Journal of Organisation and Human Behaviour
12 (3) 2023, 38-45
http://publishingindia.com/johb/

RELOOKING TEACHERS' TRANSACTIONAL STYLES OF OPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON TEACHERS OF MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

Sarita Kumari*

Abstract *A positive classroom learning experience always contributes towards creating a sustainable vibration in the minds of students, which in turn help in productive classroom engagement. There is limited knowledge concerning teacher's style of operation especially in higher education in the field of management studies. Purpose—Supportive teacher-student relationship with effective interaction is the important input for holistic growth of the students. Looking at the generational variation in patience level of students in higher education, negative ego centrism and deficiencies in ethical and right behaviour, it is obvious that teachers' role are getting more complicated. The purpose of this research paper is to understand the higher education teachers' style of interacting (exchange of ideas and behaviour) with students of post graduate management programmes and other faculty colleagues and to find out styles for their effective operation, by gaining deeper insight into their own behaviour and interaction. Design/Methodology/Approach—This study uses a quantitative approach with a sample of 142 management faculty members from four cities in India. The data was analysed by using SPSS.*

Keywords: *Transactional Analysis, Assertive, Innovative, Regulating, Task and Adaptive*

INTRODUCTION

A teacher affects eternity: he can never tell where his influence stops.' – Henry Adams

A positive classroom learning experience always contribute towards creating a sustainable vibration in the minds of students, which in turn help in productive classroom engagement. There is limited knowledge concerning teacher's style of operation especially in higher education in the field of management studies. Transactional analysis developed by Eric Berne during 1950s highlights the process of transaction during communication exchanges between people by considering different ego states such as: parent, adult and child. Understanding and implementing the same for academicians in higher education will throw some light to analyse how they operate by optimising the relationship between human behaviour, education and learning. The purpose of this research paper is to understand the higher education teachers' style of interacting (exchange of ideas and behaviour) with students of post graduate management programmes and other faculty colleagues and to find out styles for their effective operation, by gaining deeper insight into their own behaviour and interaction.

LITERATURE REVIEW

There are not many research literatures available regarding the transactional style of operations of teachers in higher education especially in management programme.

However, the learning environment created by teachers are major influencer of effective learning. Learning environment is the outcome of positive interaction/transaction among teacher and students, leading to positive and sustainable relationship between teacher and student. Positive teacher-student relationship helps in greater association with higher academic engagement. Higher quality teacher–student relationships predict lower levels of student aggression (Hughes et al., 1999) and co-occur with greater subjective well-being (Suldo et al., 2009) and more adaptive emotional functioning (Reddy, Rhodes & Mulhall, 2003).

Transaction analysis creates a win-win situation in the classroom, making a more pleasant and productive

* Professor (HR/OB), SIES College of Management Studies, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.
Email: dr.saritakumari8@gmail.com; ORCiD: 0000-0002-8940-9480

atmosphere for all concerned (Newell & Jeffery, 2002). It offers teachers practical examples of how to model behaviour, structure time, use contracts and praise students in order to avoid or resolve conflict quickly and fairly so that everyone feels OK and learning is put at the forefront.

Dr. Eric Berne in the year 1961 designed the Transactional analysis model with the objective of understanding human behaviour both self-oriented behaviour and others'-oriented behaviour so that appropriate communication and interaction are possible with maturity level of understanding. It is considered as a guideline for social interaction. One basic assumption of the theory is that social interaction satisfies three fundamental human needs: Need for stimulus, Need for structure and Need for position. Another important assumption is "a person operates in one of three distinct ego states at any one time" (Steiner, 1974), called parent ego state, adult ego state and child ego state which are primarily observed within every individual irrespective of age.

Parent ego, reflecting parent characteristics mainly of two categories such as: controlling parent (associated with rule, regulations, principles and norms) and nurturing parent (reflecting caring, nurturing and loving personality). This ego state deals with both task orientation and people orientation style to manage others.

Adult ego state symbolises with rationality and logic. Adult ego stages within an individual push him or her to take decisions cautiously by analysing past records, present scenarios and all available alternatives. This ego state also helps in future prediction by careful analysis of data. Child and parent states are emotional.

Child ego is categorised as: Adapted child and free child. Adapted child ego state refers to a state in which an individual either accept the rules and regulations set by parent ego state and give respect by obeying them or he/she may rebel against. Free child ego state reflects an individual's independency, creativity, curiosity, openness and carelessness.

Transactions and Their Classifications

When two individuals interact with each other their ego states interact. We name it "transaction", which consists of transactional stimulus (something is said by individual A to individual B) and transactional response (Individual B say or does something in relation to it).

Transactions are categorised into three different types such as: complementary transactions, crossed transactions and ulterior transaction. In complementary transaction, both individuals converse with each other in the same ego states. Example: professor asks student about why he has not completed the assignment (parent ego state—child Ego state). Student replied Sorry. I will do and show in the next lecture (child ego state—parent ego state). In crossed transaction, both the individuals converse with each other from different ego states. Example: A asks B how much is 5 times 25? (adult ego state-Adult ego state) B replied I do not like multiplication (child ego state—parent ego state). In ulterior transaction, both the individual communicates parallelly from two different ego states conveying two different messages. One message is a social message (adult ego state—adult ego state) and the other message is a covert or psychological message (parent ego state—child ego state. Example: Professor says to one student, you may take up operation specialisation. However, you have to do hard labour.

A study conducted by Stuart and Alger (2011) opined that children, young people and teachers trained in transactional analysis have better self-awareness. They can understand others in far better manner leading to better relationships. This improves class attendance and also has a positive impact on their personal and professional lives.

GAP ANALYSIS

Very minimum existence of literature in the mentioned topic implied that research to understand the interaction between teacher and student in post graduate management education does not exist, because of which the author has tried to do the noble work of finding the said relationship by using the constructs mentioned in the transactional analysis.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study is conducted to achieve the following objectives:

- To understand the transaction style of faculty members of higher education in the field of management studies with students.
- To understand the transaction style of faculty members of higher education in the field of management studies with faculty colleagues.
- To find out the important factors responsible for positive transaction.
- To study and analyse the difference between transaction analysis styles of faculty members with respect to gender.

HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

Based on the objectives, the following hypotheses are proposed to be tested:

Ho: There is no difference in the transactional analysis styles of male and female faculty members.

H1: There is significant difference in the transactional analysis styles of male and female faculty members.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The sample for the research is consisted of 142 faculty members of management education at the levels of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, having minimum age of 30 years. The sample is collected from private institutions across cities of Navi Mumbai, Mumbai, Kolkata and Bhubaneswar.

The instrument used for the study is Transactional Styles Inventory for Teachers (TSI-Te) developed by Dr. Udai Pareek (2003). The six styles included in the instrument are nurturing, Regulating, Task, Assertive, Adaptive and Innovative, all total 36 items, measured in Likert scale denoting 1: If you rarely or never behave this way, 2: If you occasionally behave this way, 3: If you sometimes behave this way, 4: If you often behave this way, and 5: If you almost always behave this way.

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Demographic Variables (Designation, Gender and Age)

Designation	Frequency	Percentage
Assistant Professor	71	50
Associate Professor	40	28
Total	31	22
	142	100
Gender	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Male	65	46
Female	77	54
Total	142	100
Age	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
30-34	25	18
35-39	32	23
40-44	30	20
45-49	45	32
50-54	10	7
Total	142	100

SPSS produced 36 factors (which are different from 36 question items). These are called 'Components' in the table and basically group the question items together in various combinations to try to find if any of them seem to be measuring the same underlying construct. Researcher considered only 10 factors as per the rule of thumb of Eigen value should be > 1. Other factors are rejected.

Annexure-1 shows the loadings of each item on each component (factor) after they have been rotated. It is observed in the component matrix table that questions 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 12 have high factor loading on component 1. So, component 1 or factor 1 is a combination of both nurturing and regulating styles. Items 9 and 36 have high factor loading on component 2. This implies factor 2 is a combination of both regulating and adaptive styles. Items 25, 27 and 28 have high factor loadings on component 3. Hence, factor 3 represents innovative style. Items 29 and 30 have high factor loadings on component 4. This implies factor 4 also represents innovative style. Items 32, 34 and 35 have high factor loading on component 5. Hence, factor 5 represents adaptive style. Items 13 and 19 have high factor loadings on component 6. This implies factor 6 is a combination of task and assertive styles. Items 22 and 33 have high factor loading on component 7. Hence, factor 7 is a combination of assertive and adaptive styles. Items 11 and 23 have high factor loadings on component 8. Hence, factor 8 is a combination of regulating and assertive styles. Items 2 has high factor loading on component 9. Hence, it is representing nurturing style. Items 24 and 26 have high factor loadings on component 10. Hence, factor 10 is a combination of both assertive and Innovative style. The Cronbach's alpha value is 0.787 for 27 items indicating favourable internal consistency among the items.

In "Item–Total Statistics," that is, Annexure-2 the last column on the right-hand side gives the Cronbach's alpha value if that item was dropped from the scale. Looking through these values, it shows that the Cronbach's alpha would be higher if items 9, 36, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 11 and 2 were deleted from the responses. It is also found that there is slight increase in Cronbach's alpha value if items 34, 35 and 22 were deleted from the responses. Hence researcher considered items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 34, 35, 22, 23, 24 and 26 as these can be taken to form a coherent scale and can be interpreted as being a reliable measure of transactional analysis of teachers. These can be considered as important items for positive transaction.

Table 2: Factors with Important Items

Style	Items
Nurturing	1. I am available to my students to solve their problems.
Regulating	3. I am available for help and guidance to students. 10. I give clear instructions to students about what should or should not be done. 22. I am highly involved in my well-thought-out suggestions and fight for them even if people do not pay attention to them. 34. I avoid meeting my students if I cannot satisfy them in my session.

Style	Items
Task	5. I provide my students support, if they need or solicit it, even after the courses are completed. 12. I clearly prescribe standards of behaviour to be followed in the class that I am teaching. 24. I do not hesitate to criticise colleagues for their bad sessions, even if they feel offended and do not accept my feedback.
Adaptive	7. I encourage my students to explore with me what should or should not be done and why. 26. I am excited by new ideas and discuss them with my colleagues and students, even when I have not worked out the details.
Assertive	4. I make the needed preparation for field work and undertake all responsibilities to make students gain from experience.
Innovative	6. I provide my students appropriate solutions to their problems. 35. I learn from my superiors and from experienced persons. 23. I strongly lobby for my colleagues.

It is inferred from Annexure-3 that Hypothesis 1 (H1), that is, "There is significant difference in the transactional analysis styles of male and female faculty members" has been partially proved. The respective null hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that gender is playing a vital role in the process of transaction.

The Table 3 below is further validating the respective items for which there is a remarkable difference in the view points of male and female faculty member.

Table 3: Mean Differences

Items	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Remark
Item 4 (Assertive)	M	65	80.42	5227.50	Male faculty members are more assertive
	F	77	63.97	4925.50	
Item 10 (Regulating)	M	65	80.42	5227.50	Male faculty members are more instruction oriented
	F	77	63.97	4925.50	
Item 5 (Task-Support)	M	65	80.42	5227.50	Male faculty members are more task oriented
	F	77	63.97	4925.50	
Item 24 (Task-Criticise)	M	65	80.42	5227.50	Female faculty members are more task oriented
	F	77	63.97	4925.50	
Item 7 (Adaptive)	M	65	80.42	5227.50	Male faculty members are more adaptive
	F	77	63.97	4925.50	
Item 6 (Innovative-Solutions)	M	65	80.42	5227.50	Male faculty members are more innovative
	F	77	63.97	4925.50	
Item 35 (Innovative-Learning)	M	65	80.42	5227.50	Male faculty members are more innovative
	F	77	63.97	4925.50	

It is inferred from Table 3 that male faculty members are more inclined to take the responsibilities for field work than the female faculty members. Huge deviation is visible looking at the mean rank. Male faculty members are more assertive. Male faculty members are more into regulation in comparison with female faculty members by giving clear instructions to students about what should or should not be done. It is inferred from Table 3 that male faculty members are more task oriented by providing support to students even after the completion of course. Female faculty members are more task oriented in comparison to male faculty members with respect to criticising colleagues for their bad sessions. They do not bother about the reaction from their colleagues. Male faculty members are more adaptive in comparison to female faculty members with respect to encouraging students for new ways of looking at things. Male faculty members are more innovative in comparison to female faculty members with respect to providing students appropriate solutions to their problems. Male faculty members are more innovative in comparison to female faculty members with respect to get learning from superiors and from experienced persons.

DISCUSSION

Transactional analysis plays a vital role to improve communication and interpersonal relationships in organisations. It helps to find out errors in communication and there by finding ways to modify and improve behaviour. By understanding and internalising transactional analysis in an effective manner individual can use the strokes to make their interactions more appreciating (Joshi, 2016). Another study by Pradhan (2016) viewed that transactional

analysis helps managers to understand the behaviour of their subordinates coming from different ego states at different point of time. Better understanding leads to better communication and more complementary transactions. The present study examines higher education teachers' style of interacting (exchange of ideas and behaviour) with students of post graduate management programmes and other faculty colleagues and to find out styles for their effective operation, by gaining deeper insight into their own behaviour and interactions. Both male and female faculty members holding the positions of assistant professor, associate professor and professor were target respondents. Respondents took part in the survey without hesitation. The Transactional Styles Inventory for Teachers (TSI-Te) developed by Dr. Udai Pareek (2003) was used as instrument. It is found that male faculty members are more assertive, instruction and task oriented. They are also more adaptive and innovative. Female faculty members are more task oriented in terms of giving feedback to colleagues. The author was keen on examining the differential viewpoints of faculty members position wise. But due to the present sample size constraint, she has considered that as scope for future study. Findings of the study will contribute to the further research in the uses of Transactional analysis in higher education. Uses of transactional analysis is a catalyst for better human understanding and better interpersonal relationships. In the subsequent time it will prepare the students of higher education ready to face the practical world with appropriate understanding and clarity of situational exigencies. "The destiny of every human being is decided by what goes on inside his skull when confronted by what goes on outside his skull" Eric Berne.

CONCLUSION

The study resulted in showcasing important findings that 14 items are playing major role in effective transaction between faculty members and students. The study also found the specific factors and the respective items for which there are differences in the transactional analysis styles of faculty members gender wise.

Customised faculty development programmes need to be conducted to make female faculty members more assertive, regulative, task oriented, adaptive and innovative.

Both students and teachers with transactional analysis knowledge develop better self-awareness and understandings and thereby contributing for the greater cause of society. They can check their communication pattern for effective communication. This can possible by transforming various areas of behaviour such as: learning, perception, motivation and attitudes, etc. through transactional analysis.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

ANNEXURES

Annexure-1: Rotated Component Matrix

	Component									
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**
1.Availability1	**.912**	-.114	-.135	-.066	-.049	-.061	-.027	-.029	-.125	-.149
2.Answer	-.036	.006	-.127	-.108	-.074	-.017	-.014	.035	**.861**	.098
3.Availability2	**.912**	-.114	-.135	-.066	-.049	-.061	-.027	-.029	-.125	-.149
4.Preparation	**.936**	-.060	-.129	-.031	.040	.106	.041	-.052	-.017	.063
5.Provide1	**.968**	-.025	-.033	-.023	.049	.099	.026	-.054	.046	.108
6.Provide2	**.968**	-.025	-.033	-.023	.049	.099	.026	-.054	.046	.108
7.Encouragement	**.976**	-.031	-.035	-.027	.042	.084	.022	-.053	.034	.090
8.Resentment	.197	.453	-.298	-.135	.433	-.257	.017	-.328	.134	.106
9.Example	-.203	**.839**	.011	.098	-.020	.184	-.048	.050	.048	-.272
10.Instructions	**.976**	-.031	-.035	-.027	.042	.084	.022	-.053	.034	.090
11.Concerns	-.265	.096	.035	-.144	.064	-.049	.011	**.760**	.113	.060
12.Prescription	.976	-.031	-.035	-.027	.042	.084	.022	-.053	.034	.090
13.Consult	.297	.335	.158	-.007	.126	**.503**	-.013	-.077	-.483	-.082

	Component									
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**
14.Collect1	-.115	-.782	-.276	-.236	.167	-.071	.140	-.076	.033	.061
15.Problem	.081	-.187	-.139	.096	.252	.269	-.018	-.619	.366	-.033
16.Priority	.335	-.361	.016	-.312	-.183	.373	.138	.002	.100	-.315
17.Collect2	.084	.393	.022	-.454	.105	.305	.459	.359	.046	-.071
18.Syllabus	.152	-.734	.130	.120	-.095	-.008	-.097	.117	.135	.039
19.Cause	.213	-.003	.004	.109	.035	**.898**	.023	-.057	-.004	.063
20.Communicate	-.014	.088	.405	.272	-.206	.381	-.403	.206	-.368	.256
21Argue	-.143	.486	.097	.003	.189	-.114	.313	.037	-.462	.400
22.Involvement	.062	.317	-.095	-.181	-.260	.278	**.578**	-.028	.182	.328
23.Lobby	.053	-.244	.187	-.199	.279	.405	.047	**.614**	.192	.002
24.Criticise	.323	-.467	.018	-.066	.048	.115	-.224	-.256	-.003	.518
25.Creativity	-.142	-.025	**.973**	-.032	.051	.026	.058	.066	-.075	-.018
26.Excitement	.209	-.309	-.077	.154	-.124	.014	-.009	.156	.159	**.629**
27.Methods	-.142	-.025	**.973**	-.032	.051	.026	.058	.066	-.075	-.018
28.Enthusiasm	-.142	-.025	**.973**	-.032	.051	.026	.058	.066	-.075	-.018
29.Challenge	-.065	.037	.006	**.952**	.071	.074	-.035	-.088	-.094	.025
30.Innovation	-.124	.072	-.035	**.933**	.077	.030	-.072	-.112	-.051	.018
31Suggestions	-.011	-.006	.214	-.500	.166	-.044	.383	.424	-.322	-.150
32.Postponement	.146	.182	.175	.129	**.640**	.114	.387	.139	.011	.037
33.Approach	.047	-.007	.165	-.088	-.139	-.073	**.881**	.029	-.113	-.104
34.Avoidance	-.082	-.109	.208	.035	**.706**	.351	-.152	.108	-.057	-.042
35.Learning	.088	.038	-.090	.033	**.816**	-.210	-.243	-.068	-.125	-.065
36.Feelings	-.095	**.690**	-.229	-.003	.083	-.264	.267	.213	.009	.062

Extraction Method

Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation. Rotation converged in 9 iterations.

Annexure-2: Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	**Scale Variance if Item Deleted**	**Corrected Item Total Correlation**	**Cronbach Alpha if Item Deleted**
1. I am available to my students to solve their problems.	77.8310	90.468	.658	.760
3. I am available for help and guidance to students.	77.8310	90.468	.658	.760
4.I make the needed preparation for field work and undertake all responsibilities to make students gain from experience.	77.9789	87.595	.814	.750
5.I provide my students support, if they need or solicit it, even after the courses are completed.	78.0000	85.816	.867	.745
6.I provide my students appropriate solutions to their problems.	78.0000	85.816	.867	.745
7.I encourage my students to explore with me what should or should not be done and why.	77.9859	86.071	.866	.746
10.I give clear instructions to students about what should or should not be done.	77.9859	86.071	.866	.746
12.I clearly prescribe standards of behaviour to be followed in the class that I am teaching.	77.9859	86.071	.866	.746

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Cronbach Alpha if Item Deleted
9.I try to set an example to my students by my own behaviour.	77.6831	108.459	-.162	**.803**
36.I do not express my negative feelings to the students during sessions, but continue to be bothered by them.	79.7606	107.545	-.118	**.802**
25.I think of new and creative material for my session.	78.1972	106.060	-.030	**.792**
27.I try out new methods to make teaching more effective.	78.1972	106.060	-.030	**.792**
28.I am enthused by new ideas and tend to overwhelm my students with them.	78.1972	106.060	-.030	**.792**
29.I always see teaching as a challenge and try out new ways of improving on the previous one.	78.3662	105.681	-.023	**.795**
30.I try out new methods of teaching and have no patience for consolidating those that I have already tried out.	78.3239	106.987	-.092	**.798**
32.I tend to postpone or delay sessions on the topics that I do not like	80.1197	101.624	.328	**.781**
34.I avoid meeting my students if I cannot satisfy them in my session.	80.1268	104.338	.108	**.788**
35.I learn from my superiors and from experienced persons.	77.7324	105.006	.052	**.789**
13.I consult my colleagues while preparing a new topic for teaching.	79.4366	97.198	.376	**.777**
19.I take up my students' cause and fight for them.	79.0352	95.665	.369	**.777**
22.I am highly involved in my well-thought-out suggestions and fight for them even if people do not pay attention to them.	79.6268	102.122	.144	**.789**
33.I change my approach if it helps to develop the students	77.7676	104.761	.046	**.791**
11.I raise the concerns I have about students' behaviour in the group to encourage them to discuss these and set desirable norms.	79.6972	108.950	-.197	**.802**
23.I strongly lobby for my colleagues.	79.9225	101.576	.170	.787
2.I answer all questions and issues raised by my students.	77.9296	107.584	-.118	**.805**
24.I do not hesitate to criticise colleagues for their bad sessions, even if they feel offended and do not accept my feedback.	79.9296	100.052	.241	.784
26.I am excited by new ideas and discuss them with my colleagues and students, even when I have not worked out the details.	79.0141	103.489	.164	.786

Annexure-3: Mann Whitney U Test

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of 1. I am available to my students to solve their problems is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.561	Retain the null hypothesis
2	The distribution of 3. I am available for help and guidance to students is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.561	Retain the null hypothesis
3	The distribution of 4. I make the needed preparation for field work and undertake all responsibilities to make students gain from experience is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.012	Reject the null hypothesis
4	The distribution of 5. I provide my students support, if they need or solicit it, even after the courses are completed is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.017	Reject the null hypothesis

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
5	The distribution of 6. I provide my students appropriate solutions to their problems is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.017	Reject the null hypothesis
6	The distribution of 7. I encourage my students to explore with me what should or should not be done and why is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.019	Reject the null hypothesis
7	The distribution of 10. I give clear instructions to students about what should or should not be done is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.019	Reject the null hypothesis
8	The distribution of 12. I clearly prescribe standards of behaviour to be followed in the class that I am teaching is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.019	Reject the null hypothesis
9	The distribution of 34. I avoid meeting my students if I cannot satisfy them in my session is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.000	Reject the null hypothesis
10	The distribution of 35. Learn from my superiors and from experienced persons is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.000	Reject the null hypothesis
11	The distribution of 22. I am highly involved in my well-thought-out suggestions and fight for them even if people do not pay attention to them is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.007	Reject the null hypothesis
12	The distribution of 23. I strongly lobby for my colleagues is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.331	Retain the null hypothesis
13	The distribution of 24. I do not hesitate to criticise colleagues for their bad sessions, even if they feel offended and do not accept my feedback is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.031	Reject the null hypothesis
14	The distribution of 26. I am excited by new ideas and discuss them with my colleagues and students, even when I have not worked out the details is the same across categories of gender.	Independent Samples-Mann Whitney U Test	.849	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is 0.05.

REFERENCES

Berne, E. (1957). Ego states in psychotherapy. *The American Journal of Psychotherapy, 11,* 293-309.

Berne, E. (1961). *Transactional analysis in psychotherapy.* New York: Bantam Books.

Berne, Eric (1964) *Games people play.* New York: Grove Press.

Boice, B. (1996). Classroom incivilities. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(4), 453-486.

Hughes, J. N. (2011). Longitudinal effects of teacher and student perceptions of teacher–student relationship qualities on academic adjustment. *The Elementary School Journal, 112,* 38-60.

Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A., & Jackson, T. (1999). Influence of the teacher–student relationship on childhood conduct problems: A prospective study. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 28*, 173-184.

Joshi, S. (2016). An evaluation of utility of transactional analysis in improving communication and human relations in the business organisations. *IJMSRR, 1*(2), February, 250-257.

Mullins, L. (1985). *Management and organizational behaviour book* (11th ed.). Pearson Publication.

Newell, S., & Jeffery, D. (2002). *Behaviour management in the classroom: A transactional analysis approach* (1st ed.). London: David Fulton Publishers,

Reddy, R., Rhodes, J. E., & Mulhall, P. (2003). The influence of teacher support on student adjustment in the middle school years: A latent growth curve study. *Development and Psychopathology, 15, 119*-138.

Pareek, U., & Purohit, S. (2010). *Training instruments in HRD & OD*. New Delhi: TMH.

Steiner, C. (1974). *Scripts people live: Transactional analysis of life scripts.* New York: Grove Press.

Suldo, S. M., Friedrich, A. A., White, T., Farmer, J., Minch, D., & Michalowski, J. (2009). Teacher support and adolescents' subjective well-being: A mixed-methods investigation. *School Psychology Review, 38,* 67-85.

Suldo, S. M., Shaffer, E. J., Shaunessy, E. (2008). An independent investigation of the validity of the school attitude assessment survey-revised. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 26,* 69-82.