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There are few words in the English language that have such a fascination for the general public as the term 'personality'. Although the word is used in various senses, most of these popular meanings fall under one of the two headings: The first use equates the term to social skill or adroitness. An individual's personality is assessed by the effectiveness with which he or she is able to elicit positive reactions from a variety of persons under different circumstances. The second use considers the personality of the individual to consist of the most outstanding or salient impression that he or she creates on others (Hall and Lindzey, 1991).

The term 'personality' is much older than the term 'psychology' itself (Mohan, 1985). Various researchers have put in a life-time effort in the study of personality. Allport (1937), in an exhaustive survey of the literature, extracted almost fifty different definitions of personality that he classified into various categories viz., biosocial, biophysical, omnibus, integrative, definitions regarding adjustment of the individual and the aspects of uniqueness, finally categorizing personality to represent the essence of human condition.

Eysenck, Lewin, Guilford, Allport, Spearman, Maslow, McClelanè, Spence, Taylor and Cattell are some of the notable contributors in the area of personality. The research in this field is still going on and newer, more explicit constructs and theories are still being formulated. Siegal (1980) and Thomas (1980) gave the cognitive theories of personality while Vernon (1980) gave a cognitive semantic processing analysis of personality development.

**EYSENCK'S THEORY OF PERSONALITY**

Eysenck's theory of personality is one of the formidable attempts in presenting a complete and explanatory theory on the point. In the present study various indices of personality have been examined in relation to Self-Rated Effectiveness. The foremost among these are the personality dimensions of Extraversion/Introversion (E/I), Neuroticism/Stability, Psychoticism (P) and Lie (Social desirability), as proposed by Eysenck's theory of personality.

These dimensions were the result of elaborate factor analysis (Eysenck, 1960; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1964). Dimensions of personality, both for children and adults, as proposed and measured by Eysenck's Personality questionnaire developed by them, seem to be very much the same in different countries and cultures where they have been studied (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1982, 1983; Barrett and Eysenck, 1985; Eysenck and Long, 1986; Mohan et al., 1987).

Eysenck (1963) also proposed a psychological model to parallel these three dimensions (Eysenck, 1969, 1981 and Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985). This is a hierarchical model which conceptualizes that each of the three broad dimensions are subdivided at a lower level into narrower and more specific traits.

Eysenck further revised the Eysenck Personality questionnaire and added a Lie Scale (Social Desirability) which was first incorporated in Eysenck's personality Inventory (EPI) to measure a tendency on the part of the subjects to 'fake good responses'. Now it measures an independent stable factor which possibly denotes some degree of 'social naivete' (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975). Recently, Perera and Eysenck (1984) further reported that Lie (Social desirability) scale has been recognized as a personality dimension of some intrinsic interest apart from faking.

The dimensions of personality, reported Eysenck and Eysenck (1985), included certain subtraits that could be categorized as follows:

- **The subtraits of Extraversion were**: sociable, lively, active, assertive, sensation seeking, carefree, dominant, surgent and venturesome.

- **The subtraits of Neuroticism were**: anxious, depressed, guilty, low self-esteem, tense, irrational, shy, moody and emotional.

- **The subtraits of Psychoticism were**: aggressive, cold, egocentric, impersonal, impulsive, antisocial, unempathic, creative, tough minded and refers to a person who does not fit in anywhere.
Personality research regarding behaviour at work has strived to investigate the role of personality in executive behaviour and identify the personality patterns of effective executives. The psychological literature abounds with studies in which the relationship between leadership characteristics and behaviours as well as several aspects of work and group effectiveness have been measured (Mohan, 1985). Eysenck (1967) and Lynn (1969) found successful businessmen and entrepreneurs to be stable introverts.

EPQ-R has been a very successful measure of personality in India also, for quite a number of years. Muthayya (1969, 1970) studied executive personality in administrative set ups connected with development administration. He used Eysenck personality Inventory in studying the administrative officers belonging to middle and higher levels of the set up. These officers were found to be introverted and emotionally stable as per comparative norms.

Kumar (1970) found successful executives to be achievement-oriented, challenging, stimulating, task-oriented and creative. Effective leaders tend to possess certain personal characteristics. Hogan (1978) stated that the leaders tend to be bright, sociable, self-confident and responsible. His results support the notion that there is a stable set of personality dimensions that characterize leaders across situations.

Singh (1982) opined that early attempts to examine effective managerial styles emphasized the analysis of personality traits. A number of studies demonstrated that managers/leaders as compared to non-leaders were more intelligent (Gibb, 1947), had self-assurance and self-knowledge (Cox, 1926), and also had better personality integration (Mann 1959). Leaders were found to be more extrovert and sociable (Mann, 1959) and moderately equalitarian in personality (Bass, 1960). Kulkarni (1983) reported that according to researchers, those who survive in executive race show diversity of accomplishments in their track records. They are people who can remain calm under stress, are outspoken without offending and are poised in handling their mistakes.

Mohan (1985) claimed that the rise of behavioural sciences, particularly of psychology and the awareness to update and modernise management and administrative sciences has brought the study of executive personality to the fore. Mohan (1985), with the help of EPI compared executives in different positions on extraversion, neuroticism and self and ideal perception. He found executives to believe in planning
things, being thoughtful, preferring a few chosen friends and theoretically conditioning better, having higher critical arousability. All these behaviours are correlates of Effectiveness. He concluded that these executives tended to be introverted on the whole and were very highly motivated. Mohan (1985) thus opined that probably successful administration and management depended upon cool decision making and then fervent implementation thereof.

Mohan and Jahangiri (1985) found managers in the private sector to score lower on Neuroticism as compared to managers of the government sector, where as the latter scored higher on Extraversion as compared to private sector managers. Comparing the perceptions of different groups of executives in their study, they emphasised variables like effectiveness, control, brilliance, human consideration, owning up the responsibilities and tactfulness to be important characteristics of executives. The sketch appeared to be of an efficiently bold man with positive value system and dynamism to direct people towards carefully planned targets.

Bowin and Attran (1987) made an attempt to replicate the original Ghiselli (1971) study of the abilities and personality traits of successful middle level managers and found similar results. Gibson (1987), in his appraisal of managerial performance, 'strongly confirmed' the validity of core personality constructs associated with managerial behaviours.

Mohan and Rattan's (1987) study revealed that by and large the Indian executives belonging to the three central services i.e. IAS, IPS and IRS, clustered around an image of effectiveness, Introversion, stability, social-desirability and they were committed to high achievement. Hasan (1990), in a study to identify the personality characteristics of successful first line supervisors (n=153), found that to be termed "effective", these individuals should be employee-oriented, satisfied with their job, independent and more or less assertive.

During the 1980s, 'personality' enjoyed a resurgence of interest among researchers in the organizational domain after a decade or two of relative neglect. Recent research and theory can be found relating 'personality' to many different organizational variables including job stressors (e.g., workload, role conflict or lack of autonomy) and job strains (e.g., job dissatisfaction, work anxiety and somatic symptoms - Spector, 1992). Intensive study of these variables would lead to a formidable conclusion about what makes one more Effective.
**TYPE A**

Type A personality has received considerable attention in the psychological research. 'Type A' refers to an 'over all style of behaviour' that is observed in persons who are excessively time conscious, are competitive, ambitious, hard driving, and confident etc. (Rees, 1990).

Friedman and Rosenman (1959) defined Type A behaviour as "an action-emotion complex that can be observed in any person who is aggressively involved in a chronic incessant struggle to achieve more and more in less and less time and if required to do so, against the opposing effects of other things or persons." Type A behaviour, thus, is designed as a rather broad, cognitive emotional, personal style of individual functioning.

In the context of work-situation, Type As were called as 'work addicts' (Burke, 1984), and were said to be particularly attracted to managerial and other high stress careers (Ortega and Pipal, 1984).

**Characteristics of Type A and Type B Personalities**

Dembroski et al. (1978) gave the following characteristics of Type A and Type B individuals:

**Type A**

- A general expression of vigour and energy, alertness and confidence.
- A firm handshake and brisk walking pace. Loud and/or vigorous voice.
- Terse speech, abbreviated responses. Clipped speech (failure to pronounce ending sounds of words).
- Rapid speech and acceleration of speech at the end of a longer sentence.
- Explosive speech that may contain swear words.
- Interrupting by frequent and rapid responses before another speaker has completed his question or statement.
- Speech hurrying in the form of 'Yes, yes,' or 'mm mm' or nodding assent while other person speaks.
- Vehement reactions to questions relating to impedance of time progress (i.e., driving slowly, waiting in lines).
Use of clenched fist or pointing finger to emphasize verbalisations.

Frequent sighing especially related to questions about work. (It is important to differentiate this from sighs of a depressed person).

Hostility directed at the interviewer or topics of interview.

Frequent, abrupt and emphatic one-word responses to questions (i.e., Yes! Never! Definitely! Absolutely!).

Type B

- A general expression of relaxation, calm and quiet attentiveness.
- A general handshake and a moderate to slow walking pace.
- A mellow voice, usually low in volume.
- Lengthy rambling responses.
- No evidence of clipped speech.
- Slow to moderate pacing of verbal responses. No acceleration at the end of the sentence.
- Minimum inflection in general speech, almost monotone with no explosive quality.
- Rarely interrupts another speaker.
- No speech hurrying.
- No vehement reactions to questions related to impedance of making progress and utilization of time.
- Never uses clenched fist or pointing finger gesture to emphasize speech.
- Rarely sighs unless he is 'hyperventilating' and showing nervous anxiety.
- Hostility is rarely, if ever, observed.
- An absence of emphatic, one word responses.

In their clinical description of Type A persons, Friedman and Rosenman (1974) noted that in contrast to Type B persons, the behaviour of Type A individuals was characterized by an exaggerated sense of time urgency that often results in pre-programmed thinking, a constant struggle for achievement that served to appease a chronic insecurity of status and high levels of aggressiveness that may evolve into chronic hostility. Later, it became clear that persons who exhibited this syndrome of behaviours were also more likely to report a variety of illnesses (Carmody et al., 1984 and Woods and Burns, 1984), and that the greater incidence of self reported illness in
Type A persons was thought to be stress-linked (Hicks et al., 1986).

Lobel (1988) found that Type As scored lower on all the dimensions of self-concept except the physical. It was also found that the Type Bs scored higher on need for Approval but only on its avoidance component. In addition, Type As scored higher on extraversion and on neuroticism. Norwack and Sarsenrath (1980), Eysenck and Fulkar (1983) found Type As to be higher in Neuroticism than Type Bs.

Several investigators have studied the relationship between TABP and various personality measures. For example, Lovallo and Pishkin (1980), using the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) and normal volunteers, reported positive correlations between Type A and neuroticism and extraversion. Smith (1984) studied cardiac patients following catheterization and reported significant correlations between Type A and neuroticism. Associations of neuroticism with Type A and the JAS factor S were also reported by Irvine et al. (1982).

Chesney et al. (1981), using the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ), classified a group of employees according to their performance on the Structured Interview, and found that Type As scored significantly higher on the EPQ scales of extraversion (E) and psychoticism (P), but that neuroticism (N) and the lie scale (L) remained uncorrelated with the degree of Type A.

Wong and Reading (1989) found Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Psychoticism to be positively correlated, while Lie (Social Desirability) Scale was negatively correlated with dimensions of Type A behaviour. Type A has been extensively studied in the context of various motives, especially need for Achievement. Carver et al. (1976); Glass (1977), Chusmir and Hood (1986) and Langeluddecke and Tennant (1986) are some of the various researchers who have reported a significant positive relationship between need for Achievement and Type A personalities.

Behavioural characteristics of power-oriented men are very much like those of Type A men. Chesney et al (1981) found a significant link between Type A and dominance. The Type A characteristics of competitiveness and hostility are interpersonal in nature. Grimm and Yarnold, (1985) and Yarnold et al. (1985) also reported Type As to be more domineering than Type Bs.

Type As have been reported to conform less than Type Bs. Type As are definitely lower on need for Approval. Tambs et al. (1989) reported lie (social...
desirability) to be negatively related with Type A behavioural patterns. Regarding the relationship between Type A and Hostility, review of past studies revealed Type As to be significantly higher in hostility (Price, 1982; Llorente et al., 1985). In fact, Glass et al. (1974) opined that aggressiveness and hostility are believed to be a major component of Type A.

Type A personality has received considerable attention in the stress literature too. Glass and Carver (1980) theorized that Type As are hyper-reactive to uncontrollable stressors. Consistent with this view, Ganster (1986) concluded that Type As were more reactive to stressful job conditions than type Bs. From this it would follow that Type As would be more likely to report job stress and experience job strains. Empirical support for this proposition exists in that Type A has been shown to correlate with reported job stressors (Ganster, 1986) and strains (Newton and Keenan, 1990).

**TYPE A AND EFFECTIVENESS**

Effectiveness in work situations is something that all individuals and organisations strive for. What kind of personality will be suited best for a particular job and what personality dimensions make an executive effective in his work, has been a topic of extensive research.

The personality attributes of Type A include certain components that have been found to be correlated to effectiveness. Rees (1990) describing the characteristics of Type A behaviour pattern, calls them "perhaps the prototype of the successful and dynamic executive."

Burke's (1983) review of the subject described Type As as showing unbridled ambition, competitiveness, free floating hostility, high need for Achievement, impatience, time urgency and polyphasic functioning (doing many tasks at the same time). Type As also showed greater job involvement, greater identification with the organizations they worked for and greater occupational self-esteem. Individuals who are highly motivated, identify with their organizations and find their work providing them with self-esteem are likely to be more effective.

Mathews et al. (1980) investigated the relationship between Type A and need for Achievement. Type A was substantially and positively associated with Mastery, Work and Competitiveness scores on an achievement measure. The more
Type A an individual, the more likely he is to prefer challenging tasks, to like work and to be competitive in his orientation.

Thus, it can be safely concluded - from a review of Type As which describes them to be more achievement motivated (Chesney et al., 1981); action oriented, dominant and leading (Friedman, 1969) - that these traits may help these individuals to be effective in their functioning. However, specific research is still required to find a definite relationship between Type A behaviour and Effectiveness, if any.

**MACHIAVELLIANISM**

Manipulative strategies of social conduct (Machiavellianism) have been studied both by evolutionary biologists and psychologists, particularly personality researchers at large. The psychological literature on Machiavellianism now includes over 300 references.

Christie and Geis (1968, 1970b) were the first psychologists to study Machiavellianism as an important axis of human behavioural variation. They developed a series of Mach tests that measure a participant's agreement with statements such as "Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so." High and low scorers on the test, often referred to as high-Machs and low-Machs, respectively, differ in many other aspects of their behaviour, from vocational choice to success at games that involve forming alliances.

Harre and Lamb (1983) defined Machiavellianism as a personality factor which is characterized by the ability to manipulate others through flattery, threat or deceit. Markova (1987) stated that Machiavellianism is manipulation of situations, emotions, information and anything else available to mould the other person in the manner required by the manipulator.

Robbins (1993) defined a Machiavellian personality as being pragmatic, maintaining emotional distance and believing that the ends can justify the means. The idea that "if it works, use it" is consistent with a high-Mach perspective. He further elaborates by stating that high-Machs manipulate more, win more, and persuade others more than do low-Machs. Yet, these high-Mach outcomes are moderated by situational factors. It has been found that high-Machs flourish when they interact face-to-face with others rather than indirectly; when the situation has a minimum number of rules.
and regulations, thus allowing latitude for improvisation, and where emotional involvement with details distracts low-Machs. High-Machs tend to be productive in jobs that require bargaining skills (such as labour negotiation) or where there are substantial rewards for winning (as in commissioned sales).

Wilson et al. (1996) defined Machiavellianism as a strategy of social conduct that involves manipulating others for personal gain, often against the other's self-interest. Machiavellianism should be regarded as a quantitative trait. Everyone is capable of manipulative behaviour to some degree, but some are more willing and more able than others. It has been argued that manipulative behaviour is not a single trait but rather a complex set of traits that cannot be captured by a single scale (Allsopp, et al. 1991; O'Hair and Cody, 1987; Panitz, 1989).

Historically the term "Machiavellianism" dates back to the works of Nicolo Machiavelli in the 16th century. Kautilya's *Arthasastra* in India and a *Book of Lord Shang* in China about 300 B.C. expounded the basic theme of the term 'Mach' as it later came to be known.

According to a passage from 'The Prince' by Machiavelli (1966), "it is a part of machiavellian strategy to be genuinely co-operative, trustworthy and so forth when it is advantageous. Perhaps we should regard Machiavellianism as a kind of master strategy that includes both co-operative and defecting sub-strategies, plus a system of rules for when to use them."

The term "Machiavellianism" can be understood on the basis of two broad frame works existing in evolutionary biology:

(a) The ability to manipulate others is treated as always adaptive or primary force in the evolution of human intelligence.

(b) The second theoretical framework treats Machiavellianism as one of several social strategies that compete with each other in Darwinian fashion. Thus, the most successful strategy becomes common through the genetic mechanism of genetic evolution, cultural change or individual learning (Tooby and Cosmides, 1992; Wilson, 1994).

Wilson et al. (1996), in a review of psychological literature concerning Machiavellianism, postulated various factors.

(a) *Genetic relatedness*: On an average, subjects indicated a lower degree of Machiavellianism towards family members and friends than towards people in general.
However, there were no differences between the categories of friends and family members, or among finer degrees within friendship or within genetic relatedness. (Barber, 1994).

(b) **Age**: Machiavellianism increases with age up to late adolescence (Gupta, 1987) and declines thereafter (Mudrack, 1989).

(c) **Gender**: Most studies of Machiavellianism that include male and female participants find gender differences, with males being slightly higher on this variable (Allsopp et al., 1991; O'Conner and Simms, 1990). Gruber and White (1986) remark, however, that it will be naive to think that women are simply more nurturing and therefore less Machiavellian than men.

Male - Male interactions are frequently characterized by overt power struggles and short time alliances. Female-female interactions are often characterized by more long-term interactions, frequently but not always, among genetic relatives. In most human societies, women are also less likely to use physical violence and must get their way by other and often more subtle means. Men are more likely to openly manipulate women, often with violence or threat of violence, whereas women may manipulate men in more subtle ways that include deception (Novgorodoff, 1974).

**Characteristics of people high on Mach as related to Effectiveness**

Psychological literature offers some support for the idea that high-Machs approximate a defect strategy that is specialized to exploit others without provocation. Sinha et al. (1982) summarized some of the major characteristics of Machiavellianism as suggested by Christie and Geis (1970a) in their monograph. They are: (a) a relative lack of affect in interpersonal relationships, (b) a lack of concern with conventional morality, (c) low ideological commitment, and (d) an instrumental view of others.

The concepts of trust, honour and decency all include an element of vulnerability that can be exploited, at least over the short term. It is, therefore, tempting to associate Machiavellianism and its alternatives with defecting and co-operative strategies, respectively (Axelrod and Dion, 1988).

Machiavellian people are generally perceived as being more attractive and desirable. Results of psychological experiments show that high-Mach frequently outperform low-Machs in short term social interactions. Moreover, even though high
- Machs are not more intelligent than low-Machs, they are perceived by their peers as more intelligent and attractive (Cherulnik et al., 1981). High-Machs take centre stage and adopt leadership roles in small-group situations (Bochner et al., 1975); they easily beat low-Machs in bargaining and alliance-forming situations (Christie and Geis, 1970).

There is conclusive evidence that high-Machs are more willing to manipulate others against their interest (Harell, 1980; Vecchio and Sussmann, 1991). A study by Harrell (1980) showed that high and low-Machs differ not only in their willingness to manipulate others but also in the specific conditions that cause them to do so. Once again, the behaviour of low-Machs seems to approximate a TFT strategy that includes both retaliation and forgiveness.

However, one point that should not be lost sight of is that just as high-Machs should not be regarded as complete scoundrels, low-Machs should not be regarded as paragons of social virtue (Christie and Geis, 1970a). Studies also suggest that high-Machs are better at manipulating others. In addition to being more willing to manipulate others, there is abundant evidence that high-Machs are also better at the art of manipulation, at least in short-term, face-to-face interactions. The evidence is especially strong for manipulative tactics that are socially acceptable, such as bargaining and competition (Christie and Geis, 1970b).

Several studies have investigated the Mach-performance relationship. Hollon (1983) found self-reported (perceived) job performance and Mach to be positively related for males in middle and lower level executives. Actual job performance, as measured by gross margin profit percent, was positively related to Mach for male (but unrelated for female) retail speciality store managers (Gable and Topol, 1989).

It is evident that though some researchers have found a positive correlation between Mach and success (Turner and Martínez, 1977; Shultz, 1993), yet the research on the relationship between Mach and Effectiveness is still inconclusive (Turnbull, 1976; Hunt and Chonko, 1984; Wilson et al., 1996). Present investigation may throw some light on this relationship.
OPTIMISM, IRRITABILITY AND SELF-ESTEEM

'Personality' is a very diverse and complex cognitive process. 'Personality' is the whole person and is concerned with external appearance and traits, self and interactions with various situations. People differ from each other on account of how they view the situations around them, how amicable and patient they are in their interactions and also how competent they perceive themselves to be, along with the kind of self-image that they hold for themselves.

The differences in personality dispositions lead to various different behavioural outcomes. People not only function in various social settings and roles, but their nature of personality also predisposes them to behave differently in social settings and to perceive such things as intimacy and social support in different ways (Lyons and Chamberlain, 1994).

The personality disposition of Optimism facilitates one in goal-directed behaviours, helps in coping with stress in a better fashion (Scheier and Carver, 1985) and leads to health enhancing states. It thus confers beneficial effects on physical well-being.

Optimism is a general feeling and inclination to hopefulness and confidence. It is a disposition to take a bright and hopeful view of things. It is one extreme of a continuum, with the other extreme being pessimism. Lin and Peterson (1990) described people with pessimistic explanatory style as ones habitually explaining bad events with stable, global and internal causes.

Optimists receive greater satisfaction from interpersonal relationships and perceive lesser stress and are better at coping. Compared to pessimists, optimists report greater satisfaction from relationships with friends, have lower levels of distress, are less depressed, have less perceived stress and are more socially supported (Scheier and Carver, 1992).

Optimism also moderates the effect of interpersonal events on health (Lyons and Chamberlain, 1994). According to them, optimism and self-esteem would interact with minor events to affect health. Interpersonal hassles interacted with optimism having a greater impact on physical symptoms for optimists than for pessimists.

Scheier and Carver (1985) also found that optimists cope with stressful events more successfully and engage in more health enhancing behaviours than...
pessimists. Optimists also report fewer physical symptoms over a pre-examination period (Scheier and Carver, 1985), and display faster rates of physical recovery following coronary bypass surgery (Scheier et al., 1989).

**IRRITABILITY**

The quality of being provoked and getting angry or fretful in the process of interaction with others has been termed *irritability*.

Irritability represents a readiness to explode with negative affect at the slightest provocation. It includes quick temper, grouchiness, exasperation and rudeness. Assault, verbal hostility, indirect hostility and negativism are all forms of aggression, while resentment and suspicion represent hostility.

People high on this trait lose their temper easily, though they also happen to get over it quickly. They are impatient, rude and get irritated at minor and unimportant things. They can be termed as being grouchy most of the time and are exceptionally annoyed if they think they are not being treated rightly by others (Buss and Durkee, 1957).

**SELF-ESTEEM**

The self is a unique product of many interacting parts and may be thought of as the personality viewed from within. This self is particularly relevant to the concepts of Self-Esteem in the field of organizational behaviour (Luthans, 1995).

According to Korman (1974), "People's self-esteem has to do with their self-perceived competence and self-image." Maslow (1954) stressed the need or desire for a stable, firmly based, sense of self-regard or self-respect that all people have. Two categories of self-esteem have been classified by him:

(a) The first set of esteem needs include the desire for strength, for achievement, for adequacy, for mastery, for competence, for self-confidence, for a degree of independence, and for freedom. (b) The second category includes the desire for prestige, status, recognition, attention, dignity and appreciation - all of which are characteristics of esteem based on others' views of the person.

Buss (1978) has developed a model of self-esteem (Figure C). It consists of more or less permanent self-esteem forming the basic core. Such self-esteem originates
Fig. C: MODEL OF SELF-ESTEEM

from constitutional factors and unconditional parental love. This core construct is surrounded by a periphery of stable self-esteem which varies with long-range affection and achievement. Peripheral self-esteem arises from affection of different kinds and from specific assets and accomplishments. While affection includes love from parents, other family members and friends and later adult sexual love, the second part of deriving self-esteem from particular assets and accomplishments includes a realistic feeling of self-worth from one's talent, popularity and knowledge etc. A positive evaluation of one's accomplishments in relation to one's aspirations, contributes positively to self-esteem.

Wallace et al. (1984) reported self-esteem to increase throughout adolescence, on the basis of their study on change and stability in self-esteem between childhood and early adolescence. Korman (1968) postulated three sources of Self-Esteem:

(a) Chronic self-esteem - a relatively persistent personality trait which occurs consistently across various situations; (b) task specific self-esteem - an individual's feeling of competence for a particular task; (c) socially influenced self-esteem - which is others' expectation of one's behaviour. Individuals high in self-esteem are characterized by emotional maturity and stability, without any social inhibitions and a feeling of being secure and relaxed.

Self-esteem does not appear to be a function of gender differences (Zuckerman, 1980). However, Lau (1989) found masculinity to be more strongly associated with self-esteem, while effects of femininity was less evident.

**OPTIMISM, IRRITABILITY, SELF-ESTEEM AND EFFECTIVENESS**

There is considerable research on the role that various personality variables may play in organizational behaviour and its effective outcomes. There is enough evidence to conclude that optimism and self-esteem are positive concepts that lead to better adjustment, effective coping, well-being in general and other such behavioural outcomes that may lead to Effectiveness. However, Irritability comprises negative feelings that may perpetuate difficulties and acts as a barrier in Effectiveness.

Considering the specific sample of the present study i.e. Judicial Officers, it is evident that subjects who are optimistic, have a positive self-esteem, are patient
and considerate instead of being irritable, may prove to be more effective judges. Scheier and Carver (1985) found optimists to be more persistent and effective than others in their goal-directed behaviours. They also found optimism to enhance one’s coping effectiveness and one’s ability to deal with stressful events. Such people obviously have a better chance of being effective.

Moreover, interpersonal events and daily hassles have a greater effect on illness vulnerability for pessimists than for optimists (Lyons and Chamberlain, 1994). Thus, optimism interacts with interpersonal events to affect health and leads to effective functioning of an individual.

As with other constructs in the field, there are both mixed and even inconclusive results on the impact of self-esteem (Jackson and Schuler, 1985) but both early (Mossholder et al., 1981; Mossholder et al., 1982) and the most recent studies indicate that self-esteem plays an important moderating role in areas such as emotional and behavioural responses (Pierce et al., 1993) and stress (Ganster and Schaubroeck, 199a; Ganster and Schaubroeck, 1991b) of organizational members. Thus, people with a more positive self-esteem are likely to be more effective than others because of their ability to deal effectively with stress and emotional conditions. Feather (1969) found that persons with low self-esteem attributed success, an outcome inconsistent with their self-concept, to factors external to themselves, whereas people with high self-esteem attributed success, internally and failure externally.

The positive relationship (Feather, 1969) of self-esteem and job satisfaction also makes it a variable contributing to effectiveness. Korman (1976) in his consistency theory of job satisfaction had predicted that high self-esteem people will choose to perform highly, will choose high prestige careers and the like, in order to maintain a consistent and, therefore, satisfying state. He also found that high self-esteem people tend to perform better than those with low self-esteem and also to prefer high status careers.

Self-esteem has been consistently found to be related positively with job satisfaction (Adler, 1980). Crook et al. (1984) opined that self-esteem influenced career attitudes and work achievement directly. Barbara and Landa (1986) found that teachers derived greater emotional support from job satisfaction than from salary, school facilities, or rapport with teachers and Principal.

Brockner (1987) found performance to be positively related to self-esteem in people receiving a negative feedback. They found that those with high self-esteem performed much better than those with low self-esteem after both had received negative feedback. Difference in performance of participants with low and high self-esteem may occur because of different attributions. Those with high self-esteem may attribute negative feedback to external sources and so can easily disregard it or eventually prove it wrong (Zuckerman, 1979; Tennen and Herzberger, 1987). However, those with low self-esteem may attribute negative feedback to internal sources and thus believe that they cannot do better. According to Hurley (1997), people who are told that they will not succeed may see that as a threat to their self-esteem and change their behaviour in order to succeed. Threats to people's self-esteem often lead to their taking action to restore their self-esteem. One may take a negative prophecy about one's performance as a threat to one's self-esteem and try to improve one's performance.

Moreover, Baumeister and Scher (1988) found that high self-esteem also seems to cause people to overestimate their likelihood of success. Earlier, Borucki (1987) investigated the interaction effects of both global self-esteem and sense of interpersonal competence on the relationship between perceived organisational stress factors (role conflict, role ambiguity, and role over-load), job-related strain (anxiety, irritation and depression) and such long term negative consequences of stress as job dissatisfaction, low job performance, poor organisational commitment, and psychosomatic complaints. Results showed that the sense of interpersonal competence effects were more useful in moderating the impact of organisational stress factors on short term as well as long term negative consequences of stress.

Rizvi and Shanker (1987) in a study of effect of self-esteem on job perception or occupational stress and job satisfaction found that at conditions of high ego strength, the job is considered more satisfying and in conditions of low ego strength, the job is perceived as less satisfying. Thus, high self-esteem contributes in ensuring effectiveness in dealing with different situations at work. Blitzer et al. (1993) also found that "both
research and everyday experience confirm that employees with high self-esteem feel unique, competent, secure, empowered, and connected to the people around them." The aim of the present investigation was to explore the relationship between Self-Rated Effectiveness and Optimism, Irritability and Self-Esteem.

LOCUS OF CONTROL

For quite sometime, there has been a notable increase in the consideration of Locus of Control as a variable pertinent to the explanation of behaviour in psychological research. The concept of perceived control has been studied in organizational domain as well.

Locus of control is a personality variable that concerns people's generalized expectance that they can or cannot control reinforcements in their lives. People who hold expectancies that they control reinforcement are considered to be internals, while people who hold expectancies that outside forces or luck controls reinforcements are considered to be externals (Spector and O'Connell, 1994).

Shukla (1995) reports that it has been observed that individuals differ in their perception of Locus of Control. Internal-external refers to the degree to which an individual perceives the event that happens to him or her depends on his or her behaviour or the result of fate, luck, chance or power beyond one's personal control and understanding.

The construct of 'Locus of Control' and the theoretical foundation underlying its development evolved from Rotter's earlier work on social learning theory (Rotter, 1954). Rotter (1966) postulated that consistent individual differences exist with respect to a person's belief in the way his or her behaviour affect the control of life-events. These beliefs were designated as 'Locus of Control'.

According to International Dictionary of Education (1977), Locus of Control is a personality construct referring to an individual's perception of the place of events as determined internally by his/her own behaviour against luck, fate or external forces. The Encyclopedia Dictionary of Psychology (1983) opined that Locus of Control is a concept relating to beliefs about internal vs. external control of reinforcement.

In an extensive study of Locus of Control, Foon (1989) referred to it as individual's perceptions and generalized expectancies concerning behaviour and the
reinforcement resulting from it. An individual who perceives his or her behaviour as being a direct cause of the reinforcements surrounding it is understood to have an internal Locus of Control. Simply put, the 'internal' person on the other hand, expects reinforcements to follow in direct consequences to his or her behavioural posture. An 'external' person, on the other hand tends to perceive behaviour as falling consistently under the influence of reinforcements which are non-controlled or random in appearance. The 'external' person characteristically expects behavioural outcomes to be directed by forces (reinforcements) such as chance, fate, societal imperatives, and powerful others. In this sense, unlike the 'internal' person, an 'external' one can be viewed as having a negative set of expectancies for success through personal behaviour control. Prior reinforcement history for any given individual becomes a crucial factor, since the influences of past reinforcements and their relationship to behaviour serve as the key in developing a generalized expectancy for all situations.

**The Internal-External Continuum**

The terms 'internal' and 'external' are not meant to imply that a person is entirely one way or the other. As Lefcourt(1976) suggests, the perception of control is a process, that is the exercise of an expectancy regarding causation. The terms 'internal' and 'external' control them, depict an individual's more common tendencies to expect events to be contingent or non-contingent upon his or her actions.

Rotter's theory (1954) suggests that people are distributed along an 'Internal-External' continuum. People along the internal end of continuum feel that their abilities, skills, personal effort, competence and similar variables control their destiny. In other words, internal people feel that the outcome of events is generally under the control of the person. An 'internal' understands that effort and reward are correlated. On the other hand, there are some people who feel that whatever happens to them is "in the cards"- controlled by chance, fate. Such people called 'Externals' by Rotter, need to feel that events in the environment are beyond the control of the individual and they blame their failure on events outside themselves.

**Antecedents of Locus of Control**

Evidence suggests that locus of control substantially derives from one's history of efficacies and inefficacies that are associated with parental background and
social groupings. Several writers (Coan, 1974; Phares, 1976) have elaborated on the results of studies on the antecedents of beliefs about locus of control. They argue that individuals develop expectancies about a multitude of areas of life-functioning (e.g., expectancy about achievement). The more collectively internal the expectancies in various areas, the more likely that one's generalized expectancy will be internal. As expectancies are transferred from one area to another, the generalized expectancy becomes stronger.

Thus, it can be hypothesized that individuals will ultimately display a characteristic expectancy which generalizes across areas of life-function in either an internal or external direction.

A look at the review of literature in the field of Locus of Control shows an emerging interest of trying to explain various behavioural tendencies by endeavouring to establish a link with one's internal/external orientations.

Locus of Control has been shown to correlate with racial prejudice (Duckitt, 1984); neuroticism (Feather, 1967); attributions for failure (Epstein and Komorita, 1971); hostility (Heaven, et al., 1986); aggressiveness (Williams and Vantress, 1969); authoritarianism (Rotter, et al., 1962); anxiety (Archer, 1979); and risk taking (Barcon, 1968). Internal control has been found to correlate with positive self-esteem (Epstein and Komorita, 1971); Dominance, Tolerance, Good impression and Achievement orientation subscales of the CPI (Hersch and Scheibe, 1967); job stressors (Robinson and Skarie, 1986) and strains at work (Hendrix, 1989); outcome of psychopathology (Foon, 1989); and in attributing causes of success and failure (Shukla, 1995). Thus, it is obvious that perceived control has been studied in detail in the organizational domain as well.

The data shows that internals report more job-satisfaction than externals, have more positive views of their superiors, report less job stress and perceive more autonomy in their job (Spector, 1982; O'Brien, 1983). Spector's (1986) meta-analysis reported significant correlations between perceived control and both job stressors (role conflict and role ambiguity) and job strains (job satisfaction, symptoms and emotional distress). From a theoretical perspective, one would expect that individuals with an external locus of control, who do not believe that they control important aspects of
their environments, will find the work environment to be more threatening and stressful (Payne, 1988). Empirical support can be found for this proposition in that locus of control has been shown to correlate with job stressors and strains (Newton and Keenan, 1990).

**LOCUS OF CONTROL AND EFFECTIVENESS**

Employees who perceive internal control feel that they personally can influence their outcomes through their own ability, skills, or effort. Employees who perceive external control feel that their outcomes are beyond their own control; they feel that external forces control their outcomes. This perceived locus of control may have a differential impact on their performance and satisfaction (Luthans, 1995). A review of literature has generally reported internals to be more effective. In fact, Rotter (1966) regards external locus of control as largely maladaptive and at least in part as a defensive response to repeated failures. It is seen as an escapism, akin to paranoia, an unwillingness to face reality and to accept one’s responsibility. Internals perform better in learning and problem solving situations, apparently because of their better use of information (Pharas, 1976). It would certainly be expected that internals would exert more effort towards collecting relevant information in situations where they attempt control. This would lead one to predict better performance by internals in training and in performing tasks that necessitate the use of information. Because of their generalised expectancies of environmental control, internals should be easier to motivate. Thus, one should find internals more responsive than externals if the appropriate performance - reward contingencies can be presented.

Internals have also been found to rate themselves as assertive, achieving, powerful, independent, industrious and more effective on the Adjective Check List (Hersche and Scheibe, 1967). Data also show that internals are more likely than externals to choose jobs that allow them to use their skills and exercise personal influence in performing the job (Gable et al., 1976 and Wertheim et al., 1978).

Majumdar et al. (1977) studied the relation among Locus of Control and several organizational variables including supervisors' rating performance. Locus of
control was correlated with performance, with internals receiving higher ratings. There is also evidence that internals are more capable at high technology and professional jobs, while external scorers are better at unspecialized, routine and clerical positions (Yulk and Latham, 1978).

Empirically, internal Locus of Control has been found to favour greater academic achievement, more persuasiveness, greater participation in social actions etc. (Lefcourt, 1972). Lefcourt et al. (1984) found that Internals are more effective in deriving greater benefits from social support than do those who have a more external orientation. According to Tanner and Tanner (1987) persistence and purposeful activities are more likely when individuals are controlled internally rather than externally. Thus, Locus of Control is related to those variables which further ascertain optimum performance and effective working of the people high on internality.

According to Spector (1982), Locus of Control is related to the performance and satisfaction of organization members. Existing literature also reports significant relations between Locus of Control and neuroticism (Broadbent et al., 1982).

Parkes (1988) studied the Locus of Control in three behavioural domains and found that external control is associated with the emotional vulnerability and psychological distress characteristic of high neuroticism scorers. As the image of an ideal judge warrants emotional stability, one may subsume that internals are more effective judges than externals.

In another study, Kren (1992), investigated the moderating effects of Locus of Control on performance incentives and participation. He reported that Locus of Control is related to performance and may modify the relationship between motivation and incentives. It has been found out that internally controlled executives besides being better performers are also more considerate of subordinates (Pryer and Distenfano, 1971); tend not to burn out (Glogow, 1986); and follow a more strategic style of executive action (Miller et al., 1982). These attributes further help them to function effectively.

The implication of most of the studies is that internally controlled executives are better than their externally controlled counterparts. However, such generalizations, should be hesitatingly warranted because there are some studies with contradictory evidence. Durand and Nord (1976) concluded that an ideal manager may have an
external orientation because the results indicated that externally controlled managers were perceived as initiating more structure and consideration than internally controlled ones. In another study, Keinman et al. (1981) found no relationship between Locus of Control and performance.

The present study also aimed to explore the relationship of Locus of Control with Self-Rated Effectiveness.

**IMPULSIVENESS, VENTURESOMENESS AND EMPATHY**

Impulsiveness refers to a tendency in the individuals to evaluate a situation as being potentially dangerous or risky. Venturesomeness refers to a tendency in individuals to perceive risk but to choose to take a gamble. Empathy refers to reactions of one individual to the observed experiences of another (Davis, 1983).

In the study of 'Personality', Eysenck conceptualised Impulsiveness and Venturesomeness as sub-factors or sub-traits of the higher order factors of Extraversion and Psychoticism. They have been reported to show partial positive correlations with each other, yet are independent in part (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1977 and Eysenck and Zuckerman, 1978). Moreover, the factors of Impulsivity and Venturesomeness have been found to be reasonably independent of the higher order factors of Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and Lie (Social Desirability) scale, irrespective of gender of the subjects (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1978).

**Impulsivity** in an individual can be identified through the criteria given by the 'Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders'-III (1980). The individual can be called an impulsive person if he is positive on any three out of the following:

- (a) “often acts before thinking;"
- (b) shifts excessively from one activity to another;
- (c) has difficulty in organizing work (this not being due to cognitive impairment);
- (d) needs a lot of supervision;
- (e) frequently calls out;
- (f) has difficulty awaiting turn in games or group situations." (American Psychiatric Association, 1980).

Eysenck and Eysenck (1978) define Impulsiveness as a generalized state of...
high arousal which is characterized by hasty responsiveness, carefreeness, impatience or low impulse control. Frcka and Martin (1987) found Impulsiveness to be related to eyelid conditioning by performance of subjects. Impulsiveness has also been found to be related to Electroencephalograph defined arousal (O’ Gorman and Lloyd, 1987).

Impulsiveness, thus is a personality trait which determines the nature and extent of an individual’s interaction with the environment, his well being and the kind of behaviour he displays in private as well as in social conditions. Eysenck (1981) found a relationship between Impulsiveness and anti-social behaviour. Impulsiveness was also found to be related to subjective well being (Emmons and Diener, 1986).

In an attempt to relate Impulsiveness to fundamental factors of Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism, Eysenck and Eysenck (1978, 1981) found that though Impulsiveness correlated positively with Extraversion and Psychoticism, it correlated more with Psychoticism in both the genders. Impulsiveness was also found to be positively correlated with neuroticism and negatively with social desirability.

The findings were further replicated by Eysenck et al. (1985). Moreover, Zuckerman (1983) and Zuckerman et al. (1988) reported that persons who scored high on measures of impulsivity also tended to score high on Psychoticism. Similarly, Schalling et al. (1988) reported that Impulsiveness was positively related to Neuroticism and Psychoticism.

Venturesomeness, along with Impulsivity, has also been found to be a subtrait of Extraversion (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985). Rawlings (1984) defined venturesomeness as the tendency of people to perceive risk but to choose to take a gamble.

Eysenck and Eysenck (1978) reported Venturesomeness to have emerged reasonably independent of the higher order factors of Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and Lie (Social Desirability) scale, both for males and females. Venturesomeness has been reported to be a unidimensional scale by Eysenck and Eysenck (1985). However, this unidimensionality has been questioned by various researchers by showing evidence of the existence of two factors, namely, risk taking and sensation seeking as components of Venturesomeness scale in factor analytic studies (Pearson et al., 1986 and Heaven, 1989). Eysenck and Eysenck (1978) found Venturesomeness to be positively correlated with Extraversion. In comparison to
Impulsiveness, Venturesome was reported to be more related to Extraversion, particularly for females.

The term *Empathy* denotes a fundamental part of the social fabric of emotions, providing a bridge between the feelings of one person and those of another (Levenson and Reuf, 1992).

Empathy, thus refers to the response process where perception of the suffering of a victim leads to sympathy (Ohbuchi, 1988). According to Webster's third New International Dictionary, "Empathy is the capacity for participating in a vicarious experience of another's movements to the point of executing bodily movements resembling his."

The concept of Empathy forwarded by Tichner, developed out of earlier works in 'Aesthetics by Visher' (Wind, 1963) and in 'Psychology' by Lipps (1903, 1905) and Prandtt (1910). The concept of Empathy or 'Einfühlung' was systematically organized by Lipps (1903). The term 'sympathy' was used in the past to describe the cognitive ability to discern other's internal states (Mead, 1934; Cooley, 1956).

Previously the terms 'Empathy' and 'sympathy' were used interchangeably. Several researcher like McDougall (1923) and Smith (1948) used the term sympathy' to denote the affective response to another's emotional state. However, as Macfarland (1985) puts it, 'sympathy' implies "sharing of the state of mind or feeling of another", Empathy allows one to know what the other is experiencing, without actually feeling it.

According to Hickson (1985) the designed psychological measures of Empathy assess three types of Empathy: (1) individual's ability to empathize with another individual (Dymond, 1949), (2) the ability of two individuals to empathize with one another (Barrett - Lennard, 1981), and (3) mass empathy or the individual's ability to empathize with a group (Norman and Leiding, 1956).

The term 'Empathy', which was coined by Tichner in his book *Elementary Psychology of Thought Processes* (1909), has been defined over the years as 'social insight' (Dymond, 1950); 'an ability to comprehend the affective - and sometimes cognitive - status of another i.e., cognitive accomplishment' (Hogan, 1969; Deutsh and Madle, 1975). People high on 'Empathy' are able to enter, temporarily into imagination to identify feelings of another person in order to identify with him and accept the others without making a judgement about them. They display a wide variety
of experiences and interactions with people, familiarity with books, theatre, art and music which will provide a fund on which to draw when trying to understand the experiences of others.

Grief and Hogan (1973) factor analytically examined the structure of 'Empathy' and found four psychologically distinct components - social confidence, even-temperedness, sensitivity and non-conformity. Clark (1980) has identified four degrees of 'Empathy': (a) a complete lack of empathy as in an egocentric person; (b) a slight movement of empathy away from self to include some close relations; (c) empathy for others who have qualities and characteristics similar to those of the person who displays this type, for example, a display of cliquishness that is characterised by empathy for people of same sex, religion, race, language or status as themselves; (d) empathy characterized by sensitivity to the condition as feelings of all others. People at this level share the joys, sorrows, anguish, anger of those who rejoice, grieve, hurt or rage.

Kozeki and Berghammer (1992) have suggested that there are three aspects of empathy. They are affective, cognitive and moral or adaptive empathy. According to them, moral empathy is the characteristic of a responsible leader who, considering the interest of his group is capable of self-denial.

However, not all prosocial behaviour is motivated by empathic or sympathetic reactions. People may assist others for non-altruistic motives, for example, to attain rewards or social approval, or because of their desire to adhere to internalized moral values (Bar-Tal, 1982; Eisenberg, 1983).

While generally no correlation is found between Empathy and Extraversion (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1978), it is negatively related to Psychoticism (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1980; Eysenck and McGurk, 1980; Eysenck, 1981; Saklofske and Eysenck, 1983; Jamson, 1984).

**IMPULSIVENESS, VENTURESONENESS, EMPATHY AND EFFECTIVENESS**

Impulsiveness, Venturesomeness and Empathy are some of the personality traits that may eventually determine the nature of interaction of individuals in a work situation. Given the same harmonious organizational climate and working environment, people may differ in the degree of their effectiveness. The nature of their personalities
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creates individual differences that may enhance or inhibit individual effectiveness.

In fact, it has been repeatedly proved that there is a stable set of personality dimensions that characterised successful or effective people across situations. Executives in various workfields been found to be thoughtful, considerate, generous, forceful, bold and emotionally balanced (Mohan, 1985). The review suggests that people who are not very impulsive and think before they act but at the same time are bold and forceful along with the presence of humane considerations, may emerge to be effective executives.

Armstrong (1988) said that there is good evidence to the effect that there are certain personality traits which tend to characterize people as leaders in wide variety of situations. Leaders tend to be better-adjusted, more dominant, more extraverted and have a better understanding of people. 'Empathy' also emerges as a determiner of effectiveness because of its importance in all interactions vital to communication (Hickson, 1985).

In a study of components of effectiveness in teachers, Gage (1965) found warmth to be one of their five global characteristics. In his study on intellectual and personality correlates of Effectiveness in teachers at higher secondary school stage, Grewal (1975) found good teachers to be sympathetic, having an understanding of children, being friendly besides having a good disposition and emotional stability. According to Panda and Mishra (1983) students invariably liked those teachers who are sympathetic, kind, helpful, considerate and consistent.

Majority of studies in teacher effectiveness report a positive relation between empathy and effectiveness (Anand, 1983; Rajinder, 1993). In another study, Macfarland (1985) also found that teachers who demonstrate a high level of empathy in their dealings with students are more positive in their attitude to themselves than teachers who manifest low empathic relationships. When students need help, they look for those adults who will listen patiently and with understanding and empathy.

Miron (1985) said that good teachers are friendly and willing to help others. In their study of personality characteristics associated with teacher effectiveness, Pal and Bhagoliwal (1987) found that more effective teachers had a higher intellectual level through their empathetic and imaginative functions.

However, a look at the basic personality characteristics postulated by people
who have a high degree of empathy reveals that they have the tendency to accept what
the other person says without making a judgement about it while they also 'tend to
identify' their feelings with others. Thus, while Empathy may be a positive factor for
Effectiveness in interactive work situations like teaching, it however may not appear
to be a contributor to Effectiveness in jobs which require objectivity and an unbiased
outlook.

The exploration of relationship between Effectiveness and Impulsiveness,
 Venturesomeness and Empathy is the subject of investigation in the present study.

HOSTILITY

Humans have a vast repertory of specific hostile, aggressive behaviours (Morgan
et al., 1986). Study of behaviour thus also includes the study of Hostility as a dimension
of personality. Buss (1961), the pioneer in contemporary research in 'hostility' defined
it as "an implicit verbal response involving negative feelings (ill-will) and negative
evaluations of people and events". He reported 'hostility' to be implicit in nature,
consisting of perception, categorisation and evaluation of past attacks on oneself,
rejections and deprivations.

Bending (1962) reported a factor called Covert Hostility, consisting mainly
of irritability items, and a factor called Overt Hostility comprising mainly of assault
 and verbal aggression items. Plutchik (1980) viewed hostility as a mixture of anger
 and disgust, associated with indignation, contempt and resentment. Price (1982)
 referred to Hostility to be marked by malevolence and a desire to injure or marked
by antagonism and unfriendliness. Three pertinent definitions of hostility are "a hostile
or antagonistic state; antagonism, opposition or resistance in thought or principle; and
animosity."

According to Spielberger et al. (1983) "hostility is a complex set of attitudes
that motivate aggressive behaviours directed towards destroying objects or injuring
other people." Williams et al. (1985) defined 'hostility' as an attitude that stems from
an absence of trust in basic goodness of others.

Buss and Perry (1992) have proposed that the personality trait of aggression
consists of the subtrait of Hostility besides Physical and Verbal Aggression, plus Anger.
Hostility, which consists of ill-will and injustice, represents the cognitive component
of behaviour.

'Hostility' has been identified as a function of hurried, time-pressured activity. Under such circumstances, individuals, especially Type A may perceive minor challenges as a stimulus for hostile, combative behaviour. Hostility may also result from projection, or the enhanced vulnerability of some individuals especially Type As, to criticism.

Resentment is another form of hostility exhibited in behaviour. Hostility is self-perpetuating to a great extent, making people at the receiving end to react in a negative way.

Hostile personalities display more aggression in their behaviour. Though a major belief is that humans are genetically and instinctively aggressive by reason of evolutionary heritage, Montagu (1976) reported that child atleast in part, learns aggression by approval enhance status, and rewards for such behaviour. It is likely that behaviours arise out of an interaction of genetic potentials and environmental factors, but personality traits, behaviours, and attitudes are probably far more the result of environmental than inherited variables.

Reviewing some effects of the environment on hostility, Konner (1982) and Mandell(1982) pointed out the association between crime and abuse with increased aggression/hostility in children. Peiffer (1981) observed hostile aggression on the sporting fields to increase aggressive behaviour among many spectators who identified with the players.

Hostility is believed to constitute a major component of Type A behaviour pattern. Hostility and TABP have been found to be positively related (Glass et al., 1980; Francis, 1981; Price 1982 and Langeloddecke and Tennant, 1986; Swan et al., 1989).

Buss and Perry (1992) found hostility to be strongly correlated with emotionality and self-esteem, moderately with impulsiveness and self-consciousness traits while it did not correlate with Activity, Sociability and Competitiveness.

Hostile individuals are likely to experience more stress and are not good at coping. Schonwetter and Janisse (1991) reported that individuals categorized as hostile and as alcohol drinkers had lower anger control scores and were more likely to externalize their anger.
HOSTILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Hostility is a negative aspect of behaviour. Hostile and aggressive attitudes are detrimental in their effect on performance. This is evident from the inter-relationship of hostility and other factors like aggression, Type A, disease and so on.

Tough mindedness, extraversion, authoritarianism, cynicism and high need for Power and need for Affiliation and low social desirability have been reported as some of the correlates of hostile behaviour (Sehgal and Bhandari, 1987). Hostility has also been reported to be positively related with TABP. The study of TABP with disease onset and progression, and an attempt to delineate more clearly the inherent pathogenic elements led to an interest in the dimension of hostility (Wong and Reading, 1989). Studies using the Cooke-Medley Hostility Scale of the MMPI have reported a relationship between hostility scores and angiographically-documented (Williams et al., 1980) or subsequent coronary heart disease (Barefoot et al., 1983). Similarly, Shekelle et al. (1983) have shown the prevalence of CHD to be related to hostility scores, even after controlling other risk factors. The maladaptive effects of hostility are important related not only to psychoneurosis, depression and schizophrenia but perhaps equally to hypertension and CHD (Diamond, 1982). Barefoot et al. (1984) reported that high scores on hostility predicted both coronary disease and total mortality.

Negative behavioural tendencies of hostile individuals, like cynicism (Williams, 1984), aggression, irritability, projection, vulnerability to criticism, resentment, excessive reliance on approval, a general mistrusting and disparaging view of others, can be assumed to create a hindrance in the effective functioning of Judicial Officers.

Smith et al. (1988) reported that high hostility group reported significantly greater levels of anger arousal and a greater range of anger eliciting situations, accompanied by greater levels of cynicism, lower levels of trust and more hostile outlook. Tavris (1982) reported that psychoanalytic theory has maintained that expression of hostility is the preferable response in dealing with the stress of frustration.

Smith et al. (1988) also reported significantly greater levels of family conflict in people high on hostility suggesting that they experience greater stress in this particular domain. Non-work stress has been found to play a major role in determining organizational variables like job satisfaction or performance (Greenhouse...
and Parasuraman, 1987). Thus, inability to cope effectively with stress and a tendency to experience more stress and more illness may lead hostile individuals to be less effective. Efficient coping was associated with reacting to stress with a minimum hostility either expressed or suppressed. (Schill et al., 1985)

From the above review of studies investigating the concept of hostility and its various correlates, one may subsume that hostile people are less likely to be effective.