CHAPTER –V
FINDINGS &
CONCLUSION
Findings

The researcher in this study on "A Study on Persona Type and its impact on Managerial Output with special reference to BPO Sector" 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 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 76 managers belonging to personality type ESTJ, there were 7 Senior managers, 23 Middle managers and 46 Junior managers. The least represented among the sixteen types are INTJ with 2 Senior managers, 7 Middle managers and 8 Junior managers.

----- In ESTJ 9.2% of the managers are in the Senior level, 30.2% are in the Middle level and 60.5% are in the Junior level. ESTJ representation increases as we go from Senior to Junior level.

----- It could be seen that 27.5% of the Senior managers have cast their preference as "Thinking -Judging". The four types that have "Thinking -Judging" preferences are ESTJ,ENTJ,ISTJ, and INTJ 29.8% of Senior managers, 14.2% of Middle managers and 12.5% of Junior managers were "Thinking- Perceiving" types (ESTP, ENTP, INTP, ISTP), Feeling- Perceiving " types (ESTP,ENFP,INFP,ISFP), were 29.8% Senior managers, 34.9% among middle managers and 29.6% among Junior managers "Feeling -Judging " types (ESFJ,ENFJ,INFJ,ISFJ.), were found to be 16.9% among Senior managers, 21.11% among middle managers and 12.5% 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 37.9% of Senior managers, 30.5% of middle managers and 30.9% of Junior managers were good performers. In Senior managers there were lesser number of managers in the medium (34.4%) and low (27.5%) performance levels. It was found that there was a higher percentage of managers in the medium performing category (49.2%) among middle managers 20.1% of the middle managers were low performers. 42.9% of Junior managers were medium performers and 25.2% 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 + 405.393 With 6 df and significance 0.024. The likelihood ratio Chi-square is also significantly high. The Eta coefficient was 0.526 so 47% of variability in Performance of managers is explained by MBTI Personality Types.

------ The Nagelkerke R2 shows that 52.6% of the variation. In the outcome variable that is 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 TJ being a low performer.

------TJs have greater probability of being a high performer than a low performer.

----- Personality type TJ is (expB) that is 5.703X10(-3) times more likely than 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 the three managerial levels.

For Senior managers

----Eta coefficient for senior managers was 0.555 so 45.5% of variability in Performance of managers is explained by MBTI personality types among Senior managers.

---- The Pseudo R Square measure indicated that 47.1% of the variability in performance in Senior managers is explained be personality types.
------ It is Exp(B) that is 1.24X10(15) times more unlikely for TJs to be low performers among Senior managers.

**For Middle managers**

---- Eta coefficient for Middle managers was 0.221 so 77.8% of variability in Performance of managers is explained by MBTI personality types among Middle managers.

---- The Pseudo R Square measure indicated that 62.4% of the variability in performance in Middle managers is explained by personality types.

------ It is Exp(B) that is 3.125 X10(14) times more unlikely for TJs to be low performers among Middle managers.

**For Junior managers**

---- Eta coefficient for Junior managers was 0.78 so 22.4% of variability in Performance of managers is explained by MBTI personality types among Junior managers.

---- The Pseudo R Square measure indicated that 88.6% of the variability in performance in Junior managers is explained by personality types.

------ It is Exp(B) that is 1.11 x 10(13) times more unlikely for TJs to be low performers among Junior managers.

Thinking Judging type was to be high performers and the hypothesis that those managers with "Thinking Judging" in their personality types show high performers 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 463.022 with 6df and highly significant.

The likelihood ratio chi-square was also highly significant.

---- The Eta coefficient was 0.684; therefore nearly 31.6% of variability in Performance was explained by MBTI types.

---- The Pseudo R2 measure -Nagelkerke shows that 57.7% 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 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 + 323.287 with 4 df. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.

---- The Eta coefficient is 0.599 and hence it was understood that 45% of variability in Performance of manager is explained by Assertiveness.

----- Pseudo R -Square shows that 44.9% 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 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 44.108. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.

The Eta coefficient is 0.417 and hence it was understood that 69% of variability in Performance of managers is explained by Assertiveness.

Pseudo R - square shows that 43.1% 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) 13.05 times likely to be a low performer than high performer.

For Middle managers

The null hypothesis that the variables of performance and assertiveness are independent is rejected since Pearson chi – square 114.841. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.

The Eta coefficient is 0.579 and hence it was understood that 43.1% of variability in Performance of Middle managers is explained by Assertiveness.

Pseudo R - square shows that 46.8% of the variation 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) 146.08 times likely to be a low performer than high performer.
For Junior managers

The null hypothesis that the variables of performance and assertiveness are independent is rejected since Pearson chi – square 194.499. The Likelihood ratio chi- square is also highly significant.

The Eta coefficient is 0.683 and hence it was understood that 35% of variability in Performance of Junior managers is explained by Assertiveness.

Pseudo R - square shows that 53.4% of the variation 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 396.0 Likely to be a low performer than high performer.

The hypotheses 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 of personality types and performance are independent is rejected since Pearson chi – square +236.341 with 6 df. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.

The Eta coefficient is 0.579 and hence 32.1% of the variability in Assertive level of managers is explained by MBTI Personality Types.

Pseudo R - square is .385 which indicates that 38.5% 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 188.237 times more likely than FJ, FP, and TP to be high in assertiveness than to be low in assertiveness.

For Senior managers

The null hypothesis that the variables of personality types and performance are independent is rejected since Pearson chi – square 49.083 with 6 df. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.

The Eta coefficient is 0.639 and hence 42.1% of the variability in Assertive level of managers is explained by MBTI Personality Types.

Pseudo R - square is 0.514 which indicates that 51.4 of the variability in assertiveness is due to the influence of personality types.

For Middle managers

The null hypothesis that the variables of personality types and assertiveness among middle managers are independent is rejected since Pearson chi – square 109.906 with 6 df. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant.

The Eta coefficient is 0.556 and hence 44% of the variability in Assertive level of managers is explained by MBTI Personality Types in Middle managers.

Pseudo R - square is .375 which indicates that 37.5% of the variability in assertiveness is due to the influence of personality types in middle managers.
For Junior managers

The null hypothesis that the variables of personality types and assertiveness among Junior managers are independent is rejected since Pearson chi–square 142.59 with 6 df. The Likelihood ratio chi-square is also highly significant in Junior managers.

The Eta coefficient is 0.566 and hence 44.4% of the variability in Assertive level of managers is explained by MBTI Personality Types in Junior managers.

Pseudo R - square is .488 which indicates that 48.8% of the variability in assertiveness is due to the influence of personality types in Junior managers.

TJs are more likely than FJ,FP and TP to be high in assertiveness as compared to being low in assertiveness. A TJ manager is 4.9 X 10(17) 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 42.6% of those managers were high performers, 30.6% of Post graduates holders were low performers.

---- The significance value of Chi-square statistic is 21.354 which are much greater than 0.05 Showing that the performance of mangers is the same irrespective of the qualification they possess which is significant at 1%.

---- Among the senior managers, 36.80% of the post- graduates managers were high performers and 36.80% were low performers. Among the professional degree holders 41.17% of the managers were medium performers.

---- The significance value of Chi-square statistic is 1.1802 showing that the performance of senior managers is not associated to the qualification they possess and hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

----- Among the middle managers, 49% of the diploma holders were high performers and 63.9% of the post graduates were low performers 63% of non-graduate degree holders were medium performers.

----- The significance value of chi-square statistic is 25.381, which is significant at 1% showing that the performance of middle managers is not associated to the qualification they possess.

----- Among the junior managers 37.8% of the professional degree holders and 24.10% of them were low performers, 62.2% of graduates were found to be medium performers.

----- The significance value of chi-square statistic is 10.909 Showing that there is no significant relationship between performance of managers and their qualification in the junior managerial level and hence the null hypothesis is accepted.
Age and Performance level of Managers

--- 37.30% of the managers in the age group 30 to 35 years were high performers and the 50.46% managers from the age group 40 to 45 were medium performers, 31.81% of the managers in 25 to 30 years were in the low performance category.

The significance value of chi-square statistic is 12.135 which is much greater than 0.005 showing that the performance of Managers is not associated to the Age they fall. So the conclusion is to accept the Null Hypothesis.

In the senior manager category 41.11% were in the age category 40 to 45 were high performers, 38.88% of the medium performers were 30 to 35 years and, 42.10% of the low performers were in 35 to 40 age range.

The significance value of chi-square statistic is 1.701 which disapproves dependence of the variables of age and performance among senior managers. The significance value of Chi-Square statistic is 1.701 showing that the performance of Senior Managers is not associated to the Age they fall. So the conclusion is to accept the Null Hypothesis.

68.57% of the high performers among middle managers were in the age group of 45 to 50 years, 29.41% of the medium performers were in the 35 to 40 Age group, 46.80% of the low performers were 40 to 45 age group. Only 14.28% of middle managers in the 45 To 50 Years category were low performers.

The significance value of chi-square statistic is 19.326 which support the null hypothesis of the table variables - age and performance among middle managers showing that the performance of Middle Managers is not associated to the Age they fall. So the conclusion is that the result is significant at the 5% Level.

40.81% of the low performers in the junior managerial category were in the 25 to 30 Age group and 75.86% of the managers in the middle age group 40 to 45 and 26.53% age group 25 to 30 high performers.

The significance value of chi-square statistic is 33.262 which show that the table variables - age and performance are independent in Junior managers. (Showing that the
performance of Junior Managers is not associated to the Age they fall). So the conclusion is that the result is significant at the 1% Level.

Upbringing and performance

--- The significance value of chi-square statistic is 15.838 which is much greater than 0.005 showing the performance of managers is the same irrespective of their upbringing. The hypothesis that performance of managers is dependent on the socio-demographic variables like age, educational qualification and upbringing is disproved.
**Recommendations**

1. One of the conclusive finding of the research is that among the all levels of managers there is the overrepresentation of managers that prefer the combination of Thinking and Judging in the MBTI personality types and Assertiveness.

2. As Thinking and Judging types are much prominent in organizational leadership and it appears that Thinking and Judging have been accepted as norm in to definition of what it means to lead and therefore people displaying these behaviors are seen as “Leadership”. While other styles of leadership fails to be a part of Leadership as they do not fit to the standard definition.

3. Whatever the possible causes for this phenomenon but however it appears that we are interacting with a majority of TJs. It is for the reason the organizations have to understand the TJ leadership style.

4. As according to the type theory people are most effective when they have developed their own natural style and then learned to use non-preferred areas as appropriate as such based on such lines hence we do say that TJs skills are supported and encouraged by their environment which they may not have valued or developed their own natural style of leadership.

5. Similarly for those leaders who are not TJs, this development of their natural way of leading may not have been occurred as organizational cultures in which they work may not have supported such development.

6. This remains an awesome challenge for Human Resources Department and the top brass when they draw about a developmental plan for the managers as such.”Thinking - Judging Strengths and weaknesses as leaders - Research and practice” (Barger & Kirby, 1995) have identified a number of components of TJ leadership style.
7. It is well do to remember that these are characteristics of TJs groups, and individual leaders with those preferences may vary on any number of these qualities and behavior.

8. The another way of looking at this one being major conclusion drawn at TJs is by acknowledging that the type theory adopted in this study is dynamic and development oriented and emphasis that all 16 types have their strengths and gives a pool of information on the developmental components in each personality type.

9. Each personality 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. The dominant function is the favorite mental process and forms the core identity of one's personality.

10. Type development is the area which most managers' neglect, when one needs to nurture the dominant function so the auxiliary function should also be developed. With each personality type has a potential area for growth detailed in this chapter.

11. The team members in each department should be selected to set the specific goal they ought to play. In this particular selection perhaps a change of organization role may be found effective in transforming the low performers to high performers.

12. Strengths in Leadership with Thinking - Judging
   a) It focuses on creating Logical order and structures in the organization and its processes.
   b) It focuses on achieving organizational goals.
   c) It uses logical reasoning to quickly analyze problems.
   d) They are often decisive in making decisions with a quick confidence.
   e) It emphasis on efficiency.
   f) They value competence, set high standards for themselves and others.
   g) They move to implement decisions with quick confidence.
Suggestions

Fitzgerald and Kirby (1997) offer suggestions for using dynamics and development in leadership management in leadership Development and executive coaching. The following Is a brief summary

1. Analyze the impact of the function and is Extraverted. For example, managers who exert 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.

2. Analyze the impact of the function that is Introverted. For example managers that exert introvert their perceiving function may want to learn how to give others the information they have inside that has guided their Extraverted decisions.

3. 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.

4. Explore the relative emphasis on the outside world, Extroverting, 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.

5. The importance of assertiveness in organizations I swell sketched in this research study. Some people confuse assertiveness with aggression, and think that to assert one is to stand ones ground and argue a point without compromise. However, being assertive means communicating yours needs, feelings, wants, opinions and beliefs to others in a direct and honest manner without hurting anyone's feelings.

6. While 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 work relationships. Assertiveness is a skill that anyone can learn. These are a few learning points.

7. Despite your best efforts to be direct and calm, the other person will sometimes behave like you are having an argument and want to shout and criticize.
8. Practical suggestions include--
- Tell the person you will 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 behavior.
- 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.

9. Contract 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.

10. Explore the impact of leader's 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.

11. Discuss emergence of the non- preferred functions at middle and beyond. For example, for dominants extraverted intuitive, what does an emerging introverted sensing look like?

12. Analyze leader's 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 as work to contribute to 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.

13. When you disagree with someone do not show agreements 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.

14. 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.

15. 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 monopolies conversations, but do not hesitate to bring them around to yourself when it is appropriate.
16. While asserting oneself, suggestion 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.
**Conclusion**

One should try to keep subjectivity as far as possible while assessing the Managerial performance. The samples in this study were classified according to their levels of performance in their own organizational setting.

The major conclusions of this study were-

1. There are lesser number of low performers at Senior level category.
2. ESTJs are the most represented among the 16 personality types.
3. Only 6 Personality types are observed to be high performers viz. ESTJs, ENTJs, ISTJs, INTJs, ESTPs, ENTPs.
4. Managers who exhibited high level of assertiveness were high in performance.
5. Only 6 types out of the 16 types were high levels of assertiveness they were- ESTJs, ENTJs, INTJs, ESTPs, ENTPs.
6. Socio-Demographic variables like age, educational qualification and upbringing do not have any association with the performance of managers.
Scope for Further Research Studies

Research studies using qualitative research methodology can also be adopted to find out the association between the variables selected in this study. Only International BPOs are studied, further research can be conducted with regard to Domestic and International comparison of such BPOs sector which is fastly becoming a outsourcing sector in our country. As an extension of this study the personality profile required for effective and successful managers in each function in an organization 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.