

## **Monitoring the Impact of Interpersonal Dimensions on Leadership Styles**

Himanshu kataria<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Satyawan Baroda<sup>2</sup>

---

**Abstract:** *Researchers in the present study examined the role of interpersonal relationship dimensions in assessing leadership styles using the FIRO – B instrument & the theoretical foundation of big five personality traits. They studied the three dimensions of FIRO – B: Inclusion, Control and Affection, including the two sub dimensions expressed and wanted. Researchers found that females show more interpersonal relationship than males. And also found significant difference among the three dimensions of the FIRO – B. Researchers in this study related interpersonal relationship with the leadership styles of the students and found that these are positively associated with each other. It means both vary with each other in the same direction with the exception of few sub dimensions. In the present study they also found that males are significantly more skillful than females. This study contributes in the organization as well as academics as knowing the interpersonal dimensions of the students beforehand will help the authority to manage individuals in a meaningful manner.*

**Keywords:** *Interpersonal Relationship Dimensions, Leadership Styles, Personality traits FIRO –B.*

---

How individuals react in a team? What are the expected needs of an individual from others and towards others? How an individual can perform better in a group? What are the needs that contribute towards the progress of a group? All these questions revolve around the characteristics of a leader. Further leaders play a significant role in making the organization. If leaders perform their functions effective and efficient and able to deliver subordinates their work and functions, an organization prosper (Sayeed, 2010). Moreover effective leader is the requirement for an organization to develop and prosper (Bartone et al., 2009). In this regard besides the theoretical foundation of leadership styles it becomes necessary to know the relationship between various aspects of management with leadership. For example, relationship of FIRO – B with leadership styles (Sayeed, 2010); impact of personality traits on leadership styles (De Hoogh et al, 2005); Impact of emotional intelligence on leadership style (Kataria & Baroda, 2015). In the present study researchers tried to establish a relationship between FIRO – B and leadership styles. And also tried to explain whether big five factors of personality traits influence leadership style or not through the various theoretical foundation. In this study researchers used FIRO – B instrument to assess the interpersonal behavior dimensions of students. As lack of these concerns may negatively affect the student attitude and behavior regarding themselves as well as teams in a workplace (Mansfield et al., 2012). Present study collaborate work on interpersonal behavior from different perspectives, such as empirical, conceptual and experimental besides the theoretical foundation. Researchers in present study try to assess the mediating relationship between interpersonal behavior dimensions & leadership styles in an empirical perspective using FIRO – B instrument. Schutz in 1958, developed the FIRO –B (fundamental interpersonal relations orientation behavior) theory of interpersonal relations. This theory deals with three basic interpersonal needs namely – inclusion, control and affection. Further having two manifestations, expressed and wanted. People desire to express the need toward others and wanted from other's aspects of the three interpersonal needs. To satisfy their needs, people make strenuous effort for compatible relationships in the three interpersonal needs (Siegel et al, 2010). Ahmetoglu et al. (2010) studied the practical usefulness of the FIRO – B in organization through assessing whether the leader's intelligence contributes to the performance of the team or not using the FIRO – B instrument. They assessed 547 managers and executives from different countries and industries. They found that leaders are more competent whose need to express inclusion and control are high. FIRO – B theory has been applied in a number of areas since the last few years. Schutz (1966) used the instrument to over 6000 individuals from the educational community, founded that the theory is valid as well as reliable. After that the theory has applied in a number of areas: (a) mentoring relationships (siegel et al. 2001); (b) relationship between leadership dimensions and FIRO –B (Sayeed, 2010); prediction of leadership style using FIRO – B (Ahmetoglu et al. 2010). Omer bin Sayeed (2010) assessed 102 managers of middle management cadre participants in different management development programmes at NITIE, Mumbai using leadership style and FIRO –B instrument. Paired t – test and correlation were employed showing extrovert behavior of managers reflected in the expressed versus wanted scores of FIRO – B dimensions (inclusion,

---

<sup>1</sup> Research scholar, Institute of Management Studies and Research, M.D.U., Rohtak, Haryana

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Institute of Management Studies and Research, M.D.U., Rohtak, Haryana

control and affection). However, correlation results found that inclusion and affection dimensions related to participative and nurturant style of leadership significantly instead of other leadership styles.

### **I. Interpersonal behavior dimensions**

In this study interpersonal behavior dimension of students was measured using FIRO – B developed by Schutz in 1958. The FIRO – B instrument measures the interpersonal behavior of an individual on six dimensions – expressed inclusion, wanted inclusion, expressed control, wanted control, expressed affection and wanted affection. Because of varied implications in different areas FIRO – B has been used in diverse areas such as measuring relationship between leadership and interpersonal relationship orientations using FIRO – B (Ahmetoglu, 2010); FIRO – B and leadership model (Sayeed, 2010); study of team performance (Mansfield, 2012); interpersonal needs of management students (Sharma, 2011); social skill preferences among auditors (Siegel, 2011). Schutz proposed an interpersonal relationship theory in 1958 named FIRO – B (fundamental interpersonal relations orientation). FIRO – B instrument has three dimensions (Inclusion, Control and Affection). Further two sub scales in each dimension: (a) expressed & (b) wanted. The basic assumption of FIRO – B model is that individuals try to establish a congruous relationship with others in social interactions (Siegel, 2001). To establish this individuals maintain a compatible relationships among three dimensions of FIRO – B namely: inclusion, control and affection to avoid conflict. According to Schutz (1958) the inclusion dimension of FIRO –B instrument represents an individual’s need for interaction with others. In doing so, need to be included in other’s activities and include other’s in your activities arise, these termed as “expressed inclusion” and “wanted inclusion”. Control is the second dimension of FIRO – B instrument. It refers to need for power and influence. Further two sub scales measures this dimension “expressed control” and “wanted control”, indicating to control others to some extent and on the other hand want to be controlled by others to some extent. Affection is the third dimension of FIRO – B instrument defines the need for intimacy and friendship (Siegel, 2001). Individuals need to express their affection behavior towards other and also need to maintain distance. This dimension measured in “expressed affection” and “wanted affection” sub scales. Mansfield et al., (2012) studied the role of FIRO –B in the performance of team by stating that teams fail due to the lack of clarity in communication resulting in disparity of goals, roles and finally problems in team formation. They stressed on the importance of interpersonal relations in the success of team. In this study interpersonal skills of students are studied and researchers tried to find out whether males and females have different interpersonal skills or not and whether interpersonal skills differ within the domain or not.

### **II. Leadership style**

Leadership theory has been the focus point of both psychology and management science from the last few years. It not only distinguishes among leaders and no leader focused by researchers but also relationship of leadership with the various aspects of management has been established by researchers and also on the effectiveness of leadership in organizational growth and development (Heyi et al., 2007). In the present study three leadership styles namely: Transformational, Transactional and Laissez – faire were studied. However, a large number of studies has been conducted on transformational leadership instead of transactional and laissez – faire leadership style (Brandt and Laiho, 2013). However according to Hautala (2005) productivity, turnover rates, job satisfaction and motivation of followers depends more on transformational leadership style rather than on the other two styles. But in the present study a focus on all the three styles of leadership is considered. Multifactor leadership questionnaire instrument having 21 items was employed to assess these leadership styles. As proper selection and further development of an individual is a matter of great concern in today’s challenging environment. And, for the same, researchers have done a vast study into this area. In this study the three leadership styles are: 1. Transformational leadership style – Leader captures the followers trust, admiration, loyalty and respect & in turn motivate the followers to perform more than expected. And also have characteristics like creative, innovative, novel, prone to risk, nurturance and self confidence (Bass, 1985, Hautala, 2005). Bass (1985) identified 4 “I” of transformational leadership: Idealized influence (charisma) – In this leaders act as role models for their followers. Leaders set very high moral standards and conduct in an ethical manner; Individualized consideration – In this leaders provide coaching, advice, delegation and feedback to the followers for their personal development; Intellectual stimulation – In this leaders insist followers to look at the problems from a new point of view. Followers are stimulated to follow new ways to solve a problem through new creative and innovative ideas; Inspirational motivation – In this leaders use symbols and images to communicate their efforts to subordinates. 2. Transactional leadership style concerns with the fulfilling of role requirements that are discussed by leaders with followers to follow, in turn, followers receive reward if they meet the set requirements. Bass also identified transactional leadership style: Contingent reward – Exchange process between followers and their leader in which rewards are given to followers for their efforts. There is an agreement between leader and followers what should be done and accordingly rewards and punishment are given; Management – by – exception – It involves corrective criticism, negative feedback and negative

reinforcement. There is a third type of leadership styles laissez – faire also exist which is non – leadership style in which followers are free to do what they want and proper decision making by leader is absent.

### **III. Personality traits, interpersonal dimensions and leadership style: Hypothesis**

Skillful leaders know how to manage teams & individuals in an organization through achieving the organizational goals keeping in mind the individuals differences among people of different cultures & personalities. Also, these interpersonal behavior dimensions decide of an individual's leadership style. And it is a requirement for organization to study the personality of leaders as well (Hautala, 2005). Knowledge about one's personality and behavior is required as it develops self – awareness among leaders which in turn is a requirement of effectiveness and good performance (Brandt and Laiho, 2013). What will be an individual's leadership style to some extent depend on interpersonal behavior. Hence, these are correlated with each other to some extent. Over the last few decades, researcher's attention is on the relationship of personality traits on leadership styles. Numerous theoretical models have been developed in this regard (De Hoogh et al, 2005). According to them the Big five factor is responsible for 16% of variance in leader effectiveness, which explained that effectiveness of a leader, to some extent, can be predicted from personality traits of an individual. In the present study researchers want to establish whether there is a relationship between interpersonal dimensions and leadership style or not through the theoretical foundation of five factor theory of personality.

Personality theory holds that the basic structure of personality consist of five factors named Big five factor theory of personality labeled: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, neuroticism & Openness to experience. These all five factors of personality are thought to possess distinct traits of personality (De Hoogh et al., 2005). According to them these are: 1. Extraversion – Extroverts are characterized by features like assertive, active, bold, energetic and adventurous. High extraversion behavior characterized by dominancy in their behavior and they are also expressive towards others. People having such characteristics are influencing and persuading in their behavior towards others and this is an important characteristic of transformational leaders (charismatic leaders); 2. Openness to experience – features such as imagination, divergent thinking, creativity and autonomy dominate in this type of personality. As they are creative in thinking and good in deliberation of social values, also a key feature of transformational leaders as they are open to change and new experiences; 3. Agreeableness – Individuals who are warm, generous, trusting and cooperative in their behavior are characterized by this trait. Hence they are friendly in nature and understandable and also concerned with the interest of other people. Transformational leaders are able to understand the follower's perspective and deliver work accordingly. Hence agreeable people have leadership characteristic to some extent; 4. Conscientiousness – It concern with the characteristics like dependability, dutifulness, responsibility, deliberation and achievement orientation. It is related with the transformational leadership as it helps in setting new challenging goals and highly conscientious leader stick to agreed upon regulation rather than grasp opportunities at hand; 5. Neuroticism – Characteristics of these types of individuals are insecure, defensive, anxious and emotional. Self confidence in these types of people is lacking. Transformational leaders are characterized by self confidence in their personality. Hence neuroticism hinders leaders. Bartone et al, 2009 studied the impact of Big five personality factors on leader's development and growth at the US Military Academy. They studied the leader performance in two groups during summer field training periods and academic periods from freshman through senior years using the Big five factors of personality scale. They found that in general mental abilities on leadership performance women cadets perform slightly better than men as leaders during the academic period but not in the summer training context. They also found that women tend to be higher than men in Big five factors of personality namely – openness to experience, agreeableness, neuroticism, conscientiousness and extraversion. However according to De Hoogh et al, 2005 in their study on linking the Big five factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership found that no significant correlation was found between the big five factors of personality and charismatic or transactional leadership. The present study concerned about the relationship between interpersonal behavior dimension and leadership styles through the theoretical foundation of personality traits of big five factor theory as to some extent the big five factor are related with interpersonal behavior dimensions, and a relationship is tried to establish among personality traits and interpersonal behavior dimensions. However over the past few decades, relationship of leadership style established with a number of organizational aspects. For example, Eid et al (2008) explored the role of personality hardiness in transformational leaders; Zopiatis & Constanti (2012) related transformational leadership with persoanltiy traits. Sayeed, 2010 did study on assessing the relationship between interpersonal dimensions and leadership styles through an empirical perspective using the Guttman scoring technique (Schutz, 1958) & using the theoretical foundation of big five factor theory of personality. He found that managers reflected extrovert behaviors in the expressed versus wanted scores of the three interpersonal dimensions – inclusion, control and affection; Prochazka et al., studied the relationship between leader warmth and transformational leadership in 2015. Personality traits and interpersonal dimension are related as if inclusion dimension of FIRO – B is considered then it is related with Extrovert trait of Big five factor theory of

personality as inclusion measure the need for belongingness and interaction (Hill, 1975), and extrovert people are high expressive towards others and wants to establish relationship with others. The other dimension affection of FIRO – B instrument can also be related with the agreeableness trait of Big five factor theory of personality. As affection defines the need for intimacy and friendship and agreeable people are trusting and cooperative in their behavior towards others and also friendly in their behavior. In the present study researchers tried to find out whether males and females have different interpersonal skills or not as males and females have different cognitive and thinking abilities due to different personalities. Males are considered to be more rational, independent while females are more warmth and helpful in behavior (Brandt & Laiho, 2013), & whether interpersonal skills differ within the domain or not. Hence following hypothesis arise:

H1: Interpersonal relationship dimensions of males and females differ.

H2: FIRO – B dimensions differ among themselves.

In terms of leadership researchers tried to find out whether difference among males and females exist or not in terms of their leadership styles and whether there is a relationship between leadership style and interpersonal dimensions or not. Hence the following hypothesis arises:

H3: Leadership styles of males and females differ among themselves.

H4: Relationship between leadership styles and interpersonal dimension exists.

From the above following purposes that arise in the present study are:

1. To determine whether males and females have different needs for interpersonal relationship dimensions or not.
2. To determine whether interpersonal relationship dimensions are different from each other or not.
3. To determine significant difference in leadership styles among males and females.
4. To determine whether leadership styles and interpersonal relationship dimensions are associated with each other or not.

#### **IV. Methodology**

The present study was designed to establish a relationship between interpersonal relationship orientation and leadership styles using FIRO – B and Multifactor leadership style instrument.

##### Participants

In the present study researchers selected a sample of students from the listed graduating students of MBA & Engineering using the simple random sampling technique. A sample of 190 students consisted of 98 males contributed 51.6% to the total sample and 92 females contributed 48.4% of the total sample. Under the supervision of the researchers the questionnaire was filled by the students in the class room with complete instructions for filling the questionnaire provided by the researchers.

##### Instrument

Researchers in the present study employed FIRO – B instrument (Schutz, 1958) consisting of 54 items. Out of which 24 items measure the behavioral preferences of respondents toward others. These items are measured on a 6 – point scale ranging from 1 = most people to 6 = nobody, whilst, the other 30 items describes the usual patterns of behavior. They are also completed on a 6 – point scales ranging from 1 = usually to 6 = never.

Leadership styles were assessed using multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ Form 6S; Vinger & Cilliers, 2006). It is a most frequently and well researched and also validated instrument to measure the three leadership styles (transactional, transformational and non – transactional).

#### **V. Results**

##### Quantitative analysis

Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and correlation analysis was performed. Table 1 describes descriptive statistics of FIRO – B dimensions. Thorough study of the interpersonal relationship dimensions shows that females reflected both expressed behavior towards others and wanted behavior from others more than males (mean 24.37>23.38), hence proving the “H1” hypothesis.

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of FIRO B (Mean and standard deviation of FIRO – B)  
(N = 190)**

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>Expressed behavior towards others</b>	Male	98	23.38	7.028
	Female	92	24.37	7.289
<b>Wanted behavior from others</b>	Male	98	22.57	8.18
	Female	92	24.65	7.82

**TABLE 2: Paired sample t test between the dimensions of interpersonal behavior (N = 190)**

FIRO B Dimensions		Mean	S.D
Inclusion	EI	8.9316	3.33025
	WI	4.1737	3.48942
Control	EC	8.8316	4.21299
	WC	12.0895	9.55947
Affection	EA	6.0947	3.62698
	WA	7.9211	6.11867
Between EI & WI		15.77	
Between EC & WC		4.86	
Between EA & WA		-3.89	

Table 2 presents paired t – test reflected the relationship between inclusion, control and affection dimensions of the interpersonal within the sub dimensions of expressed and wanted, revealed that participants scores high on expressed inclusion, wanted control and wanted affection than wanted inclusion, expressed control and expressed affection hence, explains the “H2” hypothesis. Noteworthy fact from observations on mean value here is that students want others in their activities and show social interaction instead of others includes them in their social interaction on one aspect of FIRO – B inclusion while, on the other hand, against the observable results of inclusion opposite was observed in case of control dimension of FIRO – B, in terms of students want more clear set of instructions and clear expectations instead of controlling and influencing others and situations. However, in third dimension affection results showed that students have more need for others to act warmly and share their feelings.

In order to define significant difference between the two dimensions of the interpersonal behavior researchers performed paired sample t test between expressed and wanted sub dimensions of the three dimensions of FIRO – B namely: inclusion, control and affection as shown in Table 2. There were three pairs expressed inclusion; wanted inclusion, expressed control and wanted control & expressed affection and wanted affection. One can see from Table 2 shows that there is a significant difference between the affection and control dimension and not on third dimension & same way expressed and wanted ( 15.77 & 4.86,  $p < .01$  and  $t > t_{\alpha/2}$ ).

**Table 3: Showing Descriptive Statistics for Leadership styles (Mean and Standard deviation) (N = 190)**

Leadership Styles	Gender	Mean	S.D
Transformational	Male	2.64	.06
	Female	2.41	.06
Transactional	Male	2.45	.07
	Female	2.34	.07
Non transactional	Male	2.08	.08
	Female	1.92	.09

Table 3 reveals the descriptive statistics for leadership styles, indicated males showed more leadership styles (transformational, transactional and non – transactional) than females, clear from mean value explains the “H3” hypothesis.

**Table 4: Correlation between leadership styles (Transformational, Transactional and Non – transactional) and FIRO – B (N = 190)**

	Speraman’s rho	EI	WI	EC	WC	EA	WA	EBTO	WBFO	SII
Idealized influence	Cor. Coefficient	.174	.097	-.047	.043	.043	.063	.121	.054	.107
Individualized consideration	Cor. Coefficient	-.020	.105	.044	.014	-.064	.050	-.033	.091	.038
Intellectual stimulation	Cor. Coefficient	-.028	-.078	-.075	-.101	-.072	-.049	-.088	-.153	-.157
Inspirational motivation	Cor. Coefficient	.008	-.009	-.059	-.146	-.049	.114	.062	-.026	-.060
Contingent reward	Cor. Coefficient	-.002	.166	-.021	-.223	-.045	.151	-.053	.022	-.033
Management by exception	Cor. Coefficient	.095	.034	.028	-.031	-.052	.065	.044	.024	.035
Laissez faire	Cor. Coefficient	.106	.046	-.016	.126	.143	-.036	.177	.090	.131

## VI. Qualitative analysis

Results from Table 1 shows that interpersonal behavior dimensions of females reflected both expressed behavior towards others and wanted behavior from others more than males. It means females scored high on all

the three dimensions of FIRO – B (inclusion, control and affection) than males. It is clear that females are more interactive, show power and influence and intimacy and friendship than males. Further to test the hypothesis “H2” researchers implemented t – test on interpersonal behavior dimensions within the sub dimensions of expressed and wanted. Table 3 showed that males showed more leadership behavior than females. It means males show more transformational, transactional as well as non – transactional leadership styles more than females. The results describe that followers show more trust, admiration, loyalty and respect towards male leader than female leaders. As followers consider male leaders may set high moral standards that too in an ethical manner, can provide coaching, advice and feedback to the followers, have innovative point of view as well as develop in followers and use innovative methods to communicate what is wanted from followers than female leaders. While on another aspect of transactional leadership followers think that males are more compatible to deliver role requirement, what is required from followers than female leaders and also in delivering negative feedback and negative reinforcement to the followers. Same with the laissez – faire style of leadership in which males scored high than females. Table 4 showed Correlation coefficient (spearman’s rho) revealed relationship between leadership styles and FIRO –B. This study shows that: (a) idealized influence shows positive relationship with expressed influence, wanted influence, wanted control, expressed affection, expressed behavior towards others and wanted behavior from others; (b) Individualized consideration shows positive relationship with wanted inclusion, expressed control, wanted control, wanted affection and wanted behavior from others; (c) Inspirational motivation shows positive relationship with expressed inclusion and wanted affection; (d) Contingent reward shows positive relationship with wanted inclusion, wanted affection and wanted behavior from others; (e) Management by exception positively related with expressed inclusion, wanted inclusion, expressed control, wanted affection, expressed behavior towards others and wanted behavior from others; (f) Laissez – faire positively related with expressed inclusion, wanted inclusion, wanted control, expressed affection, expressed behavior towards others and wanted behavior from others. If overall Social interaction index is observed one can see that it is positively related with idealized influence, individualized consideration, management – by – exception and laissez – faire leadership styles. However Table 4 shows positive relationship which merely indicates that the two variables (leadership style and FIRO- B dimension) covary and not that if one variable increases, so do other. This proves the “H4” hypothesis that leadership styles and interpersonal relationship dimensions are significantly related to each other.

## **VII. Discussion**

Researchers in the present study hypothesized four hypothesis and found positive association among all the four with an exception of some sub dimensions among which no association was found. In the present study researchers found females shows more interpersonal relationship dimensions than males. It means females scores high on Schutz (1958) FIRO – B dimensions – inclusion, expressed and wanted. From table 1 it is clear that within the domain of a dimension the two sub dimensions wanted and expressed are significantly different from each other. Secondly significant difference is also found among the six sub dimensions of the FIRO – B. It means expressed inclusion and wanted inclusion are differ from each other. It can be said that respondents have high need for included in other’s activities than need for including other’s in their activities. Results found in case of control dimension shows that expressed control and wanted control differs significantly from each other. It described that respondents have high need to control others to some extent than need for controlled by others to some extent as wanted control scores high than expressed control. Similar is the case with affection dimension which defines the need for intimacy and friendship. The sub dimensions expressed and wanted differed significantly from each other. Respondents have high need to maintain distance than express their affection toward others as wanted affection scores high than expressed affection. Table 3 shows the results of leadership styles and males show more leadership skills than females hence, proving the third hypothesis. Lastly, researchers performed correlation analysis to find whether there is any association between leadership styles and interpersonal relationship dimensions or not and found that with the exception of one or two they are positively associated with each other.

In this study researchers implemented correlation analysis to find out the relationship between leadership styles and FIRO – B. Transformational leadership style is associated with FIRO – B positively. It means leaders who captures trust, admiration, loyalty and respect of followers are positively associated with FIRO – B dimensions also (inclusion, control and affection). If we talk about the 4 I’s of transformational leadership then: 1. Idealized influence was positively related with inclusion in both of its sub dimensions (expressed and wanted). It means individuals who act as role models for their followers include in other’s activities as well as include others in their activities. This is associated with extroversion trait of personality also as people who are extroverts in nature are highly expressive in nature and establish relationships with other people. And as they are positively correlated with expressed affection, this kind of behavior is associates with agreeableness trait of personality as agreeable people are cooperative in their behavior. They also shows that people wanted to be controlled by others to some extent as idealized influence is positively correlated with

wanted control. 2. Individualized consideration which was positively correlated with both the sub dimensions of control (wanted and expressed) and also with wanted affection. It means individuals who provide coaching, advice and feedback to the followers want to control others as well as want to be controlled by others. Also, they were positively correlated with wanted inclusion and wanted affection, it means people include others in their activities but they also have need to maintain distance from others. 3. Inspirational motivation was also positively correlated with expressed inclusion and wanted affection. It means people who use symbols and images to communicate themselves to the followers shows need to be included in other's activities and also need to maintain distance from others. It means these people are extrovert as well as agreeable to some extent. 4. Intellectual stimulation – respondents scores in this type of transformational showed negative correlation with all the dimensions of FIRO –B. Judge and Bono (2000), also found that agreeableness and extraversion trait of personality showed strongest relationship with the transformational leadership.

Transactional leadership the other type of leadership style in which leaders discuss with the followers what is required from them and in turn, followers receive reward if they fulfill the set standards. Further two sub styles: 1. Contingent reward which was positively correlated with wanted inclusion and wanted affection. It means respondents include others in their activities but also have need to maintain distance. 2. Management – by – exception showed that respondents who believe in corrective criticism, negative feedback and negative reinforcement want them to be included in other's activities, include others in their activities, want to control others and want some space between themselves and followers.

The third style of leadership *laissez – faire* which is a non – leadership style in which followers have freedom to do what they want correlated positively with expressed inclusion (want to be included in other's activities), wanted inclusion (want to include others in their activities), wanted control (want to be controlled by others) and expressed affection (express their affection towards others). Overall the two sub types of transformational leadership style (idealized influence and individualized consideration) were positively associated with social interaction index (SSI measure the overall interpersonal needs of an individual, the higher the score, the higher the overall interpersonal need), while the other two intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation were negatively associated with social interaction index. On the other hand, in transactional leadership, contingent reward negatively while management – by – exception positively correlated with social interaction index. Whilst, the non – transactional leadership style revealed positive correlation with social interaction index.

### References

- [1]. Ahmetoglu, G., Chamorro premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2010). Interpersonal Relationship Orientations, Leadership, and Managerial Level: Assessing the practical usefulness of the FIRO-B in organizations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18(2), 220-226.
- [2]. Bartone, P., Eid, J., Johnsen, B., Laberg, J., & Snook, S. (2009). Big five personality factors. *Leadership & Organization*, 30(6), 498-521.
- [3]. Brandt, T., & Laiho, M. (2013). Gender and personality in transformational leadership context : An examination of leader and subordinate perspectives. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 34(1), 44-66.
- [4]. Dehoogh, A., Den harlog, D., & Koopman, P. (2005). Linking the Big Five-Factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership; perceived dynamic work environment as a moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(7), 839-865.
- [5]. Hautala, T. (n.d.). The relationship between personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, 25(8), 777-794.
- [6]. Heyi, S., Na, M., & Dan, G. (2007). The Study on Relationship between the Traits of Leaders. *Canadian Social Science*, 3(1), 39-46.
- [7]. Hill, R. (1975). Interpersonal compatibility and workgroup performance. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 11(2), 210-219.
- [8]. Judge, T., & Bono, J. (2000). Five-Factor Model of Personality and Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 751-765.
- [9]. Mansfield, J., & Winter, J. (2012). A Study of Team Performance in Business Communication: *ABD Journal*, 4(2), 1-19.
- [10]. Siegel, P., & Schultz, T. (2011). Social Skills Preferences Among Internal Auditors – An Explanatory Study Using The FIRO-B. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 27(3), 43-54.
- [11]. Sayeed, O. (2010). FIRO-B & Nurturant-Task Leadership Model: Moderating Influence of Individual Differences. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45(3), 446-458.
- [12]. Sharma, E. (2011). Interpersonal needs of management students: Facilitator in the choice of electives. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 37, 86-91.
- [13]. Schutz, W. (1958). *FIRO: A Three-dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behaviour*. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958.
- [14]. VINGER, G., & CILLIERS, F. (2006). EFFECTIVE TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURS. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(2), 1-9.