GENDER: ITS EFFECT ON INTERPERSONAL SKILLS OF SBO OFFICERS

Marife V. Ubalde[1], Maria Angela V. Salas [2]
[1]University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines, Lapasan, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines
[2]Cagayan de Oro College PHINMA, Cagayan de Oro City
Correspondence Tel.: [1] +63 905 136 4531, E-mail: [1]marife_ubalde@ustp.edu.ph

ABSTRACT: *This descriptive study was about the interpersonal communication skills level of Student Body Organization Officers. This study involved SBO officers from different colleges. This study investigated the respondents' gender. This variable was studied to gauge and determine how the respondents' level of interpersonal communication skills will be affected by the variable. The other factor's key problem of the study was also to determine the relationship between the independent variables such as gender. Variables on the different interpersonal communication skills were; verbal/non-verbal communication, listening and giving/getting feedback. The findings of the study revealed that the majority of the respondents were female which comprised 52.08%, while 47.92% were males. It was also revealed that the factor gender did not affect the interpersonal communication skills of the respondents. The majority of them had an average level of interpersonal communication skills. The data in the study showed that the profile of the respondents was not significant to their interpersonal communication skills level. Its P-values were greater than the 0.05 level of significance. The profile of the respondents has no significant relationship to all variables on the interpersonal communication skills of the SBO officers. With the result of the study, the researchers recommended that the school should provide programs that can promote interpersonal communication skills of the SBO Officers and to students as well.*

Key Words: gender, interpersonal, relationship

1. INTRODUCTION

It is an important thing to practice or nurture a person's interpersonal communication skills. Anywhere we go; we interact and deal with different kinds of people. It is a must to communicate with people effectively. Strong relationships, therefore, are built through interpersonal communication. However, there are some instances that the interpersonal skills of a person are getting affected.

The interpersonal skills of a person vary, particularly in an organizational community. A number of communicative activities also involve non-verbal behavior and an ability to detect and portray messages through this medium is also seen as a central interpersonal skill [1]. In an organization, there are different races of people, beliefs, culture, position, organizational affiliation, perceptions, and ideas. As a result, there are tendencies of misunderstanding among the members of an organization that doesn't aim for progress. Organizational change has an important personal dimension [2]: and it is actually an emotional experience, which notes the crucial role of employees' perceptual and attitudinal characteristics [3]. Therefore in an organization, misunderstanding, and conflicts could be unavoidable.

The research proposes that an employee's perception of organizational readiness to change may either facilitate or inhibit an organizational change initiative [4]. In other words, members of an organization don't always go with the organization's decision. That is, they reflect the degree to which the organization has the flexibility to achieve change and the extent to which an employee can actively and genuinely participate in the change process [5]. Employees do not necessarily have fixed or enduring beliefs that change only slowly over time as an effect of radically new circumstances as proposed by [6] . They take temporary positions on their organizational affiliations, such as being part of such and being subordinated to an organizational structure. One example is that employees consider that their supervisors are responsible for providing information and support because they are perceived to be the principal agents of the organization [7]. In general, the perception of a person affects his interpersonal communication skills. Members of an organization who are in the lower positions are not much vocal to assert their ideas to the workgroup compared to those who are in the higher positions, [8] also suggests that, in general, we should pay less attention in public opinion formation to silent majorities and more to

'loud minorities', which often play a larger part in opinion change.

2.METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Design

This study used a descriptive survey method of research. It included analysis, description, and interpretation of conditions that exist. The research dealt with the factor which was gender in determining the interpersonal communication skills of the Student Body Organization officers. The study underwent gathering, tabulating, and computing of data which involved analysis and interpretation of results.

2.2 The Instruments

A questionnaire was used in gathering the data needed in the study. After the approval to conduct a survey, the researchers distributed the questionnaire to the respondents. After data gathering, the data was analyzed and interpreted by the researchers. There were two parts of the questionnaire that were utilized. The first part was the filing of the respondent's profile. The profile includes their gender, year level, and position. For the second part, the respondents indicated the degree/scale that reflects their position and opinion.

2.3 The Participants

This study involved the Student Body Organization (SBO) officers. Based on the official list, there are 18 SBOs with a total of 126 officers. 7 SBOs from the chosen 7 colleges with a total number of 48 officers were taken as the respondents of the study employing sampling procedure. Purposive sampling will be applied in the study due to the small number of respondents. The 48 respondents can give the researchers tight findings thus it only surveyed 30% of its total population.

There are varied numbers of SBOs under its college/department. 7 departments have only one SBO. These are; College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), College of Education (COEd), School of Criminology and Criminal Justice (SCCJ), College of Nursing, College of Information and Technology Education (CITE).

2.4 Data-Gathering Procedure

A questionnaire was used in gathering the needed data on the study. An approval was done before conducting the study, and upon approval, the researchers personally proceeded in distributing the questionnaires to the respondents. Analyzing and interpreting data was followed

after data gathering.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1. Distribution Table Showing the Student- Respondents' Profile in terms of Gender (n = 48)

Profile	Categorization	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	23	47.92
	Female	25	52.08
TOTAL		48	100%

Table 1 above shows the distribution of the student-respondent's demographic profile in terms of gender. Results showed that 23 or 47.92% were male while 25 or 52.08% were female. This implies that the majority of the respondents of this study were female. As cited in the study of [9], gender plays important role in shaping public opinion. She further noted that this does not mean that men and women are neatly divided into campuses when it comes to public opinion. Hence, two sexes play different kinds of roles in society and family life and thus have different kinds of experiences. In general, gender does not have a great impact on the variation of one's level of interpersonal communication skills. Therefore, the results on the level of interpersonal skills of the officers have nothing to do with their gender.

TABLE 2. Distribution of Student-Respondents Level of Interpersonal Skills in terms of Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication(n =48)

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Description
1. Is it difficult for you to talk to other people?	1.92	0.454	Average
2. When you are trying to explain something, do others tend to put words in your mouth, or finish your sentences for you?	1.90	0.472	Average
3. In conversation, do your words usually come out the way you would like?	2.27	0.494	Average
4. Do you find it difficult to express your ideas when they differ from the ideas of people around you?	1.86	0.570	Average
5. Do you assume that the other person knows what you are trying to say, and leave it to him/her to ask you questions?	2.06	0.633	Average
6. Do others seem interested and attentive when you are talking to them?	2.25	0.634	Average
7. When speaking, is it easy for you to recognize how others are reacting to what you are saying?	2.46	0.617	Average
8. Do you ask the other person to tell you how she/he feels about the point you are trying to make?	2.27	0.644	Average
9. Are you aware of how your tone of voice may affect others?	2.42	0.647	Average
10. In conversation, do you look to talk about things of interest to both you and the other person?	2.35	0.525	Average
Overall	2.18	0.569	Average

Legend:
Mean Intervals   Description
2.50 – 3.00   High
1.50 – 2.49   Average
1.00 – 1.49   Low

Table 4 above shows the level of performance of the student respondents' interpersonal communications skills in terms of verbal and non-verbal communication. The result showed an overall performance of 2.18 and a standard deviation of 0.569. This implies that the student-respondents only practiced the following indicators of verbal and non-verbal communication in the average level only. In particular, they were sometimes aware that the tone of their voice affects others but they sometimes find it difficult to express their ideas when they differ from the ideas of people around them. According to [1], a number of communicative activities also involve non-verbal behavior and an ability to detect and portray messages through this medium is also seen as a central interpersonal skill. Messages can be delivered through different non-verbal channels. Verbal communication on the other hand is also a great factor in sending a message

Table 3. Distribution of Student-Respondents Level of Interpersonal Skills in terms of Listening(n =48)

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Description
1. In conversation, do you tend to do more talking than the other person does?	2.08	0.577	Average
2. In conversation, do you ask the other person questions when you don't understand what they've said?	2.56	0.616	High
3. In conversation, do you often try to figure out what the other person is going to say before they've finished talking?	2.25	0.526	Average
4. Do you find yourself not paying attention while in conversation with others?	1.69	0.589	Average
5. In conversation, can you easily tell the difference between what the person is saying and how he/she may be feeling?	2.33	0.559	Average
6. After the other person is done speaking, do you clarify what you heard them say before you offer a response?	2.29	0.651	Average
7. In conversation, do you tend to finish sentences or supply words for the other person?	1.88	0.570	Average
8. In conversation, do you find yourself paying the most attention to facts and details, and frequently missing the emotional tone of the speakers' voice?	2.08	0.613	Average
9. In conversation, do you let the other person finish talking before reacting to what she/he says?	2.42	0.613	Average
10. Is it difficult for you to see things from the other person's point of view?	1.75	0.526	Average
Overall	2.13	0.584	AVERAGE

Legend:
Mean Intervals   Description
2.50 – 3.00   High
1.50 – 2.49   Average
1.00 – 1.49   Low

Table 3 above shows the level of practice of the indicators of listening skills of the student-respondents. The result showed an overall mean rating of 2.13 and a standard deviation of 0.584 which means that they sometimes practiced the indicators of listening abilities as indicators of their level of interpersonal skills. Specifically, they sometimes asked the person talking if they do not understand what they are talking about but sometimes they were not paying attention to the conversation with another person.

According to research in science, listening ability depends largely on intelligence that "bright" people listen well, and "dull" ones poorly. Added, low intelligence has something to do with the inability to listen. In an organizational community, those who are in the higher position are perceived to have the best minds compared to those who are in the lower positions. However, based on the findings above, the position has not something to do with their level of listening skills.

Table 4. Distribution of Student-Respondents Level of Interpersonal Skills in terms of Giving/Getting Feedback (n =48)

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Description
1. Is it difficult to hear or accept constructive criticism from the other person?	2.00	0.546	Average
2. Do you refrain from saying something that you think will upset someone or make matters worse?	2.08	0.577	Average
3. When someone hurts your feelings, do you discuss this with him/her?	1.81	0.704	Average
4. In conversation, do you try to put yourself in the other person's shoes?	2.23	0.660	Average
5. Do you become uneasy when someone pays you a compliment?	2.00	0.684	Average
6. Do you find it difficult to disagree with others because you are afraid they will get angry?	1.96	0.713	Average
7. Do you find it difficult to compliment or praise others?	1.77	0.722	Average
8. Do others remark that you always seem to think you are right?	1.85	0.505	Average
9. Do you find that others seem to get defensive when you disagree with their point of view?	2.13	0.570	Average
10. Do you help others to understand you by saying how you feel?	2.29	0.683	Average
Overall	2.01	0.636	AVERAGE

Legend:
Mean Intervals	*Description*
2.50 – 3.00	*High*
1.50 – 2.49	*Average*
1.00 – 1.49	*Low*

Table 6 above shows the level of the student-respondents practice of giving and getting feedback from the other person during conversation. The result showed an overall mean rating of 2.01 and a standard deviation of 0.636. This

implies that they only practice giving and getting feedback on other people at the average level. Specifically, they were on the average level when they want others to understand themselves by saying what they feel but they find it difficult to compliment or praise other people.

Despite this need for positive workplace culture, there is no doubt that giving critical feedback is essential. The question is how to deliver it. Most advice in this area focuses on what to say — for example, give more praise than criticism, and listen more than you talk. Those are important, but our nonverbal communication is just as important as the words we use.

Table 5. Comparison of the Student-Respondents Level of Verbal/Non-Verbal Communication When Grouped According to Profile Variables (n =48)

Variables	Categorization	Mean and Standard Deviation		F-value	p-value	Conclusion
		$\bar{x}$	sd			
Gender	Male	2.20	0.247	0.35	0.559	Not Significant
	Female	2.16	0.269			

Table 5 above shows the comparison of the student-respondents level of verbal and non-verbal communication when grouped according to gender, year level, and position in the student body organization. Results showed that in terms of gender (p-value = 0.559, the level of verbal and non-verbal communication as indicators of their interpersonal skills do not differ significantly.

Table 6. Comparison of the Student-Respondents Level of Listening When Grouped According to Profile Variables (n =48)

Variables	Categorization	Mean and Standard Deviation		F-value	p-value	Conclusion
		$\bar{x}$	sd			
Gender	Male	2.12	0.252	0.14	0.712	Not Significant
	Female	2.15	0.312			

Table 6 above shows the comparison of the student respondents' level of listening skills as an indicator of their interpersonal skills when grouped according to the profile variable such as gender in the SBO. Results showed no significant difference in all profile variables, which means that regardless of gender (p-value = 0.712), they had the same level of listening skills. This implies that they had the same listening performance in all indicators of their practice of listening to others.

Table 7. Comparison of the Student-Respondents Level of Giving/Getting Feedback When Grouped According to Profile Variables (n =48)

Variables	Categorization	Mean and Standard Deviation		F-value	p-value	Conclusion
		$\bar{x}$	sd			
Gender	Male	2.02	0.276	0.05	0.818	Not Significant
	Female	2.00	0.256			

Table 7 above shows the comparison of the student respondents' level of giving and getting feedback as an indicator of their interpersonal skills. The result showed no

significant difference as indicated by the probability values greater than 0.05 alpha level. In particular, there was no significant difference between their giving and getting feedback when grouped according to gender (p-value = 0.818).

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the factors associated with the interpersonal skills of the SBO Officers did not significantly affect their performance skills level. The majority of the respondents, gender, has an average level of interpersonal skills. Therefore, the factor related to the respondents' interpersonal skills did affect the level of performance.

As a whole, diversions among organizations' members somehow affect their perception. But when it comes to the level of interpersonal communication skills of the SBO officers, all of them have the average level regardless of gender. Thus, it means that external and internal factors can greatly affect one's level of interpersonal communication skills.

Future researchers should supplement variables pertaining to their academic performance that could affect the respondents' interpersonal communication skills. To get firmer findings, the researchers can conduct interviews and observations. There should be workshops and training that would boost the interpersonal communication skills level of the officers. Future researchers can also include the duration of the officers' service in their organizations as one of the variables. Future researchers should include the years of service of the officers in their variables.

5. REFERENCES

[1]   Harrigan,J., *et al*.(2005).The New Handbook of Methods in Nonverbal ... - Google Book.
https://books.google.com ›
Psychology› Psychopathology› Compulsive Behavior ..in Nonverbal Behavior Research. Oxford University Press

[2]   Moran and Brightman 2000); According to Moran and Brightman (2001), change management .environment, Luecke, (2003); Okumus and Hemmington, (1998); Balogun and Hailey (2004).

[3]   Nicolaidis   and   Katsaros   2010.   PDF]Firm performance - EconStor

[4]   Eby 2000). Theories such as Schön's (1983, 1987) "reflection-in-action"   and   "reflection-on-action" underline contemporary professional development (Eby, 2000). Reflection ...

[5]   Smith,K.A., 2005 Pedagogies of Engagement: Classroom-Based Practices - Smith ...

[6]   Gioia, D.,et el(2000) Organizational Identity, Image, and Adaptive Instability.   The Academy of Management Review Vol. 25, No. 1 (Jan., 2000),pp. 63-81

[7]   Cole (2006). Qualitative research: a challenging paradigm for infection controlM. Cole, First Published   December   1,   2006   Research Articlehttps://doi.org/10.1177/146904460600700607 .Volume: 7 issue: 6, page(s): 25-29

[8]   Moscovici ,S. and Galam ,S.(1991) . Towards a theory of collective phenomena: Consensus and attitude changes in groups. European Journal of Social Psychology Banner. Volume 21, Issue 1,pages 49-74

[9]   Moscovici ,S. and Galam ,S.(1991) . Towards a theory of collective phenomena: Consensus and attitude changes in groups. European Journal of Social Psychology Banner. Volume 21, Issue 1,pages 49-74