CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

"Necessity is the mother of invention." The meaning of above mentioned saying is woven in today's many industrial organizations. According to an English proverb, "Rome was not built in a day." Similarly these organizations didn't emerge to their current positions within a wink of an eye. There are a number of reasons, which enforce organizations to expand beyond their boundaries. Previously organizations were limited within their local geographic area and then they expanded somewhat but were still restricted within the country. Quite recently, many of them have expanded to the international level. In the last decade, Indian Government has opened avenues for foreign companies to invest in India as a part of economic globalization. Very recently (e.g., in January 2005), the government of Gujarat initiated efforts and created events to invite the international investors to the vibrant Gujarat.

In this era of globalization, the business and industrial environment is getting more and more complex with time. These complexities come from multiple factors like uncertainty in which the business and industry operate, shifting consumer tastes as well as preferences and a rise in people's consciousness about quality of products and services. The fast growing technology has brought revolutionary changes in which operating the business or production successfully, requires lot more changes in the organizations particularly in the field of human resources and manpower, along with the managerial functions.
Majority of the work in this age takes place within the context of structured organization. Organization typically is the joint function of financial resources, materials or equipments and human resources in order to achieve the set-goals. Each of these elements is critically important for the success of the organization. During the gradual shift from traditional management to scientific management, it has been identified that the effective use of human resources and skillful management are the biggest assets to an organization. Thus, in today's scientific management era, the roles of administrators, directors, managers, the working employees, labourers and all others become very important. These are the people who represent the most important resource to business and industry because it is actually they who run the business or industry.

Even though all of the aforementioned individual personnels are important, the key to a successful management is teamwork. Thus, the leader of the team, the manager, is a very important person who plays a key role to achieve desired goals. A manager is the most important entity, whose prime responsibilities include planning, delegating and monitoring. He is the one who guides and motivates the others so as to get maximum output from them. He is also an important link between top management (Directors, Chairman etc.) and bottom level management (workers, labourers etc.).
The managerial profession is one of the most challenging and competitive professions and requires highest level of intelligence and aptitudes relevant to the nature of their work. In the present research the measurement and credential about the assessment of cognitive factors and at the same time performance are not included but it is assumed to be existing in the managers since they have attended the master degree in the field of management or in related fields. They are also working in reputed institutes so the focus is made on the non-cognitive aspects of personality, which serves the purpose of intervening variable between the cognitive abilities on one hand and the performance on other hand. The researcher is interested in studying the non-cognitive personality factors in general in terms of over all personality profile. In addition to that sex-role orientation and locus of control is also included in the study as the specific aspect of personality, which is relatively more relevant and recent in the field of research.

EMERGENCE OF THE RESEARCH

With the advancement in technology and emergence of computerized management information systems, the traditional business, which was called “Brick and Mortar” business, has shifted to “e-business”. The gradual shifting of traditional and conservative concept of the management towards scientific concept of management has opened the avenues of great research potential in the part of psychological research. Being the central focus of the whole organization, the
manager is a focused person in the recent era. Apart from the formal training of the manager and qualifications, the relative importance of personality predisposition is highly recognized in the recent years. The personality orientation makes the training and background of the manager more applicable, meaningful & fruitful.

The proposed research has emerged from the above background as an attempt to study the personality of managers in general along with most relevant traits in particular; those are locus of control & sex-role orientation.

Looking to the personality of people working in the same profession there may be lots of individual differences and diversity as each of them is unique as an individual, but there may be some similarities and generalities related to the particular profession. This may be a predisposition for selecting a particular profession or may be the effect of working in a particular role. The present research is trying to trace the some common pattern of personality of managers and also some differences in various groups and sub groups under consideration.
MANAGERIAL ROLES AND FUNCTIONS

Manager is a key person in every organization. The word manager is derived from the French word ‘La main’, which conveys handling and manipulating. Manager means, one who manages a person, who controls a business, play a key role in planning, organizing, coordinating, supervising, motivating and controlling the various resources such as men, machines and money to achieve the desired goals. It is his responsibility to ensure that the structure of the organization is consistent with advancement of the prevailing technology and changing environment.

Henry Mintzberg often quoted that managerial behaviour can be described in terms of managerial roles. A managerial role is a set of expectations for managerial behaviour. Mintzbery listed three groups of managerial role and ten specific managerial roles. These roles prepared a road map for expected managerial situations, which is shown below in diagram 1.1.
In above given chart it can be seen that for an organization, managers are the most crucial entity in today's complex and fast changing society. Managers play several roles at a time for the upliftment of an organization.
Manager is a person who can make or break the organization with his/her interpersonal skills, an eye for opportunities and future prospects and ability to perceive customer needs & wants. This makes them the driving force of the organization.

There are various types of managers. Each one has different roles & responsibilities based on which various designations are given to them. This is discussed in detail in following section.

**TYPE OF MANAGERS:**

Since disparity exists in nomenclature of the designations of managers in the three sectors, private, government and semi-government organizations of the industry, the managers have been broadly classified according to the nature of supervision; the power they exercise over their subordinates. These level are categorized as follows:

1. **LOWER (FIRST) LEVEL**

   The managers, who are directly in touch with the workers, supervising the work force in non-management cadre, have been categorized as lower (first) level management or line managers. They take day-to-day decision.
2. **MIDDLE (SECOND) LEVEL**

The managers supervising the lower level managers (not directly controlling the workforce, forming a link between “Think Tank” and execution of the job) have been categorized as middle level managers. Short-term decisions are made by them.

3. **TOP (THIRD) LEVEL**

The managers, who supervise the middle level managers as well as serve as “Think Tank” of the organization have been categorized as top-level managers. They are involved in preparing long-term strategy.

On each level there are various types of managers. The following chart shows that what types of managers are included at each level. The following diagram shows various positions that are included in each management level, i.e. top, middle and lower.
Above drawn chart is showing that there are different kinds of managers designated in the large organization to look after different activities although their type of work is different but the goal of each one is to perform for the benefit & upliftment of the organization.

To a certain extent, performance of a person is attributed to his personality. In the present research study, researcher tried to find out the personality factors of different managers and it's relation to sex-role orientation & locus of control. In the next topic, personality, sex-role, locus of control is discussed.
PERSONALITY

Each person is unique. Every human being possesses the quality of individuality. People are different in many respects in appearance, background, education, training, experience, interests and abilities. Different hereditary factors, environment, early childhood experiences and experiences through life and interaction with people makes his/her personality unique than another human being.

The term 'personality' has been derived from Latin word 'persona' which means "to speak through". This Latin term denotes the masks, which the actors used to wear in the drama, in ancient Greece and Rome.

Over the years, the psychology literature has generated countless definitions of personality. They range from the conceptualisation of personality as more or less stable and enduring organization of a person's character (Guilford 1959 p.2; Eysenck, 1953), to thinking of personality as the individual's adjustment or adaptation to the social environment (Kempt, 1919; Floyd Allport, 1924).

Mortion Prince's (1924) reconciles both of these views and states: "personality is the sum total of all the biological innate dispositions, impulses, tendencies, appetites and instincts of the individual and the acquired dispositions and tendencies."

Interestingly, behaviourists such as Watson (1930) and Donal Heble (1960) focused on the objective method in defining personality and included only activities that can be discovered by actual observations.
of behaviour. In contrast, the great humanistic theorist Carl Rogers viewed personality in terms of "an organized, permanent, subjectively received entity, which is at the very heart of all our experiences."

Finally, according to Gordon Allport, (1948 p.48) "Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment. The distinctive patterns of behaviour (including thoughts and emotions), that characterizes each individual's adaptation to the situations to his or her life." This definition by Allport is considered the most comprehensive conceptualisation of personality that has been widely accepted.

Since this research utilizes Cattell's 16 personality factors inventory as a measure of personality, it is important to include Cattell's definition here. Cattell (1950 p.2-3) STATES: "Personality is, that which permits prediction of what a person will do in a given situation. Personality is concerned with all the behaviour of the individual both overt and under the skin." Thus, Cattell has given importance to factors that are internal as well as external of a person.

In sum, in aforementioned definitions, different theorists tried to define personality in different ways depending upon the theoretical ground with which they are related to. The range of definition is as wider as theories. Given this wide range, it can be concluded that it is difficult to define personality, as it is a scientific abstraction. Just by
saying that personality cannot be observed directly, one cannot take it out of the realm of science.

Many psychologists developed different theories about personality and with the help of these theories they can predict how a person will behave, if situated in certain type of environment. The value of the theory is indicated mainly by its success in predicting the person's behaviour.

**IMPORTANCE OF PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS IN MANAGER**

Personality influences every aspect of our behaviour. Nowhere is this more true than in the work place. From childhood to retirement personality helps to determine how we relate to others, how we approach our work, the level of motivation, ambition, life goals, our responses to rules and regulations, effective teaching and effective leadership all depends upon understanding personality in others and in ourselves.

Personality factors are extremely important in organizational settings. It is widely accepted that people's personality can influence their work performance and their adjustments to jobs. Hence one could expect that individual with certain personality patterns might be more inclined to work for certain types of jobs and that once on such jobs they would adjust better to them and perhaps gain greater satisfaction
from job than people with other pattern.

Job and work performance is a deciding factor for any profession or business. Individual personality has a great influence on his/her performance. Perhaps people who have shown certain personality traits will be more motivated to perform better in particular jobs. Even success of a person is also attributed to personality to a large extent.

**LOCUS OF CONTROL**

Locus of control is regarded as a personality construct, which reflects the individual's perception of the place or events and degree of personal control that he has over the reinforcements following his behaviour.

There are two contrasting attitudes regarding the way rewards and outcomes are determined. Some people believe that we can neither predict nor influence significant events whereas others believe that we can do both. The concept is based on the extent to which people perceive contingencies to affect outcomes. Individuals who have a low perception of such contingencies are said to have an internal locus of control; they believe that their actions produce outcomes. Those who have high perception of contingencies are characterized by an external locus of control; they believe that outcomes are the result of chance, fate, and luck rather than of their own actions.
Internal and external locus of control is represented by the terms internality and externality respectively. Similarly, people with high internality are called internals while those with high externality are called externals.

The concept of locus of control is derived from a part of social learning theory (Rotter 1966), which holds that most behaviour is learned in a social situation and is fused with needs that are largely satisfied through other people; predicted on the basis of his values, his expectations and situations in which he finds himself. Rotter defines locus of control by saying, “when a reinforcement is perceived by the individual as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, it is typically perceived as a result of luck, fate, chance or other powerful control or as unpredictable as the forces surrounding him.

According to Rotter (1966 p.1) people acquire generalized expectancies to perceive reinforcing events either as dependent upon their own behaviour or as being beyond their control. Internal oriented people tend to believe that reinforces are subject to their own control and occur as a result of displaying their skills. Externals in contrast see little or no connection between their behaviour and various reinforces, instead they perceive the occurrence of the reinforces as being determined by chance, fate, luck or powerful others.
Phares (1957) demonstrated that perception of locus of control by a subject was related to his expectancies about success or failure in an assessment task.

Strickland (1977) has concluded that beliefs are related to a number of aspects of emotional and psychological well-being, ranging from preventive to remedial health care.

Valecha and others (1980) have considered, locus of control as related to a number of variables. For example, they considered striving for superiority, competence, personal causation and anomie as the main constituents of locus of control belief.

Thus the I-E dimension is considered as an expectancy variable within a social learning model which basically describes behaviour as a function of expectancies, reinforcement and the impact of psychological situations (Rotter 1954, 1966 Rotter, chance and phrase 1972).

Some of the important personality factors that determine what kind of behaviour are exhibited at work; locus of control is one of them. Locus of control orientation is reflected in the way a person views what happens in organization; that is, how much control the person believes that he or she has in important organizational matters, how much control others, and to what degree the person believes events are a matter of luck.
Locus of control also influences the attribution one makes about the reasons for success and failure. It was found that internals believed that their failures were due to their own lack of ability or effort (Phares, 1976). Externals, though, felt that their failures were due to task difficulty or bad luck.

Locus of control has been found to be useful in understanding individual differences in organizational behaviour.

SEX-ROLE

There is a clear distinction between male and female in every human society. Each society has defined set of behaviour appropriate to either male or female that how they should behave, think, feel, act, etc. also how these sexes are different than each other. There is great deal of myths in both popular and scientific views about male and female sex differences (Maccoby and Jecklin 1974).

Traditional sex role tend to emphasize the more aggressive aspects of male personality and the nurturing side of female. Traits traditionally attributed to men include ambition, independence, competitiveness and strength; women are considered as emotional, dependent, uncompetitive and weak. Appropriate sex roles are learned in early childhood, through interaction with parents and other role models, through play with other children, through language, books and television. The boys and the girls are expected to acquire the well-defined sex roles according to the society in which they are
brought up. The process by which a society thus transmits male and female into masculinity and femininity is known as the process of sex typing.

Masculinity and femininity are relatively enduring traits which are more or less rooted in anatomy, physiology and early experiences distinguishing males from females in appearance as “additive combination of trait terms judged to be significantly more desirable for more characteristics of each sex relative to the other” (Locksley and Colten, 1977).

Hindu religion and many other cultures reflected the concept of bisexuality. Greek God Hermaphroditus, Egyptian - Iris-Osiris, Japanese Izanami-Izanagi and many other Arab, Mexican and Hebrew doctrines regard their Gods as bisexuals. Same as in Hindu culture, ‘Shiva-Shakti’, ‘Purusha-Prakriti’ and ‘Ardha narishwara’ concepts are very well known. Above written notions concludes that the concept of androgynous God is developed ages ago. The conceptions of strictly defining masculine and feminine do not hold good in the present world. Sex-roles and sex-typing are in the process of constant change.

Recently the concept of psychological androgynous has developed (Bem 1974, 1975, 1976, Block 1973, Spence and Helmreich, 1978... Bem note -1) the new concept possible of androgynous, implies that it is possible for an individual to be both dominant and submissive,
both instrumental and expressive, both masculine and feminine depending on the situation. It also implies that an individual may integrate those complementary modalities in a single act (Bem 1977).

The concept of an androgynous individual is quite popular in both academic psychology literatures, as well as in amateur writings. Many definitions of what it means to be androgynous have been proposed. Though, a substantial proportion represent an inaccurate or erroneous view of the concept. For example, the Webster's dictionary defines it as bearing both male & female flowers in the same cluster, with the male flowers uppermost (Webster’s new international Dictionary, 2nd edition). This is inaccurate because it implies male dominance. Some psychologists consider it the disappearance of sex distinctions (Stoll 1973), while others think it involves both male-female characteristics (Hefner, Robecea, Oleshanskhy, 1975). The more accurate term for the latter is hermaphrodite.

A more accurate interpretation of Bem's conceptualisation of androgynous is a person who is able to integrate masculine and feminine characteristics into a stable and coherent sense of self (Raval, P., 2005; personal communication) An androgynous person develops in response to the life challenges and a series of experiences that are relatively free from gender stereotypes and traditional gender roles.
SEX-ROLE AS A PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC IN MANAGER

Everywhere leadership in general and management in particular is perceived as a masculine domain. Managerial roles are filled by male (that has also reflected in sample, where males are four times more in numbers than females in this research as a subject, the ratio is 80:20). Popular beliefs about the requisites of management are socially constructed from stereotypically masculine traits and social codes that govern interaction in the managerial arena and are forged from collective experiences and interests of men-women.

Douglas MCOROOR (1967) has mentioned in his book “The professional manager” that successful managerial model in our culture is a masculine one. Horing R. and Wells T.(1972) has mentioned in his book “Break through women in management” that manager should repress those aspects of himself which are associated with the feminine in our culture.

Woods Marion M. (1975) in his book „What it takes for a women to make in management” has identified ten characteristics being important to successful women in management are reflecting on influential male uniqueness. Above quoted literature and the difference of male-female managers in figures are reflecting male (masculine) dominance in management.

A response “Repertoire” model of sex-role style, this model has
been incorporated in the androgyny models, which states that a highly sex-typed person seems to have available limited number of effective behavioural options to deal with situations. A highly sex-typed person may be reluctant to engage in cross-sex-typed behaviour while an androgynous one has both forms of masculine and feminine responses in his or her repertoire and hence, derives adaptive behavioural flexibility from his array of options (Bem 1974, 1975). Bem (1975) Androgynous is conducive to mental health. Bem, Lenney, Martyna and Watson (1976) reported that Androgynous individual are behaviourally and emotionally more adoptable than stereotyped individuals. Halgmud, Loxley (1978), Small, Teagmo and Selz (1980) reported a Strong relation between Androgynous and self-actualisation. Spence et.al. (1975) and Berzins (1975) also reported that Androgynous have a higher self-esteem than non androgynous. It is also associated with social ascendency and intellectuality. Small, Gessner and Freguson (1984) found that Androgynous persons were least dysphoric, anxious and hostile.

It can be concluded from the past researches that males and masculine characteristics completely dominates the management field, may be women were restricted to the household work previously. Since last two decades female have stepped into managerial position, the scenario has changed. This could mean that only masculine traits may not be sufficient to possess for a successful manager. It has been hypothesized that androgyny should be
associated with effective interpersonal behaviour and psychological well-being.

OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

- To prepare and compare the personality profile of Managers in general, Different managerial levels, age groups, gender, years of managerial experience.
- To prepare and compare the personality profile of managers in relation to sex-role orientation.
- To prepare and compare the personality profile of managers in relation to locus of control.

In order to assess the objectives mentioned above, the related hypotheses were formulated and tested.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESIS

RQ1: Are there managerial level, locus of control, sex role orientation, gender, age and years of managerial experiences differ in manager's personality profile.
H1: A difference is expected in the personality profiles among different levels of managers.
H2: A difference is expected in the personality profiles between managers having different locus of control.
H3: A difference is expected in the personality profiles among
managers having different sex-role orientation.

H4: A difference is expected in the personality profiles between managers of different gender.

H5: A difference is expected in the personality profiles between managers of different age groups.

H6: A difference is expected in the personality profiles between managers of different years of managerial experience.

RQ2: Are there managerial level, sex role orientation, gender, age and years of managerial experiences differ in manager's locus of control.

H1: A Top, middle and bottom level managers differ in locus of control.

H2: A difference is expected in the locus of control among managers having different sex-role orientation.

H3: A difference is expected in the locus of control between managers of different gender.

H4: A difference is expected in the locus of control between managers of different age groups.

H5: A difference is expected in the locus of control between managers of different years of managerial experience.

RQ3: Are there managerial level, locus of control, gender, age and years of managerial experiences differ in manager's sex-role orientation.
H1: A difference is expected in the sex-role orientation among different levels of managers.

H2: A difference is expected in the sex-role orientation between managers having different locus of control.

H3: A difference is expected in the sex-role orientation among managers having different sex-role orientation.

H4: A difference is expected in the sex-role orientation between managers of different gender.

H5: A difference is expected in the sex-role orientation between managers of different age groups.

H6: difference is expected in the sex-role orientation between managers of different years of managerial experience.

In next chapter theories and review of literature is discussed.