

**A STUDY OF INTERPERSONAL NEEDS IN
TURKISH BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS**

A Master's Thesis

by

CAHİT İRİCAN

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT

BİLKENT UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

July 2006

**A STUDY OF INTERPERSONAL NEEDS IN TURKISH BUSINESS
ORGANIZATIONS**

**The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
Of
Bilkent University**

by

CAHİT İRİCAN

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
In
THE DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA**

July 2006

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

Asst. Prof. Zahide Karakitapođlu Aygün

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

Asst. Prof. Nuran Acur

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

Assoc. Prof. Nuray Sakallı Uđurlu

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Erdal Erel

Director

ABSTRACT
A STUDY OF INTERPERSONAL NEEDS IN TURKISH BUSINESS
ORGANIZATIONS

İRİCAN, Cahit

M.B.A., Department of Management

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Zahide Karakitapoğlu Aygün

July 2006

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the interpersonal needs of Turkish employees and the nature of the relationships between those needs. It is widely known that organizations and their activities are based on human beings' interactions and individual characteristics they have. Organization's purpose is to facilitate processes by which human beings and human systems live and work together for their mutual benefit and mutual well-being. A person has various characteristics to behave according to the appropriate environment, a teacher at school, a mother at home, a financial adviser in a bank etc... In order to make it easier to reach concrete conclusions and to understand the aspects of human behaviors, it is assumed that human interaction may be divided into three categories: issues surrounding inclusion, issues surrounding control, and issues surrounding affection (Schutz, 1958)

The need for Inclusion has to do with forming new relations and associating with people. It determines the extent of contact and prominence that a person needs. The need for Control has to do with decision-making, influence, and persuasion between people. It determines the extent of power or dominance that a person seeks. The need for Affection has to do with emotional ties and warm connections between people. It determines the extent of closeness that a person seeks.

In the present study, these basic needs were used to understand human behaviors. Each item was measured in two dimensions: the expressed behavior of the employee, and the behavior they want from others, the relationships between wanted and expressed forms of three needs were tested by using Excel & Stat Pad. The sample was consisted of 132 employees from different organizations in Ankara.

According to the results of the study, the interpersonal behavior of the employees was predominantly Control-oriented, with a halfway Affection-oriented and to a less degree Inclusion-oriented. Inclusion, control and affection characteristics of Turkish employees were positively related to each other. Employees' expectations from others and their behaviors towards them were strongly related. The implications of findings for practices were discussed with reference to socio-cultural context in Turkey.

ÖZET

TÜRKİYE'DE ORGANİZASYONLARDA ÇALIŞANLARIN KİŞİLERARASI İHTİYAÇLARI ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA

İRİCAN, Cahit

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İşletme Fakültesi

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zahide Karakitapoğlu Aygün

Temmuz, 2006

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye'de çalışanların kişilerarası ihtiyaçlarının doğasını ve birbirleriyle ilişkilerini incelemektir. Genel olarak bilindiği üzere organizasyonlar ve yürütülen faaliyetler, çalışanların kişisel özellikleri ve çalışanlar arası ilişkilere dayanır. Organizasyonların amacı, çalışanlar ve sistemlerin ortak amaca ve kazanımlara birlikte ulaşabilmesi için süreçleri ve faaliyetleri koordine etmektir. İnsan davranışının bulunulan ortama göre değişen pek çok farklı yönü vardır. Okulda öğretmen, evde anne veya bir bankada finans danışmanlığı ayrı davranışları gerektiren sosyal durumlardır. İnsan davranışlarını daha kolay anlamak ve somut verilere ulaşmak için, insan davranışları üç temel başlık altında incelenmektedir: Katılımcı olmak ihtiyacı, sevgi ihtiyacı ve kontrol ihtiyacı (Schutz, 1958).

İnsanların katılımcı olma ihtiyacı, yeni ilişkiler kurma, diğerleri ile kaynaşma, kurulan bağların sınırı ve toplumda etkin olmayı içerir. İnsanların

kontrol ihtiyacı, karar verme, ikna etme, sahip olunan gücün sınırı ve hâkimiyet kurmayı içerir. Sevgi ihtiyacı, duygusal bağları, sıcak ilişkileri, kişinin istediği yakınlık derecesini içerir.

Bu çalışmada, insan davranışlarını anlamak için yukarıda ifade edilen üç temel ihtiyaç gözlemlenmiştir. Her kavram kendi içinde iki boyutlu olarak değerlendirilmiştir: Çalışanların kendilerinin başkalarına nasıl davrandıkları ve başkalarının kendilerine nasıl davranmalarını istedikleri. Bu üç ihtiyacın her birinin iki boyutu arasındaki ilişkiler Excel ve Stat Pad programları ile test edilmiştir. Araştırmanın örneklemi Ankara’ da farklı kurumlarda çalışan 132 çalışandan oluşmaktadır.

Araştırmanın sonuçları, çalışan davranışlarının en fazla kontrol ihtiyacından, daha sonra sevgi ihtiyacından ve en az da katılım ihtiyacından kaynaklandığını ortaya koymaktadır. Türk çalışanlar açısından sevgi, kontrol ve katılım ihtiyaçlarının birbiriyle pozitif yönde etkileşim içinde olduğu saptanmıştır. Ayrıca çalışanların başkalarından beklentileri ile kendilerinin onlara karşı olan davranışlarının yakın ilişki içinde olduğu görülmüştür. Bulguların pratik yaşamdaki etkileri, Türkiye’deki sosyo-kültürel yapı çerçevesinde tartışılmaktadır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank SEVAL, my wife, for all her love and support. Without her company and encouragement, I could not finish this program. She pulled me into life and happiness during stressful times.

I would also thank my close friend, Serhat, who took good care of me from the time I first got here to the end of my education and helped me in my adaptation to this new school and culture. I cannot forget the support of my classmates, especially Cem Özkan and Halil Gebenliler, who listened to me every time I needed someone to talk.

Finally, I would like to thank Assistant Professor Zahide Karakitapoğlu Aygün for the guidance, understand and hard work she put forward during my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
CHAPTER 1:INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2:LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1. Introduction	6
2.2. Interpersonal Concepts In Motivational Theories	8
2.3. Personality Theories And Interpersonal Relations	10
2.4. Two-Dimensional Theories.....	12
2.5. A Three-Dimensional Theory.....	14
2.6. Firo-B Studies.....	17
2.7. A Brief Comparison Of The Theories	18
2.8. Measures Of Interpersonal Needs	19
2.9. Managerial Implications Of Need Theories	20
2.10. Impact Of Interpersonal Relations In Organizations	21
CHAPTER 3: DATA AND METHODOLOGY.....	25
3.1. The Participants	25
3.2. Procedures And Measures	26

3.3. Hypothesis Of The Study.....	28
3.4. Variables	32
3.5. Findings And Results	33
3.5.1. Participants' Responses	34
3.5.1.1. Inclusion.....	34
3.5.1.2. Control	36
3.5.1.3. Affection.....	37
3.5.1.4. Total Needs For Affection, Control & Inclusion	39
3.5. 2.Correlations Between Variables.....	40
3.5.3. Intercorrelations Between Affection, Control & Inclusion	41
3.5.3.1. Expressed Affection & Expressed Control.....	41
3.5. 3.2.Expressed Affection & Expressed Inclusion	41
3.5. 3.3.Expressed Control & Expressed Inclusion	42
3.5.3.4. Wanted Affection & Wanted Control.....	42
3.5.3.5. Wanted Affection & Wanted Inclusion	43
3.5.3.6. Wanted Control & Wanted Inclusion.....	43
3.5. 3.7.Expressed Affection & Wanted Affection.....	44
3.5. 3.8.Expressed Control & Wanted Control.....	44
3.5. 3.9.Expressed Inclusion & Wanted Inclusion	45
3.6. The Results Of The Hypotheses	45
3.6. 1. Hypothesis 1	45
3.6. 2. Hypothesis 2	46
3.6. 3. Hypothesis 3	48
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	51
4.1. Conclusions.....	51
4.2. Implications	55
4.3. Limitations	59
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	62
APPENDICES	
Appendix 1: Firo-B Questionnaire	69
Appendix 2: Firo-B Anketi	73
Appendix 3: Firo-B Assessment Forms	80
Appendix 4: Distributions On Variables.....	81

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Interpersonal relations have been found to be an integral part of the managerial job in the world. Several studies have established their importance in formal organizations, especially for effective decision-making and implementation of decisions. The domain continues to receive the attention of academicians, managers and management consultants. Despite interesting insights offered by numerous studies of interpersonal relations over the past four decades, more remains to be known about the underlying bases of interpersonal behavior.

Achieving a clear understanding of human nature is an important aspect of management in the work place. In order for managers and workers to work together as an effective and productive unit, the workers must know how they fit into the overall scheme of things. In addition, the managers must have a clear understanding of how they can maximize productivity by supporting their employees through the appropriate leadership style. It is also extremely important for managers to realistically evaluate the working environment, as well as the characteristics of the task, in order to decide how he or she deals with

and directs employees. Aside from knowing how human nature dictates a worker's actions, the manager must also be aware of the specific working environment, personalities, and motivational forces, which drive employees.

Human being is the core of the organizations and the center of the management concept. In order to understand the reasons of the failures and successes, leaders must focus on their employees and must analyze and get their way of thinking. People have many different characteristics at work and these characteristics are not independent of each other. That is, all of them are interrelated, such as motivation, needs, values, expectations etc. At the very beginning the relations among organization, leadership, human behavior and human need should be determined.

Basically, an organization is a group of people intentionally organized to accomplish an overall, common goal or set of goals. There are several important aspects to consider about the goal of the business organization. These features are explicit (deliberate and recognized) or implicit (operating unrecognized, "behind the scenes"). Ideally, these features are carefully considered and established, usually during the implementation of the tasks. Members of the organization often have some image in their minds about how the organization should be working, how it should appear when things are going well. An organization operates according to an overall purpose, or mission. All organizations operate according to overall values, or priorities in the nature of how they carry out their activities. Organizations' members often work to achieve several overall accomplishments, or goals, as they work toward their mission. In order to be successful in organizations, leaders must understand their followers

who are their subordinates or workers, since they do all the tasks. Leadership may look and be different depending on whether it is experienced in a legislative setting, on a battlefield, at a rally, on a factory floor, or in a school district. Leadership has existed as long as civilization. There were individuals throughout history that led societies, governments, armies, corporations, systems of reasoning and intellectual interpretation and expression. Whether it is the military, the corporate world, or the education arena, individuals have accepted the challenge to lead such important and vital entities. It must be based on a greater appreciation for the nature of human beings. To make leadership have an easy and appropriate style, leaders must deal mainly with people.

“Human needs are a powerful source of explanation of human behavior and social interaction. All individuals have needs that they strive to satisfy, either by using the system, 'acting on the fringes,' or acting as a reformist or revolutionary. Given this condition, social systems must be responsive to individual needs, or be subject to instability and forced change (possibly through violence or conflict).” (Coate & Rosati, 1988).

Leadership and human behavior work hand in hand. To be a successful leader, one must understand his/her subordinates and work with them to resolve their problems. Each of us has needs, and we direct our energies to meet these needs as we see fit. Helping employees resolve their problems will result in a unit that will operate smoothly and be highly productive. Human behavior is the result of attempts to satisfy certain needs. These needs may be simple to understand and easy to identify, such as the need for food and water. They also may be complex, such as the need for respect and

acceptance. Why do people act the way they do? Why do some people have an easy time, while others have a hard time adjusting to shipboard life? Why, with an upcoming extended deployment, do some crewmembers look forward to visiting foreign ports, while others prefer to stay with the familiar homeport? Finding the answers to these questions is not easy. In fact, a whole branch of science and psychology has tried to answer such questions but has found no hard-and-fast answers. In general, one could say people behave the way they do for a reason. However, the reason may not be clear; in fact, it may not be logical or rational either to you or to the person in question. By observing human behavior, one can gain the knowledge to better understand himself/herself and other people. You can learn why people act and react in certain ways. You can learn how to identify the various types of behavior and needs of people. You also can learn how to influence the behavior of people so that they can see how meeting the needs of the command will satisfy their own needs. One should not take lightly human behavior and its application to the areas of leadership and supervision. How well one understands and applies the basic concepts could determine, to a great extent, his/her success in the organization. All successful leaders must have an understanding of people's behavior. If one understands the needs of his/her employees and help them to satisfy those needs, he/she will succeed as a leader. We can reasonably determine an individual's needs by understanding basic human needs. Our needs are in order of importance; such as our need to relieve pain (survival) is more important than a need to be liked by coworkers (social belonging). If we satisfy one level, then we work to satisfy the next level of

need. This need satisfaction is an ongoing behavior that determines our everyday actions.

In many need theories, as we will discuss later, human needs are categorized differently. For example, Maslow's hierarchy of needs is often depicted as a pyramid consisting of five levels: the four lower levels are grouped together as deficiency needs associated with physiological needs, while the top level is termed growth needs associated with psychological needs. While our deficiency needs must be met, our being needs are continually shaping our behaviour. The basic concept is that the higher needs in this hierarchy only come into focus once all the needs that are lower down in the pyramid are mainly or entirely satisfied. Growth forces create upward movement in the hierarchy, whereas regressive forces push prepotent needs further down the hierarchy (Wahba & Bridwell, 1976).

Here in our study we will use FIRO-B evaluation which was created by Schutz (1958). In this form human needs are divided into three titles: inclusion, affection and control.

The organization of thesis is as follows: Chapter 2 is literature review of the organization and personal behavior, person's individual characteristics, personal needs of human beings, and related theories. The model and methodology followed is explained in Chapter 3. The results of the study and the conclusion are discussed in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

Since the early times of the 20th century, the main focus of the management in organizations has been human being. Various organizational, motivational and human needs related theories have been developed by different scientists.

Most contemporary theories of motivation assume that people initiate and persist at behaviors to the extent that they believe the behaviors will lead to desired outcomes or goals. Beginning with the work of Lewin (1936) and Tolman (1932), this premise has led motivation researchers to explore the psychological value people ascribe to goals (e.g., Kasser & Ryan, 1996; Vroom, 1964), people's expectations about attaining goals (e.g., Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Bandura, 1989; Rotter, 1966), and the mechanisms that keep people moving toward selected goals (e.g., Carver & Scheier, 1998). Whereas initially this approach assumed that any two equally valued goals with the same expectancies for attainment would yield the same quality of performance and affective experience, recent work on goal-directed behavior has begun to

distinguish among types of goals or outcomes. Researchers have, for example, contrasted ability-development goals with ability-demonstration goals (Dweck, 1986; Nicholls, 1984) and approach goals with avoidance goals (Carver & Scheier, 1998; Elliot & Church, 1997; Higgins, 1996), suggesting that the different types of goals have different behavioral and affective consequences.

Like these other theories, self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1980, 1985b, 1991) has differentiated the concept of goal-directed behavior, yet it has taken a very different approach. SDT differentiates the content of goals or outcomes and the regulatory processes through which the outcomes are pursued, making predictions for different contents and for different processes. Further, it uses the concept of innate psychological needs as the basis for integrating the differentiations of goal contents and regulatory processes and the predictions that resulted from those differentiations. The concept of needs was once widely employed in empirical psychology to organize the study of motivation. Although variously defined at the physiological or psychological levels and as innate or learned, the concept of needs specified the content of motivation and provided a substantive basis for the energization and direction of action. Beginning around the 1960s, however, the dramatic shift toward cognitive theories led to the concept of needs being repudiated and replaced by the concept of goals as the dominant motivational concept. The focus became the processes of goal selection and pursuit rather than the content of the goals being selected and pursued. The concept of valence (or psychological value) of outcomes was defined functionally (and thus was not related to need satisfaction), much as the concept of reinforcement had been defined

functionally in operant psychology (Skinner, 1953), ignoring the needs that had provided the underpinning of reinforcements in drive theories (e.g., Hull, 1943). Since the time of the shift toward cognitive theories, most motivation theorists remained unwilling to consider needs, focusing instead on goal-related efficacy. SDT has, in contrast, maintained that a full understanding not only of goal-directed behavior, but also of psychological development and well-being, cannot be achieved without addressing the needs that give goals their psychological potency and that influence which regulatory processes direct people's goal pursuits. Specifically, in SDT, three psychological needs—for competence, relatedness, and autonomy—are considered essential for understanding what (i.e., content) and why (i.e., process) of goal pursuits.

2.2. Interpersonal Concepts in Motivational Theories

One of the basic questions that psychology tries to answer is: why do people behave the way they do? In their scientific attempt to answer the question, psychologists (e.g., Alderfer, 1969; Maslow, 1954; McClelland, 1961) have theorized that human behavior is motivated or that it is triggered by some inner drives, which are based on certain needs. Interpersonal behavior, being a subset of behavior, can be viewed as founded on certain needs, too. If interpersonal behavior, as was discussed above, is an essential part of managerial work and if needs are the fundamental basis of behavior, then knowledge of the specific needs that influence the interpersonal behavior of managers can help us understand one very important aspect of managerial effectiveness.

Some of the needs that influence human behavior are biological, some emotional, and some social in nature. The most popular classification of human needs categorizes them into five groups: physiological, security, *love & belongingness*, status, and self-actualization needs (Maslow, 1954). A reclassification by Alderfer (1969) reduced Maslow's five categories into three and called them Existence, Relatedness, and Growth needs. According to McClelland (1976), human behavior in organizational settings is motivated by the need for achievement, the need for power and the need for affiliation.

As may be noticed, the italicized words in the above paragraph refer to the interpersonal aspects of human behavior (Maslow, 1954). And yet, when one tries to understand those very interpersonal aspects of human behavior in a systematic way, these theories do not help much, for they fall short of addressing the interpersonal behavior domain, directly and adequately. The concepts of love & belongingness and relatedness, apart from classifying certain behaviors 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 behavior. 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 behavior, either. While his concept of nAff (need for affiliation) does obviously refer to interpersonal aspects, his nPower, which allegedly refers to some other aspect, actually covers a good deal of what characterizes interpersonal behavior, too. When he defines nPower as the urge to have impact on others,

he is certainly referring to a basis of interpersonal behavior. How about nAch (the need for achievement)? One could argue that achievement in society has to have certain interpersonal nuance, because one's "achievement" has to be recognized by at least one other person who matters and, thus, certain interpersonal interaction is involved. But such an argument would be going too far. Accepting the concept of nAch, therefore, to be distinct from the other two needs of nAff and nPower, one would not consider McClelland's as a theory of interpersonal relations. It is not an integrated conceptual framework for understanding the interpersonal phenomenon.

2.3. 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 emphasized. 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 emphasized introversion and extroversion as the characteristic modes, in which the "life energy" of a person expresses itself. Fromm (1947) referred to three types of "interpersonal relatedness":

`Withdrawal-destructiveness', `symbiotic' and `love'; he emphasized 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 behavioral trends of moving away from, moving against and moving toward people. It 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 behavior. According to this theory, the individual human being is interminably in need of strokes, to acquire, which she transacts with other humans. A stroke, broadly, is an act of acknowledging or rejecting the presence of another person; a transaction is essentially an exchange of strokes, positive and negative. The individual is conceptualized in this theory as an amalgam of three selves or states of being or ego states, called the Parent, the Adult and the Child, any one of which may dominate the individual's transactions with others. Depending on the way a child is received and treated and the way the child interprets its early experiences, the child takes a certain basic psychological position about himself/herself as well as about others. Therefore, 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.

While this theory has acquired popularity among researchers, it does not seem to have attracted the attention of behavioral scientists, interested in empirical studies. In its concept of need (for strokes), this theory shares common grounds with the need-based motivational theories, but the concept is much less differentiated, encompassing a host of dimensions: accepting, rejecting, loving, hating, greeting, praising, scolding, criticizing, yelling, etc., despite the differences in their structural and emotional content, are all strokes. Despite such complexities at the scientific level, Transactional Analysis has acquired great popularity among the public, probably because it offers explanations for almost any and every aspect of every-day life in an easy-to-understand language. If the latter quality of the theory is strength and the cause of its popularity, this very strength is its weakness in stimulating scientific inquiry.

2.4. Two-Dimensional Theories

Freedman(1951) traced the origin of formal studies in the domain of interpersonal behavior and conceptualized interpersonal behavior 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 behavior could be placed in specific segments within any of the quadrants, depending on the kind and degree of the dimension reflected by a particular behavior (Leary, et al., 1951).

Later studies of interpersonal behavior 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 behavior 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 behavior 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 behavior (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 parent like; 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 behavior towards oneself.

Unlike the general motivational theories of human behavior 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 behavior. However, statistical analyses were found to yield unsatisfactory results regarding the complexity or the internal consistency of the scales used. 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 circumflex 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. 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 (Leary, 1957; Sullivan, 1953).

2.5. A Three-Dimensional Theory

Schutz (1958; 1982), 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 behavior. In his initial formulation of the theory, he postulated three dimensions to account for all interpersonal phenomena, operative and distinguishable at the behavioral and the feeling levels. On the level of behavior he called the dimensions Inclusion, Control, and Affection; their counterparts on the level of

feelings were called Significance, Competence, and Lovability. He identified two facets of each of the dimensions: the expressed facet (what one does to another or others, similar to Benjamin's parent like surface) and the wanted facet (similar to Benjamin's childlike surface).

Schutz called his theory FIRO (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation). His instrument to measure the three dimensions on the behavioral 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.

In the first version of the FIRO theory, the three fundamental dimensions of interpersonal behavior 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 behavior. Accordingly, Affection now is identified by its essential behavioral ingredient, Openness" (Schutz 1982).

As regards the manifestations of interpersonal behavior, 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). The

measuring instruments were then suitably modified to reflect the changes in the theory.

The final version of the FIRO theory states that there are three central and one-dimensional needs that affect the behavior of people in any interpersonal relationship. They are inclusion (the need to socialize, 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 behavioral 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 likeability (the need to feel one is good, attractive, likable). Inclusion at the behavioral level corresponds to Significance at the feeling level; Control corresponds to Competence and Openness, to Likeability. 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 behavior proceeding from the initiating or the focal person to another (the target person or persons) and the received direction indicates behavior 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. Firo-B Studies

The FIRO-B theory has been evolved and studied extensively. Schutz (1976) used the test instrument on over 6000 people from the public school community, and it was validated and found to be reliable. Gluck (1983) provides detailed information on validity and reliability of the FIRO-B instrument. The theory was also used to organize the major theories of family therapy (Doherty and Colangelo, 1984). It was also used to classify approaches to decision making and define concordance, a new method of decision making (Schutz, 1987).

In a study of undergraduate Canadian business students, McRae and Young (1990) found no significant gender differences for the FIRO-B, with reported scores for man and woman nearly the same. A study of research and development professionals by Kubes reported significant correlations of interpersonal needs with adaptation/innovation scores (Kobes, 1992). In Kobes' study no gender differences were reported.

Wiedman et al. (1979) suggested that the inclusion and affection scores added together measured general warmth. A subsequent study (Fisher, 1995) of teams fully engaged in the creation of software products supported the general warmth construct. The results of 1995 studies suggested that the FIRO-B questionnaire assesses what they labeled group warmth, which had implications for management of teams.

The reliability of the FIRO-B scales is excellent and has evidenced good stability over time (Lifton, 1975). "Work on the criterion-related validity of FIRO-B

has shown it to be strong for varying types of test groups such as sociable versus non-sociable occupations, high versus low self-esteem adolescent girls, and reticent versus non-reticent students” (Lifton, 1975). FIRO-B’s validity in predicting interpersonal compatibility has been tested with mixed results. Based on a review of studies of various populations, Lifton (1975) observed “scales provide useful information concerning the nature interpersonal relationship”. Fisher et al. (1995) noted that “the FIRO-B has been used by personal professionals for 28 years, and its popularity continues into the present day.”

2.7. A Brief Comparison of the Theories

Despite the apparent variety, evident in the different conceptions of interpersonal behavior 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 (1951) 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 Behavior) 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 conceptualizations brings 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 behavior, SASB does not address this aspect at all.

2.8. Measures of Interpersonal Needs

Various measures of interpersonal behavior have been used in the past, each representing the particular theoretical model from which the measures were derived. Although behavioral observations, rating scales, and verbal content analysis have been employed occasionally, the self-report device has been the main instrument in the assessment of interpersonal behavior (Golding & Knudson, 1975).

Several variables, such as abasement, affiliation, aggression, dominance, nurturance, and social recognition have often been measured by various modes of measurement as important markers of interpersonal behavior. In an attempt to test the convergent validity of these measures, by using a multivariable-multi-method design to analyze the data, three major dimensions were isolated,

"which were found to bear close relationships to Schutz's" FIRO factors (Golding & Knudson, 1975).

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 behavioral dimensions alone. Introducing the concept of Received and contrasting it with the Expressed also addressed the directionality of behavior more clearly. 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. Managerial Implications of Need Theories

Psychologists distinguish between *extrinsic motivation*, which means being moved to do something because of some specific rewarding outcome, and *intrinsic motivation*, which refers to being moved to do something because it is inherently enjoyable. Intrinsic motivation leads organisms to engage in exploration, play, and other behavior driven by curiosity in the absence of explicit reward. Intrinsically motivated behaviors are behaviors, which a person engages in to feel competent, and self-determining (Deci & Ryan, 1985). The primary effects, therefore, are in the tissues of the central nervous system rather than in non-nervous-system tissues. Intrinsically motivated behaviors will be of two general kinds. When there is no stimulation people will seek it. A person who gets no stimulation will not feel competent and self-determining. Therefore, he seeks out the opportunity to behave in ways that allow him to feel competent and self-determining. He will seek out challenge. The other general kind of

intrinsically motivated behavior involves conquering challenges or reducing incongruity. Only when a person is able to reduce incongruity, and only when a person is able to conquer the challenges, which he encounters or creates, will he feel competent and self-determining. Many activities are intrinsically motivated. People spend large amounts of time solving puzzles, painting pictures, and engaging in other play activities for which there is no external reward. They are also intrinsically motivated to do challenging work, which requires resourcefulness and creativity. The rewards for these activities are mediated within the individual. He engages in the activities not because they lead him to an external reward but rather because they bring about certain kinds of internal states which he finds rewarding (White, 1959).

2.10. Impact of Interpersonal Relations in Organizations

The Hawthorne studies of the 1920's identified what, in organizational behavior, has come to be known as the Hawthorne Effect, in which essence refers to the impact of interpersonal relations in the work group. It was found that morale and productivity in the experimental work group continued to increase even after the improved physical working conditions were restored to their original level. The key variable that was identified by the researchers as accounting for the results was the change in the nature of interpersonal relationships between the supervisors and the workers as well as among the work group members themselves. The study team reports, for example, that the supervisor did not behave like the usual supervisor; he was permissive, interested in the workers and was ready to be influenced by them; the

relationship was characterized by greater attention to and respect for the workers in the group (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1943).

Interpersonal relations in the context of managerial work have, since then, been studied under the supervisor-subordinate exchange or the vertical dyad linkage model. Some of these studies (e.g., Liden & Graen, 1980; Rosse & Kraut, 1983; Scandura et al., 1986) found that, compared to a low-quality exchange relationship, a high-quality exchange relationship was significantly related to greater supervisory support and guidance, higher subordinate satisfaction and performance, and lower subordinate turnover. Weick (1969) has argued that human relationships are the principal means through which organizations are controlled. Effective managerial decision-making and, especially, implementation of decisions have been found to be influenced by interpersonal relations in organizations (Mintzberg & Quinn, 1991).

Poor interpersonal relations in the work place are said to be related to stress and its undesirable correlates. One of the consequences of stress is reduced motivation to work. A manager's performance depends on task activities, behavioral settings, as well as patterns of interpersonal connectedness. Sometimes, the job roles threaten to exceed the occupant's capacities and produce role stress. The emotional, physiological and behavioral responses to experienced stress are greatly influenced by personal attributes and experiences, which, in turn, may influence an individual's output. On the basis of these ideas interpersonal relations are one of the major sources of stress; personal needs are significant moderators of stress; and stress influences performance.

Since interpersonal relations in the managerial context can affect important job-related behaviors in an organization, studies have attempted to assess the determinants of interpersonal relationship. Several studies, such as Bohra and Pandey (1984), Cardy and Dobbins (1986), Tsui and Barry (1986), found that affective reactions of superiors influenced their performance ratings and rewarding behavior toward subordinates, which in turn influenced the quality of exchange relationship between the two. A recent laboratory experiment and field study investigated the issue and confirmed the earlier findings, concluding that supervisor's liking for the subordinate was a significant determinant of the quality of the superior-subordinate exchange relationship (Wayne and Ferris, 1990).

Being broadly informed of the literature on the various concepts and concerns related to interpersonal behavior, the present study aims at contributing to the existing literature in Turkey by finding out and testing employees' needs by means of application of the conceptual framework of the FIRO theory. This theory addresses all the three *behavioral* dimensions of interpersonal behavior. The present study will offer insights into the aspects of Expressed and Wanted frames of interpersonal behavior among Turkish employees. The essential goal of the present study is to put relations among needs, to look for relative priorities of needs and to give some basic hints to employees and managers in Turkish business life. FIRO-B related studies were usually done to compare needs and their various characteristics among different nations and groups. No study, which had the objective to directly examine employees' needs in terms of FIRO-B in Turkey, was confronted. Although

FIRO-B related studies were not too much in Turkish literature, especially in business environment, the present study will fill the gaps to a certain extent in Turkish business life. The next chapter discusses the way the present study went about in pursuit of its objectives. It presents the overall design of the study, the sampling, a description of the instrument used for collection of data, the procedure adopted in administering the instrument, and the statistical methods employed for the analyses of the data.

CHAPTER 3

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The study was planned as an exploratory one, intended to map the existing interpersonal orientations of the target population. A survey-based, cross-sectional research design was adopted for the present purposes. The sample for the managerial group was randomly drawn from different organizations in Ankara.

Data were collected in terms of how the respondents behave toward others (Expressed), and how they want other people to behave towards them (Wanted), on each of the three fundamental interpersonal behavior areas of *Inclusion, Control, and Affection*.

3.1. The Participants

The sample consisted of 132 employees who were in different organizations. As explained below, the participants' occupational levels were different ranging from managers to white and blue-color workers in various organizations. The participants were selected randomly in their respective organizations. In order to provide unbiased results, a wide array of organizations

was chosen. Since the questionnaires were distributed officially, all of them returned.

The following is the list of the organizations chosen for the questionnaire:

1-Gazi University (% 15)

2-Oyak Headquarters (% 19)

3-Directorates of Foundations (Vakıflar Genel Md.) (% 10)

4-Is Bank Necatibey Branch (% 12)

5-Eti Mine Management Headquarters (% 11)

6- Is Bank Yenişehir Branch (% 7.5)

7-Turkish Red Crescent Headquarters (% 15)

8- Çankaya Municipality Police Headquarters (% 5)

9- Çankaya Police Department Headquarters (% 5.5)

3.2. Procedures and Measures

The FIRO-B is a 54-item instrument (see appendix for English and Turkish forms of the questionnaire) designed to measure ways in which an individual characteristically relates to other people, through measurement of the individual's behavior in interpersonal situations, and ultimately to be able to make predictions about the individual's interpersonal interactions based on the data obtained from the measuring instrument. The FIRO-B instrument elicits data on the interpersonal behavior needs of Inclusion, Control and Affection as Expressed and Wanted. The instrument provides data in terms of how the respondents behaved toward others, and how they wanted others to behave towards them on each of the three interpersonal behavior areas of Inclusion,

Control, and Affection. Three of the six scales in the instrument measured how one behaved (expressed) toward others with regard to Inclusion, Control and Affection, while the remaining three measured how others behaved towards the focal person or what one received from others. Each scale was responded to twice: once for the perceived (as happening) level of behavior and the second time for the wanted or would-like-to level. Thus data were collected on eleven variables, representing different aspects of the three basic interpersonal behavior needs.

In the study participants were asked 54 questions (see appendix 1). For each question they had 6 options ranging from 1 to 6. For the first 16 questions and questions between 41 and 54, 1 means **usually**- the highest level of agreement on the related question- and 6 means **never**- the lowest level of agreement. For the questions between 17 and 40, 1 means **most people** and 6 means **nobody**. In order to assess the answers, for each participant questions were divided into 6 sub scales. The variables are listed below. For each question participants answers were evaluated with 0 or 1, for instance, a person chose 4 for question 34 his/her score for that question was 0; at the same time a person chose 2 for the same question his/her score was 1. For each subscale the answers were scored according to the evaluation table (see in appendix) and the answers were scored from 0 to 9. The scale score indicates the degree to which the respondent agrees with the scale name. Zero means least agreement and nine means most agreement. For example, the score of 9 for expressed affection means he/she always wants to demonstrate his/her

compassion and dearness to others around him/her, on the other hand score of 0 means he/she doesn't want to give fondness and sympathy to others.

For a person the maximum and minimum score ranges are shown on the table below:

	Inclusion	Control	Affection	Total
Expressed	EI(0-9)	EC(0-9)	EA(0-9)	ET (0-27)
Wanted	WI(0-9)	WC(0-9)	WA(0-9)	TW (0-27)
Total	TI (0-18)	TC (0-18)	TA (0-18)	Overall personal need (0-54)

Table 3.1: Questionnaire results

Reliability and validity information for the FIRO-B indicates that it is both reliable and valid. Test-retest reliability is satisfactory, with a coefficient of 0.70. Internal consistency reliability coefficient is 0.94. Content validity is satisfactory as are predictive and construct validity (Schutz, 1966, p. 66-80).

The coefficient alpha for each of the measures used in this thesis exceeds 0.6, suggesting that these measures have acceptable reliability, since Nunnally (1978) says that the coefficient ALPHA of 0.6 is satisfactory in most research.

3.3. Hypotheses of the Study

A set of tentative hypotheses were formulated to be tested in this preliminary and explanatory study itself. Thus, in addition to descriptive presentations of the results, the study will test the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Turkey's social culture is defined by large power distance, strong collectivism (low individualism), strong uncertainty avoidance and

moderate femininity (Hofstede, 1991). Schwartz (1992) noted that Turkey ranked above average in values of conservatism, hierarchy and harmony supporting Hofstede's findings. Turkish people tend to be fundamentally collectivistic (Triandis, 1995). In other words, relatively more conservative and traditionalist values are more common, especially in lower economic parts of Turkey (İmamoğlu & Karakitapoğlu, 2004). A more recent study on the Turkish culture was conducted as a part of GLOBE study which revealed in-group collectivism and power distance as two predominant characteristics of Turkey (Kabasakal and Bodur, 1998). Generally, external/ascribed characteristics serve as an important power base for leaders. Leader power is a manifestation of feudal links and has strong roots in Turkish culture, in that leaders are expected to promote patronage relationships with their followers (Kabasakal and Bodur, 1998).

Turkish culture emphasizes relatedness, and having closer ties with family, relatives and neighbors. Family- group membership and social roles have a major influence in defining one's self and identity. In Turkish culture, it is emphasized that personal achievement at the expense of group goals is not important, and it can not result in a strong sense of competition. On the contrary, Turkish culture emphasizes family and work group goals. Therefore, it is expected that affection related and inclusion related needs would be emphasized most by Turkish people.

Despite these findings mentioned above, Turkish organizations are distinguished by centralized decision making, highly personalized, strong leadership, and limited delegation (Ronen, 1986). Turkish society is highly rule-

oriented with laws, regulations, and controls in order to reduce the amount of uncertainty (Peker, 2000) Therefore people, in all areas of life- including business- have great obedience for control over themselves. A child is expected to do what her parent says, a student's expected to do homework given by teacher on time, soldier is expected to show absolute obedience, even must die if ordered, and a wife is expected to act according to the rules put by her husband. Hence, it can be expected that control frame of the society is very large.

Under the consideration of Turkish people's characteristics, in this study it is expected that affection should come first, before issues related to control and inclusion can be successfully addressed. Inclusion issues must be resolved before those of control.

Hypothesis 2: Human being is quite complex. All aspects of behaviors and attitudes have effects on each other. It is very hard to see a successful person with great admiration for achievement at the same time without any desire to have power (McClelland, 1976). In many studies, as mentioned above, it was found out that there were interrelations among various variables about human behaviors, such as success, motivation and needs.

Similarly, motivation is determined and has positive correlations with different points available in working environment and organizational structure. Herzberg (1959) constructed a two-dimensional paradigm of factors affecting people's attitudes about work. He concluded that such factors as company policy, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and *salary* are hygiene factors rather than motivators. According to the theory, the absence of

hygiene factors can create job dissatisfaction, but their presence does not motivate or create satisfaction. He also determined that there are five *factors* in particular that were strong *predictors of job satisfaction: achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement*. These motivators (satisfiers) were associated with *long-term* positive effects in job performance while the hygiene factors (dissatisfiers) consistently produced only *short-term* changes in job attitudes and performance, which quickly fell back to its previous level. Having the same approach, Maslow (1970) stated that human needs- Physiological, Safety, Love and Belongingness, Esteem, and Self-actualization- had strong relations among them. He also theorized that a person could not recognize or pursue the next higher need in the hierarchy until her or his currently recognized need was substantially or completely satisfied.

Many studies and theories, as mentioned before, available in literature suggest that interrelations among different aspects of life and human characteristic are inevitable. In accordance with these studies, it is hypothesized that in Turkish culture the degree of affection, control and inclusion have positive relations with each other.

Hypothesis 3: People usually want to see similar behaviors from others. A person, with great concerns for the success of the company in which he/she works, desires to see colleague and managers to have the same feeling. Similarly Turkish people like to be in an atmosphere where people have mutual respect and harmony. Accordingly, it may be expected that:

- A.** There will be positive correlation between expected and wanted affection in Turkish business environment. Employees are expected to

show their fondness while they want to see the same behaviors from others.

- B.** There will be a negative correlation between wanted and expressed control needs of Turkish employees. That is, if an employee wants to control the working environment probably he/she does not want too much control on him/her.
- C.** There will be a positive correlation between expressed and wanted inclusions needs. The ones, who want to have contribution to the success of the organization (inclusion), want others to have the same ardor, effort, and endeavor.

3.4. Variables

The variables in the study were those based on the FIRO theory. The basic FIRO variables have been well standardized; the reliability and validity of their measures, as mentioned when discussing the instrument, have already been well established. The FIRO variables are listed in Table 3.2 below.

Scale Number	Variable Name	LABEL
1	Expressed Inclusion	EI
2	Expressed Control	EC
3	Expressed Affection	EA
4	Wanted Inclusion	WI
5	Wanted Control	WC
6	Wanted Affection	WA
7	Total Inclusion	TI
8	Total Control	TC
9	Total Affection	TA
10	Total Expressed	TE
11	Total Wanted	TW

Table 3.2: Names of Variables, their Labels

3.5. Findings and Results

The obtained data were subjected to statistical analyses done with Stat Pad and EXCEL. For purposes of constructing overall profiles of employees on the basis of their interpersonal needs, descriptive statistics were used.

Means and standard deviations were computed on all the variables for the group. As for the relationship among the FIRO variables themselves, we

were more concerned with the associations rather than causal links. Pearson's correlation coefficients were calculated for present purposes, because the correlations are good enough indicators of relationships among the variables in a first-approximation exploratory study (Thorndike, 1978). The results of the analyses are described below.

3.5.1. Participants' Responses

3.5.1.1. Inclusion

Table 3.3 shows the results of the answers to the questions related to inclusion. For example, 20 of 132 participants have 4 out of 9 in their answers to expressed inclusion questions, while 18 participants have 7 out of 9 in their answers to wanted inclusion.

		INCLUSION									
Total		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Expressed	Number of answers	3	5	19	18	20	26	17	13	9	2
Percentage		2.3%	3.8%	14.4%	13.6%	15.2%	19.7%	12.9%	9.8%	6.8%	1.5%
Wanted	Number of answers	53	14	16	7	4	4	9	18	4	3
Percentage		40.2%	10.6%	12.1%	5.3%	3.0%	3.0%	6.8%	13.6%	3.0%	2.3%

Table 3.3: Participants' answers to the questions related to INCLUSION

In table 3.4 it is seen that how many people gave the same answers to each related question. For example, 36 people marked answer 3 for question 9, while 49 people have answer 2 for question 37.

INCLUSION													
EXPRESSED							WANTED						
Question	Answer						Question	Answer					
	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
1	22	34	27	29	8	12	28	11	43	57	13	3	5
3	26	40	29	18	14	5	31	14	36	52	22	5	3
5	48	37	18	13	10	6	34	7	36	53	24	6	6
7	21	37	19	22	21	12	37	5	49	45	15	5	13
9	14	38	36	11	19	14	39	9	36	45	27	9	6
11	29	26	43	16	11	7	42	10	27	40	36	14	5
13	24	43	36	16	8	5	45	15	20	47	32	13	5
15	14	36	45	19	12	6	48	14	27	50	26	10	5
16	30	33	39	16	11	3	51	16	16	38	41	15	6

Table 3.4: Total answers to each question related to INCLUSION

In the distribution of EI (Table 3.5) it is observed that participants felt to include others in some of their activities (with a mean of 4.5), to join and belong to select groups and to interact with people available in the working environment. They may prefer to determine when and with whom they will have lots of contacts at work.

N=132	Mean	Std. Dev.	Coeff. Alpha
Expressed Inclusion	4,50	2,10	0,66
Wanted Inclusion	2,59	2,92	0,74

Table 3.5: Inclusion statistics

The modal value for the WI is 0 scored by%40.2, and only a small minority has scored more than 7(% 18.9). The figures indicate that the employees perceive themselves to be rather unsocial and they don't like being noticed by others (with a small mean of 2.59). They don't enjoy having others seek out input and offer them a chance for a higher profile. That is, they have no inspiration for promotion and they have no problem with their position. Probably, the reason behind this result is Turkish employees might not want to take further

responsibility in the organization. As known, promotion means responsibility, power and dedication of more time to the work, which means neglecting social life especially family members.

3.5.1.2. Control

The following tables demonstrate the results of CONTROL characteristics. The interpretations of the tables are the same as the ones in the INCLUSION parts above.

CONTROL											
Total		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Expressed	Number of answers	8	16	21	17	19	18	7	8	11	7
	Percentage	6.1%	12.1%	15.9%	12.9%	14.4%	13.6%	5.3%	6.1%	8.3%	5.3%
Wanted	Number of answers	3	16	30	28	15	8	7	6	7	15
	Percentage	2.3%	12.1%	22.7%	21.2%	11.4%	6.1%	5.3%	4.5%	5.3%	11.4%

Table 3.6: Participants' answers to the questions related to CONTROL

CONTROL													
EXPRESSED							WANTED						
Question	Answer						Question	Answer					
	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
30	12	34	48	24	6	8	2	26	34	15	17	9	31
33	12	28	43	39	7	3	6	11	8	19	22	25	47
36	16	24	50	21	13	8	10	5	23	24	18	16	46
41	23	33	32	28	6	10	14	8	13	26	16	26	43
44	6	13	40	27	27	19	18	8	8	49	25	19	23
47	3	28	31	34	14	22	20	8	19	64	32	5	4
50	16	25	45	27	16	3	22	3	29	24	21	18	37
53	17	30	44	13	17	11	24	3	19	27	22	27	34
54	13	7	56	15	14	12	26	5	13	29	19	24	42

Table 3.7: Total answers to each question related to CONTROL

N=132	Mean	Std. Dev.	Coeff. Alpha
Expressed Control	4,12	2,63	0,67
Wanted Control	3,87	2,55	0,72

Table 3.8: Control statistics

On EC it is very clear that a great majority has lower scores (with scores 0, 1, 2, 3, 4,) with %61.4. It is seen that they feel themselves rather powerless and as exerting very little influence on others. We can easily refer to their respective positions in their organizations since they have very little authority and power to use. It may be also concluded that workers do not like to take responsibility. They don't frequently take on the task of providing structure and direction for others.

The distribution of the WC is neatly left-skewed reflecting an intense dislike for being directed and controlled by others. It is very natural that people are most comfortable in flexible situations with few expectations and instructions. When EC and WC are assessed together it can be said that people currently exercise little control over others and would like to increase it to an appreciable degree, but would rather reduce or avoid similar controls from others. They usually seek out wide authority to do their jobs.

3.5.1.3. Affection

In EA (Table 3.9) it appears slightly skewed to the left (%54.6 less than 4). Consequently large proportion of workers seem to be cautious of being open and demonstrating their affection and attraction to others in their interpersonal relations. They don't provide a lot of warmth, encouragement and support for others. These lower scores do not reflect the characteristics of typical Turkish

people. It is contrary to the expectations and the general belief about Turkish society as mentioned above. As mentioned before, Turkish society has been undergoing a rapid social transformation towards individualism (İmamoğlu & Karakitapoğlu-Atgün, 2004). These recent changes in the society might prevent people from exposing their affection to a certain extent. Lack of confidence and doubt about other people, formal organizational structure, family-related severe economic problems, the fear of control on closer relations by superiors, the fear of undesirable rumors and misconceptions may have pressed on the level of the exposure of affection.

		AFFECTION									
Total		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Expressed	Number of answers	15	18	22	17	9	10	11	13	11	6
Percentage		11.4%	13.6%	16.7%	12.9%	6.8%	7.6%	8.3%	9.8%	8.3%	4.5%
Wanted	Number of answers	25	17	19	13	20	8	6	7	12	5
Percentage		18.9%	12.9%	14.4%	9.8%	15.2%	6.1%	4.5%	5.3%	9.1%	3.8%

Table 3.9: Participants' answers to the questions related to AFFECTION

When one looks Table 3.10, it is clear that large majority (%71.2) has a small-range of wanted affection. In other words, our participants implied that they don't want others to get closer to themselves. They have little desire for others to act warmly, share their feelings, and encourage them. They are not so happy when others are around them, and when others are warm, supportive and openly encouraging.

AFFECTION													
EXPRESSED							WANTED						
Question	Answer						Question	Answer					
	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
4	38	30	36	5	13	10	29	5	40	55	21	5	6
8	24	43	32	8	16	9	32	9	34	48	29	9	3
12	24	48	18	16	21	5	35	5	10	52	21	19	25
17	23	39	39	22	6	3	38	24	30	56	15	3	4
19	3	8	54	35	16	16	40	11	14	44	21	26	16
21	11	24	55	33	6	3	43	18	21	32	39	14	8
23	6	21	71	23	8	3	46	7	9	28	29	31	28
25	6	3	53	39	19	12	49	13	40	45	23	5	6
27	6	36	52	24	8	3	52	6	9	35	36	35	11

Table 3.10: Total answers to each question related to AFFECTION

Nearly there is no difference between wanted and expressed affection of the employees (Table 3.11). This suggests that affection towards others and affection from other have the same intensity and importance for people.

N=132	Mean	Std. Dev.	Coeff. Alpha
Expressed Affection	3,62	2,64	0,71
Wanted Affection	3,35	2,77	0,82

Table 3.11: AFFECTION statistics

3.5.1.4. Total Needs for Affection, Control & Inclusion

As seen in the Table 3.12, contrary to our expectations, total need for control is the highest and inclusion is the smallest. This result suggests that participants probably, as it will be mentioned below, want to secure the current situation. Probably, they would like to maintain a satisfactory balance of power and influence in relationships. They may prefer exertion of control, influence, direction over others while remaining independent from them. After control, they seem to have closer personal relationships with others and they have moderate need for warmth, intimacy, and love. Consequently, they have the least need for inclusion in their activities and in others' activities.

N=132	mean	std. dev.	Coeff. Alpha
Total control	8,9	3,45	0,91
Total affection	8,62	4,57	0,87
Total inclusion	8,07	4,52	0,94

Table 3.11: Total need statistics

3.5. 2. Correlations between Variables

In order to examine the inter-variable associations that might exist among the variables and to compare differences, if any, between them in the way their respective scores are inter-related, the Pearson's Correlation analysis was carried out. Below are the correlation coefficients between each variable.

N=132	EI	WI	EC	WC	EA	WA	TI	TC	TA	TE	TW
EI		0,44**	0,61***	0,26*	0,07	0,14*	0,77***	0,02	0,03	0,24*	0,02
WI			-0,29*	-0,30**	0,38**	0,62***	0,45***	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,25*
EC				0,68***	0,47**	0,41**	0,01	0,27*	0,03	0,31**	0,01
WC					0,56***	0,19*	0,02	0,34**	0,02	0,01	0,23*
EA						0,89***	0,01	0,02	0,56***	0,36**	0,03
WA							0,04	0,03	0,61***	0,04	0,43***
TI								0,38**	0,64***	0,02	0,03
TC									0,58***	0,05	0,14*
TA										0,15*	0,18*
TE											0,84***

Table 3.12: Correlations among variables. *, p<0.05 ** , p<0.01 *** , p<0.001

3.5.3. Intercorrelations between Affection, Control & Inclusion

3.5.3.1. Expressed Affection & Expressed Control

EA and EC are moderately correlated (0.47). For human-being, revealing his/her fondness or friendliness is not an independent behavior. When it comes to affection and its demonstration people usually need to check their behaviors. Prevention of mistakes and flaws may be the main reason for people to control. People who like to control the situation mostly feel that in order to provide success they should reflect their closeness towards others. The positive relationship between expressed affection and expressed control will be discussed further in the results of the hypotheses part.

3.5. 3.2.Expressed Affection & Expressed Inclusion

There is a very low correlation (0.07) between EA and EI. And EI does not explain a significant proportion of the variation in EA, based on the F test ($p > 0.05$). In Turkish culture it is expected that the one who is eager to get into the scene or occasion is usually talkative, close to people around him/her, benign and has a soft and tender characteristic. Generally speaking this ignorable correlation may have been affected by other factors. Recently business life has been a part of intense competition. In order to promote or to be popular at work, employees may think of inclusion in all activities, at the same time may think of being highly formal towards others. This low correlation may prevail especially in government organizations.

3.5. 3.3.Expressed Control & Expressed Inclusion

Correlation between EC and EI is very high (0.617). EC explain a significant proportion of the variation in EI, based on the F test ($p > 0.05$). If people have a tendency to have active roles in groups and tasks, consequently they have the desire to control events and processes. The control of others and situations, and the assumption of the responsibilities mean also including others in your activities, selecting people and interacting with them at work. Strong and positive correlations implies that people who want to take part in activities want also to control others. This type of people can be good candidates for upper positions.

3.5.3.4. Wanted Affection & Wanted Control

Correlation between WA and WC is low (0.19). Generally speaking, it seems that people rarely feel control and affection together. People think that closer relations and control over the atmosphere are not in accordance. If someone wants to see affection from others, it is unlikely for him/her to want others' control. Anyway, affection need sometimes comes from the disturbance of strict control. Similarly, people may want to see control while they feel that things are going in wrong direction especially as a result of closeness and lovely relations at work among employees. For these reasons it seem logical to find out a lower correlation between WA and WC, which will be mentioned and discussed below.

3.5.3.5. Wanted Affection & Wanted Inclusion

WA and WI have a high correlation between themselves (0.62), while EA and EI have a very low correlation (0.07). WA explains a very highly significant proportion of the variation in WI, based on the F test. In Turkish culture, since people are rather collectivist and relational (İmamoğlu & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, 2004), people want to see others close, frank and participative. The levels of WA and WI needs are discussed later, but from the correlational results it is clear that participants have almost the same desires for the satisfaction of WA and WI.

3.5.3.6. Wanted Control & Wanted Inclusion

WC and WI have a negative correlation (-0.3) which implies that very small portion of WC is associated with WI. Participants might want to see others to take responsibility and simultaneously don't want control. As it will be mentioned later, control needs for participants were the highest while inclusion needs were the lowest. People may have thought that control didn't mean inclusion in an activity. That is, for them when control is necessary for different purposes, this control shouldn't be interpreted as inclusion. Similarly, they may want to see others' contributions to the tasks but no control is necessary for the time being. In the present study it is expected that control and inclusion needs have a positive relation. However, when it comes to the wanted control and inclusion needs, there is a negative correlation. This is not a dilemma in itself, because, as it can be recalled from previous explanations, needs have different frames such as wanted and expressed.

3.5. 3.7.Expressed Affection & Wanted Affection

There is a high correlation between EA and WA (0.89). WA explains a very highly significant proportion of the variation in EA, based on the F test ($p < 0.01$). Probably in all cultures, people may not divide their affection or love into pieces such as expressed and wanted, and Turkish culture is not an exception. It is very easy to observe that employees, who endorse close and frank relations, show these characteristics recklessly. If someone is very miser in his/her affection towards others, he/she probably might want to see others cool and distant to him/her.

3.5. 3.8.Expressed Control & Wanted Control

The nature of control in human beings has different aspects. First, when some one wants to control the situation, he/she likes to be checked weather the things are done correctly or not. Second, the desire to control the processes will create the understanding of others' control. In this study there is a high correlation (0.675) between expressed and wanted control. If a worker doesn't like to control tasks all the time, probably he/she doesn't want to be checked. For the present study, it was expected that there should have been a negative correlation between wanted and expressed control needs. This positive correlation was an unexpected one and the reasons behind this interesting finding are discussed in the following sections.

3.5. 3.9.Expressed Inclusion & Wanted Inclusion

The correlation between EI and WI is moderate (0.44). EI does not explain a significant proportion of the variation in WI, based on the F test ($p > 0.05$). People usually want to see the same behaviors from others. In this regard, the correlation may have been expected higher. But, this study was implemented in a working environment. There are very few people, especially at work, who may want others to have the same power and popularity. Inclusion has in itself the desire to be promoted, to be appreciated, and to guarantee the position. In business life no one can say "I want to make contribution to the process and I do not have any expectation from this effort". From that point of view, employees may want to take part in, while preferring others being remote. These conclusions may not be valid in all situations but they might have been one of the reasons for the moderate correlation.

3.6. The Results of the Hypotheses

The results of the study have partially supported the research hypotheses. The possible explanations for the acceptance or rejection of hypothesis were stated below:

3.6. 1. Hypothesis 1

At Hypothesis 1, it is expected that affection should come first, before issues related to control and inclusion can be successfully addressed. Inclusion issues must be resolved before those of control.

As mentioned above Control has the highest total mean scores, and inclusion has the lowest one. The main characteristics of Turkish culture, as mentioned before, lead one to expect that affection and friendliness should come first. But there are many factors affecting the approaches of the employees. Anyway, control means, for people in countries like Turkey, the guarantee of the current position and the insurance of the future. Turkish business environment- both public and private sector- has many shortcomings in terms of usage of technology, implementation of modern management theories and easy going regulations. These working conditions end with rules and many detailed instructions about the tasks. The employees in this atmosphere may adopt themselves to rules, and these frames might foster control related behaviors. In Turkish society, people like to criticize or review others' way of life or management styles. But when it comes to the responsibility and contribution to the process, then, unwillingness prevails. The results of the study did not support Hypothesis 1 and consequently control comes first, affection and inclusion follow it.

3.6. 2. Hypothesis 2

In Hypothesis 2, it is expected that inclusion, control and affection characteristics of Turkish employees are positively related to each other.

As can be seen in Table 3.12 Control (TC) and inclusion (TI) have 0.38 as correlation coefficient. This demonstrates that correlation is moderately significant ($p < 0.05$). With correlational analysis, TC explains a very highly significant proportion of the variation in TI, based on the F test ($p < 0.001$). It is

expected in business life that for managers and for workers control to a certain extent is a must. Employees, who like to take responsibility in a group, to give orders or instructions to others on what and how they should do, to demonstrate their superiority, will meet people, go to parties, do things in a group, and start conversations with strangers easily. On the other hand, employees, with a very low degree of control to influence others or to give instructions to them and to avoid responsibility, will have a very low degree of inclusion and higher preference for being alone, being reserved, will seldom start conversations and will join groups and parties.

Inclusion (TI) and affection (TA) have 0.64 as correlation, which implies a strong relation between them. The R-squared value, 98.7%, indicates the proportion of the variance of TI that is explained by the regression model. Thus TA explains a very highly significant proportion of the variation in TI, based on the F test ($p < 0.001$). In the business life, employees, who have closer relations and social contact with others and who can easily express themselves in a group or team, have normally no problem taking part in any activity. Accordingly, it is expected that the ones, who are shy, or reserved in their inclusion to the environment, can hardly express and demonstrate their feelings, fondness or loving towards others.

Correlation coefficient for Control (TC) and affection (TA) is 0.58, which states that they are moderately correlated. TA explains a very highly significant proportion of the variation in TC, based on the F test ($p < 0.001$). Control characteristic of people in all scopes of life have strong effects. People always need to check their actions beforehand. In order to maintain harmony in his/her

relations, when an employee tries to show his/her feeling to his/her colleague, unintentionally he/she thinks in his/her mind whether his/her behavior might be interpreted in a wrong way by others. Similarly an employee, in a work context, who avoids disclosure and sharing of task-related information with persons connected with the task, and who avoids closer ties with others, have stronger self-checking mechanisms. These are the tentative explanations for the correlation between affection and control.

The results of the tests clearly explain that in the working environment control, affection and inclusion aspects of employees are strongly interrelated and they influence each other. Therefore Hypothesis 2 is supported by the results of the correlational analysis.

3.6. 3. Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 says that **(A)** There will be a positive correlation between expected and wanted affection in Turkish business environment. Employees are expected to show their fondness while they want to see the same behaviors from others. **(B)** There will be a negative correlation between wanted and expressed control needs of Turkish employees. That is, if an employee wants to control the working environment probably he/she does not want too much control on him/her. **(C)** There will be a positive correlation between expressed and wanted inclusions needs. The ones, who want to have contribution to the success of the organization (inclusion), want others to have the same ardor, effort, and endeavor.

(A) Since human-being is a social creature, he/she should have love, liking, or affection for others and must expect others to show the same feelings to him/ her. In the study correlation between expressed (EA) and wanted (WA) affection is 0.89, the highest one in the questionnaire. This correlation demonstrates that affection characteristics of people can not be divided into different perspectives such as wanted and expressed. If one has affection, then, he/she will show and expect the same feelings. WA explains a very highly significant proportion of the variation in EA, based on the F test ($p < 0.001$). 0,934 % of the changes in EA associated with an increase in WA, which is very highly significant ($p < 0.001$). As it is very clear in the results of the study, Hypothesis 3-A is strongly supported.

(B) The correlation between expressed control (EC) and wanted control (WC) is 0.68. That high correlation implies that people who want to control others in working environment want to be checked or controlled by others at the same time. In the regression model WC with a coefficient of 0.42 explains a significant proportion of the variation in EC, based on the F test ($p < 0.05$). From the study it is concluded that employees want to see colleagues and managers to have control, have the desire to check the process, relations and activities. People, who have decision-making influence, and persuasion abilities, expect others to have the determination to have power or dominance in order to provide success to the ongoing businesses. The results of the test do not support Hypothesis 3-B, because employees participating in the questionnaire have a tendency to control others but at the same time they prefer seeing others have the same feature.

(C) The correlation between WI and EI is moderate (0.44) which might have been higher. Probably other factors-mentioned in limitations part- have influenced the result. In any activity, at home, in school, at work, even at the street, people hopes to share the outcomes of any activity. They may have greater motivation to go along with others if they see others having the same ambition. It may be impossible to see someone working round the clock for the accomplishment of the tasks while colleagues or friends have no addition to the result. In Turkish culture this phenomenon can be seen widely and easily. There are many Turkish proverbs enlightening it such as “*üzüm üzüm baka baka kararır*”. One of the possible reasons for this finding may be clarified by the nature of leadership in turkish context. That is, Turkish people wish to follow and obey leaders and demonstrate great respect , consequently they do what leaders do. The results of the study mainly support Hypothesis 3-C.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

4.1. Conclusions

First of all it must be stated that FIRO-B is not a comprehensive personality test. It focuses on how people oriented to interpersonal relations. Results shouldn't be used to judge a person as good or bad. It is a measure of interpersonal needs; in this regard leaders can make sound decisions to determine workers' needs and to behave them properly.

Our findings revealed that most of the respondents don't want to interact and associate with people very much, both at their own initiatives and at that of others. A great majority of workers, however, maintain their personal contact at a superficial level and seem to be cautious of being personally close and open in their relations. This finding suggests that employees may have various problems affecting them; leaders and managers are suggested to get rid of them because human relations and closeness at work are highly related to the motivation and success of the organization (Weick, 1979). The organizational climate should be warm; cooperation between workers should be welcomed. Leaders should know more about employees' personal concerns. Furthermore, managers might try to

provide professional consultancy for employees in order to help them find ways to solve problems. When these problems are minimized and secure and sincere atmosphere is built up, the outcome probably will be more than expected because the nature of Turkish people has the potential to do so.

Another important finding of the present study was the low total need for inclusion (a mean of 8.07) among our employees. It may have different reasons; our participants may feel uncomfortable at work, and may have more important fiscal or social problems. They may preserve their energy for their kids or family members, or they may not have lots of opportunities to interact with each other. Managers should think of improving new ways to achieve recognition and status, and involving them in decision making processes, teamwork and participation. It should be known that drawing them in organizational environment and culture is vital for inclusion. In order to achieve this purpose, managers should be an ideal model in terms of timeliness, hardworking, and industriousness. Leaders don't have to wait too long to see how employees will behave before showing an interest in their contribution.

Finally, regarding the need for control, about two-thirds of our participants felt powerless at present, very little desire to take charge, initiate and exercise power in their interpersonal relationships. And as mentioned above, total need for control was not high (Schutz, 1982) and has a mean of just 8.9 (out of 18). Leaders, confronting and observing the same results in organizations, should provide new challenges and opportunities with equal amount of support and self-direction. Decisions made by upper level leaders shouldn't be final and a chance should be frequently given to employees to change course or the process. There

should be general guidelines for performance, but flexibility should be provided to deal with exceptions. It is known that Turkish people get used to see rules and regulations around them, but not too much (Peker, 2000). Managers should balance this controversy. Since power distance characteristic of Turkish society is strong, subordinates expect to be told what to do; hierarchy in organizations reflects natural differences and boss should be benevolent autocrat (Hofstede, 1980).

In summary, the interpersonal behavior of the employees in the present study was predominantly Control-oriented, with a halfway Affection-oriented and a low Inclusion-oriented. This suggests that managers must pay more attention to their workers' social and interpersonal needs while keeping in mind control. It isn't appropriate to order employees to do their jobs in any condition. Inclusion, in the formal organizational context, can survive through encouragement of employees by means of promotions to upper levels, different kinds of rewards, and maybe premiums. Moreover, affection involves trust-based mutual disclosure that enriches the relationship and enhances interpersonal reliability. Intimate interpersonal relationships in a purely social context may involve affection while managers try to deal with task-related and organizational issues. Low Affection would demonstrates itself in failures to share with colleagues (peers, subordinates and superiors) information and ideas required to accomplish the tasks well. If there is a foundation of trust or credibility, openness and disclosure can occur even where power distributions or control are asymmetrical. Therefore, managers should focus more on affection aspects which are supported by this study. Attempts to create and sustain an

atmosphere of trust in the organization may have to be shown, in terms of structural and communication mechanisms. Interpersonal trust should prevail and continue in the workplace. In an atmosphere of little or low trust, there might be an urgent need of strict control and valuable resources may have to be wasted away hopelessly in endless follow-up and monitoring activities, which will further reduce trust and openness, setting off a vicious circle.

As it may be recalled, wanted and expressed aspects of the behaviors yielded different results in the present study. The low score for Wanted Control (mean= 3, 87) indicates that some employees may avoid leadership roles and being led by others. Analysis of the study revealed that respondents' higher score was on the Expressed Control dimension (mean=4.12) and lower score was on Wanted Control. The reason behind the dislike for wanted control in Turkish organizations may be the failure of the upper-level managers in their behaviors and attitudes. Managers in Turkey may want to have all the process under control which is related to the job or interpersonal behaviors. As a result of this attitude, employees feel themselves overpowered and crushed. The difference between WC and EC may be explained by these managerial approaches.

Similarly, there was a great difference between wanted (mean=2.59) and expressed (mean=4.5) inclusion. The results of the study demonstrate that people usually have no great problems with their expressed inclusion. It is a good point for managers, since Turkish people have the inner initiatives to get into the job and they have the inclination to see their jobs as if their own ones. However, they reported lower scores in wanted inclusion, suggesting that our

participants don't like to see others take responsibility. These results suggest that managers should know and implement the fact that responsibility has the power and authority within itself. Unless people have power with their responsibility, then, they will probably avoid it. Managers should balance the control of the tasks and the initiative and autonomy level they give to others.

4.2. Implications

Interpersonal behavior is a fact of life and it forms the core of human transactions everywhere. The job of management today is recognized, more than ever before, to be inextricably connected with managing human transactions. Management scholars such as Mintzberg (1975), Kotter (1982), and others have, beyond any doubt, established the importance of interpersonal behavior in the managerial world. In order to make contribution to the solutions for interpersonal relations the theory of Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation (FIRO) was developed by Schutz, which provided a comprehensive conceptual framework that could guide a systematic investigation of the phenomenon of interpersonal relations.

Interpersonal relationships are the consequence of interactions among individuals and are affected by the personality and predispositions of the persons involved (Sullivan, 1953). The processes underlying the formation and development of these relationships involve different levels and types of behavior. Researches aimed at unraveling the interpersonal relations of managers will do well to address the conceptual and affective components of the phenomenon, in addition to the behavioral component. The theory of FIRO

recognizes these elements and offers instruments to measure them. Researching interpersonal relations with the help of all the three measures will help achieve an integrative view of them. Even studies, using different tests independently, can make valuable contribution to the research domain of interpersonal relations. Such studies can also provide additional angles of vision, from which to take a re-look at the present findings, which relate solely to the behavioral level of the phenomenon.

Studies, using direct behavioral observations in a variety of naturalistic and contrived interpersonal situations (besides self-report measures) will improve the quality of data. Detailed and comprehensive studies, though very time consuming and likely to suffer from sample attrition and other time-related problems would shed light on the developmental aspects of interpersonal relationships, which cross-sectional studies cannot capture. Studies, using experimentally varied FIRO-compatibility groups, will have additional value.

The manager, no matter how much she/he might seek to disengage himself/ herself from interpersonal relationships, is inexorably involved in them as part of his/her job. Even the organization is well structured with excellent information and control systems, managers may rely on interpersonal relations for effectively carrying out their responsibilities. The results of the present study have important implications for the managers in Turkish business life and, perhaps, also for organizations in different sectors:

- It is interesting that control needs of employees were the first concern, which probably means that they think of secure and guarantee positions rather than effective relationships. These

preferences may also be explained by social, fiscal and organizational reasons. For example, most of the participants were from public sector. This high concern for control may be explained by the stricter hierarchical and centralized structure in public organizations in Turkey.

- Inclusion needs were not dominant, as maybe recalled by the total scores for inclusion, and employees did not see them as a vital one compared to the other needs. This may have been a result of Turkish people's timid, shy and hesitant characteristic during working hours. This unfavorable situation may be avoided if various encouragement and stimulation precautions are implemented by managers.
- It is known that Turkish people are warm-blooded and they can easily share and show their emotions. This fact might be observed in the street, at home, or at a party. But when it comes to the business, this may not be always true. Perhaps due to many external reasons such as organizational structure, management style, family problems, and cultural constrains, in the present study, people were not so willing and eager to demonstrate their affection towards others. Formal relations might have been prevailing in their respective organizations.
- Astonishingly, control need of Turkish employees have had two tails. That is, in our study, their desire to control the situation and

their expectation to be checked or control have had the same characteristic. Managers may use this finding to improve satisfaction of their employees and consequently their performance. They may set their control level according to their observations on the control behaviors of their employees. There tends to be many rules, strict controls and close inspection in Turkish organizations. This control mechanism is surely necessary for any kind of organization but the appropriate level should be adjusted.

- The results of this study strongly support the reality that human behaviors related to affection can not be divided into expressed or wanted parts. People show harmony in their expressed and wanted interpersonal behaviors. They show as much affection as they want to see and feel from others. That implication may be important for managers because they can adjust their candor, closeness and affection level according to the behaviors they observe on their employees.
- The above mentioned findings should be interpreted within the socio-cultural context and the changing business life of Turkish society. Turkey is a developing economy and it is on the way to integrate with the developed global world. Competition, concrete objectives, promotion and success are the main tools for survival in globalization. Recently, Turkish organizations have been in a changing phase and they have been adopting themselves to the

international business rules and specifications. Managers should keep in mind that this reality may have great effects on employees' needs and expectations.

- Human needs at work or at home are not independent of each other. In our study, it was concluded, as mentioned before, that needs are related and affected by many factors. Therefore, managers should not separate business hours from other times. They should have interest in their employees' social, family-related or fiscal problems. It should be known that the school problem, which an employee's child has, might lower his /her motivation and drastically reduce his /her efficiency.

4.3. Limitations

It shouldn't be concluded that all the people participating in the research represent the overall Turkish people. Sample size for the survey was not enough and relatively small, reflecting maybe less than 1% of all the employees in just Ankara. Therefore, the results can not be generalized to overall Turkish business context. Future research should use wider groups to determine and assess the stability of these results.

The employees were chosen from different organizations as mentioned above in order to make unbiased evaluations. This situation might have created a drawback for the study because each group in their respective organizations have different working environment, and their organizational cultures might have had noteworthy differential effects on the results. Furthermore, in the study, no

distribution between private and public sector have been established. As known well, in public sector, the common aim of the business is to provide service to society without any profit concerns, while in private sector the only existence reason is profit. Naturally, in private sector the rules and regulations is strict in order to prevent any mistake, while in the public sector hierarchy is rigid and obedience comes first. Such kinds of organizational differences should be addressed in the future researches.

Methodologically, the present study adopted a cross-sectional design, which provided us with useful and important snapshots of the phenomenon under study, namely, interpersonal behavior. Use of an alternative design, such as the multiple heuristic research design of Moustakas (1990) or a multiple integrative design, used by Zajac and Shortell (1989), could have provided a more definitive and in-depth understanding of the phenomenon. More penetrating insights could be arrived at if mediating variables, such as culture, family background, birth order, number of siblings, etc., were included. Given the modest objectives of the present study, along with considerations of cost and time, the alternative designs were not pursued.

The composition of the sample could have been more complex, with a greater within-group differentiation. The years of experience of managers could have formed a variable in lieu of age. Final limitation of the study is the fact that the nature of the data collecting system doesn't guarantee natural views of the respondents, because they filled the forms during day-time and their workload may have been different.

Despite these limitations, the present study has shed light on the hitherto unknown interpersonal orientation profiles of the employees in the Turkish business life. With the help of FIRO-B form, this study provided preliminary findings for both employees and managers in order to recognize Turkish workers' tendencies for affection, control and inclusion.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham Maslow's, *Motivation and Personality*, published in 1954
- Abramson, L. Y., Seligman, M. E. P., & Teasdale, J. D. (1978). *Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation*. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 87, 49–74.
- Alderfer, C.P. (1969). *An empirical test of a new theory of human needs*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 142-175.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change*. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191–215.
- Becker, W.C. (1964). *Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline*. In M.L.Hoffman and L.W.Hoffman, (Eds.). *Review of Child Development Research* (Vol. 1). New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Cited in *Human Relations*, 43 (12), 1990, p.1199.
- Benjamin, L.S. (1974). *Structural analysis of social behavior*. *Psychological Review*, 81, 392-425.
- Berne, E. (1964). *Games People Play: The Psychology of Human Relationships*. New York: Grove Press.
- Birtchnell, John (1987). *Attachment-detachment, directiveness-receptiveness: A system for classifying interpersonal attitudes and behavior*. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 60, 17-27.
- Birtchnell, John (1990). *Interpersonal theory: Criticism, modification, and elaboration*. *Human Relations*, 43 (12), 1183-1201.
- Bohra, K.A., & Pandey, J. (1984). *Ingratiation toward strangers, friends, and bosses*. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 122, 217-222.
- Cardy, R.L., & Dobbins, G.H. (1986). *Affect and appraisal accuracy: Liking as an integral dimension in evaluating performance*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 672- 678.

- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1999a). *A few more themes, a lot more issues: Commentary on the commentaries*. In R. S. Wyer, Jr. (Ed.), *Perspectives on behavioral self-regulation: Advances in social cognition* (Vol. 12, pp. 261–302). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Coate and Rosati, "Preface," in *The Power of Human Needs in World Society*, ed. Roger A. Coate and Jerel A. Rosati, ix. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1988.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1980). *The empirical exploration of intrinsic motivational processes*. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 13, pp. 39–80). New York: Academic.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985a). *The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality*. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19, 109–134.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985b). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Doherty, W.J., Colangelo, N. (1984), *Journal of marital and family therapy*, Vol 10, pp. 19-29.
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). *Motivational processes affecting learning*. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1040–1048.
- Eisenthal, S. (1961). *The dependence of visibility of values upon group compatibility and level of need for affection*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, cited in Underwood & Krafft (1973), *Op. cit.*
- Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997). *A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 218–232.
- Fisher, S.G. (1995), *Psychological reports*, Vol. 76, pp. 195-206
- Fromm, E. (1947). *Man for Himself*. New York: Rinehart.
- Gluck, G.A. (1983), *Psychometric properties of the FIRO-B: A guide to research*, Consulting Psychological Press, Palo Alto, CA
- Golding, S.L., and Knudson, R.M. (1975). *Multivariable-multimethod convergence in the domain of interpersonal behavior*. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 10, 425-448.

- Hackman, Ray C. (1969). *The Motivated Working Adult*. American Management Association, Inc.
- Higgins, E. T. (1996). *Ideals, thoughts, and regulatory focus: Affect and motivation from distinct pains and pleasures*.
- Horney, K. (1945). *Our Inner Conflicts*. New York: Norton.
- Hofstede, G. (1991), *Cultures and Organizations*, Profile Books, London
- Hull, C. L. (1943). *Principles of behavior: An introduction to behavior theory*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Hutcherson, D.E. (1963). *Relationships among teacher-pupil compatibility, social studies grades, and selected factors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley. Cited in Underwood & Krafft (1973), Op. cit.
- İmamoğlu, E.O. & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z. (2004) *Self-construals and values in different cultural and socioeconomic context*, Genetic, Social, and General Monographs, 2004, 130(4)
- Kabasakal H. and Bodur M. (1998), *Leadership, values and Institutions: The Case of Turkey: Research Papers*, Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey
- Kasser, V., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). *The relation of psychological needs for autonomy and relatedness to vitality, well being, and mortality in a nursing home*. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29, 935–454.
- Kerckhoff, A.C., & Davis, K.E. (1962). *Value consensus and need-complementarity in mate selection*. American Sociological Review, 27, 295-303.
- Kotter, J.P. (1982). *The General Managers*. New York: Macmillan
- Kubes, M. (1992), *Psychology-a journal of human behavior, Vol.29, pp. 33-8*
- Leary, T., Freedman, M.B., Osorio, A.G., and Coffey, H.S. (1951). *The interpersonal dimension of personality*. Journal of Personality, 20, 143-161.
- Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Liden, R., & Graen, G. (1980). *Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 451-465
- Lifton, P.E. (1975), " FIRO-B scales", *Social studies tests and reviews*, Gryphon Press, Highland Park, NJ
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality (2nd ed.)*. New York: Harper and Row.
- McClelland, D. C., & Burnham, D. H. (1976). *Power is the great motivator*. *Harvard Business Review*, 54(2), 100-110.
- McRae, L. and Young, J. (1990), *perceptual and motor skills*, Vol. 70, pp. 493-4.
- Mintzberg, Henry (1975). The Manager's Job: Folklore and Facts. *Harvard Business Review*, 53 (July-August), pp. 49-61.
- Mintzberg, Henry & Quinn, J.B. (1991). *The Strategy Process*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- M.J. Arul's *PhD dissertation*, 1994
- Moustakas, C. (1990). *Heuristic Research: Design, Methodology, and Applications*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1984). *Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance*. *Psychological Review*, 91, 328–346.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978), *Psychometric theory*, New York, McGraw-Hill
- Peker, Ömer ve AYTÜRK, Nihat (2000), *Etkili Yönetim Becerileri*, Yargı Yayınevi, Ankara
- Powers, J.R. (1965). *Trainer orientation and group composition in laboratory training*. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Case Institute of Technology*. Cited in Underwood & Krafft (1973), Op. cit.
- Rao, T.V., & Tamil Selvan (1992). *Strengths and weaknesses of senior executives*. *Productivity*, 33(3), 443-451.
- Raphael-Leff, J. (1983). *Facilitators and regulators: Two approaches to mothering*. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 56, 379-390.
- Roethlisberger, F.J., & Dickson, W.J. (1943). *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

- Ronen, S. (1986), *Comparative and Multinational Management*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
- Rosse, J.G., & Kraut, A.I. (1983). *Reconsidering the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership*. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 56, 63-71.
- Rotter, J. (1954). *Social learning and clinical psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Sapolsky, A. (1960). *Effect of interpersonal relationships upon verbal conditioning*. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 60, 241- 246.
- Sapolsky, A (1965). *Relationship between patient-doctor compatibility, mutual perception, and outcome of treatment*. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 70, 70- 76.
- Scandura, T.A., Graen, G.B., & Novak, M.A. (1986). *When managers decide not to decide autocratically: An investigation of leader-member exchange and decision influence*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 579-584.
- Schaefer, E.S. (1959). *A circumflex model for maternal behavior*. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59, 226-235.
- Schutz, W.C. *FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1958.
- Schutz, W.C. (1976), *Leaders of Schools*, San Diego, CA
- Schutz, W.C (1982). *Trainer's Manual for the Schutz Measures*. San Diego: University Associates.
- Schutz, W.C (1987). *Concordance: decision making, WAS, Mill Valley, CA*
- Schwartz, S.H. 1992, Universals in the context and structure of values. In M. Zanna, *Advances in experimental psychology*. New York Academic Press
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Macmillan.
- Sullivan, H.S. (1953). *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry*. New York: Norton.
- Taylor, F.W. (1947). *Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Thorndike, R.M. (1978). *Correlation Procedures for Research*. New York: Wiley & Sons

- Tolman, E. C. (1932). *Purposive behavior in animals and men*. New York: Century.
- Triandis, H.C. (1995), *Individualism and Collectivism*, Boulder, CO, Westview.
- Tsui, A.S., & Barry, B. (1986). *Interpersonal affect and rating errors*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 586-599.
- Wahba, M. A., Bridwell, L. G. (1976). *Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15, 212-240.
- Wayne, S.J., & Ferris, G.R. (1990). *Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 487-499.
- Weick, K.E. (1979). *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered. *Psychological Review*, 66, 297–333.
- Wiedman, C. (1979), *Small groups' behavior, Vol. 10, pp. 49-61*
- Wiggins, J.S. (1982). *Circumflex models of interpersonal behavior in clinical psychology*. In P.C. Kendall and J.N. Butcher (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in clinical psychology*. New York: Wiley.
- Yalom, I.D., & Rand, K. (1966). *Compatibility and cohesiveness in therapy groups*. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 15, 267-275. In Underwood & Krafft (1973), Op. cit.
- Zajac, E.T. and Shortell, S.M. (1989). Changing generic strategies: Likelihood, direction and performance implications. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10: 413-430.
- Zalenzik, A., Ket de Vries, M.F.R., & Howard, J. (1977). *Stress reactions in organizations: Syndromes, causes and consequences*. *Behavioral Science*, 22, 151-162.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: FIRO-B QUESTIONNAIRE

Decide which of the answers best applies to you (using the scales provided).

Use a common frame of reference when answering these questions. (I.e: if you want to understand your behavior with co-workers, consider the following examples/situations while at work) you are responsible for making sure you complete all the responses and that they don't exceed the scale.

1=Usually, 2=Often, 3=Sometimes, 4=Occasionally, 5=Rarely, 6=Never

- 1. I try to be with people.
- 2. I let other people decide what to do.
- 3. I join social groups.
- 4. I try to have close relationships with people.
- 5. I tend to join social organizations when I have an opportunity.
- 6. I let other people strongly influence my actions.
- 7. I try to be included in informal social activities.
- 8. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.

9. I try to include other people in my plans.
10. I let other people control my actions.
11. I try to have people around me.
12. I try to get close and personal with people.
13. When people are doing things together, I tend to join them.
14. I am easily led by people.
15. I try to avoid being alone.
16. I try to participate in group activities.

1=Most People, 2=Many People, 3=Some People, 4=A few people, 5=One or two people, 6=Nobody

17. I try to be friendly to people.
18. I let other people decide what to do.
19. My personal relations with people are cool and distant.
20. I let other people take charge of things.
21. I try to have close relationships with people.
22. I let other people strongly influence my actions.
23. I try to get close and personal with people.

24. I let other people control my actions.
25. I act cool and distant with people.
26. I am easily led by people.
27. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.
28. I like people to invite me to things.
29. I like people to act close and personal with me.
30. I try to strongly influence other people's actions.
31. I like people to invite me to join in their activities.
32. I like people to act close toward me.
33. I try to take charge of things when I am with people.
34. I like people to include me in their activities.
35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.
36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.
37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.
38. I like people to act friendly toward me.
39. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.
40. I like people to act distant toward me.

1=Usually, 2=Often, 3=Sometimes, 4=Occasionally, 5=Rarely, 6=Never

41. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people.
42. I like people to invite me to things.
43. I like people to act close toward me.
44. I try to have other people do things I want done.
45. I like people to invite me to join their activities.
46. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.
47. I try to strongly influence other people's actions.
48. I like people to include me in their activities.
49. I like people to act close and personal with me.
50. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people.
51. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.
52. I like people to act distant toward me.
53. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.
54. I take charge of things when I'm with people.

APPENDIX 2: FIRO-B ANKETİ

1. Başkaları ile beraber olmaya çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

2. Ne yapacağını başkalarının karar vermesine bırakırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

3. Sosyal toplantılara katılırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

4. Ben başkaları ile sıkı ilişki kurmaya çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

5. Fırsat oldukça sosyal organizasyonlara katılmaya çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

6. Başkalarının benim hareketlerimi etkilemesine müsaade ederim.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

7. Gayri resmi sosyal faaliyetlere katılmaya gayret gösteririm.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

8. Başkaları ile yakın ve kişisel ilişki kurmaya çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

9. Gelecek planlarıma başkalarını katmaya çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

10. Başkalarının yaptıklarını kontrol altında tutmasına müsaade ederim.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

11.Etrafımda başkalarının bulunmasına çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

12.Başkalarına yaklaşılmaya ve samimi olmaya çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

13.Başkaları beraberce bir şeyler yaparken bende katılmaya çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

14.Ben başkaları tarafından kolayca yönetilirim.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

15.Yalnız kalmamaya çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

16.Grup faaliyetlerine katılmaya çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiçbir zaman

17.Başkalarına karşı arkadaşça davranmaya çalışırım.

1.herkese 2.bir çok kişiye 3.bazılarına 4.az kişiye 5.bir/iki kişiye 6.hiç kimseye

18.Ne yapılacağına başkalarının karar vermesine müsaade ederim.

1.herkese 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

19.Benim başkaları ile kurduğum ilişkiler soğuk ve mesafelidir.

1.herkese 2.bir çok kişiyle 3.bazılarıyla 4.az kişiyle 5.bir/iki kişiyle 6.hiç kimseyle

20.Başkalarının sorumluluk almasına müsaade ederim.

1.herkesin 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

21. Ben başkaları ile sıkı ilişkiler kurmaya çalışırım.

1.herkesle 2.bir çok kişiyle 3.bazılarıyla 4.az kişiyle 5.bir/iki kişiyle 6.hiç kimseyle

22. Başkalarının hareketlerimi güçlü bir şekilde etkilemesine müsaade ederim.

1.herkesin 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

23. Ben başkalarına yaklaşılmaya kişisel bağlar kurmaya çalışırım.

1.herkesle 2.bir çok kişiyle 3.bazılarıyla 4.az kişiyle 5.bir/iki kişiyle 6.hiç kimseyle

24. Başkalarının hareketlerimi kontrol altında tutmasına müsaade ederim.

1.herkesin 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

25. Başkalarına karşı soğuk ve mesafeli davranırım.

1.herkese 2.bir çok kişiye 3.bazılarına 4.az kişiye 5.bir/iki kişiye 6.hiç kimseye

26. Başkaları tarafından kolayca yönetilirim.

1.herkesin 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

27. Başkaları ile yakın kişisel ilişkiler kurmaya çalışırım.

1.herkesle 2.bir çok kişiyle 3.bazılarıyla 4.az kişiyle 5.bir/iki kişiyle 6.hiç kimseyle

28. Başkalarının beni bir şeyler yapmaya davet etmelerinden hoşlanırım.

1.herkesin 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

29. Başkalarının bana yakın ve kişisel davranmalarından hoşlanırım.

1.herkesin 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

30. Başkalarının hareketlerini güçlü bir şekilde etkilemeye çalışırım.

1.herkesin 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

31. Başkalarının beni kendi faaliyetlerine davet etmelerinden hoşlanırım.

1.herkesin 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

32. Başkalarının bana karşı yakın davranmalarından hoşlanırım.

1.herkesin 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

33. Başkaları ile beraber iken olayları kontrol etmeye çalışırım.

1.herkesin 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

34. Başkalarının faaliyetlerine beni de katmalarından hoşlanırım.

1.herkesin 2.bir çok kişinin 3.bazılarının 4.az kişinin 5.bir/iki kişinin 6.hiç kimsenin

35. Başkalarının bana karşı soğuk ve mesafeli davranmalarından hoşlanırım.

1. herkesin 2. bir çok kişinin 3. bazılarının 4. az kişinin 5. bir/iki kişinin 6. hiç kimsenin

36. Başkalarının yaptıklarını benim istediğim gibi yapmalarına çalışırım.

1. herkesin 2. bir çok kişinin 3. bazılarının 4. az kişinin 5. bir/iki kişinin 6. hiç kimsenin

37. Başkalarının yaptıkları tartışmalara beni davet etmelerinden hoşlanırım.

1. herkesin 2. bir çok kişinin 3. bazılarının 4. az kişinin 5. bir/iki kişinin 6. hiç kimsenin

38. Başkalarının bana arkadaşça davranmalarından hoşlanırım.

1. herkesin 2. bir çok kişinin 3. bazılarının 4. az kişinin 5. bir/iki kişinin 6. hiç kimsenin

39. Başkalarının yaptıkları faaliyetlere beni davet etmelerinden hoşlanırım.

1. herkesin 2. bir çok kişinin 3. bazılarının 4. az kişinin 5. bir/iki kişinin 6. hiç kimsenin

40. Başkalarının bana karşı mesafeli davranmalarını isterim.

1. herkesin 2. bir çok kişinin 3. bazılarının 4. az kişinin 5. bir/iki kişinin 6. hiç kimsenin

41. Başkaları ile beraber iken etkili kişi olmaya çalışırım.

1. genellikle 2. sık sık 3. bazen 4. arasıra 5. nadir 6. hiç bir zaman

42. Başkalarının beni bir şeyler yapmaya davet etmelerinden hoşlanırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir
zaman

43. Başkalarının bana karşı yakın davranmalarını isterim

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir
zaman

44. İsteklerimi başkalarına yaptırmaktan hoşlanırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir
zaman

45. Başkalarının kendi faaliyetlerine katılmaya beni davet etmelerini isterim.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir
zaman

46. Başkalarının bana karşı soğuk ve mesafeli davranmalarından hoşlanırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir
zaman

47. Başkalarının hareketlerini güçlü bir şekilde etkilemeye çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir
zaman

48. Başkalarının kendi faaliyetlerine beni de katmalarından hoşlanırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir
zaman

49. Başkalarının bana karşı yakın ve kişisel davranmalarından hoşlanırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir zaman

50. Başkaları ile beraber iken olayları ele almaya çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir zaman

51. Başkalarının kendi faaliyetlerine katılmaya beni davet etmelerinden hoşlanırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir zaman

52. Başkalarının bana karşı mesafeli davranmalarını isterim.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir zaman

53. Başkalarının yaptıklarını benim istediğim gibi yapmalarına çalışırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir zaman

54. Başkaları ile beraber iken faaliyetleri ele alırım.

1.genellikle 2.sık sık 3.bazen 4.arasına 5.nadir 6.hiç bir zaman

APPENDIX 3: FIRO-B ASSESSMENT FORMS

INCLUSION	EXPRESSED		WANTED	
	Question	Answer	Question	Answer
	1	1,2,3	28	1,2
	3	1,2,3,4	31	1,2
	5	1,2,3,4	34	1,2
	7	1,2,3	37	1
	9	1,2	39	1
	11	1,2	42	1,2
	13	1	45	1,2
	15	1	48	1,2
16	1	51	1,2	
Total		Total		

CONTROL	EXPRESSED		WANTED	
	Question	Answer	Question	Answer
	30	1,2,3	2	1,2,3,4
	33	1,2,3	6	1,2,3,4
	36	1,2	10	1,2,3
	41	1,2,3,4	14	1,2,3
	44	1,2,3	18	1,2,3,4
	47	1,2,3	20	1,2,3,4
	50	1,2	22	1,2,3,4
	53	1,2	24	1,2,3
54	1,2	26	1,2,3	
Total		Total		

AFFECTION	EXPRESSED		WANTED	
	Question	Answer	Question	Answer
	4	1,2	29	1,2
	8	1,2	32	1,2
	12	1	35	5,6
	17	1,2	38	1,2
	19	4,5,6	40	5,6
	21	1,2	43	1
	23	1,2	46	5,6
	25	4,5,6	49	1,2
27	1,2	52	5,6	
Total		Total		

APPENDIX 4: DISTRIBUTIONS ON VARIABLES









