of Defense is rather surprising since it is well known that they receive much larger amount of control from their superiors. However, since they are trained and conditioned to accept command and control as an essential part of their work, the perception of received control is on the lower side.
- h. WRC (I want people to control me): - The range of the Means was between 4.00 for Defense and 5.68 for School Teachers. There was significant difference incase of Defense with School Teachers as well as College Teachers, with their wanting to receive only a lower degree of control. This probably reflects their training to be independent.
- i. PEO (I am open with people): - This was 3.48 for Doctors and 4.37 for Defense with other professions in between. There was no significant difference between any two. In other words, members of the various professions express openness to the same degree i.e., Medium.
- j. WEO (I want to be open with people): - There was no significant difference between professions with the range for the Means between 3.50 for the Doctors and 4.35 for the Defense staff with others in between.
- k. PRO (People are open with me): - All four professions felt that others are open with them to the same extent with Means ranging between 3.36 for College Teachers and 4.26 for Defense.
- l. WRO (I want people to be open with me): - Here also there was no significant difference between professions with College Teachers exhibiting the lowest mean of 3.62 and Defense Personnel the highest value of 4.76.

The above observations may be further explained using Horney's 'Psychoanalytic

Social Theory' [Jack L. Rubins, Karen Horney: Gentle Rebel of Psychoanalysis (1978); Marcia Westkott, The Feminist Legacy of Karen Horney (1986); Susan Quinn, A Mind of Her Own (1987); and Bernard J. Paris, Karen Horney: A Psychoanalyst's Search for Self-Understanding (1994).] Horney identified four ways of protecting themselves against feelings of being alone and in a potentially hostile world:

- Affection
- Submissiveness
- Power (a defense against the real or imagined hostility of others)
  - prestige (protection against humiliation expressed by the tendency to humiliate others)
  - possession (the buffering against destitution and poverty manifesting itself as a tendency to deprive others)
- Withdrawal

These protective devices are not normally a sign of neurosis but when they become unhealthy and people feel compelled to rely on them and employ a variety of interpersonal strategies they are called compulsions.

### **Balance between 'Expressed' and 'Wanted' factors**

These were estimated by paired sample t-tests for Expressed and Wanted parameters by professions 1 to 4 as given under 3.4. In case of School Teachers the PEC of 3.22 is significantly different from the WEC of 3.78 at 95%. This implies that there is an apparent 'helplessness' in expressing as much control as they would like to. Further the PRC of 6.41 is significantly higher than WRC of 5.68 at 99%. In other words they receive much more control than they are prepared to accept. There is also significant difference at 99% between the PRI of 2.29 and WRI of 3.34. In other words School Teachers feel that they receive much less inclusion than they desire.

The above dichotomy in three pairs of expressed and wanted interpersonal factors is not a healthy sign especially because these professionals lay the foundation stones for the education and character building of future citizens. The reasons could be many - heavy syllabus, rigid pedagogy, large number of students, lack of opportunities for interaction with management etc. These have to be further investigated so that these assumptions may be verified.

In case of College Teachers the PRC of 6.60 is significantly higher than the WRC of 5.33 at 99% confidence level. In other words, they find that their autonomy on work is challenged.

In case of Doctors the PRC of 5.93 is significantly higher than WRC of 5.12 at 99% again implying a lack of autonomy. Further, their PRO of 3.38 is significantly lower than WRO of 3.90 implying a lack of interpersonal trust. This could be because of the fact that even though the Doctor expects his patients to be open in communication, the latter fail to live up to their expectations due to obvious reasons like privacy, shyness, etc.

In case of Defence Officers the PRC of 4.74 is significantly higher than WRC of 4.00 at 99%. Further the PRO of 4.26 is lower than the WRO of 4.76 at 99% significance level. The reasons are not difficult to understand and are probably a characteristic of the profession itself.

### **Summary**

This study revealed many interesting aspects of interpersonal factors for the four professions. It was found that there is significant difference between groups for PEI, PRI, PEC, PRC and WRC. In the case of the last two factors the differences were significant even at 99% confidence level. No significant difference was observed in case of WEI, WRI, WEC, PEO, WEO, PRO and WRO.

The study of the balance between 'Expressed' and 'Wanted' factors gave the following findings:

- a. School Teachers: - There is an apparent 'helplessness' in exercising as much control as they would like to. They also receive much more control than they are prepared to accept. Further they feel that they receive much less inclusion than they desire.
- b. College Teachers: - College Teachers also feel that they receive much more control than they are ready to accept.
- c. Doctors: - They too receive much higher control than they are ready to accept. They also think that the openness they receive is much less than the openness they want to receive.
- d. Defence Officers: - Findings same as that of Doctors.

Thus we have seen certain areas of potential interpersonal conflict with positions of authority as far as these professions are concerned. Since the first three professions are creative endeavours, it is in the interest of effectiveness that authorities grant them as much autonomy as feasible. However, in certain cases there necessarily has to be restrictions on individual autonomy in the organizational interest. It is the responsibility of management to convince the organizational participants that the restrictions imposed are fair and in the overall interest of all concerned. Participants on the other hand should gracefully accept any reasonable restriction placed on them. This will constitute a win-win strategy and a synergetic approach in which the parties concerned, the organizations and also society at large stand to benefit.

---

#### Acknowledgement

My sincere thanks goes to Dr. R. Nargundkar, Director, PES Institute of Management, Bangalore for his valuable assistance with the Statistical Analysis. He has always been a source of inspiration and an effective bridge between the theory and practice of management.

#### References

- Akhilesh, K.B., & Menon, N.M. (1991). Functionally dependent stressors: Effect on managerial performance. *Productivity*, 32(2), 223-229.
- Alderfer, C.P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 4, 142-175.
- Albrecht, K. (1979). *Stress and the Manager*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Altman, I., & Taylor, D.A. (1973). *Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Arul, M.J. (1989). Operation Flood and management development. *Management in Government*, 21 (1-3), 91-97.
- Athos, A.G., & Gabarro, J.J. (1978). *Interpersonal Behaviour: Communication and Understanding in Relationships*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Bakken, L., & Romig, C. (1992). Interpersonal needs in middle adolescents: companionship, leadership and intimacy. *Journal of Adolescence*, 15, 301-316.
- Becker, W.C. (1964). Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M.L.Hoffman and L.W.Hoffman, (Eds.). *Review of Child Development Research (Vol. 1)*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Cited in *Human Relations*, 43 (12), 1990, p.1199.
- Beehr, T.A., Walsh, J.T., & Taber, T.D. (1976). Relationship of stress to individually and organizationally valued states: Higher order needs as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(3), 41-47.
- Benjamin, L.S. (1974). Structural analysis of social behaviour. *Psychological Review*, 81, 392-425.
- Bennis, W.G., et al. (1964). *Interpersonal Dynamics*. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
- Berne, E. (1961). *Transactional Analysis in Psychotherapy*. New York: Grove Press.
- Birtchnell, John (1990). Interpersonal theory: Criticism, modification, and elaboration. *Human Relations*, 43 (12), 1183-1201.
- Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J.S. (1980). *The Versatile Manager: A Grid Profile*.
- Blau, P.M. (1955). *Dynamics of Bureaucracy: A Study of Interpersonal Relations in Two Government Agencies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bohra, K.A., & Pandey, J. (1984). Ingratiation toward strangers, friends, and bosses. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 122, 217-222.

- Bruner, J.S., & Goodman, C.C. (1949). Value and need as organising factors in perception. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 42, 33-44.
- Bugental, J.F.T. (1978). "Intentionality and Ambivalence." In Athos, A.G., & Gabarro, J.J., Op. cit., p.512.
- Beatty, M.J., McCroskey, J.C., & Heisel, A.D. (1998). Communication apprehension as temperamental expression: A communication biological paradigm. *Communication Monographs*, 65, 197-219.
- Caplan, G. (1981). Mastery of stress: Psychological aspects. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 138, 413-420.
- Cardy, R.L., & Dobbins, G.H. (1986). Affect and appraisal accuracy: Liking as an integral dimension in evaluating performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 672-678.
- Chatterjee, A.K. and Acharya, R.M. (1987). Dairy industry in India: A profile. *Dairy India - 1987*, p.3.
- Cooper, C.L., & Arbos, J. (1984). Executive stress goes global. *International Management*, May issue, 22-28.
- Cooper, C.L., & Marshall, J. (1977). *Understanding Executive Stress*. USA: PBI Books.
- Darlington, R.B. (1968). Multiple regression in psychological research and practice. *Psychological Bulletin*, 69, 161-182.
- Diener E., Wolsic B., & Fujita F. (1995). Physical attractiveness and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 120-129.
- Eisenthal, S. (1961). The dependence of visibility of values upon group compatibility and level of need for affection. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, cited in Underwood & Krafft (1973), Op. cit.
- Freud, S. (1949). *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Norton.
- Fromm, E. (1947). *Man for Himself*. New York: Rinehart.
- Fessler, Nicholas J. Experimental evidence on the links among monetary incentives, task attractiveness, and task performance. *Journal of Management Accounting Research* Date: Annual 2003 Managerial accounting (Research)]
- Gilbert, P. (1989). *Human Nature and Suffering*. London: L.E. Associates.
- Ghirardi O.; Cozzolino R.; Guaraldi D.; Giuliani A.; Andrew E.R.1; Szczesniak E.; Gilbert P.; Price J.; Allan S. Social comparison, social attractiveness and evolution: how might they be related? *New Ideas in Psychology*, Volume 13, Number 2, July 1995, pp. 149-165(17) Publisher: Elsevier
- Golding, S.L., and Knudson, R.M. (1975). Multivariable-multimethod convergence in the domain of interpersonal behavior. *Multivariate Behavioural Research*, 10, 425-448.
- Guttman, L. (1950). The basis for scalogram analysis. In S.Stouffer et al., *Measurement and Prediction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R.L. (1990). *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*. (2nd edn.). New York: Macmillan Pub. Co.
- Halse, Michael (1979). A New Institute of Rural Management - and a New Developmental Discipline? NDDDB, Anand, India, page 3.
- Horney, K. (1945). *Our Inner Conflicts*. New York: Norton.
- Hutcherson, D.E. (1963). Relationships among teacher-pupil compatibility, social studies grades, and selected factors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley. Cited in Underwood & Krafft (1973), Op. cit.
- Jacobson, W.D. (1972). *Power and Interpersonal Relations*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth.
- Jourard, S.M. (1959). Self-disclosure and other cathexis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, p.59.
- Kahn, R.L., et al., (1964). *Organizational Stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Katz, D. & Khan, R.L. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Kerckhoff, A.C., & Davis, K.E. (1962). Value consensus and need-complementarity in mate selection. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 295-303.
- Klecka, W.R. (1975). "Discriminant Analysis" in *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Klimosky, R.J., & Hayes, N.J. (1980). "Leader Behaviour and Subordinate Motivation." *Personnel Psychology*, 33(3), 543-555.
- Kotter, J.P. (1982). *The General Managers*. New York: Macmillan.
- Kramer, E. (1967). A contribution toward the validation of the FIRO-B questionnaire. *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment*, 31, 80-81.
- Laforge, R. and Suczek, R. (1955). The interpersonal dimension of personality: An interpersonal checklist. *Journal of Personality*, 24(1), 94-112.
- Laforge, R., Freedman, M.B., and Wiggins, J. (1985). Interpersonal circumplex models: 1948-1983. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 613-631.
- Laforge, R., & Suczek, R. (1955). The interpersonal dimensions of personality, III: An interpersonal checklist. *Journal of Personality*, 24, 94-112.
- Leary, T., Freedman, M.B., Ossorio, A.G., and Coffey, H.S. (1951). The interpersonal dimension of personality. *Journal of Personality*, 20, 143-161.
- Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality*. New York: Ronald Press.

- Levinger, G., & Snoek, J.D. (1972). *Attraction in Relationship: A New Look at Interpersonal Attraction*. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning.
- Liden, R., & Graen, G. (1980). Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 451-465.
- Magnusson, David (1992). Back to the phenomena: Theory, methods, and statistics in psychological research. *European Journal of Personality*, 6 (1), 1-14. Abstracted in *Sociological Abstracts*, June 1993, # 93z7022, p.684.
- Maslow, A.H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McClelland, D.C., Clark, R.A., Roby, T.B., & Atkinson, J.W. (1948). The projective expression of need: the effect of different intensities of the hunger drive in perception. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 205-222.
- McGarth, J.E. (1976). Stress and behaviour in organisations. In M.D.Dunnette (Ed.), *Hand Book of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- McCroskey, J.C., & McCain, T.A (1974). The measurement of interpersonal attraction. *Speech Monographs*, 41, 261-26
- Mintzberg, Henry (1975). The Manager's Job: Folklore and Facts. *Harvard Business Review*, 53 (July-August), pp. 49-61.
- Moustakas, C. (1990). *Heuristic Research: Design, Methodology, and Applications*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Murphy, G., Levine, R., & Chein, I. (1943). The relation of the intensity of a need to the amount of perceptual distortion: a preliminary report. *Journal of Psychology*, 13,283-293.
- Muthayya, B.C. (1989). Behavioural profile of All India Service officers. *Proceedings of Academic Conference on Application of Behavioural Sciences Research in Organisations: Selected Papers Only, FORE, New Delhi*, pp. 17.1-17.15.
- National Dairy Development Board (1993). *Monthly Progress Report on Operation Flood III: October 1993*.
- Pandey, J., & Bohra, K.A. (1984). Ingratiation as a function of organizational characteristics and supervisory styles. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 33, 381-394.
- Pareek, U. (1983). Organisational role stress. In L.D.Goodstien & J.W.Pfeiffer (Eds.), *The 1983 Annual for Facilitators, Trainers, and Consultants*. San Diego: California.
- Powers, J.R. (1965). *Trainer orientation and group composition in laboratory training*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Case Institute of Technology. Cited in Underwood & Krafft (1973), Op. cit.
- Rao, T.V., & Tamil Selvan (1992). Strengths and weaknesses of senior executives. *Productivity*, 33(3), 443-451.
- Raphael-Leff, J. (1983). Facilitators and regulators: Two approaches to mothering. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 56, 379-390.
- Roethlisberger, F.J., & Dickson, W.J. (1943). *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Rosse, J.G., & Kraut, A.I. (1983). Reconsidering the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 56, 63-71.
- Roy, A.R. (1992). Review of multiple skill scheme: A case study. *Productivity*, 33(3), 452-458.
- Sapolsky, A. (1960). Effect of interpersonal relationships upon verbal conditioning. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 60, 241- 246.
- Scandura, T.A., Graen, G.B., & Novak, M.A. (1986). When managers decide not to decide autocratically: An investigation of leader-member exchange and decision influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 579-584.
- Schaefer, E.S. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behaviour. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59, 226-235.
- Schutz, W.C. (1958). *FIRO: A Three Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behaviour*. New York: Holt Rinehart & Wilson.
- Simon, H.A. (1976). *Administrative Behaviour*. New York: Macmillan.
- Singh, S. (1990). *Organisational Stress and Executive Behaviour*. Sri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations and Human Resources, New Delhi.
- Stewart, R. (1967). *Managers and Their Jobs*. London: Macmillan.
- Sullivan, H.S. (1953). *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry*. New York: Norton.
- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (1983). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. New York: Harper & Row Publications.
- Taylor, F.W. (1947). *Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Tedeschi, J.T. (1974). Attributions, liking, and power. In Huston, T.L. (Ed.) *Foundations of Interpersonal Attraction*. New York: Academic Press.
- Thorndike, R.M. (1978). *Correlational Procedures for Research*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Truckenmiller, J.C., & Schaie, K.W. (1979). Multilevel structural validation of Leary's interpersonal diagnosis system. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 47, 1030-1045.
- Tsui, A.S., & Barry, B. (1986). Interpersonal affect and rating errors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 586-599.

Underwood, W.J., & Krafft, L.J. (1973). Interpersonal compatibility and managerial work effectiveness: A test of the fundamental interpersonal relations orientation theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 58(1), 89-94.

Van Maanen, J.(1979). Reclaiming qualitative methods for organizational research: A preface. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24 (4), 520-526.

Vansell, M., et al. (1981). Role conflict and role ambiguity: Integration of the literature and directions for future research. *Human Relations*, 34, 43-71.

Volkema, R.J., & Bergmann, T.J. (1989). Interpersonal conflict at work: An analysis of behavioral responses. *Human Relations*, 42(9), 757-770.

Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley.

Wayne, S.J., & Ferris, G.R.(1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 487-499.

Weick, K.E. (1979). *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Weinberg, G.H., & Schumaker, J.A. (1962). *Statistics: An Intuitive Approach*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Pub. Co. Inc., p.22.

Whyte, W.H.Jr. (1956). *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Wiggins, J.S. (1979). A psychological taxonomy of trait-descriptive terms: The interpersonal domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 395-412.

Yalom, I.D., & Rand, K. (1966). Compatibility and cohesiveness in therapy groups. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 15, 267-275. In Underwood & Krafft (1973), Op. cit.

Zajac, E.T. and Shortell, S.M. (1989). Changing generic strategies: Likelihood, direction and performance implications. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10: 413-430.

Zalenzik, A., Ket de Vries, M.F.R., & Howard, J. (1977). Stress reactions in organisations: Syndromes, causes and consequences. *Behavioural Science*, 22, 151-162.

Zalenzik, A., & Moment, D. (1967). *The Dynamics of Interpersonal Behaviour*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

**About the author:**

T. Thomas is a Professor at Siva Sivani  
Institute of Management, Hyderabad.

He can be reached at srprofessor1@yahoo.com