DESIGN

The aim of the present investigation was to study the relationship of Executive Success with Extrasensory Perception, Personality, Motives and Impression Management among middle level public and private sector executives. Two indeces of personality were taken - Eysenckian dimensions of Personality and Locus of Control. Four motives were studied viz., need for Achievement, need for Power, need for Affiliation and need for Approval. Impression Management scale tapped seven Impression Management Styles viz, Opinion Conformity, Self Enhancement, Other Enhancement, Name Dropping, Changing with Situation, Instrumental Dependency and Self Degradation.

To determine Executive Success the formula employed by England and Lee (1974), Ansari and Rub (1982) and Robins (1984) was used. Extrasensory Perception was measured by the Envelope Clairvoyance Test constructed by Anderson and White (1953). The revised version of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ-R) developed by Eysenck, Eysenck and Barrett (1985) was used to measure the Eysenckian personality dimensions of Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and Lie (Social Desirability) scale. Locus of Control was measured by Rotter’s (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control Scale. Misra and Tripathi’s (1980) questionnaire measures of motives were employed to measure
need for Achievement, need for Power, need for Affiliation and need for Approval. Helode’s (1986) Impression Management Scale was used to tap different Impression Management Styles viz., Opinion Conformity, Self Enhancement, Other Enhancement, Name Dropping, Changing with the Situation, Instrumental Dependency and Self Degradation. The sum of the scores obtained on each of these management styles gave the Global Impression Management score.

SAMPLE

The sample comprised of two hundred middle level male. They were selected randomly from private and public sector heavy engineering industries of Northern India. One half of the sample, i.e., one hundred executives were taken from private sector organizations viz., Escorts Pvt. Ltd. and Eicher Co. Ltd. and one hundred executives were taken from public sector organizations viz., Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd. and Punjab Tractors Ltd. (Swaraj). To select the sample the following procedure was adopted.

The Directories of Large and Medium scale Industries of the states of Punjab, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh were obtained from their respective ‘Directorate of Industries’. The directories provided important information such as addresses of the organisations, the sector to which they belonged, the end product(s) produced by the units and the
As size of the organisation is a relevant variable, therefore, it was decided to select large scale industries only. Since type of organisation is also an important factor e.g. whether it is a manufacturing concern or a service oriented organisation, or both, the present investigation limited its study to manufacturing organisations. Care was taken to select those private and public sector units for comparative analysis which were similar in size and the type of product produced. Thus, only those organisations which manufactured heavy machinery and machine parts were considered. The following organisations fulfilled this criterion:

1. Molins of India Ltd.
2. Punjab Tractors Ltd
3. Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd.
5. Escorts Ltd.
6. Kelvinator Ltd.
7. Eicher Ltd.
8. DCM Engineering Ltd.
9. Maruti Udyog Ltd.
10. Bharat Electronics Ltd.
Out of these, two private and two public sector organisations were randomly selected. The Personnel department of these four organisations viz., Escorts Ltd., Eicher Ltd., Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd., and Punjab Tractors Ltd. were contacted and lists of names of middle level executives were obtained. Respondents were classified as middle level executives on the basis of their positional hierarchy and designation. Only those executives were selected who had spent at least five years in the present organization and at least one year in the present position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Number of Executives selected</th>
<th>Out of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Escorts Ltd.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Eicher Ltd.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>HMT Ltd.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Punjab Tractors Ltd.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject selection was carried out using random independent sampling technique. Out of the total number of executives who fulfilled these criteria, subjects were selected randomly to reach the adequate sample size needed i.e. 100 each from private and public sectors.

The educational qualifications of both private and public sector executives ranged from B.Com, B.E, M.Tech to MBA and Diploma in Mechanical Engineering. The age range of
the private sector executives ranged between 27-54 years and that of public sector subjects ranged between 26-52 years. For the total sample the age range was 26-54 years.

MEASUREMENT OF CRITERION DEPENDENT VARIABLE i.e. EXECUTIVE SUCCESS

The availability of a good criterion of Executive Success has been one of the key problems in industrial and organisational psychology. Smith (1976) has recently talked about the hard and soft data for assessing Executive Success. The former is verifiable and can be obtained through the company records for evaluating success or/and performance, while the latter is subjective and involves one's evaluation and judgement. This study has used an objective criteria of Executive Success i.e. Salary Progression. Studies clearly show that salary progression (Bray and Grant, 1966; Jaques, 1968; Grant and Bray, 1969; Ansari, 1981, 1982; Ansari et al., 1982) and the hierarchical levels promoted to or attained by executives (Doktor and Bass, 1974; Ansari, 1981, 1982) have frequently been used to measure Executive Success on the assumption that compensation is related to general performance (Gilmer, 1971). The index of Salary Progression as a measure of Executive Success has earlier been used by England and Lee (1974) and Ansari and Rub (1982) and Robins (1984). The formula for measuring Executive Success is as follows:

\[
\text{Success Index} = \frac{\text{Salary}}{\text{Age}} \times 100
\]
The following standardised tests were used:

1. Envelope Clairvoyance Test (Anderson and White, 1953)
2. Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised (Eysenck, Eysenck and Barrett, 1985)
3. Rotter’s Internal-External Scale (Rotter, 1966)
4. Misra and Tripathi’s Questionnaire measure of motives (Misra and Tripathi, 1980)
5. Impression Management Scale (Helode, 1986)

ENVELOPE CLAIRVOYANCE TEST (Anderson and White, 1953)

The Extrasensory Perception ability was assessed using the Anderson and White technique (Anderson and White, 1953). The ESP targets were randomly generated by VAX-8350 computer.

The test consists of a target sheet put in an opaque envelope. The target sheet had a total of five sections, each section consisting of two columns—card column and call column. Five runs of ESP symbols (five in number) were generated randomly for the card column. Five ESP symbols used were:

- = for wavy lines
- ^ for star
- 0 for circle
- + for cross
- L for square
On top of the envelope, with a target sheet inside, a response sheet identical to the sheet was stapled. It had five sections each consisting of a card column and a call column. Card column was to be left blank and responses were to be given in call column.

The target order was different for every sheet and thus for every subject. The target sheet for each subject was prepared by writing five runs of standard ESP symbols in the card column of a standard ESP record sheet. The five symbols used were 0 for circle, ▲ for star, = for wavy lines, L for square and + for cross. These sheets were numbered and targets were concealed.

Concealing the targets

The targets were kept in an opaque container, unopened until the subject’s responses were recorded. The target sheet was wrapped on both sides with thick paper. In the next step the target sheet was put in a manila envelope with a response sheet aligned on top, so that the spaces on the response sheet were over the written targets. In the final step the assembly was stapled in order to keep it in place. The subject was asked to write, in each empty box of the response sheet, a response that corresponds to the target directly beneath it.

According to Schmeidler (1977) a mandatory precaution while using this method is that the person who puts the
targets into their envelopes and who thus might be able to identify any target order, should either not be in contact with the subject or else should not see which envelope the subject is using. A necessary part of target concealment was that the experimenter and anyone else involved with the experiment and in contact with the subject be blind about the target order.

Envelope Clairvoyance Test has been extensively and successfully used in India by Rao and Harigopal (1979), Sehgal and Bhandari (1986), Sehgal and Bhatia (1987), Tayal (1987).

**EYSENCK PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE-REVISED (EPQ-R)**
(Eysenck, Eysenck and Barrett, 1985)

Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire-Revised has been developed by Eysenck, Eysenck and Barrett (1985) to measure Psychoticism (P), Extraversion (E), Neuroticism (N) and Lie (Social Desirability) Scale.

**Psychoticism (P)** refers to a tendency in a person to be not caring for people troublesome and not fitting in anywhere, lacking in feeling and empathy and being altogether inhumane.

**Extraversion (E)** refers to a tendency in an individual to be outgoing, uninhibited, impulsive and socially inclined.
NEUROTICISM (N) refers to a tendency in a person to be anxious, worrying, overresponsive, depressed and reacting too strongly to all sorts of stimuli.

LIE(SOCIAL DESIRABILITY)SCALE (L) measures a tendency on the part of some individuals to ‘fake good’.

The EPQ(R)scale consists of hundred dichotomously responded items with thirty two items to measure Psychoticism, twenty three items to measure Extraversion, twenty four items to measure Neuroticism and twenty one items to measure Lie(Social desirability)score.

Alpha reliabilities of the Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire-revised for both the sexes were reported to range from .73 to .83 (Eysenck et al., 1985 and Corulla, 1987) for Psychoticism; from .81 to .90 (Eysenck et al., 1985 and Corulla, 1987) for Extraversion; from .79 to .88 (Eysenck et al., 1985 and Corulla, 1987) for Neuroticism and from .79 to .86 (Eysenck et al., 1985 and Corulla, 1987) for Lie (Social Desirability) Scale.

The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-revised has been extensively used in India by Mohan et al. (1989), Rana (1989), Gujral (1990), Arora (1990), Bhandari and Tayal (1990) and Dhir (1991).
ROTTER'S INTERNAL-EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL SCALE (LOC)  
(Rotter, 1966)

The Locus of Control Scale was developed by Rotter (1966). The scale consists of twenty three forced choice item along with six filler items to help disguise the purpose of the test.

Each item consists of a pair of alternative statements and the subjects are required to pick one alternative out of ‘a’ or ‘b’, which they mostly believe to be true for themselves. Scores on the questionnaire may range from zero (strong internal belief) to twenty three (strong external belief). The filler items are not scored. Scores indicate points along a continuum rather than ‘Internal’ and ‘External’ types, i.e. individuals do not represent one type or another, but rather display varying degrees of Internality or Externality. A high score on this scale indicates Externality.

The reliability and validity of the final Internal-external Scale is well established. Reported test-retest reliabilities range from .49 to .61 for two months and .60 to .83 for one month interval (Rotter, 1966 and Bledsoe and Baber, 1978). The scale has been found to have adequate internal consistency, test-retest reliability and construct validity both in laboratory and field situation (Rotter, 1975 and Lefcourt, 1976).
Rotter’s I-E Scale has been used in India by Pandey and Bohra (1986), Sehgal and Bhatia (1987), Sehgal and Bhandari (1987), Tayal (1987), Bhandari and Tayal (1990), Rana (1990), Moudgil (1991) and Kumar (1991).

MOTIVE SCALES
(Misra and Tripathi, 1980)

Four questionnaire measures developed by Misra and Tripathi (1980) were used to measure, need for Achievement, need for Power, need for Affiliation and need for Approval. The underlying idea was that certain characteristic behavior patterns which are consistently found in association with a particular motive can be validly used with considerable degree of precision for obtaining an index of motives (Misra and Tripathi, 1980).

need for Achievement refers to a tendency to strive for success against some standard of excellence.

need for Power refers to a need to master and control his environment.

need for Affiliation refers to the need for social acceptance and involves positive affective relationship with another person(s).

need for Approval refers to attempts to achieve favourable evaluations from other members of society.

The measure for need for Achievement consisted of twelve items. The measure for need for Power consisted of
nine items. The measure for need for Affiliation consisted of eleven items and the measure for need for Approval consisted of twelve items.

The responses of subjects with regard to items were given scores from 1 to 5, according to the intensity of the concerned motive. The five response alternatives were:

- To a very great extent: 5
- To a great extent: 4
- To some extent: 3
- To a small extent: 2
- Almost no extent: 1

The score of subject was total score obtained by him on all scale items. The items were constructed in such a way that in about fifty percent of the items positive responses indicated presence of high motive.

Misra and Tripathi (1980) found the test-retest reliabilities for the scales to range from .59 to .73 with an interval of one month. The odd-even split half reliabilities were also calculated and found to be in the range of .37 to .67 (Misra and Tripathi, 1980). The motive scales have been extensively used in India by Sehgal and Bhandari (1987), Bhandari and Tayal (1990), Gujral (1990), Dhir (1991) and Sahni (1991).
IMPRESSON MANAGEMENT SCALE
(Helode, 1986)

To tap the style-wise and Global amount of Impression Management, an instrument called Impression Management Scale (IMS) constructed by Helode (1986) was used. The scale is based on the central themes given by Pandey (1980). It consists of forty two positively worded statements, six for each Impression Management style arranged on a five point scale of Likert's summated rating type. The scale yields one composite score, representing the total amount of Impression Management and seven subscores representing the seven styles of Impression Management, viz., Opinion Conformity, Self Enhancement, Other Enhancement, Name Dropping, Changing with the Situation, Instrumental Dependency and Self Degradation. The higher the score, the greater is the amount of style wise as well as Global Impression Management.

Opinion Conformity (OC) emphasizes the ingratior's overt agreement with the target's expressed attitudes, values and behavioral patterns.

Self Enhancement (SE) involves the enhancement or explicit presentation of strengths and virtues by the ingratior to increase the likelihood of being judged to be attractive.

Other Enhancement (OE) refers to that class of tactics in which the ingratior finds ways to exaggerate the admirable qualities of the target person.

Name Dropping (ND) represents those behaviors through which an individual tells his target person about his high connections with important people in the society.
Changing with the Situation (CS) is related to opportunism practised by the ingratiator. The ingratiator's main emphasis is to make the target person pleased in varied social contexts by making suitable changes in behavior.

Instrumental Dependency (ID) is used by the ingratiator to induce a sort of social responsibility in the target person while showing his dependence on him.

Self Degradation (SD) is used by ingratiator to present his weakness and to over play the superiority of the target person. Individual tries to reduce his chance of being perceived competitive and threatening to him.

The split-half reliability of the Impression Management Scale, as estimated by Rulon's formula (Guilford, 1954) turned out to be .96; its validity was found fairly good as each of the forty two statements included in it showed a significantly high (beyond .01 level). IMS has been extensively used in India by Helode (1986) and Pandey (1988).

Procedure

Initially the Personnel Department of all the selected industries were contacted and on the basis of information provided by them those Executives who fulfilled our criteria were contacted personally during the office time and requested to volunteer for testing. They were assured that the results and information which they will give would be kept strictly confidential and were requested to cooperate and answer truthfully.
The subjects were administered the tests usually in two to three testing sessions of about 40-50 minutes each. In the first session the subjects were required to fill in the Personal data sheet and Envelope Clairvoyance Test was administered. In the second and third sessions the revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, Rotter’s Internal-External Scale, Misra and Tripathi’s Questionnaire of various needs and Helode’s Impression Management Scale were administered according to the instructions for each of the scales. Care was taken to ensure that the subjects had adequate rest interval between various tests.

Instructions

The standard instructions for each test were read out and doubts, if any, were clarified.

Instructions for envelope clairvoyance test

The subjects were instructed as follows:

"Have you ever taken a true false type of test. Have you ever wondered when you weren’t sure of the answer whether or not you ought to guess? The same thing often happens in a game—say basketball. If you donot know what your opponent is going to do, should you try to guess his move? Do you what according to the mathematical laws of probability? You can guess and get a certain proportion right. This has been proven by scientific experimentation. But it has been proven that some people have the ability to guess far above chance, that
is much better than average. Today we are going to find out how well you can guess. Here's the way we are going to find out. These five cards represent symbols: a star, a square, a circle and wavy lines. Got them in your minds? Fine! Now I am going to pass out these envelopes to you, but please do not write on them until I tell you to do so. Take out a pencil or pen. Now, on the white sheet on the envelope: where it says subject, write your name; where it says observer, write my name; where it says date, write the date of today; and where it says time, give the present time, date of birth.

You will observe that the white sheet on which you are writing has 5 sections running crosswise or horizontally and that these 5 sections are made up of columns, marked CALL and CARD. Going down each column vertically, you will notice that there are 25 spaces. On the inside of the manilla envelope which you are not to open, there is a sheet exactly like the one in front of you on the outside of the envelope. The only difference is that on the sheet inside the envelope, the 5 symbols are recorded on the card column of the first four columns. Now to see how good you are at guessing, you are to put down one of the five symbols in the CALL column which you think will match the one on the CARD column inside the envelope. For example if you think the symbol in the first space in the first column of the sheet in the envelope is a circle then you should match it by putting
the symbol '0' in your call column. You are to begin and work down the column. Will you please note the sentence above the columns. There you will see how to write your symbols. Now we are ready to start. Some of you want and think a moment before you put down your guess; some of you may want to put down the first symbol that comes to your mind. Once you put down a symbol, that is make a guess, it isn't a good idea to change or erase it. If you guess that 2 or even 3 of the same symbols come in a row, put them down that way. Don't go back and count how many of each symbols you have recorded. Put down the first thing that comes to your mind. If you can clear your mind of all thought and relax, the symbols may come to you more readily. When you finish putting down your 25 calls in column 1, go to column 2, then to 3, 4 and 5.

I hope you will do your best and prove to me what a good guesser you are. It's important to me and I know you can do well if you want. Ok let's start.

Instructions for Eysenck's personality questionnaire

The subjects were instructed as follows:

"Please answer each question by putting a circle around the 'Yes' or 'No' following the question. There are no right or wrong answers and no trick questions. Work quickly and donot think too long about the exact meaning of the question."
Instructions for Rotter's I-E scale

The subjects were told that:

"This is a 29-item questionnaire. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives (a or b). Please select that alternative which you personally believe to be true and mark a tick (✓) against it. Kindly see to it that you do not leave out any question."

Instructions for Misra and Tripathi's Questionnaire Measures of Motives, viz., need for Achievement, need for Power, need for Affiliation and need for Approval.

The subjects were instructed as below:

"Please answer the following questions choosing any one of the given five alternatives indicating your degree of agreement with the statements.

5  To a very great extent
4  To a great extent
3  To some extent
2  To a small extent
1  Almost no extent

Indicate your answer by circling a number for each item. Be sure to answer each statement. All your responses will be kept strictly confidential."

Instructions for Impression management scale

The subjects were instructed as follows:

"In the industrial and professional world/settings every employee is in close contact with every other employee and their interpersonal interactions strongly influence and
affect each other. Below are presented certain statements which embody certain behavior patterns which a subordinate usually employs while talking/interacting with his superior/boss. As applied to you each one of these statements could be absolutely true, true, uncertain, false, and totally false. Here

1 means absolutely true
2 means true
3 means uncertain
4 means false
5 means absolutely false

Therefore, you are requested to read each of the following statements carefully and then decide the degree of truthfulness or untruthfulness vis-à-vis your own behavior for that statement. Kindly encircle the appropriate number showing your response given in front of each statement. Keep in mind that your responses are not going to be judged as right or wrong; they will be used for research purposes only. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. Therefore, please read each statement carefully and answer honestly without any fear or hesitation.

Scoring

The scoring of each test viz., Envelope Clairvoyance Test, Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-revised, Rotter’s I-E scale, Misra and Tripathi’s Need Questionnaire and Helode’s Impression Management Questionnaire was done according to the procedure given in their respective manuals. The raw scores thus obtained were then used for statistical analysis.