

## Examining Relationship between Manager Personality Types & Effectiveness of Borujerd Education Organization Staffs

FarzaneKordi<sup>1</sup>, Saman Kordestani<sup>2</sup>, Mohammad Hasanzade Tavakoli<sup>3</sup>, Elaheh Ahmadian<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MA. Science and Research of Borujerd, Iran

<sup>2,3</sup>Department of Civil Engineering, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran

<sup>4</sup>Department of Education, Torbat-e Heydarieh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Torbat-e Heydarieh, Iran

*Received: January 19, 2015*

*Accepted: April 23, 2015*

---

### ABSTRACT

Current study examines the relationship between managers' personality types and effectiveness of Borujerd education organization staffs. The statistical society included 120 teachers and school managers in Borujerd and 92 people were chosen as sample size according to Morgan table. Research tool in current study is questionnaire. The method of study is descriptive correlation and from purpose point of view is applicative. The hypotheses are examined by Pearson test. The result has showed there is no relation between manager personality types (introvert, extravert, logical, objective, subjective, emotional, and single minded, aimless) and staff effectiveness.

**KEY WORDS:** personality type, effectiveness, education organization.

---

### INTRODUCTION

As the society managers especially education organization managers can lead the society to wellbeing or a disaster, their mental, virtual, spiritual and emotional characteristics must be considered; as educational managers alike other people in society have their own personal differences, talent, motivation, tendency, trend, knowledge and value system, so these factors can affect on their behavior. It is clear all managers do not act the same just because they are managers. Although these differences can originate from their different tendency, knowledge and value system, however their personality is also important. (Quinn&Rohrbaugh, 2008)

It is clear that improvement and the growth of society without human organizations are impossible. The nature of the most organizations is to cover humans' different needs and on the other hand reaching to their predefined organizational purposes without expert and specialist staffs is impossible. (Denison& Mishra, 2008) Hence the number and variety of organizations have been increased and on the other hand understanding human characteristics, behaviors and their incentives become more difficult and complicated. (Goodman & Pennings, 2007)

So defining human characteristics and traits, their formation conditions, behavioral reasons and how they motivated are the main subjects in management psychology and due to their importance role, generally management science and managing organization behavior in particular have studied behavioral phenomena and can predict human behaviors in organizations. (Denison, 2010) Management specialists believe nowadays people spend more time in their organizations and managers can provide suitable environment which fulfill staff satisfaction and leads to their own and organization success, high efficiency and effectiveness. (Blenkhorn & Gaber, 1995)

### Research Literature

Robins (1969) believes individual personality refers to a collection of psychological characteristics which are used for classifying them. Royce (1983) defines the personality as a composition of mental and physical traits which form the individual identity. Personality is defined as a set of organized, unique and stable traits that make a person be different from the others (Kuthans & Kreitner, 1999). Imam Ali was a human being whom had completely distinguished traits from other people. He didn't act like others; he was a symbol of strange and special person which has amazed all people from the past to future. (Scheerens & Bosker, 2007)

### Trait Theory of Personality

Personality can be defined according to some continuous dimensions which each of them is representative of an especial adjective. (Translators, 1993) so trait theory of personality determines the personality as a complicated and discrete traits. (Fallahi, 1999) From types of personalities' point of view, we have considered three general categories:

1. Neuroticism
2. Extraversion-Introversion
3. Psychoticism
4. Phenomenology theory

Psychology theory adherents believe main part of human motivation is unconscious and must be deducted directly by his behavior. It is worth to note that personality growth has an especial position in this theory.

### Personality Structure

Yung believes personality is formed from some discrete but related systems. The most important systems are Ego, personal unconscious, complexes, collective unconscious, archetypes, persona, anima, animus and shadow. In addition to related systems, there are some other adjectives such as extravert and introvert attitudes, mental actions, senses, cognition and also innovation which are important in Yung theory. Finally the concept of self or Ego has great importance in his theory.

**Ego** means conscious self that is included conscious elements such as conscious cognition, thinking and emotions. Ego is responsible of identity sense and continuity of personality and the main part of conscious self.

**Unconscious self** is opposite of ego and included experiences which were sometimes in past conscious but have been repressed or they were such a weak experiences that could not effect on conscious part. Conscious part access to unconscious personal subjects and also there is a continuous and reciprocal relation between ego and unconscious part.

**Complexes** include a set of organized emotions, thinking, cognitions and memories which are exist in unconscious part. Each complex has a nucleus part. The attraction of this part causes a collection of experiences.

### Effectiveness

Prerequisite of effectiveness is acceptance of organization purposes that using available resources for reaching to them is necessary. Effectiveness acts as a criteria to determine whether managers actions are correct or not. Hence it becomes clear there is a relation between effectiveness and defining correct and suitable purposes and how to reach them. (Niknami, 1995, p 15&16)

Effectiveness considers entrepreneur approach about his decision regarding what to do. (Armstrong, 1990) Some researchers argue that effectiveness is the main analyzing purpose, plan and improvement of each organization.

### Organizational effectiveness

Try to obtain effectiveness is the common aim of all organizations, however most researches about organization and management consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly refer to this matter. (Hall, 1996, p20)

The concept of effectiveness is obscure. Cameron, K.s, Whetton P.A. express the result of their 20 years researches as follow: effectiveness has a general meaning. It has many organizational variables. To determining the organizational effectiveness, the amount and level of reached multi purposes must be measured and judged about them. In order to measuring Organizational effectiveness, different items should be considered. (Daft, 1998, p 64)

Mintzberg believes if the organization wants to be effective, it should manage and apply seven forces.

- **Direction:** the first force gives a sense of where the organization must go and includes interpreting a purpose, aim, organization mission or sensing and understanding the phenomena. This force is hidden and involves long term and short term Organizational purposes.
- **Efficiency:** is the next force that is based on decreasing the expenses and increasing the interest.
- The third force is **proficiency** for carrying out certain tasks with high levels of knowledge and skill.
- **Innovation** is the forth force and means if the organization wants to adapt or accept environmental continuously changes, must produce and exhibit new products and services.
- **Centralization:** is the fifth force and ask organizations to concentrate their efforts on serving particular markets.
- The next two forces are **collaboration & culture – competition & politic**. Common cultural values make collaboration and are reflection of coordination between people from different cultures. competition causes the politics of separated parts and people as all of these people try to become successful and famous. (Daft, 1998, p 529)

### Main hypothesis

There is a relationship between managers' personalities and their effectiveness.

### Subordinate hypotheses

1. There is a significant relationship between introvert managers and staffs' effectiveness.
2. There is a significant relationship between extravert managers and staffs' effectiveness.
3. There is a significant relationship between logical managers and staffs' effectiveness.
4. There is a significant relationship between objective managers and staffs' effectiveness.
5. There is a significant relationship between subjective managers and staffs' effectiveness.
6. There is a significant relationship between emotional managers and staffs' effectiveness.
7. There is a significant relationship between single minded managers and staffs' effectiveness.
8. There is a significant relationship between aimless managers and staffs' effectiveness.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This is a correlated research which is included 120 Brojured education organization teachers and managers. The sample size is 92 people. The research tool is questionnaire, its spectrum is Likert and standard and Cronbach's alpha is used as an estimate of the reliability of test that is 0.83. Also for examining the hypotheses Pearson correlation test is used.

### Data analyzing

**Hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between introvert managers and staffs' effectiveness.**

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is a no significant relationship between introvert managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There is a significant relationship between introvert managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Table 1. Pearson test for the first research hypothesis**

a	number	Pearson	The significant level
0.05	46	-0.033	0.829

As Pearson test doesn't have meaning in each level (1, 5%), so there is no relation between two hypotheses and we can conclude H<sub>0</sub> and H<sub>1</sub> are rejected and there is a no significant relationship between introvert managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between extravert managers and staffs' effectiveness.**

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is a no significant relationship between extravert managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There is a significant relationship between extravert managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Table2. Pearson test for the second research hypothesis**

a	number	Pearson	The significant level
0.05	46	0.193	0.198

As Pearson test doesn't have meaning in each level (1, 5%), so there is no relation between two hypotheses and we can conclude H<sub>0</sub> and H<sub>1</sub> are rejected and there is a no significant relationship between extravert managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between logical managers and staffs' effectiveness.**

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is a no significant relationship between logical managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There is a significant relationship between logical managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Table3. Pearson test for the third research hypothesis**

a	number	Pearson	The significant level
0.05	46	-0.035	0.187

As Pearson test doesn't have meaning in each level (1, 5%), so there is no relation between two hypotheses and we can conclude H<sub>0</sub> and H<sub>1</sub> are rejected and there is a no significant relationship between logical managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between objective managers and staffs' effectiveness.**

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is a no significant relationship between objective managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There is a significant relationship between objective managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Table4. Pearson test for the forth research hypothesis**

a	number	Pearson	The significant level
0.05	46	0.123	0.416

As Pearson test doesn't have meaning in each level (1, 5%), so there is no relation between two hypotheses and we can conclude H<sub>0</sub> and H<sub>1</sub> are rejected and there is a no significant relationship between objective managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between subjective managers and staffs' effectiveness.**

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is a no significant relationship between subjective managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**H<sub>1</sub>**: There is a significant relationship between subjective managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Table5.Pearson test for the fifth research hypothesis**

a	number	Pearson	The significant level
0.05	46	-0.039	0.795

As Pearson test doesn't have meaning in each level (1, 5%), so there is no relation between two hypotheses and we can conclude  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  are rejected and there is a no significant relationship between subjective managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between emotional managers and staffs' effectiveness.**

**H<sub>0</sub>**: There is a no significant relationship between emotional managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**H<sub>1</sub>**: There is a significant relationship between emotional managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Table6.Pearson test for the sixth research hypothesis**

a	number	Pearson	The significant level
0.05	46	0.079	0.601

As Pearson test doesn't have meaning in each level (1, 5%), so there is no relation between two hypotheses and we can conclude  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  are rejected and there is a no significant relationship between emotional managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between single minded managers and staffs' effectiveness.**

**H<sub>0</sub>**: There is a no significant relationship between single minded managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**H<sub>1</sub>**: There is a significant relationship between single minded managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Table7.Pearson test for the seventh research hypothesis**

a	number	Pearson	The significant level
0.05	46	0.066	0.662

As Pearson test doesn't have meaning in each level (1, 5%), so there is no relation between two hypotheses and we can conclude  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  are rejected and there is a no significant relationship between single minded managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between aimless managers and staffs' effectiveness.**

**H<sub>0</sub>**: There is a no significant relationship between aimless managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**H<sub>1</sub>**: There is a significant relationship between aimless managers and staffs' effectiveness.

**Table8.Pearson test for the eighth research hypothesis**

a	number	Pearson	The significant level
0.05	46	0.044	0.770

As Pearson test doesn't have meaning in each level (1, 5%), so there is no relation between two hypotheses and we can conclude  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  are rejected and there is a no significant relationship between aimless managers and staffs' effectiveness.

## Research Question

**What is the dominant personality of Borujerd school managers?**

**Table 9.Variance analyzing (ANOVA) for comparison of Borujerd managers ' personality types**

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	The significant level
Between group	69.904	7	9.986	26.359	0.000
Within group	136.388	360	0379		
Total	206.292	367			

Variance analyzing table (ANOVA) has showed meaning at 1% level so according to Scheffé's method the best managers' personalities are subjective and single minded managers and the weakest ones are introvert managers.

The results show that there is no significant relationship between manager personality and the staffs' effectiveness; also variance analyzing test has showed the dominant personality is subjective managers.

### **Research Suggestion**

Current study has showed no relationship between manager personality and the staffs' effectiveness, but as the similar researches have shown managers' personality have effect on staffs' effectiveness and it seems that education organization must do widespread researches in this field.

### **REFERENCES**

- Blenkhorn, D.L. & Gaber, B. (1995). The use of warm fuzzies' to assess organizational effectiveness. *Journal of General Management*, Vol.21, no.2. PP: 40-51.
- Denison, D.R. & Mishra, A.K. (2008). Toward a theory of organization culture and effectiveness. *Organizational Science*. Vol. 6, no.2, pp: 204-23.
- Denison, D.R. (2010). *Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness*. New York: John Wiley & sons, PP: 11-15.
- Goodman, L.A. & Pennings, M. (2007). *New perspectives on organizational effectiveness*. San Francisco, London, Jossey Bass publishers.
- Kuthans .F. and Kreitner.R. (1999). *Organizational Behavior modification and beyond. An operant and social learning Approach* (Glenview, IL: scott, forseman)
- Mott, P.E. (1972). *Characteristics of effective organization*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Quinn, R.E. & Rohrbaugh, J. (2008). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*. No.29, PP: 363-377.
- Scheerens, J. & Bosker, R.J. (2007). *The foundations of educational effectiveness*. Oxford Pergamon press.
- Scott M. Meyers, "Who are your motivated workers," in David R. Hampton, *Behavioral concepts in management* (Belmont, Calif: Dickenson Publishing Co., Inc., 1968. P. 64.