

**PSYCHODYNAMICS OF A SUCCESSFUL  
EXECUTIVE\***

**MAHFOOZ A. ANSARI**  
*Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur*

*The study is based primarily on the in-depth interviewing of 150 middle-level executives (all males) representing three business concerns in Northern India and was designed to make a statistical comparison between two groups of executives--obviously successful and obviously unsuccessful--in terms of their background variables, critical decisions (academic and professional) of life, and their interpersonal relationships with people around job. Success was objectively measured through a rate of progression score. All three variables contributed significantly, to career success. A successful executive was found to be good at every thing he touches. The implications of the findings are discussed, and directions for future research are suggested.*

*What makes an executive successful?* This is a general question addressed in this paper.

A review of the literature (see e.g., Ansari, Baumgartel, & Sullivan, 1982) indicates that despite the years of theoretical and empirical attempts to answer this question, the understanding of 'executive success' still eludes the professional specialists in industrial/organizational psychology and requires further investigation. One plausible explanation in regard to some of the inconsistencies in previous research findings in this area appears to be that the concept of "success" has often been confused with the concept of

---

\*The paper is based on author's doctoral dissertation. Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Jai B. P Sinha, Professor of Social Psychology, A. N. S. Institute of Social Studies, Patna, under whose supervision the study was conducted. Appreciation is also due to Dr. (Miss) Lila Krishnan for critical comments.

"effectiveness." These two concepts have most often been used interchangeably in the organizational literature. Although there exists a significant degree of overlap, the relationship between the two is very weak (Ansari, 1981). It is important to note that an executive may be effective on his job without being successful. Alternatively stated, he may appear to be a highly successful one, although he depletes the human resources of his organization (Likert, 1967) and, hence, may not be rated as effective in his professional career. Or, the organizational dynamics of a place may push even an inefficient one up in the hierarchy. The confusion has its root in the measurement procedures and the methodology employed. Executive success has typically been measured in terms of salary progress or the number of levels promoted to or attained by the executives, while the actual job performance serves as the criterion of effectiveness as measured in a typical performance appraisal scheme. In the present investigation, attention is addressed to *success*, and not to effectiveness.

The study of career success has been of long-standing interest to organizational researchers. While, on the descriptive level, several studies have been reported relating career success with need structure (Ghiselli, 1968a, 1968b; Ghiselli & Johnson, 1970), values (England & Lee, 1974; England & Weber, 1972; Watson & Williams, 1977), and intelligence and personality (Ansari, 1982; Dubno, 1968; Ghiselli, 1966; Kinslinger, 1966; Kurtz, 1948), only a few systematic studies (Ansari, Baumgartel, & Sullivan, 1982; Ansari & Rub, 1982; Bray & Grant, 1966; Grant & Bray, 1969) are available on the predictive level. Yet empirical research and theory relating to executive success with biographical data, critical decisions of life, and the interrelationship with co-workers have been sparse, despite their importance, and there is not much that can be cited. However, there has been some research and it is to this that we now turn. Henry (1949) reported that successful business managers contain a crystallization of high drive and achievement desire, strong mobility drive, willing acceptance of authority relationship, and ability to organize unstructured situations, and to see the implications for their organizations. His thematic analysis also revealed that successful managers possessed the traits of decisiveness, sense of self-hood, aggressiveness, identification with superiors, and a detachment from parents. It is by these findings that the present study was stimulated—that is, an attempt to enhance our understanding of factors associated with career success. Specifically, the study was designed to relate executive success with biographical data, critical decisions (academic and professional) of life, and both on-the-job

and off-the-job interpersonal relationships with the top boss, immediate superiors, and subordinates.

### **Method**

#### ***Research Site and Sample***

The study concerns three organizations in Northern India. Since the organizations are many and of divergent nature, no attempt was made to draw the sample randomly. Rather, keeping in view a few dimensions of this heterogeneous universe, three contrasting business organizations were selected for the study. The points of difference between the organizations lie mainly in: (a) the styles of management, (b) the production process, (c) the sources of capital investment, (d) the efficiency, (e) the size (numerical strength), and (f) the geographical location. Altogether 150 middle level executives (all males) were interviewed individually and in private with prior appointment. They were assured of complete confidentiality of their individual responses, and the importance of frank and sincere replies was emphasized. The average age of the respondents was around 42 years. On average, they had 4 years of experience in the present positions, and the mean company tenure was 14 years.

#### ***Criterion Measures***

The problem of selecting a good criterion is well known to the industrial/organizational psychologists (e.g., see such reviews as those of Bray & Moses, 1972; Guion, 1976; Smith, 1967). It is also true with regard to the measurement of executive success. Smith (1976) has recently talked about the *hard* and *soft* data--the former is verifiable and can be obtained through the company records for evaluating success or/and performance, while the latter is subjective and involves one's evaluation and judgment. This study has attempted to integrate both data into a single vein. As mentioned at the outset of this paper, the main objective of this investigation was to compare the obviously successful executives with the obviously unsuccessful ones on their life styles and background variables. Thus, as a starting point, the study required the rating of executives by their associates (superiors, subordinates, and peers) on the following characteristics to measure: (a) ability to think critically, (b) judgment, (c) independence of thought, (d) tact, (e) cooperation with others, (f) self-expression, (g) leadership qualities, (h) breadth of knowledge, and (i) originality, as suggested by Kraut (1975). An executive

was finally selected either as *successful* or *unsuccessful* by checking the agreement among the raters. Usually, 75% or higher agreement criterion was adopted to classify an executive in either of the categories. Following this logic, then, 90 executives were classified as obviously successful and 60 as obviously unsuccessful. The objective criteria consisted of rate of progression determined by two scores—career (CP) and salary progression (SP). The two scores were computed by employing the following formulae:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SP} &= (\text{PS} - \text{FS})/\text{LS} \\ \text{CP} &= (\text{NP}/\text{LS}) \times 100 \end{aligned}$$

where,

- NP = Number of promotions;
- LS = Length of service;
- PS = Present salary;
- FS = First salary in the first job.

The relationship between the two scores—CP and SP—was found to be positive and quite high ( $r = .71$ ,  $df = 148$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Such objective measures have been used by several other investigators in the past (e.g., Ansari, 1982; Ansari & Rub, 1982; Ansari, Baumgartel, & Sullivan, 1982); Grant & Bray, 1969; Jaques, 1968; Watson & Williams, 1977).

On the basis of the subjective criterion, scores on the objective criterion measures were checked for their reliability. The reliability of measurement was judged through the application of *ANOVA* in 3 (organizations) x 3 2 (executives) data arrays. Table 1 displays the mean scores of rate of progression. It is readily observed that the successful executives appear to score significantly higher in each of the organizations on both CP ( $F = 76.50$ ,  $df = 1/144$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and SP ( $F = 131.62$ ,  $df = 1/144$ ,  $p < .01$ ) scores than their unsuccessful counterpart.

### ***Tools Used***

A depth interview was conducted lasting for an hour with each executive. The questions asked were related to the critical decisions of life and the life styles of executives in general—their interpersonal relationships with top boss, immediate superiors, and subordinates.

Descriptive information such as respondents' age, position, tenure, history of service, ordinal position, size and monthly earning of the family, family background, etc. were gathered with the help of a personal data blank.

The main objective of this paper was to see whether the two groups of executives--successful and unsuccessful--differ in terms of their background variables (own background and family background), critical decisions of life, and their interpersonal relationships with the top boss, immediate superior, and subordinates. Accordingly, the results on those variables may be displayed in order.

## Results

### *Background Variables*

This section consists of such variables as age, education, professional training, ordinal position, spatial mobility, wives' education and occupation, family size, and family income. Table 2 shows the findings on age, education, family size, and family income. It is evident that all these variables are seen to contribute significantly to executive success. The successful executives were found to be significantly ( $F = 7.52$ ,  $df = 1/144$ ,  $p < .01$ ) younger than their unsuccessful counterparts. Siegel and Ghiselli (1971) also reported a positive relationship between pay and the measures of managerial talent for the younger managers. In their study, the relationship had been weak and finally inverse for older managers.

It was also found that the successful executives are better educated ( $F = 19.50$ ,  $df = 1/144$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and they (75.55%), have received professional training for significantly ( $\chi^2 = 6.90$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .01$ ) more number of years than the unsuccessful ones (65.55%). This finding is in a manner quite consistent with the observation made by Dunnette (1967).

An inspection of Table 2 suggests that the successful executives have significantly smaller size of the family ( $F = 6.45$ ,  $df = 1/144$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and the average monthly earnings of their family are higher ( $F = 4.27$ ,  $df = 1/144$ ,  $p < .05$ ) than the unsuccessful executives. The finding, thus, suggests that an executive thrives best in the better socio-economic background.

Information on ordinal position, spatial mobility, and wives' education and occupation are reported in Table 3. It is readily

observed that the successful executives (61.11%) are either first-born or second-born significantly ( $\chi^2 = 4.57$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .05$ ) more than the unsuccessful executives (43.33%). This finding is rather difficult to interpret. Several studies (e.g., Schooler, 1972) have been conducted to see the relationship between the birth order effects and social behavior, but the picture remains cloudy. However, there is some evidence which suggest that the first-born children are higher on the need for approval (Moran, 1967) and need for autonomy (Sampson & Hancock, 1967) than the later-born children. In this study also, needs for approval and autonomy have been found to be related with executive success--a fact shown a little later in this section. It might also be because of the fact that the first child is raised up with warm affection and greater care, and these early experiences of life may facilitate him to succeed in subsequent career development.

Table 3 also makes it clear that successful executives have perceived spatial mobility (i.e., movement from one place to another due to transfer or change of jobs or organizations) reliably more than their unsuccessful counterparts. According to Ghiselli, "...this movement, often but not always in the form of advancement, is especially characteristic of those of superior talent ... a person manifests managerial talent, not just because he performs well in one given type of situation but because he has the capacity to perform a variety of them well, and the adaptability to change from one activity to another quite different activity" (1963, p. 634).

Finally, Table 3 reveals that the wives of successful executives are found to be better educated and in better employment positions. Although the difference was not significant, some (11.43%) of their wives are seen to hold professional positions such as doctors, college faculty, etc. Dunnette (1967), in a review of dozens of studies, found a similar trend.

### ***Critical Decisions of Life***

This section broadly consists of two career decisions: academic and professional. The following were the specific issues for investigation: who decided the academic and professional careers of the two groups--successful and unsuccessful--of executives? Why were they interested in these careers? What did their parents and/or others suggest to them in this connection? Do these careers meet their expectations?

### ***Academic Career***

It was soon recognized that most of the successful executives (63.46%), as against 52.24% of the unsuccessful executives, decided their career themselves. They decided these careers because of their interest and aptitude (41.57%) and career prospect (21.90%), while these percentages were distributed as 37.90 and 14.33, respectively, in the case of unsuccessful executives. The difference in each case was significant beyond chance ( $\chi^2 = 6.18$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .02$  and  $\chi^2 = 5.43$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .02$ , respectively). Contrastingly, the unsuccessful executives (32.84%) depended more on their parents and/or others in deciding their academic career than the successful executives (25.96%). Only about 11% of the successful executives and 15% of the unsuccessful executives reported that their careers were not preplanned. When asked about the mode of career advice, both groups of executives reported that parents and/or others advised them to choose these careers because they saw interest and aptitude in them, and also they (parents) considered future prospects at the decision stage. Interestingly enough, some (3.25%) of the successful executives were given monetary help by others to continue their studies. It is also interesting to mention that about 33% of the successful executives, as against 7% of the unsuccessful executives, decided their academic career against their parents' wishes.

### ***Professional Career***

The pattern with regard to professional career is quite similar to the one observed for the academic career. For example, 59.74% of the successful executives decided their career themselves as against 49.02% of the unsuccessful executives; however the difference was not significant. A clear picture ( $\chi^2 = 4.78$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .05$ ) emerged when the majority of the unsuccessful executives (50.98%) reported that their careers were decided by their parents and/or relations, while only 38.87% of the successful executives depended on others for choosing their career. It is worthy of mention that about 10% of the successful executives decided their career against their parents' wishes, while none of the unsuccessful executives was seen to fight against his parent's wishes.

Finally, the respondents were asked: *Does your career meet your expectations?* As expected, 80.46% of the successful executives answered "yes", while only 45.45% of the unsuccessful executives replied "no" ( $\chi^2 = 20.32$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Alternatively stated,

there appeared a significant difference ( $\chi^2 = 11.87$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .001$ ) with regard to the “no” answer. The responses are divided as 13.79% and 37.88%, respectively for the successful and unsuccessful executives. About 17% of the unsuccessful executives, as against about 5% of the successful executives, were uncertain whether their careers meet their expectations ( $\chi^2 = 4.79$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .05$ ). It was of interest to explore who helped these executives in getting their appointment. The contents revealed that most of the executives in both the groups--successful and unsuccessful--did not receive any kind of help from others. But the point seems much clearer when 23.21% of the unsuccessful executives compared to the successful ones (8.14%) disclosed that they were helped by their parents and/or relations in getting their jobs. On further queries, it became apparent that the help was rendered by approaching the interview board and the top appointing authority.

At this point, it may be concluded that the critical decisions of life play a significant role in career success. For both the decisions--academic and professional--the pattern is strikingly similar. It is obvious that the successful executives are more independent than the unsuccessful ones (Ansari, 1982 ; Mohoney, Jerdee, & Nash, 1961). Because their careers are according to their expectations, they feel a great deal of gratification. This feeling of psychological success has been found to be related to career progression in previous studies also (Gould, 1982; Hall, 1976). However, it is difficult to predict in this study whether psychological success is an antecedent or consequence of career success. According to the cyclical developmental model of Hall (1976), it is likely to be both.

### ***Interpersonal Relationships***

This section includes the interpersonal relationships of executives with their superiors (top and immediate) and subordinates. It was expected that the two groups of executives--successful and unsuccessful--would differ significantly in terms of their dealings with co-workers. First, the data on upward relationships will be presented which would follow the protocols on downward relationships.

***Upward Relationships.*** In this section, the first question was asked to the executives to explore *whether their superiors were pleased* with them. Table 4 reports the summary of findings. A dramatic variation, as anticipated,



occurred with regard, to the responses of the two groups of executives. Most of the successful executives reported that their superiors (both top and immediate) are pleased with them. On the contrary, most of the unsuccessful executives perceived their superiors as displeased, and some executives of this group even hesitated to talk about their top bosses.

*What led you to believe that your superiors are pleased with you?* This was the next question put to the respondents. Table 5 depicts the response categories. The findings show a similar trend for the immediate superiors as well as the top boss with regard to the indicators of their superiors being pleased. For example, the successful executives feel that they are encouraged and get recognition from their immediate superiors, that their superiors speak very high of them on the confidential report, and that quick promotion and constant support is the last (but the most important) factor.

Then the next question was asked only to the successful executives: *How do you keep your superiors pleased?* Response categories along with percentages are displayed in Table 6. It is apparent that hard work tops the list to impress upon both the immediate superior and the top boss. Interestingly enough, about 50% of the successful executives relied on the personalized relationship (showing loyalty and doing personal work) as the powerful tactic in influencing their superiors.

Now, the question arises: *Why do the unsuccessful executives feel that their immediate superiors are displeased?* The findings revealed that (i) the immediate superiors expect flattery (7.89%), (ii) that the unsuccessful executives have differences of opinion--(6.58%) with their superiors, and (iii) that the immediate superiors do not write confidential reports in their favor (6.58%), thus delaying the promotion of the unsuccessful executives.

Finally, the executives were asked: *What kind of relationship do you have with your superiors on-the-job and off-the-job?* It was expected in the light of Tables 4 and 5 that there will be more friendly and informal relationship of successful executives compared to the unsuccessful ones with their superiors both on-the-job and off-the-job. Table 7 summarizes the findings. The pattern strikes quite similar for both superiors. The successful executives maintain better relationship with their superiors not only on-the-job but off-the-job as

well. The contents further disclosed that these executives meet with their superiors most often in the club and play together, they visit their superior's families, and the superiors also visit their families. Table 7 also reveals that some of the unsuccessful executives declined to give responses to this question significantly more often than the successful executives.

***Downward Relationships.*** The part of the preceding data revealed that the successful executives are better than the unsuccessful executives in maintaining cordial relationship with their superiors. *Is this true with regard to their subordinates?* The findings are reported in Table 8. There appears to be a great deal of similarity between the relationship of executives with their superiors and subordinates. For instance, it is evident that the successful executives are more interaction-oriented than the unsuccessful executives--that is, they maintain high informal relationship with their subordinates on the job. The contents revealed that they like to visit their subordinates' families, and also they like to invite their subordinates' families to their own residence--that is, they maintain better social relationship with their subordinates. The interview protocols further disclosed that the successful executives (51.16%), as against the unsuccessful executives (25%), prefer significantly ( $\chi^2 = 9.60$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .01$ ) more often to share and discuss the personal problem of their subordinates--that is, another indicator of a successful executive being nurturant and people-oriented.

In sum, the successful executives maintain cordial and informal relationships with their superiors as well as subordinates in almost equal amount. They take every care to please their superiors. Thus, they distribute their time in different ways performing different functions and roles than do the unsuccessful ones (Brooks, 1955). That, is, they feel that the responsibility of an executive to be a successful (effective) leader is to help others, to develop and create an understanding of the teaching-learning process combined with self-understanding (Cantor, 1956).

### **Conclusions**

It is evident, as one looks back at what took place, that much did emerge as a summative concept comprising various factors and elements connoting career success. That is, there is no single dimension on which the success of an executive can be predicted adequately. In short, the survey data on the descriptive level painted

a fairly consistent portrait of a successful executive. Some of the major conclusion follow:

A successful executive was drawn as young, better educated and professional trained, first or second in birth order, has experienced a great deal of spatial mobility, has an educated and employed wife, and has a fairly posh socio-economic background.

A successful executive decides his academic and professional careers himself. Sometimes he may go against the wishes of his parents in the matters related to career because a sense of detachment from parents is high in him (Henry, 1949). Because he is responsible for his own career, he feels that his present career meets his expectations—that is, a kind of psychological success.

A successful executive is high on maintaining cordial relationship with his co-workers, i.e., a happy-go-lucky guy. For example, he is encouraged by his superiors; he gets recognition for good performance at the right time and at the right place; he receives utmost support from his superiors; his works are praised and appreciated in his confidential report; and consequently, he gets quick promotions. These indicators make him believe that his superiors (immediate and top bosses) are pleased with him. He tries to keep them pleased by showing loyalty and doing personal favors (i.e., helping them at his best) in addition to hard and sincere work. Because he is master of making personalized contacts with his superiors, he goes to club and tries his best to play with his superiors; he visits his superiors' families; and he enjoys inviting them to his residence. As a natural consequence, he is free and informal in dealing with his superiors on the job. Interestingly, he brings this relationship back in dealing with his own subordinates and prefers to solve even their personal problems—that is, he takes personal care of his subordinates.

A summary of the findings, then, provides useful insight into the factors related to career success. However, it speaks of several issues of concern. First, the study has rallied primarily on the unstructured in-depth interview technique. No standard tools, except for the measures of success and background data, were employed to measure the related facts. Hence, unless its validity is thoroughly cross-checked through technically sound and standardized tools, any conclusion derived out of this study should be interpreted with great caution.

Second, since the study involved mostly qualitative data in its deliberations, no attempt was made to establish any cause-effect linkages. Thus, longitudinal studies are certainly needed to enhance our understanding in this area.

Finally, we have discussed issues especially related to individual differences; no reference was made to environmental or structural correlations of career progression. The "selection model" predicts that a substantial amount of variance in career success is accounted for by individual differences. However, it should be noted that career success cannot be understood in terms of variables of either the individual or the work environment alone but only in terms of the interaction (or interrelationship) between the two (Ansari, Baumgartel, & Sullivan, 1982). Although the interaction model of career success awaits further empirical validation, it makes sense.

Table 1  
*Mean Scores on Rate of Progression*

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Groups</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>CP</i>	<i>SP</i>
A	SE	31	35.95	155.47
	UE	30	13.15	94.58
B	SE	24	25.96	103.33
	UE	19	18.48	92.03
C	SE	35	16.06	99.21
	UE	11	9.88	61.73

*Note.* CP = Career Progression; SP = Salary Progression;  
 SE = Successful Executives; UE = Unsuccessful Executives.

Table 2  
*Mean Scores of Age, Education, Family Size, and Family Income*

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Groups</i>	<i>Organizations</i>		
		<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>
Age	SE	38.58	39.67	46.40
	UE	42.80	40.10	51.27
Education <sup>a</sup>	SE	3.35	3.12	3.06
	UE	3.03	2.53	2.45
Family Size	SE	4.35	4.37	5.74
	UE	4.63	5.95	6.45
Family Income <sup>b</sup>	SE	5.52	4.33	4.48
	UE	4.57	4.05	4.27

*Note.* SE = Successful Executives; UE = Unsuccessful Executives;

<sup>a</sup>4 = point scale; <sup>b</sup>6-point scale.

Table 3

*Percentage Distribution of Executives on their Ordinal Position, Spatial Mobility, Wives' Education, and Wives' Occupation*

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Responses</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>UE</i>	$\chi^2$ <i>df</i> = 1
Ordinal Position	First	37.78	23.33	3.45
	Second	23.33	20.00	0.23
	Later	38.89	56.67	4.57 <sup>a</sup>
Spatial Mobility (times)	0 - 1	41.11	58.33	4.27 <sup>a</sup>
	2 - 3	18.89	26.67	1.26
	4-5	15.35	5.00	3.98 <sup>a</sup>
	> 5	24.44	10.00	4.94 <sup>a</sup>
Wives' Education	≤ High School	38.57	63.64	6.79 <sup>c</sup>
	> High School	61.23	36.36	
Wives' Occupation	Unemployed	82.86	95.12	3.52
	Semi-skilled	5.71	2.44	0.65
	Professional	11.43	2.44	2.82

*Note.* Chi squares were computed on frequencies; SE = Successful Executives; UE=Unsuccessful; <sup>a</sup>*p* < .05; <sup>c</sup>*p* < .01.

Table 4

*Percentage Distribution of Executives on Whether their Superior are Pleased*

Responses	<i>Immediate Superior</i>			<i>Top Boss</i>		
	SE	UE	$\chi^2$ ( <i>df</i> = 1)	SE	UE	$\chi^2$ ( <i>df</i> = 1)
Pleased	92.05	57.89	23.98 <sup>d</sup>	85.87	35.94	41.60 <sup>d</sup>
Displeased	2.27	21.05	14.00 <sup>d</sup>	1.09	17.19	13.80 <sup>d</sup>
50/50	4.54	19.30	8.11 <sup>c</sup>	1.09	14.06	10.61 <sup>c</sup>
No Contact	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.87	21.87	3.51
Can't Say	1.14	1.75	0.10	1.09	10.94	7.54 <sup>c</sup>

*Note.* Chi squares were computed on frequencies; SE = Successful Executives; UE = Unsuccessful Executives; <sup>c</sup>*p* < .01; <sup>d</sup>*p* < .001.

Table 5

*Percentage Distribution of Successful Executives on the Indicators of their Superiors Being Pleased*

Indicators	<i>Superiors</i>	
	<i>Immediate Superior</i>	<i>Top Boss</i>
Encouragement	31.60	21.89
Recognition	11.91	22.02
Favorable Confidential Report	16.60	13.21
Promotion and Support	15.84	22.75

Table 6  
*Percentage Distribution of Successful Executives Reporting  
 the ways of Keeping their Superiors Pleased*

Ways	<i>Superiors</i>	
	<i>Immediate Superior</i>	<i>Top Boss</i>
Doing Hard. Work	38.21	36.07
Showing Loyalty	24.32	22.33
Doing Personal Work	22.58	25.76
Making No Extra Effort	6.95	1.72

Table 7  
*Percentage Distribution of Executives on their Friendly and Informal  
 Relationships with Superiors On-the-job and Off-the-job*

Relationship	Responses	<i>Immediate Superior</i>			<i>Top Boss</i>		
		SE	UE	$\chi^2$	SE	UE	$\chi^2$
On-the-job	Yes	66.28	48.21	4.58 <sup>a</sup>	61.63	41.07	5.77 <sup>b</sup>
	No	25.58	51.79	10.12 <sup>c</sup>	31.40	39.29	0.94
	No Response	8.14	0.00	--	6.98	19.64	5.18 <sup>a</sup>
Off-the-job	Yes	48.84	19.64	12.35 <sup>d</sup>	39.57	1.79	26.08 <sup>d</sup>
	No,	36.05	46.43	1.52	38.37	44.64	0.56
	No Response	15.12	33.93	6.88 <sup>c</sup>	22.09	53.57	14.88 <sup>d</sup>

Note.  $\chi^2$  was computed on frequencies; SE = Successful Executives; UE = Unsuccessful Executives; <sup>a</sup> $p < .05$ ; <sup>b</sup> $p < .02$ ; <sup>c</sup> $p < .01$ ; <sup>d</sup> $p < .001$ .



Table 8

*Percentage Distribution of Executives on their Friendly and Informal Relationships with Subordinates on the job*

<i>Responses</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>UE</i>
Yes	26.50	38.93
No	74.50	61.07

*Note.* Chi square ( $\chi^2 = 6.70$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .01$ ) was computed on frequencies; SE = Successful Executive; UE = Unsuccessful Executives.

### References

- Ansari, M. A., *Some of the determinants of success on executive positions*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Patna, India: University of Patna, 1981.
- The semantic-differential profiles of successful executives, *Indian Psychologist*, 1982, 1, 70-78.
- & Rub, M., Executive success as a function of leadership style-organizational climate fit. *Managerial Psychology*, 1982, 3, 56-68.
- Baumgartel, H., & Sullivan, G. Personal orientation-organizational climate fit and managerial success. *Human Relations*, 1982, 35, 1159-1178.
- Bray, D. W., & Grant, D. L., The assessment center in the measurement of potential for business management. *Psychological Monograph*, 1966, 80, Whole No, 625,
- & Moses, J. L., Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 1972, 23, 545-576
- Brooks, E., What successful executives do? *Personnel*, 1955, 32, 210-225.

- Cantor, N., The executive as a leader. *Personnel*, 1956, 33, 227-235.
- Dubno, P., Group Congruency patterns and leadership characteristics. *Personnel psychology*, 1968, 21, 335-344.
- Dunnette, M. D., Predictors of executive success. In F. R. Wickert & D. E. McFarland (Eds.), *Measuring executive effectiveness*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967, pp. 7-48,
- England, G. W., & Lee, R., The relationship between managerial values and managerial success in the United States, Japan, India and Australia. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1974, 59, 411-419,
- & Weber, M. L., Managerial success: A study of organizational performance and human effectiveness. University of Minnesota, 1972, Report No. 5005, 41 pp.
- Ghiselli, E. E., Managerial talent, *American Psychologist*, 1963, 18, 631-642.
- The validity of a personal interview. *Personnel Psychology*, 1966, 19, 389-395.
- Interaction of traits and motivational factors in the determination of success of managers *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1968a, 52, 480-483,
- Some motivational factors in the success of managers, *Personnel Psychology*, 1968b, 1, 431-440.
- & Johnson, D. A., Need satisfaction, managerial success and organizational structure. *Personnel Psychology*, 1970, 23, 369-576.
- Gould, S., Correlates of career progression among Mexican-American collage graduates. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1982 ,20, 93-100.
- Grant, D. L., Bray, D. W., Contributions of the interview to assessment of management potential. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 1969, 53, 24-34.
- Guion, R. M., Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 1967, 18, 191-216.

- Henry, W. E., Psychodynamics of the executive role. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1949, 54, 286-291.
- Jaques, E. *Progression handbook*. London: Heinmann, 1968.
- Kinslinger, J. J., Application of projective techniques in personnel psychology since 1940. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1966, 134-150.
- Kraut, A. L., Prediction of managerial success by peers and training staff ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1975, 60, 14-19.
- Kurtz, A., A research test of the Rorschach test. *Personnel Psychology*, 1948, 1, 41-45.
- Likert, R. *The human organization: Its management and values*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Mohoney, T. A., Jerdee, T. H., & Nash, A. N., Predicting managerial effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 1961, 13, 147-163.
- Moran, G., Notes and comments: Ordinal position and approval motivation. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1967, 3, 319-320.
- Sampson, E. E., & Hancock, F. R., An examination of the relationship between ordinal position, personality and conformity: An extension, replication and partial verification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1967, 5, 398-407.
- Schooler, C., Birth order effects: Not here, not now! *Psychological Bulletin*, 1972, 78, 161-175.
- Siegel, J. P., & Ghiselli, E. E., Managerial talent, pay, and age. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1971, 1, 129-135.
- Smith, Patricia C., Behavior, results, and organizational effectiveness: The problem of criterion. In M. D., Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organization psychology*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally; 1976, pp. 745-775.
- Watson, J., & Williams, J., Relationship between managerial values and managerial success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1977, 63, 203-207.