The advance of scientific analysis, modernizing of the technology, shift in the emphasis in industry and realisation of human resource development have consistently and clearly focussed on the executive behaviour in the organisation. This has been brought out more sharply in the result oriented situations and setups where measurement is possible in objective as well as subjective terms. Probably, the inescapable prime factor in most of the organised efforts emerges to be the executive, who may be called manager, head administrator, chief, boss or leader. His success reflects/symbolises the success of the entire group, unit, division or organisation. In the last few years the role of the middle level executives in two major private sector and public sector industrial enterprises is specifically focussed on in terms of intuitiveness, personal and motivational characteristics and image because the concern of present investigation.

The modern man is not so much concerned with survival as he is with the success in his endeavours, in the areas of professional work and personal embellishments. Success...
means different things to different individuals opined DeBono (1987) and reviewed different aspects of WHAT IS SUCCESS? Is it success in the eyes of the world: winning an Olympic gold medal or the Wimbeldon cup; making a great deal of money; running a large organisation; making things happen; being awarded the Noble prize? Or, is it personal success i.e., the person towards the end of his or her life feels that it has been a happy and fulfilling life? Who is more successful, a man who has made millions but is unhappy and unsatisfied or an unnoticed person who has led a happy life? DeBono (1987) concluded that there are clearly many different ways of looking at success and it is only the poverty of the English language which provides us with but a single word for them. Perhaps the simplest definition is ‘to set out to do something and to succeed in doing it.’ (DeBono, 1987).

In a developing country like India the executive has a special role to perform. The executive is the most critical resource in our land of scarce resources, and his most critical problem is that he functions in the world’s most poor, populous and pluralistic society. Therefore, researching into the determinants of executive success assumes crucial significance.

Executive Success has typically been measured in terms of salary progression or the number of levels promoted to or attained by the executive. FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS
STUDY, THE TERMS 'MANAGER' AND 'EXECUTIVE' ARE TREATED AS SYNONYMOUS. According to the International Dictionary of Business (1981), 'a manager is an executive who is responsible for coordinating and controlling the work of others'. He is the one who is responsible for the work of others at any level in any kind of organisation.

Executive Success may be looked upon as a behavioural construct i.e., as a summative concept comprising various factors and elements connoting career success (Ansari, 1982). To be successful usually means that, the executive has strengthened the organisations' capacity for perpetuation, while simultaneously sustaining its values and economic viability (Corsini, 1984).

WHAT IS SUCCESS MAY ALSO DEPEND ON PERSPECTIVE OF MANAGEMENT AND ITS FUNCTIONS. Mintzberg (1973) divided managerial activities into three groups - those that are concerned primarily with interpersonal relationships (role of figure-head, liason role and leader); those that deal with the transfer of information (monitor, disseminator, spokesman); and those that involve decision making (entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, negotiator). Different studies have found that managers spend from 50 to 80 percent of their time with other people (Stewart, 1967). Management literature, in general, stresses
the importance of the manager's ability to interact well with others.

Management has been called 'the art of getting things done through people'. This definition by Mary Parker Follett (cited in Stoner and Wankel, 1986), calls attention to the fact that managers achieve organisational goals by arranging for others to perform whatever tasks may be necessary - not by performing the tasks themselves. Stoner and Wankel (1986) opined that management is that and more. Management according to them is the process of planning, organising, leading and controlling the efforts of organization members and of using all other organisational resources to achieve stated organisational goals.

Rao and Narayana (1991) cited three uses of the word 'management'. As a noun it refers to individuals who exercise leadership in an organization, that is to the managers. As a process it refers to of planning, organising, staffing, directing and controlling. As a discipline it refers to a substantive concept describing the subject, that is, a body of knowledge and practice.

Management is an organised, formal discipline researched and taught in institutions of higher learning. According to Rao and Narayana (1991) there are almost as many definitions of management as there are books on the subject.
However, most definitions of management do share a common idea - management is concerned with the accomplishment of objectives through the efforts of other people. The various definitions of management can be conveniently classified into four categories.

1. **Functional School**

   According to the functional school, management is an integrating process designed to achieve organized, purposeful results. (a) It is the process by which managers create, direct, maintain and operate purposive organizations through coordinated, cooperative human effort (McFarland, 1979).

2. **Human Relations School**

   According to the Human Relations School, management is a social process. It is a social process because managerial actions are principally concerned with relations between people. According to Koontz and O'Donnell (1972) 'Management is the art of getting things done through and with informally organized group'.

3. **Decision-Making School**

   Many have described management as a decision-making body, as a rule making and enforcing body. In the words of Drucker (1974), the life of a manager is a perpetual choice making activity. Whatever a manager does he does through decision-making only. Decision-making power provides a
dynamic force for managers to transform the resources of business organisation into a productive cooperative concern.

4. **Current view of Management**

Rao and Narayana (1991) further defined management as the process of planning, organising, directing and controlling to accomplish organisational objectives through the coordinated use of human and material resources. It is the process of efficiently getting activities completed with and through other people. It is the process by which human and non-human resources are coordinated to accomplish a set of objectives. Management is needed wherever people work together in an organisation. The managerial functions must be performed by anyone who manage any type of organised activity, whether it is a business enterprise or not. These functions are performed at all levels of an organisation, regardless of its type or size. The services of management are necessary in all cooperative endeavours for organisational effectiveness—therefore, managers/executives must strive to be successful in their jobs.

**MANY STUDIES HAVE BEEN CONDUCTED TO DRAW THE PROFILE OF A SUCCESSFUL EXECUTIVE - WHO IS A SUCCESSFUL EXECUTIVE?**

Ansari (1984) conducted a detailed study to see whether the two groups of executives—successful and unsuccessful—differed in terms of their background variables (own background and family background), critical
decisions of life, and their interpersonal relationships with the top boss, immediate superiors and subordinates. From Ansari's (1984) results it was evident that much did emerge as a summative concept comprising various factors and elements connoting career success. That is, there is no single dimension on which the success of an executive can be predicted adequately. In short the survey data on the descriptive level painted a fairly consistent portrait of a successful executive. Some of the major conclusions were: "A successful executive emerged as one who is young, better educated and professionally trained, first or second in birth order, has experienced a great deal of spatial mobility, has an educated and employed wife and has a fairly posh socio-economic background. A successful executive decides his academic and professional careers himself. Sometimes he may go against the wishes of his parents in the matters related to career because a sense of detachment from parents is high in him. Because he is responsible for his own career, he feels that his present career meets his expectations, i.e. a kind of psychological success. A successful executive is high on maintaining cordial relationship with his co-workers i.e., a happy-go-lucky guy. For example, he is encouraged by his superiors; he gets recognition for good performance at the right time and at right place; he receives utmost support from his superiors; his works are praised and appreciated in
his confidential report and consequently, he gets quick promotions. These indicators lead him to believe that his superiors (immediate and top bosses) are pleased with him. He tries to keep them pleased by showing loyalty and doing personal favours (i.e., helping them at his best) in addition to hard and sincere work. Because he is master of making personalized contacts with his superiors, he goes to club and tries his best to play with his superiors; he visits his superior’s families and he enjoys inviting them to his residence. As a natural consequence, he is free and informal in dealing with his superiors on the job. Interestingly, he brings this relationship back in dealing with his own subordinates and prefers to solve even their personal problems – that is, he takes personal care of his subordinates.

DeBono (1987) gave the following styles and characteristics of successful individuals:

1. People who are successful exhibit **energy, drive and direction** in their actions.

2. **Ego:** Strong ego is another characteristic of successful people. DeBono quoting Chris Bonington, a great mountaineer, adventurer, photographer and journalist, said that ‘the successful climber usually has a strong ego and he wants to be the first person to either stand on a summit or
find a new way up a mountain, but in actual fact this is then combined with an intellectual curiosity' - thus highlighting the 'ego' factor as a characteristic of successful styles.

3. **Can-do:** Sometimes one may mistake for an ego drive what is really the challenge and subsequently the obsession, of an idea e.g. 'This is impossible, but I can do it'. This spirit/attitude helps a man to be successful.

4. **Confidence:** Self confidence and a sense of mastery are also important ingredients to any successful style.

5. **Stamina and Hard Work:** Successful people show stamina and are hard working. The mere consistency in their pursuits results in an efficient outcome of their efforts.

6. **Efficiency and Ruthlessness:** Efficiency is a function of effort and result. Not only efficiency but ruthlessness is also a prominent characteristic of succesful people. As De Bono, (1987) states; 'Where single-mindedness and efficiency meet, ruthlessness is the charge.

7. **Ability to cope with failure:** Any style of success must also include a style of failure. How does a successful person cope with failure? Failure takes different people
different ways. It can utterly destroy or build a personality's confidence. Hence this ability to cope with failure stands out as a strong characteristics of a successful individual.

8. **Learning from failure:** According to the Olympic decathlon champion Rafer Johnson 'to my mind, the great champions are the ones that react to defeat in a positive way'. Werner Erhard, world famous philosopher, believes that the all-important thing about failure is that you accept it gallantly. This last quote seems to sum up the more general feeling among successful people - when they take up a task, they do full justice to it and also have the courage to learn from their failure, if any. There is an enjoyment in doing what seems worth doing.

DeBono (1987) talked at length about factors influencing success. The first question which he addresses is - *'Is success due to luck or madness'?* He said that the positive attitude towards luck is that you put yourself in a position to take the maximum advantage of any luck that comes your way. It implies that one is able to carry to success whatever turns up by luck. It also implies that one is ready to spot opportunities and also that one may generate such opportunities deliberately. This attitude acknowledges luck as a possible ingredient in some cases of success and then
places the operational emphasis on the other ingredients, such as determination, strategy and style.

**Successful people are often very single minded and determined.** Indeed, it would be possible to point this out as the one characteristic common to all successful people. It can take the form of drive: If you want something hard enough, you will get it. It can take the form of ruthlessness: let nothing stand between you and your goal. It can take the form of a strong sense of purpose: know where you want to go and get there. It can take the form of determination and persistence: accept failure only as a step on the path to success. This type of determination comes close to fanaticism and what might be called a little madness. It implies a rather unnatural view of life, because one single goal becomes more important than any others. A person may be willing to sacrifice his wife, his children, his friends; his health and even his life for his goal. At times the goal may seem very much like an obsession. At its extreme, obsession is a form of madness.

**TALENT** is another factor which influences success. Chess geniuses, athletes, tennis players, pianists, architects, dress designers, advertising creative directors may all seem to owe their success to a great deal of talent. There can be talent but there may have to be hard work and
training before that. Thus, it may be a matter of unlocking the talent, or maximising it or building upon it, to be successful.

**INTUITION** also has a strong influence on success. Intuition may represent processes that were once conscious and have since been internalised.

Talking about Executive Success, DeBono (1987) quoted Sir Terence Conran, a world renowned businessman, ‘They didn’t’, says Conran, ‘because they didn’t do it with conviction; that is the difference’. The ability to get the best out of people is also crucial to success. There are times when the conviction and enthusiasm of a leader rubs off on everyone else. There are other times when a team spirit and confidence are built up less through a process of charismatic ‘rubbing off’ than by careful nurturing and a sensitive use of people. In English politics the contrasting styles would be those of Churchill and Attlee.

**SOME OTHER STUDIES TRYING TO PROBE INTO WHO IS A SUCCESSFUL EXECUTIVE ARE:**

Jurgensen (1966) said that the terms aggressive, self-starting, determined, energetic and creative are most descriptive of successful executives and the terms amiable,
conforming, reserved, agreeable, conservative, kind, mannerly, neat, cheerful, formal, courteous and modest are least descriptive of successful executives.

Henry (1967) states that a successful executive is an 'active, striving, aggressive person,' but that his aggressions are "channeled into work or struggles for status and prestige". Primarily on the basis of this statement, it was hypothesized that the successful executives would be low in need for Aggression, whereas the unsuccessful executives would be high.

England and Weber (1972) and England and Lee (1974) found more successful managers to favour pragmatic, dynamic achievement-oriented values, while less successful managers prefer more static and passive values. More successful managers favour an achievement-orientation and prefer an active role in interaction with other individuals instrumental to achievement of the managers' organizational goals. Less successful managers have values associated with a static and protected environment in which they take relatively passive roles.

England and Lee (1974) found more successful managers to have values seated in high productivity, profit maximization, aggressiveness, prejudice, achievement, creativity, success, change, competition and liberalism. Less
successful managers have values which emphasize social welfare, obedience, trust, conformity, leisure, dignity, security, conservatism, equality and religion.

Margerison (1984) interviewed chief executives of British organisations (n=204) regarding factors, they considered critical in the development of their careers. Five major factors were identified: interpersonal influencing skills, responsibility for a business sector, a need to achieve results, early leadership experience and width of business experience. It is suggested that effective management development policy should include selecting managers with a high need for Achievement, encouraging interpersonal skills, providing of challenging jobs where superior performance is expected and rewarded.

Mathur and Yadav (1987) attempted to study the relationship between managerial effectiveness as criterion variables and some independent variables. The independent variables were leadership styles and self-actualization. The sample was drawn from few large public sector organizations middle level managers. The sample consisted of 100 middle level managers, representing various disciplines and ranging in age from thirty to fifty years with a mean age of 40 years. The respondents were administered Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD), developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1974), Personality Orientation Inventory (POI)
constructed by Shostrom (1963). The data set were analysed by using various statistical techniques. On the basis of the analysis of data, it was concluded that Leadership effectiveness was significantly related to leadership styles of middle level managers and it was not related with self-actualization orientation of the managers.

A study was conducted by Gattiker and Larwood (1990) which investigated the interrelationships between objective and perceived career achievement and career choices, success criteria, family variables and demographics, as well as examining vocational congruence between career and the individual. The congruence model was tested by using both objective and subjective measures. A sample composed of more than two hundred managers from a variety of organizations revealed that demographic and family variables related to individual perceptions of career achievement as well as to objective indicators of career achievement within a corporate hierarchy.

DIFFERENT CRITERION MEASURES OF SUCCESS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED

Career achievement can be considered as a subset of career success, but is not concerned with the usual measures of success, financial wealth and prestige (Crites, 1969), so much as it specifically reflects the employee's movement through the corporate hierarchy (Driver, 1979, 1985). Achievement is, of course, a relative concept; outsiders
usually judge it according to theoretically objective and obvious criteria (Jaskola et al., 1985), while individuals' perceptions of their own achievement tend to be based on less obvious, more subjective personal standards. The major problem in dealing with Executive success is measurement of success. What is managerial success and how does one measure it? Several indices of Executive success have been identified.

England and Lee (1974) measured success in terms of objective data that were relatively easy to collect. They defined success as managerial pay relative to age. This success criterion was a relative measure of personal success within the total sample of managers in each country and was not necessarily identical to organizational success or managerial effectiveness. It does, however, provided a cross-organisational measure which was sufficiently accurate.

The same measure of managerial success that was used by England and Lee (1974) has also been used by Watson and Williams (1977). Success was, therefore, identified in terms of managerial pay relative to age. As with the England and Lee (1974) study the success index does not show the degree of success differences in a meaningful fashion.

Ansari et al. (1982) opined that the availability of a good criterion of executive/managerial success has been cne
of the key problems in industrial and organisational psychology. However, there is a clear-cut indication that salary progression (e.g., Bray and Grant, 1966; Jaques, 1968; Grant and Bray, 1969; England and Weber, 1972; Watson and William, 1977 and Ansari, 1979) and the hierarchical levels promoted to or attained by managers have frequently been used as measures of success and/or effectiveness (e.g., Doktor and Bass, 1974 and Ansari, 1979). In their study (Ansari et al., 1982) job level (middle vs top) was held constant for cross-validation purposes. Hence, a single criterion, salary relative to age, was used to measure managerial success on the assumption that compensation is related to general performance. The respondents were asked to report their earned income from salary, bonuses, and/or commission on a dollar or pound scale with six intervals. The success index was calculated by the following equation:

\[ \text{Success} = \left( \frac{\text{Salary}}{\text{Age}} \right) \times 100 \]

The same criteria of Executive success has been used in the present study.

Attempts have been made to relate executive success with biographical data (Ansari, 1981), need structure (Ghiselli, 1968a; 1968b and Ghiselli and Johnson, 1970), values (England and Lee, 1974 and Watson and Williams, 1977), life style (Ansari, 1981) and intelligence and personality (Henry, 1949; Ghiselli, 1966; Kinslinger, 1966 and Ansari,
1982). However, any of these studies hardly explains or predicts more than a small amount of variance in career success.

There are a large number of speculations among the common man - Is extra-ordinary success due to luck, intuition or what psychologists term as ESP? Is it due to striving for a standard of excellence - is it due to certain belief systems an individual has or is it due to his ability to manipulate others? Despite the decades of organisational and individual interest - and conceptual and empirical inquiries in this area the evidence in regard to predicting success is far from conclusive. Therefore, the aim of the present investigation was to have a fresh look at Executive Success and explore factors contributing to it.

The present study has been designed to study Executive Success in relation to Extrasensory Perception; Eysenckian personality dimensions viz., Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and Lie (Social Desirability) Scale; Locus of control; Motives and Impression Management.

As managerial functions vary according to hierarchy, it was decided to confine the study to middle level executives - with an equal number i.e., one hundred each drawn from private and public sector organisations.