CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Indian economy witnessed the progress from green revolution to technological phase. Now our resources are mainly dependent on industrial development. Nevertheless the wellbeing of the industrial concerns obviously stands on two factors, namely, man and machine. In any organization presumably the basic interest is to increase productivity of the workforce, without forcing it to work more hours or making the men slaves of the machines. We can hopefully achieve this objective by conserving and using to the fullest extent, our human resources. The emphasis is therefore on the human factor. Given the basic amenities, it is the men who work that matter for the productivity of an industrial organization. Organizations runs almost automatically as long as the key roles are reasonably well performed.

Management is the basic, integrating process of the organizational activity. Today's managers or executives require a high capacity for identifying appropriate problems, isolating
their causes, marshaling the resources and initiating the actions of colleagues and subordinates. The success of an executive is one of the crucial components of organizational success. Hence men who manage have long been the subject of exhaustive and intensive research efforts by those interested in ascertaining the mysteries of managerial success. Why, for example, do some men succeed so remarkably as managers while others, perhaps equally gifted in terms of professional training and intellectual capacities fail even in similar circumstances?

Success, however, is a label given to the extent to which a manager has performed according to his capacities and potentials. It is a matter of degree to which purposes are achieved; and efficiency is the foundation of success. Efforts to measure the degree of success depend on clear and operational definitions. Not everyone will agree that success can be objectively measured, but subjective evaluations are made all the time. Whether measuring results or the determinants of the results, it seems clear that success does not lie entirely within the control of the manager himself, nor is it confined to a specific array of managerial traits. Such factors as the environment, the organization structure, the reward system and many others combine with the manager's personal characteristics in determining ultimate outcomes. Hence it is evident that, at least in many jobs, managerial success is multidimensional.
Here, of course, we run up against the question, what is the criterion of success? Survival is one criterion that most researchers agree is a necessary, albeit not sufficient, condition for success (it is not even clear that survival is always a criterion of success). Since the question of a composite or overall criterion is fairly basic, Seashore, Indik and Georgopoulos (1960) have concluded that the results of their study contradicted the validity of overall job performance as a unidimensional construct, and interpreted this to argue against the advisability of combining various criteria into a single composite criterion. This argument is supported by Guion (1961) who stresses the point of view that where various criteria are clearly independent, they should be used independently and should not be combined. Dunnette (1963) also argues for the use of criterion dimensions, and suggests that we 'cease searching for single or composite measures of job success and proceed to undertake research which accepts the world of success dimensionality as it really exists'.

With respect to the consideration of criteria of job success, Huttner, Levy, Rosen and Stopol (1959) in their study have used increase in salary as the criterion to success. Cummin (1967), Lal (1971) and Dalton (1979) have discussed the importance of executive performance as the criterion of success. Berlew and Hall (in Hill, 1976) have utilized promotion and performance as the standards in measuring success. Bass (1968),
Delancy (1974) and Sandra (1978) have studied the success using the opinion survey from the upper echelons of the organization. Fox (1976) explains success based on personal experiences. Gheselli and Barthol (1956) have used ratings as the best criterion for accounting success. Starch (1942) in his study has used career analysis in measuring success. Bery (1973) and Hicks and Stone (1962) have predicted success utilizing battery of tests which include test of aptitude, temperament, creativity and etc. Sandra (1978) has accounted executive status (promotion) as the criterion for success. In the studies of White (1972), Hill (1976) and Kossen (1975) leadership traits, functions and performance are used to estimate the effectiveness of the executives. Cattell and Eber (1964) have mentioned that so far as the strictly statistical prediction of success in an occupation several alternative computations are possible. We can assign a person to an occupation or give him a score on how well he fits the occupations by a. calculating the similarity of his personality profile to that of persons found typically in that category, or b. by predicting his probable degree of success on some criterion of job efficiency, educational performance by means of a regression (correlation) equation, weighting each factors standard score to give numbers that are added to give a single score on the criterion.

Despite of all this, success is best seen as something a manager produces from a situation by managing it appropriately. It is not so much what a manager does, but what he achieves.
Managerial success can seldom be obtained by achieving a single objective, no matter how broadly it is written. Profit, for instance, may be obtained at the risk of losing customers or by sacrificing human resources. Hence success is viewed as multidimensional. Several investigators have outlined in various degrees of detail those basic characteristics which the successful managers possess regardless of their areas of specialization.

**Studies Related to Executive Success**

Starch's (1942) study is based on the careers of 50 heads of large businesses, 50 executives at the mid-level and 50 heads of small businesses.

The largest difference is in the force of inner drive. In the top level, three times as many has a definite aim in life as in the lower level, and six times as many sought and are willing to assume increase responsibility. In the judgment of executives at all levels, a. ability to deal with people, b. ability to think, c. drive courage and d. hard work are essential for competent executives.

Rosen and Rosen (1957) have found that one of the scales which seem to discriminate between successful and unsuccessful union business agents is the Ego Strength Scale.

Porter's (1958) study has indicated that management personnel
have pictured themselves in a way that closely fits a 'leader' stereotype, while line personnel give the complementary picture of a 'follower' stereotype.

Chiselli and Barthol (1959) have concluded that the 'good' supervisor (high rated supervisor) sees himself as active, purposeful and forward looking. He is favorably disposed toward his company and identifies himself with his job. In addition the good supervisor a. has the good will of his subordinates, b. does his job with intelligence and ingenuity, c. is reliable and conscientious, d. wants to succeed, e. 'sells' his orders rather than dictates them. One gets the overall impression of maturity and calmness.

Hagen's (1959) investigation indicates that major executives tend to have achieved their success by moving diagonally from one firm to another, or even from one occupational field to another; while minor executives, who will never rise above a certain level, have tended to progress slowly and vertically up through the organization.

Maschino (1959) considering the factors related to success in technical jobs, presents evidence to the effect that successful technical personnel are disinterested in clerical work and, as demonstrated in numerous other research reports, are significantly more intelligent.

McClelland (1961) has found that high achievement scores
(as measured by the TAT) are significantly related to 'entrepreneurial' success in several different countries. The study concludes that achievement and entrepreneurial success are strongly associated and that when an association is not found between these variables, then one or more of the conditions defining the entrepreneurial role have not been met.

In Porter's (1961) investigation both the bottom and middle managers rank the description, intelligent, as one of the most important trait for managerial success.

From Hicks' and Stones' (1962) study it appears that managerial success can be predicted to a significant degree using current testing instruments. The study concludes that, in this organization at least, there are certain basic characteristics which the successful managers possess regardless of their areas of specialization. Another interesting result of this study is that peer evaluations of overall performance and promotability appear to be more effective in prediction than evaluations made by the superiors, with differences significant at the 1% and 5% levels respectively.

Hulin's (1962) study from a sample of 50 executives has indicated that the well educated person with the higher socio-economic background will become the more successful executive.

Torrance (1963b) has inferred that clowning or humour, is one of several effective adaptive techniques which the
creative person uses to remain in groups, or possibly to fend off, to some degree, group pressures toward conformity.

Bass' (1968) study has been to see the extent graduate business students and middle managers accept the opinions of the social theorists and the political theorists about what it takes to succeed in large organizations.

On the whole, they see that the fellow who gets ahead is one who adopts fairly or very often both social and political approaches, the former some what more than the later. He is one who will try to foster trust, share in the decisions with others, and consider the organization's needs. At the same time, to a somewhat lesser extent he is ready when necessary, to maintain his distance and his prerogatives, to act confident, even if he is not sure of himself, and to consider his own personal advantage. It has also concluded that middle managers tend to see more of both the social and political approaches which are required for a successful man in large organizations.

Weiner and Rubin (1969) have investigated motivational determinants of company success of research and development entrepreneurs. They conclude that among the three motives achievement, power and affiliation, achievement and power are related to company success.

John's and Herbert's (1971) study have concluded that
results show promise for the use of personality measures in predicting job success and employee satisfaction.

Lal (1971) generalises that a. the managers who are achieving the highest productivity, lower costs, and the highest levels of employee motivation and satisfaction, display a different pattern of leadership from those managers who are achieving less impressive results and b. the managers with highest performance, whose deviations from existing theory and practices are creating improved procedures, have not yet integrated their deviant principles into a theory of management.

Murrah (1971) expresses that the two most significant things in life are time and thought. Of the two, time is most important. Without it one cannot think.

Successful executives must learn to discharge their duties within the time they have. In other words, an executive must control the job or expand the time he devote to it. In addition, creativity is likely to be most significant in gaining a reputation and in the final evaluation of executives performance by their supervisors.

Srivastava (1971) has concluded that a manager is a person who directs coordinates and controls the activities of his subordinates towards a predetermined goal. And the success of a manager depend's to a great extent upon his ability to involve his subordinates in the process of decision making and the
cooperation they extend to him in carrying out these decisions. A manager's real authority is the authority and respect he earns from his subordinates.

It also emphasizes that integrity and sincerity of purpose coupled with an implicit faith in the human relations' approach to management and democratic exercise of authority reduce the social gap between the manager and the managed, and also enable him to meet the challenge of leadership.

Jay's (1972) study has pointed that five actions appear to help managers become effective: planning, technical competence, delegation, task emphasis and group process. Some that contribute to ineffectiveness are need satisfaction, supervision and authority emphasis. Communication has found to be a pervasive action of equal importance in effective and ineffective incidents.

Motoaki, Oda and Kimura (1972) conclude that creative attitude, motivation and circumspectness may be used to predict sales performance and that multiple prediction will be more valid than the prediction by measuring a single personality trait.

Orpen (1972) results indicate that the managerial key of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) scores of the South African business executives are: a. significantly higher than those of men-in-general, and b. positively correlate ($P < .05$)
with supervisors' competence ratings.

Allen's (1973) survey of 259 managers indicates that Theory Y is obsolete, and suggests that effective management (Theory M) must be based on scientific principles.

Bery's (1973) study deals with the contributive and causative factors in success. Accordingly, the ten key factors in the attainment of success are: a. intelligence, b. verbalization skills, c. integrity, d. self-concept, e. leadership ability, f. adaptability, g. aspirations, h. drive, i. commitment and j. accidental factors like good health, good luck, being at the right place at the right time, being with a growth oriented firm.

Delancy's (1974) study discloses certain characteristics that are shared by successful people in the upper echelons of organizations. Top executives considered themselves to be tense persons. They have expressed technical ability and interest in work as the most important characteristic in achieving success. They do consult others. They use staff subordinates for collecting information but they vary this staff.

Most of the executives are stubborn, easy going type and are more social. They prefer money and security in their jobs.

The studies of England and Lee (1974) shows that value patterns are significantly predictive of managerial success and can be used as a basis for selection and placement decisions.
It also indicates that managers from United States, Japan, India and Australian countries are rather similar in terms of the personal values that are related to success. More successful managers have pragmatic, dynamic and achievement-oriented values, while less successful managers have more static and passive values.

Katz (1974) suggests that effective or successful administration rests on three basic developable skills. These are: a. technical skill, b. human skill, and c. conceptual skill.

The relative importance of these three skills seems to vary with the level of administrative responsibility. At lower levels, the major need is for technical and human skills. At higher levels, the administrator's effectiveness depends largely on human and conceptual skills. At the top, conceptual skill becomes the most important of all for successful administration.

Ritt (1975) in his article discusses the rules in forming a sound management philosophy. He personally believes the two greatest enemies of efficiency are selfishness and over-commitment. The avoidance of these two will make the manager successful.

Fox (1976) has offered advice, based on the route he took to the top, on how young managers can reach the uppermost rungs of the management ladder. He stresses on a. to know oneself – one's strengths and weaknesses, b. control of impatience, c. not to treat subordinates as inferiors, d. proper dressing and
e. not just effort but results.

In addition, working hard, getting involved, and learning all one can about the company, its competitors and its industry all are basic to moving up in management. He also laid stress on relaxation. The need for diversion is must for everyone.

Hill (1976) explains leadership as a process of influence. There are a variety of methods available for managers to exert influence and thereby demonstrate their style of leadership. However those who influence others possess a significant degree of self-esteem. Hill points out three factors which distinguish the most successful from the least successful. These are integration toward goals, perseverance, and self-confidence. Apparently those who are the most successful recognise both their abilities and limitations and are reasonable in their aspirations and expectations.

Irwin (1976) has listed out the basic characteristics which are essential for executive success. They are: 1. integrity, 2. reasonably high level of intelligence, 3. high degree of motivation, 4. time off for diversion, 5. dedication, 6. enthusiasm, 7. self-control, 8. satisfactory home life, 9. interest in subordinates and 10. be a functional specialist.

Finally Irwin concludes that the above said basic list of characteristics for success are essentially the same for all levels of executives in management ladder.
Vinci (1976) in his article discusses the question how one can tell if employees' or one's own successes at one level of responsibility point to an ability to function effectively at a different level.

He concludes that there are three qualities necessary to a good manager. These are intelligence, flexibility and guts. Finally he points out that managers cannot manage anything, only good managers can manage anything.

White (1976) in his article supplies the answer for the question how does one become successful? Part of the answer is: By expecting to be success. And other part of the answer is: There is no assurance. Then he suggests guidelines for developing a personal program for success.

There is recognition of our potential and an acknowledgement of our human limitations. If our attempt is sincere and our objectives worthwhile, even if we experience an occasional failure, there is nothing lost. In fact, there is much to be gained in learning the true limits of our potential. And if we try and sense failure, we might ask ourselves if it is really failure or merely impatience that we are experiencing.

Birkman (1978) states that needs and motivations can change as an executive matures in success. And the possibility also exists that the means by which an executive has achieved success can become an end in itself (the so-called "workaholic" is a case in point).
In the opinion of the author, there are four major personality differences between the successful and the successful executives. There are: a. an ability to delegate authority, b. a need for worthwhile challenge with practical benefits, c. a capacity for empathy for employees, balanced by necessary objectivity and d. little desire for personal power.

Besides these, success seems to depend on four other factors - opportunity, self-awareness, motivation and ability to deal with reality.

Joe, Gary, Fierro and George (1978) have surveyed approximately 300 successful professionals to rank the variables most likely to contribute to professional success. Percentage findings includes a. high valuation of ambition and persistence across professional subgroups, b. generally low rankings for intelligence and education, c. subordinates success depending on skill performance and human relations and d. different value emphases across professional subgroups.

Sandra (1978) in his article provides an overview of Canadian women managers. When women managers were asked to account for their success as working women, the factors mentioned most often by women of all ages, status and working experience are: determination, competence, interpersonal skills, intelligence, aggressiveness, extra effort, hard work, environmental support, self-confidence and luck.
Repeatedly, they have expressed that their success is due to energy and dedication which surpasses that of their co-workers or which exceeds what is required of them.

Sandra's (1978) national study has indicated the personal characteristics needed for success at management. In the study the success attributes given by both men and women Canadian managers are: drive, intelligence, ambition, confidence, competence, interpersonal skills, health and job knowledge. These are mentioned, however, to different degrees by males and females.

Further, the study enlightens that in addition to these 'basics', men need special personal characteristics. The factors emphasized only by men managers are: leadership, communication, decision-making and honesty. And, equally significant, is that female management emphasizes that characteristics such as personality, appearance, humour and aggressiveness are also necessary to advance in management positions in addition to the eight basics.

Thain (1978) explains that current experience and research show that success in top executives requires the performance of three major tasks: a. supervision of current operations, b. strategic planning and c. political negotiation. Each of these major tasks is critical to success. All the three are interdependent and vary in priority and intensity in different organizations at different times.
He concludes that all general managers who survive for long must adopt an approach that is generally marked by the following primary characteristics: a. he is profit oriented and sensitive to 'people problems', b. has an entrepreneurial drive and c. he is a manager of change and systems oriented.

Borgos (1979) has found a vector of managing qualities that shows a consistent grouping of elements: behavior, mental control and the affective and intellectual adaptability to the social environment that gives room for individual initiative, interest and independence.

Caren (1982) has mentioned that the managerial skills like: a. leadership qualities, b. flexibility, c. decision making, d. inner work standards and e. performance stability are important for good management.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) have concluded that both the Managerial Grid (MD) and Situational Leadership (SL) styles contributes in helping managers to be more effective and improve productivity and contributions to the quality of working life.

Lewis (1982) has noticed that the most productive firms provide their employees with the greatest individual responsibilities and involvement in decision making.

McClelland and Boyatzis (1982) have concluded that moderate to high need for power, low affiliation and high activity inhibition are significantly associated with managerial success.
Tziner and Dolan (1982) have found that the best predictor of success is the peer nomination score.

Warrier (1982) has suggested that the difference in organizational culture calls for different personality types if they are to succeed as managers.

John (1983) has found that the most important characteristic a supervisor should possess is cooperativeness. Good supervisors are also identified as being friendly and impartial, using minimal authority and not taking advantage of workers weaknesses.

Maitra (1983) has concluded that effective managers are more intellectually motivated and original in thought and have broad interests. They possess high drive and activity orientation and emotionally stable in addition to being more friendly with colleagues and subordinates.

The findings of Baumgartel, Reynolds and Pathan (1984) have indicated that managers who are relatively high in need for achievement are more likely than others to apply new knowledge and skills on the job and that organizational climate affects the extent to which this knowledge is applied. The most favorable organizational climate has been characterised by appreciation of performance and innovation, a rational evaluation and reward system, and openness in relationship among managers.
Bray (1984) has identified four important areas for a successful manager. They are: a. cognitive abilities, b. administrative skills, c. interpersonal skills and d. motivation for advancement.

Margerison and McCann (1984) have suggested five key skills that managers must acquire if they wish to have a high performance team. These are linking, advising, organizing, controlling and exploring.

Siegel's (1984) study contradict conventional wisdom that argues that a. developing countries cannot afford the luxury of any, but an authoritarian system of personnel management and b. all or most Western personnel management ideas tend to be incompatible with the culture of developing nations.

Goddard (1985) has pointed out that the good management practices are: a. recognizing employees' potential for improved performance, b. showing confidence in the staff, c. setting high performance standards, d. complimenting, e. criticizing constructively and with empathy, f. helping people to advance and g. overcoming self-defeating personal prejudices.

Despite these observations, it is worthwhile to note that personality has much to do with executive behavior, performance and success. Employment managers universally recognize the importance of personality traits in employees whom they hire. Psychologists are the first to recognize the importance of
personality traits in helping an employee to adopt himself to any job or to any organization. It is desirable to be able to identify, at the time of employment, those individuals who have the personality traits that would be conducive to satisfactory job performance.

**Personality and Job Success**

The study of executive personality has progressed through an interesting kind of change. Although industrial psychologists continue to study executive traits, current research tends to discount the trait theory as a meaningful way to explain executive behavior and performance. Research on personality now places less emphasis on traits than on concepts of the total personality. Argyris (1957) says that the personality is something different from the sum of its parts; it is an organization of these parts. Research scientists have made a contribution, here, by efforts to increase our knowledge of the personality correlates of job success in management.

**Related Studies**

Utter (1947) has abstracted the information concerning personality and character requirements for a large number of jobs from the announcements of position vacancies. He summarises the most required personality characteristics for a successful professional (administrators, engineers, architects and etc.) are: 1. work effectively with others, 2. integrity, 3. resourcefulness, 4. sound judgment, 5. able to assume
responsibility, 6. able to meet the public, 7. be reliable and/or trustworthy and 8. be courteous in order of merit.


Henry (1949) states that high executives in large corporations may be especially low in affiliative needs, they have been described as "impersonal" in maintaining distance between themselves and work associates. This presumably allows them to be more coolly rational in making decisions about people and more mobile in changing positions and locations.

Henry's (1949) study on business executives have revealed that successful business executives are high in achievement desires, detached and impersonal toward their subordinates, constantly struggling for increase responsibility and as having broken all emotional ties with their parents. Finally he 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 (p. 289)".

Mosier and Kuder (1949) have found that the professional and managerial group differs significantly from the base group.
(unselected adult males) in the following scales: a. Interest in leading people and in dealing with practical problems, b. Preference for thinking and activities free from conflict, and c. Enjoyment of authority and power.

Guilford (1952) concludes that on the basis of a criterion of success defined as job performance ratings, the following traits contribute significantly to success of the executive: a. sociability, b. lack of inferiority feelings, c. co-operativeness and d. masculinity.

Ghiselli's (1954) investigation indicates that the top management personnel, when contrasted with middle management personnel, view themselves as being more self-reliant, self-confident, enterprising and bolder. The middle management individuals, on the other hand, describe themselves as more careful, thoughtful, deliberate and controlled.

The study of Wald and Doty (1954) shows that the top executives possess a high level of intelligence, seriousness of purpose, social maturity, firmness and objectiveness with respect to judgment and analytical abilities, frankness coupled with sensitivity to others, understanding and tolerance toward others, and a reasonable degree of emotional stability.

Miner and Culver (1955) have studied the personality characteristics of 44 top-level executives and their findings suggest that the typical executive is a person who suffers from
fears of failure and illness and who has a rather deep conviction of his own helplessness in attempting to solve many of the complex problems which face him. On the other hand, he has confidence in his own ability to get the cooperation of others in solving problems and in carrying out the necessary work.

Whyte (1956) describes the successful executive as a man who is concerned with "getting ahead" and not just "fitting in". He constantly suffers with the "executive neurosis" which is a mobility drive. With respect to autonomy, Whyte has suggested that, while unsuccessful executives have a feeling of personal attachment toward the organization and its policies, successful executives tend to be more "out for themselves". Whyte also states that one of the major drives of the potentially unsuccessful is to become a part of the organization, while the potentially successful executive with his well-defined self-identity, chooses to remain emotionally disconnected with his firm.

Porter (1958) has concluded that management personnel have selected traits more nearly towards the leadership end of the dimension.

Herbert (1959) has reported that most effective supervisors clearly accept more responsibility for job activities than the least effective supervisors do.
The findings of Huttner, Levy and Stopol (1959) indicate noticeable personality and mental differences among occupational groupings, company size and age.

Porter's (1959) study reveals that the favorable and unfavorable traits taken together shows that the typical supervisor views himself as a more conservative person than does the typical upper-management person. The supervisors seldom tend to check an adjective that indicates independence or strong aggressiveness. The upper-management personnel, on the other hand, seem relatively more frequently, to check adjectives that give a picture of greater enterprise, originality and boldness.

Ghiselli (1960) has concluded that the traits of intelligence, supervisory ability, initiative, self-assurance and perceived occupational level play a fundamental role in determining managerial success. He places heavy emphasis on the intellectual demands of the managerial job, for according to him, it is one demanding much creativity and innovation.

Izard (1960) has found that the average personality profiles of engineers and liberal arts students are significantly different. The engineers are found higher in achievement, deference, order, dominance and endurance and lower in affiliation, intraception, succorance, abasement and nurturance.

Porter (1961) concludes that there is little difference
between bottom level and middle level managers in how they rank the 13 common personality traits in terms of perceived importance for success in their respective jobs. In the study the co-operative type items are ranked high than the independent type items in relative importance for success. However intelligence is ranked as the most important factor for managerial success by both the groups.

Warner (1962) has described the main characteristics of autonomous man as found in the corporation. These are: motivation for mobility, increased responsibility, satisfaction, hard work, organizational ability, high adaptability and ability to make mental judgements under stress. An important component in successful managers is their ability to dissociate themselves from their past, so as to better relate themselves to their present and future.

Levinson (1964) concludes that personalities of organizational members vary over an extremely wide range. And when there are personality conflicts which inhibit effectiveness in organizations, skills of conflict resolution are important among the managers involved.

Porter and Henry (1964) indicate that to achieve job success, line managers seemingly can concentrate on Inner-Directed type behavior, while staff managers may have to attend to aspects of both Inner- and Other-Directed behavior in order to be most successful in their staff jobs.
Row (1965) has analysed the qualities which make "a good executive, really good". The emerging portrait is that of a mature, well-rounded personality with a breadth of vision, a leader of men with the ability to take decisions and having integrity, self-confidence, poise, intelligence and courage.

The study of Laurence and Mahlon (1966) indicates that drive, intellectual ability, leadership, organizing ability and initiative are significant characteristics for all levels and types of managers.

Webber's (1966) research on managers in all kinds of positions indicates that there is no consistent difference in behavior between those who are more effective and those who are less so.

In Cummin's (1967) study achievement is shown to be related to success in a sample of the business population. The business executives are with achievement desires and are constantly struggling for increased responsibility.

Eysenck (1967) has indicated that successful businessmen are on the whole stable introverts, they are stable regardless of what type of work they do within business. But their degree of extraversion may be related to the type of work.

Coleman (1970) concludes that chief executives of high-growth firms are characterized by traits more like those of farmers than of other business executives, i.e., executive
behavior which is restrained, humble, trusting and serious.

Levinson (1970) has described the characteristics of executives just below the top. The executives just below the top tend to be characterized as having excessive drive, ambition, and a greater sense of urgency - to be fighting time itself. Men at the very top seem to be more relaxed (and have less heart disease than their immediate subordinates).

Noe (1970) has studied the relative importance of 10 traits related to executive success. Results indicate 4 clusters of traits from most important to least important: a. leadership and judgment, b. communication, analytical ability, quality of work and administrative skills, c. originality, knowledge and risk-taking, and d. quality of work.

Soneif and Sayed (1970) administering creative thinking tests and personality questionnaires to 216 Egyptian males, have found that most of the correlations within each area, i.e., creativity and personality, are statistically significant, but those between the two sets of variables do not differ significantly from zero.

According to the data from household surveys of the Bureau of Labour Statistics (1971), managers put in more time than any other manfarm occupational group. The list runs as: 1. managers, officials and proprietors, 47.00 hours per week; 2. craftsmen and foremen, 40.90 hours; 3. professional and technical workers,
39.60 hours per week.

Copeman (1971) has concluded that the chief executive exhibit characteristics of both introversion and extraversion and they recognize the importance of exercising both conceptual and responsive skills. The most important quality they consider is the ability to handle and motivate people. Next come analytical skill and creativity.

Miner's (1971) study indicates that there are different personality patterns for employees in United States offices of the firm and those outside the United States.

The study of Morris and Wise (1972) concludes that programmers and systems analysts, tend to be poised and self-confident in personal and social interaction, motivated where conditions of autonomy and independence apply, flexible and assertive (but not dominant and aggressive), somewhat cynical and concerned with personal satisfaction, lacking strong regard for ethical and moral issues and having a tendency to be non-conforming.

The results of Thomas and Margaret (1973) have indicated that general managers are superior in functional specialities in several criteria of job success and are more socially desirable than those in a single function.

The findings of Ghosh and Manerikar (1974) indicate that Indian managers in different functional areas have greater
similarities than differences. The Indian managers have the following characteristics in common. They are dominance, casualness, sensitivity, realism, adaptability, practicality, confidence, conservatism and group dependence.

Nekvasil (1974) describes the following traits as the basic characteristics of young top executives — a. They are terribly impatient, b. Their values have not crystallized, c. They have not reconciled theory and practice, d. They are extremely self-critical, e. They misjudge their own abilities and f. They do not take time to think.

Allen's (1975) study of 156 middle level managers and 83 higher level executives has indicated that the two factors, impact and tactfulness are important for managerial success.

Dobruszek (1975) comparing the personality profiles of factory managers, executive heads of industrial boards, managers of selected leading factories, and heads of selected leading boards has found the leading managerial personnel to be superior to their ordinary counterparts in intellectual efficiency and in suspiciousness, enviousness, taciturnity and in security.

In the study of Ghosh and Manerikar (1975) Indian managers appear to be neither distinctly aloof nor clearly sociable, somewhat emotional, dominant, enthusiastic, neither casual nor very persistent, shy, tough and realistic, adaptable, practical, confident, accepting, group dependent, not exciting and having some tension.
Henney's (1975) study suggests that at least some particular samples of managers tend to show significantly to be above-average in extraversion.

Mansukhani (1975) expresses that one attribute that would appear virtually on everybody's list will be enthusiasm. No objective is ever achieved without it and success means fulfillment of objectives.

Inskeep (1976) has pointed that there can be no question that today's new managers have attitudes, technical qualifications and value systems, different from those of yesterday's young manager. The new manager is, or can be a better manager if he becomes aware of his strength and his short-comings and if he is intelligently coached by top management.

Patil and Vijaya (1976) have reported that the Indian executives are found to be active and ambitious, relaxed in social relations, rational, self-confident, somewhat depressed and anxious.

Wexley and Silverman (1978) have studied the difference between effective and ineffective retail store managers in terms of how they respond to a structured job analysis questionnaire. The results reveal that no significant differences exist in the way effective and ineffective store managers, used in this study, rate the importance of and time spent on seven major work activities as well as the importance of 30 worker
characteristics needed for successful job performance.

The study of Powell and Butterfield (1979) of 684 business students fails to support the hypothesis that a good manager would be seen as androgynous (possessing both masculine and feminine characteristics). Instead, the good manager is described in masculine terms. Graduate women also describe themselves in masculine terms.

Waetjen, Schuerger and Schwartz (1979) have examined the relationship between self-concept as a manager, sex and supervisors' ratings of middle managers who are successful and unsuccessful. The results shows that unsuccessful female managers have reported the highest self-concept scores, followed by the more predictable self-concept ordering of successful males, successful females and unsuccessful males.

Chakrabarti and Ramanath (1984) have concluded that differences between the three groups of managers - formal, technical and finance/commerce backgrounds in education are insignificant and a single personality profile can be used as a descriptive norm for the model personality pattern of managers. This personality profile depicts management personnel as attentive, insightful, intellectually adaptable, emotionally mature, stable, conscientious, self-confident, competitive and unfrustrated at average levels of anxiety.

Similarly, there is an increasing recognition of the
importance of creativity of the executives as a factor that is associated with success. Comparing persons on similar jobs, there are reasons to believe that those who are less creative are not as good in job performance as those who are more creative.

Creativity and Job Success

Creativity has been defined as the ability to produce a number of original and worthwhile ideas when confronted with problem situations. It has been described as related to or one that can be equated with productivity, positive mental health and originality. Creative thinking is important in many areas of life. It is a common belief that the creative person is vital to our national welfare and to the well-being of individual industries.

Creative men have described themselves as more imaginative, subjective, curious, impulsive, enthusiastic, original, confident, unconventional, and less worrying, less inhibited and less contented than the average.

The creative thinker, whether he is an artist, writer or scientist, is trying to create something new under the sun. Creativity is a style of thinking. Creative people produce more ideas, enjoy a complicated situation and are less concerned about the opinion of others.
Historically, few psychologists paid attention to the assessment of creativity before Guilford, i.e., 1950. In recent years, however, an increasing activity of both a theoretical and an experimental nature has enriched the understanding of creativity (MacKinnon, 1961; Taylor and Barron, 1963). Industrial organizations, of course, have a very direct interest in measuring creative talent of the employees for functional areas ranging from product research to advertising copy.

Several investigators pointed out the characteristics which tend to discriminate among creators and non-creators in general. Barron (1969) has indicated that there is substantial agreement among these researchers regarding the more salient discriminative properties. The work of Roe (1952), Taylor and Barron (1963), Gough (1960) and Ammons and Ammons (1962) among several others, suggests clearly that productive scientific individuals share a significant number of common traits.

**Related Studies**

It was Freud (1908) who gave a new orientation to the personality dimension of the creative mind. Accordingly, libidinal energy constitutes the essence of creative achievement. He believed that creative individuals channelled their libidinal energy in the direction of culturally respected goals.

Stein (1953) has reported that creative men perceive themselves as assertive, autonomous, striving, less submissive and acquiescent than non-creative individuals.
Barron (1954) has found that the creative groups, identified by peer ratings, to be characterised by aesthetic disposition.

Meer and Stein (1955) have pointed out age, length of service in the organization and total professional experience are not related to creativity. A consolidated analysis reveals the significant relationship between intelligence and creativity.

Barron (1957) has reported that generally the creative person is characteristically active. Barron, Buel and Bachner (1957) have reported that the creative person is generally active with some behaviors desirable and some undesirable.

Blatt and Stein (1957) have found the industrial research chemists to possess higher economic and aesthetic, but lower social and religious as well as authoritarian values.

Christensen, Guilford and Wilson (1957) have reported that ideas of greater uniqueness or uncommonness come later in a sequence of emitted ideas, while those of greater commonness or familiarity come earlier.

As Galton (1957) has pointed out mere creativity without intelligence will be all but worthless.

Goughs' (1957) study of the creative architect reveals that he is dominant; poised, spontaneous, self-confident,
sociable, intelligent, outspoken, sharp-sited, demanding, aggressive, self-centered, verbally fluent, self-assured and relatively free from conventional restraints and inhibitions.

He is strongly motivated to achieve in situations in which independence in thought and action are called for. Finally, he is definitely more psychologically minded, more flexible and possess more femininity of interests than architects in general.

Eiduson (1958) in a study of creative artists have found them to be different from non-artists, primarily in their ways of thinking and perceiving.

Bartlett (1959) employs the term of adventurous thinking which he characterises as getting away from the main track, breaking out of the mould, being open to experience and permitting one thing to lead to another.

Guilford (1959a) concludes that in divergent thinking operations one thinks in different directions, sometimes searching, sometimes seeking variety.

Guilford (1959c) have defined fluency as pertaining to the rapid generation, or generation within a limited period of time, of various kinds of units.

Sprecher's (1959) investigation has revealed that the highly creative persons (engineers) differ from the least creative persons in a. the novelty of ideas and b. the ability to produce valuable and practical solutions. It has also brought
out other factors such as independence in problem solving and
the achievement of comprehensive answers.

Spearman (1960) has gone so far to maintain that all
"creativity or originality depends solely on the education
of correlates and is therefore merely a manifestation of gene-
ral intelligence; no special creative power exists". According
to Taba (1960) a certain level of intelligence is needed to be
creative.

Buel and Bachner (1961) in a study on research personnel
in the research center of a major cereal and animal feed com-
pany have concluded that persons who are considered to possess
"creativity" are more intelligent and are interested in things
literary.

Crutchfield (1962) has thought of a creative person as an
independent functioning unit. For him the independent thinkers
are able to function effectively and be able to seek and enjoy
aesthetic and sensuous impressions.

MacKinnon's (1962) research data on Architects have re-
vealed that persons who are highly creative are inclined to
have a good opinion of themselves. They describe themselves
as inventive, determined, independent, individualistic, enthu-
siastic, industrious and sensitive. However, a zero relation-
ship between the intelligence and creativity is observed. It
is just not true that the more intelligent person is necessarily
the more creative one. In addition, the male creative groups are extremely high peak on the femininity. And also two-thirds of all the creative groups score as introverts, though there is no evidence that introverts as such are more creative than extraverts.

Mednik (1962) has suggested that there may be substantial difference in a person's associational productivity, depending upon whether the given task is cast in verbal or visual terms, or in conceptual or perceptual terms. Some people, he notes, are 'verbalizers', others are 'visualizers'. Hence he expects that the former should thrive when the mode of task presentation is verbal, the later, when it is visual.

Getzels and Jackson (1963) define creativity or creativity potential as the ability to deal inventively with verbal and numerical symbol systems and with object space relations.

According to Cureton (1964) creativity is an entity independent of intelligence and aptitudes closely related to intelligence.

Jones (1964) has investigated creativity in chemists and chemical engineers and other scientists and technologists associated with them in an industrial setting. Accordingly, the typically more creative industrial scientist or engineer is found to be: a. highly capable of reasoning well with words and other symbols, b. fluent in the output of ideas, c. original
in the quality of ideas, d. emotionally stable, e. determined to master his working environment, f. adventurous in outlook, g. high in degree of scientific curiosity and h. low in indication of general anxiety.

Koestler (1964) finds that the creative act is characterized by a process of 'bisociation' - two domains of thought that has previously led an independent existence are suddenly brought into intimate contact with each other and emerge as an integral whole.

Olshin (1964) has attempted to study the relation between age and sex to creative levels and have found age to be related to creativity and not sex. Yamamoto (1964) has defined creativity as "the process of forming new ideas or hypotheses, testing these ideas or hypotheses and communicating the results".

MacKinnon's (1965) study on architects has revealed that Architects III (the least creative group) score higher than Architect I (the most creative) on abasement, affiliation, deference, endurance, intraception and nurturance - and on all of these dimensions the mean scores of Architect II are intermediate between Architect III and Architect I. On the expressed desire to control others (E'), the Architect I score higher than Architects II, and Architects II in turn higher than Architects III.

The study also suggests that Architects II are more
conflicted and more psychologically disturbed than either Architects I or III. However, on several of these measures of tension, conflict and anxiety, Architects I stand very close to Architects II.

McDermid's (1965) study on engineers and technical personnel in the engineering division of the Hammond Organ Company has pointed out an interesting hypothesis, which may be stated as 'the ego strength is a critical correlate of creativity'. Further the research, has revealed that those engineers who rate themselves high on Autonomy, Aggression and Dominance, and low on Deference and Abasement, are considered more creative than their fellow engineers.

Wallach and Kogan (1965) are concerned with the validity of distinction between intelligence and creativity as modes of cognitive activity. They have found that the average correlation between creativity and intelligence is low, i.e., 0.1 not significant.

Ward (1966) has found that creativity measures obtained through the adapted version of the Wallach and Kogan Instruments are quite independent of intelligence.

Donald's (1967) study indicates that achievement is high under conditions that seem inconsistent, including sources of stability or confidence (security) and sources of disruption or intellectual conflict (challenge). It appears that, if both
are present, the creative tension between them can promote technical achievement.

Eisler (1967) suggests that creativity is basically a biological puzzle which cannot be solved by the means now at the disposal of psychology.

Lyman (1967) concludes that a clear understanding of the goals to which managers are highly committed and a climate that encourages free and open interaction in dealing with issues, can produce more creative solutions to organizational problems.

Kotarbink (1968) has suggested the importance of psychological, social and economic factors for development of scientific creativity. According to Lytton and Cotton (1969) scores on divergent thinking tend to increase with the socio-economic status of pupils.

Andrew and Gordon (1970) have concluded that creativity as affected by social or organizational factors where they work, clearly shows the importance of roles played by the environment. The results indicate that free environment increase quality of problem solving and originality characteristics.

Shackle (1970) indicates that in a competitive economy the organization which can make transitions rapidly is likely to have an advantage over less flexible competitors.

Raina (1971) has reported that high creatives are characterised