THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Understanding the Interpersonal Behaviour in Organisations: A Gender Comparative Study

Mridula N. Murthy
Research Scholar, Department of Post Graduation and Research Studies in Psychology
Jain University, Bangalore, India

Abstract:
The current study was titled "A study Interpersonal behaviour in Organisation". It is a comparative study comparing between Men and Women employees working in different private companies in Bangalore, Karnataka, India. The study was conducted on 60 employees consisting 30 men and 30 women. The study was conducted by administering the assessment tool FIRO B to measure the Interpersonal behaviour of the participants included in the study's sample in 12 aspects of interpersonal behaviour measured in the assessment tool. The men and women group were compared using Independent sample T-Test through all the 12 aspects studied. The results suggested that there is no gender difference seen in the interpersonal behaviour portrayed in the workplace.

Keywords: Interpersonal Relationship, Workplace, employees, 12 aspects

1. Introduction
The social process by which people interact and behave in a group environment is called group dynamics. Group dynamics involves the influence of personality, power, and behaviour on the group process.

There are two types of groups: 1) formal groups who are structured to pursue a specific task, and 2) informal groups who emerge naturally in response to organizational or member interests. These interests may include anything from a research group charged with the responsibility to develop a new product to a group of workers who spontaneously come together to improve social or member activities. While we can learn a lot from informal groups in terms of leadership and motivation, we will concentrate mostly on formal groups, characterized by member appointment and delegated authority and responsibility.

Conflict is a problem that occurs at several levels: between organizations; between groups; between members within groups; within an individual and between the multiple roles of a person's life. (Inter-organizational, intergroup, interpersonal; intrapersonal and inter-roles)

The current study looks into the interpersonal relations and behaviour within an organisation between co-workers and aims to spot the gender difference in the interpersonal behaviour of employees in various organisations in India.

2. Review of Literature
A study titled "A within-individual study of interpersonal conflict as a work stressor: Dispositional and situational moderators", by Remus Ilies, Michael D. Johnson, Timothy A. Judge, Jessica Keeney focuses on interpersonal conflict as a work stressor, the authors use a within-subjects research design to examine the effect of conflict episodes on employees' negative affect on the job. The roles of agreeableness and social support in moderating the negative effects of conflict episodes were also examined. It was predicted that the agreeableness and social support influenced individuals' patterns of emotional responses to conflict, such that conflict was more strongly associated with negative affect for agreeable employees, and for those with lower levels of social support at work. Overall, the results suggest that both personality and context significantly moderate the affective implications of interpersonal conflict at work.

Perry Den Brok, Jan Van Tartwijk, Theo Wobbles, Ietje Veldman studied "The differential effect of the teacher–student interpersonal relationship on student outcomes for students with different ethnic backgrounds" Results suggest that the teacher–student relationship is more important for second generation than for first-generation immigrant students

3. Need of the study
Understanding interpersonal behaviour in an organisation in the present scenario especially is very vital because most organisations work on team projects and hence have team building training policies. It is necessary to understand the difference aspects of interpersonal skills, relationships and behaviours in a work environment to have more effective team building and team performance.

The performance of the employees individually of as a part of a team is more when the interpersonal support around them is more. The current study would enable HR managers, Corporate Psychologists, Counsellors and trainers to understand the various aspects and areas that could be looked into to handle any kind of team conflicts or team ice breaking activities.

Current researches and studies imply that positive and satisfactory of relationship maintained in the work place can positively affect the employees' job satisfaction, creates a better organisational climate and environment for the employees, creates a better perception of Quality of Work life in the employees and gives a positive attitude to the employees towards their company and their job as a whole.

4. Objective of the Current Study
- To study the Interpersonal behaviour at work place
- To study all the aspects and constrains of interpersonal behaviour at work place.
- To study whether there is a gender difference in the interpersonal behaviour at work place
- To study whether there is a gender difference all the aspects and constrains of interpersonal behaviour at work place

5. Research Design
The current study is purely quantitative study

5.1. Sampling
The current study consists of the data collected by 60 employees working in a manufacture companies consisting of 30 men and 30 women employees.

6. Assessment Tool Utilised
Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B)

FIRO-B instrument is a personality inventory that measures interpersonal style - how you behave toward others, and what you expect from others in their behaviour toward you.

The FIRO-B instrument measures 3 basic interpersonal needs (Inclusion, Control, and Affection) on 2 dimensions (Expressed and wanted) which combine to derive at 6 aspects of Interpersonal behaviour plus namely Expressed inclusion, Expressed Control Expressed Affection, Wanted Inclusion, Wanted Control and wanted Affection.

The assessment tool also measures , 6 total scores namely total expressed behaviour score that is the sum total of Expressed control, Inclusion and affection ; total wanted behaviour score that is the sum total of all wanted scores; total inclusion score that is the total of both expressed and wanted inclusion scores; total control score that is the sum total of both the control score; total Affection score that is the sum of both the Affection scores and the social interaction index which is the sum total of all the six main aspects of interpersonal behaviour.

	Expressed	**Wanted**
Inclusion	To make an effort to include other people into my group	The need of others to include one as a part of them
Control	To make an effort to have a command and reach out to help others when they need	The need of others to reach out to one when one needs help of command from others.
Affection	To make an effort to behave with warmth with others and make them feel good	The need of others to behave with warmth with one and the need to be made to feel good.

6.1. Typical Uses of FIRO-B instrument include
- Team Building/Development: to identify sources of tension or incompatibility.
- Leadership Style: improving decision-making, conflict resolution, communication, trust, and coaching effectiveness.
- Personal/Individual Development: career development, personal growth and self-awareness.
- Interpersonal Relationship Counselling: to identify sources of dissatisfaction and incompatibility.
- Selection and Placement: in association with other measures it is useful for structuring interviews and assessing interpersonal style.

6.2. Validity and Reliability
The norm sample for the FIRO-B instrument includes a U.S. national sample of 3,091 individuals who took the assessment in 1997 (Hammer & Schnell, 2000). In examining the internal consistency reliability of each measure for the national sample, results indicate that reliability coefficients for all measures are satisfactory, ranging from .85 to .96. Test-retest reliability coefficients also demonstrate good reliability—ranging from .71 to .85—for three different samples reported in the FIRO-B Technical Guide (Hammer & Schnell, 2000).

Research results also support the validity of the instrument. A number of studies have shown the FIRO-B assessment to be related to measures of leadership (e.g., Fiedler's Least Preferred Co-worker scale, -.43 to .46), personal value such as community service (.05 to .27), and relationships/friendships (-.03 to .27) (Hammer & Schnell, 2000).

6.3. General Procedure and Analysis of Data
The current study was conducted on 60 employees, 30 men and 30 women who work in corporate set up by administrating the standardised tool, FIRO-B to measure the interpersonal behaviour in organisation.
The data will be analysed through quantitative techniques, utilising basic descriptive statistics and t test to spot the gender difference.

7. Results and Discussion
The assessment tool used in the current study contains 6 constrains to measure the Interpersonal behaviour of the participants namely, Expressed Inclusion, Wanted Inclusion, Expressed Control, Wanted Control, Expressed Affection and Wanted Affection. The total expressed behaviour score that is the sum total of Expressed control, Inclusion and affection, total wanted behaviour score that is the sum total of all wanted scores, total inclusion score that is the total of both expressed and wanted inclusion scores, total control score that is the sum total of both the control score, total Affection score that is the sum of both the Affection scores and the social interaction index which is the sum total of scores in all the 6 constrains measured in the assessment, are also calculated in every participants and the gender differences are see through all the sub constrains of the interpersonal behaviour assessment.

	Gender	N	Mean	Interpretation
Expressive Inclusion	men	30	4.76	Average
	women	30	5.16	Average
wanted inclusion	men	30	4.83	Average
	women	30	5.13	Average
expressed controlled	men	30	5.26	Average
	women	30	5.43	Average
wanted control	men	30	5.46	Average
	women	30	5.76	Average
Expressed Affection	men	30	5.73	Average
	women	30	5.56	Average
Wanted affection	men	30	5.30	Average
	women	30	5.43	Average
Total Inclusion	men	30	9.60	Low
	women	30	10.30	Average
Total control	men	30	10.73	Average
	women	30	11.20	Average
Total Affection	men	30	11.03	Average
	women	30	11.00	Average
Total Expressed Behaviour	men	30	15.76	High
	women	30	16.16	High
Total wanted behaviour	men	30	15.60	High
	women	30	16.33	High
social interaction Index	men	30	31.36	Average
	women	30	32.50	Average

Table 1

The table 1 shows the mean and interpretation of the scores obtained by men and women in all constrains measured in the current study.
It is seen in table 1 that there is not much difference in the mean scores obtained by men and women in any of constrains and aspects of interpersonal relations measured in the current study.
The interpretation of the mean scores obtained by both men and women as seen in table 1 is that in most of the aspects of interpersonal behaviour measured in the current study, both men and women are interpreted average that is they are neither too high or too low in most of the aspects of interpersonal behaviour they maintain in their workplace. The mean interpretation of the total inclusion behaviour shown by men is low whereas that shown by the women is average Though there is a difference in gender in the interpretation here, statistically there is no difference in this aspect of interpersonal behaviour which will be seen in the later part of the analysis and discussion.
The mean interpretation of the total expressed and wanted behaviours shown by both men and women are high.

The gender difference was measured by SPSS, utilising independent sample t test through all constrains measured calculated in the current study.

F value	Significance
0.141	0.709

Table 2: Expressed Inclusion (EI)

Table 2 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in EI behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in EI is more than 0.05 which means there is no significant gender difference in the EI behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in how a man or a woman would make efforts to include others into their group both formally and informally in their workplace.

F value	Significance
0.158	0.692

Table 3: Wanted Inclusion (WI)

Table 3 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in WI behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in WI is more than 0.05 which means there is no significant gender difference in the WI behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in how a man or a woman would expect others to make efforts to include them into their formal or informal group in their workplace.

F value	Significance
0.011	0.918

Table 4: Expressed Control (EC)

Table 4 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in EC behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in EC is more than 0.05 which means there is no significant gender difference in the EC behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in how a man or a woman would make efforts to help and give feedback to others in their workplace.

F value	Significance
0.715	0.401

Table 5: Wanted Control (WC)

Table 5 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in WC behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in WC is more than 0.05 which means there is no significant gender difference in the WC behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in how a man or a woman would expect others to make efforts to help them and give them feedback in their workplace.

F value	Significance
0.107	0.744

Table 6: Expressed Affection (EA)

Table 6 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in EA behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in EA is more than 0.05 which means there is no

significant gender difference in the EA behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in how a man or a woman would make an effort to behave with warmth with others and make them feel good in their workplace.

F value	Significance
0.853	0.360

Table 7: Wanted Affection (WA)

Table 7 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in WA behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in WA is more than 0.05 which means there is no significant gender difference in the WA behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in how a man or a woman would expect others to make an effort to behave with warmth with them and make them feel good in their workplace.

F value	Significance
0.000	0.984

Table 8: Total Inclusion (TI)

Table 8 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in TI behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in TI is more than 0.05 which means there is no significant gender difference in the TI behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in a man's or a woman's total behaviour of including and expecting to be included in formal and informal groups at their workplace.

F value	Significance
0.107	0.744

Table 9: Total Control (TC)

Table 9 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in TC behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in TC is more than 0.05 which means there is no significant gender difference in the TC behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in a man's or a woman's total behaviour of helping and giving feedback to others and expecting the same from others at their workplace.

F value	Significance
0.009	0.926

Table 10: Total Affection (TA)

Table 10 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in TA behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in TA is more than 0.05 which means there is no significant gender difference in the TA behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in a man's or a woman's total behaviour of making others feel warm and being friendly to others and expecting the same from others at their workplace.

F value	Significance
0.191	0.663

Table 11: Total Expressed

Table 11 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in TE behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in TE is more than 0.05 which means there is no

significant gender difference in the TE behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in a man's or a woman's total behaviour making efforts to make others feel included, helped and friendly at their workplace.

F value	Significance
0.002	0.963

Table 12: Total Wanted (TW)

Table 12 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in TW behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in TW is more than 0.05 which means there is no significant gender difference in the TW behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in a man's or a woman's total behaviour of expecting to be made feel included, helped and friendly at their workplace.

F value	Significance
0.051	0.823

Table 13: Social Interaction Index (SII)

Table 13 shows the F value and the sig value obtained in the independent sample t test utilised to statistically check the gender difference in SII behaviour shown by men and women in their work place. The significance value was checked for having 0.05 significance-level. As it is observed in the table, the significance value obtained in SII is more than 0.05 which means there is no significant gender difference in the SII behaviour portrayed in the workplace. That is, there is no significant difference in a man's or a woman's total behaviour of making efforts to make others feel included, helped and friendly and expecting the same in their workplace.

8. Conclusion
- The interpersonal relationship at workplace was studies in 12 aspects.
- The gender difference was studied in all the 12 aspects of interpersonal relationships at workplace.
- No gender difference was seen in any of the aspects nor in over all the interpersonal behaviour at workplace

9. Implications of the Study
- The current study can help in team building processes in companies when the employees' interpersonal behaviours are understood in all the 12 aspects measured in the current study
- The current study can help in understanding the group dynamics in organisations and reasons of conflicts and poor interpersonal behaviour within the team/ organisation can be understood using the measurement tool FIRO-B

10. References
1. Brok P.D, Jan Van Tartwijk, Theo Wobbles, Ietje Veldman (2010), "The differential effect of the teacher–student interpersonal relationship on student outcomes for students with different ethnic backgrounds", British Journal of Educational Psychology, 80: 2, 199–221.
2. Formal and Informal group, Factors affecting group performance, group conflict
   http://www.learningace.com/doc/2474314/c9a9d83f177d3fe6034765dcb109150a/chapter13
3. Group dynamics, group structure and team formation,
   http://www.ibrd.gov.nl.ca/regionaldev/CCB/Group_Dynamics/CCB_GroupDynamicsGuide.pdf
4. Ilies R, Michael D. Johnson, Timothy A. Judge, Jessica Keeney (2011) "A within-individual study of interpersonal conflict as a work stressor: Dispositional and situational moderators", Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32:1, 44–64
5. Newstorm JW, Organisational Behaviour- human behaviour at work
6. Schultz D and Schultz SE, Psychology and Work Today