

Analysis of Relational Practices in Indian Multinational Organizations

Mukta Rohatgi*
Kavita Singh**

Abstract

Modern Business Organizations are Global entities which are complicated structures of humans and systems, overlapping individual and organizational solutions in harmony which leads to a unified whole. In the wake of Globalization, due to dynamism in the environment, the interactions among employees and their resultants has become significant as the camaraderie between them only can lead to the successful end result. Therefore, In Modern Management, the emphasis catapults from not only considering individual excellence in segregation but on teamwork, collaboration, partnering, friendliness and mutual learning in aggregation. In this light, there are certain practices exhibited by the employees in the organizations which may not directly relate to the assigned work or does not come under the job specified or designated but are solely done for the betterment of whole project or entire organization viewed in larger perspective. Such Practices according to Fletcher are Relational Practices. According to her, Relational Practices are interpersonal and intrapersonal behaviors of an employee at the work place that are exercised on a relational belief rather than as an organizational obligation. These are some relational forms of behavior that one is willing to do rather than one is obliged to do. Fletcher (1999) identified four such practices in her ethnographic study of six engineers in an organization. Carlson and Crawford (2011) examined these practices in business organizations by forming Questionnaire adopting eight vignettes (two for each practice) from Fletcher's work. The present paper attempts to study Relational Practices in Indian Business environment adopting similar Practices proposed by Fletcher. A four point scale based on eight relational practices by Fletcher was used to survey 495 employees of three sectors namely Information Technology, Banking and Telecommunications services. The data was subject to various statistical techniques including factor analysis to find out the validity of factors. Also, the data was observed to find out whether Relational Practices exist in Indian Business Organizations and to what extent. It was also explored through the data that whether there is any difference in the Relational Practices exhibited in three sectors under study. The current research also looks into whether age, experience or income level affects the Level of Relational practices exhibited. The Importance of Relational Practice comes from the fact that these are few invisible and backstage supportive activities which have greater long term implications on the sustainability of the business. Therefore, the talented employees exhibiting such practices are to be motivated and rewarded adequately for imparting such services.

INTRODUCTION

Early developmental and clinical theories exhibit the phenomena of individuation that stresses on ego strengthening, objectivity, stubborn individualistic boundaries, controlling and capability of delaying that often appear to be symbolizing greater development and maturity. According to David Bakan (1966), Our Society gives unnecessary importance to agentic ethic (self-defensive, self-assured, domineering, egotistical and pushing towards accomplishments) at the cost of

Keywords:

Relational Practices (RP),
Interpersonal Behaviours,
Intrapersonal Behaviours.

* Assistant Professor, Shyam Lal college, University of Delhi, Email: muktarohatgi@gmail.com

** Professor, Faculty of Management Studies, University of Delhi, kavita@fms.edu

communal ethic (oneness with others, characterized by groups and teams). Modern American logicians of early psychological theory, from Erikson (1950) to Levinson (1978) appears to view all growth as a process of curding oneself out from other's matrix and becoming "one's own man". Similarly, Freudian theory developed on the basis of instinctive drives depicts the relationships to be only auxiliary to the drive and conveniently ignores the relatedness to psychological development postulate.

The most apparent theory can be observed in the structural components of organizing given by Taylor (1911) as the principles of scientific management and were resurrected by Weber (1964) in principles of bureaucracy. It is this over emphasis on ideologies of rationalizing organizational work to ease of authoritative structure as it supports predictability on which historical concept of organizational discourse of work has come up. The techniques of managing like, Management by objectives which involves segregating the jobs in some order in easily measurable and verifiable objectives to be achieved in stipulated time offering predictability and perfect control, models of responsibility, dominance and leadership signifying individual persona and charisma and ability of thinking forward, linear models of decision making highlighting problem characteristics and decision norms, appraisal systems using time span of accountability to find out significance of one's work in the organization by differentiating between upper segment thinkers and lower level doers, according to Jaques, 1979. Such norms have gone down deeply in the organizational work and hinder any change.

Introduced by Jean Baker Miller and other psychologists at Wellesley College and backed and supported by Carol Gilligan and others, Relational theory and its associated topics became relevant to listen to the voice and views of women at workplace. Relational theory advocates that though the operative models for people and their accomplishments are deemed to be depending upon public- sphere features such as individuality, freedom, and separation, there is substitute, that is, *growth-in-connection* model which is present and based on private sphere characteristics of mutuality, cooperation and connection (Jordan et al, 1991).

Fletcher challenged the formal definition of work in her book as every day practices at work and not the general work which is displayed in job descriptions, cards, manuals and performance appraisals. She observed the already present sources of relational conduct and proposed other desirable behavior that motivated people

to exhibit relational practices. It derives that relational theory stresses on connection and not separation as path for development. It is the theory of efficiency with five good things that inspires for the output of relational interactions.

According to General Electric's CEO, Jack Welsh, the modern organizations are boundaryless, where information is shared with everyone openly and freely across all the functions and divisions. These organizations should perceive themselves as various laboratories that collaborate through ideas, financial resources and managers according to Slater, 1994. The dynamic organizations need an employee who is not only an ongoing learner (as the surroundings are ever changing making environment increasingly challenging) but also an ongoing teacher. The ultimate sustainable competitive advantage for the organization as per Welsh is in its ability to learn, to transfer the learning across all its components and to act quickly.

Not only Interpersonal but Intrapersonal intelligence is also suggested by Gardner (1983). Introspection and reflective capacity of an individual determines its intrapersonal intelligence.

Relational Practices

Relational practices refers to the strategies which are used or exhibited as relational skills such as emotional and social intelligence to do work efficiently and accomplishing organizational goals effectively (Fletcher, 2009).

According to Fletcher, Relational Practices are interpersonal and intrapersonal behaviors of an employee at the work place that are exercised on a relational belief rather than as an organizational obligation. Relational forms of behavior are something that one is willing to do rather than one is obliged to do. These practices may not come under direct ambit of organizational duties of the employee but still are very much desirable for efficiency in the organization. It is a behavior that is motivated by personal need for connection rather than by more agentic requirements (Fletcher, 1999). In other words, relational practices are the numerous skills of offline, backstage, or collaborative work that people display which goes largely unrecognized and unrewarded in workplace (Carlson & Crawford, 2011).

Fletcher collected all instances of possible relationally motivated behaviors and divided them in four major categories. The four major types of relational practices according to Fletcher are:

- Creating team
- Mutual Empowering
- Preserving
- Self-achieving

Interestingly, Fletcher found that relational practice which were relatively unfamiliar in the context of workplace she studied, were construed on personal style, a natural expression of gender or private sphere behavior inappropriate into the public sphere. They often go unnoticed and unstudied.

Literature Review

All the Relational work can be labeled as interpersonal behaviour in the place of work that is motivated by a relational belief system that inappropriately goes unnoticed and unstudied (DeVault, 1991; Goleman, 1998; Haskins et al., 1998; Ray, 1989). As per feminist theorists (for example, Daniels, 1987; DeVault, 1991; Harding, 1986), the nonexistence of relational practice from traditional definitions of work devalues relational behaviour because it submits that they are distinctive and natural, instead of the forms of behaviour that necessitate intelligence, skill or expertise. It also advocates that such behaviour are not what one must do, but instead something that one desires to do (Fletcher, 1999, p. 29). It is a behaviour which is encouraged by a personal requisite for connection instead of the needs arising out of agency. Relational attributes, according to Theorists are skills or traits associated with Female's greater emotional needs (Gilligan, 1993; Jordan et al., 1991; Miller, 1976). They elucidate that males are Socialized to refute their relational capabilities and females are trained to provide these expertise without expecting any recognition, suggesting females as the 'societal carriers' of relational behaviour (Fletcher, 1999, pp. 9-10; Miller, 1976).

Winn (1994) observes Taiwan's development experience, and scrutinizes the informal financing techniques used by small businesses, in order to clarify the interaction between the network structure of Taiwanese society and the formal Republic of China (ROC) legal system. Winn observes that the dynamic of the relationship between the Republic of China legal system and Taiwanese society does not favor ideas of legal-centralism and legal plurism, so he offers the idea of marginalization of law, as a better description.

Dachler and Hosking (1995) observed that, a long history suggested the view that socially constructed knowledge was in some sense relational. It has been mostly at the forefront of theoretical traditions such as symbolic interactionism, cognitive sociology, phenomenological sociology, and system theory according to McCall & Simmons, 1978, Cicourel, 1974, Schutz, 1962, Mead, 1934, Berger and Luckman 1966, Garfinkel 1967, von Glaserfeld 1985 and Watzawick, Weakland and Fish, 1974. As per them, a relational view has largely been ignored in the literatures of management and organization. These literatures were predominant by the thought that variously has been characterised as entitative according to Hosking & Morley, 1991, as possessive individualism according to Sampson, 1988 or as realist ontology according to Dachler, 1988. As per them, the term relational means many different connotations, working from different theoretical traditions and practical concerns. They worked towards an explicit and systematic statement of the prime features that needed to be scrutinized in a relational position. In their view, the prime issue in any relational approach is in matters of content.

The book by Jordan and Dooley (2000) is from Jean Baker Miller Institute and elaborates upon the relational practices in action. This book takes a relational approach on day to day actions and analyzes them according to their relational nature.

Bouwen (2001) argued that knowledge sharing and integration are definitely relational activities. The people following it explain and deal with content issues while mutually enacting the new found social relationship at the same time. These relational aspects are handled subtly.

Buttner (2001) performed qualitative analysis of role of female entrepreneurs' in their organizations using Relational Theory as the analytical framework. Relational skills included preserving, mutual empowering, achieving, and creating team. Findings exhibited that Relational Theory is a useful framework for identifying and amplify women entrepreneurs' interactive style at their own workplace.

Hosking and Bass (2001) in their paper endeavored to provide an understandable introduction to what they called relational constructionism in the context of organizational development and consultancy work. They attempted to propose the processes to carry out changes in the relational processes with a social constructionist

approach in view.

Janet Holmes and Meredith Marra (2004) explore variety of ways in which relational work is enacted at the workplace. Their analysis focuses on specific instances of relational practices. Their study illustrates how such support work is ignored and typically discounted in New Zealand workplace.

Craps, Rossen, Prins, Taillieu, Bouwen and Dewulf (2005) conducted a Case Study in Water and Nature Management to elaborate significance of Relational Practices in Social learning. In their perspective on social learning in natural resource management, they concluded that it is essential that learning also takes place on a societal level.

Gelfand et al (2006) propagated a distinctly relational view of negotiation. They enumerated the circumstances through which relational self constructs become available in negotiations and the conditions that hinder their use. They exhibited mechanisms through which relational self-constructs impacts negotiation processes and output

Hosking (2006) in his study provided a structural overview of various discourses of relations by elaborating three intelligibility nuclei given by Gergen, 1995, in terms of their interrelated lines of distinction propounded by Deetz, 2000. He called these discourses, one, as this and that thinking, Two, as constructivism, and Three, as critical relational constructionism. In each case, he focused on how relations or relating are understood when the wider network of distinctions are given. He borrowed examples from the literature of organization studies and specially from Fred Fiedler's theory of leadership effectiveness, and outlined them.

Mcnamee (2006) propose that we bracket the metaphor of teaching as a technique or method for conveying knowledge. We must use conversation to enhance self-reflexive phenomena and use it as growth in connection

Boydell and Blanter (2007) propose that all knowledge comprises of social processes and is political in nature because of the people involved. If one invests in a relational or historical ontology which is an obvious philosophical choice, there is scope for the way action learning is practiced. They enlighten few of such relational practices.

Yun Sun et al (2007) studied relational perspective on the employment relationship and analyzed processes like mediation and moderation, linking two indicators of organizational performance namely high performance human resource practices and productivity and turnover

Comstock, Hammer, Stretzsch, Cannon, Parsons and Salazar (2008) advocated Relational Culture Theory. These theorists advocate augmenting the multicultural social justice counseling. They explained how creating and taking part in growth inducing relationships are vital for human development and psychological wellness.

Relational Practices are applied and explored in other aspects of business like Ness (2009) explored relational practice in strategic alliance. Focusing on how governance mechanisms and negotiation strategies developed and created patterns of interactions which are under influence of both recursive and adaptive forces, four ways of relational practice are observed namely recursively integrative, recursively distributive, adaptive toward integrative, and adaptive toward distributive.

The theory of the relational work of nurses is derived by DeFrino and Terrizzi (2009) from a psychodynamic theory of the relational practices of females and their workplace. Walker and Avant's (2005) process of theory derivation dominates this article's organization. It is a process in which a set of interlinked concepts is shuffled from one field to another and adopted to the requirements of the new field. According to Walker & Avant, 2005, when a theorist has various concepts that are linked with each other but aren't structured properly to represent the linking of the concepts, a theory derivation is useful at that time. This article supports Fletcher's theory and derives and adopts it to the new nursing theory. The theory of relational work of nurses is taken from Fletcher, Jordan, and Miller's (2000) theory of relational work to chalk out the explicit and obvious but the unrecognized work which is vitally necessary relational work for nurses.

Manning (2010) developed a relational practice perspective on the strategic formation of project networks as organizational structures, rooted through structuration theory. The study augments our understanding of the institutional submission of network agency and the micro foundations of networks as organizational ways in project businesses and further research.

[Steyaert](#) and [Looy](#) (2010) presents a series, featuring articles on a broad range of important and timely topics related to relational practices including participative organizing professionalism, social responsibility, ethical judgment, and accountability. They investigate taking a relationally oriented practice turn in Organization behavior Studies. They recommend prospecting participative organizing in relation to change of relational practices due to politics and aesthetics and its emergence as unique concept. They explored polyvocal organizing

in their study.

Reeves (2010) observed that there was an urgent need for those involved in professional education to develop a robust understanding of how variation in practice occur because of much attention is being given to transforming professional work by the adoption of trans disciplinary and enquiry based approaches to service development. Reeves proposes a more inclusive approach to the analysis of the processes involved across the varied and interrelated contexts in which they occur is thus very timely. She proposes that by building a picture of the ephemeral spaces and linkages that educating activities develop, mapping relational practices allows those involved in professional education to believe rather differently about how professional grasping and dynamism in knowledge and practice may be perceived, supported and developed.

[Farah Naqvi \(2011\)](#) brings in notice that women in India have struggled hard to create an identity and carve a niche for themselves at their workplaces, especially in terms of leadership. Her study analyzed and presented women's perceptions and dilemmas when confronted with the ideas and expectations of traditional society while following a contemporary code of conduct at place of work.

Hosking (2011) observed that the terms social constructionism and social constructivism were usually engaged in the perspective of different problematic and diverse philosophical assumptions. He offered relational constructionism as a social science outlook.

Carlson and Crawford (2011) examined the interface of gender and work through an examination of relationally motivated behavior in the place of work. Using Fletcher's ethnography of females' relational practices in a masculine work environment as the core, they examined Fletcher's typology of relational practice, members' insights of employees who exhibit these kinds of behavior and whether these insights were related to gender. Working adults online surveys revealed workplace situations and graded how effective and submissive they supposed the behavior to be. However, they reported the Relational practices remain enigmatic in the place of work, both indispensable and devalued.

According to Hosking and Shamir (2012), first had to describe something about social science dialogues of person and world and their relations. Therefore, they delineated two to describe it. One which they called

relational constructionist and the second one they termed as entitative. The study attempted to provide such outline to use the term dialogue in the context of a discourse of relational processes. The study further proposed that relational processes can construct some degree of soft self- differentiation and that dialogical practice was key to producing such relations.

According to Uhl Bien and Ospina (2012), Leadership occurs in complex nets of linkages and dynamically changing contexts as leaders and their followers live in a relational world. In spite of this, the theories of leadership are beached in assumptions of individuality and linear connection. To get progressive understandings of leadership that is more relevant to the world of practice, one needs to entwine issues of relationality into leadership studies. Their study addressed this issue by collecting together, for the first time, a set of noticeable scholars from varied paradigmatic and disciplinary viewpoints to involve in dialogue regarding ways to meet the challenges of relationality in leadership research and training. They included unique edge thoughtfulness, heated arguments, and passionate viewpoints on the issues at hand.

Devey (2014) in her article outlines a dynamic, relational theory of workplace inequalities. She starts with the basic model presented by Charles Tilly in *Durable Inequality* that categorical distinctions, such as sexual characteristics or education, are charted, overstated, and naturalized within structural divisions of labor.

Hanley and Williamsburg (2015) in their paper, applies a relational perspective on work related inequality to comprehend the origins and applications of the business climate phenomena, based on a case study of the General Electric Company by means of archival data and relative historical methods. Their paper is part of a historical case study of employment restructuring at the General Electric Company that is designed to conceptualize our knowledge of rising earnings inequality in the United States by pointing attention to organization level dynamics and processes.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES:

The research questions to be examined in the study are as follows:

- Do employees exhibit Relational Practices in the Indian Business Organizations?
- Whether Relational Practices vary among different sectors under study?

The following hypothesis are formulated to achieve the above outlined objectives-

H₀: There is no difference in the Relational Practices exhibited by employees in different business sectors

H1: There exists a difference in the Relational Practices exhibited by employees in different business sectors

H₀: There is no relationship between age and Relational Practices

H2: There is significant positive relationship between age and Relational Practices

H₀: There are no differences in Relational Practices due to variations in education level of employees.

H3: There are differences in Relational Practices due to variations in education level of employees.

H₀: There are no differences in Relational Practices due to variations in socio economic status of employees.

H4: There are differences in Relational Practices due to variations in socio economic status of employees.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study consisted of sample of executives at different levels working in private sector industrial organizations, in and around Delhi. Through a preliminary interview, attempt was made to understand the behaviour, actions and the underlying reasons of such actions of the employees to have a fair view on the Relational Practices prevalent in the Indian Organizations. The questionnaire was administered to a total of 750 respondents in various sectors namely Information Technology, Banking and Telecommunication. However, a total of 495 correctly completed questionnaires were returned hence yielding a response rate of approximately 66%.

Measure of Relational Practices

The scale consisted of 48 items and assessed 8 dimensions namely:

- I. Creating Team: Reducing Conflict (RP1): Communication and such interface which approve people by empathic listening or promptly responding to unique needs, situations and preferences to prompt group life.
- II. Creating Team: Absorbing Stress (RP2): It includes generating situations among individuals, to generate an atmosphere that fosters cooperation and collectiveness.
- III. Mutual Empowering: Empathetic Teaching

(RP3): It refers to the way of making learner understand the concept by considering his intellect, relational and emotional context into account and emphasizing on the learner instead of on self.

- IV. Mutual Empowering: Reducing Tension (RP4): It refers to ironing out potentially explosive situations or conflicts in people's relationships that might be detrimental to the ability of one or both of the workers and might affect their efficiency and achievements
- V. Preserving: Increasing Visibility (RP5): It is about shouldering or assuming responsibility for the work to be done beyond the technical limits and definition of job or task
- VI. Preserving: Extending Responsibility (RP6): Extending responsibility implies willingness to extend not only to horizontal aspects of one's job but not hesitating to foray into vertical aspects of it as well.
- VII. Self- Achieving: Reflecting (RP7): It implies revisiting one's own feelings - a kind of self-assessment from the source of your own actions
- VIII. Self- Achieving: Reconnecting (RP8): This strategy includes following up with co-worker after a perceived or apparent disagreement and going out of the way to mend relations with him

Scope of the Study

The scope of the study was limited to employees of three sectors namely Information Technology, Banking and Telecommunication. Also, the study was limited to the top, middle and junior managers. For the purpose of the study, the definitions of these positions are as follows: the top managers are those who shoulder overall responsibility of the organization. The middle managers are those managers who are active in hierarchy between top managers and junior managers. The junior managers are those who function under supervision of middle managers and direct foremen and workers for performing the basic work.

Methods of Data Collection and Analysis

Data was collected through self-administered questionnaires and the respondents were asked to respond as per the instructions in the questionnaire and were assured of confidentiality.

The data obtained from the survey were coded and fed into the computer through Google Drive. This included processing, coding, tabulation and analysis of data. The

computation of the raw data was done in order to carry out the following statistical analysis:

1. Descriptive Statistics
2. Inferential Statistics

Table 1.1: Sample Profile

Age-Group	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Below 30 years	193	39	39
31-45 Years	271	54.7	93.7
46 and above	31	6.3	100
Total	495	100	
Sex			
Male	321	64.8	64.8
Female	174	35.2	100
Total	495	100	
Marital Status			
Married	299	60.4	60.4
Unmarried	196	39.6	100
Total	495	100	
Education			
Diploma	74	14.9	14.9
Graduation	234	47.3	62.2
Post Graduation and above	187	37.8	100
Total	495	100	
Organization			
IT Services	194	39.2	39.2
Banking	144	29.1	68.3
Telecom	157	31.7	100
Total	495	100	
Income			
Below 40000 pm	216	43.6	43.6
40000-100000 pm	196	39.6	83.2
100000 pm	83	16.8	100
Total	495	100	
Experience			
Less than 2	180	36.4	36.4
2 to 5	218	44	80.4
More than 5	97	19.6	100
Total	495	100	

Questionnaire Validity and Reliability:

Validity: The reliability of the scale was established by two methods: (a) the Cronbach’s Alpha method , with a sample of 495 subjects, for the dependability co-efficient, is 0.918 (b) the Guttman split half reliability co efficient, from a sample of 495 subjects corrected for full length, is 0.905 and Spearman-Brown Coefficient is .906. The results are given in table

Table: 1.2 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach’s Alpha	Part 1	Value	.873
		N of Items	4 ^a
	Part 2	Value	.835
		N of Items	4 ^b
Total N of Items			8
Correlation Between Forms			.828
Spearman-Brown Coefficient	Equal Length		.906
	Unequal Length		.906
Guttman Split-Half Coefficient			.905

DATA ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

The responses obtained through questionnaire were analysed using SPSS data analysis tool. Secondly, the mean value and standard deviation have been computed for questions which are asked on Likert’s Scale ranging from 1-4 (from strongly agree to strongly disagree). Statistical comparisons have also been made using a student sample *t*-test to establish if the means are statistically different.

Table 1.3: The Results of Mean Comparison of Relational Practices with Different Age Groups Under Study

Age	N	Mean RP	Std. Deviation
Below 30	193	3.2214	.30687
30-35	271	3.2326	.35195
Above 45	31	3.2271	.43062
Total	495	3.2279	.33999

Summary of Results

As shown in the Table above, there are very less differences in the Relational Practices exhibited by different Age Groups. One Way ANOVA was applied to further the claim.

Table 1.4: The Results of One Way ANOVA for the Comparison of Persons with Different Age Groups

Relational Practices	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.014	2	.007	.062	.940
Within Groups	57.088	492	.116		
Total	57.103	494			

From the above table, we can observe that there are no significant differences in the Relational Practices of employees with different Age Groups as $F(2, 492) = .062$, $p = .940 > 0.05$

Table 1.5: The Results of Mean Comparison of Relational Practices with Different Education Levels Under Study

Relational Practices and Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Diploma	74	3.2437	.27890
Graduation	234	3.2478	.33507
Post Graduation	187	3.1968	.36642
Total	495	3.2279	.33999

The result of descriptive statistics reveals that the mean Value of Relational Practices is greater for graduates and Diploma holders than Post Graduates. There appear significant differences in the Relational Practices exhibited by different Education Levels. One Way ANOVA was applied to know whether differences between means are significant.

Table 1.6: The Results of One Way ANOVA for the Comparison of Persons with Different Education Levels

Relational Practices	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.292	2	.146	1.263	.284
Within Groups	56.811	492	.115		
Total	57.103	494			

From the above table, we can observe that there are no significant differences in the Relational Practices of employees with different Education Levels as $F(2, 492) = 1.263$, $p = .284 > 0.05$

Table 1.7: The Results of Mean Comparison of Relational Practices with Different Income Groups Under Study

Salary	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Below 40000	216	3.2427	0.32516
40000-100000	196	3.1856	0.32873
Above 100000	83	3.2893	0.39179
Total	495	3.2279	0.33999

As depicted in the Table above, the mean Value of Relational Practices is greater for employees earning more than Rs100000 a month than employees earning lesser. There appear significant differences in the Relational Practices exhibited by different income Levels. One Way ANOVA was applied to know whether differences between means are significant.

Table 1.8: The Results of One Way ANOVA for the Comparison of Persons with Different Income Groups

Relational Practices	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.711	2	.356	3.103	.046
Within Groups	56.391	492	.115		
Total	57.103	494			

From the above one way ANOVA table, we can observe that there are significant differences in the Relational Practices of employees with different income Groups as $F(2, 492) = 3.103$, $p = .046 < 0.05$. On examining the above table, we find that there is a significant difference in the Relational Practices in the three sectors under study. Post-Hoc comparison procedures (i.e. Bonferroni) are needed if/when we have significant F-statistic on a one way ANOVA. The results of multiple comparisons of Relational Practices among the three sectors have been shown in table 1.9.

Table 1.9: The Multiple Comparison Results of Relational Practices Among the Three Income Levels Under Study

(I) Salary	Comparison	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Below 40000	40000-100000	.05708	.03340	.264
	Above 100000	-.04667	.04372	.859
40000-100000	Below 40000	-.05708	.03340	.264
	Above 100000	-.10375*	.04434	.059
Above 100000	Below 40000	.04667	.04372	.859
	40000-100000	.10375*	.04434	.059

The results of multiple comparisons using Bonferroni’s adjustments reveal that the **Above 100000** Income Group has significantly higher Relational Practices as compared to **40000-100000** Income Group (p -value=.059<.10).

On the Basis of Three sectors under Study

The present study also attempts to investigate and compare various organizations in the three sectors namely IT, Banking and Telecom sector. To accomplish this, t-test was computed for the various dimensions of Relational Practices.

A Summary of means and standard deviation of the eight dimensions of Relational Practices in three sectors under study is presented in the Table below.

Table 1.10: Means and Standard Deviations of Eight Relational Practices in the Three Sectors

Sectors		Relational Practices							
		RP1	RP2	RP3	RP4	RP5	RP6	RP7	RP8
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	Mean	3.350	3.079	3.342	3.211	3.187	3.320	3.091	3.338
	Standard Deviation	.479	.619	.477	.571	.573	.490	.625	.539
BANKING	Mean	3.306	3.278	3.297	3.230	3.373	3.226	3.256	3.229
	Standard Deviation	.298	.300	.304	.325	.288	.333	.325	.299
TELE COMMUNICATIONS	Mean	3.156	3.167	3.178	3.150	3.285	3.145	3.084	3.092
	Standard Deviation	.434	.380	.362	.441	.403	.438	.383	.396

It can be summarized from the above Table that Information Technology Sector and Banking sector has got the highest mean values on various dimensions of Relational Practices. In these two sectors, apparently the employees are exhibiting more relational Practices score than Tele-Communication sector.

A comparison is drawn between the mean values for the dimensions of Relational Practices for various organizations in the IT and Banking Sector to find out how do the employees in IT sector and banking sector differ significantly on the eight practices. The scores and results thereof have been shown in the Table below.

Table 1.11: Comparison Between IT Sector and Banking Sector for the Different Relational Practices

VARIABLES	MEAN(IT)	MEAN(BANKING)	S.D.(IT)	S.D.(BANKING)	t value	p value (two tailed)
RP1CT.RC	3.35	3.31	.47	.29	.96	.334
RP2CT.AS	3.08	3.28	.61	.30	-3.56	.000
RP3ME.ET	3.34	3.29	.47	.30	.99	.319
RP4ME.RT	3.21	3.23	.57	.32	-.35	.721
RP5P.IV	3.19	3.37	.57	.28	-3.58	.000
RP6P.ER	3.32	3.22	.49	.33	1.97	.049
RP7SA.RF	3.09	3.25	.62	.32	-2.90	.004
RP8SA.RC	3.34	3.22	.53	.29	2.19	.029

As shown in the Table 1.11, 1.12 and 1.13, a t-test on the mean values for the dimensions of Relational Practices for various organizations in the Information Technology and Banking Sector revealed that Creating Team: Reducing Conflict (RP1), Mutual Empowering: Empathetic Teaching (RP3) and Mutual Empowering: Reducing

tension (RP4) are significantly different in two sectors. Whereas, in IT and Telecom sectors, only Creating Team: Reducing Conflict (RP1) showed significant difference. The comparison of Banking sector with Telecom revealed there were no significant differences in the Relational Practices in these sectors.

Table 1.12: Comparison Between Banking Sector and Telecom Sector for the Different Relational Practices

VARIABLES	MEAN (BANKING)	MEAN (TELECOM)	S.D. (BANKING)	S.D. (TELECOM)	t value	p value
RP1CT.RC	3.30	3.15	.29	.43	3.47	.000
RP2CT.AS	3.27	3.16	.30	.38	2.79	.013
RP3ME.ET	3.29	3.17	.30	.36	3.07	.019
RP4ME.RT	3.23	3.15	.32	.44	1.76	.000
RP5P.IV	3.37	3.28	.28	.40	2.16	.001
RP6P.ER	3.22	3.14	.33	.43	1.80	.000
RP7SA.RF	3.25	3.08	.32	.38	4.17	.004
RP8SA.RC	3.22	3.09	.29	.39	3.35	.000

Table 1.13: Comparison Between IT Sector and Telecom Sector for the Different Relational Practices

VARIABLES	MEAN(IT)	MEAN(TELECOM)	S.D.(IT)	S.D.(TELECOM)	t value	p value
RP1CT.RC	3.35	3.15	.47	.43	3.93	.210
RP2CT.AS	3.07	3.16	.61	.38	-1.57	.000
RP3ME.ET	3.34	3.17	.47	.36	3.56	.000
RP4ME.RT	3.21	3.15	.57	.44	1.09	.001
RP5P.IV	3.18	3.28	.57	.40	-1.81	.000
RP6P.ER	3.32	3.14	.49	.43	3.48	.065
RP7SA.RF	3.09	3.08	.62	.38	.10	.000
RP8SA.RC	3.33	3.09	.53	.39	4.76	.000

ANOVA

As it was observed in the above Tables that there are significant differences in Relational Practices in the three

Table 1.14: Comparison of the Overall Relational Practices in All the Dimensions of the Three Sectors Under Study- IT, Banking and Telecom

Relational Practices	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.961	2	.480	4.211	.015
Within Groups	56.142	492	.114		
Total	57.103	494			

sectors under study ,one way ANOVA was computed to identify whether the difference between means of different sectors are significant or not.

As depicted in the table, there are significant differences in the mean Relational Practices of employees in the three job categories as $F(2,492) = 4.211, p = .015 < .05$. On examining the above table, we find that there is a significant difference in the Relational Practices in the three sectors under study. Post-Hoc comparison procedures (i.e. Bonferroni) are needed if/when we have significant F-statistic on a one way ANOVA. The results of multiple comparisons of Relational Practices among the three sectors have been shown in table 1.14.

Table 1.15: The Multiple Comparison Results of Relational Practices Among the Three Sectors Under Study

Organization(I)	Organization (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Standard Error	Sig.
IT	Banking	-.04649	.03716	.634
	Telecom	.06562	.03626	.213
Banking	IT	.04649	.03716	.634
	Telecom	.11211*	.03898	.013
Telecom	IT	-.06562	.03626	.213
	Banking	-.11211*	.03898	.013

The results of multiple comparisons using Bonferroni’s adjustments reveal that the banking sector has significantly higher Relational Practices as compared to Telecom sector($p\text{-value} = .013 < .05$). Also, there are no significant difference in Relational Practices exhibited by IT sector and Telecom sector($p\text{-value} = .213 \& .634 > .05$).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Relational Practices are interpersonal and intrapersonal behaviors exhibited by an employee at his work place which are implemented by the employee on a relational belief rather than as an obligation towards organization. Relationally motivated behaviors are the ones that are

exercised out of willingness rather than any obligation on someone.. These practices may not come under direct ambit of organizational duties of the employee but still are very much desirable for efficiency in the organization. The present study found out that:

- Employees exhibit all forms of Relational Practices in Indian Business Organizations.
- On comparing the three sectors namely, Information Technology, Banking and Telecommunication, the employees in banking sector exhibits highest level of relational practices as compared to IT and Telecom sector.

- The mean value of Relational Practices has not come out to be significantly different in various age groups under study implying age does not affect Relational Practices.
- There are no significant differences in the Relational Practices of employees with different Education Levels implying education does not change the Relationally motivated behaviour.
- The employees with different Income Groups are having different Relational Practices mean scores. The employees earning Above 100000 are exhibiting highest level of relational practices as compared to other groups. This finding somewhere gives a clue for Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory, as when the lower needs like money are satisfied, individuals move towards higher needs of relationships, trust, love, belongingness and self-actualization.

Relational practices are vital for any organizations fulfillment of long term goals. Yet, everything hinges on recognizing and rewarding Relational Practices.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1990): Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations, *Gender and Society*, Vol.4(2), pp.139-58.
- Boydell, T and Blanter, C.(2007): Action Learning as Relational Practice. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, Vol.4(1), pp.95-104.
- Bouwen, R.(2001): Developing Relational Practices for Knowledge Intensive Organisational Contexts, *Career Development International*, Vol.6(7), pp.361-369.
- Carlson, J.H. and Crawford, M. (2011): Perceptions of Relational Practices in the Workplace, *Gender, Work and Organisation*, Vol.18(4).
- Comstock, D.L., Hammer, T.R., Strentzsch, J., Cannon, K., Parsons, J., Salazar, G.(2008): Relational-Cultural Theory: A Framework for Bridging Relational, Multicultural and Social Justice Competencies, *Journal of Counselling & Development*, Vol.86.
- Craps, M., Rossen, E.V., Prins, S., Taillieu, T., Bouven, R., Dewulf, A.(2005): Relational Practices to Make Social Learning Happen: A Case Study in Water and Nature Management. In *Active Citizenship and Multiple Identities*, pp.227-244.
- Daniels, A.K. (1987): Invisible Work, *Social Problems*, Vol.34(5), pp.403-15.
- DeVault, M.L. (1991): *Feeding the Family: The Social Organization of Caring as Gendered Work*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fletcher, J.K. (1998): Relational Practices: A Feminist Reconstruction of Work. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol.7(2), pp.163-86.
- Fletcher, J.K. (1999): *Disappearing Acts: Gender, Power, and Relational Practice at Work*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Foldy, E. (2002): Review of J.K. Fletcher (1999) *Disappearing Acts: Gender, Power and Relational Practice at Work*, *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol.9(2), pp.119-22.
- Holmes, J. and Marra, M.(2004): Relational Practices in Workplace: Women's Talk or Gendered Discourse, *Language in Society*, Vol.33, pp.377-398.

Undoubtedly, Relational Practices is an important concept from the perspective of both individuals and organizations. Present paper brings out:

- Awareness of Relational Practices and conscious effort to follow them can bring sea change in Organizational Environment.
- Relational Practices can be applied in all aspects of life like strategic alliance, legal systems, knowledge sharing, resource management and education and is not only confined to boundaries of behaviors exhibited in Modern Business Organizations.

Research on Relational Practices is going on for some time now. This study would add to the existing literature on Relational Practices as:

- It develops an understanding and appreciation of Relational Practices.
- It builds on Relational Practices and global organizational perspective.

- Jordan, J.V., Kaplan, A.G., Miller, J.B., Stiver, I.P. and Surrey, J.L. (1991): *Women's Growth in Connection: Writings from the Stone Center*, New York, Guilford Press.
- Kanter, R.M. (1977): *Men and Women of the Corporation*, New York, Basic Books.
- Kerfoot, D. and Knights, D. (1993): Management, Masculinity and Manipulation: From Paternalism to Corporate Strategy in Financial Services in Britain, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol.30(4), pp.650-67.
- MacNamee, S.(2006): *Relational Practices in Education: Teaching as Conversation*, Draft for Anderson, H. and Gehart, D.(2006), *Invitations: Applications of Postmodern Collaborative Therapy*, New York.
- Manning, S.(2010): The Strategic Formation of Project Networks: A Relational Practice Perspective. *Human Relations*, Vol.63, p.551.
- Martin, P.Y. (2006): Practising Gender at Work: Further Thoughts on Reflexivity, *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol.13(3), pp.254-76.
- Miller, J.B. (1976): *Toward a New Psychology of Women*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D. (1987): *Doing Gender: Gender and Society*, Vol.1(2), pp.125-51.
- Ness, H.(2009): Governance, Negotiations and Alliance Dynamics: Explaining the Evolution of Relational Practice, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol.46(3).
- Winn, J.K. (1994): Relational Practices and the Marginalization of Law: Informal Financial Practices of Small Businesses in Taiwan, *Law & Society Review*, Vol.28(2), pp.193-232.