CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS & CONCLUSION
Summary, Findings and Conclusion

Summary

The researcher in this study on "Personality and Performance – An enquiry into the nature of their relationships" had identified three variables which were important to organizations which would invest time, effort and money to develop its human potential to compete in the global market, the variables were – Managerial Performance, MBTI Personality Types and Assertiveness. This is an area of research where not many studies have been conducted in the Indian context and it was all the more relevant to explore whether there existed any relationship among the three variables.

Managerial performance is no doubt a critical parameter in the current scenario. Assessing the performance of a manager can be done only in the context of their own organization where there is a set of achievable targets keeping in mind the organizational objectives. This study was conducted in three organizations with a sample size of 594.
It could be observed that all the sixteen personality types were represented in the sample selected for the study. The following are the highlights on the profile of the samples.

> ESTJ was the most represented personality type when compared with the other fifteen types. Out of the 84 managers belonging to personality type ESTJ, there were 16 senior managers, 24 middle managers and 44 junior managers. The least represented among the sixteen types are ENFJs with 5 senior managers, 9 middle managers and 7 junior managers and ENTPs with 8 middle managers and 13 junior managers.

> In ESTJs 19.04% of the managers are in the senior level, 28.5 % are in the middle level and 52.5 % are in the junior level. ESTJ representation increases as we go from Senior to Junior level.

> It could be seen that 43.6% of the Senior managers have cast their preference as "Thinking – Judging". The four types that have “Thinking – Judging” preference are ESTJ, ENTJ, ISTJ and INTJ. 20.7% of senior managers, 23.6% of middle managers and 19.1% of junior managers were “Thinking – Perceiving” types (ESTP, ENTP, INTP, ISTP). “Feeling – Perceiving” types (ESFP, ENFP, INFP, ISFP) were 24.2% among senior managers, 34% among middle managers and 31.9% among junior managers. “Feeling – Judging” types (ESFJ, ENFJ, INFJ, ISFJ), were found to be 11.5% among senior managers, 10.9% among middle managers and 20.7% among junior managers.
The first objective of the study was to classify the managers into high medium and low performers. The following were the findings:

- It was found that 49.4% of senior managers, 29.6% middle managers and 28.3% of junior managers were good performers. In senior managers there were lesser number of managers in the medium (39.1%) and low (11.5%) performance levels. It was found that there was a higher percentage of managers in the medium performing category (53.2%) among middle managers 17.2% of the middle managers were low performers. 42.9% of junior managers were medium performers and 25.3% were low performers.

The second objective of the study was to find out whether the performance of managers has any association with the personality types of managers. The following were the findings;

For TJ classification:

- The null hypothesis that the table variables of managerial performance and personality types are independent was rejected since Pearson chi-square +406.087 with 6df and significance .000. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant. The Eta coefficient was 0.666 so 45% of variability in Performance of managers is explained by MBTI Personality Types.
The Nagelkerke R² shows that 55.5% of the variation in the outcome variable (i.e., performance) is explained by personality types and hence we can observe a fairly strong association between the two variables—managerial performance and personality types.

- The probability of FJ being a low performer is greater than a TJ being a low performer.
- TJs have a greater probability of being a high performer than a low performer.
- Personality type TJ is \( \exp(B) \) i.e., \( 5.604 \times 10^{-3} \) times more likely than a FJ to be a low performer than a high performer.
- For senior, middle, and junior managers, the null hypothesis was rejected since the Pearson chi-square and likelihood ratio showed high significance, proving that there is an association between managerial performance and personality in all three managerial levels.

For Senior managers

- Eta coefficient for senior managers was 0.875 so 77% of variability in performance of managers is explained by MBTI personality types among Senior managers.
- The Pseudo R square measure indicated that 84.8% of the variability in performance in senior managers is explained by personality types.
➢ It is \( \exp(B) \) ie; \( 1.35 \times 10^{17} \) times more unlikely for TJs to be low performers among Senior managers.

**For Middle managers**

➢ Eta coefficient for Middle managers was 0.742 so 55 % of variability in Performance of managers is explained by MBTI personality types among Middle managers.

➢ The Pseudo R square measure indicated that 64.7% of the variability in performance in Middle managers is explained by personality types.

➢ It is \( \exp(B) \) ie; \( 3 \times 10^{17} \) times more unlikely for TJs to be low performers among Middle managers.

**For Junior managers**

➢ Eta coefficient for Junior managers was 0.84 so 70.5 % of variability in Performance of managers is explained by MBTI personality types among Junior managers.

➢ The Pseudo R square measure indicated that 80.5% of the variability in performance in Junior managers is explained by personality types.

➢ It is \( \exp(B) \) ie; \( 1.49 \times 10^{18} \) times more unlikely for TJs to be low performers among Junior managers.
Thinking Judging type was found to be high performers and the hypothesis that those managers with “Thinking Judging” in their personality types show high performance is supported.

For ET Classification

- The hypothesis that the table variables of Performance and MBTI Personality types are independent was rejected since Pearson Chi-square is 457.662 with 6df and highly significant. The likelihood ratio chi-square was also highly significant.

- The Eta coefficient was .662, therefore nearly 45% of variability in Performance was explained by MBTI types.

- The Pseudo $R^2$ measure – Nagelkerke shows that 60.7% of the variations in performance is explained MBTI personality types.

- The probability of an ET to be a low performer is less than an ET being a high performer. Thus the probability of an IT to be a low performer is greater than an ET to be a low performer.

Extraverts with Thinking function in their personality type were found to be high performers and the hypothesis that those managers with “Extroverted Thinking” in their personality types show high performance is supported.
The third objective of the study was to find out the association between managerial performance and their level of assertiveness. The following were the findings:

- The null hypothesis that the variables of performance and assertiveness are independent is rejected since Pearson chi-square +417.480 with 4df. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.
- The Eta coefficient is 0.704 and hence it was understood that 50% of variability in Performance of managers is explained by Assertiveness.
- Pseudo R-square shows that 55.7% of the variation in the performance is explained by assertiveness thus denoting the strength of association between the two variables.
- The probability of a high assertive person to be a high performer is more than the probability of a high assertive person to be a low performer.

For Senior Managers

- The null hypothesis that the variables of performance and assertiveness are independent is rejected since Pearson chi-square 28.772. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.

- The Eta coefficient is 0.387 and hence it was understood that 14.9% of variability in Performance of managers is explained by Assertiveness.
Pseudo R-square shows that 22.8% of the variation in the performance is explained by assertiveness thus denoting the strength of association between the two variables.

Manager with a low level of assertiveness is \exp(B) \times 11.667 times likely to be a low performer than a high performer.

For Middle Managers

The null hypothesis that the variables of performance and assertiveness are independent is rejected since Pearson chi-square 107.917. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.

The Eta coefficient is 0.552 and hence it was understood that 30.25% of variability in Performance of middle managers is explained by Assertiveness.

Pseudo R-square shows that 45.6% of the variability in the performance is explained by assertiveness among middle managers thus denoting the strength of association between the two variables.

Manager with a low level of assertiveness is \exp(B) \times 748.22 times likely to be a low performer than a high performer.
For junior managers

- The null hypothesis that the variables of performance and assertiveness are independent is rejected since Pearson chi-square 193.473. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.

- The Eta coefficient is 0.689 and hence it was understood that 47% of variability in Performance of junior managers is explained by Assertiveness.

- Pseudo R-square shows that 53% of the variability in the performance is explained by assertiveness among junior managers, thus denoting the strength of association between the two variables.

- Manager with a low level of assertiveness is \( \exp(B) \times 788.4 \) times likely to be a low performer than a high performer.

The hypothesis that high performing managers have significantly high level of assertiveness stands proved.

The fourth objective was to find out whether there is any relationship between personality type of managers and their level of assertiveness.

- The null hypothesis that the variables personality types and performance are independent is rejected since Pearson chi-square +259.38 with 6df. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.
The Eta Coefficient is 0.590. Hence, 35% of the variability in Assertiveness level of managers is explained by MBTI Personality Types.

Pseudo R-square measure is .404, which indicates that 40% of the variability in assertiveness is due to the influence of personality types.

TJs are more likely than FJs to be high in assertiveness compared to being low in assertiveness. A TJ is 190.278 times more likely than FJ, FP, TP to be high in assertiveness than to be low in assertiveness.

For Senior managers

The null hypothesis that the variables personality types and performance are independent is rejected since Pearson chi-square 97.764 with 6df. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.

The Eta Coefficient is 0.861. Hence, 74% of the variability in Assertiveness level of managers is explained by MBTI Personality Types.

Pseudo R-square measure is 84.8, which indicates that 84.8% of the variability in assertiveness is due to the influence of personality types.

TJs are more likely than FJ, FP and TP to be high in assertiveness compared to being low in assertiveness. A TJ is $1.35 \times 10^7$, $3.5 \times 10^{15}$, $6.37 \times 10^8$ times more likely than FJ, FP, TP respectively to be high in assertiveness than to be low in assertiveness.
For Middle managers

- The null hypothesis that the variables personality types and assertiveness among middle managers are independent is rejected since Pearson chi-square 147.508 with 6df. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant in middle managers.
- The Eta Coefficient is 0.861. Hence, 58% of the variability in Assertiveness level of managers is explained by MBTI Personality Types in middle managers.
- Pseudo R-square measure is .647, which indicates that 64.7% of the variability in assertiveness is due to the influence of personality types in middle managers.
- TJs are more likely than FJ, FP and TP to be high in assertiveness compared to being low in assertiveness. A TJ is $1.35 \times 10^7$, $3.5 \times 10^{15}$, $6.37 \times 10^8$ times more likely than FJ, FP, TP respectively to be high in assertiveness than to be low in assertiveness.

For Junior managers

- The null hypothesis that the variables personality types and assertiveness among junior managers are independent is rejected since Pearson chi-square 176.257 with 6df. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant in middle managers.
The Eta Coefficient is 0.676. Hence, 45.7% of the variability in the Assertiveness level of managers is explained by MBTI Personality Types in middle managers.

Pseudo R-square measure is .504, which indicates that 50.4% of the variability in assertiveness is due to the influence of personality types in middle managers.

TJs are more likely than FJ, FP and TP to be high in assertiveness compared to being low in assertiveness. A TJ manager is $6.07 \times 10^{16}$ times more likely than FJ to be high in assertiveness than to be low in assertiveness.

The fifth objective was to find whether age, educational qualification, type of upbringing of managers has any relationship on their performance.

Educational Qualification and Performance

- Among the managers with professional degree 39.4% of the managers were high performers. 36.3% of Diploma holders were low performers.
- The significance value of chi-square statistic is .914, which is much greater than 0.05 showing that the performance of managers is the same irrespective of the qualification they possess.
- Among the senior managers, 56% of the post-graduate managers were high performers and 28% were low performers. Among the professional degree holders 58.6% of the managers were medium performers.
The significance value of chi-square statistic is .814 showing that the performance of senior managers is not associated to the qualification they possess.

Among the middle managers, 44.4% of the diploma holders were high performers and 30.0% of the postgraduates were low performers. 47% of professional degree and diploma holders were medium performers.

The significance value of chi-square statistic is .614 showing that the performance of middle managers is not associated to the qualification they possess.

Among the junior managers, 40.5% of the professional degree holders and 43.2% of them were low performers, 47.6% of graduates were found to be medium performers.

The significance value of chi-square statistic is .455 showing that there is no significant relationship between performance of managers and their qualification in the junior managerial level.

Age and Performance level of Managers

39.7% of the managers in the age group 35 to 40 years were high performers, 72% of the managers in the age group 25 to 30 years were medium performers, 42.9% of the managers in 45 to 50 years were in the low performance category.
The significance value of chi-square statistic is 0.721 which is much greater than 0.005 showing that the performance of managers is the same irrespective of their age.

In the senior manager category 58.3% were in the age category 45 to 50 were high performers, 53.4% of the medium performers were 50 years and above, 77.8% of the low performers were in 40 to 45 age range.

The significance value of chi-square statistic is 521 which disproves dependence of the table variables of age and performance among senior managers.

44.5% of the high performers among middle managers were in the age group of 40 to 45 years, 77.8% of the medium performers were in the 25 to 30 age group, 37.9% of the low performers were 50 and above. Only 5% of middle managers in the 25 to 30 years category were low performers.

The significance value of chi-square statistic is 0.732 which supports the null hypothesis of the table variables - age and performance among middle managers.

62.2% of the low performers in the junior managerial category were in the 45 to 50 age group and 44.1% of the managers in the 50 and above age group were high performers.
The significance value of chi-square statistic is .621 which shows that the table variables - age and performance are independent in junior managers.

Upbringing and performance

The significance value of chi-square statistic is 0.914 which is much greater than 0.005 showing that the performance of managers is the same irrespective of their upbringing.

Conclusion

Managerial performance assessment can never be fully objective in nature but one can try to keep away subjectivity to the best possible extent. This study is such an attempt where the samples were classified according to their levels of performance in their own organisational setting.

The major conclusions of the study were the following

- There were lesser number of low performers among senior managers.
- ESTJs were the most represented among the 16 personality types.
- Among the 16 personality types managers belonging to 6 personality types were observed to be high performers. They were ESTJs, ENTJs, ISTJs, INTJs, ESTPs, ENTPs.
- Managers who showed a high level of assertiveness were high in performance.
- Of the 16 personality types 6 types were found have a high level of assertiveness. They were ESTJs, ENTJs, ISTJs, INTJs, ESTPs, ENTPs.

- Socio - Demographic variables like age, educational qualification and upbringing do not have any association with the performance of managers

**Recommendations**

One of the conclusive finding in all levels of managers is the overrepresentation of managers who prefer the combination of Thinking and Judging in the MBTI personality types and Assertiveness.

Because Thinking and Judging types are so prevalent in organizational leadership, it may be that Thinking and Judging behaviors have become the accepted definition of what it means to lead, and therefore, people displaying these behaviors are seen as "leadership material". Other styles of leading may then not be seen as "leadership" because they do not fit the standard definition.

The challenges this presents whatever the causes for this phenomenon, we will usually find ourselves interacting with a majority of TJs. It is for the organizations to understand and support the natural style and developed skills of TJ leaders while assisting them in seeing the benefits of modifying those skills and that style.
The corollary to the predominance of TJs in management is that managers with different combinations of preferences normally will have developed a number of skills and behaviors related to Thinking and Judging. With such TJ skills encouraged and supported by their environment they may not have valued or developed their own natural style of leadership. According to type theory, people are most effective when they have developed their own natural style and then learned to use non-preferred areas as appropriate. For some leaders who are not TJs, this development of their natural way of leading may not have occurred, as the organizational cultures in which they have worked and succeeded may not have supported such development. This is a challenge that the Human resources Department and the top team should take when they draw out a developmental plan for the managers.

"Thinking-Judging Strengths and Weaknesses as Leaders – Research and practice" (Barger & Kirby, 1995) have identified a number of components of TJ leadership style. It is important to remember that these are characteristics of groups of TJs, and individual leaders with those preferences may vary on any number of these qualities and behaviors.
Strengths in leadership with Thinking–Judging.

- Focus on creating logical order and structures in the organization and its processes
- Focus on achieving organizational goals
- Use logical reasoning to quickly analyze problems
- Are decisive – make decisions quickly and with confidence.
- Move to implement decisions quickly and with confidence.
- Emphasize efficiency.
- Value competence, set high standards for themselves and others.

Another way of looking at this one major conclusion of TJs is by noting that the type theory adopted in this study is dynamic and development oriented and emphasizes that all the 16 personality types have their strengths and this tool gives information on the developmental components in each personality type. Each personality type has a dominant, auxiliary, tertiary and inferior preference. It is not enough for one to develop only the dominant and auxiliary function. Tertiary and inferior preferences will also be put to use as the situation changes. For the types that have fallen into the low performing category, in this study, definitely have their strengths too and their dominant and auxiliary have not developed to the extent where they can effectively use their skills. The dominant function is the favorite mental process and forms the core identity of one’s personality. This should be identified and nurtured to bring out the best in the individual. Type development is an area which most managers neglect,
when one needs to nurture the dominant function so the auxiliary function should also be developed. Each personality type has a potential area for growth which is mentioned in this chapter. The team members in each department should be selected to suit the specific role they should be playing. In this selection perhaps a change of organisational role may be found effective in transforming the low performers to high performers.

Guidelines for Using Type Dynamics and Development with managers:

Fitzgerald (1997b) and Fitzgerald & Kirby (1997a) offer suggestions for using dynamics and development in leadership development and executive coaching. The following is a brief summary:

- Analyse the impact of the function that is extraverted. For example, managers who extravert Thinking may need to hear the impact their logical dissection of problems can have on others and explore ways to provide more positive feedback.

- Analyse the impact of the function that is introverted. For example, managers who introvert their perceiving function may want to learn how to give others the information they have inside that has guided their Extraverted decisions.
Explore the relative emphasis on perception versus judgment. For example, leaders who prefer judging may want to develop ways to feel comfortable putting off decisions by more information gathering. Those who prefer perceiving may need to develop comfort in sometimes making decisions without perfect information.

Explore the relative emphasis on the outer world, extraverting, versus the inner world, introverting. For example, leaders may find that the fast pace and demands of their environment have resulted in their not giving their introverted part an opportunity to play a role. Whether that is their perceiving function or their judging function, they will be missing some of their own important strengths if they have not found the time and space for their Introversion to play a role.

Contrast leaders' type dynamics with those of colleagues or subordinates. For example, exploring what each extraverts and introverts can illuminate in long-standing misunderstandings and provide new ways for them to connect.

Explore the impact of leaders' tertiary and inferior functions. For example, have sensing leaders learn to use and trust their intuition when it is appropriate. Have thinking leaders learn to listen to their Feeling.

Give opportunities to discuss leaders' inferior functions, especially ways in which it may function as their Achilles heel. For example, are there some things they always overlook? Are there some areas where they never seem to learn from experience?
Discuss emergence of the non-preferred functions at midlife and beyond. For example, for a dominant extraverted intuitive, what does an emerging introverted sensing look like?

Analyze leaders' environments and demands in terms of current and potential use of their strengths and opportunities for development. For example, can a dominant feeling type find areas at work to contribute to the strengths of that function?

Jung's concept of lifelong growth is extremely appealing to clients. For many managers, it should open up exciting opportunities personally and professionally.

The importance of assertiveness in organizations is well sketched in this research study. Some people confuse assertiveness with aggression, and think that to assert oneself is to stand one's ground and argue a point without compromise. However, being assertive means communicating your needs, wants, feelings, beliefs and opinions to others in a direct and honest manner, without intentionally hurting anyone's feelings. It is helpful to imagine assertiveness as the middle ground between aggression and passivity. The use of bully tactics is destructive to relationships and, ultimately, to your self-esteem. Remaining passive may help you to avoid conflict, but the price paid includes feelings of helplessness and lack of control. Direct communication can reduce conflict, build your self-confidence, and enhance your personal and work relationships. Assertiveness is a skill that any one can learn. These are a few learning points:
When you disagree with someone do not show agreement in the interest of "keeping the peace" by smiling, nodding, or paying close attention. Instead, change the topic. Look away. Disagree more actively and emotionally when you are more confident on the subject.

When you are asked to do something by a person in authority that does not sound reasonable or enjoyable to you, ask "why" you should do it. You are an adult and should not accept authority without question. Insist on an explanation that is convincing.

When you have done something you consider worth sharing, let others know about it. Also, let people know how you feel about things. Do not monopolize conversations, but do not hesitate to bring them around to yourself when it is appropriate.

While asserting oneself, suggestions for body language include:

- Look the person in the eye
- Hold your body upright
- Consciously relax your shoulders
- Try to breathe normally and don’t hold your breath
- Keep your face relaxed
- Speak at a normal conversational volume (don’t yell or whisper).

Despite your best efforts to be direct and calm, the other person will sometimes behave like you're having an argument and want to shout, criticise and goad.
Practical Suggestions include:

- Tell the person you'll take up the subject again at another time, and leave.
- If you decide to stick it out – remain calm, steer the conversation back to the original point, and try to understand the other person's point of view.
- Appreciate there may be other issues motivating their behaviour.
- Don't take heat-of-the-moment criticisms to heart.

Afterwards, learn from the experience and try to think up better ways to negotiate. Training can help in a big way to make a person assertive.

Scope for further research studies:

Research studies using qualitative research methodology can also be adopted to find out the association between the variables selected for this study. Only manufacturing industries in the private sector came under the purview of this study, further research can be conducted with regard to the service sector also which is fast mushrooming in our country. As an extension of this study the personality profile required for effective and successful managers in each function in an organizational setting can also be drawn out as this would be of much relevance to the organizations, especially for selecting the right candidate for the right job.