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Chapter 2

Literature Survey

2.0 Introduction:

Research in common parlance refers to a search for knowledge. Research is an art of scientific investigation. D. Slesinger and M. Stephenson in the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences define research as 'the manipulation of things, concepts or symbols for the purpose of generalizing to extent, correct or verify knowledge, whether that knowledge aids in construction of theory or in the practice of an art.' In the social science literature, there are numerous studies, which focus on any of the multifarious human issues such as health, illnesses, conflict, stress, motivation and performance, and show that all these issues are somehow (as causes and/or consequences) related to interpersonal relations. We shall, however, restrict our review to studies that will sufficiently help us focus the objective of the present study in some perspective. The review begins with studies that refer to the significance of interpersonal relations in management and proceeds to those that have attempted to explain interpersonal behavior itself. Since the objective of the thesis is to map the existing interpersonal needs (of the chosen sample), we shall also scan the literature for help in this regard.

2.1 Interpersonal Relations in Management:

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 effectiveness, 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 interconnected) 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 needs 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.
2.1.1 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.

2.1.1.1 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.

2.1.1.2 Physical Attractiveness:

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.

Physical attractiveness is a perception, a perception which may or may not be shared by people with different backgrounds, cultures, or experiences. It is a matter of taste and
preference. This is why two people may see the same person at the same time and report very different levels of physical attraction. Generally, however, within a culture and to an extent even across cultures, there is substantial agreement on the physical appearances characteristics, which result in people seeing an individual as physically attractive.

Perceptions of physical attractiveness have their greatest importance during the initial phases of human relationships, particularly within organizations. Humans often prevent contact with people they perceive as interpersonally unattractive. The implications of this for job interviews are obvious. All kinds of positive characteristics are commonly attributed to people who are seen as physically attractive—intelligence, honesty, experience, insight, wealth, credibility and sexuality. There are two reservations to this presumably obvious conclusion. First, people who are extremely physically attractive often are rejected by those less endowed. They are not seen as approachable. They are seen as having a superiority complex. They are seen as getting a lot of advantages they have not earned. Often they are deeply disliked by others of the same gender.

However, the second reservation probably is more important. That is, the impact of physical attractiveness has a short life. If we interact with the physically attractive individual and find a lack of other positive qualities, we tend to see the person as less attractive on the other attractiveness dimensions. Overtime, one even reevaluates their physical attractiveness downward. Thus, physical attractiveness has a major impact in organizations during initial encounters, but that impact tends to lessen for the more attractive individuals as more interaction occurs. In contrast, people seen initially as
unattractive, may actually be seen as more attractive over time. Within organizations, physical attractiveness is particularly important for people who apply for positions which call for direct contact with the public—such as positions in hospitality, direct sales, and public relations. Much of the communication in these positions is conducted within the context of initial encounters. Where more long-term contact is mandated, the other dimensions of attractiveness come into play more strongly.

2.1.1.3 **Social Attractiveness:**

This 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. While we might initially be socially attracted to a person because of their physical appearance, this attraction will disappear unless the person is socially desirable. If we find someone socially attractive, it is likely that we will desire a relationship with them that continues for an extended period.

In contemporary society, many people spend more time with their coworkers in an organization than they do with any other people including family. It is no longer unusual for a person's social friends to also be their coworkers. Hence, when people move to new organizations, it quite common that they will find new people to be socially attractive, and friendship has become finer in recent decades. This, of course, does not mean that we will develop friendships with all of our coworkers. This will be true
only with those coworkers we find socially attractive and who also see us as socially attractive.

2.1.1.4 Task Attractiveness:

This dimension of attraction 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 attractiveness, then, is based on what one desires as a work partner, Generally, but not universally, we want pleasant, hard-working, competent people as coworkers. We want people who will do their share, if not more, and do it in such a way that the work environment is a pleasant place to be.

2.1.1.4.1 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. (Setton, R.P & Mossholder, K.W, 2002)

2.1.1.5 Other Interpersonal Perceptions:

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

2.1.1.5.1 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.

2.1.1.5.2 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.

2.1.1.5.3 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. (Beatty, M.J., McCroskey, J.C., & Heisel, A.D., 1998, McCroskey, J.C., & McCain, T.A., 1974).

2.2 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 was 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.

2.2.1 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).

Some of the needs that influence human behaviour are biological, some emotional, and some social in nature. The most popular classification of human needs categorises them into five groups: physiological, security, love & belongingness, status, and self-actualisation 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 organisational 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 n-Aff (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, too. 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 recognised 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 n-Aff 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.
2.2.2 *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 in 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.
2.3 **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 to 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 conceptualised 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. Hence 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, criticising, 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 everyday 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, emphasised in some personality theories, we now
turn to theories that are directly addressed to the specific domain of interpersonal behaviour.

2.4 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-vs-hostility and restrictive-vs-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).

2.5 A 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.

2.6 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!

2.6.1 A 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.

2.7 *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]

2.8 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 recognition, 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.

2.9 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
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, discussed above.
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.

The above limitations have been overcome with reference to Indian Cooperative diary sector by a pioneering study by Arul, M.J. (1995) in which 575 subjects from the sector were studied, of whom 253 were managers and 322 were management students. According to the above investigations, the interpersonal behavior of the Indian cooperative diary managers was found to be characterized most by Inclusion, followed by control and least by openness. He also found that the managers' desire to engage in
successful managers and gender differences in some aspects for the management students.

Whereas the above study has been interesting and revealing, the subjects belong to only one sector by industry namely Diary. Further the actual managers covered were only 253, the rest being management students. It is a well appreciated fact that when a student graduates into a manager, there is a significant change in his behavior orientation by the process of Unfreezing-Change-Refreeing. The Manager of today is no more the student of yesterday. Behavioral aspects which was successful and effective as a member of the student & community is likely to fail as a member of the management team. The present study therefore aims to reveal the interperson's need orientation of managers with special reference to their variation across manager levels and professions. The profession here refers to the various functional specializations like Marketing, Finance, HRM, IT and Production. It may also be interesting to note that we have recently carried out a study on Interpersonal Need Orientation of School Teachers, College Lecturers, Doctors and Defense Officers, using the same instrument of investigation namely FIRO Element-B. (Thomas, T and Rao, Dyakar, T; 2003). The Sample size was around 40 each. It was found that there is significant difference between groups for PEI, PRI, PEC, PRE and WRC.

Thus our present investigation covers the five functional specializations mentioned above. Managers are also subdivided into three levels namely Junior, Middle and Senior. Five levels of experience are also considered for the study.