

AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON THE EFFECT OF AGE, QUALIFICATION AND UPBRINGING UPON THE PERSONALITY OF MANAGERS IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE INDICATOR USING MBTI-DICHOTOMY IN BPO SECTOR AT DELHI, INDIA

Ashish Kumar Singh

*Shri Jagdishprasad Jhabarmal Tibrewala University,
Jhunjhunu*

ABSTRACT

All managers are not effective and similarly efficient but even though it is a general opinion which is rational also that a good qualification and upbringing makes a good personality. But even though the performance of managers is never good and managers suffers in their performance show off which are hampered by many reasons and so than the question arises- is it a age factor or something else. The paper hence tries to identify the relations amongst these detrimental yet important factors of association for any successful personality into analyzing what matters in the performance of managers in shaping the whole of theirs dimensions of success.

Key words: Personality, Performance, Managers, Temperament

INTRODUCTION

Personality is a wide term and its meanings are interpreted differently among people who study it. The term personality has been derived from the Latin term “persona” that means to speak through. There are many definitions on the subjects as there are authors on it but however two definitions are quite prominent where one is given by Gordon All port [1] and the second one by Fred Luthans [2] . According to Gordon All port [1] personality is a dynamic organisation within the individual of those psychological systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment. [2]Personality means how a person affects others and how he understands and views himself as well as the pattern of inner and outer measurable traits and the person situation interaction. So from these definitions it’s clear that personality counts physical appearance and behaviour where the former is based on the tangible factors like its height, weight, facial features, colour etc while the latter corresponds to the basic behaviour which is intangible in terms of courteous, friendly, expressive, cooperativeness etc. As far as the determinants of personality are concerned its basically of four types Biological factors,

Family and Social factors, Situational factors and Other factors. Biological factors state three dimensions the heredity, brain and physical features into explaining personality. Heredity simply means transmission of the qualities from ancestors to decedents through a mechanism lying primarily in the chromosomes of the germ cells. However the importance of heredity varies from one personality to another. For example heredity is generally more important in determining a person's temperament than his values and ideals. In case of brain there is no conclusive proof available so far that it shapes personality however the notion beauty with brains is seldom observed. Physical features are important as it is tangible and attracts others and may have a tremendous effect of one's personality and good physical features are always rated higher in defining ones personality such factors like height, weight, colour, facial features etc. The other family and social factors are basically the socialization process and identification process the socialization process starts when there is a first initial contact between the mother and hers new born infant and later on reinforced by the friends and social groups as such. The identification process takes the model the child likes in the family to behave like in three aspects. Firstly the similarity in behaviour between the child and the model secondly the motives and desires to be like of the model as perceived by child as intention of his and lastly how the child takes on the attributes of the model. *Socialization is the process by which an infant acquires, from the enormously wide range of behavioral potentialities that are open to him at birth, those behaviour patterns that are customary and acceptable to the family and social groups* [3]. *The identification process occurs when a person tries to identify himself with some person whom he feels ideal in family* [4]. The situational factors represent a totally different approach which states that individual personality may change in different situations therefore we should not look at the personality factor in isolation. Although one can make certain generalizations about personality but still however there exists significant individual differences which are further influenced by situational factors. Other factors include temperament, interest, character, schema and motives. Temperament is the degree to which one responds emotionally and other non – intellectual personality traits along with it are distributed according to normal distribution. Interest means desire to do patently and enjoy it which again varies from person to person in managers such desire may be inculcated as a fire in them through opportunities like job rotation and special training programme. We must know that successful persons in the same occupation have, to a large extent, the same interests. Character simply means honesty which is a resistance to stealing and cheating others. Schema represents a belief, perception, frame of reference and attitude which the individual possess towards the job, management, pay, incentive systems, working conditions, fringe benefits and development programmes in the organisation. Motives being the last represent the inner drives of the individual that states behavior of an individual to accomplish the goal varies because of his inner drives.

Myers – Briggs Type Indicator and MBTI – Dichotomies

The MBTI was developed by Isabel Briggs Myers and Katherine C. Briggs over a period of 20 years which tries to represent Jung's (1923) theory of psychological types which contains 126 – item questions of forced – choice questionnaire concerned with individual differences in their preferred manner of gathering information and taking decisions. These are classed under

the following types called dichotomies which are opposites to each poles of reference and holds good in each of its class making it neither inferior nor superior as such.

The four dichotomies of the MBTI are the following Extraversion – Introversion Dichotomy (E-I)

1. Sensing – Intuition Dichotomy (S-N)
2. Thinking –Feeling Dichotomy (T-F)
3. Judging – Perceiving Dichotomy(J-P)

E-I represents obtaining energies from outer world with people and things for Extroverts (E) while those of Introverts (I) tends to gain energy from concentration on the inner world of concepts and ideas.

S-N represents gathering information through observance for Sensing (S) while Intuitive (I) gather the same but through using sixth sense or hunch.

T-F represents taking decisions on logical facts and solid observations for Thinkers (T) while Feelers (F) tends to take decisions based on subjective observations.

J-P represents people preferring to live in an orderly, structured and planned fashion for Judging (J) while individuals living in flexible and spontaneous as Perceiving (P).

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

The principle purpose of study was to Study on the Effect of Age, Qualification and Upbringing upon The Personality of Managers in Terms of Performance Indicator using MBTI–Dichotomy. So the specific objectives for study are the following:

- 1. to find out whether age, educational qualification, type of upbringing has any relationship on the performance of the managers.*

In order to validate this objective the following hypothesis were drawn -

H1- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Managers

H2- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Senior Managers

H3- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Middle Managers.

H4- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Junior Managers

H5- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Managers

H6- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Senior Managers

H7- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Middle Managers

H8- There is a significant relationship between Age and performance level of Junior Managers

H9- There is a significant relationship between Type of Upbringing and Performance level of Managers

So in order to study this objective tables are drawn for the following references to test the hypothesis.

- Table 01 Qualification and Performance level of Managers
- Table 02 Qualification and Performance level of Senior Managers
- Table 03 Qualification and Performance level of Middle Managers
- Table 04 Qualification and Performance level of Junior Managers
- Table 05 Age and Performance level of Managers
- Table 06 Age and Performance level of Senior Managers
- Table 07 Age and Performance level of Middle Managers
- Table 08 Age and performance level of Junior Managers
- Table 09 Type of Upbringing and Performance level of Managers

PROCEDURE

A total of 594 managers were studied taking three organizations all together maintaining the strict confidentiality of the data, information pertaining to the performance of managers and hence the names of organizations were kept secret. The three organizations are represented by A, B and C. out of 594 managers was 87 senior managers, 203 were middle managers and 304 were junior managers. For the collection of data the questionnaires were used 1) MBTI personality type indicator 2) assertiveness inventory 3) socio- demographic variables- age, education and upbringing.

Scoring of MBTI Type Indicator

A special inventory was used for the study where many statements were made based on 16 personality types which was again segregated for senior, middle and junior level managers where again each managerial level was classified into high medium and low performers. The data was analyzed using SPSS.

Scoring of Assertiveness Inventory

It contained 15 statements which were to be rated on three point scale- always, sometimes never. And the rigor level assigned to them are like three points to “always”, two to “sometimes” and one for “never”. A scoring level was determined with the following ranges 0-19 being at low level of assertiveness, 20- 34 being at medium level of assertiveness and 35- 45 as high level of assertiveness.

Socio- Demographic Data

This is collected against age, education and upbringing. Received data pertaining to this were segregated accordingly into high, medium and low performers and further analyzed into if any association exists between managerial performance and selected- demographic variables- age, education and upbringing. In order to calculate the chi – squares value an interactive calculation tool for chi- square tests of goodness of fit and independence was used available online at <http://quantpsy.org>.

Table 00-Profile of Managers in Organizations A, B, C

Managerial Levels	Organisation A	Organisation B	Organisation C	Total
Senior	39	26	22	87
Middle	125	42	36	203
Junior	116	99	89	304
Total	280	167	147	594

Table 01 Qualification and Performance Level of Managers

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	

Non Graduates Percentages	9	45	7	61
Graduate Percentages	40	42	34	116
Post Graduate Percentages	49	63	22	134
Professional Degree Percentages	61	54	43	158
Diploma Percentages	30	51	44	125
Total	189	255	150	594

Table-01A-Qualification and Performance Level of Managers between Non Graduates and Graduates

Graduate Percentages	0	3	0	3
Post Graduate Percentages	12	3	6	21
Professional Degree Percentages	13	18	0	31
Diploma Percentages	15	8	9	32
Total	40	32	15	87

TABLE 02A-Qualification and Performance Level of Senior Managers between Non Graduates and Graduate

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Non Graduates Percentages	9	45	7	61
Graduate Percentages	40	42	34	116

Table-01B-Qualification and Performance Level of Managers between Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Non Graduates Percentages	0	0	0	0
Graduate Percentages	0	3	0	3

TABLE 02B-Qualification and Performance Level of Senior Managers of Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Post Graduate Percentages	49	63	22	134
Professional Degree Percentages	61	54	43	158

Table-01C-Qualification and Performance Level of Manager between Diplomas and Non Graduates

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Post Graduate Percentages	12	3	6	21
Professional Degree Percentages	13	18	0	31

TABLE 02C-Qualification and Performance Level of Senior Managers of Non -Graduates and Diploma holders

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Non Graduates Percentages	9	45	7	61
Diploma Percentages	30	51	44	125

TABLE 02-Qualification and Performance Level of Senior Managers

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Non Graduates Percentages	0	0	0	0
Diploma Percentages	15	8	9	32

Table-03 Qualification and Performance level of Middle Managers

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Non Graduates Percentages	0	0	0	0

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Non Graduates Percentages	14	19	10	43
Graduate Percentages	13	16	6	35
Post Graduate Percentages	10	13	12	35
Professional Degree Percentages	17	24	8	49
Diploma Percentages	18	18	5	41
Total	72	90	41	203

Table-03A- Qualification and Performance level of Middle Managers of Non Graduates and Graduates

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Non Graduates Percentages	14	19	10	43
Graduate Percentages	13	16	6	35

TABLE 03B-Qualification and Performance Level of Middle Managers of Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Post Graduate Percentages	10	13	12	35
Professional Degree Percentages	17	24	8	49

TABLE 03C-Qualification and Performance Level of Middle Managers of Non -Graduates and Diploma holders

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Non Graduates Percentages	14	19	10	43
Diploma Percentages	18	18	5	41

Table -04 Qualification and Performance level of Junior Managers

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Non Graduates Percentages	13	17	15	45
Graduate Percentages	20	28	15	63

Post Graduate Percentages	28	12	26	66
Professional Degree Percentages	27	16	27	70
Diploma Percentages	12	26	22	60
Total	100	99	105	304

Table -04A-Qualification and Performance level of Junior Managers of Non Graduates and Graduates

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Non Graduates Percentages	13	17	15	45
Graduate Percentages	20	28	15	63

TABLE 04B-Qualification and Performance Level of Junior Managers of Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Post Graduate Percentages	28	12	26	66
Professional Degree Percentages	27	16	27	70

TABLE 04C-Qualification and Performance Level of Junior Managers of Non -Graduates and Diploma holders

Qualification	Performance Levels			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Non Graduates Percentages	13	17	15	45
Diploma Percentages	12	26	22	60

Table 05 Age and Performance level of Managers

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
25-30 Percentage	11	35	6	52
30 to 35 Percentages	33	45	21	99
35 to 40 Percentages	47	57	20	124
40 to 45 Percentages	52	51	30	133
45 to 50 Percentages	21	44	40	105
50 above Percentages	25	23	33	81
Total	189	255	150	594

Table 05A- Age and Performance level of Managers between the age range of 25-30 years and 30-35 year

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
25-30 Percentage	11	35	6	52
30 to 35 Percentages	33	45	21	99

Table 05B- Age and Performance level of Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
35 to 40 Percentages	47	57	20	124
40 to 45 Percentages	52	51	30	133

Table 05C- Age and Performance level of Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
45 to 50 Percentages	21	44	40	105
50 above Percentages	25	23	33	81

Table 06 Age and Performance level of Senior Managers

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
25-30 Percentage	0	0	0	0
30 to 35 Percentages	0	0	0	0
35 to 40 Percentages	0	0	0	0
40 to 45 Percentages	3	0	9	12
45 to 50 Percentages	26	18	3	47
50 above Percentages	11	14	3	28
Total	40	32	15	87

Table 06A- Age and Performance level of Senior Managers between the age range of 25-30 years and 30-35 years

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
25-30 Percentage	0	0	0	0

30 to 35 Percentages	0	0	0	0
----------------------	---	---	---	---

Table 06B- Age and Performance level of Senior Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
35 to 40 Percentages	0	0	0	0
40 to 45 Percentages	3	0	9	12

Table 06C- Age and Performance level of Senior Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
45 to 50 Percentages	26	18	3	47
50 above Percentages	11	14	3	28

Table 07 Age and Performance level of Middle Managers

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
25-30 Percentage	4	17	4	25
30 to 35 Percentages	18	18	8	44
35 to 40 Percentages	21	20	9	50
40 to 45 Percentages	11	11	4	26
45 to 50 Percentages	10	14	6	30
50 above Percentages	8	10	10	28
Total	72	90	41	203

Table 07A- Age and Performance level of Middle Managers between range of 45-50 years and above 50 years

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
25-30 Percentage	4	17	4	25
30 to 35 Percentages	18	18	8	44

Table 7B- Age and Performance level of Middle Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
35 to 40 Percentages	21	20	9	50

40 to 45 Percentages	11	11	4	26
----------------------	----	----	---	----

Table 07C- Age and Performance level of Middle Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
45 to 50 Percentages	10	14	6	30
50 above Percentages	8	10	10	28

Table 08 Age and performance level of Junior Managers

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
25-30	8	21	4	33
30 to 35	25	23	16	64
35 to 40	22	32	5	59
40 to 45	12	6	26	44
45 to 50	7	12	28	47
50 above	26	5	26	57
Total	100	99	105	304

Table 08A- Age and Performance level of Junior Managers between the age range of 25-30 years and 30-35 years

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
25-30 Percentage	8	21	4	33
30 to 35 Percentages	25	23	16	64

Table 8B- Age and Performance level of Junior Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
35 to 40 Percentages	22	32	5	59
40 to 45 Percentages	12	6	26	44

Table 08C- Age and Performance level of Junior Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years

Qualification	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
45 to 50	7	12	28	47

Percentages				
50 above Percentages	26	5	26	57

Table 09 Type of Upbringing and Performance level of Managers

Type of Upbringing	Performance			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Urban	98	96	72	266
Rural	114	125	89	328
Total	212	221	161	594

Table10: Interpretation of Results of respective Tables

TABL E No.	Category TABLE Type and Hypothesis	Corresponding Values	Interpretation against table value at 5% significant level taking p- value
1	Table-01- Qualification and Performance Level of Managers		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	H1- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Managers	Chi-square= 44.313 Degrees of freedom= 8 p-value= 5e-7	15.507 < 44.313 Result: Significant

1A	Table-01A- Qualification and Performance Level of Managers between Non Graduates and Graduates		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value	and Performance Level of Senior Managers <i>H2- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Senior Managers</i>		Vs. calculated value
	<i>H1a- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Graduates and Non Graduates</i>	Chi-square= 22.587 Degrees of freedom= 2 p-value= 0.00001245	5.991 < 22.587 Result: Significant		Chi-square= 22.863 Degrees of freedom= 6 p-value=0.00084369	12.592 < 22.863 Result: Significant
1B	Table-01B- Qualification and Performance Level of Managers between Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value	TABLE 02A- Qualification and Performance Level of Senior Managers between Non Graduates and Graduates <i>H2a- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of between Non Graduates and Graduates</i>		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H1b- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders</i>	Chi-square= 6.86 Degrees of freedom= 2 p-value= 0.03238694	5.991 < 6.86 Result: Significant		Chi-square= 14 Degrees of freedom= 5 p-value=0.01560942	11.070 < 14 Result: Significant
1C	Table-01C- Qualification and Performance Level of Managers between Diplomas and Non Graduates		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value	TABLE 02B- Qualification and Performance Level of Senior Managers of Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders <i>H2b- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Senior Managers of Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders</i>		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H1c- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Diplomas and Non Graduates</i>	Chi-square= 18.721 Degrees of freedom= 2 p value=0.00008606	5.991 < 18.721 Result: Significant		Chi-square= 15.401 Degrees of freedom= 2 p-value=0.0004526	5.991 < 15.401 Result: Significant
2	TABLE 02- Qualification		Table value of Chi square	TABLE 02C- Qualification and Performance Level of Senior Managers of Non Graduates and Diploma holders		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value

	<i>H2c- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Non - Graduates and Diploma holders</i>	Chi-square= 21.375 Degrees of freedom= 5 p-value=0.00068799	11.070<21.375 Result: Significant
3	Table-03 Qualification and Performance level of Middle Managers		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H3- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Middle Managers</i>	Chi-square= 7.558 Degrees of freedom= 8 p-value=0.47779064	15.507>7.558 Result: Not-Significant
3A	Table-03A- Qualification and Performance level of Middle Managers of Non Graduates and Graduates		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H3a- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Non-Graduates and Graduates</i>	Chi-square= 0.479 Degrees of freedom= 2 p-value=0.78702127	5.991> 0.479 Result: Not-Significant
3B	TABLE 03B- Qualification and Performance Level of Middle Managers of Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value

	<i>H3b- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Middle Managers of Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders</i>	Chi-square= 3.653 Degrees of freedom= 2 p-value=0.160976	5.991>3.653 Result: Not-Significant
3C	TABLE 03C- Qualification and Performance Level of Middle Managers of Non - Graduates and Diploma holders		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H3c- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Middle Managers of Non - Graduates and Diploma holders</i>	Chi-square= 2.147 Degrees of freedom= 2 p-value=0.34181009	5.991>2.147 Result: Not-Significant
4	Table -04 Qualification and Performance level of Junior Managers		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H4- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Junior Managers</i>	Chi-square= 20.223 Degrees of freedom= 8 p-value=0.0095245	15.507< 20.223 Result: Significant

4A	Table -04A- Qualification and Performance level of Junior Managers of Non Graduates and Graduates		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H4a- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Junior Managers among Non-Graduates and Graduates</i>	Chi-square= 1.207 Degrees of freedom=2 p-value=0.54689415	5.991>1.207 Result: Not-Significant
4B	TABLE 04B- Qualification and Performance Level of Junior Managers of Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H4b- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Junior Managers of Post Graduates and Professional Degree holders</i>	Chi-square= 0.491 Degrees of freedom= 2 p-value=0.78231328	5.991>1.491 Result: Not-Significant
4C	TABLE 04C- Qualification and Performance Level of Junior Managers of Non-Graduates and Diploma holders		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value

	<i>H4c- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Junior Managers of Non-Graduates and Diploma holders</i>	Chi-square= 1.128 Degrees of freedom=2 p-value=0.56892879	5.991>1.128 Result: Not-Significant
5	Table 05 Age and Performance level of Managers		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H5- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Managers</i>	Chi-square= 46.031 Degrees of freedom=10 p-value=0.00000142	18.307<46.031 Result: Significant
	Table 05A- Age and Performance level of Managers between the age range of 25-30 years and 30-35 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
5A	<i>H5a- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Managers between the age range of 25-30 years and 30-35 years</i>	Chi-square= 6.593 Degrees of freedom=2 p-value=0.03701248	5.991<6.593 Result: Significant
5B	Table 05B- Age and Performance level of Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value

	<i>H5b- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years</i>	Chi-square= 2.273 Degrees of freedom= 2 p-value=0.32094035	5.991 > 2.273 Result: Not-Significant
5C	Table 05C- Age and Performance level of Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H5c There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years</i>	Chi-square= 4.581 Degrees of freedom=2 p-value=0.10121584	5.991 > 4.581 Result: Not-Significant
6	Table 06 Age and Performance level of Senior Managers		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H6- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Senior Managers</i>	Chi-square= 35.212 Degrees of freedom=4 p-value=4.2e-7	9.488 < 35.212 Result: Significant
6A	Table 06A- Age and Performance level of Senior Managers between the age range of 25-30 years and 30-35 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H6a- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Senior Managers between the age range of 25-30 years and 30-35 years</i>	Chi-square= 0 Degrees of freedom= 1 p-value=1	3.841 > 0 Result: Not-Significant

6B	Table 06B- Age and Performance level of Senior Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H6b- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Senior Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years</i>	Chi-square= 27 Degrees of freedom= 5 p-value=0.00005704	11.070 < 27 Result: Significant
6C	Table 06C- Age and Performance level of Senior Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H6c There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Senior Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years</i>	Chi-square= 1.889 Degrees of freedom= 2 p-value= 0.38887396	5.991 > 1.889 Result: Not-Significant
7	Table 07 Age and Performance level of Middle Managers		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H7- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Middle Managers</i>	Chi-square= 12.477 Degrees of freedom=10 p-value= 0.2543999	18.307 > 12.477 Result: Not-Significant

7A	Table 07A- Age and Performance level of Middle Managers between the age range of 25-30 years and 30-35 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H7a- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Middle Managers between the age range of 25-30 years and 30-35 years</i>	Chi-square= 5.453 Degrees of freedom=2 p-value=0.6544796	5.991 > 5.453 Result: Not-Significant
7B	Table 7B- Age and Performance level of Middle Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H7b- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Middle Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years</i>	Chi-square= 0.091 Degrees of freedom=2 p-value=0.9555196	5.991 > 0.091 Result: Not-Significant
7C	Table 07C- Age and Performance level of Middle Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H7c There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Middle Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years</i>	Chi-square= 1.822 Degrees of freedom=2 p-value=0.4021219	5.991 > 1.822 Result: Not-Significant
8	Table 08 Age and performance level of Junior Managers		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value

	<i>H8- There is a significant relationship between Age and performance level of Junior Managers</i>	Chi-square= 79.997 Degrees of freedom=10 p-value=0	18.307 < 79.997 Result: Significant
8A	Table 08A- Age and Performance level of Junior Managers between the age range of 25-30 years and 30-35 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H8a- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Junior Managers between the age range of 25-30 years and 30-35 years</i>	Chi-square= 6.84 Degrees of freedom=2 p-value=0.03271243	5.991 < 6.84 Result: Significant
8B	Table 8B- Age and Performance level of Junior Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H8b- There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Junior Managers between the age range of 35-40 years and 40-45 years</i>	Chi-square= 33.482 Degrees of freedom= 2 p-value=5e-8	5.991 < 33.482 Result: Significant
8C	Table 08C- Age and Performance level of Junior Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value

	<i>H8c There is a significant relationship between Age and Performance level of Junior Managers between the age range of 45-50 years and above 50 years</i>	Chi-square= 13.055 Degrees of freedom=2 p- value=0.001462 66	5.991<13.055 Result: Significant
9	Table 09 Type of Upbringing and Performance level of Managers		Table value of Chi square Vs. calculated value
	<i>H9a- There is a significant relationship between Type of Upbringing and Performance level of Managers</i>	Chi-square= 0.34 Degrees of freedom=2 p- value=0.843664 82	5.991>0.34 Result: Not-Significant

A total of 594 questionnaires when analyzed against the hypothesized framework of study exercised upon 230 males and 364 females (see last table no.11) it has been observed that total overall performance of managers taking the base table for reference table 01. Indicated that ESTJs (=30) are the most preferred high performers while ENTJ (=23) being next to it, ESFP (=62) being the highest in medium performers followed by ENTP (=47) in the same class whereas ENFJ (=23) are the lowest performers. In this way for the hypothesis (Table 01) Qualification and Performance level of Managers that H1- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Managers has been found more than the tabular value 15.507 at 0.05% ie.15.507 < 44.313 at 8 d.f Hence the Result is Significant. Similarly when the same hypothesis is simplified to test among its variables as to theirs significant it has been observed that H1a- There is a significant relationship between Qualification and Performance level of Graduates and Non Graduates as for 2 degrees of freedom at 5 % level of significance the value of chi square calculated 22.587is more than the table value of chi square 5.991 that is 5.991<22.587 Hence the Result is Significant. Similarly for each hypothesis the values of chi squares are calculated and tested in accordance with 5% significance levels which are shown in tabular forms in provided in table Table10: interpretation table with results. It can be inferred that the genders as such does not affect the performance indicator of any level of degree to be performed in a BPO Sector but however the Qualification matters a lot which is evident from the table no 3 ,3A,3B,3C being not significant which can also be observed well in tables 7,7A,7B,7C also. The only table that shows significant at all levels are 1,1A,1B,1C and2,2A,2B,2C and 8,8A,8B,8C.The significance of could be understood by a logic that managers matrix significant as chi square value calculated 44.313 is of seniority at height rank have enough experience and the majority of them hold a mix of ESTJ and ENTJ which is a dominant

factor in success so homogeneity of success can be drawn in this class where the success rate of genders contributes to 87 males and 102 females .It must not be interpreted that all ESTJ and ENTJ are composite of 87 males and 102 females but it only means that those few who belong to these range should have exhibited the characteristics of extrovertedness. Similarly the managers who represent within the middle performance range exhibit ENFP and ESFP characteristics making the performance medium but not slow as they again are extroverts type and represents a total workforce of 255 out of which 90 males and 165 females. The difference between the two is wider than the most senior ones as females tend to perform better than males in their extrovertedness while handling the prerequisite portfolio. However a better training and job satisfaction can't be excluded. The level of satisfaction that they derive out of such preference. Again it is evident that the significant relationship exhibited in table 8 suggests that the age factor dominates the performance with 97 females and 53 males where 15 females are represented with ENTP and 10 males to INTP. A simple look at the table 11 so formulated also suggests that most of the females showed high preference to "E" factor in majority as contrast to males. This shows that females are more motivated and take on challenge well in accepted form to prove themselves when more responsibility is assigned to them in the form of targets. Tables 3 and 7 with their constituent tables exhibit "not significant" as in middle level managers the ratio of females dominates the working atmosphere and these females are more career oriented as could be seen from table 11 that in middle managerial ranks are filled with more females which have dominated and transited from lower rank. A mere thought of earning a necessary qualification with a progressive work performance was the only factor because of which they were able to outshine the males at work. Again less homogeneity of genders in relation to performance and necessary qualification fail to establish the hypothesis to be "significant" as such. In other words females cash their performance and qualification to the next ladder of career opportunity while very few proportion of males were able to do so who just want to perform better for whatever reason rather than qualifications as this could be established from that fact that at high ranks of BPOs there is a marginal difference between females and males executives with a sudden fall of males and a drastic appearance of 102 females alone from 187 positions at Senior levels. As there are no high performers up to the age of 40 years as was suggested from the table 6 shows that maximum pressure is handled by the middle and lower executives and the leadership of these experienced 40 + age results the overall success of their organizations. In other ways the seniority and the age gap may be more evident in the failure of performance indicator as seniority starts from the age of 40 where the lowest rank holders are youth of 18+ in majority. So the level of significant of homogeneity is rejected in table 6 at par suggesting overall that it is rather significant in its "senior" primetable no 6 as such. Analyzing table 5 on the same pattern as analyzed for 6 shows a very narrow margin of uniformity of "seniority" of middle and lower managers suggesting that there is a sound understanding in these groups as the pattern of males to males and females to females is almost same but rather more drastic to males. So as we go up the ladder we see more people achieving the heights with the experience and qualification but not taking into age as, age is replaced with earning of qualification hence rejecting the basis of promotion on seniority but upon the qualification and good progressive records.

CONCLUSION

After analysis and subsequent data interpretation it was discovered that in all the organizations A, B and C there was a high significant proportion of females dominating in middle level especially over males. Further it was also observed that the women tend to possess mainly in common the dichotomy pair of E, N, F, P, S, T. However in detail examination males tend to possess I, N, S, and T as the most preferred preference. This indicates that females are better than men with “E” factor pressing them to work hard and win over others while males tend to be dominated by “I” factor which is associated with more work efforts and nothing else and being shy. This can be supported by a fact that most of females are better employees than males when it comes to successfully analyzing manpower performance over three successive years and on. Qualification yet adds value to the personality in terms of growth in professional front and it was most cashed by females than males in general as at the highest rank there is a dominance of females in all organizations taken together over males. In terms of failures of employees in the performance range of “Low” it is rather shocking that females ranking is high in achievement against failures while males exhibited a low standard of performance which could be seen in the next stage of performance in “medium” stage. At this stage there is a drastic gap in between the self achievement indicator in terms of standards of performance wherein again females dominated males. So summarizing the study it can be concluded that females are appropriate to serve at highest level, enough to support in middle level and remarkable in performance at initial level. However the study could not answer to the question as to why men were not able to do so and the possible reasons for it. Anyway the researcher was happy to note that when these findings were made known to top guns of organizations A,B,C they are now motivated to know the reasons for such lack of men in such indicative performances and the organizations have started taking following initiatives with a hope that it will solve problem –

1. Counseling sessions with males to be chaired by a male executive each week.
2. Frequent games and activities which enable males and females share more interactions.
3. Shifting the mix of males and females at the workplace to soothe their psychological working.
4. Displaying a good performer from each gender weekly and rewarding them.
5. Organizing Training and Development programmes for males and females in heterogeneous groups.

Table: 11 MBTI trend among Males and Females vs. Level of Performance

MBTI Type	PERFORMANCE LEVELS								
	High	M	F	Medium	M	F	Low	M	F
ESTJ	30	18	12	2	0	2	0	0	0
ENTJ	23	8	15	3	0	3	2	0	2
ISTJ	15	8	7	10	3	7	11	2	9
INTJ	22	17	5	14	6	8	5	1	4
ESFP	6	2	4	62	13	49	12	4	8
ENFP	2	1	1	47	20	27	11	6	5
ISFP	6	3	3	12	8	4	3	2	1
INFP	8	6	2	10	7	3	17	10	7
ESTP	10	3	7	11	2	9	11	2	9
ENTP	2	0	2	12	5	7	19	4	15
INTP	7	2	5	10	7	3	13	4	9
ISTP	14	11	3	5	1	4	4	1	3
ESFJ	10	2	8	15	3	12	6	4	2
ENFJ	10	1	9	6	2	4	23	9	14
ISFJ	18	3	15	30	11	19	10	3	7
INFJ	6	2	4	6	2	4	3	1	2
Total	189	87	102	255	90	165	150	53	97

*** It ought to be noted that when the organizations were taken for study there was a high density of female employees in "Executives" and this study is only restricted to executives not to all employees as such.***

REFERENCES

1. Babcock, L. & S. Laschever. 2003. *Women don't ask: Negotiation and the gender divide*. Princeton N. J. Princeton University Press
2. Barbuto, J.E., (1997). A critique of the Myers – Briggs indicator and its operationalization of Carl Jung's psychological types. *Psychological Reports*, 80, 611 – 625.
3. Catalyst. 2003a. *Advancing Latinas in the workplace: What managers need to know?* New York: Author.

4. Catalyst. 2003b. Advancing Asian women in the workplace: Catalyst's new guide for managers. New York: Author.
5. Hays-Thomas, R. 2004. Why now? The contemporary focus on managing diversity. In Stockdale, M.S. & F.J. Crosby, eds. The Psychology and management of workplace diversity. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd. 1-30.
6. Harvey, R J (1996) Reliability and Validity, in MBTI Applications. A.L. Hammer, Editor. Consulting Psychologists Press: Palo Alto, CA. p. 5- 29.
7. Hill, A. B., (1999). Personality characteristics associated with academic achievement among developmental college students. (Doctoral)
8. Kanter, R.M. 1977. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.
9. Karsten, M.F. 1992. Gender issues in management.. Madison: Author. p. 23.
10. Myers, Isabel Briggs; McCaulley Mary H.; Quenk, Naomi L.; Hammer, Allen L. (1998). MBTI Manual (A guide to the development and use of the Myers Briggs type indicator). Consulting Psychologists Press; 3rd ed edition. ISBN 0-89106-130-4.
11. Pettigrew, T., & Tropp, L. (2006, May). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory.
12. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 90(5), 751-783
13. Sokal, Michael M. (ed.) (1990) Psychological Testing and American Society 1890-1930 Rutgers.