

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTER-HUMAN RELATIONS AT S.C. ROMTELECOM S.A., BAIA MARE

Gavrilescu Liviu

Instituția Prefectului – Județul Maramureș, Str. Gh. Șincai, nr. 46, 430311 Baia Mare, Romania, tel. +40 262 215001

The North University of Baia Mare, The Faculty of Sciences, Str. Victoriei, nr. 76, 430122 Baia Mare, Romania, tel. +40 262 276059, liviugavrilescu@yahoo.com

Good inter-human relations within groups of an organization can ensure the well-functioning of the team, an increased competitiveness, and better decisions, more creative and productive. On the other hand, the opposite situation can have disastrous consequences. Sociometric studies can reveal the real situation within the group, and can give valuable solutions of problems. The paper presents an analysis of the social relations existing between members of a quite young group belonging to S.C. Romtelecom S.A. The purpose of the study is to determine the formal and informal leaders of the group, and the degree of attractions and rejections between the members of the group, using sociometric instruments, such as the sociometric matrix, and the sociogram.

Keywords: inter-human relations, sociometric test, informal leader, behavior,

JEL code: M12

THE ANALYSYS METHOD

Men occupy a certain position inside a group. They possess a status and they want others to respect and approve it. Every individual positions and all considerations and feelings about each other give as a result the strength or the weakness of the group.

The application of a sociometric test can determine the quality of a group, resulting the real attractions and rejections, also the perceived attractions and rejections among the members of the group.

The sociometric test was applied to a group of employees of the Financial-Accounting Department of S.C. „Romtelecom” S.A.

The study concerning the inter-human relations intends to determine the informal and formal leaders of the group, also the measure of the attractions and rejections between its members. It was also determined the cohesion of the group and the way it influences the work efficiency.

The test consisted of applying to the group the following questionnaire:

Name:

Length of experience in the group:

1. In case of forming a special team in order to achieve a highly appreciated objective, whom of the present group colleagues would you like to work with?

- a) first place 4;*
- b) second place 3;*
- c) third place 2;*
- d) fourth place 1.*

2. Whom you would not like to work with?

- a) first place 4;*
- b) second place 3;*
- c) third place 2;*
- d) fourth place 1.*

3. Who do you think would like to work with you?

- a) first place 4;*
- b) second place 3;*
- c) third place 2;*

- d) fourth place 1.
 4. Who do you think would reject you?
 a) first place 4;
 b) second place 3;
 c) third place 2;
 d) fourth place 1.

The subjects were asked not to communicate with one another and to answer to all questions, without the intervention of the interviewer, for an increased relevance of the result. The absenters were not taken into account with the sociometric test. After collecting the completed questionnaires, the effective analysis of the data was conducted, using the sociometric matrix and the sociogramm.

THE GROUP ANALYSIS

The Financial-Accounting Department of S.C. „Romtelecom” S.A. group has 9 members. The sociogramm resulting after the completion of the questionnaires is presented in Table 1. The employees from the group are:

- Cristi, Dragoş, Mircea, Dana, Anca, Nicoleta - accountants;
- Silviu – chief accountant.

The meaning of the numbers is:

- +3 the first choice
- +2 the 2nd choice
- +1 the 3rd choice
- 3 the first rejection
- 2 the 2nd rejection
- 1 the 3rd rejection

The numbers between the brackets is what the individual believes, that he is chosen or rejected, from the behavior of his colleagues.

	Cristi	Dragoş	Mircea	Silviu	Dana	Anca	Nicoleta
Cristi	X	+1(+1)	-3(+3)	+3(-3)	-2(-2)	+2(-1)	-1(+2)
Dragoş	+1(+3)	X	-3(-3)	+3(+2)	+2(-1)	-2(-2)	-1(+1)
Mircea	-1(-1)	-3(+1)	X	+3(+3)	-2(-3)	+2(-2)	+1(+2)
Silviu	+3(+2)	+2(+3)	-1(-3)	X	+1(+1)	-3(-2)	-2(-1)
Dana	+2(-1)	-3(-3)	+1(+2)	+3(+3)	X	-2(-2)	-1(+1)
Anca	-2(+2)	+2(+3)	+1(-2)	+3(+1)	-3(-3)	X	-1(-1)
Nicoleta	+2(-1)	+1(+2)	-3(-3)	+3(+3)	-2(-2)	-1(+1)	X
Real choices	4/6	4/6	2/6	6/6	2/6	2/6	1/6
Real rejections	2/6	2/6	4/6	0/6	4/6	4/6	5/6
Perceived choices	3/6	5/6	2/6	5/6	1/6	1/6	4/6
Perceived rejections	3/6	1/6	4/6	1/6	5/6	5/6	2/6
Isp real	0,33	0,33	-0,33	1	-0,33	-0,33	-0,66
Isp perceived	0	0,66	-0,33	0,66	-0,66	-0,66	0,33

Table 1. The sociogramm

The calculation of the sociometric indicators:

The index of the real preferential status of each member of the group:

$$I_{sp}^{real} = \frac{R_p - R_n}{N - 1}$$

where:

R_p – positive real reciprocities;

R_n – negative real reciprocities;

N – the number of subjects in the group.

$$I_{sp}^C = 0.33$$

$$I_{sp}^D = 0.33$$

$$I_{sp}^M = -0.33$$

$$I_{sp}^S = 1$$

$$I_{sp}^D = -0.33$$

$$I_{sp}^A = -0.33$$

$$I_{sp}^N = -0.66$$

The limit values of the index of the real preferential status in the group are –0.66 and 1.

The index of the perceived preferential status of each member of the group:

$$I_{sp}^{perceived} = \frac{R_p - R_n}{N - 1}$$

where:

R_p – positive perceived reciprocities;

R_n – negative perceived reciprocities;

N – the number of subjects in the group.

$$I_{sp}^C = 0$$

$$I_{sp}^D = 0.83$$

$$I_{sp}^M = -0.33$$

$$I_{sp}^S = 0.66$$

$$I_{sp}^D = -0.66$$

$$I_{sp}^A = -0.66$$

$$I_{sp}^N = 0.33$$

The limit values of the index of the perceived preferential status in the group are –0.66 and 0.83.

The group cohesion index:

$$I_c = \frac{\sum c}{N(N - 1)}$$

c – reciprocal choices

N – the number of subjects in the group.

$$I_c = \frac{\sum c}{N(N - 1)} = \frac{5}{7(7 - 1)} = 0,24$$

The index shows that the group is weakly cohesive.

The preferential power index:

The preferential power index of the group is used to determine the intensity of the force of the inter-group preferential attraction (I_{pG}). It is calculated by considering the concrete values of the power indexes of the group members..

$$I_{pG} = \frac{\sum FI_p}{N}$$

where:

F – the frequency

I_p – the individual preferential power index

N – the number of subjects in the group

$$I_{pG} = \frac{\sum FI_p}{N} = \frac{3 \times 1 + 4 \times (-1)}{9} = \frac{3 - 4}{9} = -0,11$$

The -0.11 value of the preferential power index highlights a negative situation inside the group. The number of those with a negative preferential status exceeds the number of those with a positive preferential status, the situation needing to be immediately corrected.

The index of preferential stability of the group

This index highlights the interpersonal balance achieved within the group, or between the its members being in reciprocal relations. Its calculation formula is:

$$I_{spG} = \frac{R_p - R_n}{N}$$

where:

R_p – positive reciprocities;

R_n – negative reciprocities;

N – the number of subjects in the group

$$I_{spG} = \frac{R_p - R_n}{N} = \frac{5 - 5}{7} = 0$$

The preferential stability of the group is low, because the number of reciprocal preferences equals the number of reciprocal rejections.

In this respect, it should be taken measures of augmentation of the positive reciprocities, as they have a lower probability to brake apart. The equality between the positive and the negative reciprocities leads to a critical situation.

DATA INTERPRETATION

With the help of the preferential status index, there can be established the place occupied by each member in the preferences of the other members. Also, the informal leader of the group can be deduced.

The analysis of the sociomatrix and the real preferential status index indicates the following repartition of the group members:

Number of preferences	Number of subjects ith the same number of preferences	Isp real	Psychosocial value of preferential type
6	1	1	Very popular
2	2	0.33	Popular
-2	3	-0.33	Rejected
-4	1	-0.66	Rejected

Table 2. The repartition of the group members, function of $I_{sp\ real}$

As shown above, Silviu is the most popular member of the group, with 6 choices and no rejection. He has the position of chief-accountant, being at the same time formal and informal leader, which is the ideal situation.

Number of preferences	Number of subjects ith the same number of preferences	Isp perceived	Psychosocial value of preferential type
4	2	0.66	Very popular
2	1	0.33	Popular
0	1	0	Indifferent
-2	1	-0.33	Rejected
-4	2	-0.66	Rejected

Table 3. The repartition of the group members, function of Isp perceived

As shown above, Silviu and Dragoş perceive themselves as very popular, believing to be chosen by 4 colleagues out of the 6, and Nicoleta perceives herself rejected, also feeling very isolated.

At individual level, considering the preferential status, one can determine the position of each member within the group.

Two extreme positions can be detached:

- members with all positive preferential statuses – Silviu, the chief accountant;
- members with all negative preferential statuses, only rejections from the other members – no such cases.

The other members have mixed statuses, containing in different proportions choices and rejections. The negative statuses show the fact that their owners are rejected, disliked (Mircea, Dana, Anca, and Nicoleta).

A first step to increase the cohesion of the group would be: transparency, open communication between the group members, especially with the rejected members.

The sociometric analysis of the group shows that the formal leader of the group is also the informal leader, occupying the position of “very popular”, being part of 3 reciprocal choices and no rejection.

The group leader (formal and informal) could be more close with the isolated members (Mircea, Anca și Nicoleta, whom he rejects, but who accept him), and the group will become more cohesive.

For example, Mircea accepts Silviu, but Silviu rejects Mircea, thinking to be rejected by him, which is false. If Silviu would be told that, in fact, Mircea accepts him, he could change his attitude, helping in a substantial way Mircea’s integration in the group.

The important thing is that the members with a positive preferential status should be more communicative, more open, to give those with a negative preferential status the chance to feel accepted by their colleagues.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The team is a group of individuals who work together in order to accomplish a task. When a team starts its activity, the cohesion between its members is little, and there is no understanding of the way this group will act to accomplish the task. The team from S.C. “Romtelecom” S.A. is young, in process of formation. As the members work together, a synergy is developed.

During a group’s life, the unsolved problems will appear again ad the group may adopt unproductive behavior, so it is very important that the problems are well understood.

What is necessary for the team work to be carried on with best results:

- the preparations for the team work;
- the organization for action;
- establishment of a climate;
- clarification of the task;
- establishment of the resources;
- the work and the reflection upon it.

The productivity of a team is largely determined by the efficiency in solving the problems. To be more efficient, teams should recognize and treat problems connected to both tasks and

interpersonal issues. Any type of problem can block the productivity of the group, when ignored, or insufficiently treated.

Teams are valuable because the individuals that form them are different. Experience has shown that a team that works well, in which the members contribute with different points of view, will take more productive and creative decisions than several individuals working separately and then gather their results.

In the group observed in this study, the formal leaders are also informal ones, which is very good for the performance of the group. As the leader helps the group to increase its cohesion, the growth of competence and the degree of involvement will be noticed.

The leader should focus more on support and relationship within the group, than on exactness and on the task. They should stimulate creativity in the group, and try to understand problems, to be open to new ideas, to be able to tolerate different values, beliefs, and points of view.

In order to increase competitiveness, the team from the study should:

- communicate clearly the objectives (a very important role of the leader);
- improve internal relations;
- have high standards of quality;
- reduce the number of complaints;
- reduce the conflicts within the group;
- increase the level of motivation;
- establish an efficient communication;
- increase the participation of the group members
- reduce the centralized control

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BUCUREAN, M., 2003, *Management general*, Editura universitară, Oradea
2. DOMOKOS, E., 1999, *Management – ieri, azi, mâine*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj
3. DUMITRESCU, M., 1995, *Introducere în Management și Managementul General*, Editura Eurounion, Oradea
4. GAVRILESCU, L., 2006, *Selectia și antiselectia managerilor*, Editura Risoprint, Cluj-Napoca
5. MATEI, L., 1998, *Managementul întreprinderilor mici și mijlocii. Strategii și performanțe*, Editura Fundației „România de mâine”, București
6. MIHULEAC, E., 1994, *Managerul și principalele activități manageriale*, vol. II, Editura Fundației „România de mâine”, București
7. MIHULEAC, E., 1994, *Managerul și principalele activități manageriale*, vol. I., Editura Fundației „România de mâine”, București
8. NICOLESCU, O., VERBONCU, I., 2001, *Fundamentele managementului organizației*, Editura Tribuna Economică, București
9. NICOLESCU, O., VERBONCU, I., 1986, *Fundamentele conducerii microeconomice*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București
10. NICOLESCU, O., ș.a., 1992, *Management*, Editura Didactică și pedagogică, București
11. RUS, C., VOICU, M., 1993, *ABC-ul managerului*, Editura „Gh. Asachi”, Iași
12. RUS, W. D., 1996, *Arta managementului*, Editura Tehnică, București
13. VLĂSCEANU, M., 2003, *Organizații și comportament organizațional*, Editura Polirom, București
14. ***, 1985, *Dicționar de conducere și organizare*, Editura Politică, București.