

**ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL  
LEADERSHIP**

by

*REHANA SHUJAAT*

National Institute of Psychology  
Centre of Excellence  
Quaid-i-Azam University  
Islamabad

1992

ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP

by

REHANA SHUJAAT

A thesis submitted to the National Institute of Psychology  
Centre of Excellence, Quaid-i-Azam University  
Islamabad

In partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY  
IN  
PSYCHOLOGY  
1992

ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP

by

REHANA SHUJAAT

Approved by

---

Supervisor

---

Director, NIP

---

External Examiner

## CONTENTS

	Page No.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ABSTRACT	ii
Chapter I : INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter II : METHODOLOGY	40
Chapter III : RESULTS	50
Chapter IV : DISCUSSION	57
REFERENCES	64
ANNEXURE	73

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research reported here benefitted from the support, cooperation and goodwill of many. My warmest thanks to Dr. Z.A.Ansari, Director National Institute of Psychology, whose valuable advice, full cooperation and persuasive criticism helped me to complete this work.

I am grateful to Mr. Sabir and Mr. Usman for their help in analysis of data. My thanks are also due to Mr. Azhar and Ms. Gulnaz for their assistance.

I would also like to thank Mr. Khalid Marouf for his invaluable assistance in typing the manuscript.

I am immensely grateful to my friend and colleague Fatima Zehra for her valuable feedback, practical and moral support at each and every step of my research.

I also appreciate the heads of the departments and all the executives whose generous contributions of time made this research possible.

I would also like to thank Ms. Ghazala and Ms. Anila for their cooperation.

My special thanks are due to my uncle Kazi Iqbal Saeed who always encouraged me and helped me in data collection.

Finally I would like to thank my family members who wished me success in my work and remained a source of inspiration.

REHANA SHUJAAT  
November, 1992

## ABSTRACT

A study was carried out to assess personal characteristics of leaders in business organizations. 98 executives from four renowned organizations were included in the study. To measure the characteristics of executives two questionnaires, were used; one was a data sheet, to obtain demographic information and the other was a questionnaire, comprising of seven scales of British version of California Psychological Inventory (CPI). These scales, as indicated by various studies, measure leadership traits. The questionnaires were used to see if the more successful business executives differed significantly in terms of personality profile from the executives who are not so successful in terms of success in organizations. The criteria of leadership success in organization was the number of promotions achieved and salary to which the employee had ascended. The results showed significant difference between successful and unsuccessful executives on six out of seven scales i.e. Dominance (Do), Capacity for status (Cs), Sociability (So), Achievement via independence (Ai), Managerial Potential (Mp) and Work orientation (Wo) scale. The difference between two groups was not significant on responsibility (Re).

Chapter I  
INTRODUCTION

## INTRODUCTION

Leadership is a subject that has long excited interest among scholars and layman alike. The term connotes images of powerful, dynamic persons who command victorious armies, direct corporate empires from atop gleaming skyscrapers, or shape the course of nation. Much of our course of conception of history is the story of military, political, religious and social leaders. The wide spread fascination with leadership may be because it touches every one's life.

### Historical Development

Historically, the concept of leadership was derived from leadership in a religious sectarian setting or in groups of primary relationships. Sectarian followings inspired by prophetic figures have been at the genesis of many religious movements. The solitary, dramatic personality who mobilized and inspired masses to new goals and methods of religious salvation became an important prototype of leadership. The conceptual view was reinforced by research on historical and primitive governmental institutions, e.g., tribal chiefs and leaders of small city, states, vested with absolute authority. Such studies also contributed the notion of status and hierarchy to the concept of leadership. Power was vested in the states, as well as in the person of a ruler. The personalization of leadership was thus further reinforced. By the twentieth century several intellectual trends had already effected a change in this conception of leadership. First the democratic revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries depersonalized the concept of authority.

The positivistic influence of the social sciences drastically modified the concept of political leadership. The traditional "hero" disappeared in the face of new views of



psychology. The prevailing instinct and trait psychology gave way before the critiques of Mead, Cooley, Dewey and others(Sills,1968) and their conceptions of a variable human behavior molded by social interaction. Leadership came to be viewed, not as a set of fixed traits and attributes, biologically peculiar to some individuals, but as a role that satisfies mutual expectations of leaders and followers. Building on this new, interactional emphasis, research in the social sciences added increasing sophistication to the concept of leadership. Situational and group components were strongly emphasized. The leadership role was found to vary with situations.

Trends in the study of leadership parallel those in psychology regarding the sources of behavior, which range from the biological to the social ends of the spectrum, with individual cognitive processes in between. Hereditary and instinct conceptions emphasized biological determinants. Trait approaches grew out of these notions but moved more toward a recognition of personality adapted to the circumstances of leadership events. Situational approaches moved further along the scale toward social determinants, almost to the exclusion of individual differences in personality. Today's interest in perceptual attributional conceptions reflect a fundamental point that permeates psychology. The effect of all events, and other so called situational factors, depends upon perceptions - and at times relatively transient ones. Therefore it is not so novel to assert that leadership is an "attribution" or "inferred state" (Sills, 1968).

## **EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP**

Ideas about leadership date back to antiquity, as exemplified in the writings of Confucius, Plato and Plutarch. Plutarch said in his biographies that leadership resides not in histories but in lives(Lindzey & Aronson, 1985). The ancient

Egyptian attributed three qualities of divinity to their king. They said of him. Authoritative utterness is in thy mouth, perception in thy heart, and thy tongue is the shrine of justice. (Bass,1981). An analysis of Greek concept of leadership, as exemplified by different leaders in Homer's Iliad identified; (1) justice and judgment; (2) Wisdom and counsel; (3) shrewdness and cunning and (4) valor and action. All these qualities were admired by the Greeks(Sarachek,1968). Thus the pattern of behavior regarded as acceptable in leaders differ from time to time and from one culture to another.

Leadership is a universal human phenomenon. Citing various anthropological reports on primitive groups in Australia, Fiji, New Guinea, the Congo, and elsewhere. Smith and Krueger(1933) concluded that leadership occurs universally among all people regardless of culture. Parenthood makes for ready-made patterns of leadership(Bass, 1981). Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth".

#### MEANING OF LEADERSHIP

The term "leadership" means different things to different people. Leading is the process of influencing others to act to accomplish specified objectives. Leadership has never been precisely defined and it still carries extraneous connotations that create ambiguity of meaning (Janda, 1961). Further confusion is caused by the use of other imprecise terms such as power, authority, management, administration, control and supervision to describe the same phenomena. Researchers usually define leadership according to their individual perspective and aspect of the phenomenon of most interest to them. After the comprehensive review of the leadership literature, Stogdill (1974) concluded that there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept. The Oxford English Dictionary (1933) notes the appearance

of the word "leader" in the English language as early as the year 1300. However, the word leadership did not appear until the first half of the nineteenth century. Different definitions and conceptions of leadership have been reviewed. Some representative definitions of leadership are: Leadership is the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Leadership is the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal (Hemphill & Coons, 1957). Leadership is a particular type of power relationship characterized by a group members's perception that another group member has the right to prescribe behavior patterns for the former regarding his activity as a group members (Janda, 1960). Leadership is an interaction between persons in which one presents information of a sort and in such a manner that the other becomes convinced that his outcomes will be improved if he behaves in the manner suggested or desired (Jacobs, 1970). Leadership is the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction (Stogdill, 1974). A precise and comprehensive definition of leadership is formulated by Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik (1961) who states that it consists of leadership is an interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation and directed through the communication process toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals. They point out that leadership always involves attempts by a person (leader) to affect or influence the behavior of a followers in a situation.

Most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves an influence process. In research the operational definition of leadership depends on the purpose of the researcher Campbell (1977) Karmel (1978).

The person who occupies leadership position must transmit feelings and exhortations to followers through communication. The successful leader is the one who can appeal to constituents

in a meaningful way(Wexley,1975). There is no single kind of skill that will make a man always a leader. Nor we can regard leadership as dependent on a distinct psychological traits. It is something within the individual. What makes for a good leadership in one situation may make for bad leadership in another. In this sense effective leadership is function of situation. On a battle field a man of energy, intelligence and quick decision is needed.In religion people may require a different set of qualities. In the sphere of organization yet a different set of qualities are expected and these too may differ in different countries.There are certain characteristics which are essential for all leadership irrespective of the specific nature of the situations.Allport(1924) lists them as follows: The trait of ascendance, rapid and energetic reactions, tenacity, a face to face mode of address, a fairly high emotional level, a restraint that gives the impression of an unlimited reserve of power, an air of inscrutability, participation with other and drive or the capacity to concentrate energy and ability on the task.

#### RESEARCH ON LEADERSHIP TRAITS

Over a hundred studies on leader traits were conducted by Stogdill (1948) in the period from 1904 to 1948. In the majority of studies, the general approach was to compare leaders with non-leaders to see what difference existed with respect to physical characteristics, personality and ability. A smaller number of studies compared successful leaders with less successful leaders, or correlated measures of various traits with measures of leadership effectiveness. Success and leadership effectiveness were sometimes measured in terms of group performance and sometimes in terms of personal advancement up the authority hierarchy of the organization (i.e.successful leaders get promoted to higher levels of management and earn a large salary relative to persons of the same age). In his early review,

Stogdill (1948) examined the results of 124 trait studies. A number of traits were found to differentiate repeatedly between leaders and non-leaders. Stogdill (1948) classified the factors which have been found to be associated with leadership, under the general headings of capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation and status;

1. Capacity (intelligence, alertness, verbal facility, originality and judgment).
2. Achievement (scholarship, knowledge and athletic accomplishments).
3. Responsibility (dependability, initiative, persistence, aggressiveness, self-confidence and desire to excel).
4. Participation (activity, sociability, cooperation, adaptability, humor).
5. Status (Socioeconomic position, popularity).
6. Situation (Mental level, status, skills, needs and interests of followers, objective to be achieved etc).

Stogdill (1974) reviewed 163 trait studies conducted during the period from 1949 to 1974. More of the recent trait studies have dealt with managers and administrators. Stogdill suggested that the following trait profile is characteristic of successful leaders.

The leader is characterized by a strong drive for responsibility and task completion, vigor and persistence in pursuit of goals, venturesomeness, an originality in Problem solving, drive to exercise initiative in social situations, self-confidence and sense of personal identity, willingness to accept consequences of decision and action, readiness to absorb interpersonal stress, willingness to tolerate frustration and delay, ability to influence other persons, behavior and capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at "hand" (Stogdill, 1974, p.81).

One early measure to assess managerial potential is the performance in college as indicated by grades. Two research programs of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company found a definite relationship between grades in college and salary level achieved. In a study of 10,000 managers, (Flipppo, 1984) 51 percent of those in the top tenth of their college class were located in the top third of the salary levels in the company. Correlation between grades and salary level was .33. Another study of managers, relate job success to measurements produced by a scale named Individual background Survey. The criteria of job success in the study included the organization level of job held, salary, job title, number of promotions and general rating.

The measurement scale consisted of ascertaining degree of possession of following traits: (1) favourable attitude toward authority, (2) desire to compete, (3) assertive motivation to take charge and make decisions (4) desire to exercise power, (5) desire for attention of others and a sense of responsibility. Research has indicated that high scores on these measures correlated with managerial success. In one study of managers it was found that executives who had not been promoted scored lower than those promoted two or three levels (Flipppo, 1984).

#### THE BACKGROUND OF CLASSIC STUDIES ON LEADERSHIP

During the last few decades hundreds of laboratory and field studies have been conducted to investigate the nature of leadership in organizations. Most of early studies of leadership were attempts to identify unique traits that are characteristics of successful leaders but not of unsuccessful leaders or non-leaders. Failure to find measures of personality and aptitudes consistently associated with successful leadership led to a shift of attention from leader traits to leadership behavior (Luthans, 1985).

### **Iowa Studies**

A series of studies carried out by Lippitt and White (1933) in which they observed the impact of three separate leadership styles, autocratic, democratic and laissez-fair. The basic difference between three styles was the location of the decision making function in the group. Findings of these studies generally supported the effectiveness of a democratic leadership style.

### **Ohio State Studies**

Many important studies carried out at Ohio State University during late 1940 and early 1950s attempted to identify meaningful and relatively independent categories of leadership behavior by analyzing the relationship among hundreds of specific acts performed by a variety of leaders. Results showed that leadership acts could be classified into a few categories or dimensions. The two most important dimensions were labelled "consideration" and "initiating structure". Another important leadership dimension that was investigated intensively during this period is the degree of subordinate participation and influence in decision making. A sizeable number of studies tested the hypothesis that leaders who allow extensive participation have more satisfied and productive subordinates (Luthans, 1985).

### **Michigan Studies**

At about the time the Ohio State Studies were being conducted, researchers at the University of Michigan became concerned about which leadership style, employee centered or production centered, was most likely to result in improved performance. Findings seemed to indicate that employee-centered leaders were more effective than production centered leaders (White & Bednar, 1986).

## THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

Theories of leadership attempt to explain either the factors involved in emergence of leadership or the nature of leadership effectiveness in terms of the leader. The greatman approach, as well as trait theories of leadership, focussed on the qualities of the individual and how those qualities influenced the individual's effectiveness (Sanford,1973). Major theories of leadership are:

### 1. Great-Man Theories

The Great Man approach represented the earliest theory of leadership. The theory suggested that great leaders were born, not made. Such men and women were believed to possess certain qualities that lead them to greatness and no doubt would have done so at any time in history or under any set of circumstances. Greatman theories were influenced by studies of such world leaders as Alexander the great, Joan of Arc, Hitler etc. Research studies produce little agreement on the qualities these and other outstanding leaders shared. Some observers assumed that greatness passed through families from one generation to another. However, little evidence exists to suggest that factors other than political, economic, or social opportunities have been responsible for the succession of influential leaders in the families (White & Bednar,1986).

### 2. Trait Theories

Eventually "great man" theory gave way to a more realistic traits approach to leadership. In the first half of the century a great deal of attention in psychology was directed to the study of traits of leadership. The trait approach is mainly concerned with identifying personality traits of the leaders held in common. In hundreds of studies successful leaders were observed



by researchers. This research, however produced an array of confusing findings for example one analysis of more than 100 trait studies found that fewer than 5 percent of the traits thought to be important were common in four or more of the studies. Although leaders appeared to have marginal advantages over non-leaders in such traits as intelligence and certain physical dimensions (height, weight etc), there were no characteristics on which leaders were consistently superior. The trait approach failed to explain the source of effective leadership for a number of reasons. First and foremost, inconsistent research findings suggest that successful leaders, unsuccessful leaders and even non-leaders, sometimes possess the same traits. Second, defining and measuring traits often present problems. Trait can be viewed differently by different individuals. When the trait approach is applied to organizational leadership, the result is even cloudier. Stryker found that 75 executives defined the trait dependability in twenty five different ways. Measuring traits can also present a problem, since many traits are Psychological in nature and can not be observed directly (White & Bednar, 1986).

### 3. Environmental Theories

Many early theorist advanced the view that the emergence of great leader is a result of time, place and circumstances. For Hegel the great man was an expression of the needs of his times.

What the great man did was automatically right to do because he fulfilled what was needed. He actually couldn't help what he did, since he was directed by his historical environment. Mumford (1959) describe that the leaders that emerge depend on the abilities and skills required at the time to solve the social problems existing in times of stress, change and adaptation. Leadership is an innate as well as acquired modal societal tendency of force. As such it is related to the organized and organizing phases of the social process.

#### 4. Psychoanalytic Theories

Freud himself (1922) and many others psychoanalytically oriented writers such as Frank (1939), From (1941), Erikson (1964) and Levinson (1970) addressed the leadership issue at length. Favourite interpretations see the leader as father figure, as source of love or fear, as embodiment of the superego, as the emotional outlet for followers, frustrations and destructive aggression, as in need to distribute love and affection fairly among followers, Wolman (1971). Psychoanalysis has had a marked influence on Psychohistorian trying to understand adult leaders in terms of their childhood deprivations, cultural, milieu, and relationship with parental authority, and the psychodynamic needs they fulfill among their followers. Psychoanalytic theory was also used by Devries (1977) and Hummel (1975) to show how the interaction of leader personalities and situations is dramatized in times of crisis in an

organization(Yuki,1981).

## 5. Interaction - Expectation Theories

### (a) Leader Role theory

Homans(1950) developed a theory of the leadership role using three basic variables, action, interaction, and sentiments. It is assumed that an increase in the frequency of interaction and participation in common activities is associated with an increase in sentiments of mutual liking and in clarity of group norms. Leadership is defined in terms of the origination of interaction. In Hemphill's (1957) theory, leadership arises in situations in which component parts of group tasks are dependently related to one another and to the solution of a common problem among group members. His theory emerges from the differentiation of structure - in interaction which permits prediction of future interaction activity with an accuracy exceeding chance. Leadership acts initiate structure-in-interaction, and leadership is the act of initiating such structure.

### (b) Role attainment theory

Stogdill (1959) developed an expectancy reinforcement theory of role attainment. As group members interact and engaged in mutual task performance, they reinforce the expectation that each will continue to act and interact in accord with his previous performance. Thus the individual's role is defined by mutually confirmed expectations relative to the performance and

interactions he will be permitted to contribute to the group the leadership potential of any given member is defined by the extent to which he initiates and maintains structure in interaction and expectation.

**(c) Reinforcement change theory**

In a theory proposed by Bass(1981) leadership is the observed effort of one member to change the motivation and understanding of other members or to change their behaviour. If a member is successful, a change is observed in other members accepting leadership. Motivation is changed by changing the expectations of reward or punishment. As group is a collection of individuals whose existence is rewarding to members or enables them to avoid punishment. Changes occur in the behaviour of group members in order to increase the rewards for performance. Leaders acquire their position by virtue of their perceived ability to reinforce the behaviour of group members by granting or denying rewards or punishments. Leaders are valued when they can enable a group to provide expected rewards. The congruence of leader status, esteem and ability can account for the leader's success and effectiveness.

**(d) Path-Goal theory**

According to House (1971) the Path-Goal theory of leadership focuses on the kinds of behaviours a leader would exercise to allow subordinates to achieve their goals. Specifically the

theory can states that leaders can increase their subordinates, motivation, satisfaction, and performance by giving rewards that depend on achieving particular goals.

Path-goal theory proposes four specific types of leader behavior: directive, supportive, achievement oriented and participative. This theory suggests that a leader may select from among these four leadership styles a style that most appropriately fits the situation (Bass,1981).

#### **6. Humanistic Theories**

The theories of Arguris,Blake, Likert and McGregor are concerned with development of effective and cohesive organizations(Bass,1981).They believe that human being is by nature a motivated organism. The organization is by nature structured and controlled. It is the function of leadership to modify the organization in order to provide freedom for individuals to realize their own motivational potential for fulfillment of their own needs and at the same time contribute toward the accomplishment of organizational goals.

#### **7. Exchange Theories**

One set of theories Homans, March & Simon, Thibaut & Kelley, and Gergen (Bass,1981) is based on the assumption that social interaction represents a form of exchange in which group members make contributions at a cost to themselves and receive returns

at a cost to the group or their members. Interaction continues because members find social exchange mutually rewarding. Blau (Bass, 1981) begins with the fact that for most people being elevated to a position of high status is rewarding; it is also rewarding for members to associate with their high status leaders. Jacobs (1971) formulated a social exchange theory and buttressed it with a wide range of research findings. The group provides status and esteem satisfactions to leaders in exchange for their unique contribution to goal attainment. Authority relationships in formal organizations define role expectations that enable group members to perform their tasks and to interact without the use of power. Leadership implies an equitable exchange relationship between leader and followers. When role obligations are mutually acknowledged, each party can satisfy the expectations of the other on an equitable basis.

#### 8. Behavioral Theories of Leadership

Mawhinney and Ford (1977) reinterpreted Path-goal theory in terms of operant conditioning. Scott (1977) saw the need to replace conceiving of leadership as due to influence or persuasion with an analysis of the observable leader behaviors that change the behavior of subordinates. Emphasized were reinforcement and making rewards contingent on the subordinate that a leader's positive reward behavior will increase a subordinate's performance.

## 9. Perceptual and cognitive theories

These perceptual and cognitive theories include attribution theories, system analysis, and rational deductive approaches.

### (a) Attribution theory

According to this theory each member of a group is seen to have his/her own theory of leadership. If we want to understand a leader's behavior we must begin by going inside the leader's head to find out what he/she is thinking about the situation in which he leads (Pfeffer, 1977). We observe the behavior of leaders and infer the causes of these behaviors to be various personal traits or external constraints, if these causes match the observer's naive assumption about what a leader should do when leadership is used to describe the person observed (Caldwell, 1977).

### (b) System analysis

Sensitivity to the larger environment and organization in which the leaders and their subordinate groups are embedded is dictated by a system point of view. Osborn and Hunt (1975) formulated an adaptive reactive model of leadership to incorporate macro-variables such as environmental constraints or organizational demands as antecedents of leaders' behavior. Bass and Valenzi (1974) used systems theory to construct a model of leader-follower relationships. Leaders and their followers can be conceived as open social systems. The systems are open to the outside environment and they are sensitive to the constraints

imposed on them by the outside. The systems imports and energy (power) and information from the outside, transforms it, and exports goods and services.

### **(c) Rational-Deductive approach**

Some of the accepted facts about leadership were joined rationally into prescribing what is most likely to succeed—direction or participation—by Vroom and Yetton (1974). They posed ten questions which leaders should ask themselves in deciding whether to be directive or participative in decision making with their subordinates and whether to do so one at a time with individual subordinates or with the whole group all at once. Essentially, they argued that supervisor ought to be directive when they are confident that they know what needs to be done and when their subordinates do not have this knowledge. Further more, Vroom and Yetton (1974) suggested that in this situation a decision made by the supervisor will be accepted by subordinates. On the other hand, if the subordinates have more of the information than the superiors, if their acceptance and commitment are of paramount importance, and if subordinates can be trusted to concern themselves with the Organization's interests, the supervisor should be participative.

### **10. Situational Theories**

The situational approach came through the writings of Hemphil(1949), Sanford (1950) and Couldner(1950) among others.



Essentially the situational approach was an effort to define what was demanded of leaders in their situations. The situational approach emphasized the leader's qualities that were appropriate relative to a group functioning in a particular situation. Hembphil (1949) expressed his point in asserting that there are no absolute leaders, since successful leadership must always take into account the specific requirements imposed by the nature of the group which is to be led.

According to Hersey and Balanchard (1982) the situational leadership theory is concerned with two kinds of managerial leadership behaviour. (1) task behaviour, the extent to which managers organize and direct the work of subordinates (2) relationship behaviour, the extent to which managers develop and maintain a personal relationship with subordinates by providing social and emotional support and by development two way communication channels. The theorists argue that managers can display either high or low task behaviour and high or low relationship behaviour resulting in four possible combinations high task/high relationship, or low task/low relationship. According to this theory managers must choose one of these combinations in dealing with their subordinates (Lindzey & Aronson, 1985).

#### **(a) Fielder's Leadership Theory**

Fielder's contingency model of leadership contained the

leadership between leadership style and the favourableness of the situation. The foundation of Fielder's theory is three situational components which influence the leader's effectiveness. (1) The leader member relationship. This refers to the leader's personal relationship with members of his group, the degree of confidence, the loyalty to the leader. (2) The degree of task structure. This refers to the degree of routineness in the group's assigned task. (3) The leader's position power. This is the formal authority which the leader's position holds. It includes the rewards and punishments associated with the positions and the support the leader receives from his own supervisors. These three components, combine in a number of ways to create specific organizational situation. Fielder's contingency theory has implications for placing individuals in leadership positions as well as for people given the opportunity to accept such roles. He is also implying that effective leader must be flexible and must have accurate perceptions of the three situational components before deciding which style is most appropriate(Fielder1954).

#### **(b) Contingency theory**

Fielder's theory has dominated much of the research activity during 1970 and 1978. In contingency theory a leader's effectiveness is determined by the interaction between the leader's personal characteristics and some aspects of the situation. Leaders are classified as primarily person oriented

or task oriented. According to this theory, in extreme situations (highly favourable or highly unfavourable) the task oriented leader will be more effective. When the situation; is moderately favourable, the person-oriented leader will be more effective. The theory has generated a great deal of research, much of which is supportive House & Singh; Peters, Hartke and Pholmann, (Schultz & Schultz, 1990).

Modern leadership theory suggests that there is no one most effective leadership style. Each of the three general styles may be the most effective or the least effective, depending upon certain important conditions or variables. Research indicates that there are at least four important sets of variables that affect the effectiveness of leadership behaviour. The effects of (1) leaders' personal traits (2) general styles uses, (3) leaders orientations, and (4) their support and upward influence. (Fielder, 1954).

Fielder has developed a simplified theory of managerial leadership which attempts to integrate much of the fragmentary theory. His research indicates that the quality of relations prevailing between managers and their subordinates, the degree of task structure and managers power positions determine the general leadership style that is the most effective. Though Fielder's theory is a more practically useful theory of leadership effectiveness, but much more research needs to be done.

The practical objective of leadership theory is to improve the practice of managerial leadership in one or a combination of two ways: it can be used to predict and identify individuals with leadership potential and it can be used as a basis for developing leadership ability in individuals. Although the identification of leadership potential is an important practical use of leadership theory, the goal of improving managerial leadership through the development of leadership ability is equally as important. There is no one theory of managerial leadership that describes and explains adequately leadership effectiveness. Research has provided tentative answers to some of the questions concerning the way leaders behave and the reasons why they are effective and ineffective (Sanford,1973).

Leadership is the most extensively researched construct in the behavioral sciences and is particularly important to the study of organizational behavior. Since human beings learned to use organization to help to overcome their individual limitations in accomplishing things, there has been much interest in the subject of managerial leadership.

Organizations today grow large and complex very rapidly and they spend vast amount of money, energy and time searching for outstanding managers who can lead the way to organizational success. Every day we see practice of management involving the

management of entire nations or it may be on smaller scale. But management of large, complex organizations often is tense, creative and exciting. Leadership is one of the requirements for managerial success. To a large degree the effectiveness of any organization depends upon the quality of its managerial leadership; without leadership, organizations are nothing more than masses of individuals. Because of its importance, researchers and managers have shown great interest in the subject of managerial leadership.

In each organization the staff usually consists of three management levels (i) Top management (ii) Middle management (iii) Bottom management; briefly described below.

#### **Top Management**

"Top level" is defined as consisting of those positions such as Head of different sections in an organization, General Managers and Secretary etc.

#### **Middle Management**

Middle management in general includes these post: Personnel officers, Public relation officers, Managers of Public corporations and institutions, Executives, Accounting officers, senior supervisor, Welfare officers, Junior officers etc. The responsibility of middle management is to supervise direct and control the performance of business within the scope of law,

policy, and regulations already established, to keep the financial and other records, incidents for the performance of work. It is not responsible for the formulation of administrative policy, yet it is directly concerned with program planning and the direction of operation.

#### **Bottom Management**

It includes all lower level staff in an organisation.

#### **Assessment of Leadership**

Assessing leaders is as old as man starting living in groups. But formal research on leadership started in early 30,s. In 1933 Smith and Kruegar surveyed the literature to leadership in general and Jankins in 1947 studied the development of leadership methodology . Over the years innumerable investigators have employed various methods to identify leaders from non leaders.

The primary methods which have been employed for the identification and study of the personal characteristics of leaders are following:-

#### **I. Observation and time sampling of behavior in group situations**

In this method the behavior of two or more individuals is

observed in situations which permits the emergence of leadership activities. The situation may be highly structured in advance, or the situation may be natural and uncontrolled. The period of observation may range from five second periods at definitely spaced intervals to an hour or more of continuous observations. The relative method of various time sampling methods have been evaluated by Arrington(1943),Chapple and Donald (1946) have devised a method for recording the frequency and duration of observed social contacts by executives.

## **II. Choice of associates (voting, Naming, Ranking, Sociometries)**

In this method a member of a group is asked to name the persons whom they would prefer as leaders, and in some cases, to describe the characteristics of each nominee which make him desirable as a leader. Sociometric is an extension of this method which involve the construction of "Sociogram" of chart showing graphically the preference relationship of each member to every other member of the group. A very large proportion of the research in leadership has made use of the Sociometric method. The principle theories of leadership are based on the sociometric method.

## **III. Nomination by qualified observer**

In this method leaders are named by teachers, Club leaders or other adult observer who are regarded as being in a position

to identify the leaders in the group selected for study. The leaders are compared with the members of the control group.

#### **IV. Selection of persons occupying positions of leadership**

In this method leadership regarded as synonymous with holding office or some position of responsibility. The majority of studies used high school and college subjects, and define leadership as holding some office such as President of student body, captain of athletic or debating team and chairman of the club etc.

#### **V. Analysis of biographical and case history data.**

Ackerson and Brown ( 1942) base their studies on the analysis of case histories of delinquent children. Some studies are based on analysis of biographical data.

#### **VI. The Listing of traits considered essential to leadership.**

In this method the author have asked different group of persons, usually business executives and members of the professions, to list the traits which they believe to be essential to leadership.

## **2. BEHAVIORAL TESTS**

In these methods persons are exposed in actual test situations demanding a display of leadership. Two commonly used situation tests are the In-Basket and leaderless Group



Discussion. The In Basket test consists of letters, memos, and reports that supposedly have accumulated in the in-basket of a hypothetical manager. The candidate has a limited amount of time to indicate how to deal with each of the managerial problems contained in these materials. The Leaderless Group Discussion places candidates in a group situation where there is no designated leader. Candidates assume the roles of different managers try to make a group decision. Observer rate each candidate on qualities such as initiative, assertiveness, persuasiveness, dominance etc.

#### **I. A role playing situation:**

The candidate is required to deal with a "staged" personnel problem. An assistant examiner acted the role of the subordinate and the examiner recorded specific aspects of the candidates performance.

#### **II. A standardized panel interview:**

The candidate is interviewed by three interviewers. Topics and questions related to supervisory and attitudes are introduced into the discussion and candidates responses are evaluated independently by each interviewer. Among these measures the leaderless group discussion was the most efficient predictor of leadership.

### 3. PERSONALITY TESTS

Personality tests have been widely used in studies of leadership traits. These include projective tests like TAT. Its proponents claim that it is able to tap deep underlying motives better than the other instruments and cite empirical studies showing that it can predict management ability. The Miner sentence completion scale has been used for measurement of leadership traits by Stogdill (1948).

A number of researchers have administered several measures of personality to various groups of business executives. Harrell (1970) used management orientation scale of Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB), the general activity and social interest scale of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZTS) etc. to measure the potential for leadership.

#### THE CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY (CPI)

California Psychological Inventory was developed by Harrison Gough (1951), was constructed as a test on lines of Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) developed for psychiatric patients. CPI was first published in (1957). The original profile of CPI (Gough, 1956) contains 18 of these folk measures where as the current form (Gough, 1987) contains 20 folk concepts.

The CPI is divided into four classes of scales that address

"folk concepts" relevant to the understanding of interpersonal behavior in any environmental setting. Class I consists of measures of interpersonal style and orientation; it includes seven scales. Dominance (Do), Capacity for status (Cs), Sociability (Sy), Social presence (Sp), Self-acceptance (Sa), Independence (In), and Empathy (Em). Class II consists of measures of normative orientations and values; it includes the following scales: Responsibility (Re), Socialization (So), Self-control (Sc), Good impression (Gi), Communality (Cm), and well being (Wb), Formerly the scale, sense of well-being was included in class-I; it has more recently been placed in class-II. Class-III consists of measures of cognitive and intellectual functioning; it contains the following scales; Achievement via conformance (Ac), Achievement via independence (Ai), and Intellectual efficiency (Ie). Finally class IV consists of measures of Role and personal style, has three scales; Psychological mindedness (Py), Flexibility (Fx) and Femininity/masculinity (Fm).

In addition there are several special scales and indexes that have been used with some frequency. Among these are Management potential (Mp), Work orientation (Wo), Creative temperament (Ct), Leadership potential Index (LPI), Social maturity index (SMI) and Police Effectiveness index (PPE) (Gough, 1989).

First form of booklet of CPI consisted of 480 items. In the revision of the CPI, the 12 repeated items plus six others referring to body functions or sexual practice were dropped, and 29 others have been changed in wording so as to make them easier to understand, more upto date and less encrusted with sexist or other undesirable phraseology. The goal was to develop a booklet easier to read and more acceptable to respondents in cross cultural testing. Secondly, two new scales, Independence and Empathy have been added. The present version of the CPI (Gough, 1987) contains 462 items and 20 folk concepts scales. A third change is the inclusion of three "structural" scales for use in assessing the underlying theoretical dimensions of the matrix of measurement.

Harrison Gough the author of CPI takes this inventory as a measure of traits important to social living, interaction and adjustment. He seems to emphasize the need for having tests which are relevant to actual life situations even across cultures and takes CPI to be one which takes traits that are cross-culturally relevant and universally acclaimed. He, therefore, calls CPI traits as folk concepts which are extensively applicable to normal human beings at home as well as abroad. To Gough, language and literature is the source of folk concepts that are operative in a society/culture. Since these folk concepts emerge from people's social interaction and social life. CPI scales have two instrumental purposes, namely (1) forecast

what people will say, and do in defined, consequential situations and (2) to identify individuals who will be described and talked about by others in predictable and informative ways.

The CPI is an "open" system, from which scales may be removed if and when they no longer serve any useful purpose and some scales may be added as appear to be desirable. Over the years both additions and subtractions have been made. Thirteen of the twenty folk scales were developed by the method of criterion keying, in which items were selected with external criteria. Four scales were developed by internal consistency method, specially Social presence, Self-acceptance, Self-control, and Flexibility. The remaining three scales, Good Impression, Communality and well being were developed by mixed strategies, in which both internal consistency and relationship to non test, criteria were considered (Gough, 1987).

#### USE OF CPI

The CPI as assessment tool has been extensively used in individual counseling, job placement, evaluation, and selection for academic superior job performance (Dyer, 1987; Hergrave & Hiatt 1989); law enforcement personnel (Hogan, 1971; Jogan & Kurtines, 1975; Mill & Bohannon, 1990). Another major area has been the study of persons in different occupations; for instance teachers (Gough, Durflinger, & Hill, 1968; Kegel & Flom 1983; Police officers (Gettys & Flam, 1985; Hogan, 1971; Pugh 1985);

achievement (Alker & Wohl, 1972; colleges (Gough & Lanning, 1986; medical school (Gough & Hall, 1975); dental school (Gough & Kirk, 1970); optometry school (Kegel & Flom, 1974). Attention has also been given to special aspects of performance, such as graduation versus dropout from high school (Gough, 1966; Irvine, 1979); interest and attainment in certain fields such as Mathematics (Aiken, 1968; Anspacher, 1960); Psychology (Gough, 1983); cross-cultural verification of CPI configurations for forecasting academic performance in Greek (Reapi, Gough, Lanning & Stefanis, 1983).

CPI also has been used to identify personal and social problems, for instance, studies of criminal and delinquent behavior (Laufer, Jonson & Hogan 1981); drug abuse (Burger & Collins, 1982; Goldstein, 1974; Kay, Lyons & Newman 1978); CPI has often been used in clinical settings, sometimes as a diagnostic instrument and other times in connection with planning or evaluating treatment programs. The CPI profile can be used as a resource for depicting and recognizing management style, approaches, and skills as well as interpersonal style and "best fit" for certain work environments. A number of personality studies have been conducted about managers and executives. (Bamon and Egan; Gough 1984; Megargee, 1972).

CPI has also been used in studies of leadership (Carhonell, 1984; Gough, 1990; Hogan, 1978; Megargee 1969);

athletics interests and performance (Johnson, 1972, Schendel, 1965).

The CPI has been described as one of the best developed and researched, self-report Psychological inventories available (Anastasi, 1982). CPI has been use for the assessment of managerial leadership and its results can contribute to a better understanding of the reasons behind employee performance problems in the work place. The inventory can also pin point issues, such as dominant leadership style of the organization (Meyer & Davis, 1981).

#### **Rationale for Selection of Scales for this study.**

In many countries the CPI has been used for the measurement of organizational leadership and managerial potentials. It is a self-administering paper and pencil test, designed for group administration, it also can be taken individually or even by mail. Standardized testing conditions are not essential and no time limit is imposed. Interpersonal behavior can be forecast and rationalized either from a single scale, or (more often) from a small cluster of scales that will be reasonable from both conceptual and psychometric standpoints. However, best results regarding a personality profile are only possible if the whole test is administered. As it is a lengthy and time consuming test consisting of 462 items, and 20 scales, selected scales have used by many researchers. Each scale of CPI can be administered

and interpreted independently. This has been made possible also because each scale was developed separately and was validated on separate criterion. In research settings usually few scales are selected, depending on the required information. For present study only seven scales were selected, which were considered relevant to qualities that are essential to lead or initiate. Dominance (Do), Capacity for status (Cs), Sociability (Sy), Responsibility (Re) and Achievement via independence (Ai). two scales were selected from special category of scales. These are Managerial potential (Mp) and Work orientation (Wo).

The selected scales are briefly described as follows:

1. Dominance (Do).

The Dominance Scale (Do) is used to identify strong, dominant, influential and ascendant individuals who are able to take the initiative and exercise leadership. In recent years there has been a resurgence of research and theory on the need for dominance/power and its relationship to effective management and occupational suitability. Several studies have shown that dominance is a desirable quality in managers. Medcof(1990) has reported that scores on Manifest Need Questionnaire (MNQDOM) are positively correlated with ratings of management ability. Gough (1969) and (Megargee, 1972) has reported two studies using high school students, nominated by their principal as most dominant and least dominant students. The differences between the groups



were statistically significant on CPI, Do scale. Those rated as most dominant were also high on dominance scale. Rawls and Rawls (see Megargee 1972) reported that Do scale significantly differentiated the most successful executives from least successful executives. Vingoe (1968) found Do scores correlated significantly with peer ratings and self ratings of dominance based on the trait description in the CPI. The Do scale was also used in two other studies by Altrocchi (1959) and Smelser (1961). It was noted in both studies that the high Do subjects behaved dominantly and the subjects low on Do, submissively. Overall the Do scale is one of the best-validated of the 20 CPI scales, Butt and Fisk (1968) in their broad comparison of dominance scales from a variety of personality inventories concluded that the CPI Do scale is the most appropriate for assessing leadership.

## 2. Capacity for Status (Cs)

Status is defined as the relative level of income, education, prestige and power attained in one's social cultural milieu. Capacity for status (Cs) scale is used to identify those qualities of ambition and self-assurance that underlie and lead to status. Many of the items on the Cs scale reflect social poise and self-confidence. Large number of studies suggesting that leaders coming from a good socio-economic background have higher status. Evidence from a diversity of studies indicates that leaders are persons who tend to rate higher than average in popularity. Hollandar (1961) reviewed research which indicated

that persons perceived to have high status were more acceptable as authority figures and their idiosyncratic behavior received greater acceptance.

Gough (1968) compared highly qualified high school students, with those who did not go to school, by using Cs scale of CPI. The results indicates that students who went on to college had significantly higher Cs scores than those who did not attend the college. In general, the evidence collected by Gough supports the validity of the Cs scale as a measure of potential status.

### 3. Sociability (Sy)

The Sociability (Sy) scale is used to differentiate people with an outgoing, sociable, participative temperament from those who shun involvement and avoid social visibility. Many of the items deal with enjoyment of social interactions. Number of studies shows that leader are more social than non leaders. Fairly high positive correlations between sociability and leadership are reported by Bonney and Drake ( Bass,1981).

Several studies have used participation in extra curricular activities and joining the social societies as criteria. Gough (1969) compare Sy scores of students nominated by their principals as most active in extra curricular activities with those who participated the least. The differences were statistically significant. Hase and Goldberg (1967) found

significant correlations between Sy scores and peer ratings of sociability. Hase and Goldberg's findings were replicated by Vingoe (1968) who obtained a Correlation of .42 between Sy scores and peer ratings of sociability. Vingoe also reported correlation of Self-rating and sociability. Sy is correlated consistently with the criterion in a variety of situations.

#### **4. Responsibility (Re)**

Responsibility (Re) scale is used to identify people who are conscientious, responsible, articulate about rules and order, and who believe that life should be governed by reason. Generally leaders perceive their responsibilities to be broader and more far reaching than other group members perceive their own responsibilities. Several studies have been conducted on Responsibility (Re) scale of CPI. Hase and Goldberg (1967) found Re correlated significantly with peer ratings of responsibility. Studies conducted by Gough (1969) found that high school students nominated by their principals as the most responsible, had significantly higher Re scores than a group nominated as least responsible. Several studies have tested the validity of the Re scale by examining the score of people in occupations in which responsibility and attention to duty are demanded.

#### **5. Achievement via Independence (Ai)**

Achievement via Independence (Ai) scale is used to predict achievement in setting where independence of thought, creativity

and self-actualization is rewarded. McClelland and Winter (see Bass ,1981) provided strong evidence to support the proposition that need for achievement is an important value for effective leaders, particularly successful entrepreneurs. A number of studies suggest that managerial success was predicted by need for achievement. Meyer and Walder (1961) found that more successful executives were higher in their achievements.

Most of the validation work on the Ai scale has been done in college settings. A number of studies have related Ai scores to grade point average (GPA). These studies have been conducted by Barnette(1961), Goldberg and Hase (1967), Gough(1969), compared high school graduates with high school drop outs; they found significant differences between two groups.

Trites, etal (1967) found a small but significant correlation between Ai and grades in an air traffic control training program. In military training programs Datel,Hall,and Rufe (1965) found soldiers who completed an Army language training course had higher Ai scores than those who dropped out. Ai scale is one of the more thoroughly investigated CPI scales(cited in Megargee 1972).

## **6. Managerial Potential (Mp)**

Managerial Potential (Mp) scale is designed to identify those who have talent for supervisory and managerial roles and who tend to seek out such positions. Included in the definition

of a good manager are behavioral effectiveness, self-confidence, cognitive clarity, and goal orientation. Mp is used to assess interest and talent for managerial pursuits (Gough, 1984). In management leadership is the actual ability to direct or to supervise others Zdep (1969) reported that subjects with high scores on Mp scale exhibited more leadership than subject low on the scores. Several studies have been conducted in which the standard scales of the CPI were related to managerial performance. A study conducted by Grant and Patton (1981), indicate that subjects who rate higher as managers were also higher on Mp scale.

#### **7. Work Orientation (Wo)**

Work orientation (Wo) scale is designed to measure sense of decision to work, the strength of the work ethic and the likelihood of performing well even in routine work. Specifically seeking to identify persons who are industrious, conscientious, responsible, stable and persevering. Number of investigators have found leaders to rate high on this scale in industry (Gough, 1985).

### **AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of this study was to explore certain qualities of organizational leadership in Pakistan by using seven scales of a well known personality test CPI, developed in USA but used in a number of other countries for similar researches. The

objectives included:

- (1) To see if the more successful business executives (as defined in terms of salary and promotion) differed significantly in terms of personality profile from the executives who are not so successful in terms of the criteria.
- (2) To see if the non technical executives are different from technical executives in terms of personality profile.
- (3) To see if the personality profile of Pakistani executives is different from that of their American counterparts.
- (4) To see whether the profile of young executives (below 40 years) is different from those who are older (above 40 years).

Chapter II

METHODOLOGY

METHODOLOGY

Pilot Study

Seven CPI scales were selected to measure the organizational leadership. These scales consist of 243 items, of which 52 are common in more than one scale. Therefore total number of items was 191. Items of these scales were identified and a questionnaire form was prepared.

Three tryout studies were carried out to see whether subjects comprehend items in real sense.

First tryout

In this study questionnaire (American version) was given to 10 male M.A. Final year students at Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad. They were asked to translate the items into Urdu. Translated items were checked and compared with Urdu translation, by Ahmed (1986) in order to see whether the meaning of items were understood by the subjects correctly or not. It was found that there were 15 to 20 items which were left untranslated and there were about 15 items which were translated incorrectly. It showed that some items posed comprehension/language problem.

Second tryout:

The questionnaire was administered to ten executives of medium sized firms. Questionnaire was administered according to



standard instructions as given in the manual (Gough,1987). It was found that same items were left by executives because they could not understand the meaning.

Findings of the study showed that there were some American slangs/phrases which were difficult to understand in Pakistan. Therefore it was decided that British version of the CPI may be used for this study because it was simple and more comprehensible as compared to American version.

### **Third tryout**

The procedure outlined above was repeated with the British version of the CPI. First it was given to same students at Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad for Urdu translation. Then each translated item was checked and compared with original items. It was found that all the items were translated correctly. It showed that items did not pose any comprehension/language problem.

Then questionnaire was administered to 5 executives of a firm to verify the correct comprehension of items. Findings of this try out showed that this questionnaire did not pose any comprehension/language problem.

## Final study:

### Sample

The sample consisted of 78 middle and 20 top level management personnel. The sample was obtained from four leading and renowned organizations of the country, namely:(a) Bata Shoe Company,(b) Packages,(c) Siemens and(d) Kohinoor Textile Mills Ltd.

**Organization A:** This organization is a large international organization. One plant of this organization was sampled. This plant employs 5000 workers and of which 80 individuals are classified as "Manager".

**Organization B:** This organization is a nationwide concern. One plant was sampled for this study. This division employs approximately 3,000 workers of which 45 individuals are classified as "Manager".

**Organization C:** This is an internationally leading organization for this study only one division of this organization having 500 workers Of which 30 are classified as "Manager".

**Organization D:** This is a large national organization and it employs 3000 workers in the unit which was included in the sample. This unit has 25 Managers.

All male executives were included in the study except those who were not available during the period of data collection due to leave or other commitments.

Table A

The total number of executives and selected number from each organization

Organization	No of Executives	Sample
A	80	35
B	45	30
C	30	20
D	25	13

The characteristics of the executives in terms of age, education, job experience and salary level are shown in table B to E.

TABLE - B

Age of executives with frequencies.

Age Range (in years)	Frequencies ( <i>N</i> = 98)	Percentage
24-29	16	14.28
30-35	27	27.55
36-40	17	17.34
41-45	16	16.33
46-50	11	11.22
51-55	08	8.16
56-59	03	3.06

**TABLE - C**

Educational level of executives.

Education	Frequencies ( N = 98 )	Percentage
ACMA/CA	08	8.16
M.Com	05	5.10
MBA/MPA	14	14.28
MA/M.Sc.	19	19.38
Engineering B.E./M.Sc.	30	30.61
B.Sc,B.Com/B.A.	14	14.28
LL.B.	03	3.06
F.A.	02	2.04
Matric	03	3.06

**TABLE - D**

## Job Experience

---

---

Experience (in years)	Frequencies ( <i>N</i> = 98 )	Percentage
2 & below	05	5.10
3 - 6	22	22.44
7 - 10	10	10.20
11 - 14	11	11.22
15 - 18	08	8.16
9 - 22	10	1.02
23 - 26	06	6.12
27 - 30	20	20.40
31 - 34	04	4.08
35	02	2.04

---

---

**TABLE - E**

## Monthly Income

---

---

Income (in rupees)	Frequencies ( N = 98 )	Percentage
5,000 & below	05	5.10
6,000 - 9,000	35	35.71
10,000 - 13,000	25	25.51
14,000 - 17,000	17	17.34
18,000 - 21,000	05	5.10
22,000 - 25,000	02	2.04
26,000 - 29,000	01	1.02
30,000 - 33,000	03	5.10
34,000 - 37,000	02	2.04
38,000 - 41,000	02	2.04
42,000 & above	01	1.02

---

---

**Instrument**

To measure the organizational leadership two questionnaires were used.

**(i) Biographical Questionnaire**

A questionnaire was designed to collect demographic information like age, higher qualification, occupation, salary,

number of promotions, and job experience etc. (see Annexure A).

(ii) A questionnaire comprised of Seven scales from British version of California Psychological Inventory (CPI) (Gough, 1987). (see Annexure B).

### **Procedure**

In the first instance the heads of organizations were requested to identify successful and unsuccessful executives on basis of parameters defined by the researcher. Initial contact revealed reluctance by the administration to identify the managers on basis of their performance, efficiency etc. So it was decided that all of them may be included for study and subsequently bifurcated on basis of a criteria. The criteria of successful executives was determined by the number of promotions and salary increases to which the employee had ascended, relative to others of his age and with same length of experience in the organization. The group called successful executives consisted those subjects who got first promotion after four years or less. Unsuccessful executive were described as those who got first promotion after ten year or more or got no promotion at all. Subjects were contacted in the respective organizations with the permission of the head of the organization. First the subjects were ensured of the confidentiality of responses. Two questionnaires were given to each subject. First they were given a data sheet to collect biographical information about them.



Later CPI questionnaire was given with instructions printed on the first page, which were also verbally explained by the researcher. Subjects were told to read the instructions carefully, and mark the option either TRUE (T) or false (F) whichever is applicable in their case. Data was gathered individually and average test taking time was about 40 minutes.

Chapter III

RESULTS

R E S U L T S

The data was analyzed with the help of Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS).

1. To study the reliability of each scale selected in the study internal consistency of items was computed through Kuder Richardson reliability formula (K-R 20). 2. To study the relationship between the scales inter scale correlations were computed.
3. To see the significance of difference between successful business executives and unsuccessful business executives; technical vs non technical executives and senior vs junior executives in terms of age; Mean and SD was computed. The significance of difference between means was studied by applying t-test.
4. To see the significance of difference between Pakistani and American business executives one way analysis of variance was computed

TABLE- I

Kuder Richardson reliability of selected CPI scales.

Scale	a	b	c
Dominance (Do)	.71	.77	.70
Capacity for status(Cs)	.68	.66	.60
Sociability(Sy)	.72	.69	.62
Responsibility(Re)	.70	.83	.60
Achievement via independence(Ai)	.56	.93	.62
Managerial potential (Mp)	.75	**	.71
Work orientation(Wo)	.75	**	.77

(a) Based on Megargee(1972); Gough(1984,1987).

(b) Based on Ahmed (1986).

(c) Based on the present data.

\*\* Not available.

Table above shows the alpha coefficient and the Kuder Richardson reliability coefficients of CPI scales on American and Pakistani samples.

TABLE - 2

CPI scale Intercorrelation matrices for Pakistani and American sample.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Do							
Cs	.40**						
	(.64)						
Sy	.54**	.56**					
	(.73)	(.68)					
Re	.34**	.26*	.21				
	(.42)	(.55)	(.38)				
Ai	.17	.61**	.33**	.36**			
	(.45)	(.71)	(.44)	(.55)			
Mp	.40**	.49**	.31**	.59**	.58**		
	#	#	#	(.65)			
Wo	.40**	.53**	.33**	.64**	.51**	.67**	
	#	#	#	#	#	(.74)	

Feagures in parenthesis based on American sample (Gough, 1987).

\* $P < .01$ . \*\* $P < .001$ .

# Not available on American sample.

The above table shows that all the inter scale correlations are positively significant.

TABLE - 3

Mean , *SD* and *t*-values of successful and unsuccessful executives.

Scale	Successful Executives <i>n</i> = 35		Unsuccessful Executives <i>n</i> = 49		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>		
Do	26.05	4.31	22.34	4.31	3.89	0.000
Cs	15.31	3.13	12.46	3.58	3.86	0.000
Sy	21.51	3.86	19.24	4.17	2.56	0.01
Re	24.28	4.19	23.51	3.89	0.86	0.39
Ai	19.97	3.90	17.02	4.22	3.30	0.001
Mp	19.45	5.34	17.35	4.50	1.92	0.05
Wo	26.60	5.37	24.16	5.80	1.98	0.05

The above table shows that there are significant differences between successful and unsuccessful business executives on all the scales except Responsibility(Re).

**TABLE - 4**

Mean, *SD* and *t*-values of technical executives and non technical executives.

Scale	Technical Executives		Non Technical Executives		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
	<i>n</i> = 30		<i>n</i> = 60			
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>		
Do	22.66	4.95	24.85	4.39	2.05	0.04*
Cs	13.63	3.64	14.25	3.35	0.78	0.44
Sy	20.16	4.30	20.65	3.93	0.52	0.60
Re	22.66	4.13	24.56	3.88	2.10	0.04*
Ai	19.00	4.71	18.51	3.62	0.49	0.62
Mp	17.53	5.11	19.13	4.55	1.45	0.15
Wo	24.83	5.84	26.25	5.52	1.10	0.27

The results in above table shows that there is a significant difference on only two scales i.e Dominance(Do) and Responsibility(Re). Mean scores of non technical executives are higher on Dominance(Do) and Responsibility(Re) scales as compared to technical executives.

**TABLE - 5**

Mean, *SD* and *t*-values of Pakistani executives and American executives.

Scale	Pakistani Executives <i>n</i> = 98		American Executives <i>n</i> = 185			
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Do	23.89	4.64	24.64	5.10	1.47	0.22
Cs	13.67	3.67	19.12	3.69	140.27	0.00
Sy	20.23	4.07	22.98	4.33	26.92	0.00
Re	23.85	3.97	28.56	4.35	79.70	0.00
Ai	18.40	4.22	24.70	4.90	116.26	0.00
Mp	18.37	4.78	25.71	4.42	116.90	0.00
Wo	25.66	5.60	34.15	3.70	233.34	0.00

Source of American *data* (Gough, 1987)

The above table shows that there is a significant difference in profile of Pakistani business executives and American business executives, on six out of seven scales. Only on Dominance (Do) scale the difference of mean score is not significant.



**TABLE - 6**Mean, *SD* and *t*-values of executives with regard to age groups.

Scale	Below 40 years <i>n</i> = 60		Above 40 years <i>n</i> = 38		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>		
Do	22.95	4.72	25.39	4.15	2.69	0.04*
Cs	13.81	3.83	13.44	3.46	0.49	0.62
Sy	19.89	4.29	20.78	3.68	1.11	0.26
Re	23.23	4.22	24.84	3.35	2.09	0.04*
Ai	18.66	4.24	18.00	4.22	0.76	0.45
Mp	17.60	5.07	19.60	4.05	2.16	0.03*
Wo	25.16	5.66	26.44	5.50	1.11	0.27

The above table shows that there is a significant difference between means of the two age groups on three scales i.e Dominance (Do), Responsibility (Re) and Managerial potential (Mp).

Chapter IV  
DISCUSSION

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to assess the personality profile on leadership qualities of Pakistani executives. For this purpose a questionnaire consisting seven CPI scales was used.

### Reliability

Reliability is one of the most important properties of a test. Therefore reliability was estimated from the present data. For this purpose Kuder Richardson-technique of formula KR-20 was used for all the selected scales. The computed index of reliability (see table I) ranges from .60 to .77. Highest reliability coefficient was of Work orientation (Wo) scale; a specific purpose scale based on items drawn from other scales. The results are comparable with the American data, (in parenthesis) which ranges from .56 to .75. Dominance (Do) scale had highest reliability coefficient of .77. Ahmed (1986) study also indicates high reliability coefficient of these scales. High reliability indices of all the scales indicate that items of scales are internally consistent.

### Interscale Correlations

The seven CPI scales were intercorrelated (see table 2) and it was found that all the correlations except two are significant

at  $P < .001$  level of significance, and scales correlates with each other in positive direction. The highest correlation is .69 between Work orientation (Wo) vs Managerial potential (Mp) scale. The two lowest values are those of .17, for Achievement via Independence (Ai) vs Dominance (Do) and .21 for Responsibility (Re) vs Sociability (So). Pakistani data was compared with American data to see how close or otherwise they are vis-a-vis the two national samples. Interscale correlations on American data are consistently high on all the scales as compared to Pakistani data. The reason for this may be that the Pakistani sample ( $N = 98$ ) is small belongs to a restricted group of executives while the American sample is quite large (Gough, 1987) and belongs to general population, which include people, belonging to different walks of life.

Any organization is expected to comprise of workers of diversified skills, abilities and personal qualities. These range from an outstanding an enterprising individual to a steady worker who might not possess the qualities that bring him to the forefront. Keeping in view this assumption present study was carried out to see personality profiles of successful or otherwise executives.

In order to determine the significance of difference between successful and unsuccessful executives  $t$ -test was computed; significant difference was found between two groups on Do, Cs,

Sy, Ai, Mp and Wo scale. No significant difference was found on Re scale. The Mean score of successful executives was high on the scales as compared to unsuccessful executives. Do and Cs differed between two groups at  $P < .000$  level of significance which shows that successful executives tend to be more forceful, assertive, usually like to assume leadership roles, have more initiative and would like to direct others rather than being passive followers. On Sy scale they differed at  $P < .01$  level of significance, indicating that successful executives tend to be more participating and sociable as compared to the other group. Ai differed between the two groups at  $P < .001$  level of significance this reflects of the tendency to be more independent minded, can be innovative and desirous of freedom in decision making. Scores on Mp and Wo differed between the two groups at  $P < .05$  level of significance. It indicates that the more successful executives have a talent for supervisory and managerial roles and have a sense of dedication to work.

The results have shown that there is a significant difference between successful and unsuccessful executives. The success on the basis of criteria already stated reveals that there is a significant difference between successful and unsuccessful business executives on all the scales except Re scale. This is suggestive of the fact that <sup>unsuccessful executives</sup> ~~they~~ did not lack sense of duty, conscientious or organized approach but are wanting in other qualities like dominance, assertion, ambition and sociability

prerequisites of social effectiveness. This can be visibly seen in difference on Do, Cs, Sy and Ai scales. This supports the assumption that successful executives will have an elevated profile on such scales. Similar results were obtained in the studies of Rawls and Rawls (Megargee, 1972) and Harrell (1970).

*t*-test was also computed to see the significance of difference between mean scores of technical executives and non technical executives. The technical executives include engineers belonging to different areas whereas non technical executives include designations of Managers who were responsible for administration, marketing, personnel management etc. Comparison between technical and non technical executives has revealed a significant difference ( $P < .04$ ) on two scales mainly Do and Re. Non technical executives secured higher means on Do and Re, which indicates that they are dominant, responsible, conscientious types who exercise foresight and plan ahead. Difference between the two categories is in the expected direction as demanded by their nature of duties in the organizational set up. Dealing with individuals requires more personal thrust and "rule bound" approach than the skill in maintenance of machines/equipment.

One way analysis of variance was computed to see the significance of difference between Pakistani executives and American executives. Cs, Sy, Re, Ai, Mp and Wo differed significantly ( $P < .000$ ) between Pakistani executives and American

executives. Mean score of American executives are high as compared to Pakistani executives on all scales but no significant difference is found on Do scale. The profile of American executives indicate that they are more ambitious, independent, friendly, take their duty seriously, have strong drive to do well, are socially effective and possess more sense of dedication to work as compared to Pakistani executives.

In comparative study of American and Pakistan norms it was observed that significant differences exist between means on all scales except Do. This indicates that Pakistani executives, technical and non technical both inclusive, are less ambitious, independent and sociable. This could be a reflection of our socio cultural milieu which as compared to American setup in more controlling and less demanding in terms of resourcefulness, initiative and ambition.

*t*-test was also computed to see the significance of difference between executives of two different age groups (see Table 6). Significant differences were found on means of Do, Re and Mp. Do differed between two groups at  $P < .05$ . Executives belonging to age group of above 40 years scored higher on Do scale which means they are more domineering, assertive and inclined to express and defend their own opinions. This can be a result of their roles which demands such qualities as executives. Re differed between two groups at  $P < .04$  level of statistical

significance this suggesting that senior executives are more orderly, self disciplined and conscientious; regulated by reasons and regulations. The two age groups differed at ( $P < .03$ ) level of significance on Mp scales. Executives belonging to age groups above 40 years have higher means score on these scales. This suggests that senior executives have talent for supervisory and managerial roles. They are goal oriented, responsible, can direct cooperation from others, are ambitious, ~~are~~ mature and clear in their thinking as compared to the younger lot. No significant difference was found between two groups on Cs, Sy, Ai, and Wo scale. On the whole profile of executives belonging age group above 40 years indicates that senior people are more dominant, responsible and conscientious as compared to young executives. This is suggestive of the fact that there is a relationship between these scale and more responsible position and status in any organization.

By and large this study indicated that there is a difference between profiles of successful (who possess leadership qualities) and unsuccessful executives in terms of some personality traits like assertion, dominance, desire for excelling and achieving at the top. Sociability pattern of two groups also differ.

While this study offers an insight into the differences between the more successful and the less successful executives, it does not mean that it was due to these personal qualities that



one group was more successful than the other. However, this study paves way for future longitudinal studies aimed at looking into personality differences in selectees in their early carrier, and their later performance. Such studies will indicate if a particular personality profile is conducive to greater success in organization. Such investigation can also help in determining the suitability of test for selection of executives in organizations.

## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

Ahmed, I. (1986). Development of Urdu version of California Psychoklogical Inventory (CPI) in Pakistan, *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 1(2), 3-16.

Allport, F.H. (1924). *Social Psychology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Anastasi, A. (1982). *Psychological testing* (5th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Attrocchi, J. (1959). Dominance as a factor in interpersonal choice and perception. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59, 303-308.

Bass, B.M. (1966). A plan to use programmed group exercised to study cross cultural differences in management behaviour. *International Journal of psychology*, 1, 315-322.

Bass, B.M., & Valenzi, E.R. (1974). Contingent aspects of effective management styles. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson. (Eds), *Contingency approaches to leadership*, Southern Illinois University Press

Bass, B.M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. London: Macmillan Publishers.

Beach, D. (1985). *The management of people at work*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Butt, D.S., & Fiske, D.W. (1968). Comparison of strategies in developing scales for dominance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 70, 505-519.

Calder, B.J. (1977). *An attribution theory of leadership*. In B.M. Staw & G.R. Salancik (Eds.), *New directions in organizational behavior*, Chicago: Aldine.

Clark, M.B., & Clark, K.E. (1990). *Measures of leadership with CPI*. New Jersey: Leadership Library of America Inc.

Collins, B.E. & Ashmore, R.D. (1970). *Social psychology: Social influence, attitude change, group process and prejudice*. London: Wesley Publishing Co.

Fielder, F.E. (1954). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Flippo, E.B. (1984). *Personnel Management*. (6th ed). New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.

Gibson, J.L., Ivancevich, J.M., & Donnelly, J.H.(1973). *Organizations structure, process, behavior*. London: Business Publications.

Gough, H.G. (1969). A leadership index on the california psychological inventory. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 16, 283-289.

Gough, H.G.(1985). A work orientation scale for the california psychological inventory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70(3), 505-513.

Gough, H.(1987). *California psychological inventory: Administrator's guide*. U.S.A: Consulting psychologists press.

Gough, H. (1984). A managerial potential scale for the california psychological inventory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(2),233-240.

Gough, H. (1989). *Major Psychological Assessment Instruments*. New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Harrell, T.W. (1970). The personality of high earning M.B.As in small business. *Personnel Psychology*, 24, 369 - 375.

Hase, H.D., & Geldberg, L.R.(1967). Comparative Validity of different strategies of constructing. Personality inventory scale. *Psychological Bulletin*, 67, 231-248.

Hemphill, J.K. etal. (1981). *Leadership acts*. In B.M. Bass Stogdill's handbook of leadership, New York: Macmillan (PP.31-32).

Hicks, H.G.,& Gullett, C.R. (1976).*Organizations: Theory and behavior*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hogan, R. (1971). Personality characteristics of highly rated policeman. *Personnel Psychology*: 24, 679-686.

Hollander, E.P. (1961). Some effects of perceived status on rresponses to innovative behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63, 247-250.

House, R.J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administration Science Quarterly*, 16. 321 - 328.

Jacobs, T.O. (1970). Leadership and exchange in formal organizations. VA: *Human Resources research organization*.

Janda, K.F. (1960). Towards the explanation of the concept of leadership in terms of the concept of power. *Human Relation*. 13, 345 - 363.

Karmel, B.(1987). Leadership: A challenge to traditional research methods and assumptions. *Academic Management Review*, 3, 475-482.

Katz, D., & Khan, R.L.(1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (3rd ed), New York: Wiley.

Landy, F.J., & Trumbo, D.A.(1980). *Psychology of work behavior*. Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Lindzey, G., & Aronson, E.(1985). *The hand book of social psychology: Special fields and applications*. Vol.II, New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lippitt, R, & White, RK. (1960). Leader behavior and member reactions in three social climates. In Cartwright I.D. and Zandar, A (Eds.), *Group dynamics*, New York: Harper & Row.

Lundgren, E.F.(1974). *Organizational management: Systems and process*, New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Luthans, F.(1985). *Organisational behavior:Series in management*. New York:McGraw-Hill .

Medcof, J.W.(1990). The need for dominance scale of the manifest needs questionnaire: Its reliability and validity.

Megargee, E.I.(1972). *The california psychological inventory: Handbook*. London: Jossey-Bass inc.

Meyer, P., & Davis, S. (1992). *The CPI application guide*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologist Press Inc.

Miner, J.B.(1965). *Studies in management education*. New York: Springer.

Megargee, E.I. (1969). Influence of sex roles on the manifestation of leadership. *Journal of applied psychology*, 53(5) 377-382.

Mumford, E.M.(1959). Social behavior in small work groups. *Social Review*, 7, 137 - 157.

Onions, C.T. (1933). *The shorter Oxford English dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon press, Vol,1.

Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership. *Academic Management Review*, 2, 104 - 112.

Ribeaux, P., & Poppleton, S.E.(1978). *Psychology and work: An introduction*. London: The Macmillan press.



Saal, F.E., & Knight, P.A.(1988). *Industrial/ Organizational Psychology Science & Practice*. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Sanford, A.C.(1973). *Human relations: Theory and practice*. USA: Mervill Publishing Co.

Sarachek, B. (1968). Greek concepts of leadership. *Journal of Acad. Management*, 11.39-48.

Schultz, D.P., & Shultz. R.A. (1990). *Psychology and industry today: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. (5th ed), New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Scott, W.E. (1977). Leadership a functional analysis. In J.G. Hunt & L.L Larson (Eds), *Leadership: the cutting edge*. Corbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Sills, D.L.(1968). *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*. New York: Macmillan Inc, Vol,9.

Smelser, W.T. (1961). Dominance as a factor in achievement and perception in co-operative problem solving interactions. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 63, 247-250.

Siegel, L.(1969). *Industrial Psychology*. USA: Irwin Inc.

Stogdill, R.M. (1948). *Personal factors associated with leadership and organization*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Stogdill, R.M.(1959). *Individual behavior and group achievement*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stogdill, R.M.(1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

Stogdill, R.M.(1988). Personal factors with leadership: a survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.

Stryker, P. (1960). *The character of executive*. New York: Harper & Row.

Szilagyi, A.D., & Wallace, M.J. (1980). *Organizational behavior and performance*. (2nd ed), California: Goodyear Publisher.

Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I.R, & Massarik, F.(1961). *Leadership and organization*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Vingoe F.G. (1969). Note on the validity of california Psychological inventory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 32, 725-727.

Vroom, V.H. & Yetton, P.W.(1974). *Leadership and decision making*. New York: Wiley.

Wexley, K.N., & Yuki, G.A.(1975). *Organizational behavior and industrial psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

White, D.D., & Bednar, D.A.(1986). *Organizational behavior: Understanding and managing people at work*. London: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Wolman, B. (1979). *The psychoanalytic interpretation of history*. New York: Basic Books.

Yuki, G.A.(1981). *Leadership in organizations*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Zdep, S.M. (1969). Intragroup reinforcement and its effect on leadership behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 284-298.

ANNEXURE A

DATA SHEET

1. Organization \_\_\_\_\_
2. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_
3. Highest degree obtained \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_
4. Designation at the time of joining (Date) \_\_\_\_\_
5. Present designation (Date) \_\_\_\_\_
6. (a) Number of promotions \_\_\_\_\_  
(b) First Promotion (Date) \_\_\_\_\_
7. Starting Salary \_\_\_\_\_
8. Present Salary \_\_\_\_\_
9. Have you served any other organization    Yes            No
10. Working experience outside this organization:-  

<u>Organization &amp; Designation</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
a. _____	_____	_____
b. _____	_____	_____
c. _____	_____	_____
11. Have you ever taken up a part time job            Yes    No  
If yes, when \_\_\_\_\_
12. (a) When did you start working on \_\_\_\_\_  
full time basis:  
(b) What was your first job for how \_\_\_\_\_  
long:

ANNEXURE B

## QUESTIONNAIRE

### DIRECTIONS

- This questionnaire contains a series of statements. Read each one, decide how you feel about it.
- If you agree with a statement, or feel that it is true about you, answer **TRUE (T)**. If you disagree with the statement, or feel that it is not true about you, answer **FALSE (F)**.
- Be sure to answer either **TRUE** or **FALSE** for every statement, even if you have to guess at some.
- Show your answer by putting a cross (x) on the appropriate option.
- There is no right or wrong answer, your own honest opinion will be an appropriate answer.
- Test information will remain confidential and would be used only for research purpose.

- T. F. 1. I enjoy social gatherings just to be with people.
- T. F. 2. I looked up to my father as an ideal man.
- T. F. 3. A person needs to "show off" a little now and then.
- T. F. 4. Our thinking would be a lot better of if we would just forget about words like "probably" "approximately" and "perhaps".
- T. F. 5. When in a group of people I usually do what others want rather than make suggestions.
- T. F. 6. I like fairy tales.
- T. F. 7. There's no use in doing things for people; you only find that you get no appreciation in the long run.
- T. F. 8. I would like to be a journalist.
- T. F. 9. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.
- T. F. 10. My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.
- T. F. 11. When a person fiddles an income tax return it is just as bad as stealing money from the government.
- T. F. 12. In most-ways a poor person is better off than a rich one.
- T. F. 13. Clever, sarcastic people make me feel very uncomfortable.
- T. F. 14. It's a good thing to know people in the right places so you can get small favours done.
- T. F. 15. I doubt whether I would make a good leader.
- T. F. 16. When I was going to school I played truant quite often.
- T. F. 17. I have very few fears compared to my friends.
- T. F. 18. I get very nervous if I think that someone is watching me.
- T. F. 19. For most questions there is just one right answer once a person is able to get all the facts.
- T. F. 20. It's no use worrying my head about public affairs; I can't do anything about them anyhow.



- T. F. 21. As a child I used to be able to go to my parents with my problems.
- T. F. 22. Women should not be allowed to roam about leisurely alone just for fun.
- T. F. 23. Most people would tell lie if they could gain by it.
- T. F. 24. When someone does me a wrong I feel I should pay him back if I can just for the principle of the thing.
- T. F. 25. I seem to be about as capable and smart as most others around me.
- T. F. 26. Every family owes it to the city to keep its pavements cleared.
- T. F. 27. I think I would enjoy having authority over other people.
- T. F. 28. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.
- T. F. 29. Some of my family have quick tempers.
- T. F. 30. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.
- T. F. 31. I liked school.
- T. F. 32. I think Akbar was a greater King than Babar.
- T. F. 33. It is always a good thing to be frank.
- T. F. 34. I am embarrassed by dirty jokes.
- T. F. 35. I used to keep a diary.
- T. F. 36. May be some minority groups do get rough treatment, but it's no business of mine.
- T. F. 37. It is very hard for me to tell anyone about myself.
- T. F. 38. We ought to worry about our own country and let the rest of the world take care of itself.
- T. F. 39. When I get bored I like to stir up some excitement.
- T. F. 40. I am afraid of deep water.
- T. F. 41. I usually feel nervous and ill at ease at a formal party or soical gathering.

- T. F. 42. I have at one time or another in my life tried my hand at writing poetry.
- T. F. 43. As long as People vote at elections they have done their duty as citizens.
- T. F. 44. People often expect too much of me.
- T. F. 45. I would do almost anything for a dare.
- T. F. 46. With things going as they are, it's pretty hard to keep up hope of amounting to something.
- T. F. 47. I take a rather serious attitude towards ethical and moral issues.
- T. F. 48. People today have forgotten how to feel properly ashamed of themselves.
- T. F. 49. I like to be the center of attention.
- T. F. 50. I like to listen to classical music on the radio.
- T. F. 51. I am fascinated by fire.
- T. F. 52. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.
- T. F. 53. I have no dread of going into a room by myself where other people have already gathered and are talking.
- T. F. 54. I get pretty discouraged sometimes.
- T. F. 55. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.
- T. F. 56. It is annoying to listen to a lecturer who cannot seem to make up his mind as to what he/she really believes.
- T. F. 57. I don't blame people for trying to grab all they can get in this world.
- T. F. 58. I was a slow learner at school.
- T. F. 59. I like poetry.
- T. F. 60. I am likely not to speak to people until they speak to me.
- T. F. 61. I do not dread seeing a doctor about a sickness or injury.

- T. F. 62. It takes a lot of argument to convince most people of the truth.
- T. F. 63. I think I would like to drive a racing car.
- T. F. 64. Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy "on top of the world".
- T. F. 65. I fall in and out of love rather easily.
- T. F. 66. It makes me uncomfortable to take a turn doing an act at a party even when others are doing the same sort of thing.
- T. F. 67. I wake up fresh and rested most mornings.
- T. F. 68. It is hard for me to sit still and relax.
- T. F. 69. I seldom or never have dizzy spells.
- T. F. 70. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it.
- T. F. 71. I enjoy hearing lectures on world affairs.
- T. F. 72. Parents are much too easy on their children nowadays.
- T. F. 73. Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than to lose it.
- T. F. 74. I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems.
- T. F. 75. I would like to wear expensive clothes.
- T. F. 76. I have strange and peculiar thoughts.
- T. F. 77. I like tall women.
- T. F. 78. I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something.
- T. F. 79. I would like to hear a great singer on the stage.
- T. F. 80. Every citizen should take the time to find out about national affairs, even if it means giving up some personal pleasures.
- T. F. 81. I like parties and social gatherings.
- T. F. 82. My parents have often disapproved of my friends.