CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION
Introduction and Statement of the Problem

The liberalization of the Indian economy in all major areas has caused each system and subsystem in every Indian organisation to vibrate or fluctuate. “Managing Change” is the working principle of any successful manager today who is facing a plethora of challenges from every sphere of life. Organisations worldwide, are nurturing a performance – driven work culture that would help them develop leaders. Leaders who are innovative and flexible enough to accept change and who are also effective. Managerial Performance is the platform for enhanced competitive advantage that will ensure the viability and prosperity of the organisation. Organisations are always in search of information that will throw light on the fruitful linkage of managerial performance with various other factors. Improving the performance of managers is another area of interest for organisations. One way to augment competency is to build insights into ones style of behaviour which will lead to better awareness of strengths and weaknesses. This will help managers face today's challenges with more confidence. Insights into human behavior and behavioral differences that exist among team members will also lead to increase in basic managerial skills. This understanding will help managers be more effective in handling day- to-day problems in meeting the challenges of today's competitive business environment.
Big Corporations now aspire to recruit managers with talent and they also want their existing team of managers to grow into high performing managers for a reason that is pure and simple: to survive in today’s rapidly changing competitive business environment. In today’s unforgiving business climate, more and more managers, who perform well, are required to effect phenomenal changes for the very survival of organizations. Most organizations attempt to retain the more proficient employees.

Conceptual Framework and Theoretical background of the Study

Literature surveys reveal that there are many empirical studies linking managerial performance with other variables like motivation (Mitchell and Biglan 1971, House and Wahba 1973), cognitive ability, job satisfaction (Jackofsky 1994) and job commitment (Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977), (Wood and Vilkinas 1994).

Attempts have also been made to link managerial performance with different personality types. Though researchers were not very successful in this area, available evidences indicate that the Myers and Briggs Personality Type Indicator (MBTI) model has been relatively successful in linking managerial performance with personality types. The Myers and Briggs personality theory identifies 16 personality types and sorts people into valuable groups that reflect preferences in their behavior patterns.
Researches conducted by Myers and Kirby (1994) observed the linkage between
the ‘Thinking Judging’ type, one of the types of Myers and Briggs Type
Indicator, and effective managerial performance. Walck (1996) also reported on
a strong association between managerial performance and Myers and Briggs
Personality Types. Fleenor (1997) concluded that a relationship exists between
Myers and Briggs Personality Types and the measures of performance in
managerial groups.

The survey of literature and leading journal websites however revealed that
most of the studies linking the MBTI and managerial performance were
conducted in the context of the western societies. On the other hand studies
linking the two variables are practically absent in the oriental research
literature.

In India, MBTI is a widely used personality measuring instrument. There are
certified trainers who administer this instrument and it is the most widely used
one for assessing the personality types of managers. However, research
attempts linking MBTI types with managerial performance have not been
reported so far. This study is an attempt to bring out the relationship between
managerial performance and MBTI Personality Types as this knowledge would
help in understanding the characteristics of managers who could perform well
in the Indian context.
Another variable investigated in the study is the level of Assertiveness in managers. A manager/leader has to influence others and articulate his own views in order to be effective. Many a time, while facing a difficult situation, managers tend to react aggressively and thus overreact; alternatively some managers become passive, holding back what they really have to say (Alberts, R.E and Emmons, M.L 2004). To attain the goals set by the organization managers have to convince others by expressing what he thinks, wants or feels without denying the thoughts, needs or feelings of others (Bower, S. and Bower G, 1976). Expressing one's needs, feelings and opinions clearly without violating the rights of others is "Assertiveness" - (Zuker, E.1983).

While conducting the literature survey researchers found that a few empirical studies were available linking assertiveness and managerial performance but mostly in the western context. Fritchi & Melling M (1993), when discussing the importance of assertiveness say, assertive people are more likely to get more of what they want, be it in organizations or in other fields. In an organizational set up, getting things done by convincing others is very important and the success of a manager, to a great extent, depends on convincing others.
In the research study conducted by Quenk & Quenk (1996), Shelton (1996), and DiTiberrio (1996) it was found that the managers with personality preferences that extraverts their thinking process would be more assertive in influencing others.

Though personality types and assertiveness could influence or determine the performance of managers, the personal background of the managers could also be important in defining their performance at work. Empirical studies indicate that socio-demographic variables such as age, education and upbringing of managers could often have an impact on the level of performance displayed by managers.

**Myers and Briggs Personality Types**

Development of the MBTI is based on the C. G. Jung's Personality theory where he attempts to explain the individual differences in personality using the concepts of Introversion (I) and Extraversion (E), which are seen as the orientations of energy (Hammer & Kummerrow, 1992). In the introverted attitude, energy is drawn from the environment towards inner experience and reflection. One desires to stay focused on the internal, subjective state, to affirm its value, and to maintain this focus as long as possible. In the extraverted attitude, energy and attention flow out or are drawn out, to the objects and people in the environment.
Jung points out in the 'Psychological Types' that mankind is equipped with two distinct and sharply contrasting ways of 'Perceiving' (P). One means of perception is the familiar process of Sensing (S), by which we become aware of things directly through our five senses. The other is the process of Intuition (N), which is the indirect perception by way of the unconscious, incorporating ideas or associations that the unconscious tacks onto perceptions coming from outside. He also says, the basic difference in Judgment (J) arises from the existence of two distinct and sharply contrasting ways of coming to conclusions. One way is by the use of 'Thinking' (T), that is a logical process aimed at an impersonal finding. The other is by Feeling (F), which is by appreciation or bestowing a personal subjective value on things. Myers and Briggs extensive research on Jungian Typology has led to the development of this instrument of MBTI. When people respond on the MBTI assessment tool they are not only casting votes for Extraversion (E) or Introversion (I), Sensing (S) or Intuition (N), Thinking (T) or Feeling (F), and Judging (J) or Perceiving (P); they are also providing the information needed to form a hypothesis about their personality type dynamics. Each of the four letter type stands for a complex set of dynamic relationships among the functions (S,N,T & F), the attitudes (E and I) and the attitude or orientation to the outside world (J and P).
Jung's Type Theory was interpreted by Isabel Myers and Katherine Briggs in the Myers–Briggs Type Indicator personality inventory in the following manner.

The MBTI instrument identifies four separate dichotomies: Extraversion versus Introversion, Sensing versus Intuition, Thinking versus Feeling, and Judging versus Perceiving. An individual is assumed to have a preference for one of each pair of opposites over the other. The four preferences direct the characteristic use of perception and judgment by an individual. The particular preferences that interact in a person affect not only what is attended to in any given situation but also how conclusions are drawn about what has been perceived. The MBTI classifies the first and the fourth dichotomies listed as attitudes or orientations and the middle two dichotomies as functions or processes.

The Four Dichotomies of the MBTI are the following:

1) Extraversion–Introversion Dichotomy (E–I)
2) Sensing–Intuition Dichotomy (S–N)
3) Thinking–Feeling Dichotomy (T–F)
4) Judging–Perceiving Dichotomy (J–P)
1) Extraversion or Introversion (E-I)

The E-I dichotomy is designed to reflect whether a person prefers Extraversion or Introversion in the sense intended by Jung. Extraverts are oriented primarily toward the outer world: thus they intend to focus their energy on people and objects. Introverts are oriented primarily towards the inner world, thus they tend to focus their energy on concepts, ideas and internal experiences. Jung regarded Extraversion and Introversion as mutually complementary attitudes whose differences "generate the tension that both the individual and society need for the maintenance of life". Jung thus saw both Extraversion and Introversion as necessary for psychological adaptation.

Sensing or Intuition (S - N)

The S - N dichotomy is designed to reflect a person's preference between two opposite ways of perceiving. A person may rely on the process of Sensing (S), which attends to observable facts or happenings through one or more of the five senses, or a person may rely more upon the less obvious process of Intuition (N), which attends to the meanings, relationships and/or possibilities that have been worked out beyond the reach of the conscious mind.
Thinking or Feeling (T-F)

The T-F dichotomy is designed to reflect a person's preference between two contrasting ways of making a judgment. A person may rely primarily on Thinking (T) to decide impersonally on the basis of logical consequences, or a person may rely primarily on Feeling (F) to decide predominantly on the basis of personal or social values. In Jung's and Myers's approaches, the term Feeling is not to be confused with the emotional. Intelligence and emotional expression are independent of psychological typology.

Judging or Perceiving (J-P)

The J-P dichotomy is designed to identify the process a person tends to use in dealing with the outside world, that is, with the extraverted part of life. A person who prefers using a Judging (J) process, typically uses either Thinking or Feeling (the Judging processes) when dealing with the outside world. Concurrently, a person who prefers a Perceiving (P) process, reports a preference for using either Sensing or Intuition (the perceiving processes) when dealing with the outside world. It should be noted that while Myers and Briggs believed this dichotomy was implicit in Jung's theory, it was not explicitly described in Jung's writings.
It is important to note that a preference for one alternative of each dichotomy does not mean that the opposite, less preferred alternative is never used. Both the theoretical and practical observations identify individuals using each of the eight preference categories at least some of the time. A preference for any one dichotomy is designed to be psychometrically independent of the preferences on the other three dichotomies. Therefore, preferences of the four dichotomies yield 16 possible combinations called types which are denoted by the four letters identifying the poles preferred (eg; ESTJ, INFP). Each type is described in terms of effective use of functions and attitudes and also in terms of the specific difficulties arising when types are less developed or not used effectively. Each type has its own gifts and strengths, its own areas of vulnerability and its own pathway for development. Each of the preferences is a fork in the road of human development and how much excellence people actually achieve depends in part on their energy and their aspirations. But according to the type theory, the kind of excellence towards which they are headed is determined by the inborn preferences that direct them at each fork on the road (Myers & Briggs 1994)
Fitzgerald & Kirby, (1997a) points out that managers as leaders must operate so much in the extraverted world. In this scenario, an extraverted manager shows an eagerness to interact with the outside world with ease of communication, openness to new experiences, sociability and a desire to talk things out. These factors are essential for the success of a manager. Extraverted Thinking types are considered to be the standard executive type (Myers & Myers 1995) and it is doubtful whether any other type so enjoys being an executive or works so hard to get to be one and is brilliantly successful.

Myers & Briggs have termed “Extraverted Thinkers” as “The Action Oriented Thinkers”. They are the ones who make things happen in reasoned, analytical and logical ways and making things happen in a reasoned, analytical and logical way is a very important attribute, especially when the organizations in India are facing the impact of immense competition. These natural attributes can drive them to perform better and the managers who are “Extraverted Thinkers” can be hypothesized to be high performers.

The over-representation of managers who prefer the combination of Thinking and Judging on the MBTI is well documented in a wide variety of studies and in data from a wide variety of cultures (Fleenor, 1997; Fitzgerald & Kirby 1997b). Kirby suggested the following explanation: the structure and values of organizations seem to have favoured the logical and decisive behaviours most comfortable to those preferring Thinking and Judging (TJ), and people displaying these behaviours are seen as “leadership material”. Other styles of leading may then not be seen as leadership because
they do not fit the standard definition (Kirby 1997). Strengths of TJs as described by Barger and Kirby (1995a) are – focus on creating logical order and structures in the organization and its processes, focus on organizational goals, are precise and confident, implements decisions quickly, emphasizes efficiency, values competence and sets high standards for themselves and others. They base their decisions and plans on logical analysis and on the other side may fail to involve others in analysis and decision making. Large groups of managers and leaders from a wide variety of cultures demonstrate an over-representation of Thinking and Judging compared to the general population (Fitzgerald & Kirby, 1997b). As studies relating to the Indian context could not be traced, the researcher wanted to find out whether it was true in the Indian scenario also and hypothesised that managers who have Thinking Judging preference (TJ) in their preference are high performers.

Dawis (1996), in his study on leadership approaches of Managers in High Performing organizations, says that the basic leadership approach of high performing managers includes a people-centered approach which puts people first and organizes around people. East Asian cultures emphasize on developing a relationship before carrying out tasks and it has been strongly influenced by principles of harmony and believes in establishing long term relationships.
‘Feeling – Judging’ personality types base their decisions and plans on weighing and assessing values, building relationships, establishing rapport with subordinates and value-based decision making (Myers & Briggs, 1994). The researcher therefore hypothesised that Feeling – Judging type may stand to be better performers in the Indian context.

**Assertiveness**

Assertiveness has been considered an important element in Leadership. Keenan (1989) for example points out strong associations of assertiveness with the emergence of leadership. Assertiveness increases the chances of our needs being met, Somers (2003). Then, developing assertiveness can be the key to getting the best out of people – increased sales, better customer service, higher productivity and more ideas for improvement says management experts. It encourages those who are shy or short of confidence to become more involved and helps the more extrovert or volatile to fine tune their dealings with customers, suppliers and colleagues (Bridges, 1992).

An assertive person is a positive, resourceful person in an organization, being assertive one can learn to avoid unproductive behaviour patterns, to focus on goals, solve problems and feel more at ease with themselves and their work (Smith, 1993)
Managers need to reinforce a win-win culture in the workplace and this can be brought about by assertiveness which improves the working relationship, builds self-confidence and control and increases the chances of everyone winning – Davidson (1976). Assertiveness training is becoming more and more important in today’s organizations and is based on the idea that individuals have certain rights and responsibilities to themselves and other people.

Silveria (1999) points out that research and training in assertiveness have by now thrown up a universal charter of Rights and Responsibilities.

**Rights:**

- The Right to make mistakes
- The Right to change your mind
- The Right to be your own self
- The Right to be successful
- The Right to decline responsibility for other people’s problems
- The Right to change and assert yourself
Responsibilities:

With rights come responsibilities. The rights you give yourself, you need to give to others, as well. Communication is about respect for the integrity and self-esteem on both sides. One holds the responsibility to assert his rights in a reasonable and responsible manner, one has to seek relevance and appropriateness.

Appropriateness is a social skill that matters a lot, particularly when learning to be an assertive person, it is about being balanced verbally and non-verbally, it is about saying ‘No’ constructively.

“A ‘No’ uttered from the deepest conviction is better and greater than a ‘Yes’ merely uttered to please or what is worse to avoid trouble” – Mahatma Gandhi.

Assertive behaviour is characterized by a constant search for a win–win situation and the individual maintaining an assertive position usually maintains that he or she is the ultimate judge of his or her own behaviour, although other people are free to have their own opinions and approve or disapprove as they see fit. An assertive person stands up for his or her tastes, desires, values and opinions while respecting other people’s freedom to have their own individual differences. A person who behaves assertively understands that he or she is naturally incompatible with certain people, therefore establishes friendship with compatible persons while leaving incompatible people alone to live their lives as they see fit. Assertive behaviour shows that we respect others and ourselves
and in turn elicits respect from others. It also promotes self-confidence, self-control and feelings of positive and self-worth which are essential for managerial performance.

When confronted with an intolerable situation assertive people describe it objectively, express their feelings, empathise, offer problem-solving alternatives and indicate consequences that will follow.

Thus, assertiveness is a very relevant skill in today's industrial world and more and more training programmes are being conducted worldwide to foster this skill. However, scientific research studies linking managerial performance and assertiveness are not many in number.

Gillen (1992), based on his research findings, emphasizes that people behaving assertively make good managers, they will say clearly what they want and equally be supportive of staff and take into account the needs of others. They can compromise and negotiate. Gillen says that assertive behaviour in the workplace gives everyone a better chance of influencing people and participate in the change process and this is expected from a manager to a great extent. In the Indian organisational context too, one can observe that the more a manager can influence his subordinates, peers and superiors the more successful he becomes. The level of assertiveness each manager has is relevant. Higher the level of his assertiveness, higher his performance (Lloyd, 1986). In this study, the researcher therefore hypothesises
that higher the level of assertiveness, higher would be the level of managerial performance.

There is no empirical data correlating the personality types and assertiveness in the Indian context. In one of the research studies conducted by Myers and Briggs, in the western context, correlating the Emotional Quotient Inventory and MBTI, 'Extraversion' and 'Thinking' type was found to correlate with assertiveness. In the studies conducted by Quenk & Quenk (1996), Shelton (1996) and DiTiberrio (1996) managers with personality preferences that extraverts their thinking process would be more assertive in influencing others. The researcher for the purpose of this study would like to hypothesize that managers with 'Thinking Judging' in their personality preference are likely to be more assertive.

As the personal background of the managers is an important factor the researcher also hypothesized that the performance of managers is dependent on the socio-demographic variables - age, education and upbringing selected for the study.

The next chapter deals with the study of relevant literature on the selected variables.