

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS AS MODAL OF THE ENTERPRISE'S SOCIAL CAPITAL

Disconnections on the sociocultural level, e.g. in a firm, happen due to practices of categorizing, stereotyping, and stratifying individuals. All theoretical approaches (affective events theory, emotional labor approach, relational-cultural theory) focus on a very specific aspect of relationships – affective states, emotional display, or psychological experiences of marginal groups. For the purpose of this research a broader theory, which incorporates dimensions of work, distribution, exchange, morals, values, and other important work aspects, and which is cross-culturally validated was needed. This research applies the relational models theory (RMT) as a theory meeting all named requirements.

RMT was applied to questions of trust in institutions connecting the issues of trust with a prevailing relational model. A relational model in this event can be seen as a part of psychological contract between the firm and an employee. Relational models are associated with social identities and their breach can jeopardize moral and rational self-images of people. RMT also helps understand organizational management.

Fiske assumed that individuals switch between the four different relational models according to the situation, interactions in a firm on different levels are a good representation of such different situations. For example, RMT incorporates interactions in work, distribution, morale, communication, exchange, and other dimensions, and these dimensions differ for employees and their peers and for employees and their managers. The use of relational models on different levels of organizations, however, has not been investigated yet.

The aforementioned aspects dictate a necessity of a study on relational models in order to contribute to the literature by, first, strengthening RMT application in organizational behavior research; second, testing Fiske's and Tetlock's (1997) arguments on cultural predispositions for certain relational models in the business domain; and, third, investigating mechanisms of choice of relational models on different organizational levels.

In their 1997 paper, Fiske and Haslam even provide a proof for relational models playing a more important role than personalities. They show that in relationships where one of the parties needed to be substituted, the initial party preferred not the person with similar personal characteristics, but the one using the same relational model [2].

As a result of his anthropological research, Fiske proposed four elementary models of relationships: communal sharing, authority ranking, equality matching, and market pricing. These four models are present in all societies and form a framework for communication, work, distribution, exchange, and other aspects of relating. RMT is one of the first theories incorporating relational and societal structures, natural selection and culture, cognition, motivation, and emotion and psychology [1].

Manifestations and four elementary relation models are described in table 1. The first model of interpersonal relationships – communal sharing is based on the principle of equivalency and collegiality. This model is grounded in common beliefs, values, and goals, and explains group cohesion. The main features of which is common value system and community's achieved targets. The community interests are more important than personal. The communal sharing model can be applied to a firm if the core values of the firm are focused on commonalities

The main peculiarities of the second model of interpersonal relationships – authority ranking are hierarchical structure of relationships and remote participants in decision-making. Management is reduced to a clear chain of command and subordination.

Table 1

Domains and features of relational models

Domains and features	Relational models			
	communal sharing	authority ranking	equality matching	market prices
	commonality collegiality equivalence lack of individualism consentience	authoritarian style content of control hierarchical subordination	the balance of interests, equivalence in job fulfillment collegiality	rationality, monetary basement of relationship, evaluation " cost-benefit " according to spent time and efficiency
	be of a group	power motivation	desire for equality	achievement motivation
	reciprocal emulation communal consensus	leadership	eye-for-eye feuding tit-for-tat reprisals	mercantile basement

The third model – equality matching provides the balance in the relationship, herewith the system of values and target sets of its participations have an individual character. Reciprocal relationships are typical for this model, meaning a fair exchange of knowledge, time, property, and so on. If one employee accomplishes a task, the others are morally obliged to balance such action out by their actions, e.g. accomplishing other tasks with similar amount of work, or taking turn in accomplishing the same task next time.

Implementation the principle of proportionality is provided by the fourth model – market prices. In contrast to the equality matching model where group members agree on some sort of approximate balance, market prices needs a well-defined scale or a set of scales. For example, if employees include a precise amount of expected time and effort investments, salary, and so on in their agreement on work distribution, one can observe the market prices model of relating.

Relational models can be applied to various aspects of a firm. For example, in terms of a free market, firms have to compete for employees and offer them better conditions, including well-being and favorable organizational climate, in order to increase productivity. Core values are used to find and motivate people to achieve specified results (introduction of CS-based relationships) and to achieve a group cohesion [3]. Fairness (EM-based relationship) is the important aspect of motivational policy. Moreover, the issue of gender and diversity becomes more important to achieve balance and promote fairness. Linear execution (AR-based relationships) proved to be especially efficient in the mode of low-pace environments, whereas less linear iterative structures showed their efficiency in high-velocity environments. Consequently, a correct choice of relational models indirectly influences the firm's efficiency.

1. Fiske, A.P. and Haslam, N. (2005), "The four basic social bonds: structures for coordinating interaction", *Interpersonal Cognition*, Guilford Press, New York, NY, US, pp. 267–298.

2. Fiske, A.P. and Haslam, N. (1997), "The structure of social substitutions: a test of relational models theory", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 27 No. 6, pp. 725–729.

3. Dion, K.L. (2000), "Group cohesion: from 'field of forces' to multidimensional construct", *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 7–26.