CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

This chapter focuses on the results of the study. The present results are in the order of statistical analysis used. As it is a comparative study, tables are given for percentage frequency, correlation tables for different dimensions, and tables of regression values for finding various predictions between dimensions. The last portion of the chapter shows some secondary conclusions showing F ratios and t values comparing the different organisations.

Table - 17
Frequencies of respondents falling in 16 MBTI dimensions corresponding to nine Enneagram points

MBTI TYPES	Enneagram Types									Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
ESTJ	1	0	1	0	2	1	5	3	0	13
ESFJ	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
ESTP	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
ESFP	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
ENTJ	2	0	3	0	2	0	3	3	0	13
ENTP	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
ENFJ	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	0	9
ENFP	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3
ISTJ	5	0	13	5	2	1	7	13	0	46
ISFJ	4	1	0	2	0	0	6	2	0	15
ISTP	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	6
ISFP	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
INTJ	2	0	5	0	1	1	1	11	1	22
INTP	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	7
INFJ	1	0	3	0	0	0	4	2	1	11
INFP	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	22	1	31	7	9	7	32	46	2	157

The Table 17 presents the raw data showing the number of individuals in all (16) MBTI dimensions falling in Nine Enneagram types. Only one (1) Helper had one ISFJ preference, and two (2) Peacemaker individuals had one INTJ and one INFJ preferences each. Out of 157 cases, the maximum incidences (46) fell in Asserters dimension. This may be because our sample were that of managers. So, we had maximum number of

204

Asserters.

In order of numbers falling in Enneagram categories there were 31 Achievers and 22 Perfectionists. Rest of the personality dimensions had very few cases in each. For example there were 9 Observers, 7 Romantics and Questioners each.

Looking at the frequencies of occurences of the 16 MBTI types, the maximum number of cases belonged to ISTJ (46) followed by INTJ (22), ISFJ (15), ENTJ and, ESTJ (13 each), INFJ (11), ENFJ (9), in that order. Rest of the preferences had very few takers.

Table - 18
Showing the per centage of frequencies (Table 17) obtained for MBTI preferences on Nine Enneagram types

MBTI TYPES	Enneagram Types									Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
ESTJ	4.5		3.22		22.22	14.28	15.62	6.52		8.28
ESFJ	9.2						3.12	2.17		2.55
ESTP					11.11	14.28	3.12			1.91
ESFP			3.22							0.64
ENTJ	9.2		9.67		22.22		9.37	6.52		6.37
ENTP	4.5							2.17		1.27
ENFJ	4.5		3.22				6.25	10.86		5.73
ENFP	4.5						3.12	2.17		1.91
ISTJ	22.7		41.93	71.42	22.22	14.28	21.87	28.28		29.3
ISFJ	18.2	1.100		28.57			18.75	4.34		9.61
ISTP			3.22			28.57	3.12	4.34		3.82
ISFP					11.11					0.64
INTJ	9.2		16.13		11.11	14.28	3.12	23.91	50	14.01
INTP	9.2		6.45			14.28		4.34		4.46
INFJ	4.5		9.67				12.15	4.34	50	7.01
INFP			3.22							0.64
TOTAL	14.08	0.64	19.84	4.48	5.76	4.48	20.48	21.16	1.27	157

1	ISTJ, ISFJ, ESFJ, ENTJ, INTJ, INTJ, ESTJ, ENTP, ENFJ, ENFP, INFJ
2	ISFJ
3	ISTJ, INTJ, ENTJ, INFJ, INFP, INTP, ESTJ, ESFP, ENFJ, ISTP
4	ISTJ, ISFJ
5	ESTJ, ENTJ, ISTJ, ESTP, ISFP, INTJ
6	ISTP, ESTJ, ESTP, ISTJ, ISFP
7	ISTJ, ISFJ, ESTJ, INFJ, ENTJ, ENFJ, ESFP, ESTP, ENFP, ISTP, INTJ
8	ISTJ, INTJ, ENFJ, ENTJ, ESTJ, ISFJ, ISTP, INTP, INFJ, ISFJ
9	INTJ, INFJ

This Table 19 shows the results regarding the per centage frequency of Nine Enneagram personality types and sixteen MBTI types which shows the maximum per centage i.e. 22.7 for Ones in ISTJ and 18.20 for ISFJ, 9.2 for ESFJ, ENTJ, INTJ, INTP and 4.5 for ESTJ, ENTP, ENFJ, ENFP, INFJ.

Twos yielded only one frequency in the sample of 157 managers in ISFJ preference.

Threes yielded maximum in ISTJ i.e. 41.93 and 16.13 in INTJ preference. The rest showed very low frequencies, 9.67 for ENTJ and INFJ, 6.45 for INTP and 3.22 for ESTJ, ESFP, ENFJ, ISTP, and INFP.

Fours scored maximum on ISTJ i.e. 71.42 and 28.57 on ISFJ.

Fives yielded relationships with six MBTI preference, 22.22per cent for ESTJ, ENTJ, ISTJ and 11.11 per cent for ESTP, ISFP and INTJ preference.

Sixes yielded maximum per cent i.e. 28.57 on ISTP preference. Rest five preferences i.e. ESTJ, ESTP, ISTJ, ISFP yielded 14.28 per cent.

Sevens scored 21.87 per cent the maximum in ISTJ and 18.75 in ISFJ preference

15.62 for ESTJ and 12.15 for INFJ, 9.37 for ENTJ, 6.25 for ENFJ and lowest 3.12 for ESFJ, ESTP, ENFP, ISTP and INTJ.

Eights show relationship with ISTJ to 28.28per cent and INTJ to 23.91per cent. ENFJ to 10.86per cent, ESTJ and ENTJ to 6.52per cent, 4.34per cent to ISFJ, ISTP, INTP and INFJ and lowest 2.17per cent on ESFJ and ENFP.

There were only two Nines, one showed INTJ and other INFJ preferences i.e. 50per cent each.

Conclusively, the above result indicate that there is no significant distribution over various dimensions. Many MBTI dimensions yielded zero with Enneagram dimensions. One reason for this might be relatively small sample size (n = 157) in this research.

Had the sample size been bigger, a different picture might have emerged.

Table 20
Showing correlations between Enneagram and MBTI types scores (n = 150)

Enneagram	MBTI							
	I	E	S	N	T	F	J	P
1	-0.003	0.00	0.11*	-0.11*	-0.07	0.07	0.04	-0.06
2	0.14*	-0.14*	0.02	-0.02	-0.28#	0.28#	-0.20**	0.18**
3	-0.06	0.07	-0.09	0.09	0.10	-0.09*	0.31#	-0.32#
4	0.09	-0.10	0.06	-0.06	-0.15**	0.15**	-0.15*	0.13*
5	0.11*	-0.11*	0.03	-0.02	-0.22**	0.21**	-0.06	0.03
6	0.10	-0.10	0.05	-0.05	-0.12**	0.13*	0.09	-0.12*
7	-0.06	0.06	0.001	-0.001	-0.09	0.09	0.16*	-0.19**
8	-0.08	0.08	-0.04	0.05	-0.01	0.01	0.20**	-0.20**
9	0.17**	-0.17**	-0.04	0.05	0.22**	0.20*	-0.10	0.09

* < 0.05, ** <0.01, # <0.001

Table 20 shows correlation values between Enneagram types (1 to 9) and 8 MBTI types (n=150). The above table shows 29 significant correlations out of 72 worked out. Several factors on the two tests of Enneagram and MBTI were found to be significantly correlated. Again, out of 29 significant correlations as many as 15 correlations were negative and 14 were positive. Positive correlations were obtained for the following variables :

Feeling dimension of MBTI was positively correlated with Helpers, Romantics, Observers, Questioners and Peacemakers. Introversion, in general, was positively correlated with Helpers, Peacemakers and Observers. Judging was positively correlated with Achievers, Adventurers and Asserters. Perceiving was positively correlated with Helpers and Romantics. Sensing was positively correlated to Perfectionists. In brief, maximum number (3) of correlations were obtained for Helpers with MBTI preferences.

Negative correlations were obtained between Perceiving dimension of MBTI and Achievers, Adventurers, Asserters and Questioners of Enneagram types. Thinking was negatively correlated with Helpers, Romantics, Observers, Questioners and Peacemakers. Judging yielded negative correlations with Romantics and Helpers. Extraverted were negatively correlated with Helpers, Peacemakers and Observers dimensions. Finally, Intuitives were negatively correlated to Perfectionists. Briefly, it could be said that Helpers yielded maximum (3) correlations.

Table 21
Showing regression values for Introversion (dependent variable)
and nine Enneagram types (Independent variable)

VARIABLE	N	R	R²	adjR	SE	β	F
Peacemakers	150	0.171	0.029	0.023	1.41	0.171	4.45*

* p =< 0.05

Table 21 shows the result of stepwise regression analysis for Introversion as dependent variable and Enneagram dimensions as independent vairables where only Nines i.e. Peacemakers variable was significant at step 1, none other variable could find place in the equation. That means only Peacemaker dimension can predict the Introversion dimension to the extent of 17 per cent of certainity.

Table 22
Showing regression values for Thinking (dependent variable)
and nine Enneagram types (Independent variable)

VARIABLE	N	R	R²	adjR	SE	β	F
Helpers	150	0.284	0.080	0.074	1.63	-0.284	12.96*

* p =< 0.001

Table 22 shows the result of step-wise regression analysis for Thinking as dependent variable and Enneagram dimensions as independent vairables where only Twos i.e. Helpers variable was significant at step 1, none other variable could find place in the equation. That means only Helpers dimension can predict the Thinking dimension to the extent of 28 per cent of certainity.

Table 23
Showing regression values for Judging (dependent variable) and nine Enneagram types (Independent variable)

VARIABLE	N	R	R²	adjR	SE	β	F
Achievers	150	0.311	0.097	-	-	0.311	15.86
Helpers	150	0.383	0.147	0.135	1.65	-0.224	12.65

* p =< 0.001

Table 23 shows the result of step-wise regression analysis for Judging as dependent variable and Enneagram dimensions as independent variables where only Threes i.e. Achievers variable was significant at step 1, and Helpers, i.e., Twos was found significant at step 2. None other variable could find place in the equation. That means only Helpers and Achievers dimension can predict the Judging dimension to the extent of 31 per cent and 38 per cent of certainity.

Table 24
Showing regression values for Feeling (dependent variable) and nine Enneagram types (Independent variable)

VARIABLE	N	R	R²	adjR	SE	β	F
Helpers	150	0.2772	0.0768	0.0706	1.645	0.28	12.32*

* p =< 0.001

Table 24 shows the result of step-wise regression analysis for Feeling as dependent variable and Enneagram dimensions as independent vairables where only Twos i.e. Helpers variable was significant at step 1, none other variable could find place in the equation. That means only Helper's dimension can predict the Feeling dimension to the extent of 28 per cent of certainity.

Table 25
Showing regression values for Extroversion (dependent variable) and nine Enneagram types (Independent variable)

VARIABLE	N	R	R²	adjR	SE	β	F
Peacemakers	150	0.169	0.029	0.022	1.39	-0.169	4.34*

* p =< 0.05

Table 25 shows the result of step-wise regression analysis for Extraversion as dependent variable and Enneagram dimensions as independent vairables where only Nines, i.e., Peacemakers variable was significant at step 1, none other variable could find place in the equation. That means only Peacemakers dimension can predict the Extroversion dimension to the extent of 17 per cent of certainity.

Table 26
Showing regression values for Perceiving (dependent variable) and nine Enneagram types (Independent variable)

VARIABLE	N	R	R²	adjR	SE	β	F
Achieves	150	0.318*	0.101	-	-	-0.318	16.697
Helpers	150	0.377*	0.142	0.130	1.66	0.201	12.14

* p =< 0.001

Table 26 shows the result of stepwise regression analysis for Perceiving as dependent variable and Enneagram dimensions as independent vairables where only Threes i.e. the Achievers variable was significant at step 1, and at the second step analysis, Helpers, i.e., Twos variable was found significant. None other variable could find place in the equation. That means only Helpers and Achievers dimension can predict upto 20 per cent and 32 per cent respectively about the perceiving dimension of MBTI.

Step-wise regression analysis and correlation techniques to find the extent of predictive relationships between Enneagram types and Leadership styles. The results have been summarisec below :

Table 27
Showing correlation between Enneagram types (1 to 9)
and Task oriented leadership style scores (n = 150)

Leadership Style	Enneagram								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Task oriented	0.18**	0.01	0.19**	0.03	-0.10	0.12*	0.25#	0.13*	-0.03

*<0.05; ** <0.01; # <0.001

Table 27 snows the correlations between Task-oriented leadership style and nine Enneagram personality dimensions where 5 significant positive correlations are obtained between Task oriented leadership on the one hand and Perfectionists, Achievers, Questioners, Adventurers and Asserters personality dimensions of the Enneagram on the other hand.

Table 28
Showing correlation between Enneagram types (1 to 9) and Authoritative leadership style scores (n = 150)

Leadership Style	Enneagram								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Authoritative	0.11*	0.01	0.15**	0.00	-0.01	0.14**	0.23#	0.19**	0.06

*<0.05; ** <0.01; # <0.001

Correlations between Authoritative style of leadership and nine Enneagram types are shown in the above Table 28. Five significant positive correlations are obtained for Perfectionists, Achievers, Questioners, Asserters and Adventurers with Authoritative leadership style.

Table 29
Showing correlation between Enneagram types (1 to 9) and Participative leadership style scores (n = 150)

Leadership Style	Enneagram								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Participative	0.12*	0.02	0.09	0.06	-0.01	0.17**	0.14**	0.12*	0.04

*<0.05; ** <0.01; # <0.001

Table 29 shows the correlations between Participative leadership style and nine Enneagram personality dimensions. Here four positive significant correlations are obtained between Participative style of leadership and Perfectionists, Questioners, Adventurers and Asserters dimensions of personality.

Table 30
Showing correlation between Enneagram types (1 to 9) and A, ϱ + N leadership style scores (n = 150)

Leadership Style	Enneagram								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A, ϱ + N	0.06	0.09	0.12*	0.04	0.03	0.19**	0.20#	0.22#	0.15**

*<0.05; ** <0.01; # <0.001

Table 30 shows that the A, ϱ + N style of leadership and Achievers, Questioners, Adventurers, Asserters and Peacemakers personality dimensions are significantly positively correlated.

In all 19 significant correlation values (out of 36 possible correlations worked out) were obtained. All significant correlations were positive.

A general trend appearing in the above 4 tables is that Adventurers, Asserters and Questioners (6, 7, 8) have yielded significant positive correlations with all the four leadership style. It also yielded two non-significant negative correlations with Observer and Peacemakers. Four personality types namely, Helpers, Romantics, Observers and Peacemakers generated lowest correlation values i.e. 0.09 only.

Table 31

Shows the regression values for A, ϱ + N (dependent variable)
and nine enneagram types (independent variable)

VARIABLE	N	R	R²	adjR	SE	Sig f	β
Adventurer	150	0.275	0.076	0.069	2.84	0.001	0.275

Table 31 shows the result of step wise regression analysis for A, ϱ + N as dependent variable and enneagram as independent variable where only Sevens i.e. Adventurer variable was significant. None other variable could find place in the equation. That means, only Adventurers dimension can predict the A, ϱ + N style to the extent of 28 per cent of certainity.

Table 32

Shows the regression values for Participative leadership style (dependent variable)
and nine enneagram types (independent variable) (n = 150)

VARIABLE	N	R	R²	adjR	Sig f	SE	β
Questioner	150	0.168	0.028	0.022	0.04	2.86	0.168

Table 32 shows the result of step wise regression analysis for Participative as dependent variable and Enneagram as independent variable where only Sixes, i.e., Questioners Variable was significant at step 1, none other variable could find place in the equation. That means only Questioners dimension can predict Participative style of leadership to the extent of 17 per cent of certainity.

Table 33

Shows the regression values for Authoritative (dependent variable) and nine Enneagram types (independent variable) (n = 150)

VARIABLE	N	R	R²	adjR	Sig f	SE	β
Adventurer	150	0.226	0.051	0.045	0.005	2.85	0.226

Table 33 shows the result of step wise regression analysis for Authoritative as dependent variable and Enneagram as independent variable where only Sevens, i.e., Adventurers was sign ficant at step 1, none other variable could find place in the equation. That means, cnly Adventurers dimension can predict Authoritative leadership style to the extent of 23 per cent of certainity.

Table 34

Shows the regression values for Task-oriented (dependent variable) and nine Enneagram types (independent variable) (n = 150)

VARIABLE	N	R	R²	adjR	Sig f	SE	β
Adventurer	150	0.247	0.061	0.054	0.002	2.72	0.247

Table 34 shows the result of step wise regression analysis for Task-oriented leadership style as cependent variable and enneagram as independent variable where only Sevens, i.e., Adventurers Variable was significant at step 1, none other variable could find place in the equation. That means, only Adventurers dimension can predict the Task oriented dimensicn to the extent of 25 per cent of certainity. That is, Adventurers are likely to be Task-oriented leaders.

Table 35

Showing correlation between Extraversion - Introversion and Leadership

Leadership Styles	MBTI Types	
	Introversion	Extraversion
Task oriented	-0.03	0.03
Authoritative	-0.04	0.04
Participative	-0.12*	0.12*
A, p + N	-0.08	0.09

* <.05

Table 35 shows the correlation values for Introversion - Extraversion personality dimensions with 4 leadership styles. Only two significant correlations were obtained. Participaive style of leadership was significantly and positively correlated to Extraversion preference and significantly but negatively correlated with Introversion preference.

A general notable trend is that Introversion obtained negative correlations with all four leadership styles whereas Extraversion personality dimension obtained all positive correlations with four leadership styles (though only one significant in each case). Could it be tha , as many people believe, Introversion may not cultivate leadership qualities particularly the four styles tested here.

Table 36
Showing correlations between 6 preferences of MBTI and Leadership style
(n = 150)

Leadership	MBTI					
	Sensing	Intuitive	Thinking	Feeling	Judging	Perceiving
Task oriented	0.03	-0.02	0.07	-0.07	0.09	-0.10
Authoritative	-0.01	0.02	0.07	-0.08	0.19*	-0.12*
Participative	-0.03	0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.03
A, p - N	-0.02	0.02	-0.06	0.06	0.06	-0.07

* < 0.05

The above Table 36 shows the correlation between six types namely Sensing - Intuitive, Thinking - Feeling, and Judging - Perceiving of MBTI dimensions to four Leadership style of Task-oriented, Authoritative, Participative and A, p + N. Only two significant correlations were obtained for Authoritative style of leadership with Judging having significan positive correlation while Perceiving having significant negative correlation with authoritative types. Rest of the correlation values were nonsignificant.

Table 37
Showing differences between the scores on Perfectionists dimension
of Manufacturing organisation (O1 + O3) and Service sector organizations (O4)
(n = 135 , O1 + O3 = 78 , O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Mean
Between groups	1	1.19	1.19	10.19	0.001	O1+O3 =
Within groups	133	15.48	0.116			2.81
Total	134	16.67				O4 = 2.99

The above Table 37 shows significant interaction between the variables under consideratons. That is, managers in manufacturing organisation and service organisation differed among themselves on the 'Perfectionists' personality dimensions of Enneagram. The mean values of the two types of organisations namely, manufacturing (O1 + O3 = 2.8) and service (O4 = 2.99) indicate that managers in service organisations are more Perfectionists types than those of manufacturing organisation.

Table 38
Showing differences between the scores on Peace-makers dimension
of Manufacturing organisation (O1 + O3) and Service sector organizations (O4)
(n = 135 ; O1 + O3 = 78 , O4 = 57)

SOUFCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Mean
Betweer groups	1	2.303	2.303	13.60	0.003	O1 + O3 =
Within groups	133	22.84	0.169			2.47
To al	134	24.82				O4 = 2.73

The above Table 38 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under considerations. That is, managers in manufacturing organisations and service organisation differ among themselves on the 'Peace-makers' personality dimensions of Enneagran. The mean values of the two types of organisations namely manufacturing (O1 + O3 = 2.47) and service (O4 = 2.73) indicate that managers in service organisations are more Peacemakers types than those of manufacturing organisation.

Table 39
Showing differences between the scores on Helpers dimension
of Manufacturing organisation (O1 + O3) and Service sector organizations (O4)
(n = 135 , O1 + O3 = 78 , O4 = 57)

SOUFCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Mean
Betweer groups	1	0.76	0.76	5.18	0.02	O1 + O3 =
Within groups	133	19.63	0.15			2.41
To al	134	20.39				O4 = 2.56

The above Table 39 shows significant interact on effect between the variables under

considerat ons. That is, managers in manufacturing organisation and service organisation

differed a nong themselves on the 'Helpers' personality dimensions of Enneagram

personali y types. The mean values of the two types of organisations namely

manufacturing (O1 + O3 = 2.41) and service (O4 = 2.73) indicate that managers in

service organisations are more Helpers types than those of manufacturing organisation.

Table 40
Showing differences between the scores on Romantics dimension
of Manufacturing organisation (O1 + O3) and Service sector organizations (O4)
(n = 135 , O1 + O3 = 78 , O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Mean
Betweer groups	1	0.98	0.985	8.62	0.03	O1 + O3 =
Within groups	133	15.21	0.114			2.63
Total	134	16.19				O4 = 2.81

The above Table 40 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consthe considera ions. That is, managers in manufacturing organisations are significantly different f om the managers in service organisation on the personality dimension of Romantics of Enneagram.

The mean values of the two organisations manufacturing O1 + O3 = 2.63 and service O4 = 2.81 indicate that managers in service organisations are more Romantics than in manufacturing organisation.

Table 41
Showing differences between the scores on Questioner dimension of Manufacturing organisation (O1 + O3) and Service sector organizations (O4)
(n = 135 , O1 + O3 = 78 , O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Mean
Between groups	1	0.56	0.56	5.02	0.02	O1 + O3 =
Within groups	133	14.85	0.11			2.78
Total	134	15.41				O4 = 2.91

The above Table 41 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under considera ions. That is, managers in manufacturing organisations and service organisaitc n differ among themselves on the personality dimension 'Questioners' of Enneagran.

The mean values of the two organisations manufacturing O1 + O3 = 2.78 and service, O4 = 2.91 ndicated that managers in service organisations are more Questioners types than in menufacturing organisation.

Table 42
Showing F values for differences between the scores on Enneagram dimension
of Manufacturing organisation (O1 + O3) and Service sector organizations (O4)
(n = 135 , O1 + O3 = 78 , O4 = 57)

Enneagrams Dimension - Achievers

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.22	0.22	1.67	0.197	O1 + O3 = 3.04
Within groups	133	17.62	0.13			O4 = 3.12
Total	134	17.84				

Enneagrams Dimension - Observers

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.31	0.306	1.93	1.66	O1 + O3 = 2.44
Within groups	133	21.06	0.158			O4 = 2.53
Total	134	21.36				

Enneagrams Dimension - Adventurers

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.13	0.13	0.82	0.36	O1 + O3 = 3.03
Within groups	133	20.96	0.16			O4 = 3.09
Total	134	21.09				

Enneagrams Dimension - Asserters

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.299	0.299	1.70	0.194	O1 + O3 = 3.15
Within groups	133	23.39	0.175			O4 = 3.06
Total	134	23.68				

Table 42 shows nonsignificant differences between manufacturing and service organisations

on the four Enneagram dimensions - Achievers, Observers, Adventurers and Asserters types.

Table 43
Tables showing Means, SDs, SEds, t values and their significance levels for
9 Enneagrams types in manufacturing (O1 + O3)
and service (O4) sector organisation

Enneagram	Organisations	X̄	SD	SE_D	t*
1	O1 + O3	3.16	0.325	0.122	0.01
	O4	3.15	0.218	0.120	
2	O1 + O3	3.00	-	-	-
	O4	a			
3	O1 + O3	3.32	0.368	0.136	0.72
	O4	3.41	0.323	0.130	
4	O1 + O3	3.13	0.245	0.165	0.54
	O4	3.04	0.194	0.172	
5	O1 + O3	3.12	0.884	0.461	0.03
	O4	3.10	0.475	0.654	
6	O1 + O3	3.02	0.359	0.269	2.56
	O4	3.44	0.042	0.163	
7	O1 + O3	3.35	0.285	0.092	1.66
	O4	3.49	0.212	0.087	
8	O1 + O3	3.47	0.284	0.098	0.37
	O4	3.43	0.369	0.110	
9	O1 + O3	3.14	b	-	-
	O4	3.57			

* None of the t - value is significant.

a No individuals fell in this category in this organisation so no t value could be found.

b There was only one individual in each of the above organisation so the t value was not possible.

t values were not significant. So, no further analyses was done. The total absence of significant t value in these analyses might have occurred because this set of analysis deal with comparisons of the same personality traits across different or- ganisations and signficant differences between the same personality traits can not be legitimately expected. Hence, such a series of non-significant t values was not surprising.

Table 44

Showing differences between two organisations manufacturing (O1 + O3) ,
service (O4) on Feeling variable of MBTI (n = 135, O1 + O3 = 28, O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	14.69	14.69	5.32	0.022	O1 + O3 = 4.38
Within groups	133	367.30	2.76			O4 = 5.05
Total	134	382.00				

The above Table 44 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under
considerations. That is managers in manufacturing organisation and service organisation
differ among themselves on the Feeling variable of MBTI personality dimensions.

The mean values of the two organisations of manufacturing (O1 + O3 = 4.38), service
(O4 = 5.05) indicate that managers in service organisations are more Feelings types
than those of manufacturing organisation.

Table 45

Showing differences between two organisations manufacturing (O1 + O3) ,
service (O4) on Thinking variable of MBTI (n = 135, O1 + O3 = 28, O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	13.99	13.99	5.14	0.024	O1 + O3 = 6.56
Within groups	133	361.74	2.72			O4 = 5.91
Total	134	375.73	-			

The above Table 45 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under
considerations. That is, managers in manufacturing organisations and service organisation
differed among themselves on the Thinking variable of MBTI personality dimensions.

The mean values of the two organisations in manufacturing (O1 + O3 = 6.56), and service
(O4 = 5.91) indicate that managers in manufacturing organisations are more Thinking types
than those of service organisation.

Table 46
Showing nonsignificant differences on MBTI dimensions
between manufacturing organisation (O1 + O3) and service organizations (O4)
(n = 135 , O1 + O3 = 78 , O4 = 57)

MBTI Dimension - Extraversion

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.226	0.226	0.113	0.73	O1 + O3 = 5.01
Within groups	133	266.71	2.005			O4 = 4.93
Total	134	266.93				

MBTI Dimension - Introversion

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.030	0.804	0.015	0.903	O1 + O3 = 5.99
Within groups	133	273.96	2.059			O4 = 6.02
Total	134	266.93				

MBTI Dimension - Sensing

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.878	0.878	0.3382	0.5618	O1 + O3 = 5.54
Within groups	133	345.31	2.596			O4 = 5.701
Total	134	346.19				

In the above Table 46 no significant difference was found between manufacturing organisations and service organisation on the three MBTI dimensions Extraversion, Introversion, and Sensing types.

Table 47
Showing nonsignificant differences on MBTI dimensions
between manufacturing organisation (O1 + O3) and service organizations (O4)
(n = 135 , O1 + O3 = 78 , O4 = 57)

MBTI Dimension - Intuitive

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.929	0.929	0.354	0.552	O1 + O3 = 5.45
Within groups	133	348.80	2.62			O4 = 5.28
Total	134	349.73				

MBTI Dimension - Judging

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	2.785	2.785	0.863	0.354	O1 + O3 = 7.45
Within groups	133	428.87	3.224			O4 = 7.16
Total	134	431.65				

MBTI Dimension - Perceiving

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	1.077	1.077	0.332	0.565	O1 + O3 = 3.54
Within groups	133	430.89	3.23			O4 = 3.72
Total	134	431.970				

In the above Table 47 no significant difference was found between manufacturing

organisations and service organisation on the three MBTI dimensions Intuitive,

Judging and Perceiving types.

Table 48
Showing Means, SDs, SEᴅs, t values and significance levels of
8 MBTI types on manufacturing organisation (O1 + O3)
and service organisation (O4)

MBTI Types	Organisations	X̄	SD	SEᴅ	t*
I	O1 + O3	6.41	1.089	0.312	0.42
	O4	6.53	0.743	0.274	
E	O1 + O3	6.64	0.960	0.210	0.12
	O4	6.61	1.168	0.218	
S	O1 + O3	6.85	1.026	0.252	0.97
	O4	6.61	0.983	0.249	
N	O1 + O3	6.57	1.100	0.235	1.06
	O4	6.81	0.910	0.225	
T	O1 + O3	6.62	1.096	0.317	0.08
	O4	6.65	0.988	0.314	
F	O1 + O3	7.29	1.214	0.235	2.26
	O4	6.79	0.031	0.224	
J	O1 + O3	7.84	1.528	0.266	0.49
	O4	7.72	1.280	0.254	
P	O1 + O3	5.35	1.823	0.704	1.53
	O4	6.40	1.506	0.681	

*   None of the t value is significant.

t values were not significant. So no further analyses is taken. The total absence of significant t value in these analysis might have occurred because this set of analysis deal with comparisons of the same personality traits across different organisations and signficant differences between the same personality traits can not be legitimately expected. Hence, such a series of non-significant t values was not surprising.

Table 49

Showing F values for differences between the scores on Leadership dimensions of Manufacturing organisation (O1 + O3) and Service sector organizations (O4) (n = 135 , O1 + O3 = 78 , O4 = 57).

Leadership Dimension - Task oriented

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.194	0.195	0.023	0.879	O1 + O3 = 17.26
Within groups	133	1127.54	8.478			O4 = 17.33
Total	134	1127.73				

Leadership Dimension - Participative

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	2.63	2.63	0.299	0.585	O1 + O3 = 15.76
Within groups	133	1170.58	8.801			O4 = 15.47
Total	134	1173.21				

Leadership Dimension - Authoritative

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.413	0.413	0.045	0.045	O1 + O3 = 16.74
Within groups	133	1218.135	9.158			O4 = 16.63
Total	134	1218.548				

Leadership Dimension - A, p + N

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.0002	0.0002	0.000	0.936	O1 + O3 = 15.44
Within groups	133	1237.21	9.30			O4 = 15.44
Total	134	1237.21				

No significant difference was found between manufacturing and service organisations on any of the four leadership styles of Task oriented, Authoritative, Participative and A, p + N.

233

Table 50
Showing Means, SDs, SEɒs, t values and their significance levels on
4 Leadership styles in manufacturing (O1 + O3)
and service (O4) sector organisations

Leadership	Organisations	X̄	SD	SEɒ	t*
Task oriented	O1 + O3	16.63	2.735	0.997	0.05
	O4	16.69	3.038	1.025	
Authoritative	O1 + O3	15.97	1.756	0.453	2.25
	O4	17.04	1.989	0.472	
Participative	O1 + O3	16.50	3.777	1.605	0.31
	O4	17.00	3.780	1.606	
A, p + N	O1 + O3	17.90	2.077	0.438	0.67
	O4	18.20	2.127	0.439	

* None of the t value is significant.

Table 50 shows that t values were not significant. So no further analysis is taken. The total absence of significant t value in these analysis might have occurred because this set of analysis deal with comparisons of the same leadership styles across different organisations and signficant differences between the same leadership styles can not be legitimately expected. Hence, such a series of non-significant t values was not surprising.

Table 51

Showing differences between two organisations private manufacturing (O1) and public manufacturing (O3) on Adventurer variable of Enneagram (n = 78, O1 = 32, O3 = 46)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	1.33	1.33	11.70	0.001	O1 = 3.19
Within groups	76	8.65	0.11			O4 = 2.92
Total	77	9.98				

The above Table 51 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is managers in chemical manufacturing organisation in private and public sector differed among themselves on the Adventurer variable of Enneagram types. The mean values of the two organisations private (O1 = 3.19), public (O3 = 2.92) indicate that managers in private sector manufacturing organisations are more Adventurer types than those in public sector manufacturing organisation.

Table 52

Showing differences between two organisations private manufacturing (O1) and public manufacturing (O3) on Asserter variable of Enneagram (n = 78, O1 = 32, O3 = 46)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	2.26	2.26	14.91	0.002	O1 = 3.36
Within groups	76	11.56	0.15			O4 = 3.01
Total	77	13.83				

The above Table 52 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is managers in chemical manufacturing organisation in private and public sector differed among themselves on the Asserter variable of Enneagram types. The mean values of the two organisations private (O1 = 3.36), public (O3 = 3.01) indicated that managers in private sector manufacturing organisations are more Asserter types than managers of public sector manufacturing organisation.

Table 53

Showing differences between two organisations private manufacturing (O1) and public manufacturing (O3) on Achievers variable of Enneagram (n = 78, O1 = 32, O3 = 46)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	1.36	1.36	11.65	0.001	O1 = 3.197
Within groups	76	8.92	0.117			O4 = 2.928
Total	77	10.29				

The above Table 53 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideraion. That is managers in chemical manufacturing organisation in private and public secor differed among themselves on the Achievers variable of Enneagram types. The mear values of the two organisations private (O1 = 3.197), public (O3 = 2.928) indicated that managers in private sector manufacturing organisations are higher Achievers types than their counterparts in public sector manufacturing organisation.

Table 54

Showing F values related to differences on the scores of Enneagram dimensions in private sector manufacturing organisation (O1) and public sector manufacturing organizations (O3) (n = 78 , O1 = 32 , O3 = 46).

Enneagram Dimension - Perfectionists

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.07	0.07	0.53	0.46	O1 = 2.84
Within groups	76	10.15	0.13			O3 = 2.78
Total	77	10.22				

Enneagram Dimension - Helpers

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.33	0.33	2.14	0.14	O1 = 2.53
Within groups	76	11.61	0.15			O3 = 2.46
Total	77	11.93				

Enneagram Dimension - Romantics

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.01	0.01	0.129	0.72	O1 = 2.62
Within groups	76	8.33	0.10			O3 = 2.64
Total	77	8.34				

Enneagram Dimension - Questioners

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.26	0.26	2.54	0.114	O1 = 2.45
Within groups	76	7.82	0.10			O3 = 2.43
Total	77	8.08				

Table 55
Showing F values related to differences on the scores of Enneagram dimensions in private sector manufacturing organisation (O1) and public sector manufacturing organizations (O3) (n = 78 , O1 = 32 , O3 = 46).

Enneagram Dimension - Observers

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.007	0.007	0.050	0.82	O1 = 2.45
Within groups	76	11.17	0.147			O3 = 2.43
Total	77	11.17				

Enneagram Dimension - Peace-makers

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.004	0.0004	0.0026	0.9594	O1 = 2.47
Within groups	76	10.945	0.1440			O3 = 2.46
Total	77	10.946				

Above Tables 54 and Table 55 show that F values were not significant between private and public sector manufacturing organisations on the six dimensions of Enneagram - Pefectionists, Helpers, Romantics, Questioners, Observers and Peace-makers.

Table 56
Showing Means, SDs, SEɒs, t values and their significance levels related to
9 Enneagrams types in private (O1) and public (O3) sector manufacturing organisations

Enneagram	Organisations	$\overline{X}$	SD	SEɒ	t*
1	O1	3.43	0.189	0.213	2.75
	O3	2.99	0.345	0.159	
2	O1	a		-	-
	O3	3.000	3.000		
3	O1	3.52	0.289	0.139	2.77
	O3	3.13	0.344	0.138	
4	O1	a		-	-
	O3	3.14	0.245		
5	O1	3.13 a	0.884	0.884	-
	O3				
6	O1	2.71a	0.361	0.103	-
	O3	3.10b		0.403	
7	O1	3.45	0.235	0.122	1.64
	O3	3.25	0.306	0.122	
8	O1	3.53	0.286	0.102	1.64
	O3	3.37	0.257	0.098	
9	O1	a	-	-	-
	O3	3.14			

* None of the t value is significant.
a No individuals fell in this category in this organisation so no t value could be found.
b There was only one individual in each of the above organisation so the t value was not possible to find.

Table 56 shows t values were not significant. So no further analysis was undertaken. The total absence of significant t value in these analysis might be because this set of analysis deal with comparisons of the same personality traits across different organisations.

Table 57

Showing F values related to Extraversion dimension of MBTI between public (O3) and private (O1) sector manufacturing organisations (n = 78, O1 = 32, O3 = 46)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	14.58	14.58	8.12	0.005	O1 = 5.53
Within groups	76	136.40	1.79			O3 = 5.01
Total	77	150.98				

The above Table 57 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is, managers in chemical manufacturing organisation in private and public sector differed among themselves on the Extraversion dimension of MBTI types. The mean values of the two organisations private (O1 = 5.53), public (O3 = 5.01) indicate that managers in private sector manufacturing organisations are more Extraverts than the counterpart in public sector manufacturing organisation.

Table 58

Showing F values related to Introversion dimension of MBTI between public (O3) and private (O1) sector manufacturing organisations (n = 78, O1 = 32, O3 = 46)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	14.58	14.58	8.12	0.005	O3 = 6.35
Within groups	76	136.40	1.79			O1 = 5.00
Total	77	150.98				

The above Table 58 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is managers in chemical manufacturing organisation in private and public sector differed among themselves on the Introversion dimension of MBTI types. The mean values of the two organisations private (O1 = 5.00), public (O3 = 6.35) indicate that managers in public sector manufacturing organisations are more Introverted types than private sector manufacturing organisation.

Table 59
Showing F values related to difference between the scores of dimensions of MBTI in public (O3) and private (O1) sector manufacturing organisations (n = 78, O1 = 32, O3 = 46)

MBTI Dimension - Sensing

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	6.68	6.68	2.45	0.121	O1 = 5.19
Within groups	76	206.701	2.71			O3 = 5.78
Total	77	213.38				

MBTI Dimension - Intuitive

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	7.18	7.18	2.64	0.10	O1 = 5.81
Within groups	76	206.11	2.71			O3 = 5.19
Total	77	213.29				

MBTI Dimension - Thinking

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	1.94	1.94	0.654	0.42	O1 = 6.38
Within groups	76	225.23	2.96			O3 = 6.69
Total	77	227.17				

MBTI Dimension = Feeling

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	3.13	3.13	1.03	0.31	O1 = 4.22
Within groups	76	231.32	3.04			O3 = 5.19
Total	77	234.46				

Table 60
Showing F values related to Introversion dimension of MBTI between public (O3) and private (O1) sector manufacturing organisations (n = 78, O1 = 32, O3 = 46)

MBTI Dimension - Judging

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	3.95	3.95	1.24	0.26	O1 = 7.72
Within groups	76	241.33	3.17			O3 = 7.26
Total	77	245.29				

MBTI Dimension - Perceiving

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	3.58	3.58	1.13	0.28	O1 = 3.28
Within groups	76	239.79	3.15			O3 = 3.72
Total	77	243.38				

Above Tables 59 and Table 60 show that F values were not significant between private and public sector manufacturing organisations on the six dimensions of MBTI types - Sensing, Intuitive, Thinking, Feeling, Judging and Perceiving.

Table 61
Showing Means, SDs, SEds, t values and their significance levels on
8 MBTI types in private (O1) and public sector manufacturing organisation (O3)

MBTI Types	Organisations	X̄	SD	SEd	t*
I	O1	6.57	0.746	0.416	0.89
	O3	6.10	1.595	0.530	
E	O1	6.50	0.860	0.247	1.04
	O3	6.75	1.025	0.240	
S	O1	6.85	1.064	0.384	0.05
	O3	6.87	0.990	0.328	
N	O1	6.55	1.099	0.319	0.10
	O3	6.58	1.119	0.317	
T	O1	6.44	1.042	0.505	1.35
	O3	7.17	1.169	0.537	
F	O1	7.51	1.379	0.294	1.28
	O3	7.12	1.067	0.307	
J	O1	7.98	1.640	0.346	0.83
	O3	7.69	1.390	0.341	
P	O1	5.50	2.380	1.121	0.15
	O3	5.30	1.703	1.306	

*   None of the t value is significant.

t values were not significant. The reason may be that both the organisations are chemical manufacturing belonging to the same city, so culturally and socially there may not be much difference in the two organisations. Hence no significant difference in their managers' personality types.

Table 62
Showing F values related to the scores on Leadership dimensions in private (O1)
and public sector manufacturing organizations (O3)

Leadership Dimension - Task oriented

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	3.219	3.219	0.5466	0.462	O1 = 17.50
Within groups	76	447.65	5.890			O3 = 17.08
Total	77	450.87				

Leadership Dimension - Authoritative

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	4.49	4.49	0.713	0.401	O1 = 17.03
Within groups	76	478.38	6.29			O3 = 16.54
Total	77	482.87				

Leadership Dimension - Participative

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	3.58	3.58	1.137	0.289	O1 = 16.06
Within groups	76	239.79	3.15			O3 = 15.54
Total	77	243.38				

Leadership Dimension - A, p + N

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	4.34	4.314	0.686	0.41	O1 = 15.72
Within groups	76	480.813	6.32			O3 = 15.24
Total	77	485.17				

No significant difference was found between private and public sector manufacturing organisations on the four Leadership dimensions namely, Task oriented, Authoritative, Participative and A, p + N styles.

Table 63
Showing Means, SDs, SEps, t values and their significance levels related to
4 Leadership style on private (O1) and public sector manufacturing organisation (O3)

Leadership styles	Organisations	X̄	SD	SEᴅ	t*
Task oriented	O1	17.27	1.737	1.161	1.10
	O3	16.00	3.435	1.161	
Authoritative	O1	16.32	1.725	4.82	1.41
	O3	15.64	1.620	4.82	
Participative	O1	16.89	4.014	1.825	0.43
	O3	16.11	3.723	1.825	
A, p + N	O1	18.18	1.520	0.565	0.98
	O3	17.63	2.514	0.565	

* None of the t value is significant.

t values were not significant. So, no further analysis was undertaken. The total absence of significant t value in these analysis might have occurred because this set of analysis dealt with comparisons of the same leadership styles across different organisations and signficant differences between the same leadership styles can not be legitimately expected. Hence, such a series of non-significant t values might have emerged.

Table 64
Showing F valued for two public sector organisations,
a chemical manufacturing (O3), and a service organisation (O4)
on Peacemakers dimension of Enneagram (n = 103, O3 = 46, O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	1.81	1.81	10.73	0.001	O3 = 2.46
Within groups	101	16.99	0.17			O4 = 2.73
Total	102	18.79				

The above Table 64 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is managers in chemical manufacturing organisation in private and public sector differed among themselves on the Peacemakers dimension of Enneagram. The mean values of the two organisations namely, chemical manufacturing (O3 = 2.46), and service organisation (O4 = 2.73) indicate that managers in service organisations are more Peacemakers types than the managers of the manufacturing organisation.

Table 65
Showing F valued for two public sector organisations,
a chemical manufacturing (O3), and a service organisation (O4)
on Adventurers dimension of Enneagram (n = 103, O3 = 46, O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.75	0.75	4.813	0.0305	O3 = 3.03
Within groups	101	15.77	0.16			O4 = 3.20
Total	102	16.52				

The above Table 65 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is managers in manufacturing and service organisations in public sector differed among themselves on the Adventurers dimension of Enneagram.

The mean values of the two organisations namely, chemical manufacturing (O3 = 3.03), and service organisation (O4 = 3.20) indicated that managers in service organisations are more Adventurers types than the managers in the manufacturing organisation.

Table 66
Showing F valued for two public sector organisations,
a chemical manufacturing (O3), and a service organisation (O4)
on Questioners dimension of Enneagram (n = 103, O3 = 46, O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.81	0.75	7.35	0.001	O3 = 2.73
Within groups	101	11.17	0.16			O4 = 2.91
Total	102	11.99	-			

The above Table 69 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is managers in chemical manufacturing organisation and service organisation in public sector differed among themselves on the Questioners dimension of Enneagram.

The mean values of the two organisations namely, chemical manufacturing (O3 = 2.73), and service organisation (O4 = 2.91) indicate that managers in service organisations are more Questioners types than the managers of the manufacturing organisation.

Table 67
Showing F valued for two public sector organisations,
a chemical manufacturing (O3), and a service organisation (O4)
on Achievers dimension of Enneagram (n = 103, O3 = 46, O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	- mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.945	0.94	8.20	0.005	O3 = 2.93
Within groups	101	11.63	0.12			O4 = 3.12
Total	102	12.58				

The above Table 67 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is managers in chemical manufacturing organisation and service organisations in public sector differed among themselves on the Achievers dimension of Enneagram.

The mean values of the two organisations chemical manufacturing (O3 = 2.93), and service organisation (O4 = 3.12) indicate that managers in service organisations are higher on Achievers types than the managers of the manufacturing organisation.

Table 68
Showing F valued for two public sector organisations,
a chemical manufacturing (O3), and a service organisation (O4)
on Perfectionists dimension of Enneagram (n = 103, O3 = 46, O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	1.18	1.81	12.17	0.001	O3 = 2.78
Within groups	101	9.75	0.97			O4 = 2.997
Total	102	10.93				

The above Table 68 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is managers in public sector - chemical manufacturing organisation and service organisation differed among themselves on the Perfectionists dimension of Enneagram.

The mean values of the two organisations chemical manufacturing (O3 = 2.78), and service organisation (O4 = 2.997) indicate that managers in service organisations are more Perfectionists types than the managers of the manufacturing organisation.

Table 69
Showing F valued for two public sector organisations,
a chemical manufacturing (O3), and a service organisation (O4)
on Romantics dimension of Enneagram (n = 103, O3 = 46, O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.67	0.67	6.05	0.016	O3 = 2.64
Within groups	101	11.12	0.11			O4 = 2.81
Total	102	11.79				

The above Table 69 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is managers in public sector - chemical manufacturing organisation and service organisation differed among themselves on the Romantics dimension of Enneagram.

The mean values of the two organisations chemical manufacturing (O3 = 2.64), and service organisation (O4 = 2.81) indicate that managers in service organisations are more Romantics types than the managers of the manufacturing organisation.

Table 70
Showing F values for two public sector manufacturing organisation (O3) and service organizations (O4) (n = 103 , O3 = 46 , O4 = 57) on the Enneagram dimensions

Enneagram Dimension - Helpers

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.25	0.25	1.68	0.198	O3 = 2.46
Within groups	101	14.82	0.15			O4 = 2.56
Total	102	15.07				

Enneagram Dimension - Observers

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.28	0.28	1.84	0.178	O3 = 2.43
Within groups	101	15.33	0.15			O4 = 2.43
Total	102	15.60				

Enneagram Dimension = Asserters

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.06	0.06	0.36	0.55	O3 = 3.01
Within groups	101	18.59	0.15			O4 = 3.06
Total	102	15.65				

Table 70 shows nonsignificant F values found between public sector manufacturing organisations and service organisation on the three Enneagram dimensions Helpers, Observers and Asserters.

Table 71
Showing Means, SDs, SEᴅs, t values and their significance levels of
9 Enneagrams types on public sector manufacturing organisation (O3)
and service organisation (O4)

Enneagram	Organisations	X̄	SD	SEᴅ	t*
1	O3	3.05	0.312	0.126	1.06
	O4	3.19	0.202	0.129	
2	O3	3.000	-	-	-
	O4	a			
3	O3	3.13	0.344	0.146	1.90
	O4	3.41	0.323	0.146	
4	O3	3.13	0.245	0.165	0.54
	O4	3.04	0.194	0.172	
5	O3	a	-		
	O4	3.10		0.475	0.194
6	O3	3.10	0.361	0.271	1.85
	O4	3.44	0.042	0.183	
7	O3	3.25	0.306	0.108	2.16
	O4	3.49	0.212	0.113	
8	O3	3.37	0.257	0.131	0.55
	O4	3.43	0.369	0.125	
9	O3	3.14	b	-	-
	O4	3.57			

* None of the t value is significant.

a No individuals fell in this category in this organisation so no t value could be found.

b There was only one individual in each of the above organisation so the t value was not possible to find.

Table 71 shows the nonsignificant t values. So, no further analyses was undertaken. The total absence of significant t value in these analysis might have occurred because this set of analysis deal with comparisons of the same personality type across different organisations and signficant differences between the same personality type can not be legitimately expected. Hence, such a series of non-significant t values was not surprising.

Table 72

Showing differences between two public sector organisations,
a chemical manufacturing (O3), and a service organisation (O4)
on Feeling dimension of MBTI (n = 103, O3 = 46, O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	17.76	17.76	7.27	0.0082	O3 = 4.63
Within groups	101	246.67	2.44			O4 = 5.05
Total	102	264.43				

The above Table 72 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is managers in public sector - chemical manufacturing organisation and service organisation differed among themselves on the Feeling dimension of MBTI. The mean values of the two organisations chemical manufacturing (O3 = 4.63), and service organisation (O4 = 5.05) indicated that managers in service organisations are more Feeling types than the managers of the manufacturing organisation.

Table 73
Showing differences between two public sector organisations,
a chemical manufacturing (O3), and a service organisation (O4)
on Thinking dimension of MBTI (n = 103, O3 = 46, O4 = 57)

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	15.62	15.62	6.51	0.01	O3 = 6.70
Within groups	101	242.30	2.39			O4 = 5.91
Total	102	257.92				

The above Table 73 shows significant interaction effect between the variables under consideration. That is managers in public sector - chemical manufacturing organisation and service organisation differed among themselves on the Thinking dimension of MBTI. The mean values of the two organisations chemical manufacturing (O3 = 6.70), and service organisation (O4 = 5.91) indicate that managers in manufacturing organisations are more Thinking types than the managers of the service organisations.

Table 74
Showing F values for two public sector - manufacturing organisation (O3) and service organizations (O4) (n = 103 , O3 = 46 , O4 = 57) on the MBTI dimensions

MBTI Dimension - Extraversion

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	1.96	1.96	0.98	0.32	O3 = 4.65
Within groups	101	202.15	2.00			O4 = 4.93
Total	102	204.12				

MBTI Dimension - Introversion

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	2.78	2.78	1.34	0.25	O3 = 6.35
Within groups	101	209.42	2.07			O4 = 6.02
Total	102	212.19				

MBTI Dimension - Sensing

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.166	0.17	0.07	0.79	O3 = 5.19
Within groups	101	243.76	2.41			O4 = 5.70
Total	102	243.92				

MBTI Dimension - Intuitive

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.18	0.18	0.075	0.78	O3 = 5.19
Within groups	101	246.75	2.44			O4 = 5.28
Total	102	246.93				

Table 74 shows nonsignificant differences in manufacturing and service organisation in public sector on the four MBTI dimensions - Extraversion, Introversion, Sensing and Intuitive.

257

Table 75
Showing F values for two public sector - manufacturing organisation (O3) and service organizations (O4) (n = 103 , O3 = 46 , O4 = 57) on the MBTI dimensions

MBTI Dimension - Judging

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.24	0.27	0.088	0.76	O3 = 7.26
Within groups	101	308.45	3.05			O4 = 7.16
Total	102	308.72				

MBTI Dimension - Perceiving

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.0001	0.0001	0.000	0.99	O3 = 3.72
Within groups	101	310.83	3.08			O4 = 3.72
Total	102	310.84				

Table 75 shows nonsignificant F values between public sector manufacturing organisations and service organisation on the two MBTI dimensions Judging and Perceiving

Table 76

Showing Means, SDs, SEds, t values and their significance levels of
8 MBTI types on public sector manufacturing organisation (O3)
and service organisation (O4)

MBTI Types	Organisations	X̄	SD	SEd	t*
I	O3	6.10	1.595	0.471	0.80
	O4	6.53	0.743	0.540	
E	O3	6.75	1.025	0.251	0.53
	O4	6.62	1.168	0.248	
S	O3	6.87	0.990	0.320	0.78
	O4	6.61	0.983	0.320	
N	O3	6.58	1.119	0.259	0.87
	O4	6.81	0.910	0.259	
T	O3	7.17	1.169	0.479	0.98
	O4	6.65	0.998	0.546	
F	O3	7.12	1.067	0.239	1.43
	O4	6.78	1.031	0.239	
J	O3	7.69	1.390	0.294	0.10
	O4	7.72	1.280	0.298	
P	O3	5.30	1.703	0.719	1.53
	O4	6.40	1.506	0.719	

* None of the t value is significant.

Table 76 shows that t values were not significant. So, no further analyses was undertaken. The total absence of significant t value in these analysis might have occurred because this set of analysis deal with comparisons of the same personality traits across different organisations and signficant differences between the same personality traits can not be expected. Hence, such a series of non-significant t values was not surprising.

Table 77
Showing F values for two public sector manufacturing organisation (O3) and service organizations (O4) (n = 103 , O3 = 46 , O4 = 57) on the Leadership dimensions

Leadership Dimension - Task oriented

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	1.55¯	1.55	0.69	0.79	O3 = 17.09
Within groups	101	916.32	9.07			O4 = 17.33
Total	102	917.06				

Leadership Dimension - Participative

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.12	0.1240	0.129	0.909	O3 = 15.54
Within groups	101	967.62	9.5804			O4 = 15.47
Total	102	967.75				

Leadership Dimension - Authoritative

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	0.197	0.197	0.0203	0.8871	O3 = 16.54
Within groups	101	984.67	9.749			O4 = 16.63
Total	102	984.87				

Leadership Dimension - A, p + N

SOURCES	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F Ratio	p	Means
Between groups	1	1.012	1.012	0.1016	0.75	O3 = 15.23
Within groups	101	1006.40	9.96			O4 = 15.44
Total	102	1007.41				

Table 77 shows nonsignificant difference between public sector manufacturing organisations and service organisation on the four Leadership dimensions Task oriented, Participative, Authoritative and A, p + N.

Table 78
Showing Means, SDs, SEɒs, t values and their significance levels on
4 Leadership style on public sector manufacturing organisation (O3)
and service organisation (O4)

Leadership	Organisations	X̄	SD	SEɒ	t*
Task oriented	O3	16.00	3.435	1.321	0.52
	O4	16.69	3.038	1.335	
Authoritative	O3	16.11	3.723	1.822	0.49
	O4	17.00	3.780	1.824	
Participative	O3	15.61	1.751	0.543	2.65
	O4	17.04	1.989	0.540	
A, ᴘ + N	O3	17.63	2.514	0.570	0.97
	O4	18.20	2.127	0.589	

* None of ᴛhe t value is significant.

According to Table 77 t values were not significant. So no further analyses is taken. The total absence of significant t value in these analysis might have occurred because this set of analysis deal with comparisons of the same leadership styles across different organisations and signficant differences between the same leadership styles can not be legitimately expected. Hence, such a series of non-significant t values was not surprising.