CHAPTER IV

PERSONALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS
CHAPTER IV

PERSONALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS

How intricately effectiveness is linked with personality has been discussed in an earlier chapter. An attempt has been made in this chapter to examine empirically the association between personality and effectiveness of branch managers to test the following hypotheses:

a) Branch managers who score high on effectiveness scale would obtain high score on extroversion.

b) Branch Managers who score high on effectiveness scale would obtain low scores on neuroticism.

c) Branch managers who score high on effectiveness scale would obtain low score on psychoticism.

Before testing the above hypotheses, an attempt is made to discuss the concept of personality with a view to developing its operational definition.

PERSONALITY - A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Man's endeavour to discover himself extends certainly beyond any historical and recorded annals of the Homo-sapiens. But the true research for an understanding of personality, individual differences, temperamental
peculiarities and other deviations from the strictly average behaviour, can in real sense be said to have a beginning from Glen. He was a Greek physician who lived in the second century A.D. and who is widely accredited with the enunciation of the doctrine of the four temperaments: melancholic, choleric, the sanguine and the phlegmatic. Wundt pointed out that choleric and sanguinics, both shared the characteristics of being changeable while phlegmatics and melancholic were unchangeable. He substituted extrovert and introvert for changeable and unchangeable respectively, thereby giving birth to the modern theory of personality in its descriptive aspect. But in recent years personality research has assumed great importance and most thoughtful people have often asked the question "What is Personality?" But few agree on an answer. According to Webster's New American Dictionary, personality is, "Existence of a person, the assemblage of qualities, physical, mental and moral that set one apart from others." But psychologists have defined personality in a variety of ways emphasizing one aspect or another. This has created a good deal of confusion. Mischel\(^1\) states that the term "personality" has many definitions and no single meaning is accepted.

universally. Super\textsuperscript{2} aptly remarks that the field of personality is one of the most popular, challenging, important and confused in contemporary psychology. According to him the main obstacle to the clarifications of the concept of personality is the lack of agreement about a definition of personality. Allport\textsuperscript{3} too has said that personality has dozens of different meanings, legal, grammatical, ethical, religious, economic and psychological. Literature reveals that various approaches, that is, philosophical, psychological, sociological, physiological and psychiatric, have been used to understand personality. Even within the field of psychology, psychologists have had varied approaches to personality, that is, psychoanalytical, behaviouristic, humanistic and existential. But there is a growing realisation among the thinkers of various disciplines that for a clear understanding of personality there has to be an interdisciplinary approach. The present trend is to regard the individual himself as a major focus of interest. Thorpe and Schmilar\textsuperscript{4} say that

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
an adequate definition of personality needs to emphasise the point that the individual is a human being enmeshed in a social order and symbolic culture which influences his every action. This emphasis on the individual has brought with it need for a clear understanding of the nature of personality. So in an attempt to find an operational definition of personality, a few definitions need analysis.

DEFINITION OF PERSONALITY

There are different theories of personality. Many of these theories are not mutually exclusive. They differ mostly in emphasis given to different aspects. In reviewing the theories of personality, Hall and Lindzey5 concluded that no substantive definition of personality could be applied with any generality. It means that the way in which a given individual defines personality will depend completely upon his particular theoretical preference. Hall and Lindzey6 provided a very general definition. According to them personality consists concretely of a set of values of descriptive terms which are used to describe the individual being studied according to the variables or


dimensions which occupy a central position within the particular theory described. Cattel\textsuperscript{7} emphasised the predictive part of the personality. He said that Personality is that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation. According to him Personality is concerned with all the behaviour of the individual, both overt and under the skin. Recently Ivancevich et al.\textsuperscript{8} defined personality as:

The combination of human characteristics or variables we employ to define, clarify or type a person . . . . Personality classifications are only useful to the extent that they can predict behaviour.

Maddi\textsuperscript{9} has also defined personality. From a close scrutiny of his definition, one would gather that personality is a stable set of characteristics and tendencies that determines those commonalities and differences in the psychological behaviour (thoughts, feelings and actions) of people that have continuity in time. The view can be further clarified by using

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Bonner's propositions. The propositions spell out areas of interest for managers in that they provide needed insight into the personality concept. These propositions are:

1. Human behaviour consists of acts. In responding to a managerial directive or request for a more productive work day, the individual responds. In attempting to comply with these requests the person acts.

2. Personality conceived as a whole actualises itself in a determining environment. The gist of the proposition is that an employee cannot be understood apart from his environment. The employee is part of a work unit and a work group. These affiliations interact with the total organisational atmosphere to influence his personality.

3. Personality is characterized by self-consistency. The normal personality is in a state of dynamic equilibrium. It is flexible but it maintains a consistency.

4. Personality is goal-directed behaviour. The employee, through his personality, seeks to achieve objectives

---

or ends. The objectives are dictated by their contribution to the maintenance of self-stability.

5. Personality is a time-intergrating structure. Man is a product of conditioned responses, habits learnt through previous experiences. Man is also future-oriented.

6. Personality is a process of becoming. As Bonner\textsuperscript{11} aptly states that personality is an organisation of potentialities striving to actualise themselves. The concept of actualizing is important in most theories of motivation.

These propositions illustrate that personality represents a total complex individual network of factors, knowledge of which is very important for the managements concerned about the effectiveness of managers.

Allport\textsuperscript{12} has also made significant contributions to the concept of personality. He has championed and elaborated a thesis that rests firmly on the foundations of individuality, uniqueness, the personal experience of the single individual and adjustment as the most meaningful

\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}.

\textsuperscript{12}G.W. Allport, \textit{loc. cit.}
subject matter for the explanation of personality. He made an extensive survey of the literature, extracted about fifty definitions, classified them into a number of broad categories and finally formulated his own definition. Thus, according to Allport:

Personality is the dynamic organisation, within the individual, of those psychological systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment.

Eysenck, a persistent and versatile worker in this area has also proposed a definition of personality as, "More or less, a stable and enduring organisation of a person's character and temperament, intellect and physique which determine his unique adjustment to the environment."

A careful look at these two definitions revealed that Allport emphasized the dynamic part of the individual's organisation whereas Eysenck emphasised more or less stable and enduring part of the individual's organisation. Secondly, Allport's definition takes psychological and physiological systems in general which are too global to determine the individual's adjustment to the environment, while Eysenck takes specific areas of

---

individual's organisation that determine his unique adjustment to the environment.

Eysenck's definition has been accepted as operational definition of personality in the present study. Eysenck is a living authority in psychology and his definition is eclectic, comprehensive, functional, personalistic and humanistic as well as holistic. His approach seems to have reached a fairly high level of sophistication as it demands full recognition of all aspects of man and it seems to be more appropriate for this study because:

1. it emphasizes the integration of inner psychological system and supports that this integration is unique in each individual.
2. it takes into consideration the response of the individual to the challenge of the environment.
3. It provides a basis for the social stimulus value of personality.
4. it stresses both the analytical and the synthetic point of view.
5. it also provides a useful basis for making group comparison.

The literature review on personality revealed that personality has been studied by researchers from different
viewpoints with different assumptions. These viewpoints represent major conceptual emphases of contemporary psychology, each with its own methods, procedures and assumptions. The various viewpoints of contemporary psychology are:

The biological viewpoint, experimental viewpoint, the social viewpoint and the psychometric trait/type viewpoint.

So far as the objectives of the present study are concerned, it involves psychometric trait/type viewpoint. The central assertion of this viewpoint, according to Wiggens et al. is that the behaviour of the individual is best understood in terms of attributes which reflect the underlying trait organisation.

After having taken the decision to accept Eysenck's definition as operational definition and to study the present problem from psychometric trait/type viewpoint, there remains the problem of categorising people into distinct personality types. One of the most enduring approaches to personality measurement seeks to label and classify people according to their psychological characteristics. In looking for a model for describing

the personality organisation, one finds two claimants in the field, namely, the concept of "trait" and the concept of "type."

Allport, one of the pioneers of the trait theory, regards trait to be, "a generalised and focalized neuropsychiatric system (peculiar to the individual), with the capacity to render many stimuli functionally equivalent, and to initiate and guide consistent (equivalent) forms of adaptive and responsive behaviour." Thorpe and Schmuiler consider trait as "a legitimate structure of personality which can provide us with insight into the dynamics of individual behaviour." Personality in terms of traits has been measured by various inventories and tests. In the last few decades many psychologists like Hathaway and Mckinley, Guilford Zimmerman, Lovell, and Cattell, to mention a few, have constructed omnibus personality inventories

15 Allport, loc. cit.
16 Thorpe and Schmuiler, loc. cit.
aiming at measuring different traits of personality. Reviewing these multiphasic inventories, one arrives at the conclusion that personality traits are numerous and the proliferation of traits makes it rather difficult to apply them in a practical situation. Although the trait theories have also contributed personality tests and factor analysis techniques to the behavioural sciences, yet the major drawback of these theories is that they are descriptive rather than analytical and are a long way from being comprehensive theories of personality. Vanita pointed out that many psychologists have vehemently criticized the attempts to analyse personality into traits for special investigation. The ground for the objection is that personality is an organised whole and that any form of analysis changes its quality. Sinha writes:

A trait approach analyses personality into bundles of bits, qualities or elements. It assumes that one may usefully study isolated and separate elements of an organism and compare one individual with another in terms of these elements. In its extreme form, the trait approach adopts the basic assumption of reductionism, that the total organism is merely the sum of its parts and no more.

---


But keeping in view the objectives of the present study the assumptions of reductionism do not appear to be sound. The organism should be taken as a whole while studying its reaction to a given stimulus. Shreedhar\textsuperscript{23} observes that psychologists conceive personality as a man's total reaction pattern to situations. In this context, Gestalt's concept of personality appears to be more rational and has been used by various psychologists.

Since Freud, certain theories of personality have developed which are termed as holistic. Holistic means "whole" or "entire". Personality is a whole, and has the characteristics of an organism in being unified, distinct from its environment and having inter-related parts. A holistic approach is concerned primarily with the study of a total personality, examining its internal structure and dynamics. The essential idea of holism is the Gestalt dictum that the whole is more than the sum of its parts. In view of this, analysing the individual into parts and comparing individuals in terms of such elements is of doubtful validity. It was, therefore, decided to take holistic view of personality and adopt the "type" concept of personality for the present study. It may also be recalled here that Eysenck's definition of personality

has been adopted in the present study as operational definition of personality. It was, therefore, logical to use Eysenck's "type" concept for assigning personality.

Eysenck\textsuperscript{24} tackled the problem of finding personality dimensions with the aid of factor analysis techniques. He conceived personality as composed of acts and dispositions organised in a hierarchical manner. Four levels of organisations are conceived: the lowest level of specific responses, next level of habitual responses, the third level where habitual responses are organised into traits and finally organisations of traits into type. Eysenck\textsuperscript{25} views type:

As a group of correlated traits just as a trait is defined as a group of behavioural acts or action tendencies. According to this view the difference between the concept of trait and type lies not in continuity or lack of continuity of the hypothesized variables, not in its form of distribution but in the greater inclusiveness of the type concept.

Type is, therefore, a higher order concept and trait is the second order concept.


It appears that the concept of personality as elaborated by Eysenck appears to serve the dual function of theory building as well as that of meeting the practical demands of psychologists. His view is the latest and his approach seems to have reached an acceptable level of sophistication. It has, therefore, been used in the present study as well.

Eysenck's system included four dimensions: extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism, and intelligence. In terms of available evidence and fairly respectable data the first two dimensions emerge as most relevant while the third was added comparatively recently. By dimensions Eysenck meant focal points of frequently occurring groups of characteristics, concentration of correlated traits which exist along a continuum. It may also be recalled here that many researchers like Mohan and Virdi, Gupta and Nijhawan, Muthayya, to mention a few, have used

26 Ibid.
27 Ibid.
Eysenck's approach and his instrument in their research studies on personality in India with gratifying results.

Eysenck developed a series of instruments to measure personality. Maudsley Medical Questionnaire was the first of series of instruments to measure neuroticism. This was followed by Maudsley Personality Inventory (M.P.I.). It attempted to provide an adequate measure of each of the two principal personality dimensions, namely, extroversion and neuroticism. But even among normal subjects the extroversion scale and neuroticism scale of the Maudsley Personality Inventory are negatively correlated. This negative correlation between measures led Eysenck and Eysenck31 to construct a revised version of the Maudsley Personality Inventory called Eysenck's Personality Inventory (E.P.I.). In this revised and modified test, the extroversion and neuroticism scales are decalred to be uncorrelated. The reliability of the Eysenck's Personality Inventory is somewhat higher than that of Maudsley Personality Inventory.

In the latest personality test developed by Eysenck and Eysenck,32 an additional variable, which is labelled

---

32Ibid.
...and stands for psychoticism, has been added. This new scale is called Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire (E.P.Q.). According to the authors, the E (Extroversion) and N (Neuroticism) scales in Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire are very similar to the corresponding scales of the other questionnaires. Consequently, whatever has been discovered about correlates of E and N with the use of the other scales must be assumed to apply with equal force to the new scales. With regard to N* and P*, scales Eysenck and Eyseneck say:

In spite of the psychiatric nature of the terms used, and its resemblance to other psychiatric concepts, it must be emphasised that our scale differs profoundly from pathological scales like the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (M.M.P.I.). We are dealing throughout with normal behaviour, not with symptoms; just as in the case of neuroticism, we are concerned with variables underling behaviours which become pathological only in extreme cases. Similarly, psychosis is a pathological exaggeration of high degree of some underlying trait of psychoticism. It is for this reason that this scale is appropriate for use with normal, non-pathological samples of population, and it is for this reason that we have suggested that in the interest of communication with users, who are not familiar with the underlying theory of the term "Neuroticism" and "Psychoticism" be dropped and the terms "Emotionality" and "Toughmindedness" be substituted.

It is, therefore, concluded that Eysenck's instruments can be applied to the normal, non-pathological samples of population.

33 Ibid.
INSTRUMENT USED TO MEASURE PERSONALITY

In view of the above, it was decided to use Eysenck's instrument to measure personality. Eysenck's latest work in this direction is Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire. His Personality Questionnaire as modified at N.I.M.H.A.N.S., Bangalore, was applied to measure personality of commercial bank branch managers. This scale has 101 statements (See Annexure IV). Out of these 101 statements, twenty-five measure extroversion, twenty-one measure neuroticism, twenty-four measure psychoticism and twenty statements reveal lie scores, while eleven are filler statements. The respondents are required to record their responses by putting a circle around "yes" or "no" whichever is applicable.

About the three dimensions, namely, extroversion, neuroticism and psychoticism, included in Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire, the authors have given a brief account. These dimensions, according to them, are idealised extremes on a continuum to which real people may approach to a greater or lesser degree.

Extroversion

High "E" scores are indicative of extroversion. High scoring individuals tend to be outgoing, impulsive,
and uninhibited, having many social contacts and
frequently taking part in group activities. The typical
extrovert is sociable, likes parties, has many friends,
needs to have people to talk to, and does not like reading
or studying by himself. He craves excitement, takes
chances, often sticks his neck out, acts on the spur of
the moment and is generally an impulsive individual. He
is fond of practical jokes, always has a ready answer, and
generally likes a change. He is carefree, easy going,
optimistic and likes to "laugh and be merry." He prefers
to keep moving and doing things, tends to be aggressive
and to lose his temper quickly. His feelings are not kept
under tight control, and he is not always a reliable person.

The typical introvert is a quiet, retiring sort of person,
introspective, fond of books rather than people. He is
reserved and distant except with intimate friends. He
tends to plan ahead, "looks before he leaps" and distrusts
the impulse of the moment. He does not like excitement,
takes matters of every day life with proper seriousness,
and likes a well-ordered mode of life. He keeps his
feelings under close control, seldom behaves in an
aggressive manner, and does not lose his temper easily.
He is reliable, somewhat pessimistic and places great
value on ethical standards.
Neuroticism

High 'N' scores are indicative of emotional liability and over reactivity. High scoring individuals tend to be emotionally over-responsive and to have difficulties in returning to a normal state after emotional experiences. Eysenck describes typical high 'N' scorer as being an anxious, worrying individual, moody and frequently depressed. He is likely to sleep badly, and to suffer from various psychosomatic disorders. He is overly emotional, reacting too strongly to all sorts of stimuli, and finds it difficult to get back to a state of emotional balance after each emotion arousing experience. His strong emotional reactions interfere with his proper adjustment, making him react in irrational, sometimes rigid ways. When combined with extroversion, such an individual is likely to be touchy and restless, to become excitable and even aggressive. To describe high 'N' individual in one word, one may say he is a worrier. The stable individual, on the other hand, tends to respond emotionally only slowly and generally weakly, as also to return to baseline quickly after emotional arousal; he is usually calm, even-tempered, controlled and unworried.
Psychoticism

High scoring individuals tend to be tough minded, unfriendly and trouble creators. A typical high scorer on 'P' scale, as the authors communicate, is indicative of being solitary, not caring for people. He is often troublesome, not fitting in anywhere. He may be cruel and inhuman, lacking in feelings and empathy, and altogether insensitive. He is hostile to others, even his own kith and kin, and aggressive, even to loved ones. He has a liking for odd and unusual things, and a disregard for danger. He likes to make a fool of others and upset them.

Thus these three dimensions of personality, namely, Extroversion, Neuroticism and Psychoticism, are measured on Eysenck's latest questionnaire (E.P.Q.).

The data collected on Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire is correlated with the effectiveness scores of the respondents to see the association between effectiveness and personality. It was also examined if the arithmetical mean of the scores of highly effective, moderately effective and less effective respondents should differ on these scales.
Administration of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire

It may be recalled here that the present study was conducted on branch managers heading medium and large branches operating in five cities namely Amritsar, Jalandhar, Ludhiana, Patiala and Chandigarh and that out of 305 branch managers who were selected for the study only 249 had consented to take the test. The respondents were so scattered that group contact was not possible and all the 249 branch managers who acted as respondents for this test were contacted individually in their respective branch offices. A self-introduction was given to each of these respondents and personal identity was shown to them. The objective and the topic of the research study were explained. They were informed that the data were being collected from the academic point of view only and that the accuracy of the findings of the study would depend upon their cooperation and the frankness of responses. They were assured that the information given by them would be treated as strictly confidential and would be used for research purposes only. The curiosity of those who wanted to know the usefulness of the study to the banking institutions was satisfied by explaining to them briefly the objectives of the study. Before actually giving the test material, an attempt was made to give them a feeling that the questionnaires were interesting. The value of the
test for each respondent was stressed, so that he would not only accept the questionnaire but also offer fullest cooperation. A copy of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire was given to each of the respondents. Instructions necessary for filling the questionnaire were printed on the proforma. These instructions were also explained orally to each of them. It may be recalled here that there are 101 statements in the questionnaire and the respondents were requested to put a circle around *yes* or *no* whichever was their answer to the statement.

**COLLECTION AND PRESENTATION OF DATA ON PERSONALITY**

The completed responses on Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire were received from 210 respondents. Out of these 210 responses, 150 responses only were considered for analysis as the other requirements, namely, job-satisfaction and adjustment questionnaire and their performance evaluation reports had also been received and found to be complete. The scoring of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire was done manually with the help of scoring stencils provided by the author. The scores on personality scales were arranged in the order in which their effectiveness scores were arranged. The mean scores on extroversion, neuroticism and psychoticism for the total sample (n = 150) were 12.68, 8.14 and 4.32 respectively.
It may be recalled that for the purpose of the present study, the sample was divided, on the basis of effectiveness scores, in three categories namely:

a) **Highly effective**

Branch managers scoring 124 points or above on the effectiveness scale were placed in the highly effective category.

b) **Moderately effective**

Branch managers scoring less than 124 points but more than 106 points on effectiveness scale were placed in this category.

c) **Less effective**

Branch managers scoring 106 points or below, on the effectiveness scale, were classified as less effective branch managers.

It may be noted from above that none of the branch managers in the sample was found in the ineffective category. This is expected as well because responsible positions, as those of branch managers, cannot be filled, by and large, by ineffective personnel. However, relative effectiveness is a different issue. Within the effective group, some are expected to be highly effective, some less effective while
some others may be moderately (neither highly nor less) effective.

The procedure adopted for determining the relative effectiveness was as follows:

Values of quartile one and quartile three were calculated and these were taken as indicators of low and high effectiveness. According to this criterion, all those who scored 106 points or below were placed in the category of less effective managers while those who scored 124 points or above were placed in the highly effective category. The remaining managers were classified as moderately effective personnel and their score range was between 107 and 123 points.

To test the hypothesis laid down in the beginning of this chapter, mean scores of these three categories of managers on each of the three dimensions of personality, namely extroversion, neuroticism and psychoticism, and the mean of their effectiveness scores were computed and entered in Table 4.1.

The mean score on a dimension for a category is the sum total of scores obtained on the dimension by all the respondents in the category divided by the number of respondents in that category. An example may clarify it. There are forty-two respondents in the highly effective
TABLE 4.1

Mean and standard deviations of scores on effectiveness and on three dimensions of personality, namely, Extroversion, Neuroticism and Psychoticism, for three categories of branch managers and for the total sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
<th>Extroversion</th>
<th></th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th></th>
<th>Psychoticism</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>129.04</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>115.20</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>98.68</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>114.31</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
category of branch managers. Their total score on extroversion scale is 584. The mean score on extroversion for this category is 14.14, that is, 584 divided by 42. Same procedure is followed to calculate the mean score for moderately and less effective categories and also for the three categories on neuroticism and psychoticism.

To test the hypothesis, that:

a) Branch managers who score high on effectiveness scale would obtain high score on extroversion,
b) Branch managers who score high on effectiveness scale would obtain low scores on neuroticism,
c) Branch managers who score high on effectiveness scale would obtain low score on psychoticism

the mean scores on three dimensions of personality would be compared and test of significance would be applied to see if the difference between two means was significant.

Another way of testing the hypothesis would be by examining the association between:

a) Extroversion and effectiveness
b) Neuroticism and effectiveness
c) Psychoticism and effectiveness

This association would be confirmed or rejected through a correlational analysis between the two variables.
It may be noted that such an association would be tested at group level and within the groups as well. For example, it would be seen whether extroversion and effectiveness are positively or negatively related or are not related with effectiveness for the entire sample as well as for various groups separately.

To test the validity of the hypotheses, each of the three dimensions of personality: extroversion, neuroticism and psychoticism, was dealt with separately for the purpose of data analysis, discussions and recording of results.

**Extroversion and effectiveness**

Extroversion is a type of personality which has largely been acknowledged and used by psychologists. Jung's type theory of personality suggesting two major types: extroversion-introversion, of personality had been the basis of all typological theories - developed by various psychologists. Eysenck, a versatile and living researcher in the field of psychology, also took Jung's personality type model as a starting point in developing a more rigorous typological theory of his own. But he based his theory on central nervous system which is generally of two types - excitatory and inhibitory. These physiological characteristics were made use of by
him in describing mode of behaviour of human-beings as extrovert-introvert. He construed a scale to measure the extroversion dimension of personality. According to Eysenck, a typical extrovert is sociable, likes parties, has many friends, needs to have people to talk to. He craves excitement, takes chances, often sticks his neck out, acts on the spur of the moment and is generally an impulsive individual. He is fond of practical jokes, always has a ready answer and generally likes change. He is carefree, easy going, optimistic and prefers to keep moving and doing things.

The typical introvert, according to him, is a quiet, retiring sort of person, introspective, fond of books rather than people. He is reserved and distant except to intimate friends. He tends to plan ahead, looks before he leaps and distrusts the impulse of the moment. He does not like excitement, takes matters of every day life with seriousness. He keeps his feelings under close control.

The characteristics of typical extrovert and typical introvert, listed above, convey that extroversion

---

introversion dimension, as the name itself implies, is a bipolar one. Extroversion and introversion are situated at opposite ends of a continuum. Accordingly, one who gets high scores on extroversion would automatically get low scores on introversion. But there may be individuals who may score high neither on extroversion nor on introversion and possess a mixture of the two types.

Hilgard\(^{35}\) had opined that extroversion and introversion are two extremes on a scale and not actually two distinct types.

Garret had also observed that most people are neither introvert nor extrovert but are ambivert, that is, possess both ingoing and outgoing qualities. Indeed few people are so shut in or so generally exuberant as to deserve the blanket description - introvert or extrovert.

But from a study of the characteristics of extrovertive and introvertive personality it appears that both types of personalities may not be equally effective in a job. There are some jobs which carry more pressures and stresses than other jobs. Similarly there are some jobs which require more of public contact like salesmanship,


promotional work etc., than other jobs. From the characteristics of extroverted personality, it appears that extroverts are more successful than introverts in jobs where more of public contacts are required. The research work of Hilgard and Eysenck support this view. Hilgard,\textsuperscript{37} while observing that an extrovert tends to choose occupations such as sales or promotional work where he deals with people rather than with things, perhaps meant that such jobs suit extroverts.

Eysenck\textsuperscript{38} has calculated means of extroversion scores for different occupational groups. Perusal of his table also indicates that vocations, where contact had to be established with other people, have scored higher on extroversion than those where public contacts are relatively less.

It may be recalled here that in the Indian context of commercial banking, a branch manager is expected to sell banking services effectively with a view to promoting banking habits in the masses and to undertake developmental banking. On the one side he is to develop public contacts to attract masses to make use of banking facilities and on

\textsuperscript{37} R. Earnest Hilgard, \emph{loc. cit.}

\textsuperscript{38} H.J. Eysenck, \emph{loc. cit.}
the other hand in spite of greater pressure from staff unions and the characteristics of bank customers in India he is to keep his men motivated to provide satisfactory service to those who visit branches. Nevertheless, he is there to guard the interests of the institution also. In brief, it may be added that to be an effective bank branch manager, he should be sociable, outgoing, talkative, lively in behaviour, responsive and impressive. All these characteristics are grouped together as a type called extroversion by Eysenck. It is, therefore, contended that more effective bank branch manager should relatively be more extroverted than a less effective manager.

To test this statement the mean scores on extroversion for the three groups, namely highly effective, moderately effective and less effective branch managers, were computed and compared. Test of significance of the difference between two means was applied and *t* ratios were computed. The relevant data for the three categories of branch managers has been entered in Table 4.2 to enable group comparison on extroversion.

Table 4.2 reveals that the mean score on extroversion is 14.14, 12.63, and 11.34 for highly effective, moderately effective and less effective managers.
### TABLE 4.2

Group comparison of mean, standard deviation and "t" ratios of three categories of Branch Managers on Extroversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group comparison</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot; ratio</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>Significant at .05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>Significant at .05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>Significant at .001 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. One tail test of significance was used.
respectively. An examination of the data in Table 4.2 indicate that mean score obtained on extroversion by highly effective branch managers is higher than the mean score obtained by moderately effective and by less effective managers. This implies that highly effective managers are scoring high on extroversion as compared to moderately effective and less effective branch managers. Also the data show that mean score on extroversion obtained by moderately effective managers, is higher than that obtained by less effective managers. This implies that moderately effective branch managers are scoring high on extroversion than what less effective ones are scoring on this dimension of personality.

Tests of significance was applied to find out whether the difference between mean scores on extroversion between the three groups namely, highly effective, moderately effective and less effective was significant or otherwise. *t* ratios between two means have been computed and entered in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 reveals that the *t* ratio between highly effective and moderately effective is 1.9, between moderately effective and less effective is 1.7 while between highly effective and less effective is 3.5.
An examination of Table 4.2 indicates that in each case the difference between two mean scores on extroversion is significant at 0.05 level for highly effective and moderately effective, .001 level for highly effective and less effective and at 0.05 level again between moderately effective and less effective managers. This confirms that these scores differed significantly between the three groups.

The data in Table 4.2, therefore, validate the hypothesis that extroversion is positively correlated with effectiveness.

To validate the hypothesis further, a correlational analysis was also done. Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of correlation was calculated between extroversion and effectiveness for the total sample and was entered in Table 4.3.

An examination of Data in Table 4.3 reveals that the value of \( r \) for the total sample is 0.34 which is significant when \( p < 0.05 \). This again confirms the positive relationship between extroversion and effectiveness for the sample of Branch Managers.

It may be interesting to find out whether such an association (between extroversion and effectiveness) exists
Values of Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of correlation between scores on extroversion and scores on effectiveness for the total sample and for each of the three categories of Branch Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Branch Managers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>Significant when p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective group</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>Significant when p = .025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective group</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>Significant when p = .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective group</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>Significant when p = .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in the branch managers in each of the three groups separately, namely, highly effective, moderately effective, and less effective. To find out whether the association exists or otherwise an intra-group correlational analysis has been also done and the data for the same have been entered in Table 4.3.
An examination of data in Table 4.3 reveals that the values of *r* are 0.32, 0.25 and 0.25 for highly effective, moderately effective and less effective groups respectively. When compared with critical values of *r*, it is found that *r* for highly effective group is significant when \( p < 0.025 \) and for both moderately and less effective groups when \( p = 0.05 \). This once again validates the hypothesis that managerial effectiveness is positively related with extroversion at least for the group of branch managers which was focused upon for the present study.

In an attempt to trace out a research evidence supporting or rejecting the results of the present research work, it may be stated that no significant empirical research work could be traced in which performance of managers was correlated with extroversion-introversion dimension of personality. Even while communicating with Eysenck it was clearly conveyed by him that he (Eysenck) was not aware of any similar study where his scale has been used. There has, however, been theoretical research evidence which can be quoted here for gaining support for the present investigation. The results on extroversion and effectiveness derived from the data collected during

\footnote{H.J. Eysenck, "Personal Communication," 1982.}
the present research, confirming the hypothesis framed in the study, are in conformity with the observations made by authors like Hilgard, and Campbell et al. Hilgard\(^{40}\) has stated that an extrovert tends to choose occupations such as sales or promotional work where he deals with people rather than with things. This indicates that extroverts are more interested in such jobs and, thus, are expected to be more effective in these jobs. A bank branch manager, too, has to sell banking to the people. He is to deal with people for promoting banking habits in them (customers) and also he is to get effective customer service from the personnel working in his branch. The results in the present research work, confirming that branch managers with higher extroversion score are more effective and vice versa, therefore, are in agreement with Hilgard's view. Campbell et al.,\(^{41}\) describing extroversion as one of the qualities for effective managers, also support the result of the present research work.

Sociability is one of the main characteristics of Eysenck's extroversion. Dwivedi\(^{42}\) has revealed, on the

\(^{40}\)R.E. Hilgard, *loc. cit.*


basis of empirical data, that sociability is one of the four top-ranking traits considered important by Indian managers. This implies that sociability is one of the top four traits desirable in managers for successful performance. Thus Dwivedi's findings too support the results of the present research study.

In view of the above, it is concluded that statistically significant but low correlation between extroversion and effectiveness, obtained in the present study suggests that extroversion is not the only factor which contributes to the effectiveness of the individual but it does contribute its share to it. It is, therefore, suggested that it would be better if this factor is also taken care of at the time of assignment of responsibilities of a branch manager to a bank officer.

**Neuroticism and effectiveness**

Eysenck, in his attempt to develop a more comprehensive theory of personality, has postulated neuroticism and psychoticism over and above the dimension of extroversion-introversion.

According to Eysenck, neuroticism is expressed chiefly as emotional liability and over-reactivity. He

---

finds that individuals who score high on neuroticism tend to be emotionally over-responsive and have difficulties in returning to a normal state after an emotional experience. They report of having many worries, anxieties and other disagreeable emotional feelings. Such individuals, it is noted, are predisposed to develop neurotic disorder under stress. Such a predisposition, however, is not confused with actual neurotic break down, for a person may have high scores on neuroticism while yet functioning adequately in work, sex, family and social spheres.

Eysenck described the typical high scorer on neuroticism:

as being an anxious, worrying, individual, moody and frequently depressed. He is overly emotional, reacting too strongly to all sorts of stimuli, and finds it difficult to get back on an even keel after each emotionally arousing experience. His strong emotional reactions interfere with his proper adjustment, making him react in irrational, sometimes rigid ways.

In view of the above characteristics of neuroticism, it can be said that to be an effective branch manager of a commercial bank, an individual, as discussed in an earlier chapter, has to be sociable, calm and stable. He should be optimally optimistic in approach. These are lacking in

---

44 Ibid.
an individual who scores high on Eysenck's neuroticism scale. It is, therefore, hypothesised that individuals who have a low score on neuroticism would be more effective managers than those who score high on neuroticism.

To test this statement the mean of scores on neuroticism obtained by three groups of respondents, namely, highly effective, moderately effective and less effective, have been compared. Test of significance of the difference between two means is applied and *t* ratios have been computed. The relevant data for three categories of branch managers have been entered in Table 4.4 to enable group comparison on neuroticism. To validate the results further the coefficients of correlation between neuroticism and effectiveness have been worked out for the entire sample as well as for each of the three groups separately and have been shown in Table 4.5. An examination of data in Table 4.4 clearly shows that highly effective managers are significantly less emotional than moderately or less effective managers. The mean scores on neuroticism, as depicted in Table 4.4 are 6.76, 8.64 and 8.75 for highly effective group, moderately effective group and less effective group respectively. This shows that the tendency to score low on neuroticism scale is as predicted, in as much as the mean score of highly effective group is lower
### Table 4.4

Group comparison of mean, standard deviations and "t*" ratios of three categories of branch managers on neuroticism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group comparison</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>&quot;t*&quot; value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Significant at .025 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>Significant at .05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B.: One tail test of significance was used.
than that of moderately effective group of managers whose mean score in turn is slightly lower than less effective managers. This trend is as hypothesized. Table 4.4. further reveals that the difference between mean scores on neuroticism is significant between highly effective and moderately effective groups when \( p = 0.025 \) and between highly effective and less effective groups when \( p = 0.05 \). Sartain, using EPI of good and poor supervisors, also found good supervisors to be less neurotic than poor supervisors although the difference between two means was insignificant. The coefficient of correlation between neuroticism and effectiveness of branch managers for the entire sample \( (n = 150) \) as given in Table 4.5, is \(-0.16\). This too supports the same conjecture, that is, this inverse relationship suggests that those who are high on neuroticism are likely to be less effective in the performance of the job of a branch manager and vice versa. This was expected as well. A high scoring individual on neuroticism is highly tense, worries for anything and everything. Such an individual is not only unstable but an exaggerator of little things. Such a person would find it difficult to establish warm relationship with his superiors, subordinates and with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Branch Managers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$r^*$ values</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Significant at p = .025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective group</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective group</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective group</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
people in general. He may also find it difficult to concentrate on specific work related activities. Fisher and Henna observed that a large part of vocational maladjustment and industrial unrest are secondary to, and a reflection on emotional adjustment. It is very likely that when everything is going on smoothly, the emotionally stable and the unstable make little difference on the job. However, when the situations are stressful or difficult, petty annoyances take on major significance. It may be said that the individual reacts to these situations in proportion to his stability. The value of coefficient of correlation which is -0.16, for the total sample (n = 150) in the study, therefore, confirms to some extent that neuroticism/emotionality is negatively correlated with effectiveness. Chiselli and Barthol arrived at a similar conclusion. They found that high-rated supervisors do not see themselves to be nervous and unstable. However, when correlation between neuroticism/emotionality and effectiveness was examined for the three groups of branch managers namely highly effective, moderately effective and less effective, separately, the


significance of correlation vanished. The range of coefficient of correlation, as depicted in Table 4.5, is 0.07 to -0.15. The explanation for this phenomenon is not far to seek. It is a statistical fact that the value of coefficient of correlation depends upon at least two things:

a) Range of the score,
b) Number of subjects in the study group.

When the correlation between the two variables, namely neuroticism and effectiveness, was calculated separately for the three groups, the number of respondents was reduced in each group and range of scores narrowed causing disappearance of the significance of correlation.

There have been a number of studies in the literature where correlation between effectiveness and emotionality/neuroticism/anxiety has been demonstrated to be in the range of 0.000 to -0.21. The significance of correlation, depending upon the size of the sample, has been varying from significant to insignificant. Vanita commented that the variables of neurotic tendency and supervisory effectiveness were not significantly related.

—Vanita, loc. cit.
with each other in any of the two groups of subjects and the value of coefficient of correlation varied in two groups from 0.00 to -0.21 (not significant). Sartain also obtained an insignificant correlation of -0.11 in one study and -0.12 in another study when the correlation between neuroticism scores of good and poor supervisors was worked out.

Looking at the above studies, it is clear that the results of the present study are in no way different from the reported finding by others. There has, however, been one striking difference: the correlation -0.16 was found to be significant in the present study whereas the correlation -0.21 reported by Vanita failed to reach the level of significance. The reasons for this have already been mentioned earlier. It is that the significance of correlation depends upon the number of respondents included for the purpose. In spite of the fact that the results are significant in the present study, it remains very low and no worthwhile generalisation can be made. The literature as cited above does agree that mean of neuroticism score of more effective workers is always lower than that of less...

49 Sartain, loc. cit.
50 Vanita, loc. cit.
effective workers but it does not find it to reach 
significant level. While offering this type of 
conclusion most of them seem to have forgotten the fact 
that the trend has been significant in their studies as 
well, for it does not change from study to study. It 
could, thus, be safely concluded as significant for the 
obtained results. While interpreting it as insignificant, 
they might be more concerned with the practicability of 
the results rather than its theoretical implications. In 
the present study, the trend is much more apparent that 
the highly effective group of individuals have obtained 
the lowest mean score on neuroticism whereas the less 
effective group has obtained the highest mean score 
putting moderately effective group of managers inbetween.

It can, therefore, be concluded that though the 
effectiveness of branch managers is inversely related to 
neuroticism score on Eysenck Personality Questionnaire 
yet the practical implication of the results are minimum 
because of very low level of association between the two 
variables. This fact, however, can be taken care while 
selecting the officers for the post of branch managers for 
better performance of the branches which are the 
operational units of commercial banks in India.
Psychoticism and effectiveness

It has already been stated earlier that Eysenck postulated psychoticism dimension of personality in an attempt to develop a more comprehensive theory of personality. It is a comparatively exploratory dimension in studies like the present one.

According to Eysenck, an individual may score high or low on this dimension of personality. A high scorer, he says, is solitary, not caring for people, troublesome, cruel, inhuman, lacking in feeling and empathy, insensitive and not fitting anywhere. Therefore, in view of the demands put on today's commercial bank branch manager the characteristics of psychoticism, as described by Eysenck, are opposed to the qualities which a branch manager should possess for an effective working performance. A manager, along with many other qualities as discussed in an earlier chapter, has to be sociable and cooperative. It can, therefore, be hypothesized that a more effective branch manager would score low on psychoticism and vice versa.

It may be recalled here that for the purpose of this study the branch managers constituting the sample

---

were divided, on the basis of their effectiveness scores, in the following three categories:

1. Highly effective branch managers: Those whose effectiveness score was 124 points or above.
2. Moderately effective branch managers: All those with effectiveness score less than 124 points but more than 106 points.
3. Less effective branch managers: All those branch managers whose effectiveness score was 106 points or less.

To test the hypothesis stated above the mean of psychoticism scores for these three categories of branch managers were compared. Test of significance was applied to see if the difference between two mean scores on psychoticism for each of the two categories stated above was significant or otherwise. With this view "t" ratios were computed and have been entered in Table 4.6. To validate the results further the coefficient of correlation between psychoticism and effectiveness has been worked out for the entire sample as well as for each of the three groups separately and the same have been shown in Table 4.7.
TABLE 4.6

Group comparison of mean, standard deviations and *t* ratios of three categories of branch managers on psychoticism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group comparison</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th><em>t</em> value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B.: One tail test of significance was used.
As depicted in Table 4.6, the mean score on psychoticism for highly effective, moderately effective and less effective groups is 4.04, 4.79 and 4.58 respectively. On examination of the data in Table 4.6, one would observe that mean scores on psychoticism gave no clear direction of association between psychoticism and effectiveness. But in view of the objectives of the study, relative effectiveness of the branch managers is the main focus of study. It may be recalled that there being no branch manager in the ineffective category the categorisation was done on the basis of relativity of effectiveness. It was, therefore, desirable to compare the psychoticism scores of highly effective and less effective groups of branch managers because branch managers in moderately effective categories are nearer either to the highly effective group or less effective group. Mean scores on psychoticism as depicted in Table 4.6 indicate that highly effective group of managers scored low on psychoticism than the less effective group.

Test of significance was, then, applied to see if the difference between the mean scores on psychoticism was significant or otherwise. *t* ratios were computed and have been entered in Table 4.6.

An examination of the data in Table 4.6 reveals that difference between mean scores on psychoticism of
none of the three groups of comparison is statistically significant. It is, however, argued that if the phenomenon created due to the lower mean score of highly effective category than that of less effective category has any relevance, there should be a negative association between psychoticism and effectiveness, that is, the lesser the score on psychoticism, higher would be the effectiveness score that the branch manager obtains and vice versa.

To test the above statement and look for an evidence of association or disassociation, a correlational analysis was done. The value of coefficient of correlation between psychoticism and effectiveness of branch managers for the total sample as well as for three groups separately was worked out. The relevant data have been entered in Table 4.7.

It is evident from the correlational analysis of the data regarding psychoticism and effectiveness that the value of $r$ in each of the four cases, viz., total sample and three groups separately, is insignificant. This establishes that there appears to be no relationship between psychoticism and effectiveness. However, looking at the negative value of correlation coefficient in all the four cases and the low mean score on psychoticism of highly effective group as compared to that of less
TABLE 4.7

Values of Pearson's Product Moment Coefficient of correlation between scores on psychoticism and scores on effectiveness for the total sample and for each of the three categories of Branch Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Branch Managers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective group</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective group</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective group</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

effective group, as depicted in Table 4.7 and 4.6 respectively, it can, at the most, be said that there is some trend in the predicted direction, that is, branch managers with higher effectiveness would score low on psychoticism and vice versa, but it could not be confirmed statistically.

The weakness of the data to bring about any significance of association between psychoticism and
effectiveness can be attributed to the following factors involved in the study:

It may be recalled that the branch managers, forming the sample for the present study, were all effective managers and they were categorised on the basis of the degree of their effectiveness into the following three groups namely highly effective, moderately effective and less effective. It may be noted here that there is no ineffective category as none of the branch managers was ineffective, a fact that was expected as well. The selection and placement procedures of the public sector commercial banks such positions as of branch managers leave little scope for the selection of ineffective personnel as branch managers. It may be useful here to recollect that in the present study the focus is upon middle management level in banks. Officers in this cadre come from junior management on seniority-cum-merit basis. Also the officers from various cadres of management are placed on various jobs meant for them in branches as well as in Head Offices. It is the quality of performance on a job which generally determines the stay of an official on a job in general and on a branch manager's job in particular.

Secondly, the peculiar feature of data on psychoticism is its group mean score. The value of sample
mean on psychoticism comes to 4.52 which is too low keeping in view the minimum and maximum score of 0 and 25 respectively that a respondent could obtain on psychoticism. This low mean was not unexpected because the focus in the present study is on branch managers who are normal and non-pathological. The branch managers who acted as respondents for this scale were expected to be normals and non-pathological as no abnormal and pathological individual can be placed on a job like a branch manager's. An analysis of psychoticism scores revealed that 135 of the 150, that is, 90 per cent of the branch managers were scoring 7 or below and the number of respondents scoring 3 or below was 68. Thus, it is evident that respondents in the sample are normals and non-pathological.

In view of the above, it can be said that the peculiar features revealed by the data in the study are the absence of the ineffective category of branch managers and the range of scores on psychoticism. These features could be attributed to insignificant relationship between psychoticism and effectiveness found during the analysis of the data on these two variables. It is just possible that if all the officers of the same rank working in any capacity in the commercial banks are taken randomly, the trend observed in the study might become statistically
significant also. This, however, needs to be substantiated by future researchers.

**SUMMARY**

The chapter was devoted to a brief study of the concept of *personality* and an operational definition of the term *personality.* The concepts of *trait* and *type* having been briefly discussed, the rationale for adopting the type concept of personality in the present study was given. Then there was a brief description of the instrument used to measure personality dimensions. This was followed by an enunciation of the characteristics of three personality dimensions of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire - extroversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism. Then, the chapter examined the association between extroversion and effectiveness, neuroticism and effectiveness and between psychoticism and effectiveness on the basis of data collected during the study and partly substantiated the hypotheses laid down in the beginning of the chapter.