

SOUTH ASIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT RESEARCH (SAJMR)

Volume 3 Number 1

January 2011

Contents

Editorial

- Personality Mapping: Tool to understand interpersonal need and enhance performance: Dr. Ekta Sharma** 138
- Effect of future trading on spot price volatility for NSE Nifty using time series regression and GARCH model: Dr. Neha Parashar, Amey Karambelkar, Tarang Jibhate, Manit Goyal, Aditi Kulkarni, Puneet S. Deshpande** 148
- Impact of Irrigation on Cotton Cultivation in Kurnool District (A.P.): Dr. K. Visweswara Reddy and Prof. K. Satyanarayana Reddy** 160
- Satisfaction of ATM card users with reference to Gujarat : Dr. J. M. Badiyani** 168
- A STUDY OF JOB STRESS AND ITS IMPACT ON JOB ATTITUDE : Dr. V. S. Dhekale** 180
- CASE STUDY**
- The Landscape Resorts Limited (A), Barnabas N. and Nandakumar Mekoth** 196
- BOOK REVIEW**
- Never Stop Learning : Straight Talk from the World's Top Business Leaders (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2010)** 199



**Chh. Shahu Institute of Business
Education and Research (SIBER)**

(An Autonomous Institute)

Kolhapur - 416 004, Maharashtra State, INDIA

SOUTH ASIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT RESEARCH (SAJMR)

ISSN 0974-763X

(An International Peer Reviewed Research Journal)



Published by

Chh. Shahu Institute of Business Education & Research (SIBER)
University Road, Kolhapur - 416 004, Maharashtra, India

Contact: 91-231-2535706 / 07 Fax: 91-231-2535708 Website: www.siberindia.co.in, Email: sajmr@siberindia.co.in, sibersajmr@gmail.com

■ *Patron*

Late Dr. A.D. Shinde

■ *Editor*

Dr. Babu Thomas
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

■ *Editorial Board*

Dr. Francisco J.L.S. Diniz
CETRAD, Portugal

Dr. R.V. Kulkarni
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. R.A. Shinde
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. Paul B. Carr
Regent University, USA

Dr. M.M. Ali
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. Lal Das
RSSW, Hyderabad, India

Dr. M. Nand Kumar
Goa University, Goa, India

Dr. Babu Zachariah
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. Gary Owens
CERAR, Australia

Dr. K. Pradeepkumar
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. R.M. Bhajracharya
Kathmandu University, Nepal

Dr. P.R. Puranik
NMU, Jalgaon, India

Prof. K.R.R. Mahanama
Colombo University, Sri Lanka

Dr. Yogesh B. Patil
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. Rajendra Naragundkar
IFIM, Bangalore, India

Dr. K.V.M. Varambally
Manipal Institute of Management, India

Dr. R.L. Hyderabad
Karnataka University, India

Dr. B.U. Dhandra
Gulbarga University, India

Dr. T.V.G. Sarma
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Academic Assistance

Mr. V. Ravi Kishore Kumar
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

In the last issue of South Asian Journal of Management Research, in the editorial note I mentioned about humor. Humor can increase the happiness and reduce the stress.

Stress is most vulnerable condition in the organization because experts as well as non-experts are handling the stress situation of the employees. Some scientists still argue that they know little about stress whereas many people claim that they know everything about stress. And the result is handling the stress improperly.

Job stress has several impacts on individual employee and organization. Most of the employees in modern organization experience stress. It can have a damaging effect on employee, especially managers. It can affect the effectiveness of the organization as well as employees. The problem of stress is very much relevant of change that is spreading across the globe in all the fields. The employees are unable to cope of with changes. Organizations are doing little to handle the change process. For any organizational process the change must be helping the employees in improving the ability of organization to cope up with the change in its environment.

Lazarus's view on stress is that an individual perception of the psychological situation is the critical factors for stress. It includes potential harms, threats, and challenges on one hand, and on another an individuals ability to cope with them. The ability or inability to cope with stress is the perceived ability of an individual. Coping strategy differs from individual to individual in a different manner.

Less research is available on coping strategies of stress. Readers can contribute research articles on coping strategies of stress.

Dr. Babu Thomas
Editor

Personality Mapping: Tool to Understand Interpersonal need and Enhance Performance

Dr. Ekta Sharma^{1*}

^{1*}Amrut Mody School of Management, Ahmedabad University.

*Email: ektas55@rediffmail.com

Abstract: The personality of an individual is a clue to his interpersonal needs. Identifying the type of personality might help organizations to map their employees' needs. This is a well known fact that every individual have different needs and if they are fulfilled, he is motivated enough to perform. The sample of the study is the future workforce i.e. students pursuing business management course. The study reveals that there is close relationship between personality & interpersonal needs.

Keywords: Personality Mapping, Neuroticism, extraversion, interpersonal needs, agreeableness, conscientiousness.

1. Introduction

Human being is highly social in his behavior. He interacts with people around him in a wide variety of ways, ranging from just being together to most intimate forms of socializing. People seek company to avoid being alone, to confabulate, to ask for as well as to offer help, to accomplish common goals, to share joys and sorrows, to listen and to be listened to, to show or to be shown the way, to show off, compete or fight with one another, etc. These interactions are referred to as interpersonal (between persons) behavior. Due to this interpersonal behavior arise the interpersonal needs i.e. what does one expect from others or from oneself?

The personality of an individual is a clue to his interpersonal needs. Identifying the type of personality might help organizations to map their employees' needs. This is a well known fact that every individual have different needs and if they are fulfilled, he is motivated enough to perform. The sample of the study is the future workforce i.e. students pursuing business management course. The study reveals that there is close relationship between personality & interpersonal needs.

Many empirical studies have investigated the relations between Interpersonal needs and the Big Five personality factors. Measures include the Big Five Inventory (BFI: Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991)

and FIRO-B. In a study of personality and interpersonal resources, a total of 399 students pursuing MBA, have completed the Big Five Inventory, a personality measure, and the FIRO-B, a measure of interpersonal resources. Sayles (1964) suggests that administration involves virtually constant contact with people, and managers whose personalities do not dispose them toward a high amount of interpersonal activity are likely to be frustrated and dissatisfied. Thus it seems appropriate to examine the interpersonal needs of potential managers i.e. Management students.

2. Literature review

The paper entitled "Psychometric Correlates of FIRO-B Scores: Locating the FIRO-B scores in personality factor space" by Furnham, Adrian investigated the relationship between the six Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation (FIRO)-B scales, the Big Five Personality traits assessed by the NEO PI-R, the Hogan Development Survey (HDS) and two measures of cognitive ability (Watson Glaser; Graduate and Managerial Assessment). It studied the concurrent and construct validity of the measure in various adult groups attending assessment centres in order to locate the FIRO-B dimensions in established personality factor space. The FIRO-B was consistently correlated with Extraversion, though analysis at the primary factor level reflects many traits from all

five factors were strongly correlated with the six FIRO-B scores. The regression of the six FIRO-B facets onto each of the Big Five shows that all are significant particularly for Expressed Inclusion and Wanted Control. The second study also showed considerable and logical overlap between the six FIRO-B scales and the 11 dysfunctional personality strategies as measured by the HDS.

The study entitled "Interpersonal needs & vocational specialization among female business students" was conducted by Raymond E. Hill. This study examined interpersonal needs as measured by the FIRO-B instrument in relation to choice of functional specialty among a sample of female business students. The results indicated a significant relationship between total need for interpersonal interaction and choice of specialty, with personnel majors preferring more active interpersonal relations and finance majors preferring less active, more distant personal relations.

Another study titled "Relationships between Interpersonal needs & preference for a functional area of management among MBA students" was conducted by Raymond E. Hill. This study also examined interpersonal needs as measured by the FIRO-B instrument in relation to choice of functional specialty among a sample of first year MBA students. The research shows that the most influential dimensions are the needs related to affection & inclusion. The need for control is not related to preference for functional areas.

Sullivan (1953) redefined personality itself as an interpersonal phenomenon. He viewed "personality" as a relatively stable pattern of interpersonal behaviors arising from interactions with others, especially during critical developmental periods. Sullivan argued that interpersonal skills and the sense of identity can develop from human interactions. He asserted that interpersonal skills arise from individuals' reactions to an innate drive to reduce anxiety. This global, undifferentiated drive becomes transformed through maturity and experience to become more focused as differentiated needs for security and satisfaction. Empathy is a central component of socialization, as a skill for evaluating others' needs and abilities. An individual who fails to

master the distinctions among social identity, power, and love is at substantial risk for the development of pathological relationships.

As fields of research, personality (with its intrapersonal emphasis), and interpersonal relations (emphasizing dimensions of interaction among individuals) are both maturing as alternative, yet complimentary, foci of individual differences. Personality, from the purely psychometric view of factor models, has tended to focus on a small number of predispositions, resulting in the increasingly prominent Five Factor Model (FFM; Costa & McCrae, 1985; 1992; Wiggins, 1996). This perspective views the internal, more-or-less stable behavioral predispositions, as orthogonal dimensions of personality which have been labeled Extraversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness. The Big Five model was the basis for Basic Factors Inventory (John & Srivastva, 1999), a 44-item measure of extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness. The model has not only achieved a certain bedrock status by its scope and apparent robustness, but has the virtue of substantive convergent support from lexical, symbolic-interactionist and dyadic-interactional perspectives, each lending individual support to, and ultimately mutually validating, the factors (Wiggins, 1996).

The measurement of interpersonal constructs presents a more intricate problem. The assessment of interpersonal behaviors is more complex than that of personality. For most purposes, the personality is conceived as static—a person is more or less the same as he or she was yesterday, and will presumably be very similar to his or her personality tomorrow. Measurement of interpersonal behavior requires that the person be viewed as interacting in a number of different situations. Insight into this perspective was provided by early analyses of group behavior (Lewin, 1947), in which it was argued that there are dimensions of interpersonal behavior that cannot be predicted by personality measures alone. This argument was further supported by Cattell (1948), who asserted that there was an interpersonal component of "syntality" that arose from interpersonal interaction. Syntality could not be

predicted directly from measured personality traits. Instead, it was a distinct and relationship-specific phenomenon.

While researchers such as Leary (1957) and Kiesler (1996) have tended to focus on two-dimensional interpersonal models, there remains the issue of the minimum number of dimensions that actually exist. There is general agreement that the dimension of Dominance-Submissiveness is well established. However, there is considerable disagreement as to the components of positive and negative emotional aspects of interaction, since it is possible to interpret the dimension of positive and negative interactions as reflecting the existence of an additional component. Schutz (1958) advanced the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation (FIRO) system. Schutz posited the existence of three basic dimensions of behavior. "Control" reflects the person's dominance in the interaction--an individual elevated in Control tends to direct, lead, or manipulates the relationship; those persons low in Control tend to emit patterns of behavior that facilitate others to initiate dominance. Schutz made a critical distinction between two components of interaction involving the definition of an individual's role in a relationship. "Inclusion" addresses the issue of personal significance in an interaction. A person elevated in inclusion is recognized as positively or negatively significant in an interaction. The third dimension is "Affection," a measure of the positive or negative emotional aspects of a relationship. Individuals elevated in Affection are emotionally bound to the relationship; those low in affection have little emotional investment in the relationship.

Schutz (1958) defined each of these three relational components as having two distinct tactical operations. Each aspect has an "Expressed" component and a "Wanted" component. Inclusion Expressed (IE) behaviors signify a desire to be a member of a relationship. Inclusion Wanted (IW) behaviors are internal desires to be included by another. If the person is socially competent, he or she will manifest appropriate matches in Expressed and Wanted aspects. Problems arise, however, for the individual who lacks the interpersonal skills to match Wanted and Expressed needs.

Interpersonal incompetence arises from a disjunction in the level of expression versus wanting of a component.

The literature is mixed regarding evidence for the tripartite distinction posited by Schutz (1958). The three-dimensional model was developed by a careful analysis of self-reports. However, other researchers have failed to support a distinction between Inclusion and Affection (Gough & Bradley, 1996). This issue is further complicated by the subtleties inherent in assessment; indeed, a major paper argues that the failure to cross-validate personality or interpersonal measures founders on the actual structure of the language itself (Hofstead, DeRaad & Goldberg, 1992). Thus, the direct comparison of dimensions across linguistic communities presents problems.

The current study was conducted to explore the relationship between two established models of individual differences. The personality-within model was represented by the Big Five measure; the personality-between models was represented by the FIRO-B model. It was hypothesized that the two approaches would have common variance in some areas, but that unique dimensions of behavior would emerge for each measure.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study has been undertaken to find out the relation between personality & the interpersonal needs.

4. Objective

The objective of the research is to analyze the impact of personality traits on the interpersonal needs and hence coining the term "Personality Mapping" as the tool to analyze these needs.

5. Participants

The participants of the study were of MBA students. 274 male and 125 female students were considered for the present study. Out of these 236 belong to, general category and 163 to reserved category. The sample distribution as per area of specialization is as follows: Finance specialization 199, marketing specialization 133 & Human resource specialization 67.

6. Materials

6.1 BIG FIVE

The Big Five Inventory consists of 44 items aggregately measuring five independent dimensions. Extraversion has 8 items, of which 3 are reverse-scored. Agreeableness and Conscientiousness are each represented by 9 items, including 4 reversals, for each scale. Neuroticism has 8 items, with 3 reversals; Openness has 10 items, 2 reversed.

The five factor model of personality focuses upon those behaviors that one expresses while dealing with people, changing circumstances and the environment. The two remaining behavioral dimensions relate to work and depression situations. The five big personality tests measure intensity of one's behaviors in these five areas.

6.1.1 Factor 1: Agreeableness (A)

How does one react to others' opinions? When you agree to them easily, you are considered agreeable. However, your strong reactions qualify you as challenger in the words of Howard and Howard (2001).

6.1.1.2 A Higher Degree in 'A'

The five factor model of personality considers one as good natured, sympathetic and forgiving, tolerant, agreeable and courteous. They prove to be an excellent team member. They strive to bring harmony amongst their mates. They are friendlier, approachable and appeasing. They can ignore their own needs for others'.

6.1.1.3 A Lower Degree in 'A'

Five factor model of personality considers them as critical, analytical and tough. They are expressive in their opinions. They don't hide their reactions. They want their efforts and achievements to be acknowledged. They can challenge & are born leader.

6.1.2 Factor 2: Openness to Change (O)

Five factor model of personality considers one open for change when one accepts new thoughts, ideas and changes.

However, one is considered close to change when one avoids new experiments and follows rules and regulations very strictly.

6.1.2.1 A Higher Degree in 'O'

The person high on this variable is considered as

original, creative and curious. For them change is more than essential for social evolution & hence they love revolutions. They enjoy complexities of things and strive to find out the solutions. They can handle new systems, technologies and tools with great ease.

6.1.2.2 A Lower Degree in 'O'

They are resistant to change and traditional. They love peaceful environment, secure jobs and serene family life. They spend a lot of time on details and can execute plans very well.

6.1.3 Factor 3: Extraversion (E)

Five factor model of personality considers that their preferred way to handle their environment is very important.

6.1.3.1 A Higher Degree in 'E'

They are social, friendlier and talkative, often assertive and energetic. They are charismatic & prefer to lead others.

6.1.3.2 A Lower Degree in 'E'

They are considered private, serious, quiet and skeptic and don't rely on others easily.

6.1.4 Factor 4: Conscientiousness (C)

How do you take your work?

6.1.4.1 A Higher Degree in 'C'

As per the five factors model of personality they are considered as an organized, focused and timely achiever of their goals. They tend to be workaholic and are self-disciplined, confident, dutiful and reliable.

6.1.4.2 A Lower Degree in 'C'

They are careless, relaxed and unorganized. They don't plan things and pursue their goals with a flexible approach.

6.1.5 Factor 5: Neuroticism (N)

How do you handle depression?

6.1.5.1 A Higher Degree in 'N'

The five factor model considers such people as nervous, unstable and vulnerable to negative emotionality. They are never satisfied with their life. They are reactive and often fail to recover from depression shock easily.

6.1.5.2 A Lower Degree in 'N'

They are emotionally stable, strong nerved and composed person. They are often calm and optimist.

7. FIRO-B

The FIRO-B is a 54-item instrument that measures six dimensions of an individual's behavior toward others: (a) Expressed Inclusion (eI), (b) Expressed Control (eC), (c) Expressed Affection (eA), (d) Wanted Inclusion (wI), (e) Wanted Control (wC), and (f) Wanted Affection (wA). This instrument can be self-administered and also requires approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Schutz (1967) originally developed the tool in the late 1950s to predict how military personnel would work together in groups. He first described his creation in his book, *FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior* (Schutz, 1958). Ideas from the works of three distinguished psychologists—T. W. Adorno, Erich Fromm, and Wilfred Bion—are incorporated in the theory that underlies the FIRO-B (Schnell & Hammer, 1993, 2004).

Based on a simple model, the FIRO-B proposes that individuals are motivated by three interpersonal needs:

1. *Inclusion (I)*: a need to maintain relationships with others, to be included in their activities, or to include them in the activities of the individual.
2. *Control (C)*: a need to maintain a balance of power and influence in relationships.
3. *Affection (A)*: a need to form personal alliances with others (Schnell & Hammer, 1993, 2004).

Additionally, Schutz (1978) proposed that two dimensions of each need can be identified:

(a) The extent to which individuals are likely to *express* the associated interpersonal behaviors toward others and (b) the extent to which individuals *want* to receive those same interpersonal behaviors from others (Hammer & Schnell, 2000). The interactions between interpersonal needs and *expressed* and *wanted* behaviors form the six subscales (Schutz, 1978) that are measured from the individual's responses to each of the included statements. A client's responses to the FIRO-B yields 12 scores that are examined when interpreting the FIRO-B profile:

- Six individual "cell" scores.
- One Overall Need score.
- Two Total Behavior scores.
- Three Total Need scores (Hammer & Schnell, 2000).

The individual's scores are aggregated across the rows to obtain Total Expressed Behavior and Total Wanted Behavior scores, down each column for the Total Need scores, and over all of the individual cells to provide an Overall Need score (Schnell & Hammer, 1993, 2004). Scores in the six individual cells are estimates of "how much" each of the interpersonal dimensions is characteristic of the test-taker (Schnell & Hammer, 1993, 2004).

The general interpretation of the FIRO-B *individual* cell scores is as follows (Schnell & Hammer, 1993, 2004):

- *0 to 2 (Low)*: the behaviors are not characteristic of the test-taker.
- *3 to 6 (Medium)*: the behaviors are periodically a noticeable characteristic.
- *7 to 9 (High)*: the behaviors are frequently a noticeable characteristic of the test-taker.

The Overall Need score (Overall Need = eI + wI + eC + wC + eA + wA) represents the overall strength of an individual's interpersonal needs (Hammer & Schnell, 2000). It shows how much a person believes that other people and intimate interaction can be a source of goal attainment and personal achievement (Schnell & Hammer, 1993, 2004). Higher scores indicate that a person is extensively involved with others, whereas lower scores indicate less interpersonal liaisons (Schnell & Hammer, 1993, 2004). The scores are generally interpreted as follows (Hammer & Schnell, 2000):

- *0 to 15 (Low)*: Interactions with others are minimal sources of need satisfaction.
- *16 to 26 (Medium-Low)*: Once in a while interactions with others are sources of satisfaction.
- *27 to 38 (Medium-High)*: Interactions with others are usually sources of satisfaction.
- *39 to 54 (High)*: Interactions with others are

Control, EA for Expressed Affection and WA for Wanted Affection.

7. Procedure

All items for both instruments were scored on a 5-point continuum where "1" indicated complete disagreement and "5" indicated complete agreement. Pearson correlation coefficients were computed on the combined matrix of the 6 FIRO-B and 5 BFI scales.

8. Hypothesis

1. People high on Expressed variable are extroverts. As extroverts are those who are social and talkative, it infers that they are being able to express themselves.
2. People with higher need for inclusion are agreeable. This conjecture is taken as it seems obvious that if someone works in group, he needs to be tolerant.
3. People high on Wanted variable are high on neuroticism. Those who can't express themselves but have desires and if they are not understood by others they become emotionally unstable.

9. Data Analysis

9.1 Hypothesis testing (Table 2)

1. People high on Expressed variable are extroverts.

Expressed and extraversion are positively correlated (.296). Hence, the hypothesis is accepted.

2. People with higher need for inclusion are agreeable.

The study rejects the hypothesis, as there is no significant correlation between the need for inclusion and agreeableness.

3. People high on Wanted variable are high on neuroticism.

The correlation between wanted and neuroticism is 0.212, which is significant. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted.

The other observations are: (Table 2)

- A clear pattern emerged in the relations among the FIRO scales. The correlations between the Affection and Inclusion measures were quite strong (.423). In addition, the Wanted and Expressed levels

of both Affection and Inclusion were highly correlated (.377 for affection and .287 for inclusion). Thus, participants did not seem to distinguish affection from inclusion, and seemed to desire and express similar amounts of these relationship dimensions.

- EI is significantly related with WI (.371), WA (.287), extraversion (.294), Agreeableness (.155) and Conscientiousness (.156).
- EC is significantly related with EA (.135), WI (.326) and WC (.112). It is negatively correlated to Agreeableness (-0.107)
- EA have positive correlations with WI (.188), WC (.273), WA (.393) and extraversion (.197)
- Expressed is positively correlated to Extraversion (.296), Conscientiousness (.139).
- WI has positive correlation with WC (.243), WA (.331). But there is no significant correlation with any of the Big 5 factors.
- WC is related to WA (.265), extraversion (.203), Agreeableness (.187) and conscientiousness (.164), neuroticism (.346), openness (.117)
- WA is related with extraversion (.213), Agreeableness (.129) and conscientiousness (.103).
- Wanted has significant correlation with extraversion (.178), Agreeableness (.129) and conscientiousness (.121), neuroticism (.212)
- Inclusion is related with extraversion (.144)
- Control has significant correlation with extraversion (.203) and conscientiousness (.150), neuroticism (.273)
- Affect have correlations with extraversion (.755), Agreeableness (.598) and conscientiousness (.659), neuroticism (.433), openness (.602)

10. Discussion

The research proves that people with need for affection are extroverts (.755), Agreeable (.598) and conscientious (.659), neurotic (.433) and

open to learn new things (.602)

The study shows that EI is significantly related with big 5 traits. People high on EI are high on extraversion (.294). This is apt as we know those who can express their need for inclusion are those who are sociable and talkative. Such people are also high on Agreeableness (.155), as to form a group or team one has to agree with other members too. EC is negatively correlated to Agreeableness (-0.107), which strengthens the argument that people who want to control others are despots, as they try to impose rather than work by consensus. The relationship between EA and WA (.393) proves the well known saying "affection is a give & take relationship". People who can express their feelings are extroverts (.197).

Thus if one can express his need, he is high on Extraversion (.296)

The research shows that people high on WC are extroverts (.203). But this correlation is not too high, as those who want to be controlled by others can't be considered extrovert in true sense. The relation with

Agreeableness (.187) seems apt as if others control you, and then you have to be agreeable. The interesting relation exists between the want for control and neuroticism (.346), which means that such people are more emotionally unstable.

Thus, if one has want but can't express, he becomes emotionally unstable but is ready to follow the rules of others.

11. Conclusion

The results of the research are similar to the earlier research as it proves that FIRO-B factors are correlated with the Big-five factors. The interpersonal needs can predict the personality of the individual. All individual have interpersonal needs but all the needs are not dominant. If the dominant need is identified, the organizations can motivate the individual by satisfying his dominant need. So, the analysis of both i.e. interpersonal needs and the personality can help the organizations to find the Person- job fit and also help them in understanding the motivational aspects of the individual.

References

- Cattell, R. B. (1948). Concepts and methods in the measurement of group syntality. *Psychological Review*, 55, 48-63.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McRae R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McRae R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 887-898.
- Furnham, Adrian .Psychometric Correlates of FIRO-B Scores: Locating the FIRO-B scores in personality factor space. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Volume 16, Number 1, March 2008 , pp. 30-45(16). Blackwell Publishing
- Gough, H. G. & Bradley, P. (1996). *CPI manual*. (3rd ed). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Hofstee, W.B.K., DeRaad, B., and Goldberg, L. R. (1992). Integration of the Big Five and the circumplex approaches to trait structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 146-163.
- John, O. P., & Srivastva, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O.P. John, (eds.). *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford.
- Kiesler, D.J. (1996). *Contemporary interpersonal theory and research: Personality, psychopathology and psychotherapy*. New York: Wiley.
- Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality*. New York: Ronald.
- Lewin, K. (1945). *Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science*.

Human Relations, 1, 5-41.

Mischel, W. & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system of personality: Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics and invariances in personality structure. *Psychological Review*, 102(2), 246-268.

Sayles, L.R. (1964). *Managerial Behaviour*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.

Schutz, W.C. (1958). *FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal relations*. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Sharma, Ekta. (2011). Interpersonal needs of Management students: facilitator in the choice of electives at MBA course- The empirical study. *Indain journal of applied Psychology*

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York: Norton.

Wiggins, J. S. (ed.). (1996). *The Five-Factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives*. New York: Guilford.

List of Tables

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
EI	399	5.61	2.024
EC	399	4.40	2.342
EA	399	3.75	2.242
expressed	399	13.68	4.213
WI	399	4.08	2.786
WC	399	4.53	2.482
WA	399	2.94	1.960
wanted	399	11.58	5.256
Inclusion	399	9.69	4.005
ctrl	399	8.93	3.599
affect	399	13.72	6.984
Total	399	32.38	11.434
Extro	399	21.89	9.251
Agree	399	26.69	11.061
conscient	399	25.46	10.451
Neuroticism	396	19.06	7.399
Open	396	26.85	12.686
Valid N (listwise)	396		

Table 2. Correlations

		EI	EC	EA	expressed	WI	WC	WA	wanted	Inclusion	ctrl	affect	Total	Extr	Agree	conscient	Neuroticism	Open
EI	Pearson Correlation	1	.060	.062	.587 **	.371 **	.093	.287 **	.358 **	.763 **	.103 *	.425 **	.549 **	.294 **	.155 **	.156 **	-.002	.057
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.232	.219	.000	.000	.064	.000	.000	.000	.040	.000	.000	.000	.002	.002	.961	.258
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
EC	Pearson Correlation	.060	1	.135 **	.655 **	.326 **	.112 *	.023	.240 **	.257 **	.728 **	.260 **	.472 **	.097	-.107 *	.056	.056	.007
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.232		.007	.000	.000	.025	.643	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.054	.033	.262	.263	.892
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
EA	Pearson Correlation	.062	.135 **	1	.599 **	.188 **	.273 **	.393 **	.379 **	.162 **	.276 **	.525 **	.466 **	.197 **	.046	.089	-.046	.062
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.219	.007		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.361	.077	.362	.215
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
expressed	Pearson Correlation	.587 **	.655 **	.599 **	1	.477 **	.257 **	.377 **	.524 **	.629 **	.604 **	.646 **	.797 **	.296 **	.024	.139 **	-.024	.046
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.634	.005	.628	.358
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
WI	Pearson Correlation	.371 **	.326 **	.188 **	.477 **	1	.243 **	.331 **	.778 **	.883 **	.380 **	.299 **	.609 **	-.006	-.025	.003	.043	-.080
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.899	.624	.959	.389	.110
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
WC	Pearson Correlation	.093	.112 *	.273 **	.257 **	.243 **	1	.265 **	.699 **	.216 **	.763 **	.387 **	.548 **	.203 **	.187 **	.164 **	.346 **	.117 *
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.064	.025	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.020
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
WA	Pearson Correlation	.287 **	.023	.393 **	.377 **	.331 **	.265 **	1	.670 **	.375 **	.198 **	.566 **	.533 **	.213 **	.129 **	.103 *	.058	-.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.643	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.010	.039	.251	.976
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
wanted	Pearson Correlation	.358 **	.240 **	.379 **	.524 **	.778 **	.699 **	.670 **	1	.722 **	.638 **	.559 **	.789 **	.178 **	.129 **	.121 *	.212 **	.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.010	.015	.000	.754
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
Inclusion	Pearson Correlation	.763 **	.257 **	.162 **	.629 **	.883 **	.216 **	.375 **	.722 **	1	.316 **	.423 **	.701 **	.144 **	.061	.081	.029	-.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.004	.222	.107	.566	.591
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
ctrl	Pearson Correlation	.103 *	.728 **	.276 **	.604 **	.380 **	.763 **	.198 **	.638 **	.316 **	1	.436 **	.685 **	.203 **	.059	.150 **	.273 **	.084
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.040	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.239	.003	.000	.095
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
affect	Pearson Correlation	.425 **	.260 **	.525 **	.646 **	.299 **	.387 **	.566 **	.559 **	.423 **	.436 **	1	.892 **	.755 **	.598 **	.659 **	.433 **	.602 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
Total	Pearson Correlation	.549 **	.472 **	.466 **	.797 **	.609 **	.548 **	.533 **	.789 **	.701 **	.685 **	.892 **	1	.570 **	.401 **	.473 **	.354 **	.379 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
Extr	Pearson Correlation	.294 **	.097	.197 **	.296 **	-.006	.203 **	.213 **	.178 **	.144 **	.203 **	.755 **	.570 **	1	.754 **	.822 **	.518 **	.820 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.054	.000	.000	.899	.000	.000	.000	.004	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
Agree	Pearson Correlation	.155 **	-.107 *	.046	.024	-.025	.187 **	.129 **	.129 **	.061	.059	.598 **	.401 **	.754 **	1	.836 **	.531 **	.832 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.033	.361	.634	.624	.000	.010	.010	.222	.239	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
conscient	Pearson Correlation	.156 **	.056	.089	.139 **	.003	.164 **	.103 *	.121 *	.081	.150 **	.659 **	.473 **	.822 **	.836 **	1	.566 **	.877 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.262	.077	.005	.959	.001	.039	.015	.107	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	399	396	396
Neuroticism	Pearson Correlation	-.002	.056	-.046	-.024	.043	.346 **	.058	.212 **	.029	.273 **	.433 **	.354 **	.518 **	.531 **	.566 **	1	.561 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.961	.263	.362	.628	.389	.000	.251	.000	.566	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396
Open	Pearson Correlation	.057	.007	.062	.046	-.080	.117 *	-.001	.016	-.027	.084	.602 **	.379 **	.820 **	.832 **	.877 **	.561 **	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.258	.892	.215	.358	.110	.020	.976	.754	.591	.095	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

EA = Expressed Affection EC = Expressed Control

EI = Expressed Inclusion WA = Wanted Affection;

WC = Wanted Control IW = Wanted Inclusion E = Extraversion;

A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; N = Neuroticism;

O = Openness