

# FIRO-B & Nurturant-Task Leadership Model: Moderating Influence of Individual Differences

Omer Bin Sayeed

---

*Present study explored relationships between interpersonal needs and leadership styles in superior-subordinate context. Interpersonal behaviour defined by inclusion and affection dimensions of FIRO-B related more strongly to participative and nurturant dimensions than task behaviour dimension of leaders, while control expressed behaviour failed to show any relationship with task-orientation. Extroversion based on total scores of expressed components of FIRO-B demonstrated significant influence on task orientation, participative and nurturant leadership dimensions. However, inclusion and affection continued to sustain similar trend of relationship with the participative and nurturant dimensions, whereas control expressed behaviour partly confirmed relationship with task orientation being a fragment of nurturance-task dimension.*

*Omer Bin Sayeed* is Professor of Organizational Behaviour in National Institute of Industrial Engineering, Vihar Lake, Mumbai 400087.  
Email:omersayeed@gmail.com

## Leadership

Leadership makes or mars the organization. Subordinates enjoy their work and function effectively if some directions in their work activities are perceived by them. It is also besides the fact that for each one of them there must be some guiding and enabling situation created by the position based leaders as part of the work process. Growing research literature in this field has pointed out ever expanding boundaries of leadership that need to be fathomed from different perspectives, such as theoretical-conceptual, empirical and experimental, besides identifying snippets of those who have talked about leadership and leadership behaviour as a domain of practical utility. The present paper tries to assess in an empirical perspective how leaders view their leadership styles and how it is intrinsically determined by what one prefers in an interpersonal mode where leaders holding higher hierarchical positions and their reference group members, mainly their subordinates, are involved.

## **Review of Literature**

Di-Marco, Kuehl and Wims (1975) examined the relationship of leadership style and of interpersonal need orientation to changes in self-reported leadership dimensions for first and second level supervisors (n=467) in a manufacturing company. Pre-post training changes in consideration were found positively correlated with pre-training supervisory development training scale and with the FIRO-B subscale scores except “Expressed Control” which showed a negative correlation. Pre-post training change in initiating structure showed a pattern of correlations with supervisory training and development scale and FIRO-B subscale scores exactly the opposite of the pattern of consideration change. Kuehl, Di-Marco and Wims (1975) further examined the relationship of interpersonal need structure using FIRO-B subscales to leadership behaviour and the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPC) in a group of 245 first and second level supervisors. The LPC score (higher scores indicative of relationship orientation) and the consideration dimension were found to be related positively to all the FIRO-B subscales except expressed control. Initiating structure, indicative of task orientation, was found related positively to expressed control.

Tucker (1983) attempted to replicate the data of Kuehl et al (1975) with student population considered to be more representative of younger managers, using 151 students (median age 28 yrs) in a graduate business course. A battery of

tests that included the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), the Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) Scale, and the FIRO-B were used for the purpose. Data from the study by Kuehl et al supported the idea that task/person constructs in the questionnaires used (FIRO-B, LOQ, LPC) underlie their study. However, the conclusions drawn by Tucker failed to confirm those drawn by Kuehl et al (1975) and questioned whether the values and assumptions about leadership that were prevalent 20 years ago are still valid and whether the questionnaires used have value in predicting leader behaviour.

Ilgen and O’Brien (1974) investigated the influence of the task organization and group composition factors on leader-member relations, using 192 male undergraduates. Leader-member relations were defined according to contingency model of leadership and the task organization specified by two forms of cooperation viz. coordination and collaboration. Member compatibility was defined by “interchange compatibility” (Schutz 1958) on the three needs measured by FIRO-B scale. Results showed that leader-member relations were affected by the coordination requirements of the task and the interaction of collaboration with member compatibility.

**Leader-member relations were affected by the coordination requirements of the task and the interaction of collaboration with member compatibility.**

A study in a simulated environment conducted by Lundgren and Knight (1977) documented relationships between T-group members' and trainers' needs for control and affection and the members' evaluative attitudes toward the group and the trainers. Members and trainers of thirty one T-groups completed the FIRO-B scales at the beginning of the laboratories to assess control and affection needs; need scores from this measure were categorized as low control/low affection, low control/high affection, high control/low affection, and high control/high affection. Members' feelings for the trainers and groups were obtained on the 54-item Interpersonal Reaction Form, administered once after four sessions and again after 15 sessions. Members' attitudes toward both the trainers and the groups increased favourably over the 2 time periods for 3 of 4 of the trainers' need categories, the exception being low control/low affection.

Comparing with the above though not completely similar Hurley, Feintuch and Mandell's (1991) study was more concerned with how superior-subordinate appraisal leads to more or less constructive attitude toward each other. For the purpose, 95 small personal development groups of undergraduates were assessed for their interpersonal behaviour. It was observed that the mix of declining appraisals of others with rising self-acceptance moved leaders toward a less constructive interpersonal attitude, perhaps leading to exercise of task dominant behaviour more often than required.

The discrepancy theory of leader effectiveness was tested with twenty 3-person groups (O'Brien & Kabanoff 1981). Each group leader was pre-selected on the basis of scores on the FIRO-B, which measured control and participation needs. Half of the leaders selected had high control and low participation needs, and the other half had low control and high participation needs. Matched and discrepant group structures were used with two levels of treatment that provided either high control and low participation opportunities or low control and high participation opportunities. The effects of leader style and group structure were tested with rated productivity on production/discussion tasks being the dependent measure. Group structure had a significant effect on group productivity, but the results showed no significant interactions between leader style and group structure. Group structure accounted for 41% of variance in the group productivity, whereas the Style by Structure interaction accounted for 1%.

**Group structure had a significant effect on group productivity, but the results showed no significant interactions between leader style and group structure.**

In a more structured military environment, Polley and Eid (1994) investigated 96 Norwegian Naval Cadets who rated 112 of their fellow cadets on interpersonal behaviour and ranked each other as leaders and peers before and after an outdoor training exercise. The

analysis revealed that: (1) leaders were chosen on the basis of dominance and conformity, whereas co-workers were chosen on the basis of friendliness; and (2) these criteria were affected by the group's interpersonal context.

Horne and Carron (1985) assessed 74 female athletes and 9 coaches from intercollegiate volleyball, basketball, track and field, and swimming teams participated for their interpersonal skills, leadership orientation and athlete performance. Compatibility was evaluated using a sport-adapted version of the FIRO-B, and a leadership scale for sports relationship, athlete performance, and satisfaction with the coach's leadership were obtained. Results showed that discrepancies between the athletes' perceptions of and preference for coach reward behaviour and between perception/preference regarding autocratic coaching behaviour were associated with incompatibility.

**Interpersonal efficacy is a key factor that needs to be considered for evolving a leadership pattern that produces results.**

From the above review of studies dealing with varied aspect of interpersonal relations and leadership behaviour in diverse situations ranging from interpersonal behaviour among athletes to leadership training in structured environment to group development for personal effectiveness, it was hinted upon that interpersonal efficacy is a key factor that needs to be considered for evolving a

leadership pattern that produces results. The present study is, therefore, conceptualized to test the following questions:

- Is there a relationship between inclusion and affection measures of FIRO-B and participative-nurturant components of leadership?
- Is there a relationship between control dimension of FIRO-B and Task-orientation or nurturant-task leadership dimension?
- Whether individual differences (high and low scores) on FIRO-B subscales would relate differently with leadership dimensions?

### **Sample**

Data were collected from 102 managers of middle management cadre, who were participants in different Management Development Programmes at NITIE, Mumbai. As a group they represented a wide ranging industrial set ups such as heavy/light engineering companies, chemical/pharmaceutical concerns, public/private sector organizations, co-operatives and power generation/supplying organizations etc. The managers from private and public companies were represented in the ratio of 2:3. The average age of respondents was 42 years with a range from 25 to 55 years.

### **Instrument**

A questionnaire battery comprising leadership style questionnaire (Sinha 1995) and FIRO-B scale (Schutz 1958) was used. The Leadership Style Question

naire consisted of 60 items and each item is rated on a 5-point scale ranging from '1-never' to '5-Always'. Six dimensions, namely participative, nurturant-task, authoritarian, nurturant, task-orientation and bureaucratic were assessed by 10 items each. The FIRO-B developed by Schutz (1958) measured interpersonal behaviour through 54 items classified under 6 dimensions such as inclusion expressed, inclusion wanted, control, expressed, control wanted, affection expressed and affection wanted. The items are rated on a 6-point scale ranging from '1-usually' to '6-never'. The scoring procedure accumulated scores in 6 dimensions in accordance with the Guttman scoring technique (Schutz 1958). The scores of each dimension ranged from 0 to 9.

**Results**

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics of FIRO-B subscales and leadership dimensions. From a close scrutiny of the

interpersonal dimensions one can see that the managers sampled for the present study are predominantly extroverted as reflected in the expressed versus wanted scores of inclusion, control and affection areas. A paired t-test within inclusion, control and affection areas, using expressed and wanted scores within the domain, revealed significant differences for inclusion and control dimensions but not for the affection dimension. On the other hand, against the obtainable score of 50 for each dimension of leadership a narrow range of mean values from 31.6 to 41.7 was noted for dimensions of leadership, suggesting lesser variance in perceiving various leadership characteristics or dimensions defined by Sinha (1980). However, the noteworthy fact is that authoritarian and bureaucratic dimensions were placed at the lower end whereas nurturant-task, participative, task-oriented and nurturant factors of leadership showed close-knit score patterns and were placed at the higher level.

**Table 1: Means and Standard Deviation of FIRO-B and Leadership Dimension. (N=102)**

FIRO-B Dimension			Leadership Dimension		
	Mean	SD		Mean	SD
1. Inclusion Expressed (EI)	5.78	1.77	1. Participative	40.11	4.27
2. Inclusion Wanted (WI)	4.14	2.78	2. Nurturant task	41.72	4.80
3. Control Expressed (EC)	5.46	2.43	3. Authoritarian	31.60	5.46
4. Control Wanted (WC)	4.33	2.16	4. Bureaucratic	31.94	4.46
5. Affection Expressed (EA)	5.26	2.63	5. Nurturant	39.77	4.33
6. Affection Wanted (WA)	5.09	2.40	6. Task Oriented	41.61	3.94

Paired t test between EI and WI = 6.93, Between EC and WC = 3.31 and between EA and WA = 0.71

In order to verify the conceptually defined styles of leadership with statistically identified clusters of leadership dimensions a varimax rotated factor struc-

ture was obtained as shown in Table 2. There were 2 factors, each explaining 38.1 and 24.6 per cent of variance. The varimax rotated factor loadings showed

clustering of participation, nurturant, nurturant-task dimensions as one style of leadership and authoritarian and bureaucratic dimensions together as another style of leadership. In other words, based on the composite scores of leadership dimensions one can say that leadership style comprises only two major dimensions of which one is participative-nurturant-task style and the other is position based authoritarian-bu-

reaucratic (or authoritative) style. The respondents of the present study do not seem to perceive more than two styles as they experienced in the work context. However, within each style there seems to be some degree of variation in leadership behaviour which is expressed through participative or nurturant-task mode or on the opposite side through authoritarian or bureaucratic leadership style mode.

**Table 2: Varimax Rotated Factor Structure of Leadership Dimensions.**

Leadership dimension	Factor I Participative– Nurturant-Task Orientation	Factor II Authoritarian- Bureaucratic Orientation (Authoritative)	h <sup>2</sup>
1. Participation	.73	-.32	.63
2. Nurturant Task	.73	.08	.54
3. Authoritarian	-.02	.81	.66
4. Bureaucratic	.00	.82	.67
5. Nurturant	.79	-.08	.63
6. Task-orient	.76	.21	.63
Eigenvalue	2.296	1.48	
Per cent of variance explained	38.10	24.63	

Table 3 presents correlation between FIRO-B dimensions such as inclusion, control and affection and leadership dimensions characterized as participative, nurturant-task, authoritarian, bureaucratic, nurturant and task-oriented. Since all the three factors of FIRO-B are measured on expressed and wanted aspects, total scores for inclusion, control and affection and also expressed and wanted total scores (representing extroversion and introversion respectively) were included in the correlation analysis. It can be observed that inclusion and affection dimensions significantly related to participative and nurturant style of leadership but failed to relate with other lead-

ership dimensions such as nurturant-task, authoritarian, bureaucratic and task-oriented styles. On the contrary, it was expected that control dimension of FIRO-B would relate with task-orientation dimension. Surprisingly, it was found that there was no significant positive relationship with task-oriented leadership behaviour as conceptualized by Sinha (1995). It can also be noted that the trend of relationship was positive but non-significant with nurturant-task and task-oriented leadership dimensions. However, expressed components of FIRO-B (expressed total score) showed relationship with participative, nurturant leadership styles besides showing significant

relationship with task-orientation of leaders. The wanted components (wanted total scores) related significantly with participative, nurturant dimensions but not with task orientation dimension.

**Table 3: Correlations between FIRO - B and Leadership Dimensions**

(N = 102)

FIRO-B Dimension	Leadership Dimensions					
	Participative	Nurturant Task	Authoritarian	Bureaucratic	Nurturant	Task-Oriented
Inclusion Expressed	.32*	.07	-.12	.18	.53**	.15
Inclusion Wanted	.24*	.06	-.14	-.16	.34**	.11
Inclusion Total	.31**	.07	-.15	.19*	.47**	.15
Control Expressed	-.09	.18	.12	.02	.11	.16
Control Wanted	.16	.06	.05	.04	-.02	-.13
Control Total	.04	.19	.13	.06	.07	.03
Affection Expressed	.28**	.07	-.03	-.00	.33**	.11
Affection Wanted	.35**	.03	-.20*	-.18	.26**	.13
Affection Total	.36**	.06	-.13	.10	.34**	.14
Expressed total	.23*	.16	-.00	-.06	.43**	.20*
Wanted total	.37**	.08	-.15	-.15	.31*	.07

\*\*p<.01; \*p<.05

Table 4 describes relationship between FIRO-B dimensions and leadership styles through canonical correlation procedure that uses two linear composites of FIRO-B and leadership dimensions with their unique underlying variations to establish linkages between the two sets of variables. The canonical correlation between the two sets mentioned above established a relationship of .57 significant well beyond .01 level of confidence. The correlations between leadership dimensions and the respective canonical variables (i.e. canonical loadings) were very high for participative style and nurturant style, whereas other dimensions showed canonical loadings being low for bureaucratic, authoritarian, task-oriented and nurturant-task dimensions in decreasing

order. The canonical loadings of inclusion and affection needs were very high whereas the loadings for control needs were close to zero. The redundancy explained by leadership and Interpersonal dimensions was 8.23 per cent and 11.16 per cent respectively. A multiple regression analysis between FIRO-B dimensions and leadership dimensions one at a time showed significant contribution of FIRO-B needs to nurturant and participative style, explaining 28.84 and 19.91 per cent of variance significant well beyond .01 level of confidence.

As it is expected that the higher scores of FIRO-B needs might affect leadership dimensions differently, an analysis of high and low scores of six interpersonal needs

**Table 4: Canonical Correlation between Interpersonal Behaviour and Leadership Dimension.**

Root #	Canonical Correlation	Wilks' Lamda	F ratio	P
1	.57	.48	2.04	.001
Leadership Dimensions	Correlation between leadership dimensions and Canonical variable	R <sup>2</sup>	FIRO-B Dimensions	Correlation between FIRO-B and Canonical variable
1. Participative	-.63	19.91*	1. Inclusion Expressed	-.97
2. Nurturant-task	-.10	4.59	2. Inclusion Wanted	-.64
3. Authoritarian	.27	7.58	3. Control Expressed	-.02
4. Bureaucratic	.34	7.53	4. Control Wanted	-.00
5. Nurturant	-.91	28.84*	5. Affection Expressed	-.58
6. Task-oriented	-.24	6.23	6. Affection Wanted	-.57
Redundancy (%)	8.23		Redundancy (%)	11.16

\*p<.01

were carried out with six leadership dimensions. Each interpersonal need scores was split at the median of respective score distribution and related separately with leadership dimensions. There was a significant shift in the correlation pattern for some of the FIRO-B needs. It can be seen that low inclusion expressed need related equally strongly with participative and nurturant dimensions whereas high scores of the same component related with nurturant dimension but not so strongly with participative dimension of leadership. Inclusion wanted low scores related positively and significantly with nurturant dimension of leadership but failed to relate with participative dimension. Control need (both high and low groups) under expressed and wanted domain failed to relate with task oriented leadership dimension; the exception was nurturant-task and nurturant orientation with which control expressed (high scores) showed positive and significant relationship. Further, affection ex-

pressed high score showed negative significant relationship with nurturant-task dimension and affection wanted high score related positively and significantly with authoritarian dimension. In a more or less similar manner affection wanted low score and inclusion expressed high score related negatively and significantly with bureaucratic dimension. It is interesting to note that with bifurcation of FIRO-B dimension scores, at least two correlations for bureaucratic dimension turned out to be negative and significant whereas observing Table 3 again one could notice that none of the correlations for bureaucratic dimension under three interpersonal need areas leaving aside inclusion total was significant.

**None of the correlations for bureaucratic dimension under three interpersonal need areas leaving aside inclusion total was significant.**

**Table 5: Correlations between FIRO-B and Leadership Dimension under Low and High FIRO-B Scores**

		Participative	Nurturant-task	Authoritarian	Bureaucratic	Nurturant	Task-Oriented
Inclusion Exp:	Low (N = 63)	.33*	-.01	-.11	-.10	.42**	.13
	High (N = 39)	.19*	-.12	-.23	-.45**	.36*	-.01
Inclusion Wanted:	Low (N = 54)	.12	.17	.17	-.11	.34*	.20
	High (N = 48)	.10	-.26	-.18	.15	.22	-.05
Control Expressed :	Low (N = 58)	-.22	-.23*	.17	.09	.10	.16
	High (N = 44)	.19	.36*	-.19	-.26	.37*	.09
Control Wanted :	Low (N = 54)	.02	-.23	-.04	-.01	-.20	-.20
	High (N = 48)	.26	.07	-.04	.13	.22	.01
Affection Expressed :	Low (N = 61)	.02	.07	.06	.17	.19	.13
	High (N= 41)	-.05	-.33*	-.13	.14	-.04	-.17
Affection Wanted :	Low (N = 58)	.22	-.19	-.10	-.25*	.14*	-.15
	High (N = 44)	.01	-.07	.36*	-.01	.32*	.15

## Discussion

The findings have clearly pointed out that managers of the present study who belonged to middle management cadre had relatively higher scores on extroversion than introversion. Their extroversion approach does not seem to be truly outgoing due to the fact that their average obtained scores on various dimensions of FIRO-B as against theoretical upper limits showed large differences for both extroversion and introversion dimensions. This pattern is suggestive of subscribing to normative standard of outgoing activities that managers may have committed themselves to, besides maintaining formal role-based dealings in various spheres of activity they are involved with.

The leadership components of managers are expressed through different behavioural patterns and shades of

styles, sometimes pure and independent and sometimes overlapping. It would be of great interest to researchers if the overlap among various leadership styles is taken note of. It is worth noting that the participative, nurturant-task, nurturant and task-oriented dimensions are perceived together by the managers of middle management cadre vis-à-vis authoritarian-bureaucratic (or authoritative) dimensions. In view of the fact that the two styles of leadership are factorially distinct and are relatively independent of each other, they seem to provide some support to the style constructs predominantly projected and practiced by the respondents at the macro-level as Fleishman (1953) demonstrated in his leadership study. On the other hand, Sinha (1980, 1995), Ansari (1990) and Hassan (1986) documented at the micro-level the constructs or dimensions of leadership using item responses. These attempts roughly sug-

gested the dimension names currently in use, but do not define the construct of leadership based on these dimensions. In order to define the leadership behaviour at the micro-level item responses are factored, whereas for defining the differentiating capability of composite scores at the macro-level, subscale scores are factored applying second order factoring method. As seen in the present study emergence of two clusters distinctly indicated two major styles of leadership even though there were six dimensions of leadership behaviour. These findings can be compared with major research findings reported in the West, where consistently two dimensions of leadership are identified (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler & Weick 1970:83-85). In other words, the current evidence heavily weighs against 6 dimensions or styles of leadership suggested by Sinha (1980, 1995), rather our findings have substantially confirmed along the lines of Western researches that the managerial leadership style comprises mainly two major dimensions i.e., Participative-Nurturant and Authoritative styles.

**The managerial leadership style comprises mainly two major dimensions i.e., Participative-Nurturant and Authoritative styles.**

A theoretical point that needs further elaboration here is that of the interpersonal skills of managers as embodied in the construct of FIRO-B (inclusion and affection representing participation needs) that are assumed to

influence the constructs of leadership dimensions are fully confirmed in the present study (Kuehl, Di-Marci & Wims 1975, O'Brien & Kabanoff 1981). The managers who establish personal ties, maintain human relations and carry on their networking are those who have strong needs to include themselves into others' activities (inclusion need). Expressing warmth, being open to one self and to the group signify affection need or the need for openness. Setting directions and dominating the group through ideas, conceptual schemes, schedules and programmes are indicative of control or domineering need of managers. The inclusion and affection needs compel these managers to exercise participative styles in groups and be emotionally involved with people. The trends of findings have clearly confirmed these linkages between inclusion-affection dimensions and participative-nurturant dimensions. Indirect support for moderating influence of control need is provided by negative and non-significant relationships between inclusion and affection dimensions and authoritative style of functioning (i.e. both Authoritarian and Bureaucratic dimensions). In fact, it is merely suggestive that being increasingly participative does not allow the managers to be authoritative in approach and style. Enough evidence, however, is not available to buttress this point of view.

With the nexus of inclusion-affection and the participative-nurturant styles, as demonstrated above, it is expected that control dimension of FIRO-B signifying domineering needs of managers would

show significant relationship with nurturant-task style to a lesser extent and task-oriented style to a greater extent as because nurturant-task dimension is defined on contingency term, i.e. a leader becomes more nurturant if better performance of subordinates follows. The findings failed to support this assumption and the hypothetical linkage supposedly thought of between the two. Nevertheless, small positive and non-significant relationships between the above dimensions were noted, probably suggesting a likely tendency of control need and leadership styles, mainly of nurturant-task, task orientations and authoritative styles (i.e., bureaucratic and authoritarian dimensions both) to vary together.

Is it possible to prove the above contention in a multivariate framework, where interpersonal dimensions and leadership styles are used jointly as two linear composites? The magnitude of canonical correlation and respective loadings obtained for participative-nurturant dimensions and Inclusion-affection needs fully validated the above findings of a close nexus between interpersonal needs (inclusion and affection) and leadership behaviours comprising participative and nurturant orientation. While the above is true, surprisingly control need failed to relate with leadership behaviour envisaged as domineering style in the workgroup generally known as task orientation or authoritative styles.

Nevertheless, extroversion scores based on expressed scores of three interpersonal need areas revealed positive significant relationship with participa-

tive and nurturant dimensions besides indicating meaningful co-variation with

**These findings are suggestive of making control expressed behaviour more effective if inclusion and affection are also equally strongly perceived and interacted with control expressed behaviour.**

task-orientation of managers. In fact, these findings are suggestive of making control expressed behaviour more effective if inclusion and affection are also equally strongly perceived and interacted with control expressed behaviour. In fact, this makes the managers more task-oriented with increased participation of subordinates caused by higher inclusion and affection behaviour routinely expressed by managers.

A critical issue that requires discussion here is whether *individual differences* reflected in the interpersonal need patterns would explain and support the above contention in a more cogent manner. For this purpose correlations obtained under high and low FIRO-B need dimensions (expressed and wanted both) showed variation in the correlation pattern, which became more obvious with respect to nurturance orientation than participative orientation. Besides this, control expressed behaviour showed, as expected, significant relationship with nurturant-task behaviour and nurturant behaviour of leaders that was not at all observed in an overall group analysis. It is also besides the fact that control expressed need (high and low scores) ut-

terly failed to relate with task orientation, authoritarian and bureaucratic dimensions simply suggest a possibility that control expressed behaviour is more effective in the context of conditionally defined nurturant style (nurturant-task orientation) but not necessarily with the independent dimension of leader's task orientation. The wanted scores for inclusion, control and affection (split into high and low scores) also showed a different pattern of relationship for participative behaviour than shown for the overall group analysis, thereby suggesting a possibility of moderating influence of high and low tail of score distribution of FIRO-B dimensions. The findings obtained in the present study partially confirmed the hunch about presence of moderating influence of FIRO-B dimensions. What appears to be more desirable is to investigate this issue in a larger sample and isolate significant differences between high and low group of inclusion, control, and affection dimensions for expressed and wanted dimensions. By and large, the obtained results signify importance and partly moderating influence of individual differences, besides partially testing a point of view that high control expressed behaviour does contribute to some aspect of task orientation measured as a component of nurturant-task leadership behaviour, conceptualized to be contingent upon task performance.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the three dimensional theory of interpersonal skills demonstrated positive relationship of Inclusion and Affection dimensions with that

of participative and nurturant styles of leaders. The Control Expressed dimension failed to relate with leaders' Task Orientation component, thereby the trend of relationship suggested that control expressed behaviour in *work context* perhaps cannot be characterized as fully representative of *managerial task oriented behaviour*. However, extroversion or outgoing interpersonal style of managers, epitomized in overall expressed component of FIRO-B, seemingly played a role more than the introversion component, in making the leaders more participative, nurturant and task oriented, which is rather suggestive of interaction effect of three dimensional model of interpersonal behaviour. By and large, the individual profile of subscale scores that altered the correlational pattern with leadership dimensions suggested a possibility of moderating and compounding influence of FIRO-B dimensions.

### **Implications**

The implication of FIRO-B and Leadership Styles for building skills of practicing managers to be effective on the job/role/position is a well accepted proposition tried by many practitioners and internal change agents. As the theory elaborates itself, it is expected that with inclusion and affections needs being high, managers may enhance developmental strategies of their subordinates resulting in better team building orientation at their level and with strong control orientation also exercised simultaneously they might turn their teams to be high achievers. This is more likely to happen if across the lev

els of organizations managerial interpersonal skills comprising inclusion and affection needs are seen predominantly expressed all along the control need making its head way for achieving the targeted goals of each of the work groups. The present findings are significant in communicating a message to the organizational policy makers that organization's overall developmental plan should follow a two dimensional model of enhancing interpersonal skills along with leadership development strategies rather than a one dimensional approach of building leadership potentials alone among managers. Since interpersonal skills are intricately connected to leadership development it is necessary to enhance one's ability to be an extrovert at the workplace together with being more nurturant-task oriented than be simply a task-oriented manager.

## References

- Ansari, M (1990), *Managing People at Work: Leadership Styles and Influence Strategies*, New Delhi, Sage Publications.
- Campbell, J.P, Dunnette, M.D, Lawler, E.E. III & Weick, K.E. Jr.(1970), *Managerial Behaviour, Performance and Effectiveness*, New York: McGraw-Hill
- Di-Marco,N., Kuehl, C. & Wims, E (1975), "Leadership Style and Interpersonal Need Orientation as Moderators of Changes in Leadership Dimension Scores", *Personnel Psychology*, 28(2): 207-13.
- Fleishman, E.A (1953), "Leadership Climate, Human Relations Training and Supervisory Behaviour", *Personnel Psychology*, 6: 205-22.
- Hassan, A (1986), *Subordinate and Task Characteristics as Moderators of Leadership Effectiveness*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Patna University, Patna.
- Horne, T & Carron, A V(1985), "Compatibility in Coach-Athlete Relationships", *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7(2) :137-49.
- Hurley,J. R., Feintuch, B. & Mandell, M.J. (1991), "Novice Leaders' First Three Groups: Change and Consistency in Acceptance of Self and Others", *Journal of Social Psychology*, 131(2): 233-45.
- Ilggen, D R.,& O'Brien, G (1974), "Leader-member Relations in Small Groups", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 12(3): 335-350.
- Kuehl, C.R., Di-Marco, N. & Wims, E.W. (1975), "Leadership Orientation as a Function of Interpersonal Need Structure", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60 (1): 143-45.
- Lundgren, D. C. & Knight, D. J.(1997), "Trainer Style and Member Attitudes toward Trainer and Group in T-Groups", *Small Group Behaviour*, 8(1):47-64.
- O'Brien, G.E. & Kabanoff, B. (1981), "The Effects of Leadership Style and Group Structure upon Small Group Productivity: A Test of a Discrepancy Theory of Leader Effectiveness", *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 33(2): 157-68.
- Polley, R.B. & Eid,J. G. (1994), "First among Equals: Leaders, Peers, and Choice", *Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Psychodrama and Sociometry*, 47(2): 59-76
- Schutz, W (1958), *FIRO-B: A Three Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behaviour*, New York, Rinehart.
- Sinha, J.B. P (1980), *The Nurturant-Task Leader*, New Delhi, Concept Publishing House.
- Sinha, J.B.P (1995), *The Cultural Context of Leadership and Power*, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Tucker, J. H. (1983), "Leadership Orientation as a Function of Interpersonal Need Structure: A Replication with Negative Results", *Small Group Behaviour*, 14(1): 107-14.