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ABSTRACT

In sociological research, there is a need for studies of mobility within the life-spans and occupational histories of comparative samples of individuals. Most previous studies of mobility have been inter-generational in nature and merely compare social origins. In leadership research, there is a need for studies of the transferability of leadership from one situation to another. Most previous studies of leadership have focused either on leadership traits or on the development of leadership within situations.

The present research is uniquely time dimensional in nature. It studies formal and informal factors in the career patterns of comparative samples of high level and low level individuals with long occupational histories in executive management in industry, business and administration in a dynamic Southern community. It focuses on real-life constants and variables as they operate to implement or limit movement upward, from managerial positions of low status, prestige and functional importance to executive positions of high status, prestige and functional importance; i.e., the implementing and limiting factors in the process of climbing the executive ladder through the years. In addition, this research investigates generalized attitudes, values and beliefs directly and indirectly related to leadership, occupational mobility and the ideology of success. Some of these are products of social and economic change through the years, particularly the recent years.
The literature was surveyed and an essentially sociological and socio-psychological frame of reference and situational approach developed, focusing on the social skills as well as the technical skills associated with career progress. Fifty highly successful and fifty only moderately successful individuals in the same or similar environments in executive management were objectively selected for study and comparison. The comparative samples were effectively matched on the basis of age and length of occupational histories. The method chosen for studying individuals was the anonymous, retrospective, personal interview, guided by interview schedules standardized in pilot studies. When responses to questions on the interview schedules were analyzed and compared, factors and patterns of similarities within and differences between groups were identified.

The following are the major findings and conclusions:

(1) Although the two samples differed fundamentally in social origins, socio-economic backgrounds, educational attainments and occupational opportunities, these are not the sole determinants of differential occupational mobility and career success.

(2) Differential occupational mobility and career success result not only from differential opportunities, personal attributes, abilities and capacities, but also from differential attitudes, values and beliefs, differential definitions of career situations and life-goals, differential motivations and levels of aspiration and differential social and community participation patterns.
(3) In addition to technical skills associated with the ability to manipulate ideas and materials, social skills associated with the ability to manipulate people are important determinants of career success. Some revision of educational preparation for executive careers is suggested.

(4) Among recent socio-cultural changes associated with the ideology of success are: increased human-relations-mindedness, increased security-consciousness, increased other-directedness, increased emphasis on personality manipulation and increased "socially-engineered" emphasis on conformity to group values and expectations.

(5) Superior performance and career success tend to result from the interaction of four important complexes: those of opportunity (a complex of education, training, development and occupational contacts), of capacity (a complex of technical abilities and skills), personality (a complex of manipulative social skills) and motivation (a complex of mobility drives).

(6) Hypothetically granting an individual opportunity, capacity, personality and motivation, if he demonstrates conformity to higher level group values and expectations, he will be accepted in those groups; if he is able to manipulate others and influence group action, he will become an expert group member; if he becomes an expert group member, he will achieve outstanding career success.
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND THE LITERATURE

Purpose of the Study

The achievement of vertical occupational mobility and career success are two aspects of social mobility which have been comparatively neglected in sociological research of a real-life nature. Much more psychological research has been accomplished, but most of this research has focused on experimental situations rather than on real-life ones. The dearth of sociological literature in this area of research has been commented upon by various scholars.

In 1948, Ralph M. Stogdill reviewed the psychological literature on the personal factors associated with leadership and concluded: "Problems which appear to be in need of thorough investigation are those relating to factors which condition social participation, insight into situations ... and transferability of leadership from one situation to another." He thus implied a need for more of a sociological approach. In 1953, Harold W. Pfautz reviewed the sociological literature and stated: "Mobility, a crucial aspect of social stratification, has been almost entirely neglected in the community studies to date. The usual

---

procedure involves relating father's to son's occupation and often reduces the matter to a study of social origins. 2

Students of social mobility have usually focused their attention on movement from one occupation to another within the occupational hierarchy rather than on movement from one position to another within an occupation. Such a focus has been more speculative than empirical. Some of this speculation confuses occupational mobility with occupational opportunity. When references are made to the Horatio Alger tradition of "rags to riches" and "strive and succeed," it is often called an American myth, once applicable to our frontier society but now only an ideological prop supporting the real-life factors which operate to control modern American social and occupational life chances. Nevertheless, the myth persists if it is defined neutrally, as by MacIver, as "the value-impregnated beliefs and notions that men hold, that they live by and for." 3 However, these value-impregnated beliefs concerning the road to career success in Modern America have changed from those of the frontier days of "equal opportunity for all" to the extent that the means to the end of the road have changed. New skills are required in the achievement of vertical occupational mobility and career success because new attitudes and values have arisen to condition the traditional American myth. New "techniques," again as defined by


MacIver, are required for the successful manipulation of people and things as a means to the end of career success. These techniques appear to be a new combination of technical abilities and social skills.

Recent writings indicate that professional scholars are becoming increasingly aware of the emergence and importance of these new techniques for the achievement of career success. However, there seems to be a lack of such awareness on the part of the general public, which may be one reason why the majority of people still cling to the traditional American myth or dream as it is rooted in our culture. Although there is increasing professional awareness of the emergence of these new techniques, there is the clear implication that more research is needed concerning the real-life factors which operate to make some individuals more successful than others in their chosen occupational fields. Stated otherwise, there is a need for more real-life research and less speculation concerning the vertical transferability of leadership potential through time from occupational positions of low status, prestige and functional importance to occupational positions of high status, prestige and functional importance.

From the above, the purpose of this study can be brought into focus. While it has as its general purpose the accumulation of additional knowledge concerning the real-life nature of leadership, occupational

---

4Ibid., p. 3. "By techniques we mean the devices and skills of every kind that enable men to dispose of things— and of persons .... A technique is a way of manipulating objects, including persons as objects ...."
mobility and career success in general, these phenomena are subject to such occupational variability, and situational variability within occupations, that the scope of the study must be limited in order to make it manageable. The study will therefore focus directly on the occupational field of managerial executives in the three related but situationally different environments of business, industry and administration. Since the study is restricted to one dynamic community setting, its specific purpose will be to identify real-life factors and patterns associated with the achievement of vertical mobility and career success in the field of executive management in a selected community.

Statement of the Problem

Since this will be a real-life study rather than an abstract one or an experimental study involving the manipulation of variables, the problem is essentially one of designing a research frame of reference and methodology suitable for the accomplishment of the general and specific purposes of the study as set forth above. The frame of reference and design must facilitate the identification of factors which implement vertical occupational mobility, as opposed to those which limit such mobility and result in comparative occupational stability through time.\(^5\)

Stated otherwise and with repetitive emphasis, the problem

\(^5\)To clarify terms in the sense used here, "occupational mobility" will refer to attaining a high level executive position and outstanding career success through time, while "occupational stability" will refer to retaining a low level supervisory position and limited career success through time. Further clarification of terms will be made in the next chapter.
becomes one of investigating real-life constants and variables as they operate to implement or limit movement upward from managerial positions of low status, prestige and functional importance to executive positions of high status, prestige and functional importance, i.e., the implementing and limiting factors in the process of climbing the executive ladder.

Stated practically, the problem involves the selection of two representative samples or groups of individuals from an actual community, one having attained high level executive positions in management through time, the other having retained supervisory positions in management through time. Analytically, the problem involves the identification of factors which have resulted in differential levels of achievement of objective career success by individuals in the samples, together with the patterns of similarity within and difference between the two samples.

Survey of the Literature

In order to accomplish the purposes of the study and to design a research frame of reference and methodology suitable therefor, it is necessary to survey the literature and to formulate an adequate theoretical background, while also exploring any related or pertinent studies and their findings. It should be borne in mind, however, that there is such a multitude of studies of fringe relevance in the sociological, psychological, personnel management and allied literature that mention of all of them would make this survey and the resultant bibliography practically limitless. Actually, as was pointed out at the outset, there are very few recent studies in the sociological, psychological and allied literature which are sufficiently similar to the present study to rule out its claim to comparative
uniqueness. Since this study is essentially sociological in nature, it is logical to begin by surveying the relevant sociological literature in search of an adequate theoretical background.

Social Mobility and Social Stratification

Sociological concern with the subject of social mobility was greatly stimulated by the publication in 1927 of Sorokin's classical theoretical statement about the nature of the phenomenon. Since that time, however, the term "social mobility" has come to be used rather loosely, and, strangely, no other volume has appeared concentrating entirely upon the subject. The term has usually been interpreted to mean upward, downward or horizontal movement in social space by individuals or groups of individuals, i.e., the process of movement from one social status or stratum to another in an hierarchy of socially sanctioned statuses or classes which form the framework of social stratification. Horizontal mobility has usually been defined as a change in function, and vertical mobility as a change in rank. Individual vertical social mobility, then is movement of the individual upward or downward with a gain or loss in social rank.

In 1953, W. Lloyd Warner published a revision of his Structure of American Life (1952), which contains an excellent chapter on "Individual Opportunity and Social Mobility in America." Warner stresses in


the beginning that, since such a great premium is placed on success in our culture, the American Dream is so directly rooted in the desire for vertical social mobility that it should not be dismissed lightly as a mere fantasy. He says:

The opportunity for social mobility for everyone is the very fabric of the "American Dream." The American Dream is not a mere fantasy that can be dismissed as unimportant to those who think realistically, for it does provide the motive power for much of what Americans do in their daily lives. It is the basic, powerful motivating force that drives most of them. Social mobility is a basic motivation for the worker as well as the manager.8

As Americans believe that the opportunity for advancement is available for anyone who wants to try for it, the American Dream is real and true for them in the sense of W. I. Thomas' famous "definition of the situation." However, Warner claims that the American worker can no longer expect to advance and achieve success with anything like the same probability as did his father and grandfather.9 What Warner seems to imply is that the rate of social mobility is slowing up, not that there are diminishing opportunities to be successful.

There are many opportunities for social mobility in the United States, but vertical mobility is achieved by devious routes and various means. It is commonly assumed, says Warner, that it is necessary only for an individual to accumulate money in order to increase his social status. This is only partly true, since vertical mobility is accomplished by most people through the proper use of certain recognized

8Ibid., p. 107.

9Ibid., p. 107.
sources of social power, among the principal ones being: occupation, education, talent, and the exercise of skill in a variety of social and technical activities such as the successful manipulation of people and highly prized symbols.\textsuperscript{10}

Whatever the source of social power, says Warner, it must be transformed into behavior acceptable to the superior levels, in order that the individual may achieve the approval and social acceptance necessary for social advancement.\textsuperscript{11}

We turn now away from Warner himself and to one of his associates. In the type of analysis found in the stratification studies of the Warner school, an outstanding one is found in the 1949 volume, Democracy in Jonesville. In a chapter on social mobility by Carson McGuire, a penetrating discussion of mobility is presented which goes much deeper into the phenomenon than the comparatively limited reference usually found in the literature.\textsuperscript{12} McGuire's analysis is unusually penetrating because it investigates not only the conditions which must be met if mobility is to occur, but also the motivations which must be present if the individual is to experience mobility.

McGuire's analysis is based on an examination of the mobility patterns of individuals (and their families) in his study sample as they rose upward. Utilizing clues gained from these case studies, he generalizes

\textsuperscript{10}See ibid., pp. 108-109.

\textsuperscript{11}See ibid., p. 109. One form of acceptable behavior, of course, is leadership behavior.

about uniform factors and patterns in mobility. Broadly speaking, he finds that mobility results from changed social behavior and social relationships on the part of the individual. Flexible social behavior and relationships become characteristic of the mobile. McGuire feels that such changes can be studied in two ways. Accordingly, he makes a distinction between manifest mobility and potential mobility. Manifest mobility refers to that which has already occurred, and potential (latent) mobility refers to the factors which might make vertical mobility occur in the future. (In leadership theory these distinctions would apply to manifest leadership and potential leadership).

McGuire examines a number of instances of actual manifest mobility by individuals in certain families. Those who had improved their social status had deviated from other family members in educational attainment and occupation. They had also transferred their group memberships and clique affiliations as well as revised their social roles. Although McGuire suggests that these several factors are interrelated and interdependent, he feels that a change in one factor does not occur without some degree of change in the others.

Concerning the conditions which must be met if mobility is to occur, McGuire lists six as follows:

1. The first condition is that the individual must attain a high achievement level. The two basic areas for achievement are (1) obtaining an education, and (2) finding a suitable level in the occupational hierarchy. Success in both these areas is almost indispensable for the mobile individual.

2. Personal talent is also important for the mobile individual. The possession of some special talent setting one apart from others,
affords social intercourse with persons in upper social levels. (Likewise it would afford intercourse with persons in upper occupational levels).

3. Another condition is that associated with learning approved social techniques. The individual must be capable of changing the ways he thinks, feels and acts. He must be able to select behavior patterns which find approval in the upper social (and occupational) levels, while discarding disapproved behavior. In other words, he must conform to the behavioral expectations associated with persons of the social (and occupational) level to which he seeks admittance.

4. The aspirant needs also to reflect status anxiety. He should maintain a constant concern with getting ahead in the world and not become self-satisfied. In balancing the satisfactions of the status he is seeking against those of the position he already holds, he must recognize the superiority of the former.

5. In addition, an individual must learn the proper situational responses, i.e., he must situationally adopt the role behavior associated with the higher status he desires.

6. Finally, the individual must feel a sense of emotional deprivation. He must conclude that his emotional needs are not being fulfilled entirely through membership in the groups with which he is affiliated, and that they would be realized through membership in the groups to which he aspires.

McGuire feels that these six conditions were present in some combination in the case of every person he studied who was in the process of experiencing mobility. To all intents and purposes it might seem that McGuire had answered the question as to what makes people mobile; but he
also found these same conditions present in persons who were not experiencing upward mobility.

McGuire, therefore, searched for another kind of answer to the question of what makes some people more mobile than others. He sought this answer in terms of the presence or absence of motivational factors. Four kinds of these factors were typically present or absent. First, there may be self-motivation in which the individual is able to make and follow of his own accord decisions concerning behavior patterns different from those of the family in which he was reared. Second, a person may be motivated by his family toward the attainment of a higher social or occupational level. Third, there may be a combination of self-family motivation, which facilitates matters for the individual very much, obviously. Finally, the individual may be motivated by experiences with other persons (for example, some boyhood ideal).

There is considerable logic to McGuire's thesis and it is related to another theory of the Warner school, namely, that social mobility is facilitated through the development of family, clique and organizational contacts. If an individual (and his family) are able to associate with individuals (and their families) on upper social and occupational levels, and if he is able to join their organizations, he is afforded much opportunity for learning their behavior patterns and otherwise ingratiating himself and making himself useful. The clique is emphasized more than family or organizations as a mobility device of this nature. Typically, the clique is an informal association, without explicit rules, membership,

time or place of meeting, and with no elected officers or leaders and no specifically stated purposes. Warner and Lunt consider the clique a mobility device **par excellence**, since all members know each other intimately and participate in frequent face-to-face relations. Once one gains admittance to a clique composed of people from the upper social and occupational strata, he is afforded maximum opportunity for assimilating their attitudes, skills and other characteristics. (Anyone who has observed managerial executives in action knows that they are as clique-ridden as any other groups of people who are striving for social power and prestige).

It was noted earlier that there is a scarcity in the literature of community studies of social mobility as it affects social stratification. The studies of the Warner group are among the few that are available. They reveal certain conditions, motivations and devices which make some individuals more socially mobile than others. By implication these same factors would make some individuals more occupationally mobile than others. We turn now to a specific focus on occupational mobility as that form of social mobility with which the present study is more directly concerned.

**Occupational Mobility: Definitions and Types**

Since the American Dream of success is positively equated with occupational success, **occupational mobility** has come to be accepted as one of the principal forms of social mobility in American society. However, if we are to avoid the confusion which leads some scholars to

---

14Ibid., pp. 110-111.
deplore diminishing opportunities for occupational mobility in our society while others are decrying the consequences of increased mobility, we should be explicit concerning the various forms which occupational mobility may take. In 1954 Theodore Caplow published an excellent volume which will be very useful in our attempt at clarification. To Caplow we are indebted for the basis of the discussion of occupational mobility which follows.

The simplest form of vertical occupational mobility is a change of occupation, which in turn, involves a change in social position, as when a wage worker becomes a businessman. Another form of vertical mobility is intergenerational occupational change, usually studied as the correlation between the occupations of fathers and sons. A third type of vertical mobility is that within an occupational group associated with age and length of service, usually referred to as seniority. A fourth type involves promotion (or demotion) within an occupational group, as when a supervisor is made a managerial executive (or when a foreman reverts to being an operator). It is on the first and fourth of these types of mobility that this study will focus, that is, vertical mobility into and within the occupational field of managerial executives.

There remains another important type of vertical occupational mobility, involving the ascent or descent of an entire occupational group, as when foremen are given more or less voice in management.

This is an important phenomenon, according to Caplow, but he considers it more an aspect of occupational change than of mobility.

Horizontal mobility, being a change in function, affects both the technical and social skills associated with group membership. It may also take several distinct forms. The simplest form involves a change in employment within the same occupational field without promotion or demotion, as when a manager is permanently transferred from one department to another in the same company. A second type of horizontal mobility is a change in occupational position which involves new and different functional activities, as when rotational assignment is used by management for training purposes prior to possible promotion. There is a third category of intergenerational horizontal mobility in which comparison is made between fathers and sons, rather than between successive stages in individual careers. The final form of horizontal mobility involves either migration in search of an occupation of equivalent or higher rank or geographical transfer entailed in the occupation itself.

Among managerial executives on whom this study focuses, most vertical occupational mobility is a result of hierarchical promotion. Further discussion of promotion as a mobility device will be reserved for later.

Education and Occupational Mobility

With increasing specialization in business, industry, administration and other occupational fields, education has become an increasingly important initial requirement and implementing factor in occupational mobility.
It will be recalled that W. Lloyd Warner previously implied that the American worker could no longer expect to achieve occupational success with anything like the same probability as his father and grandfather. Concerning occupation as a form of mobility, Warner says:

At one time occupation, particularly in business enterprise, was the principal route used for the upward climb of those who were ambitious. For young men preparing for life, this out-ranked all others as the route to advancement, success and higher status. The ambitious needed only to start at the bottom of the ladder, learn what they had to do in each job, apprentice themselves for the job above, and be assured that, with the necessary talent, it was likely that they would continue to advance toward their goals.

Our studies at the present time indicate that something has happened to this route to success, for occupation as a means of mobility is diminishing in importance. In fact, it is no longer the principal form of mobility.

What Warner obviously means is that mere entry into and apprenticeship in an occupation no longer, of themselves, insure occupational mobility for he says later that education has become more important than occupation as the surest route to success. What Warner also apparently means to imply is that education is becoming an increasingly important factor in the acquisition of social power in a society which is more and more occupationally specialized and specialized within occupations. The acquisition of education per se does not necessarily make an individual more socially or occupationally mobile. It is a

---


17 Ibid., pp.-110-111.

18 See ibid., p. 113.
means to an end rather than an end in itself, and must be applied occupationally in order to receive social recognition. We disagree with Warner's statement that occupation is no longer the principal form of mobility. We maintain that occupational mobility is still one of the principal forms of social mobility, and that education has simply become an increasingly important initial requirement and implementing factor. The question could be asked, "Education for whom, in what kinds of skills, for what occupation?", but we will not attempt to debate the question here.19

In his much discussed 1951 book, White Collar, C. Wright Mills makes some pertinent observations concerning education as a means up the occupational ladder when he says:

"In the new society, the meaning of education has shifted from status and political spheres to economic and occupational areas.... The educational segment of the individual's career becomes a key to his entire occupational fate.

Formal requirements for entry into different jobs and expectations of ascent tend to become fixed by educational levels .... As the virtues and talents of the entrepreneur are replaced by the skills of the educated expert, formal education becomes central to social and economic success."20

According to Mills, then, education becomes not only a formal requirement for entry into an occupation, but also an important implementing factor in occupational mobility and means to the end of occupational success, as we have said.


One of the few empirical studies of the effects of education on occupational mobility from an intergenerational standpoint is that of Richard Centers in 1949. Centers found that the overall effect of education on sons having better occupational statuses than their fathers was apparent, but the results were inconclusive because of the fact that the educational requirements at different periods of time had to be considered. Whereas some occupations now require graduate training in a university, for example, a generation previously a bachelor's degree or less would have been sufficient. The most striking effect of education was on the sons of manual workers, who seemed to have outdistanced their fathers much more than had the sons of business, professional, and white collar fathers. In addition, Centers points out that education is only one of the implementing factors in occupational mobility, as we have previously noted.

Another empirical study of the relation of education to occupational mobility was reported by Raymond A. Mulligan in 1952. Mulligan made a large scale analysis of 1949 college enrollment trends and examined all available studies of the social origins of college students. He concluded that: (1) Social mobility through higher education in this country is a function of socio-economic background, which is the determinant of who goes to college, (2) Increased college

---


enrollments do not automatically mean increased social mobility, and
(3) Opportunities for social mobility through higher education alone
are limited by the selective nature of higher education itself and
also by the diminishing relative value of a college education as more
and more individuals receive it.

The findings of Mulligan are additional evidence that some­
thing in addition to education per se is necessary for the achievement
of social and occupational mobility.

Studies of Mobility Trends

We have reviewed the pertinent literature on social mobility,
defined types of occupational mobility as a principal form of social
mobility, and reviewed the effects of education on social and occupa­
tional mobility. It now seems appropriate to review recent trends in
occupational mobility in the United States. (It should be borne in
mind that trends in social mobility are equated by most scholars with
trends in occupational mobility because objective data on the latter
are more readily available).

In the discussion of trends which follows we have been ex­
tremely fortunate in the appearance of Eli Chinoy's excellent article
on the subject in the April, 1955, issue of the American Sociological
Review as this chapter was being written. 23 The discussion of trends
which follows is a condensation of Chinoy's article with appropriate
footnote references and parenthetic additions.

23Eli Chinoy, "Social Mobility Trends in the United States,"
Chinoy states that, because of the growing awareness among sociologists of the inadequacy of the available data, a reappraisal of our knowledge concerning possible changes in the rate of upward mobility in American society is called for. Only in this way, says Chinoy, can we avoid confusion, see the gaps in our knowledge, and define the direction which research should take.

Research on social mobility has usually focused upon movement in the occupational hierarchy. This has been true because no other type of data has been as amenable to systematic analysis. In addition, occupational data are relevant to all theories of social stratification utilized by contemporary sociologists. This is so even for the Marxists, to whom occupational mobility is roughly equivalent to social mobility, if occupations are classified according to their relationship to the means of production. For the Weberians, occupational mobility is directly related to determining life-chances in the market place. There is a mass of evidence which demonstrates a high correlation between occupational position and various criteria of social class, such as prestige, power, wealth, income and style of life. (These are often assumed to be criteria of objective career success). Although there is some disagreement concerning the relative importance of these criteria, occupation is more likely to influence them than they are to influence occupation.

The analysis of occupational mobility, says Chinoy, has taken two forms, inferential and direct. In the inferential form, conclusions about trends are inferred from the facts of institutional, structural and demographic change. (There is another type of inferential analysis
which Chinoy does not mention, namely, inferences made as a result of speculation concerning changes in the success ideology). In the second form of mobility analysis which Chinoy mentions, social origins and career patterns are compared. These direct studies fall into three categories: (1) research into social origins and career patterns of specific occupational groups, usually those at the top of the occupational ladder; (2) investigations of mobility in samples drawn from specific localities; (3) a study by Richard Centers of a sample drawn from the total population.

---


Chinoy says that the direct studies of occupational mobility trends which encompassed all occupations found that the general tendency was for more sons to be located on their fathers' occupational level than on any other. However, he says that specific comparisons are difficult to draw for several reasons: (1) there is considerable variation in the occupational categories used, the only consistent classification being skilled workers; (2) little information is available about the specific localities in which the studies were carried out, and it is questionable whether they are typical of the larger society; (3) each investigation covered different periods of time—for example, Davidson and Anderson, 1933-1934; Centers, 1945; Bendix, Lipset and Malm, 1949-1950; Rogoff, both 1905-1912 and 1938-1941.

Chinoy considers the question of whether or not the mobility rate is declining debatable, and concludes with the statement that obviously more research is needed concerning various factors which affect mobility rates. The present study is concerned only indirectly with general mobility trends. Therefore we will shift our survey of the literature to studies of how individual mobility is achieved.

Theories and Studies of Mobility Achievement

Concerning the relationship of studies of mobility trends to individual career advancement, Chinoy makes this direct statement: "Most of these studies deal with intergenerational mobility, that is, changes in occupation from father to son. Much less attention has been given to career advancement, that is, movement from occupation to
occupation during the life-time of individuals." It might be added that too little attention has been given to the social factors in the achievement by the individual of promotion within an occupational hierarchy, it being too often assumed that it results from merit alone.

Among various theories related to career advancement, Miller and Form offer two contrasting theories of what they call "career causation," a term which is apparently equivalent to career determination. First, there is an individual causation theory of career patterns, and second, there is a social causation theory of career patterns. The theory of individual causation expresses the belief that personal motivation and hard work explain the career pattern, and that occupational success can be achieved regardless of social background. In contrast, the theory of social causation expresses the belief that a network of interrelated social factors is associated with career causation and career success.

Miller and Form state that there is a direct relationship between occupational level and (1) father's occupation, (2) intelligence of the individual, (3) father's income and education, (4) financial aid and influential contacts, and (5) social and economic conditions. To quote Miller and Form directly:

28Chinoy, op. cit., p. 184. (Underscoring supplied).

An accurate weighing of the facts will demonstrate that the social background of the individual is a base of opportunities and limitations. As opportunities are enlarged, the possibilities of occupational mobility are increased. Personal motivation and work are necessary to an enlarging career pattern. However, there is good evidence that the social backgrounds of workers are the crucial determiners of the number who are able to come into various occupational levels. The reservoir of human ability among all socio-economic levels is greater than is generally assumed. The discounting of ability goes on because observers are unable to visualize the possible growth of millions of workers who, if placed within the kind of social settings which have been shown to be correlated with the upper occupational classifications, would acquire new outlooks, motivations and work skills.30

According to Miller and Form then, social background, native ability, historical circumstance, and individual attributes are the influences determining any person's career, and these forces intertwine and push and pull with different intensities until, when the individual attains approximately forty years of age, they seem to become equilibrated.

As we develop our review of the literature on the achievement of mobility we turn naturally to one of the better textbooks on social relations in industry, the 1951 revision of Wilbert E. Moore's volume on Industrial Sociology.31 While Moore focuses centrally on the industrial environment, much of what he writes applies as well to any business or administration which is bureaucratically organized. (The classic analysis of bureaucratic organization, of course, is that of Max Weber, which need not be gone into here). Moore's discussion of

30 Ibid., p. 739.

the nature of industrial managerial mobility applies also to business and administrative management.

Specialization is characteristic of any bureaucracy, and, as Moore points out, personnel are assigned rights and duties, following the principle of the division of labor, according to differential native abilities, training and occupational interests. These rights and duties are assigned persons by virtue of their incumbency in positions which are hierarchically arranged according to relative importance. Authority, as it pertains to these positions, becomes functional. The functional organization is known as the formal organization, but no organization can function without communication. Much of this communication is social interaction. Out of social interaction an informal system of relationships arises.

Moore points out that: "Over and beyond the officially expected rights and duties, lines of authority, and rigidly defined formal relationships, any managerial system is characterized by a great variety of informal, unofficial activities, attitudes, sentiments and symbols." This results in an inevitable informal organization paralleling the formal organization. It is in the informal organization that individual "personalities" influence people as contrasted with the formal influence of the authority associated with positional rights and duties. The executive is not necessarily the most skilled person in the

32 Ibid., p. 68.

33 Ibid., p. 102.
organization, but he is presumably the most skilled coordinator.\(^{34}\)

This coordinative skill is, in part, a function of his personality.

If a junior executive wishes to become occupationally mobile, i.e., promotable, he must learn not only the technical requirements of his office and those of other offices, but must also learn the appropriate social behavior associated with his formal position.\(^{35}\)

(This principle is constantly illustrated in the recurrent emphasis by management on the necessity for "getting along with people"). The process of learning appropriate social behavior is one of the main reasons why "cliques" appear, says Moore. He further says that cliques have more of a tendency to appear when there are poorly defined criteria of job success. Job performance can be judged according to well defined standards, but it is rarely judged exclusively by these standards. Concerning the effect of cliques in competitive situations, Moore has this to say:

Irrelevant considerations, such as nationality, fraternal affiliation, family connections and a host of others, may thus play into the relationships between functionaries. Intensified solidarities and intensified antagonisms come to mark the social interaction of persons who are presumably expected to carry on certain activities in an impersonal fashion....

The clique functions to reduce purely individual competition through the substitution of group action and to establish standards of conduct that are well understood, even though at complete variance with the primary objectives of the organization as a whole....\(^{36}\)

\(^{34}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 106.}\)

\(^{35}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 139.}\)

\(^{36}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 141.}\)
Thus clique membership would seem to be an important factor in promotability and what we shall call here "within-occupation vertical mobility."

Moore makes some very interesting observations concerning the relationship between what he refers to as "trained incapacity" (a term borrowed from Thorstein Veblen) and promotion. The way to the top in a bureaucratic structure being through promotion, there is decreased possibility of purely impersonal competition because promotion depends so much upon the personal judgment of superiors. Where favoritism, nepotism and clique politics are operating, bureaucracies customarily resort to the seniority principle. Nevertheless, unless the experience of those senior in the organization actually fits them for occupying higher positions, the individual who has effectively mastered the demands of his position, and who, through long habituation, has thoroughly internalized the special attitudes appropriate to that position, has a trained incapacity for other positions.37 This individual, if he is outside the clique structure, is apt to have further vertical mobility blocked by his own trained incapacity, despite his seniority.

Foremen and first-line supervisors of long service often find themselves in a similar position as far as promotability is concerned. The foreman or first line supervisor has usually risen from the ranks of the workers, and is apt to find himself in the uncomfortable middle-ground "between the devil and the deep blue sea," since he represents

37Ibid., pp. 144-145.
management to the worker and the worker to management.

We have said previously that in business, industry and administration, upon which this study focuses, most vertical occupational mobility results from hierarchic promotion. We return now to Caplow in elaborating this principle, and quote him directly:

The essential element in hierarchic promotion is that promotion depends on the judgment, and hence the good will, of one's superiors....

The more serious the individual's involvement in his occupational milieu, the greater will be his dependence upon his superiors....

The effect of this dependence is, in general, to magnify the consequences of errors and malfeasances, and to encourage a high degree of conformity to the will of superiors. This conformity need not be brutally exacted. Many industrial studies have described the exaggerated sensitivity to the behavior of the boss which is characteristic of the work situation.38

It seems therefore that the good will of one's superiors is an essential factor in being selected for promotion, but the good will of superiors can be obtained in other ways than by the demonstration of job competence alone. In this connection, Caplow says:

The official ideology of any hierarchy necessarily includes the insistence that all promotions are determined by merit and achievement. Popular insight counters with the wistful or derisory observation that all promotions are nepotistic. Both positions are correct. A functioning hierarchy which wishes to stay in business must necessarily consider the talents of candidates in making its selections. But.... any such hierarchy will also evaluate the candidate as a potential in-group member, and will therefore give special attention to his congeniality in the broadest sense—a factor which depends upon his ability to conform to the habits and standards

38 Caplow, op. cit., pp. 68-69.
of his elders, and also upon the quality of his ancestors, his relatives and his friends.39

The requirements underscored above obviously result from the face-to-face relationships which are an essential part of group life and are derived from the natural tendency of the group to enforce norm conformity, norms being defined as informal rules of conduct. In addition there are other qualities related to group expectations which serve to make some persons more promotable than others. Concerning these, Caplow has this to say:

Other secondary qualities which typically figure in hierarchic promotion are appearance, skills of sociability (including sexual attractiveness), religious and athletic affiliations, participation in formal and informal associations, miscellaneous talents for oratory, poker, golf, or judiciously conspicuous consumption....

Thus the elders are inclined to select those who are like themselves in general appearance and who, in addition, have demonstrated specific ability to conform to hierarchic expectations, to render personal services to their sponsors, to conduct themselves prudently in internecine conflicts, and to maintain the interests of the group against all outsiders....

The net effect of hierarchic organization is to bring to the fore persons who have carefully shaped themselves to conform to group norms imposed by authority....40

Caplow goes so far as to venture that, even at the time of employment, formal job qualifications are so standardized that, in addition to them:

... the most important differentiating factors arise out of personal relationships.... The individual's chances for advancement

39 Ibid., p. 71 (underscoring supplied).

40 Ibid., p. 72.
or for the good fellowship of his fellows, depend much more upon his personal relationships than upon his work performance whose variability is strictly limited....41

We consider Caplow's observations very pertinent to our theoretical frame of reference, but we turn now to another study of an actual empirical nature which we consider even more highly relevant to our present research. This is Melville Dalton's 1951 report on the informal factors in the career achievement of 226 individuals at several levels in management in an actual industrial environment.42 The validity of Dalton's study was enhanced by the fact that he was an actual participant observer over a considerable period of time, and complete statistical data were available to him.

Dalton calls attention to the belief common in the United States that social background and personal relations are important in occupational promotion, i.e., such factors as "pull," "connections," "family contacts," "nationality," "religious faith," etc. Dalton's specific problem was to find out what factors were actually operating in the selection and promotion of individuals in this particular managerial hierarchy. He first attacked the problem by studying formal statements in the managerial handbooks, supplemented by formal statements by high, responsible officers. Both sources indicated that the essential formal qualities for promotion were ability (variously defined), honesty, cooperation, and industry. But these official expressions were confidentially challenged by many well-informed, reliable individuals throughout

41Ibid., p. 86.

the managerial hierarchy who expressed the belief that other factors were often of much greater importance in achieving promotion.

Ascertaining the truth or falsity of these privately expressed beliefs, however, was very difficult because of the secrecy surrounding such matters. Accordingly, Dalton made a further three-fold approach to the problem by:

(a) Examining such objective factors as age, occupational experience, years of service, amount and character of education, etc., on the assumption that these factors would be of importance in a bureaucracy in which position in the structure might be thought to correlate fairly highly with training, experience and related factors.

(b) Getting confidential information and judgments from trustworthy intimates among managers.

(c) Showing objectively, as far as possible, the significance of the informal factors, such as, being a member of specific organizations, having a certain religion, having a certain ethnic make-up etc. 43

Dalton found that age and years of experience as criteria for selection and promotion were not functioning in this particular plant. However, education was significantly correlated with managerial rank, which suggested that education and training were related to managerial skills and probably a criterion for advancement. But, only a minority of managers were in positions relevant to their schooling, while a majority were in positions not related to their formal training. The

43 Ibid., p. 408.
significance of this was difficult for Dalton to assess, but he hypothesized that formal education generally increased the desire for status and a higher style of life, with resultant eagerness to seize upon advantages and create favorable impressions. (At this point, we are again reminded that formal education is only one factor, although an important one, in implementing career advancement). On the other hand, Dalton found that age, length of service and formal education showed such irregularities that neither the maximum or minimum of any of them were definite criteria for promotion. In view of the above findings, Dalton concluded that:

The data on occupational experience showed no definite formal procedure for selection of the managers. In the absence of such a method, selection to a large extent was carried on informally, with personnel rising from lower strata by conforming to social characteristics of personnel in upper strata, the chief criteria (varying as dominant groups of personnel changed through time) being ethnicity, religion, participation in specific out-plant social activities, political affiliation, and membership in accepted secret societies.44

We have said that we consider Dalton's study very significantly related to our present research. However, over-generalizations from it should not be made because of obvious plant-to-plant and locality-to-locality variations in social environments and objective criteria for promotion. Nevertheless, Dalton's findings do lead us to suspect that we will find informal factors of the same general nature operating with relative importance in the career progress of the individuals to be included in our present research.

44Ibid., p. 415.
Dalton has shown that there are differences in the beliefs that individuals hold concerning the factors influencing promotion and career advancement. There are two studies by Richard Centers which it would be appropriate to mention in this connection. One has to do with commonly held attitudes and beliefs in relation to occupational stratification, and the other concerns the motives which affect aspirations for occupational mobility. In 1945, Centers studied the attitudes and values of 1,100 male adult whites. His study of the opinions and beliefs of these persons, categorized into various occupational strata, indicated that individuals in higher income groups (like executives) believed that success is due to ability, while individuals in lower income groups (like supervisors and foremen) believed that success is due to luck, "pull" or superior opportunities. His analysis of motivational aspects indicated that men's desires, satisfactions, aspirations and goals are conditioned or determined by their present roles, statuses and levels of achievement as these are manifested in their placement in diverse occupational strata.

Dalton's subjects apparently believed that informal factors had the most influence in occupational mobility, and Centers' subjects apparently believed that ability on the one hand and luck, pull or superior opportunities on the other were the primary determinants of


occupational mobility. Nevertheless, the American open-class ideology holds that occupational mobility is governed, in large part, by impersonal competition. In this connection, we return to Wilbert E. Moore for a discussion of how this so-called impersonal competition actually operates.\textsuperscript{47}

According to Moore, the open-class ideology assumes equal competitive opportunity for all, and expects the individual to take part in an impersonal competition governed by well understood rules. The ideology also assumes that every individual has risen to that position in the occupational hierarchy which he rightly ought to occupy. Yet, there is factual evidence, says Moore, that there is notable inequality of opportunity prevailing in actual competition. In addition to inequalities resulting from favoritism, nepotism, family connections, inheritance and income, there has been general transference to the sons of the propensities and cultural outlook of the fathers' occupations or occupational categories.\textsuperscript{48} There are also various structural limitations on the number of available positions open at the top of any highly bureaucratic organization. In addition the increased complexity of many of the higher positions serves to make specialized training an important factor in occupational mobility.

\textsuperscript{47}Moore, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 578-588.

\textsuperscript{48}Cf. Davidson and Anderson, \textit{op cit.}, and F. W. Taussig and C. S. Joslyn, \textit{American Business Leaders}. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932. (The latter showed that, in 1932, business executives were being increasingly recruited from the sons of business leaders).
(For example, potential executives are being increasingly enrolled in special courses at institutions like the Harvard School of Business Administration). Many higher positions are filled directly from colleges and technical schools. Nevertheless, Moore maintains that belief in the open-class ideology has an integrating and stabilizing effect, since it is real in effect if it is thought to be real. Whatever the numerical odds against advancement, it always is possible.

We have referred previously to C. Wright Mills' much discussed book, *White Collar*. In his provocative chapter on "Success," Mills maintains that a new middle-class ideology has arisen to replace the older open-class ideology which we have been discussing. He claims that there has been a change in the success ideology in our society. He says that while success has been a widespread phenomenon, an engaging image, a driving motive and a way of life, yet "in the middle of the twentieth century, it has become less a widespread fact, more confused as image, often dubious as motive and soured as a way of life." We must remember that Mills is describing a so-called "new middle-class ideology," but nevertheless these are poignant words. This conclusion on Mills' part is based on his analysis of the popular success literature rather than on empirical evidence. He says:

The success literature has shifted with the success pattern. It still focuses upon personal virtues, but they are not the sober virtues once imputed to successful entrepreneurs. Now

49Mills, *White Collar*, Chapter XII.

50Ibid., p. 259.
the stress is on agility rather than on ability, on "getting along" in a context of associates, superiors and rules, rather than "getting ahead" across an open market; on who you know rather than what you know; on techniques of self-display and the generalized knack of handling people, rather than on moral integrity, substantive accomplishment and solidity of person; on loyalty to or even identity with one's own firm, rather than entrepreneurial virtuosity. The best bet is the style of the efficient executive, rather than the drive of the entrepreneur.51

When we witness motion pictures and television programs and read the popular literature or even some of the literature published by management, we realize that there are many grains of truth in what Mills has said above. Concerning the "tarnished image of success" as portrayed in the popular literature, Mills goes on to say this:

In the last twenty years, a new style of inspirational literature relevant to a new style of aspiration has risen in the United States.... As a literature of resignation, it strives to control goals and ways of life by lowering the level of ambition, and by replacing the older goals with more satisfying internal goals....

This is accomplished negatively by tarnishing the old image of success.... the externally successful are portrayed as internal failures....

Positively, the new literature of inspiration holds out internal virtues in line with a relaxed consumer's life rather than a tense producer's.... the literature of resignation justifies the lowering of ambition and the slackening of the old frenzy.52

If such a lowered level of ambition does exist, as Mills implies above, it could naturally be an important motivating factor in the relative desires of individuals to climb the occupational ladder. However, an important implication of the so-called "new middle-class ideology"

51 Ibid., p. 263.
52 Ibid., pp. 282-283.
is brought out by Mills when he says:

There is a curious contradiction about the ethos of success in America today. On the one hand, there are still compulsions to struggle, to "amount to something"; on the other, there is a poverty of desire, a souring of the image of success.

The literature of resignation... fits in with all those institutional changes involving the goal of security and collective ways of achieving it. As insecurities become wide-spread, ... the population has groped for collective ways of regaining individual security. The most dramatic means has been the labor union but demands on government have resulted in social security and increasingly the government intervenes to shape the structure of opportunity. The governmental pension is clearly of another type of society than that of the standard American Dream ....

While labor union pressure as a means of obtaining collective security does not apply directly to the present study because management generally is not unionized, there is the clear implication in the above quotation from Mills that, if individuals expect the government or some other agency to hand them security "on a silver platter" there is the definite possibility that the motivational factors associated with the desire for occupational mobility, as rooted in the traditional American Dream, may have been influenced negatively by the type of social change Mills mentions.

Mills also reminds us that occupational mobility is conditioned by ups and downs in the business cycle. Whereas the old ideology of success assumed that the structure of occupational opportunity was always expanding, the new ideology assumes that the structure of occupational opportunity waxes and wanes within a slump-war-boom economy. It is

---

53 Ibid., p. 285

54 Ibid., p. 278.
entirely possible that worry about possible depressions and wars causes people to be more "security-minded" and less "achievement-minded."

Finally, Mills states that the most important single factor in the new ideology of success is individual personality, which commands attention by charm, force of character or social demeanor. Getting ahead becomes a continual selling job, the product to be sold being one's own personality. "The skillful maneuver and the political approach in interorganizational contacts, the planful impressing of the business superior, becomes a kind of Machiavellism for the little man, a turning of one's self into an instrument by which to use others for the end of success."55

Mills' suggestion that the "new way" up the executive ladder is related to one's ability to sell himself in a competitive personality market undoubtedly stems from an earlier study he made of what he called the "competitive personality."56 In this earlier study Mills says that, in trying to sell himself in the personality market, the ambitious individual attempts to bring himself to the favorable attention of the men who make the decisions as he services their fears and encourages their various whims. Part of his competitive frenzy, says Mills, is due to the fact that, in his life, there are few objective criteria for success,

55 Ibid., p. 264.

the subjective criteria dearest to him being the indefinite good will of the top level chieftains and his shifting symbols of status. Another part of his frenzy is due to his fear that his function will disappear. Thus, he is constantly directed toward maintaining the good will of others as he tries to sell not only his personality but also his functional importance.57

Mills' emphasis on the selling of one's personality as a means up the success ladder reads almost as though he is taking issue with the Weberians who maintain that occupational mobility is directly related to life-chances in the economic market. On the contrary, he seems to be implying that occupational mobility is directly related to life-chances in the personality market.

Studies of Mobile Personality Types

We have mentioned earlier, and Mills has just emphasized, the importance of personality factors in the achievement of occupational mobility. We now wonder what kinds of personalities, successful and less successful managerial executives may have.

A study of comparative personality types, not so well known by sociologists but better known by students of personnel management, is a 1948 article by Burleigh Gardner on the personality characteristics of 473 executives in 14 firms in the Chicago area.58 Using the

---

57 David Riesman and Arnold Green also discuss the kind of manipulative, Machiavellian, other-directed personality which Mills has been referring to here. Elaboration of Riesman's and Green's discussions will be made later in connection with the findings of the present research.

projective Thematic Apperception Test, Gardner found that among the characteristics of successful executives were strong achievement desires; a flexible idea of authority; strong mobility drives; considerable organizing ability; decisiveness; firmness of convictions; activity and aggressiveness; a constant need to overcome a sense of frustration; a definite orientation toward reality; personal attachment to his superiors; impersonal attachment to his subordinates; and freedom from boyhood dependency on parental guidance. In the unsuccessful executives he studied, Gardner found that, in addition to commonly ascribed characteristics of laziness, stupidity, unfriendliness, inability to handle people, etc., the following were also basic liabilities: inability to "see the forest for the trees" (bogging down in details and losing sight of the big picture); failure to carry responsibilities; unconscious desire to "be someone else"; unconscious desire to "be something else"; yearning for short cuts; inability to make room for other people; resistance to authority; arrogance with subordinates; prejudices which interfere with judgment; overemphasis on work; gravitation toward self-destruction (through fear of accepting the added responsibilities associated with success); mental neuroses and nervous disorders (through fearing they are not as productive as they should be).59

One of Gardner's associates at the University of Chicago, William E. Henry, published in 1948 another study on the relationship

of executive personality to job success. Henry studied 300 executives in various types of firms in business and industry, using Rorschach ink blots and Thematic Apperception Tests. He says that the value of studying personalities in this manner arises from the fact that the successful executive's greatest abilities are in the area of ideas, dealing with people, and complex planning for future action. Henry further says the studies showed that:

**First,** there is a personality configuration, a personality type, that makes the best executive.

**Second,** where failure has occurred, it can be traced directly to certain personality characteristics.

**Third,** the presence of certain personality characteristics is of as vital importance as the presence of certain intellectual characteristics.

**Fourth,** the role of the executive in modern business has both its own rewards and its own punishments.

**Fifth,** this personality configuration is a matter of long-time development. Parts of it have been in progress since childhood.

**Sixth,** the successful utilization of this personality type depends to a large extent upon the nature of the social situation in which the executive finds himself.

The specific characteristics which Henry found in this study are elaborated upon in a later study he made of the social role of the executive. This 1949 study by Henry of more than 100 business executives in various types of enterprises is fairly well known to

---


61 Ibid., p. 4.

sociologists. In addition to the Thematic Apperception Test which he had used previously, Henry used a number of other traditional personality tests and a short undirected interview, the study being essentially socio-psychological in nature. Henry states that, because the business executive is such a central figure in the economic and social life of the United States, social pressure plus the constant demands of his business organization, direct his behavior into a mold appropriate to his socially defined role. **Success then becomes a must** associated with his whole-hearted adoption of his socially defined role. Society rewards the individual with success if his behavior conforms to role expectations, and likewise punishes him with failure if his behavior deviates from role expectations. Since role behavior cannot be considered apart from personality structure, says Henry, his study focuses on the personality communalities of the group of executives selected. Although individual uniqueness in personality characteristics was found, all of the executives seemed to have a common personality pattern substantially as follows:

**Achievement Desire.** Successful executives display high achievement desire. They consider themselves hard-working, achieving persons who **must** accomplish something in order to be happy and are continually stimulated by the pleasure of immediate accomplishment.

**Mobility Drive.** All successful executives feel the necessity for moving upward occupationally and socially, and accumulating the rewards of increased accomplishment. While some are more interested in

---

63 Ibid., pp. 287-291. This discussion of the executive personality is a condensation therefrom.
actual job accomplishment, others are more interested in social reputation and prestige.

**Conception of Authority.** The successful executive considers authority as a helpful, controlling relationship and not as a destructive, prohibitive force.

**Ability to Organize.** While successful executives vary considerably in intelligence test ratings, they all have considerable ability to organize unstructured situations and to predict future implications for their organizations. In doing this they tend to rely on proven techniques and to resist innovations.

**Decisiveness.** The successful group of executives possess this trait to a considerable degree because their roles demand it. If they show uncertainty and a lack of conviction, it is disastrous to career success.

**Self-Structure.** Successful executives are firm in their self-conceptions. They think they know what they are, what they want, and have well developed techniques for getting what they want.

**Activity and Aggression.** The successful executive is essentially striving, active and aggressive. In being so he is never overtly hostile in dealing with people. But he often cannot sublimate his aggressiveness to leisurely introspection.

**Apprehension and Fear of Failure.** Any lack of ability to solve problems and make correct decisions leads to frustration. Frustration leads to apprehension and fear of failure.

**Reality Orientation.** Successful executives are strongly oriented to immediate realities and their implications. They are therefore
continually concerned with the practical, the immediate and the direct means to ends.

**Interpersonal Relations.** The mobile and successful executive looks to his superiors with a feeling of personal attachment and tends to identify himself with them. His superiors represent to him symbols of his own achievement desires, and he tends to identify himself with the traits of those who have accomplished more than he has. He tends to view his subordinates as symbols of things he has left behind, and looks upon them in a detached impersonal way. This does not mean that he is unsympathetic, but he is most sympathetic to those who display personality traits similar to those he admires in his superiors. (He may even feel that he is, in large part, responsible for the development of these traits).

In summary, we may quote Henry directly:

The successful executive represents a crystallization of many of the attitudes and values generally accepted by middle-class American society. The values of accumulation and achievement, of self-directedness and independent thought and their rewards in prestige, status and property, are found in this group. But they also pay the price of holding these values and of profiting from them, uncertainty, constant activity, the continual fear of losing ground, the inability to be introspectively leisurely, the ever present fear of failure, and the artificial limitations put upon their interpersonal relations—these are some of the costs of this role.64

---

leadership theory, since the achievement of leadership status is closely related to the achievement of occupational mobility and career success. Both in research and in concepts about leadership, a basic difference in point of view exists. On the one hand is the concept that leadership is a characteristic trait of an individual, an ability largely independent of the situation in which it is called into play. The bulk of psychological research on leadership is concerned with the personality traits of leaders. Long lists of desirable leadership traits are compiled, many of these so-called leadership traits being equivalent but assigned different names. On the other hand, there is the concept that leadership is primarily a group phenomenon in which the characteristics of the group members and the leadership situation are as important as the traits of the leader himself.

The situational approach to the study of leadership has recently received increasing emphasis and additional validity, but a great deal of this type of research has been devoted to studying small groups and specific group situations. Much of this research has involved the manipulation of experimental variables. Relatively little of it has been concerned with the transferability of leadership from one real-life situation to another, as occurs in vertical occupational mobility. Attention was invited on the first page of this dissertation to Stogdill's 1948 conclusion that leadership problems which appear to be in need of thorough investigation are those relating to factors which condition social participation, insight into social situations, and transferability of
of leadership from one social situation to another. 65

Stogdill was led to his 1948 conclusions after reviewing 124
studies of personal factors associated with leadership in which efforts
to identify personal characteristics or traits invariably associated
with leadership behavior were comparatively unproductive. This is not
to be taken to mean that leaders have no personal characteristics in
common, for they do frequently exhibit many similar characteristics. 66
What it does mean is a new emphasis among the situationalists on view­
ing leadership, not as an invariant attribute of the personality, but
as a quality associated with an individual's role in a particular and
specified social system, small or large. 67

Prominent among the students of group phenomena is George C.
Homans. 68 Homans finds four behavioral elements universally present in
all group situations: activity, interaction, sentiments and norms. 69
It is variation in these universal elements from one group to another,
and from situation to situation, which produces situational variability
in the technical skills, social skills and personality characteristics

65Stogdill, op. cit., See also, Ralph M. Stogdill, "Leadership,

Harper and Brothers, 1950, p. 31.


68George C. Homans, The Human Group, New York: Harcourt Brace

69Ibid., pp. 34-40, 121-130. (Noms can be defined as the inform­
mal group standards and expectations which govern individual and group
behavior).
required to fulfill leadership roles. Applying the universal behav-
ioral elements mentioned above to the development of a conceptual
scheme for studying the achievement of leadership statuses in small
groups, Roland J. Pellegrin selects two elements, norms and activities,
and finds that:

In order to achieve any status in the group the prospective
member must conform to its norms....

For a person to achieve and maintain a position of prestige
and functional importance, he must conform to group norms to a
greater extent than do his fellows....

Another way in which the aspirant may achieve high status
is by taking a specialized role with respect to the activities in
which the group engages....

Norms and activities are the essential variables in a group
situation which permit members with certain characteristics to
achieve high positions....

The group structure necessarily consists of statuses which
range from low to high in functional importance....

To achieve a high status, the aspirant needs to develop those
personal characteristics which permit him to take a role of greater
functional importance....70

The observations which Pellegrin makes concerning the manner
in which leadership status is achieved in small groups generally, apply
as well to groups of executives in business, industry and administra-
tion, but we are not trying to develop a theory of leadership here. We
are briefly reviewing the situational approach to the study of group

70 Roland J. Pellegrin, "The Achievement of High Statuses and
behavior and leadership as a continuation of our search for insights.

We have gained at least one insight which we will attempt to apply later in our study, *i.e.*, vertical mobility within a managerial hierarchy may be a function of the relative degree to which an individual can successfully adopt the roles, conform to the norms and engage in the social and functional activities of persons in the next higher group in the hierarchy.

Our survey of the literature will not be complete until we have briefly mentioned the types of publications found in the personnel management and popular literature on the development of leadership potential. Generally speaking, these publications fall into two categories of the "how to" variety: (1) How to train and develop executives, and (2) How to develop one's own executive potential.

The flow of publications in the first category was given impetus by the appearance in 1950 of the work of Myles L. Mace and his associates in the Harvard School of Business Administration. Mace made an excellent, intensive study of the training and development programs of 25 large manufacturing firms which had become acutely aware during World War II of the shortage of potential executives. Of relevance to our present research are Mace's general findings that (1) There are differences in job knowledge requirements, skills and personality traits of successful executives, but all have the common ability to get things

---

done through group effort and (2) No universally applicable list of qualities for executive success was found, executive capacities and skills varying and being determined in terms of the working environment in which they are exercised.

Other major publications of the first "how to" category are those of the American Management Association and the University of Michigan, both in 1952. Of pertinence to the present study in these is the increasing use by management of job rotation as a training and development procedure. This reflects a growing awareness by top management of the situational variability of leadership requirements. The implication is that individuals who have performed well in rotational assignment and have displayed transferable technical and social skills can be expected to experience considerably more promotion and vertical occupational mobility than those who have not performed as well and have not displayed these transferable skills.

Publications of the second "how to" category usually take the form of speeches and articles by highly placed executives giving advice to young executive aspirants, or books and articles for public consumption by miscellaneous "personality experts."
Inferentially, these latter publications are related to the trait theory of leadership and tell us mainly that if an individual is able to acquire these traits, he will become more occupationally mobile and successful. They do, however, also reflect an increasing general awareness of the importance of social skills in a business and industrial society that emphasizes the necessity for "getting along with people."

Our survey of the most relevant and pertinent findings in the literature concerning how vertical occupational mobility is or may be achieved is now complete, although we will introduce other theoretical references later in connection with our approach, our study proper, and its results. We are tempted to summarize our findings and insights thus far and bring them into clearer focus. However, since they will be added to and elaborated upon as we proceed, we prefer to commence this process in the next chapter, in which we will develop our general frame of reference, approach and method of study.
CHAPTER II

METHOD OF STUDY AND THE STUDY GROUPS

Frame of Reference and Approach

It should be apparent from the selective nature of the preceding review of the relevant literature, that this research will be approached in an essentially sociological and socio-psychological frame of reference. There will be no testing of individuals nor any attempt at manipulating variables. On the contrary, the approach will emphasize a focus on real-life variables as they appear in on-going social systems in related, though unique, environments in an actual community setting. These environments will be those in which management is bureaucratically organized, positions hierarchically arranged according to functional importance and positional rights and duties more or less formally expressed. We wish to study not only the formal factors, but also, with more relative emphasis, the informal factors which influence the progress of individuals up the career ladder through time. Stated otherwise, ours will be a situational approach to the study of relative occupational mobility, with emphasis on social situations. We will proceed now to bring our findings in the literature into clearer focus as they are related to our research problem.

Social mobility, as it pertains to an individual, has been defined as movement by the individual in social space, within a rank-ordered system of social statuses. The American Dream has been referred
to as the basic motivating force in the individual's desire to achieve vertical social mobility, and it is commonly assumed that the accumulation of money alone is the chief source of social power. Yet there are other sources of social power, such as occupation, education, talent and the successful exercise of technical and social skills in the manipulation of people and symbols.

To become socially mobile an individual must obtain an education, find a suitable occupational level and apply some special talent setting him apart from others at that level. He must also learn the approved social techniques and behavior patterns associated with his present level and the higher level to which he aspires and he must be able situationally to adopt new role behavior. Being motivated by status anxiety and feeling a sense of emotional deprivation in his present role and status, he must also feel that his aspirations will be realized in the higher role and status which he desires. His motivation may be increased of his own accord or through the influence of his family and/or other persons whom he would like to please or emulate. If the individual can develop influential family, organizational and clique contacts, his social mobility is facilitated.

Occupational mobility, as a principal form of social mobility, can be both horizontal and vertical. Vertical occupational mobility results from entry into and ascent within a particular occupational field. Education, as an initial requirement and implementing factor in occupational ascent, is more important than it was a generation ago, but education per se does not assure occupational mobility.

Studies of mobility trends have usually been intergenerational
in nature and throw little light on how career advancement is achieved within the life-time of individuals. There are two theories of individual career determination, one maintaining that personal motivation, hard work and merit explain career progress, and the other maintaining that an interrelated network of social factors causes career progress. The most reasonable compromise theory is that a combination of abilities, historical circumstances, individual attributes and social factors determine an individual's career progress, and that his career pattern begins to be stabilized when he reaches about forty years of age.

In bureaucratically organized managerial hierarchies, the formal demands of the organization require that satisfactory job performance be displayed by the individual in order that he fulfill his functional responsibilities. But, an informal social organization inevitably springs up alongside the formal organization, in which personal attributes and social factors are of major importance. It is in this social situation that individual "personalities" influence people as contrasted with the formal influence of functional authority, rights and duties. **Successful managerial behavior must be situationally and socially appropriate in addition to being functionally appropriate.** Career success, then, is rarely judged on meritorious job performance alone. Additional criteria of career success include social background, nationality and religious background, formal and informal group memberships, clique affiliations, ability to conform to the habits, standards, expectations and behavior patterns of superiors, and other factors in the social environment. The existence of these secondary criteria of success forces us to adopt a situational approach to their identification and understanding.
In most managerial hierarchies, vertical occupational mobility is a result of positional promotion in a presumably impersonal competitive situation. Since promotion depends not only on meritorious job performance but also on the good will of one's superiors, the individual is constantly motivated toward being in his superior's good graces. Whereas the old success ideology maintained that hard work and merit alone would insure promotion, there is evidence of a "new success ideology" which stresses the individual personality as a means of obtaining and maintaining the good will of those who make the promotions and thereby determine individual career progress. In a competitive promotional situation, then, the individual's career progress is conditioned not only by his meritorious job performance but also by his ability to sell his functional importance and his personality in a competitive personality market.

The individual's relative desire to sell his functional importance and personality may be affected negatively by a lowering of aspirations in line with this so-called "new ideology of success." There is evidence in the "new ideology" that people, in general, and particularly those of the middle classes, may be becoming more "security-minded" and less "achievement minded." There also is evidence in the popular literature that success through ability and hard work may be becoming less sought after than success through devious means and various manipulative "personality skills."

Studies of mobile personality types reveal that the career success of many managerial executives is a function of the manner in which they fulfill expectations associated with their social roles, in addition
to those associated with their functional roles. To mobile executives success becomes a must. Society and organizations reward the individual with success if his behavior conforms to role expectations, and he is considered a failure if his behavior deviates from them. He is motivated by a high achievement desire and mobility drive but he is continually apprehensive and fearful of failure. He conceives his authority as a helpful relationship, has considerable ability to organize, is decisive, active and aggressive, knows what he wants and how to get it, is strongly oriented toward reality, considers his superiors as symbols of his own achievement desires and regards his subordinates as symbols of things he has left behind. Presumably, then, less successful managerial types are lacking in some or all of these personal attributes and do not fulfill their role expectations as well.

While the personality attributes mentioned above are "traits" common to most successful executives, recent studies of leadership tend to discard the trait theory approach in favor of a situational approach in terms of group memberships and the leadership environment. Few of these studies, however, explain how leadership is transferred from one situation to another. If leadership is studied in terms of norms, activities and role expectations, then a more fruitful approach would view vertical mobility within a managerial hierarchy as a function of the relative degree to which an individual can successfully adopt the roles, conform to the norms and engage in the social and functional activities of persons in the next higher group in the hierarchy.

Studies of programs for developing executive potential by management show that there are situational differences in job knowledge,
skills and personality traits required. For achieving executive success, however, one universal requirement is the ability to get things done through group effort. These studies also show that there is no universally applicable list of qualities for executive success, the capacities and skills of successful executives varying and being determined in terms of the working environment in which they are exercised.

Wherever we have turned in the literature we see evidence, and implications between the lines, that occupational mobility and career success "depend on the situation"! If an individual is to achieve mobility, he must have an education appropriate to the occupational situation to which he aspires; he must have functional abilities and capacities appropriate to the higher situation; he must have the attitudes and values of persons in the higher situation; he must adopt the behavior patterns and conform to the role expectations of persons in the higher situation; he must be motivated by himself or others to aspire to the higher situation; his organizational and clique affiliations must receive the approval of persons in the higher situation; he must outsell his competitors in the situational personality market; he must have the ability to get things done through group effort in a social situation. Our findings in the literature, then, focus directly or indirectly on a situational approach to the understanding of occupational mobility.

We have said that we would add to and elaborate upon our previously mentioned findings in the literature as we proceed. We consider it now appropriate to "dust off," so to speak, several older and well
known sociological concepts which we consider relevant to our frame of reference.

We are at once reminded that the "situational approach" in social psychology was given great impetus long ago by W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki in their five classic volumes on The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (1918-1920). The study was later republished in two volumes in 1927. (Herbert Blumer made an excellent summary appraisal of this monumental work in 1939). To Thomas and Znaniecki we are indebted for their famous concepts of "the definition of the situation," "attitudes and values" and "the four wishes." In The Unadjusted Girl (1923), Thomas clarifies what is meant by the "definition of the situation," when he says:

Preliminary to any self determined act of behavior there is always a stage of examination and deliberation which we may call "the definition of the situation." And actually not only concrete acts are dependent on the definition of the situation, but gradually a whole life policy and the personality of the individual himself follow from a series of such definitions.

The attitudes and values of individuals are conditioned by their differential definitions of a series of situations and, according to Thomas, their behavior is motivated, in part, by the four wishes which he explains as follows:

---


The human wishes have a great variety of concrete forms but are capable of the following general classification:

1. The desire for new experiences.
2. The desire for security.
3. The desire for response.
4. The desire for recognition.

If we relate these four wishes or desires to the desire for career advancement, Thomas provides us with clues to some of the kinds of motivational factors which we may find later in our research proper, although they are by no means the only kinds of motivational factors we expect to find.

References in our survey of the literature to the importance of role playing in accordance with role expectations, remind us of Charles H. Cooley's and George H. Mead's theories of the genesis of the self— the reflected or "looking glass self" and the "taking of the attitude of the other toward the self"— which are so well known to sociologists that they hardly seem necessary to footnote specifically. There is the clear implication that individual occupational mobility may be a function of one's ability to critically reflect upon himself, to anticipate what roles "the other" (his superior) and "the generalized other" (superiors in general) wish him to adopt and to present a self that will win the approval of superior others and result in career advancement. This concept is very much akin to the more recent notion, mentioned previously,

---

3Ibid., p. 4.

that the individual's career advancement is a function of his ability to "sell himself" and his personality through flexible role playing in anticipation of the approval of others.

We are also impressed with Robert L. Merton's and Alice Kitt's discussion of "reference group theory" as it is related to our situational approach to understanding differential occupational promotion. Their discussion grows out of an analysis of various researches in the classic *The American Soldier* and focuses in particular on the incidence of promotion among enlisted soldiers. It was found that enlisted men who consistently expressed attitudes conforming to military mores were the most likely to be promoted. Positive orientation toward the norms and activities of non-membership reference groups served to facilitate promotion. "For the individual who adopts the values of a group to which he aspires, but does not belong, this orientation may serve the twin functions of aiding his rise into that group and of easing his adjustment after he has become a part of it."6

We could further elaborate our theoretical framework, but we feel that we had best state now our frame of reference in terms of the following general hypothesis:

Individuals in management who have achieved high level executive positions and outstanding career success through time define their

---


6 Ibid., p. 405.
career situations differentially and have differential personal attributes, abilities and capacities, differential attitudes, values, beliefs and life-goals, differential motivations and levels of aspiration, differential social and community participation patterns, differential conceptions of career success and differential explanations for success or failure from individuals who have not achieved comparable managerial positions and career success.

We have stated our frame of reference in the form of a situational general hypothesis, but we have not yet approached the problem of designing a suitable method of study.

The problem of designing a productive and scientific methodology is related to the large scale problem facing an eminent research team at Columbia University which is studying "Issues in the Study of Talent,"7 The Columbia research problem arose from a larger research project on the "Conservation of Human Resources" established in 1950 within the Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, by General Eisenhower when he was Columbia's president. The over-all Columbia project was sponsored by thirteen major corporations and the Ford Foundation. The interest of these major corporations stemmed, in part, from their concern in the post-war years with problems connected with the selection and development of executives.8 Chapter V of the cited monograph outlines the Columbia research team's "Design for the Study of Talent and Superior


8Ibid., p. vi.
What follows is a condensation of that portion of the Columbia design which is relevant to the study of executive talent and performance.

The Columbia group states that:

In elementary terms a systematic study of talent and superior performance should seek to consider the question of why some people are successful and others are not. An elaboration of this simple query would ask: What factors explain the differences between top performers in one field of endeavor and individuals in the same field who, while not failures, perform only moderately well?

A research investigation focused on answering the foregoing types of questions about superior performance must provide scope within its design for a study of the interaction of three important complexes: those of capacity, of opportunity for development and of personality.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 50-63.}

The Columbia group implies that while superior performance generally takes place in adulthood, the developmental processes commence to take place in childhood and adolescence. They propose to trace the developmental process from childhood through adolescence to adulthood, focusing not only on the work environment but also on the educational environment.

As a point of departure, the Columbia group proposes to identify and interview groups of individuals recognized as superior performers in important areas of work, the criteria of superior performance being significant monetary, status and other social rewards for success. Their interview questions would be, on the whole, general and open-ended rather than narrow and specific. Thus, the questions would be aimed at

\footnote{Ibid., p. 53 (Underscoring supplied).}
illuminating the interaction between the individual's capacities, opportunities and personality.\textsuperscript{11} (The term "capacities" is not clearly defined but is interpreted from context to be roughly equivalent to functional abilities resulting from education and training). In addition to interviewing individuals who are already at the top of their fields, the Columbia group plans to study other groups of individuals in an attempt to understand the differences between them and the superior performers. Their assumption is that:

The more possible it becomes to differentiate these persons from the superior performers and to isolate the factors responsible for the differences, the more understanding we will have about the qualities essential for superior performance.\textsuperscript{12}

The three different groups which the Columbia team planned to interview were: superior performers, average performers, and unsuccessful individuals who showed promise in music, research in physical science, and business administration. While pointing out that musicians and research scientists, though possessed of natural talents and interests, are largely products of education and training, the Columbia group states that:

The success of the business executive apparently had different roots, for it may be connected very little, if at all, with any early recognized potential or even with the normal processes of education. A major challenge in this area is to delineate the complex of qualities responsible for superior performance on the part of executives and the different kinds of environments which facilitate or frustrate the full utilization of these qualities.

\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 54.

\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 54.
The first answers concerning superior executive work may have to be sought within the work situation rather than in the school situation which we expect to provide the most fruitful clues for the analysis of the research scientist, or in early childhood experiences which may be the best source of understanding the future musician.13

We agree with the Columbia group's assumption that the most fruitful clues to executive success will be found in the work situation, though we do not discount the undoubted influence of early childhood experiences as factors in character development and of education as a factor in occupational choice and career progress. We also agree with the Columbia group's assumption that: "The problem of establishing criteria for success among business executives can be met tentatively by deciding that individuals who have achieved certain positions of power and prestige are by definition superior performers."14 Finally, we agree with the Columbia group's decision to limit their initial study to males, since theirs, like the present study, is structured to bring out the interplay between personal qualities and the social environment, in which environment women suffer serious handicaps, at least as far as climbing the executive ladder is concerned.

Although we had formulated the general design of our study prior to knowledge of the research design of the Columbia group's larger study, we are indebted to them for helpful clarification. While we note that the Columbia group proposes to interview "three different groups: superior performers, average performers and unsuccessful individuals who

13 Ibid., pp. 60-61.
14 Ibid., p. 62.
it would be difficult for us to identify unsuccessful individuals, most of whom have long since left or are about to leave the ranks of corporative executive management. We will therefore reduce our categories of management executives to two: those who have achieved outstanding objective career success, and those who have achieved only moderate objective career success. We will measure objective career success in terms of occupancy of high or low positions on the executive ladder, to which positions are attached high or low status, prestige, material rewards and functional importance.

With our frame of reference developed and stated in the form of a general hypothesis and our approach to a suitable method of study taking form, we can now proceed to setting our research methodology in firm design.

Design of the Study and Study Procedure

It was stated in the beginning and subsequently that this would be a study of two samples of individuals functioning in real-life situations at two levels in business, industrial and administrative management in an actual community. In formulating the final study design, a number of important considerations had to be borne in mind: (1) The samples of individuals studied should be representative of an entire community rather than any particular business, industrial or administrative organization, (2) The size of the samples and the scope of the study should be such as to make it manageable by one researcher within a reasonable period of time, (3) There should be some objective criteria for

15Ibid., p. 57
categorizing and selecting individuals according to their relative
degree of career success, (4) The design should be given a time di-
mension by selecting individuals with comparatively long occupational
histories, (5) There should be no formal testing of individuals, (6)
The data collected should be more qualitative than quantitative in order
that the richness of its subjective nature could be exploited as fully
as possible, and (7) Some effective method of establishing rapport with
and gathering information from individuals should be devised.

With the above considerations in mind, the following procedural
decisions were made:

(1) Baton Rouge, Louisiana was selected as the community in
which the study would be made, it being a metropolitan area of about
175,000 people, in which dynamic functional organizations could readily
be identified in business, industry and administration.

(2) In order to hold the study within manageable limits, fifty
top level executives would be studied as a basic sample, and fifty in-
dividuals in supervisory management would be studied as a comparative
sample.

(3) The top level executives would be selected objectively by
virtue of their incumbency in positions such as president, vice-
president, general manager or major department head in large organiza-
tions in which management was known not to be essentially entrepreneurial,
Likewise, the supervisory level of individuals would be selected objec-
tively according to their incumbency in positions such as supervisors,
long service foremen, minor department heads or the equivalent in such
organizations. Preferably, the supervisory level of individuals would be
selected from the same, or same types of, organizations as the top level executives.

(4) In order that career analyses would be placed in a time dimension, all individuals selected should preferably have comparatively long occupational histories.

(5) Generalized appraisals of comparative personality types and abilities would be substituted for any kind of formal testing of individuals.

(6) The method of retrospective, personal interviewing would be employed. However, this interviewing would not be completely random lest it lose a large measure of its research validity. Therefore, the interviewing would be guided by standardized general questions with provision for inclusion of spontaneous related queries of an illustrative or insightful nature.

(7) As a first step in establishing rapport, every interviewee would be guaranteed anonymity and concealment of his affiliation with any particular organization in reporting the subject matter of his interview.

The above procedural decisions having been made, the next step was to formulate a preliminary interview schedule to be used in a pilot study of approximately ten top level executives. The questions in this preliminary schedule were derived from insights obtained in reviewing the literature, and other insights conceived independently, and were related to the general hypothesis previously stated.

Each of the ten executives selected for the pilot study was contacted by telephone, the identity of the researcher made known, the
purpose of the study briefly explained, an invitation to participate extended and a fifteen minute preliminary interview requested. In this contact interview, the purpose and method of the study was fully explained, a copy of the preliminary interview schedule left with the individual, and a return interview requested at the interviewee's convenience.

As a result of the pilot study, it became apparent that the time required for interviewing was too long and that the interview schedule should be shortened and revised.\textsuperscript{16} It also became apparent that rapport with top level interviewees could be strengthened by casting the research in the light of a general study of career success and by telling prospective interviewees that they had been selected for study by virtue of their incumbency in high functional positions and by virtue of their known reputation in the community for having been outstandingly successful. It further became apparent that the contact interview would be made more effective by handing each prospective interviewee a written invitation to participate, explaining the nature of the research and asking him to study the questions on the interview schedule and fill in answers to those of a purely biographical nature prior to the return interview proper.

The invitation to participate and the revised interview schedule used in studying the sample of fifty top level executives are attached

\textsuperscript{16}Dr. Roland J. Pellegrin, Sociology Department, Louisiana State University, was present during all of the pilot interviews and many of the subsequent ones. The author's appreciation is due him for helpful insights and suggestions.
hereto as Appendix A. It will be noted that the interview schedule is divided into four main sections: (1) A summary of biographical information, (2) Questions concerning personal careers, (3) Questions concerning the careers of others, (4) Questions concerning the hypothetical career of a manipulative, ruthless type of individual. It will also be noted that the questions concerning the careers of others are designed to bring out contrasts between highly successful and moderately successful individuals, the relative effect of formal and informal factors presumed to implement or limit career progress, and the relative effect of differential behavior patterns, motivations, attitudes and values. There is, of course, other relevant information which the interview schedule is designed to bring out, and which a perusal of the types of questions will indicate.

When the study of fifty top level executives was completed, a pilot study of five individuals on the supervisory level of management was designed. A preliminary interview schedule, similar in most respects to that in Appendix A, with obviously necessary deletions and additions, was prepared. However, a two-fold problem presented itself: (1) How to identify individuals of the type visualized, and (2) How to establish rapport with them. (There was no problem of the first sort in the identification of top level executives, since their identity, position and reputation were well known in the community). Foreseeing a possible problem in identifying suitable subjects on the supervisory level, the interviewer asked the advice of several top level executives by describing to them the types of subjects visualized and asking them to name several, if they felt so inclined. From these sources, with the addition of personal acquaintances of the interviewer, an initial list of suitable
supervisory subjects was compiled. Reference to rosters of "old
timers" in large organizations and the "snowball technique" of one sub-
ject suggesting another, later proved to be of considerable help in
rounding out the supervisory sample.

The problem of establishing rapport with the supervisory sub-
jects was attacked by casting the research in the light of a general
study of comparative occupational careers, stating that the career pat-
terns and opinions of a sample of top level executives had been studied,
and inviting them, as "old timer" with long dependable service, to fill
in the "other side" of the overall big picture. This approach to es-
tablishing rapport proved to be very effective in the pilot study of
five supervisory individuals and was incorporated in a written informal
invitation to participate in the research.

The invitation to the supervisory sample of individuals and the
final revision of the interview schedule used are attached hereto as
Appendix B. It will be noted that this interview schedule is similar in
most respects to that previously used in interviewing top level execu-
tives. It also is divided into four sections: (1) An identical form for
summarizing biographical background, (2) Questions concerning personal
careers which in no way imply any lack of career success, (3) Questions
concerning the careers of others, with particular emphasis on drawing
forth contrasting images of top level executives, and (4) Questions con-
cerning the hypothetical career of a manipulative,ruthless type of in-
dividual, these questions also being practically identical with those
previously used.

The design of the study and the study procedure were then complete,
All that remained was the time consuming process of contacting the remaining forty-five supervisory subjects, establishing individual rapport with them and completing the interview schedules. Practically all of this was accomplished off the job, most of it at night and on weekends, and some of it in the homes of individuals. In contrast, practically all of the top level executives granted final interviews during working hours either in the privacy of their own offices or conference rooms, or in the privacy of the conference room of the Sociology Department, Louisiana State University, where a surprisingly large number elected to come.

We now turn to describing more fully the background characteristics of individuals in the two comparative samples as revealed through analysis of the first section of the respective interview schedules.

**Descriptive Background of the Community and Comparative Samples**

The metropolitan community in which this study was made, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, has undergone a spectacular population growth since the census year of 1940. While a large part of its population increase, to an estimated 175,000 people in 1955, is due to city-limit expansion and changes related to census enumeration procedures, a substantial proportion of its population growth is due to enlargement of its already important industrial area with consequent expansion in its business activities. In addition, Baton Rouge is the seat of the state administration, and the home of the state university. Thus, it was an easy task to identify a wide variety of bureaucratically structured business, industrial and administrative organizations.

It was also a relatively simple task to choose a sample of fifty
top level executives which would represent large business, industrial and administrative organizations in proportion to their relative importance in the metropolitan economy. Since industrial, manufacturing and processing activities are the most important elements in the community's economy and provide occupational opportunities for a major share of its people, more executives were chosen from industrial and manufacturing organizations than from organizations in business and administration. Business, being second in economic importance in the community, was represented in the sample by more executives than was administration. The total sample of executives could have been larger, but is believed adequately to represent the over-all classification of top level executives in the community.

In terms of the relative numbers of executives actually chosen from industry, business and administration, the breakdown was as follows: Industry (including manufacturing and processing), 26; Business, 17; Administration, 7; Total 50. An attempt was then made to match the executive sample, as nearly as possible, in choosing a comparative supervisory sample. A comparable breakdown of the supervisory sample was as follows: Industry (including manufacturing and processing), 26; Business, 19; Administration, 5; Total 50. Thus, the two comparative samples appeared to be effectively matched on the basis of types of organizations. In addition, the majority of the supervisory individuals were chosen from

17 To simplify terms, the sample of top level executives will hereinafter be referred to as the "executive sample." Likewise, the sample of supervisory individuals will be referred to as the "supervisory sample."
the same organizations as the executive individuals, although no attempt was made to study any particular organization, per se.

A further descriptive breakdown of the two samples was made from the first page of the interview schedules and it was found that, position-wise, the two samples were distributed as follows:

**Executive Sample.** Industry, 4 Presidents, 13 General or Plant Managers, 2 Assistant General or Plant Managers, 7 Major Department Heads; Business, 5 Presidents, 4 Vice Presidents, 7 General Managers, 1 Major Department Head; Administration, 1 President, 6 Major Department Heads.18 (The prevalence of general managers in industry and business indicates a relatively high degree of absentee ownership).

**Supervisory Sample.** Industry, 6 Minor Department Heads, 13 Supervisors, 7 General Foremen; Business, 10 Minor Managers in Department Stores, 2 Minor Officials in Banks, 3 Supervisors in Utilities Companies, 2 Managers in Grocery Chains, 1 Manager of a Dry Cleaning Plant, 1 Manager of a Chain Theater; Administration, 3 Supervisors, 2 Managers of Minor Departments.19

Further analysis of the first page of the interview schedules revealed that the average age of individuals in the executive sample was 51 years, with a range in ages from 35 to 66. The average age of

18Seventeen large industrial and manufacturing organizations, 3 large banks, 8 large business organizations and 2 large administrative organizations are represented in this sample, for a total of 30 different organizations.

19All but seven of the individuals in the supervisory sample were from the same organizations from which individuals in the executive sample had been chosen.
the supervisors was 54 with a range in ages from 38 to 69. The executives had occupational histories extending, on the average, over a period of 29 years, while the occupational histories of the supervisors extended on the average, over 32 years. Thus it appears that while the executives, on the average, were slightly younger and had slightly shorter occupational histories than the supervisors, there was also effective matching on the basis of age and length of occupational history. The long average occupational histories in both samples are indicative, in most cases, of comparative occupational stabilization and give the study the time dimension sought for. (It should be pointed out that young supervisors, who could be expected to experience considerable future vertical mobility, were purposefully excluded from the study).

Analysis of the first page of the interview schedules also showed that executives had held their present positions, on the average, for 7 years, with positional occupancy ranging from 1 to 30 years. They had been with their present organizations, on the average, for 17 years with organizational membership ranging from 1 to 43 years. By comparison, supervisors had held their present positions, on the average, for 9 years, with positional occupancy ranging from 1 to 38 years. They had been with their present organizations, on the average, for 23 years with organizational membership ranging from 1 to 45 years. Thus, supervisors, on the average, had somewhat longer occupancy of present positions and somewhat longer membership in present organizations than did executives. This indicates that, on the average, the executives experienced faster upward mobility within their present organizations than
did the supervisors, most of whom spent considerably more time in positions below the management level than did the executives. Otherwise stated, the executives were, on the average, more promotable through the years than were the supervisors.

The analysis further revealed that the executives, on the average, had held 3 positions in the management hierarchy of their present organizations, while the supervisors, on the average, had held only 2 such positions. The executives had held, on the average, 4 positions in other organizations while the supervisors, on the average, had held only 3 such positions. This can be interpreted to mean that the executives, on the average, had experienced not only more vertical mobility but also more horizontal mobility than had the supervisors.

A closer examination of the occupational histories of the executives showed that 2 industrial executives had risen from the ranks of labor to a presidency, 2 business executives had risen from clerk to a presidency and 1 administrative executive had risen from the lowest rank in another occupation to a presidency. Thus, there is evidence, even in this small sample, that the American Dream has some basis in fact and is not a mere fantasy.

From the standpoint of intergenerational occupational mobility, it was found that, in the executive sample, 15 of the 26 industrial executives had exceeded the occupational statuses of their fathers, 10 of the 17 business executives had done likewise and 5 of the 7 administrative executives had also done likewise. This may support a speculation that executive talent is less hereditary than acquired, but it may, of course, be due to different intergenerational occupational opportunities.
To make a comparable assessment of intergenerational occupational mobility in the supervisory sample was very difficult. An attempt to do so resulted in a mere analysis of social origins with the occupations of the supervisors' fathers distributed as follows: 18 farmers, 16 skilled workers, 7 supervisors and foremen, 4 merchants, 2 undertakers, 2 barbers, 1 teacher — total 50. These figures, while indicative of comparative social origins, may also be due to different intergenerational occupational opportunities.

In continuing the analysis of the first page of the interview schedules, it was found that the educational attainments of individuals in the executive sample were distributed as follows: 2 Doctors of Philosophy (both in administration), 5 Masters of Science (all in industry), 2 Batchelors of Law (1 in industry and 1 in business), 17 Batchelors of Science (mostly in industry), 13 Batchelors of Arts (mostly in business), 3 individuals with 2 years of college (all in business), 4 high school graduates (2 in industry and 2 in business), 2 individuals with a tenth grade education (1 in industry and 1 in business), and 2 individuals who had completed grammar school only (both in industry) — total 50. Since 39 of the executives had a bachelor's degree or better from college, while 11 of them did not, it would seem that a college education is a very important factor in executive success, but not an absolute essential. (During the course of the interviews it became apparent that other factors, including social skills, had been important in the career success of the 11 executives who did not graduate from college).

When the educational attainments of the supervisory sample were
analyzed, it was found that there were 2 Masters of Arts (both in administration), 6 Bachelor's of Arts (4 in business and 2 in administration), 7 individuals with two years of college, 20 high school graduates, 5 individuals who completed the tenth grade, 6 individuals who completed grammar school, and 4 individuals who completed the fifth grade only — total 50. Since only 8 of the supervisors had a college degree while 42 of them had much less education, it would seem that the lack of a college education is a definite handicap in climbing the executive ladder. (During the course of the interviews it became apparent that socio-economic conditions forced those supervisors with comparatively little education to quit school and seek employment, thereby being denied the opportunity for a college education).

Practically all of the individuals in the two samples were married. Among the wives of the executives, 21 had college degrees, 27 were high school graduates and 2 had completed grammar school only. Seven of the executives' wives were better educated than their husbands, 22 had equivalent education and 21 had less education. Thirty-three of the executives' wives had some work experience, while 16 had none. The majority of the executives' wives' fathers had had occupations generally associated with middle-class socio-economic status. Many of them had had occupations similar to their sons-in-law's own fathers. (Only 4 of them had had occupations similar to that of corporation executives). Thus, it can be seen that, in general, both the executives and their wives had social origins and educational backgrounds usually associated with middle class standards but had risen, through the years, to upper middle and upper class status.
Among the wives of the supervisors, 10 had college degrees, 30 were high school graduates, 4 had completed grammar school and 4 had less than a grammar school education. Nineteen of the supervisors' wives were better educated than their husbands, 17 had equivalent education and 10 had less education. Thirty-six of the supervisors' wives had some work experience while 22 had none. The majority of the supervisors' wives' fathers had had occupations generally associated with working class socio-economic status. A great many of them were farmers and skilled mechanics and had had occupations similar to those of their sons-in-law's own father. Thus, it can be seen that, in general, both the supervisors and their wives had social origins and educational backgrounds usually associated with working class levels, but had risen, through the years, to lower middle or middle class status.

In completing the analysis of the first page of the interview schedules, it was found that all but one of the executives had some church affiliation, categorized as follows: 5 Catholics, 42 Protestants, 2 Jews. Four of the 5 Catholics were active church members, as were 35 of the 42 Protestants and both Jews. One of the Catholics, 14 of the Protestants and both Jews were church leaders. (Both of the Jews were business executives). It would seem that some religious affiliation, though not necessarily religious leadership, is a social expectation associated with the role of executive. That a preponderance of Protestant executives were found is partly explainable on the basis of geographical migration in absentee owned corporations. That only 2 Jews were found is explainable on the basis that Jews tend to associate themselves with entrepreneurial enterprises, which this study attempted to exclude.
No plausible explanation for the paucity of Catholic executives can be offered here.

By comparison, it was found that all but 3 of the supervisors had some church affiliation, categorized as follows: 21 Catholics, 26 Protestants and no Jews. All of the 21 Catholics and 21 of the 26 Protestants were active church members. Seven of the Catholics and 10 of the Protestants were church leaders. (That no Jews were found in the supervisory sample was coincidental rather than purposeful, since religious affiliation was unknown at the time of selection). Generally speaking, there seems to have been no significant difference between supervisors and executives in church activity and leadership. For supervisors, however, church activity and leadership may be less a matter of fulfilling role expectations than it is compensatory status striving, i.e., achieving more status in their churches than they are able to achieve occupationally.

In turning to an analysis of that portion of page two of the interview schedules which concerns organizational memberships, it was found that, in the executive sample, 37 individuals belonged to the Chamber of Commerce, 31 belonged to the Rotary Club, 5 belonged to the Kiwanis Club, 16 belonged to fraternal organizations, 18 belonged to high level social organizations and 40 belonged to state or national professional organizations. A bimodal distribution of present organizational memberships was found among the executives, since industrial executives tended to restrict their current memberships to 2, 3, or 4 important organizations, whereas business executives tended to maintain memberships in 6 or more such organizations. Such a distribution is
indicative of a tendency for business executives to use their organizational memberships for business purposes more than industrial executives use theirs for similar purposes. Modally, most of the executives had discarded 2, 3 or 4 past memberships of a more or less temporary nature. Practically all of the executives showed present or past participation in organizations of a civic nature. Such participation, of course, can be associated with well established role expectations.

A comparable analysis of the organizational memberships of the supervisors showed that 6 individuals belonged to the Chamber of Commerce (on company-paid-for memberships), 4 belonged to organizations below the prestige and power level of Rotary and Kiwanis, 25 belonged to fraternal organizations, 35 belonged to middle level social organizations or company clubs, and 6 belonged to state or national professional organizations. Modally, most of the supervisors had discarded 1 or 2 past memberships in mutual-aid lodges, indicative of the benefits of these having been replaced by company benefits. That supervisors showed a tendency to maintain fraternal, middle level social and company club memberships may be indicative of a general desire on their parts to acquire social participation patterns and social status which they had not been able to acquire occupationally.

An analysis of the last portion of page two of the interview schedules showed that there was little significant difference in the types of recreational activities and hobbies engaged in by executives and supervisors (hunting, fishing, gardening and handicraft predominating). The significant difference was found in the type of persons with
whom these activities and hobbies were shared. Generally speaking, executives tended to engage in these activities with other executives and business associates, indicating that such activities may often be used not only for social but also for organizational purposes. By comparison, supervisors tended to engage in these activities with their families and personal friends, indicating that supervisors tend to use such activities for social purposes only.

Our description of the background characteristics of the community and the two comparative samples is now complete. Certain general contrasts between the two samples have already been found and the possible significance of these contrasts, as factors in differential occupational mobility, briefly mentioned. We will proceed in the next chapter to a study of other factors influencing career choice and career progress, as revealed in the interviewees' own analyses of their personal career patterns.
CHAPTER III

SELF APPRAISALS OF PERSONAL CAREER PATTERNS

This chapter will present comparative qualitative analyses of answers to the questions in the second section of the respective interview guides, which questions were concerned with appraisals by individuals themselves of factors in their own career patterns. An analysis will first be made for the executive sample. Because of individual and situational differences among the executives and their general tendency to talk freely about their career patterns, inclusion of all of the material in their self appraisals would make this analysis entirely too voluminous. Therefore, what will be sought for are patterns of similarity and elements of difference in the various appraisals. However, since a large measure of the richness of subjective material, such as is contained in these self appraisals, lies in the nature of the material itself, and would be lost if too many generalizations were attempted, illustrative quotations will be used rather extensively where appropriate. These quotations will not be foot-noted directly, since anonymity was guaranteed to interviewees. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that the nature of the appraisals is influenced, not only by individual and situational differences between interviewees, but also by differential types of working environments. For this reason, long quotations will be given an abbreviated prefix which will identify types of working environments but
not organizations or individuals themselves.¹

When the analysis of self appraisals of the executive sample has been completed, a similar analysis will be made for the supervisory sample. Although immediate implications will be mentioned briefly as the respective analyses progress, a fuller discussion of factors and patterns of similarity and difference with resultant general implications, will be reserved for the last section of the chapter.

**Self Appraisals by Executives**

Instead of repeating the questions in the second section of the interview schedule verbatim and attempting to answer them analytically, the self appraisals of the executive respondents will be categorized as follows: (1) Retrospective Explanations of Personal Success; (2) Personal Rules for Achieving Success; (3) Career Plans and Goals; (4) Conceptions of How to Achieve Success; (5) Conceptions of Personal Rewards and Satisfactions; (6) Conceptions of Personal Penalties and Sacrifices; (7) Differential Definitions of "Career Success".

This method of categorical analysis was chosen because many of the questions were elaborated upon through spontaneous queries as the interviews proceeded. The corollary queries were used, not only to clarify meanings, but also to insure that the appraisals were placed in the time

¹For example, **Ind. Ex. A.** will indicate an anonymous industrial executive; **Bus. Ex. B.** an anonymous business executive; **Adm. Ex. C.** an anonymous administrative executive.
Retrospective Explanations of Personal Success.

Without doubt, individual, situational and environmental differences were apparent to a greater extent in the manner in which the executives accounted for their personal success, than in any other portion of their self appraisals. This was to be expected, however, because of obvious variations in family influences, early boyhood and adolescent experiences, educational attainments, occupational opportunities, socio-economic backgrounds and factors of like nature.

The majority of the executives commenced their accounts by mentioning their boyhood ideals and influences. Many of them mentioned their fathers, brothers, relatives, teachers or some other ideal person as models whom they wished to emulate. Quite a few of them referred to the positive influence of their mothers and the positive and negative influence of their boyhood friends. Many of the executives referred to early development of their aptitudes and interests with such phrases as, "When I was a boy, I liked to build things"; "When I was a kid, I sold papers and learned the value of a dollar early"; "I had to work with my hands if I wanted any money"; "As a youngster, I worked in a store and learned how to convince people"; "I always wanted to out-do my boyhood friends, even in school work"; "I surely did want to be like the man who ran the machine shop"; etc.

Considerable importance was attached to their college education, as career preparation, by those executives who had had one. This
was particularly true among administrative executives, business executives who placed a premium on a knowledge of business practices, and industrial executives who placed a high value on technical knowledge. Typical of those successful executives who had not been to college, however, were remarks such as this, "I had to go to work and didn't go to college. You don't learn how to handle people in college. I got my job knowledge and learned how to handle people in the school of hard knocks." The non-college executives attached considerable pride to their having "come up the hard way."!

In addition to boyhood and adolescent ideals, interests and influences, educational qualifications and differential occupational opportunities, a wide variety of other factors was mentioned by executives as having been important in their personal success. Among these were: early marriage and influence of wife, influence of father-in-law (sometimes negative), learning to take advice, learning from superiors, watching competitors, learning present and higher jobs thoroughly, being willing to work harder than others, making influential friends and getting along with people, demonstrating abilities to helpful contacts, being willing to accept responsibilities and make decisions, knowing how and when to delegate authority and responsibility, being able to judge people and their personalities, selecting and training good assistants and department heads, and being prepared for promotion by being in the right place at the right time.

Typical illustrative quotations follow:

Ind. Ex. A. Education is a great help in getting started on your career but it is only a starter. In the past few years,
new skills have come to be required in addition to technical skills. My engineering background was fine but, as I rose in management, I found that there were human problems of morale in addition to engineering problems. I suppose I can attribute a large share of my success to an ability to solve both human problems and engineering problems. Being able to understand and motivate my people in a direction in line with their personalities and abilities is the main secret of whatever managerial success I have achieved.

Ind. Ex. B. Due to my engineering education and training, I think I have developed an analytical approach to problem solving. I think I have the ability to analyze and get along with people. I got a lot of this from my dad. I followed his approach to solving human problems. You don't learn how to get along with people in engineering school. I learned it through broad social contacts. Mine was a large family. I never was very husky so I had to learn early to think and talk my way out of difficulties.

Ind. Ex. C. There are two interacting secrets of my success. I have always tried in every way to prepare myself for the job I aspired to and to be in the right place at the right time. One should try to work himself up from a job by developing people underneath to replace him. Then he is available for promotion when the time comes. Above all, don't get earmarked as a specialist in a highly technical field. Then you are indispensable and unavailable. It is much easier to find technical specialists and keep them in a slot, than it is to find people who can handle and manipulate others. My secret in handling people is to delegate all possible authority and responsibility and then assume the role of high-level coordinator. This way I'm always available.

Ind. Ex. D. You'll pardon my saying so, but I think I've got basic intelligence. I've always been completely honest with myself and others, which requires fairness and courage. I've always had a singleness of purpose and have been able to make opportunities for myself even though I didn't strictly have the educational qualifications. One's general conduct has a great deal to do with how he impresses others. He creates favorable impressions without trying to do so and opportunities for promotion come his way. I've always tried to display my ability and sincerity and do my job as well as possible. If you have the ability to get along with and favorably impress people, workers and management, you'll be successful.

Ind. Ex. E. My father and mother were dreamers and idealists. They impressed me early with the necessity for accomplishing
something by working hard and getting a good education. We had a bad financial situation at home so I started working when I was twelve and worked my way through college.

As a youngster I was interested in electricity and liked to make electrical machines. So I studied electrical engineering. But in college I decided I would rather be in the management end of engineering than in the research end because it paid off better financially.

I developed a desire to be a perfectionist in management and was rather Puritanical in my ideas. It took me a long time to become tolerant of others but now I know the value of getting along with people.

Ind. Ex. F. When I graduated from high school I started drifting around from job to job, teaching grade school, working in a store and working in the oil fields. I decided to quit drifting, settled down and looked for a job in the new plants. I couldn't get into the biggest one, so I started as an operator with a plant just being built. I worked hard, 16 to 18 hours a day, 7 days a week. Pretty soon I was a big operator and when the boss was off having a good time, I was running the place.

I didn't have much education but I did have horse sense which you don't get in college. I had horse sense enough to make myself wanted. I always had the ability to please the top brass. Anticipated their desires and fancies and got what I could out of them. "You can't tame cats by pulling their tails" so I was practical about it. If you work like and act like you own the place, you'll either own it or manage it eventually.

We have chosen to quote directly six different top level executives from six different industrial organizations, including the largest ones in the community. It is unfortunate that limitations of space do not permit us to quote others directly but those chosen are typical cases. Individual and environmental differences are apparent. The individuals chosen could be dubbed "the enlightened engineer," "the social engineer," "the manipulative coordinator," "the personality salesman," "the materialist" and the "boss-pleaser," respectively. If
there is one pattern of similarity in the quotations, it is an emphasis on the necessity for getting along with and manipulating people.

The immediate implication here is that social skills, in addition to technical abilities, are important factors in career advancement. As one executive put it, the highly technical specialist may become so indispensable and stereotyped as to become "unavailable" for further promotion in management.

For purposes of comparison we will now choose four typical business executives and quote their general explanations of personal success.

**Bus. Ex. A.** You say you want to find out how I got to be successful. If you'll pardon me for saying so I think I could be Chairman of the Board of the biggest organization like this in the country. The way to do it is to learn the jobs of the men higher up. Fix it so you've got ability that can't be overlooked when the time for promotion comes. I never asked for a higher job in my life. If I wanted it, I went to work and learned it. Replacements are always necessary. Look for the first vacancy that's apt to occur and learn that job and some others too. If you have the job knowledge and the ability to get along with people, you don't have to ask for a higher job — you'll be asked to take it.

When you get in a high position you begin to see what kind of men you need under you. In an organization like this you have to fit your men to your community because its success depends on the good will of its customers. And so you look around for men with social skills and ask them to work for you. Then you teach them the business.

If you want to get higher jobs in this kind of business, learn them inside out and learn how to get along with everybody high and low. If you do that, opportunity and career success will come looking for you.

**Bus. Ex. B.** I was reared in the retail business and greatly influenced by my father. I think I had a good family background and know how to mix socially.
When I graduated from college in business administration, I realized there weren't enough college men in retailing so I decided to make it my career, after teaching two years.

In retailing, you have to be well groomed and have a good appearance. I've always worked hard. Never watched the clock and easily adjusted to new situations.

It's very important to get along with people and make the right contacts and friends, particularly among potential customers. I've had an advantage in this because of my family background and college training.

The big thing is to always look and act the part. Show your ability for and knowledge of higher jobs. If you never do more than you're paid for, you'll never get paid for more than you do.

Bus. Ex. C. When I was a boy I was greatly impressed by a man who sold me my first pair of shoes and who later came to be head of a nation-wide chain. He was my boyhood ideal. I always wanted to be a merchant like him and follow his principles.

I have always liked the store atmosphere and the glamour of the business world. Dreamed of being a manager some day and now I am. I account for my success in terms of long range goals, firmly fixed. It has helped a lot to have a boyhood model and follow his principles. He taught me to have faith in the Supreme Being, to help and accept help from others and to create opportunities for young people. You succeed when you work hard, help others and get them to help you.

Bus. Ex. D. A lot of my success has been due to being in the right place at the right time. This isn't just luck. If you look around, you'll see opportunities, prepare yourself and be there. Get in a position to sell yourself and your ideas and get others to sell you. You know, I try to "plant" ideas in people and get them to think these ideas are their own. Then they look for someone to carry them out, figure I know a lot about them, and pick me. But I give the others all the credit — that makes them my firm friends. I enjoy getting ideas and solving difficult problems. I think I have the ability to get the help of others because I show them that what I suggest will be profitable to them either in their business or in the community.

Among the business executives, individual and situational differences were again apparent, as they were among the industrial
executives. If we were to dub these business executives as types, we might refer to them as "the forward-looker," "the personality salesman," "the idealist" and "the idea man." Again we find an emphasis on manipulating people, particularly in the case of "the idea man." Business executives also seem to be more "customer-conscious" than are industrial executives, which is another environmental difference.

Typical of the administrative executives are the following accounts of personal success:

Adm. Ex. A. I've had a more varied than usual educational background in several fields and I've also worked with my hands. I learned to be sympathetic with people by working in an industrial environment.

The military service taught me how to adjust to new situations. I never thought of myself as administrator until then. That's where I really learned to handle people. I think my success may be attributed, in large part, to my ability to adapt to a variety of situations as my career progressed.

Adm. Ex. B. I started out as an engineer but I got sick and had to look to desk work. So I latched on in a new and expanding administrative set-up at a time when it was beginning to take on a new scientific look. My war service taught me organization and administration.

The important thing is to get into an expanding field with a challenge, prepare yourself and be in the right place at the right time. Get in on the ground floor, outwork your competitors and show the top side you can handle people better.

While these two accounts are typical of the administrators, all of them mentioned having been successful in more than one type of environment, and four of the seven of them gave the military service credit for having developed their administrative ability. None of them attached as much importance to technical or business abilities as they did to the ability to handle people. It is possible that the
administrative type of leadership is more transferable than business
or industrial leadership and we venture to dub the administrators "flex-
ible, transferable coordinators."

**Personal Rules for Achieving Success.**

Many of the executives in all three categories chose to list
their personal rules for achieving success almost in the form of the
Ten Commandments. Individual differences were more apparent than sit-
uational and environmental differences, but a great deal of similarity
between individuals was also apparent. In order to avoid too much du-
plication, these personal rules will be grouped according to environmen-
tal category, rather than according to individuals.

**Ind. Exs.** Have ambition and enthusiasm. Know your
company and its product. Learn the job above you as fast
as possible and get promoted. Be willing to take on re-
sponsibilities and make decisions. Get along with people.
Give praise and recognition for jobs well done. Study per-
sonalities so you can anticipate reactions. Accept com-
munity responsibilities, whether you like it or not. Be
honest with yourself and others. Be critical of your own
deficiencies. Be devoted to your job and company. De-
velop social skills to go with your technical abilities.
Always set the example, on and off the job. Set up diffi-
cult tasks for yourself and others. Be a good listener to
other people's ideas. Don't be too formal — keep human.
Present a neat, not flashy appearance. Try to lead a happy
home life. Keep yourself in good health. Maintain the
respect and loyalty of others. Study off the job, par-
ticularly psychology and human relations. Recognize merit
in others and take advantage of their ability to help you.
Make every effort to be honest, fair and impartial. Keep
yourself loose and flexible. Delegate responsibility and re-
sponsibility and get things done through people. Select
a good staff and department heads. Never be impatient,
abrupt or sarcastic. Look for simplicity and orderliness.
Maintain an objective attitude in making decisions. Keep
planning your activities methodically and well ahead.
Keep informed of your field by reading widely and participating in professional organizations. Don't be a small fish in a big pond — be a big fish in a small pond. If you can't say something good about people, don't say anything. Throw decision making at yourself and others. Watch your conduct with liquor and women — bad impressions are hard to overcome. Train and move your subordinates up — they'll push you up. Don't practice fakery and tricks. Get out and make friends — you can't go anywhere without them. Set intermediate goals to your final ones. Take the initiative in getting acquainted in other organizations and the community. Start with a positive attitude before adopting a negative one. Be discreet in talking company business outside the plant. Beware of gossip among wives. Plan while the other fellow sleeps and show up in the morning ready to take the initiative. Look for opportunities for yourself, your subordinates and your company and make the most of them. Try to set broad goals, break them down and set priorities. Solidify your thinking and actions — don't go off half-cocked. Know what you're doing and be sincere about it. You can't buy people's loyalty with money, so get it through leadership and respect.

There were, of course, many other personal rules stated by the industrial executives, a great many of which stressed the importance of honesty, integrity, hard work and other similar virtues. Yet, in almost every set of personal rules, the importance of handling people was apparent. It is safe to say that the average industrial executive is "human relations minded" and realizes the importance of social skills in addition to technical abilities. This is probably the result of a new managerial ideology in large industrial corporations.

In turning to the business executives, it was found that, in general, their personal rules were similar to those above. A few additional though similar ones are included in the following composite:
Bus. Exs. Develop a sense of humility and don't be a know-it-all. Try to learn from your competitors. Don't make the same mistakes twice. Don't be too radical or you might become a crack-pot. Apply the Golden Rule personally and in business. Model yourself after other successful business executives — then try to out-do them. Give the little fellow credit. Look your part and talk your part. Learn to be a good public speaker. Surround yourself with able assistants. Don't quibble about salaries — if you're good, you'll get paid. Don't get lost in details — keep the big picture before you. Be friendly with authority. Reason out problems rather than memorize rules. Treat your workers and your customers like you'd like to be treated. If you can't say "yes", explain the reason why. Lead and coordinate people instead of bossing them. Nothing pays off like praise, even with the customers. Never shirk responsibility for your decisions. Respect people's confidences and they'll respect you. Directionalize your purposes and plan objectively. Develop a broad personality through broad social contacts. Don't do a rule book job. Do more than your job requires, even if it is inconvenient. Take part in church and community activities for the good of yourself and your company.

Again we see the stress on manipulating people and, in addition, a "competitor and customer consciousness" which was to be expected from business executives.

The personal rules of the administrative executives were, in general, like those of other executives. Additional ones are included in the following composite:

Adm. Exs. Try to be competent in whatever you're doing—there are too many executives doing things for which they are not competent. Concentrate on one thing at a time. Utilize small amounts of free time. Express yourself clearly in writing and orally — nothing convinces people more than well chosen, well delivered English. When administering the rules, put all the cards on the table. Get all the angles before you make a decision. Be frank but not brutal — if you must say "no", say why. Be sincere, don't act like you are running a racket. Let people tell you what the score is. Praise people in public — censure them in private. If you are wrong, be the first to say so. Do part of tomorrow's work today. Broaden yourself in other fields.

It might seem from the above that administrators tend to think of themselves more as enforcers of rules and regulations than do industrial
and business executives, but they also appear to be very conscious of human values in doing so.

When asked a corollary query as to whether their personal rules for success had changed during their careers, the majority of all three types of executives tended to answer that there had been more crystallization than radical change in them through time. However, among the changes mentioned were: increased emphasis on caution and foresight; increased willingness to seek and accept advice from others; increased concern with being esteemed by others; becoming less brutally frank and more considerate; becoming less impatient and more mature in judgment; becoming less the rugged boss and more the understanding leader; becoming more wary of self-seekers in and out of the organization; increased desire to make subordinates successful; increased emphasis on getting jobs done through capable assistants and group effort; increased awareness of the value of personal and professional contacts and friendships; increased awareness of the value of good public relations. The immediate implication apparent here might be called the development of an increased "human relations consciousness" through time.

Career Plans and Goals

All of the executives were asked to place their career plans and goals in time perspective by comparing their original ones with their eventual long range ones and giving reasons for changes through time, if any. A great many individual differences were to be expected and are apparent in the following typical quotations from industrial executives:

**Ind. Ex. A.** After college I wanted to learn all I could about engineering design because I thought there was a big
future in it. When I started dealing with customers, I became more interested in managerial operations than in construction. I wanted to settle down and manage people.

Ind. Ex. B. At first I wanted to be an independent chemist. Then I wanted to be a plant career chemist. But I was afraid I'd get earmarked so changed my goals to running a plant of my own.

Ind. Ex. C. At first, I wanted to be a good advertising man. Then I shifted to a desire to doing something materially constructive that would help people. So I accepted a job with this plant.

Ind. Ex. D. At first, I just wanted to be a respectable citizen and make a decent living. Then I realized the opportunities in professional management and have studied hard to improve myself ever since.

Ind. Ex. E. At first I was money conscious, just trying to figure out how to get the next raise. Then, money began to mean less to me as I acquired a desire for achievement, respect and prestige. I became more interested in people as I moved up. The Government changed my ideas about trying to accumulate too much money.

Ind. Ex. F. The height of my original ambition was to make and save $25,000. Then I wanted to become one of the experts in our field, out-do our competitors, and give the public better products than they were giving.

Ind. Ex. G. I don't think anybody has separate sets of short and long range goals. He just revises his plans step-by-step as he moves upward. He becomes less money conscious and more achievement conscious.

Ind. Ex. H. Originally, I just wanted the next higher job. Now I've gotten interested in people and want to be a good industrial relations man. When I retire here, I'm going back to college and learn all I can about it.

Ind. Ex. I. My first plan was to be an expert chemist and control chemical development in a medium sized plant. Then I got into training and learned the joys of working with people. So I ditched my aspirations as a chemist and shot for employee relations work, training and developing people. I get more personal satisfaction that way.

Ind. Ex. J. I rather despise calculating people who make too many personal plans and goals. They are apt to lose sight of the good of the company and its people. Do right by your company and take care of your people and your goals will take care of themselves.
Ind. Ex. K. Originally, I would have been satisfied with achieving minor goals. Then my horizon commenced to broaden and I wanted to be in top management. Now it is narrowing as I see the hazards of bigger jobs. I guess I'm not as ambitious as formerly and I sometimes wonder if it's worth it. Happiness may be worth more.

Ind. Ex. L. When you're working hard in a big outfit, you don't have time to make personal plans and set personal goals. You automatically achieve them if you're working hard and are happy. But you can't be happy unless the people under you are also working hard and are happy.

Ind. Ex. M. I had one short range goal — to do better than my father financially. Later, when I was better off than he was, I began to realize the value of working with people. Personal monetary gain was then out-weighed by a goal of making our plant a more productive and happier place in which to work.

In general, we see in these quotations an original concern with material values, mellowed through time with an increasing concern with human values. Caution should be observed in making implications here. After high level material rewards have been achieved, executives can well afford to pay lip-service to human values, for to do otherwise would be a deviation from role expectations.

The following is a sample of comparable expressions from business executives concerning their personal plans and goals:

Bus. Ex. A. I always have had the goal of becoming a top-notch business operator. It has been intensified with the passage of time. But more recently I have as a goal the transmission of my ethics to the younger men in my profession.

Bus. Ex. B. I've always shot for the next higher job. Short term achievements lead to long range goals. Reset your sights as you go. But now I don't know what to aim at next. There's a time element of experience in every job, so I haven't raised my goals too fast.

Bus. Ex. C. I had more long range plans when I was younger. Business cycles force you to realize the inevitability of things as they are and force you to accept short range goals.

Bus. Ex. D. Originally, I just wanted to make a good living and amount to something. I only formulated my long range goals a
few years ago when I started mending my fences for retirement. When I retire I want to do something humanitarian for people.

Bus. Ex. E. When I was younger I was much more ambitious than I am now. I wanted to be president of the world's largest organization like this. As I grew older I dwelt less in fantasy and got in better touch with reality as I realized my capabilities. Now I'm satisfied with what I am, but I'd rather be a college professor if I could afford to.

Bus. Ex. F. I haven't yet set up any long range plans because I'd rather be better off physically than financially. I can set myself higher goals but I wonder if I want to.

Bus. Ex. G. When I first started out I wanted to own my own business. But when I found out how tough the competition was I decided to change my goals to being a top corporation executive. What I want now is retirement at age 60 with security.

In general, business executives seemed to be more self-centered in setting and revising their goals than did industrial executives. There is a speculative implication here. It is possible that labor union pressure has caused industrial executives to express more "lip-service" to human values than business executives do, since businesses have not felt a corresponding pressure from white-collar unions.

Sample statements of the personal plans and goals of administrators follow for comparison:

Adm. Ex. A. My original goal was to make a decent salary, get raises and get promotion, because I couldn't see much farther. Only recently have I wanted to make a name and reputation for myself so I can reach a goal of making a contribution on a national scale.

Adm. Ex. B. My original goal was to be a good professional man. Force of circumstances made me an administrator. Opportunities set your goals for you.

Adm. Ex. C. My first goal was to rise as high as I could in my former profession. Since I always liked to coordinate the efforts of people, I chose to become a top administrator because I still wanted to make a contribution by helping young people.
There being only seven individuals in the administrative sample, individual differences in plans and goals were more apparent then any pattern of environmental similarity.

Conceptions of How to Achieve Success.

Again the interviewees were asked to place their conceptions of how success could be achieved in time perspective by comparing their present conceptions with their former ones and giving reasons for changes, if any. In their answers, similarities were more apparent than individual differences. Almost all executives started their careers with the conception that hard work and ability alone would result in success. In later years they seemed to have become more aware of the necessity for the successful handling of people. The following are typical comments:

Ind. Ex. A. My present and former conceptions do not fit at all. At first I pictured the dynamic go-getter as typified by the high pressure salesman and advertising executive. This didn't work. I soon learned you had to lead people instead of pressuring them.

Ind. Ex. B. My conceptions changed a lot. At first I thought only of myself. Now I have the success of others at heart too. It's the cooperation and loyalty of your fellow workers that make you successful.

Ind. Ex. C. I started as a technician. When I got into management, I became less a technician and more a manipulator of ideas, people and things. Fortunately, I had a self-centered authoritarian boss and decided never to be like him.

Ind. Ex. D. Sure my ideas have changed. So have those of other successful managers. Why does management publish so much about new management techniques? Simply because, these days, to be successful you've got to know how to handle people.

Ind. Ex. E. I used to go out and issue instructions. Now I keep the channels of communication open both ways. You have to know what those below you think if you are going to manage successfully.
Ind. Ex. F. Formerly I thought I'd be successful if I just went out and worked hard with my hands. Now I know I still have to work hard, but with my mind. You have to plan ahead to be successful.

Ind. Ex. G. To be successful these days you have to be able to train men to replace you and push you up. The top men are looking for the ability to train key men.

Ind. Ex. H. I started with Ben Franklin's principles of saving money and being individualistic. These days you have to be group-minded and use a lot more tact.

Ind. Ex. I. When I started I thought it was keeping my nose to the grindstone. Now I know you have to sell your ideas to a group and be able to delegate work, responsibility and authority.

Ind. Ex. J. After I had been successful in establishing a satisfactory income, I wanted a new kind of success in working with and through people.

It is entirely possible that a new management ideology has caused industrial executives, in general, to change their conceptions of how to achieve managerial success. Let us compare a few typical statements from business executives.

Bus. Ex. A. In business you have to have something on the ball but these days it is more who you know than what you know. The big successes these days are the good mixers and personality men — the public relations experts. Let your assistants be the technical experts.

Bus. Ex. B. After all, success is relative. If you want to achieve the highest level these days you have to sacrifice your private life to the interest of other people.

Bus. Ex. C. Actually there has been very little change in my notions. Loyalty, faithfulness, cooperating with people of all levels — These will always make you successful if you work hard enough.

Bus. Ex. D. We are changing to a new social order and a new way of doing things. You have to get people to cooperate instead of ordering them around. The days of the authoritarian boss have gone. You can't be successful that way. Today success is achieved through people. You've got to train and lead your employees, establish good customer relations and engage in community activities. Hard work alone isn't enough.
Typical of the administrative executives were the following:

**Adm. Ex. A.** Originally I thought you had to be a specialist to achieve success. Now I think it is a question of being versatile and flexible.

**Adm. Ex. B.** You have to be a diplomat these days and somewhat of a politician. You see, administration isn't out to make money like business but to get money to operate on. That requires diplomacy.

**Adm. Ex. C.** When you start out you don't know the road to success. Experience is a great teacher. It teaches you that to be successful, you must know how to work with, understand and handle people.

The common thread in the above statements of the various executives, is an increasing emphasis on achieving success through understanding, working with, handling and manipulating people. We are constantly led back to our original premise that social skills are as important as technical skills in the achievement of managerial success.

**Conceptions of Personal Rewards and Satisfactions**

In this area, executives were asked to state whether the passage of time had changed their conceptions of the rewards and satisfactions of being an executive. In general, almost all of the executives claimed that their original desires for monetary and other material rewards had been conditioned by more subjective satisfactions. Typical of the statements of industrial executives are these:

**Ind. Ex. A.** There has been a lot of change. My original idea of rewards was the power, prestige and salary. Salary still remains but other big satisfactions are the sense of accomplishment in building up your organization and developing people. Prestige still counts some, but power no.

**Ind. Ex. B.** I wanted to be the boss because I thought his job was easy and he made the most money. Now I have a warm feeling of pride and contentment in accomplishment. You reach a point where you don't think about money any more.
Ind. Ex. C. At first I wanted to run things and get paid big money. Now I get the biggest kick out of being respected for my ability as a problem solver, both technical and human problems.

Ind. Ex. D. Praise, commendations and the satisfaction of doing a good job outweigh the monetary reward. The government can tax the latter but not the former.

Ind. Ex. E. Reality never quite comes up to expectations because problems are greater than you supposed. The big satisfaction is the realization that the happiness, jobs and success of others are dependent on you and that you are not letting them down.

Ind. Ex. F. I don't think the average executive is too money-minded. It is outweighed by the satisfaction of seeing his company grow and his people grow with it. He feels he has made a contribution to both.

Ind. Ex. G. I had a big job and was making good money but I wasn't happy because the higher ups expected me to compromise my principles. So I quit and now I'm happy because I'm making enough money through making other people happy rather than exploiting them.

Ind. Ex. H. When you're worried about making money you're in a constant strain. You get circumscribed and lose sight of other people's interests. Success frees a man from worrying about money and he has time to do things for other people and his community.

Other industrial executives mentioned the levelling effect of the income tax on the desire to accumulate wealth. Almost all of them placed a high value on subjective rewards and satisfactions. Again more similarities than individual differences were found.

The comparative statements of business executives were typically as follows:

Bus. Ex. A. The biggest reward I ever received was the approbation of the head man of this nation-wide organization. The most money I ever made in my life came when I forgot about making it and became immersed in developing young people. There is no satisfaction like pride in those you have developed.

Bus. Ex. B. Yes, my conceptions have changed. Security means more to me now than money. I'd take a job at less salary to be
secure. This way I wouldn't have to worry about accumulating enough money for security and could devote more time to helping other people.

Bus. Ex. C. Yes, my notions have changed. Originally I set out to get another fellow's job because I wanted more money and the authority to make people do things. Now, I think differently. I want to lead people into doing things. My new satisfactions are in developing young people. They are my pride and joy. My other big satisfaction comes from serving the public.

Bus. Ex. D. Young people are too self-centered and too money conscious. As you get older you get the satisfaction of doing a good job and seeing things grow. The satisfaction of being responsible for the growth of your business and its people is your greatest career reward.

Subjective satisfactions in addition to material rewards are as apparent in the conceptions of business executives as they were in those of industrial executives.

The conceptions of the administrative executives were typified by the following:

Adm. Ex. A. There has been a definite change in my conceptions. At first I thought about a big car, big house, a big yacht and getting rich. Now, money is incidental to me. It is a question of recognition in one's field and the prestige and respect of society. Doing something useful and being credited for it gives you an inner satisfaction that money can't buy.

Adm. Ex. B. Administrative executives don't get paid as much as business and industry pay their top people, so money can't be the main rewards. Originally I didn't appreciate the tremendous satisfaction of working with people — particularly young people. Now the satisfaction of having helped many young people through the years is tremendously satisfying. You feel you have left your mark on them.

It is difficult to set forth positive implications from the above statements of the various executives. It is an obvious role expectation that they should not overtly express too much concern with the accumulation of material rewards such as money. It is a role expectation that they should express satisfactions in job accomplishment and developing
people. The chances are that, after a certain level of material reward has been reached, executives are freed of financial worries and find other more subjective satisfactions. This is probably why executives prefer to speak of "enough money" instead of "a lot of money". Nevertheless, the general expressions of subjective satisfactions, pride in accomplishment and in developing people, are believed to be genuine and can be accepted as evidence that the modern executive, generally speaking, is now more humanistic than materialistic, though the reverse was probably true before he achieved substantial material success.

**Conceptions of Personal Penalties and Sacrifices.**

When asked a corollary question concerning the personal penalties and sacrifices attached to the role of executive, there was an almost unanimous agreement concerning their nature. Here was found a definite pattern of similarity between individuals and environments. Among the penalties and sacrifices mentioned were: (1) Adverse effect of a pressure environment on personal health; (2) Considerably more worry than the average professional person; (3) Lack of time for recreation and leisure; (4) Insufficient opportunity for normal family life; (5) A certain amount of loneliness associated with an isolated position; (6) Feeling that hard work will lead to even harder work; (7) Inability to take vacations; (8) Constant invasions of personal privacy; (9) Constant suppression of personal desires; (10) Constant disruption of personal plans; (11) Fear of making wrong decisions.

As one executive put it:

This company has been reorganized and I turned over the presidency to a younger man. I wanted to get rid of all those responsibilities, worrying and pressure. The ups and downs in
the competitive business world are terrific. You're on the phone days and nights and holidays. I've got to get more time with my family and more time for recreation before it is too late. I haven't had a vacation in four years and the only way to get one is to just pack up and leave town.

**Differential Definitions of "Career Success."**

The words "career success" mean different things to different people. The various executives were asked to define the term, now that they had climbed the executive ladder. A variety of definitions was expected and was received. The following are typical examples:

**Ind. Ex. A.** Money isn't everything. Success is the inner satisfaction of accomplishment. Having the courage of your convictions and feeling good about what you have achieved. Realizing that people appreciate you and have confidence in you.

**Ind. Ex. B.** Career success means money enough to care for my family comfortably plus the satisfaction of job accomplishment. Believing you are doing your job better than it has ever been done before.

**Ind. Ex. C.** Success means wanting something above average and getting it — above average income and prestige and the respect of your family, friends, fellow workers, superiors and the community.

**Ind. Ex. D.** Reaching a goal several steps higher than you ever dreamed of reaching and being able to compare yourself favorably with your boyhood friends.

**Ind. Ex. E.** An executive feels successful when his services are desired by his superiors and are requested by other companies.

**Ind. Ex. F.** Too much money can worry you to death. Success is a question of being considered an outstanding individual in your occupational field — to have a respected reputation.

**Ind. Ex. G.** Success is complex. It cannot be divorced from personal and family happiness and security. If you can't meet your family obligations you aren't successful despite your job success. There must be a balance between the two.
Ind. Ex. H. A successful person is one who has reached the highest bracket with regard to salary and responsibility that his talent and character permit.

Ind. Ex. I. Success means recognition by your contemporaries, financial security and being asked by big companies to accept new challenges.

Ind. Ex. J. A man is successful when everybody in the company says he has done a good job and aren't jealous. He is successful when he is contributing to the welfare of his workers, his company and the public. A man must pay his debt to the people who gave him his opportunities.

Bus. Ex. A. Money has nothing to do with success. Racketeers accumulate money. Many people with too much money are a detriment to the community. What your family or friends think of you is the criterion of success. It means achieving the respect of your family, your friends, your competitors and your community.

Bus. Ex. B. I don't define success in terms of power, authority or prestige, but in terms of a comfortable income, self-satisfaction and community respect.

Bus. Ex. C. The respect of those whom and with whom you serve is the highest criterion of success. Couple this with a moderate financial income and the good opinion of your competitors.

Bus. Ex. D. To be a good company man and a good community man is the criterion of success. You are known in the company and community for having achieved more and more responsible positions.

Bus. Ex. E. Success is not a question of money. It depends on whether you wind up with a happy, satisfying home and have raised your children right.

Bus. Ex. F. To me success means happiness and a clear conscience, plus a fair amount of means and a position of respect in the community.

Adm. Ex. A. Success means the attainment of recognition by your colleagues for high level performance as judged by the criterion in your field. That is, if you have "made the grade" and been rewarded whether it be with a scroll, a medal or a $50,000 salary.

Adm. Ex. B. Many people are happy without objective career success. Too much objective career success may lead to unhappiness, so I prefer to define the term as a subjective feeling of achievement.
Adm. Ex. C. If the job seeks you without your seeking the job you know you are successful. Jobs will seek you when you have demonstrated outstanding ability and achieved the respect, esteem and confidence of your fellows without trying to pile up material wealth and money.

Although success has been variously defined above, considerable importance has been almost invariantly attached to subjective criteria. Caution should again be observed in making implications. The definitions given were obviously conditioned by the passage of time during which the executives had achieved considerable objective success and monetary reward. The chances are that, had these same individuals been asked to define "career success" at an earlier stage in their careers, they would have done so more objectively and less subjectively. Like their conceptions of rewards and satisfactions, their definitions of success were apparently conditioned and mellowed by the passage of time.

We have now completed a descriptive analysis of the self-appraisals by executives of their personal careers and have attempted to make immediate implications as we progressed. We will turn in the next section to a comparative analysis of the self-appraisals of supervisors.

Self Appraisals by Supervisors

It will be recalled that, in inviting the individuals in the supervisory sample to appraise their personal careers, care was taken not to imply any lack of career success on their parts. For this reason, the supervisory self appraisals do not fall into the same analytical categories as those of the executives. However, the analytical categories chosen do permit ready comparison of the supervisory self appraisals with those of the executives. Such comparisons and resultant implications will be made.
in the last section of this chapter.

As in the analysis of the executive sample, the questions asked
the supervisors will not be repeated verbatim because spontaneous queries
were added as the interviews progressed. The analytical categories chosen
were as follows: (1) Occupational Choices and Progress; (2) Career Plans
and Goals; (3) Career Satisfactions; (4) Career Dissatisfactions; (5)
Retrospective Alternate Occupational Choices; (6) Retrospective Alternate
Career Goals; (7) Projective Levels of Aspiration; (8) Differential
Definitions of Career Success.

**Occupational Choices and Progress**

As was to be expected in the sample of supervisors, a great many
individual differences were found in their explanations of occupational
choices and occupational progress. These were, in large part, due to
differential socio-economic backgrounds and differential occupational
opportunities. Considerable horizontal mobility was evident before they
finally settled into a more or less permanent occupation.

Among the factors mentioned as having influenced early occupational
choices were: economic necessity for going to work, influence of father's
occupation, lack of opportunity to prepare for an occupation in college
(a circumstance of considerable retrospective regret), quitting school to
get married, applying what skills they had where they could, wanting to
get off the farm, being victims of the great depression, looking for a
company that did not require a college education to start, hearing of open-
ings in new industrial plants, hitting the road with boyhood friends in
search of new experiences, being offered a steady job by a relative or
family friend. Many supervisors stated that they had had no early occu-
pational choice at all, but had entered their occupations by force of
circumstances or necessity. Some industrial supervisors stated that they
were originally hired by plants because their hands showed the calluses
of hard work. Many business supervisors had had boyhood jobs selling
newspapers or working in stores. Several administrative executives
claimed they got started through looking for "nice clean work" (they had
had considerably more education than other supervisors).

Typical of the various supervisors are the following quotations:

**Ind. Sup. A.** I had a brother with the brewery. They needed
a driver, so I quit school and went to work. I got to know people
and became a sales manager with a bottling company, but it took a
long time.

**Ind. Sup. B.** I liked the man running this company and he
liked me. So I started with him when I was a kid. You take up
with somebody you admire, do a good job and they take care of
you.

**Ind. Sup. C.** My father was a tenant farmer and didn't have
any land. So I took off for town and got me a job in the plant.
I hardly went to school at all, so I guess I've done O. K.

**Ind. Sup. D.** I was standing in line with a bunch of guys and
was the only one who could speak English. The company hired me
right off the bat as a foreman over them. I'm a supervisor now.
At least my men can speak English and I can teach them.

**Ind. Sup. E.** What could I do without a college education?
Well, I just decided to hook on with a big company and work up as
high as I could. What I learned was on the job.

**Ind. Sup. F.** I knew I had a limited education so I thought
I'd get with some new industrial corporation. It has grown and
so have I.

**Ind. Sup. G.** Roustabouting taught me the drudgery of manual
labor. So I took some night courses in practical chemistry.
That's how I was able to get started here. And then I learned
more practical chemistry on the job.

**Ind. Sup. H.** I was taking chemistry in college and working
summers in the plant. Like a fool I quit college. I wish I hadn't
or I'd be a lot higher.
**Ind. Sup. I.** When I was a young fellow I was fooling around on the railroad. I quit and went with the plant because it was big and growing. Without an education I've risen as high as I could.

**Ind. Sup. J.** I was riding the rails with another boy, headed for Oklahoma. We passed this plant, got off and got jobs as pipe fitters' helpers. Just been around ever since. It took a long time to get where I am.

**Ind. Sup. K.** I used to work in the shipyards but the union took all my money and I got disgusted. You didn’t have to be a union man to start in here. I showed them my callused hands and they hired me. I always have worked hard to get into supervision.

**Bus. Sup. A.** I was influenced by my friends to quit school and join them here. It has been a nice environment, but I wish I hadn't quit school. With more training I might have risen higher.

**Bus. Sup. B.** I was a newspaper agent and had no future. I wanted to get with a going company. They offered me $60 a month. I thought that was so swell, I've been here ever since.

**Bus. Sup. C.** I started out as a clerk in a small town bank. They fired me to make room for a family friend. So I came here and looked for a company where family influence didn't operate so much. Through the years they put the younger clerks under me.

**Bus. Sup. D.** When young, I used to sell things just for pocket change. Later I found retailing fascinating because I like to meet and deal with people. But you get stuck unless you have connections.

**Bus. Sup. E.** I used to be a union painter. I was hired to run this department because I know about paint and know the paint contractors. I'm too old now to expect much more.

**Bus. Sup. F.** I started in a store when I was fifteen. Once you get in retailing it gets in your blood. I was a country boy and it made me feel like a big shot to become a buyer and department manager.

**Bus. Sup. G.** I was influenced to get started in retailing by a buddy of mine. Then I found out I liked it. When you find out you like something you just stick around. Maybe you just get too satisfied.

**Bus. Sup. H.** What happens is this. You start working around at odd jobs when you're a kid. Then you get to liking the people and you quit school. You just sort of grow up in the place and probably die there too.
Adm. Sup. A. When I finished school I got a job to fill in until I got into the Army. Made a lot of friends. After the Army, I just drifted back to my old job with my friends.

Adm. Sup. B. I worked my way through college with a campus job. Shifted courses several times and never did find what I really liked. So when I graduated I just stuck around the campus in the business end. This job doesn't fit in with my education. I guess I just like the environment.

Adm. Sup. C. I started out as a country teacher because I wanted to be like an old teacher whom I admired. But you can make more money in supervision. This set-up is so departmentalized that at my age I don't know how much higher I can go.

In the above quotations there seems to be a variety of individual differences but three general situational similarities. The implication is that, in general, the occupational choices and progress of supervisors are determined by: (1) Differential socio-economic backgrounds, (2) Differential educational qualifications, and (3) Differential occupational opportunities. It should be noted, however, that supervisors have achieved a limited amount of occupational ascent, with the three conditions mentioned as the probable limiting factors.

Career Plans and Goals.

The various supervisors were asked to state whether their original plans and goals had fitted in with their actual career experiences. Most of the interviewees stated that they had had no particular plans and goals when they first started working other than to get a good job and make a decent living. It was only after they had become more or less occupationally stabilized that, in most cases, they began to formulate definite plans and goals. It was at this period in their careers that they apparently began to reflect seriously upon their educational limitations and job qualifications. Usually, this occurred after they had made a
connection with some going concern. Typical illustrative quotations follow:

**Ind. Sup. A.** When I had been around the plant a while, I realized that I was a specialist working for wages. I wanted to get off wages and on to a salary as a foreman. Then I wanted to get off shift work. When you get off shift and get to be a supervisor, you've got it made.

**Ind. Sup. B.** I never set my goals too high because I know my educational limitations. So I figured the best way was to get with a growing company and try to work up. Yes, my actual experiences have been O.K. This plant takes care of us old timers. I've done good, considering.

**Ind. Sup. C.** I had some property and some money, but lost everything in the depression. What do you do in a case like that, without much education? So I just planned to hook up with this growing company and it has paid off well enough. After all I've got good retirement coming.

**Ind. Sup. D.** Before you are married and have some kids you don't have too many goals. Then you settle down with some big company and do the best you can. You learn a lot on the job and after some years they make a foreman out of you. Then you join the management club.

**Ind. Sup. E.** Don't set your goals too high if you haven't a college degree. I've worked up step-by-step to the next highest job, through hard work, determination and constant study. I'm in a technical department and I'm the only division foreman there without a college degree. I feel good that I've done that well.

**Ind. Sup. F.** When I was younger, I didn't know what it was all about and how you can get blocked without an education. You get in so deep with family responsibilities you have to try to rise up if you can. But now I wish I'd started out raising cattle out in the country. At least you are your own boss that way.

**Ind. Sup. G.** My original goal was to make enough money so I'd never have to go back to being a rough-neck. It was tough but I made it. No more rough-necking for me! They invite me to the management conferences now — you know, the big team-work talks.

**Ind. Sup. H.** I wanted to get as high as I could with my limited education. The best way is with a growing company. It took me 18 years to get off shift and make supervisor. I guess I've done all right. I go to work same time as the front office now.
I used to be subject to union seniority. You'll never get into management if you stay in the union. So I transferred to another plant and finally made general foreman. Yea, we got a foreman's association, called the management club.

I'm an immigrant and I didn't have any lofty goals. Hard work in America paid off beyond my fondest expectations. I've enjoyed being assimilated. It shows what you can do over here. I've got a nice home and a good family and I think I've exceeded my goals. I know how to get along with everybody.

Recurrent in the plans mentioned by industrial supervisors was a general recognition of their educational handicaps. One supervisor mentioned that all the other supervisors in his department were college graduates, indicative of increasing specialized job requirements. There was an undercurrent of pride in this group that, without a special education, they had risen as high as they did. Realization of a lack of formal education, in most cases, conditioned levels of aspiration. A generalized goal among this group seemed to have been to get off wages and shift work and on to a salary. When the average long service industrial supervisor accomplished that goal, he felt that he had achieved substantial vertical mobility, had "arrived" in management and had "got it made."

Like the industrial group, the business supervisors seemed to lack any clear-cut plans and goals when they first started working. It was usually a question of "a good job in a pleasant environment." The following are a few typical cases:

The low level management in retailing doesn't amount to much. You can't get any particular goals. You are just a highly paid clerk. The biggest mistake I ever made was in not starting out with one of the plants. You have to make your own retirement here or depend on social security.
Bus. Sup. B. My plans were to go in business for myself. But how can you without any capital? You stick around so long you just get stuck and get in charge of a lot of kids and old folks. Then they start calling you, "Pop!"

Bus. Sup. C. At first, I wanted to be a store manager. But somewhere, someone decided I could only manage a department. I guess you just get satisfied after so long a time and you can't afford to leave. You wind up down stairs and there you stay.

Bus. Sup. D. I wanted to work up into top retail management, but I got into the wrong clique and now I'll never make it. If you take the wrong side in store arguments you are sunk. You look up and see some young fellow in charge of you. The fair-haired boys come in from the outside.

Bus. Sup. E. I wanted to reach the top level but after years of hard work and study, my career plans and goals are yet to be fulfilled. They give you titles and raises but not much responsibility.

Bus. Sup. F. At first I just wanted to make a living in a pleasant occupation. It has been pleasant enough and a good enough living. The main thing is I've made a lot of friends. That's what keeps you going.

There is the danger of over-generalizing from the above quotations, but there seems to be a decided environmental difference between these business supervisors of long service and the comparative industrial group. They expressed little pride in accomplishment. Educational handicaps were not so much a matter of concern to them. Their mobility, for the most part, seems to have resulted from longevity. Whatever managerial status they had was apparently "reflected" rather than achieved. It is probable that such a "reflected" status in the white collar business environment, results in either self-complacency on the one hand or frustration on the other.

The small group of administrative supervisors were unlike either the industrial or the business group in stating their career plans and goals. They generally seemed to feel that they were still due to rise
occupationally through bureaucratic longevity and promotion.

Career Satisfactions.

Unlike the decided environmental differences found in the previous section, more similarities than differences were found in the answers of the majority of the supervisors concerning the factors which make for occupational satisfactions in careers like theirs. While the questions were phrased impersonally, it was apparent that the majority of the individuals were projecting their own satisfactions into their answers. Composite categorical answers follow:

Ind. Sups. Liking your work, satisfaction in accomplishment, good treatment and encouragement by superiors, feeling you are making a contribution and being rewarded, setting goals and reaching them, fair income, job security, family and community respect, making friends as you go, overcoming educational handicaps, modernizing your job, getting along with anybody, rubbing elbows with persons with more technical knowledge while being respected by them, happy home life on a moderate scale, pleasant working conditions and surroundings, being able to adapt to something distasteful, working for a loyal company, understanding bosses, the feeling of belonging, being able to give your children a college education, helping others, training subordinates, physical safety, pension benefits, overcoming terrific personal obstacles, being able to influence younger workers.

Bus. Sups. Liking your employer and fellow workers, dealing with and meeting new people, job security, pleasant surroundings, satisfactory pay, practicing psychology on the public, being in glamorous work, enjoying yourself while working, feeling you're important to the company, having a satisfied family, having the confidence of your bosses and fellow workers, satisfying your customers, being physically and mentally suited for your work, knowing more about your job than the other fellow, being appreciated by top management, feeling "on the team".

The expressions of the administrative supervisors were similar to the above and need not be repeated. Actually, the expressions of the majority of all supervisors could have been categorized as "What Supervisors Want" and are similar, in most respects, to the findings of
several well known studies of "What Workers Want."²

Career Dissatisfactions

The various accounts of career dissatisfactions were much more revealing than were the expressions of career satisfactions. The interviewees were not asked to express their own dissatisfactions directly, but to state reasons why some of their contemporaries were not satisfied with their occupational progress. The general question was "loaded," so to speak, and the end result was to bring to light both objective and subjective factors negatively related to mobility. The subjective factors were probably most important and usually took the form of negative definitions of career situations with resultant negative effects on levels of aspiration. It was probable that a great deal of self-projection occurred particularly among the business group. The following are illustrative quotations.

Ind. Sup. A. Being in the wrong job in the first place. Won't admit he's not better qualified. Gets in so deep in salary and benefits, he can't afford to quit, so stays on just getting by. Gripes about being discriminated against. Thinks somebody had it in for him.

Ind. Sup. B. Knowing if he stays he won't get any further, but, if he quits he'll have to start at the bottom elsewhere. He gets little recognition and says "What's the use." Management doesn't praise him because they are afraid he'll ask for a raise.

Ind. Sup. C. He's not healthy and has a bum home life. If he can't get along at home he can't get along with people on the job. He gets jealous of everybody and doesn't realize his mistakes. Then he gets rotated instead of promoted.

Ind. Sup. D. I know a dissatisfied misfit who had a nervous breakdown until he went back down to being an operator. The usual answer is that they just don't want responsibilities.

Ind. Sup. E. Nagging wives ruin a man. They block him at home so he keeps on doing work he's not interested in. Because of her he gets jealous of other better qualified people and then decides he doesn't like his boss. He can't afford to quit and he can't get any higher. He's in a hell of a fix!

Ind. Sup. F. Thinking they should advance without being qualified, being unable to get along with people, getting jealous of others, having an unhappy home life. These things lead to intemperance in personal habits and the guy is stuck.

Ind. Sup. G. Down in their hearts, they know they are in a wonderful place to work, but they are just professional grippers. They run around with chips on their shoulders, but you couldn't get them to leave.

Ind. Sup. H. There are always greener pastures over the fence, but they never jump the fence. They just stick around on the job unaware of their own short-comings.

Ind. Sup. I. A big negative factor is being treated like a machine instead of a human being. You feel like you are just clocking in and clocking out. They want to feel their job is important and leads somewhere besides dollars and cents. They get frustrated but, because of the dollars and cents, they get self-satisfied.

Ind. Sup. J. Some guys think the world owes them a living and think they ought to get the same pay as top management. They don't care about their company or their boss. They are never satisfied with anything. But they are in so deep, they are hog-tied.

Bus. Sup. A. In a job like this you either get frustrated or self-satisfied. Either way, you know you can't go any higher but you have family responsibilities and you are so old you can't afford to quit. So there you are.

Bus. Sup. B. The main thing is being around so long you are stuck. You can't leave so you just make the best of it.

Bus. Sup. C. Some people just can't stay put. Other pastures are always greener. Wherever they are, they imagine they are discriminated against. They have no clear goals. Don't know good opportunities when they see them. They get to be old-time floaters, wear good clothes and run around talking big.
Bus. Sup. D. Some of them stand around in the store, looking at people and day-dreaming. They know they have no higher future, but they're always jealous of others.

Bus. Sup. E. Management doesn't tell them they are valuable. They get old on the job and can't afford to quit. They just turn into old crabs that people put up with.

Bus. Sup. F. Some characters are always screaming! They feel like they are being dumped on. Haven't got sense enough to know they have a good job. If you offered them one with a lot of responsibility, they wouldn't take it.

Bus. Sup. G. Let's nail it down to two main causes: (1) Being unwilling to accept responsibilities or (2) Being around so long they can't afford to quit. They either get frustrated or complacent, usually the latter. Either way they don't stop griping.

Adm. Sup. A. I think there are four main causes: (1) Being in the wrong job in the first place, (2) Looking for easier ways to make bigger money, (3) Overestimating their abilities, (4) Being jealous of others.

Adm. Sup. B. Let's put it this way. They get in a rut and can't get out. They are afraid to take chances. Although jealous of others, they lack real aggressiveness. Finally, they accept what life has to offer.

It would seem from the above illustrative quotations that supervisors, in general, tend to give rationalized objective reasons for limited career progress. There is, however, as has been said, the definite implication that negatively defined career situations negatively affect levels of aspirations. Nevertheless, it is probable that most supervisors, while overtly expressing themselves otherwise, are covertly satisfied that they have risen to their present positions. It should also be cautiously recalled that most supervisors have risen from the ranks of workers where they probably acquired habits of "blowing off steam" difficult to discard, which they suppress or express depending on the nature of the audience.
Retrospective Alternate Occupational Choices.

When asked to state whether they would choose a different occupation if they could start over again, if so, why, and if not, why not, most of the industrial supervisors stated that they would choose the same occupation but would, by all means, get a college education. They felt that the retirement and pension benefits offered by industrial corporations were very attractive, but they also felt that a better education would enable them to rise much higher in management. In the minority who stated that they would choose a different occupation, the usual reason given was "to be my own boss." Those in the minority also expressed the necessity for a better education, at least a college degree.

The reverse trend was apparent in the answers of the business group of supervisors. Most of them stated that they would choose a different occupation. Some of this group stated they would like to start over with an industrial corporation because the retirement benefits were better, but the different occupations most often mentioned were doctor and lawyer and the reason given "to be my own boss." This group were also aware that a college degree would be necessary if they could start over again. The minority who said they would start over again in the same occupation expressed self-complacency by saying, "This has been pleasant and a good living"; "This sort of business gets in your blood!"; "I'd just operate differently, that's all," etc.

No pattern was apparent in the answers of the administrative supervisors. Two of them, however, said that they would like to go into politics because "you get the inside track to better administrative jobs
that way. Since this sample was well educated by comparison to the other two, they did not express a need for a better education to start over with.

Retrospective Alternate Career Goals.

The various interviewees were next asked whether they would like to become top level executives if they could start over again. In the sample of industrial supervisors the majority stated they would not. The following are statements typical of the majority:

Ind. Sup. A. No. Not way up top. That kind of job commands a man's whole being, day and night. Almost commands his soul. He wonders if he has a real friend in the world and is scared to death of his job. I'd rather be happy. I don't think the top man at our plant is happy.

Ind. Sup. B. No. I'd rather be in middle management. Not in the head man's shoes. I wouldn't want all of that responsibility and pressure.

Ind. Sup. C. No. The top men aren't really running the place. The middle men are.

Ind. Sup. D. Not me. There's too much mental and physical strain. Your life is not your own. You're always on the go — away from home half the time. The pressure killed one of my best friends.

Ind. Sup. E. No. If you get too high you just get cooped up. You wrestle around with responsibilities when you want to go fishing.

Ind. Sup. F. Hell no! Look at our head man. He has a wonderful education, makes a lot of money and has a big reputation. But, he's always contending with labor problems and all sorts of worries and responsibilities. I'd rather have a pleasant life. With power goes headaches and ulcers.

Ind. Sup. G. I started out with a man who has gone all the way to the top. Now he is completely out of touch with all his old friends. One of my other old friends died the other day of "industrial suicide".
Again we see negative definitions of higher career situations with corresponding negative influences on personal levels of aspiration. In the minority of industrial supervisors who stated that they would like to be top executives if they could start over, the usual reason given was "the added salary, power, and social standing." Yet their answers were hedged with a cautious awareness of "headaches, responsibilities, worrying, etc." It is apparently safe to speculate that industrial supervisors, in general, if they could start over, would aspire at most to positions in middle management.

Like the industrial group, the majority of the business group of supervisors also stated that they would not aspire to being top level executives if they could start over. They also attached too many "headaches, responsibilities, worries," etc., to top level positions. The following statements are typical of the majority of the business group:

**Bus. Sup. A.** No. Just manager of a small store would be good enough for me. There are too many sacrifices to get much higher. You lose the joy of everyday living with the ones you love. There are too many demands on people with big money.

**Bus. Sup. B.** The top man is the hardest job in the organization. The directors hound you to death. There are too many headaches and worries. I don't think the sacrifices are worth it.

**Bus. Sup. C.** One top executive I know of was very successful but committed suicide. I wouldn't want to be like that. Too much detail on their minds for everyday good living.

**Bus. Sup. D.** No, Sir! Let some one else have that. Maybe I'm lazy, but there's too much mental strain. I think happiness and contentment are more important than reaching the top level.

Once more we see negative definitions of higher situations with corresponding negative effects on levels of aspiration. It should be recalled that the majority of business supervisors had previously stated
that they would choose different occupations if they could start over, not to be a top executive but "to be my own boss".

Curiously, all of the administrative supervisors stated that they would not desire to be top level executives if they could start over. They tended to equate these top positions negatively with personal happiness, as had the majority of the other groups of supervisors.

Projective Levels of Aspiration

It had been expected that direct and indirect definitions of career situations and levels of aspiration would be an area in which significant differences between supervisors and executives would be found. To further exploit this expectation, another "loaded" question of a projective nature was included in the interview schedule. Supervisors were asked to suppose that they had an adolescent son, to state what kind of an occupation they would like to see him enter, and why, and to state what kind of education or training would best prepare him for that occupation. It was assumed that considerable self projection would occur and it was apparent that such was the case.

Many of the supervisors did have adolescent sons or had sons who had come into adulthood and entered an occupation. Almost invariably the answers commenced substantially with, "Well, it would depend on his aptitudes and interests. The main thing would be to get him into something for which he was qualified and which he would enjoy as his life-work."

In the industrial group, there was an almost even division of
of statements of occupational preferences for their sons. Roughly half of them thought some forms of engineering or electronics would hold good futures because, "They are the coming fields." The other rough half expressed a preference to see their sons become professional men (doctors and lawyers being most frequently mentioned) because, "They would be their own bosses, would achieve more social standing and would do more good for people." There was an almost unanimous agreement that their sons should have much more formal education than they themselves had had, at least a college degree and graduate training, if possible. Those who suggested engineering for their sons thought additional courses in business administration and the social sciences would be advisable because, "Engineers don't know enough about how to handle people and ought to learn more about it in college."

In the business group, there was a decided preference for their sons to become professional men like lawyers or doctors because, "You have to have connections to get very high in business these days." A minority thought that engineering or allied occupations offered their sons good futures while only a few thought that business would be a good field. Like the industrial group, the business group placed a premium on their sons receiving a college education.

The two administrative supervisors who expressed definite preferences for their sons mentioned the profession of lawyer. All of them thought a college degree and graduate training would be advisable.

**Differential Definitions of "Career Success."**

As was expected, a variety of definitions of the term was received.
Individual differences were more apparent than environmental differences. The general tendency was to define "career success" subjectively, the usual formula being "happiness plus security equals success". Typical variations of this basic definition follow:

**Ind. Sup. A.** Success means happiness, peace of mind, security, family respect and providing good starts for one's children.

**Ind. Sup. B.** Success is the satisfaction of knowing you are accomplishing something, being personally happy, making other people happy, providing well for your family and being recognized as a respectable citizen. Whatever money you make is only a means to these ends.

**Ind. Sup. C.** Success is the satisfaction of being as good or better than your contemporaries and being happier and more secure than most of them.

**Ind. Sup. D.** You can't measure success in dollars and cents. It is the personal satisfaction of accomplishing your goals, while helping others to accomplish theirs.

**Ind. Sup. E.** Career success is job satisfaction plus the ability to get along with and help other people. It means enjoying life with one's family, providing security for them and giving one's children a college education.

**Bus. Sup. A.** It isn't wealth, power and glory. It is security, contentment, self-respect and the respect of others.

**Bus. Sup. B.** Everybody can't reach the top level. There are plenty of successful people in low levels. Their success comes from contentment, security, self and family satisfaction and happiness.

**Adm. Sup. A.** If high blood pressure means success, I've been unsuccessful because I have normal blood pressure. To me career success means making a continuous contribution on whatever level you are. It isn't the acquisition of wealth and power.

**Adm. Sup. B.** Career success means making a contribution to your field, a contribution to your community, having family respect and achieving financial security.

It is probable that, throughout the supervisory sample, subjective rather than objective conceptions of career success tend to condition
levels of aspiration and to limit career plans and goals accordingly.

Our analyses of self appraisals of personal career patterns by the comparative samples of executives and supervisors is now complete. Immediate implications have been made as the respective analyses progressed. We will turn in the next section to comparing the factors and patterns found, with a view to better understanding the similarities and differences between the two samples.

Comparisons and Implications

Prior to comparing the inferences and implications found in the preceding self appraisals of executives and supervisors, it is appropriate to recall certain of the differences and distinctions found in the analysis of the descriptive backgrounds of the two samples outlined in the last section of Chapter II. These were: (1) Differential social origins; (2) Differential socio-economic backgrounds; (3) Differential educational attainments; (4) Differential occupational opportunities. These distinctive differences between the two samples are fundamental and have been sharpened by evidence obtained in the respective self appraisals. In fact, it seems safe to say that these four conditions determine occupational placement, influence an individual's "start in life" and continue to affect subsequent social and occupational ascent.

Inasmuch as immediate implications have already been made as the analyses of self appraisals of the two groups proceeded, the following comparisons and general implications will be fairly brief.

When the retrospective explanations of personal success of executives were compared with the retrospective explanations of career choices
and progress of supervisors, a great many individual and situational differences were found in both. There were, however, patterns of similarity within groups and dissimilarity between groups in which important implications appeared. When the patterns of similarity within groups were identified, it became apparent that the main differences between groups were: (1) Differential boyhood and adolescent experiences; (2) Differential influences of families and friends; (3) Differential social origins and socio-economic backgrounds; (4) Differential educational qualifications; (5) Differential occupational opportunities; (6) Differential aptitudes and interests; (7) Differential technical abilities and social skills.

While executives, in general, attached considerable importance to technical abilities acquired through education and/or training, supervisors, in general, particularly those in industry, were acutely aware of their educational handicaps. While most executives attached considerable importance to their ability to handle and manipulate people as a positive influence on their career progress, most supervisors were not aware that any lack of this primary social skill was a negative influence on their career progress. It, therefore, seems logical to offer this general implication: Differential occupational mobility between executives and supervisors is, in large part, a product of the differential interactive effect of the seven conditions listed above.

When the executives stated their personal rules for achieving success, a great many individual differences were again apparent but there was also a general pattern of similarity. In addition to the commonly accepted virtues of honesty, integrity and hardwork, considerable
emphasis was placed on: (1) Understanding, getting along with, handling and manipulating people; (2) Being willing to accept responsibilities and make decisions; (3) Being willing and able to properly delegate, supervise and coordinate authority; (4) Developing personality attributes commensurate with technical abilities. The logical implication is that executives, in general, possess these qualities to a greater extent than they are possessed by supervisors.

In comparing the career plans and goals of executives with those of supervisors and in identifying the patterns of similarity within groups as opposed to the patterns of difference between groups, it was apparent that short range goals were essentially the same, i.e., "to get a good job and make a decent living." As careers progressed with the passage of time, there was a tendency in the executive group to feel that a suitable level of material reward had been achieved, to express more concern with human values and to set long range goals in terms of subjective satisfactions, including the acquisition of additional prestige and esteem. (The acquisition of power was generally denied as a goal). Comparably, there was no tendency in the supervisory group to raise their career plans and goals but to redefine them in terms of personal and family respect, happiness and security. (These are goals commonly associated with middle class levels of aspiration). The implication here is that the career plans and goals of executives are altered more with the passage of time than are the plans and goals of supervisors.

When the pattern of similarity in the executives' conceptions of the personal rewards and satisfactions associated with career success had been identified, it was apparent that the passage of time had influenced
them in the same manner that it had influenced the transformation of their short range career plans and goals into long range plans and goals. In other words, after a certain level of material reward had been reached, with resultant freedom from financial concern, subjective satisfactions, including the development of others, the growth of their organizations, and the acquisition of additional recognition and prestige were considered more rewarding. (Again, the acquisition of power was denied as a reward or satisfaction). By comparison, the pattern of similarity in the expressions of the supervisory group concerning their career satisfactions took the form of the rewards which workers, in general, want and, in addition, the satisfaction of being able to provide better career opportunities for their children and the achievement of personal and family respect, happiness and security. (The acquisition of prestige and power was never mentioned as a career satisfaction by supervisors, for obvious reasons). The implication here is simple -- executives and supervisors have initially similar though subsequently different conceptions of career rewards and satisfactions.

The pattern of penalties and sacrifices which executives associated with their careers was totally dissimilar to the pattern of career dissatisfactions expressed by the supervisors. Executives were strongly oriented to the present in referring to penalties such as pressure, atmosphere, business worry, lack of time for recreation and family life, loneliness, suppression of personal desires, disruption of personal plans, etc. Supervisors were strongly oriented to the past in rationalizing their career limitations as penalties resulting, in large measure, from their educational handicaps and lack of occupational opportunities.
Retrospectively, supervisors engaged in considerable wishful thinking and tended to project their unachieved levels of aspiration into other career fields and into their career preferences for their sons. The implication is that executives and supervisors have different definitions of career situations which differentially affect their levels of aspiration.

Caution must be observed in comparing the patterns of executive and supervisory definitions of "career success". It cannot be said that executives tend to define "career success" more or less objectively or subjectively than supervisors do. The difference is in the elements of the criteria of success selected for inclusion in the definition. Whereas executives tended to include sufficient material reward, pride in accomplishment and the acquisition of recognition and prestige in the definition, supervisors tended to equate "career success" with personal and family respect, happiness and security. However defined, success does seem to have a different meaning for the two groups.

In concluding this chapter, we wish to restate, in part, the general hypothesis developed in our frame of reference and approach (pp. 58-59, supra):

Individuals in management who have achieved high level executive positions and outstanding career success through time, define their career situations differently, have differential attitudes, values and life-goals, differential levels of aspiration, differential explanations for success or failure and differential conceptions of career success, from individuals who have not achieved comparable managerial positions and career success.

At this point in our research investigation we consider that favorable evidence has been offered in support of our partially restated general hypothesis.
CHAPTER IV
APPRAISALS OF FACTORS IN THE CAREER PATTERNS OF OTHERS

This chapter will present descriptive analyses of answers to ques­tions in the first portions of the third sections of the respective inter­view guides, which questions were, in part, designed to bring out specific distinctions between highly successful executives and moderately successful supervisors, together with similarities and contrasts in their personal capacities and attributes. The questions were also designed to bring out the relative importance of informal factors which presumably influence career progress and success. The material contained in the various appraisals of the career patterns of others was not as subjective in nature as was the material contained in the self appraisals analyzed in the previous chapter. Nevertheless, much of its richness would be lost if some amount of illustrative quotations were not employed. To minimize profuse quotation, however, illustrative composites and excerpts will be used where appropriate.

The answers of individuals in the executive sample will be analyzed first, following which a comparative analysis of the answers of individuals in the supervisory sample will be made. While immediate implications will be referred to as the analyses proceed, a fuller discussion of general im­plications will be reserved for the last section of the chapter.

Executive Appraisals of Others

The executive appraisals fall naturally into three categories: (1) Main distinctions between executives and supervisors, (2) Contrasts in
personal capacities and attributes, (3) Informal factors influencing career progress. These three analytical categories will also facilitate a better understanding of the differences between executives and supervisors as managerial types and of the differential effects of situational factors on their respective levels of career achievement and success.

Main Distinctions Between Executives and Supervisors.

The various executives were asked to commence their contrasts of executives and supervisors, whom they had known, by evaluating the main distinctions between those individuals in management who had reached the top level and those who had remained at a low level through time. The time element was purposely injected so that young supervisors would not be contrasted with seasoned executives. A wide variety of distinctions was offered and environmental differences were apparent. The evaluations usually began with a statement of qualities which executives possess and which supervisors either lack or possess to a lesser degree. Among the distinctions most frequently made were: differential amounts of energy, alertness, objectivity and ambition; differential over-all values; aggressive as opposed to submissive attitudes; differential understanding of and ability to handle people; differential motivation; differential willingness to assume responsibilities; differential ability to deal with and impress associates and superiors; differential resourcefulness and initiative; more logical and diversified thinking; better judgment and foresight; more tact and poise; better problem solving ability; more situational flexibility; broader general outlook; more ability to perpetuate and build the organization; willingness to work longer hours; differential ability to make decisions; differential strength of personal character;
differential definitions of success; differential determination and aggressiveness; differential ability to sell themselves and their ideas; differential leadership qualities; differential education and training; differential ability to get things done through people; differential contacts and opportunities; differential loyalties and job interests; differential basic intelligence, perseverance and courage.

The following quotations are typical of the various executives:

Ind. Ex. A. The main distinctions between the two levels are: "spark" or the lack of it, ambition or the lack of it, willingness to accept responsibility or the lack of it, ability to handle people or the lack of it. I can't define "spark", but you recognize it when you see it.

Ind. Ex. B. The low level people lack imagination, initiative and motivation. They never exceed job expectancy. They are too self-satisfied and complacent.

Ind. Ex. C. Top level people have burning ambition, are willing to sacrifice, get work done through others, are flexible, roll with punches, don't stick their necks out, are consistent, are dependable, have long range vision, can pick good assistants, understand the plant and the community. Low level people are unwilling to handle people well, get into the wrong cliques and can't get out.

Ind. Ex. D. Top men think like the people over them. They temper their thinking with common sense. They figure out solutions to problems and know how to handle people. They work hard and long without watching clocks. Low level people have sluggish minds, are afraid to make decisions, don't know how to handle people well and are always watching clocks.

Ind. Ex. E. Top men have knowledge and the determination that goes with it. Supervisors by contrast, lack both. But, regardless of your knowledge and determination, if you haven't the personality to lead instead of pushing people you'll never climb high. That's why many men stay on low levels. They are pushers, not leaders.

Ind. Ex. F. Low level men lack the incentive and driving force to get ahead. The big difference is in how much they want to get ahead and are willing to work to do so. Low level people don't know how to delegate authority and they quickly lose sight of human factors.
Bus. Ex. A. Top level people are good mixers with wide social contacts. The most important distinctions between them and the low level people are in personality, dealing with people and getting along with them. Top men have sparkling, magnetic personalities. Low level personalities are dull.

Bus. Ex. B. The big difference is the ability to analyze the motives of others and to foresee their reactions. Low level men are unable to recognize why people react as they do. They lack the ability to plant ideas in others and get them to do things.

Bus. Ex. C. Although many on both levels have similar ability, training and opportunities, low level men simply lack the inner drive and determination to climb further up the ladder.

Bus. Ex. D. Low level people can't organize their thinking. They dissipate their energies on details, keeping their subordinates confused instead of organized. You can't get much done when you and your people are confused. They memorize the rules and don't analyze problems logically.

Bus. Ex. E. Top executives have ambition and the desire to advance. Low level men are complacent after reaching a certain point. They neglect their responsibilities and leave them to others. They simply don't follow through.

Bus. Ex. F. Successful executives are not born or made in college but are products of their acquaintances and social environment. Compared to low level managers they have more ability, personality, and human understanding. They have different attitudes and values and different definitions of career success. Top men are broad in outlook, low men are narrow.

Adm. Ex. A. Top level men have ambition. They set goals and strive for them. They take advantage of opportunities by being ready when opportunity knocks. Low level men lack ambition and have to be pushed. Instead of doing something constructive, they sit around feeling sorry for themselves and blaming others.

Adm. Ex. B. Granting equal opportunity and ability, low level men are lazy, indifferent, opinionated, tactless, and uncooperative. They fail to understand people, lack strength of character and become satisfied with mediocrity.

Adm. Ex. C. There is differential receptivity to new ideas. Low level men resist change. Top level men think beyond their jobs, low men think only about their jobs. The top level men are getting people to work with them rather than for them. Low level men lack initiative and imagination and are unwilling to accept responsibility.
It is apparent from the above quotations that executives, in general, have rather exalted images of themselves and other successful executives. They tend to view other top level executives as possessed of attributes commonly associated with the highly successful fulfillment of role expectations. These attributes are very similar to those ascribed to the role of the executive by William E. Henry in our review of the literature (pp. 39-43, supra). It is probable that, when we analyze later the distinctions which supervisors make between themselves and executives as types, we will find different distinctions emphasized. There is, however, the definite implication that executives and supervisors, in general, do differ markedly in the capacities and attributes most frequently associated with high level performance, in definitions of situations (opportunities, subjectively defined), in attitudes and values and in levels of aspiration. Practically all of the distinctions made above can be translated into the socio-psychological terminology underscored here.

Contrasts in Personal Capacities and Attributes.

Having asked the executive group to give the main distinctions between high level and low level individuals in management, the various interviewees were next asked to make contrasts between the two kinds on specific factors. Environmental differences did not seem to affect the answers as much as they did the answers analyzed in the previous section. Individual differences in emphasis were more apparent than environmental influences. There follows a factor by factor analysis of the executives' evaluations of specific contrasts.
Ability to Get Jobs Done Through Others. There was a general tendency to emphasize this factor as a distinct difference between executives and supervisors. Supervisors were described as having the ability to do their own jobs satisfactorily, but the big difference noted was in the ability to get jobs done through group effort, that is, the ability to effectuate teamwork. (This may be one reason why the new management ideology constantly preaches "teamwork"). Some executives accused supervisors of dodging jobs outside the "run of the mill" and of resisting innovations in job procedures. Top men were described as being more flexible, that is, having more ability to get other jobs done as well as their own. Generally speaking, executives were referring to differential leadership qualities in executives and supervisors — leadership as opposed to "boss-ship." Supervisors were described as "getting lost" in new job assignments, whereas executives "find their way out of the woods through logical problem solving." Another distinction was made on the basis of differential job horizons, that is, involvement in the "big job picture" versus the "little job picture." Top men were described as having the ability to get jobs done now, even if it meant working far into the night, while supervisors were described as putting off job completion when they heard the quitting whistle blow. Another distinction drawn was the ability to get jobs done through the influence of one's personality, which again is a differential leadership quality. Some supervisors were described as having the ability to get jobs done but simply not applying it. As one executive put it, "It isn't so much a differential ability to get jobs done as it is differential amounts of other qualities such as personality and motivation." As another executive
put it, "Ability within the two levels may be the same, but performance is not." As a third executive put it, "Top men may not know how to do jobs personally, but they do know how to get others to do them." As a fourth executive put it, "Low level men operate on people. Top level men operate through people in getting jobs done." As a fifth executive put it, "The real distinction is in the ability to delegate job authority and to coordinate its delegation." Though stated differently by different individuals, the immediate implication is that executives and supervisors do possess differential amounts of leadership attributes.

Getting Along With and Handling People. There was a general agreement among executives that the distinctive difference between their level and the supervisor level was not so much a question of simply "getting along with people" as it was the ability to handle and manipulate them. Some executives preferred to make the distinction not on the ability to get along with people but on the ability to make people get along. There seemed to be a general agreement that getting along with people is more important to individuals who are climbing the executive ladder than it is to those who have already climbed it. As one executive put it, "I think this notion of getting along with people has been overplayed. If it means soft-heartedness, then it's all wrong. After you arrive at the top, it becomes a question of firmness tempered with fairness." Another executive said, "Getting along is basic to leadership, but top men don't necessarily have to get along with anyone except their superiors. They handle, inspire and manipulate others." In general, executives thought their level was possessed of considerable restrained
human warmth as opposed to self-centeredness on the low level. Some supervisors were accused of "rubbing people the wrong way and developing superiority complexes." (The chances are, as we may see later, that supervisors will accuse executives of the same tendency). Several executives thought that "getting along" was an attitudinal attribute and that the ingredient missing in the attitude of supervisors was "loyalty to others, high and low." As one executive put it, "As far as getting along is concerned, the loyalties of top level men are broad while the loyalties of low level men are narrow. The difference is attitudinal." As another executive put it, "As far as getting along with and handling people is concerned, the difference is this — top level men exercise their authority without arousing animosity, while low level men arouse animosity while exercising authority." Still another executive said, "I think the distinctive difference is in the ability to inspire a sense of loyalty in others and to develop a spirit of teamwork. Top level men are much better at this." An industrial executive said, "Industry is spending a lot of time and money preaching loyalty and teamwork. The way to handle people is to lead them, not boss them. Getting along with people is a function of leadership. Industry wouldn't spend so much time and money preaching it, if it didn't think low level management is lacking in it." An administrative executive said, "Handling people is not a question of glad-handing. It is the ability to achieve respect for your competency and fairness. I'm afraid we find people on both levels lacking enough of this ability."

The inference drawn from the above is that the ability to get along with and handle people is another attribute of individual and
situational leadership. Executives, in general, imply that their level possesses this attribute to a greater degree than does the supervisory level.

**Ambition and Motivation to Advance.** There was the general tendency for the executive sample to ascribe to their level considerable ambition and motivation to improve themselves and advance their careers. By contrast, the executives tended to describe the lower level as possessing the ambition but lacking the motivation to develop themselves and climb the executive ladder. As one executive drew the distinction, "Not only are top men ambitious and motivated to improve themselves, but they also like to develop others and see them advance. Low level men may be ambitious but are jealous of the advancement of others." Another executive said, "Top men know that advancement results from achievement. Sometimes I wonder if low level men are motivated at all or are just wishful thinkers." A third executive said, "If ability is there, opportunity is there. The difference in the levels is in motivational drive." A fourth executive said, "The ambition and motivation of low level old timers in a big corporation are probably stifled. They think they've had it." A fifth executive said "Low level people loudly proclaim their desire to advance but they won't put out to get there. They want advancement to come while they are sitting down." A sixth executive put it this way, "Ambition is one thing, but willingness to assume additional responsibilities is another. This is the big difference." A seventh executive said, "An ambitious person is motivated to train others to push him up from his job. You don't see much of this on the low level. They are
jealous and afraid they'll be pushed out of a job." A business executive made the distinction this way, "I think many individuals are satisfied to remain on a low level. Usually it's a realization of their own shortcomings. Low level people don't want to take on responsibilities and make decisions. Therefore they aren't motivated to advance much further." An administrative executive made this distinction, "Ambition and motivation produce a strong mobility drive. Generally, low level people lack this drive."

In making inferences from the general trend of executive answers and the illustrative excerpts above, it seems logical to agree with the executives who implied that the passage of time has stifled the ambition and motivation of most supervisors and that, by and large, they are satisfied to remain in low level management, however jealous of the advancement of others they may be.

Organizational and Community Attitudes. On these attitudinal factors, the executive sample tended to make a wide variety of distinctions between their level and the supervisory level. Such phrases as the following were typical: "Top men are much more company-minded and community-minded. Low level men tend to be self-centered"; "Top executives are very interested in what they can do for their organization and community. Low men are only interested in what the organization and community can do for them"; "Low level men are often bitter, frustrated and not particularly loyal to their company or community"; "There isn't much difference in company loyalty. The top man is interested in the community because he has to be. Lots of low level people have good community attitudes but lack the opportunity to participate in community affairs"; "Top
men are sold on their company and community but they often have to sell them both to the lower level"; "Top men are interested in putting something into their organization, low men in taking something out. It's the same way with the community"; "These are interrelated attitudes. Community-mindedness is a projection of company-mindedness"; "While both levels may be community-minded, top men are much more loyal to their companies"; "In a company with good morale, both levels have good company attitudes. High level position requires community activity. Low level community-mindedness is usually a compensation for not achieving more in the organization"; "Top men use community activities as personal and company instruments. Low men have little access to these instruments"; "The difference between the levels is a question of loyal interest on one level and indifference on the other"; "Low level people take their organization and community for granted. High men want to see them both prosper and grow." "The organizational leader is a community leader. Low level individuals lack the qualities for company and community leadership."

Though stated in a variety of ways, the inference in the above excerpts is that executives, in general, consider that their level has a better attitude toward and is more loyal to both their organization and the community. Whether supervisors are less community-minded, however, is debatable. This would appear to be more a question of differential opportunity to participate in community activities than of differential community loyalty. As we have seen in their definitions of success, most supervisors consider themselves good solid citizens and their community loyalty is hardly open to doubt.
Differential Personality Characteristics. "Personality," like "career success," is another term which means different things to different people. Some executives referred to personality in terms of capacities and abilities. Others considered it an attitudinal attribute, Still others considered it a generalized quality which individuals have more or less of. Such a variety of conceptions of the meaning of the term was not surprising in view of the wide range of "traits" commonly associated with the personality. However they defined or conceived of the term, the executives were in general agreement that their level either possessed more of it or different "traits" of it than did the lower level in management.

The excerpted quotations which follow are illustrative of the wide variety of distinctions which the executives made: "There's a definite difference in personality on the two levels. Top men are more conscious of human values. Lower men are egotistical and self-centered"; "The two levels can't have the same personality characteristics with different drives, motives and ambitions"; "Some of the nicest guys you ever saw are on the lower level and there are some s.o.b.'s on the top level. It's something besides personality"; "I could write a book on this. Top men have much more dynamic personalities. A dynamic personality is one which commands the esteem and respect of others and makes them willing to follow leadership"; "It's more a difference in character and intellect than it is in personality"; "The difference is that top men just understand people better and develop more human warmth"; "There are so many individual differences in personality that it's hard to make distinctions
between the two levels. The kind of personality that works in one sit-
uation is not appropriate to another"; "Top men absorb much better
balanced personalities by virtue of their diversified contacts with
people on all levels"; "Top men have broader personalities and under-
stand people better. Low men have channelized personalities and are
likely to be emotionally unstable under stress"; "I prefer to contrast
the levels on personality control like actors. The top man's personality
is more flexible and adaptable. He knows how to manipulate his personal-
ity and emotions and to project them into changing situations"; "Low
level personalities are subjective, idealistic, emotional, methodical and
sensitive. High level personalities are more objective, mature, ruthless
in cutting red tape and less sensitive"; "There is much more social con-
sciousness and awareness of human values in top level personalities";
"Top level men have more tempered aggressiveness, more human understand-
ing and more tolerance"; "It's a question of personal magnetism and the
ability to manipulate people. That's what I meant by personal spark";
"This is a tough one. I'm a top man but some people on my level are
pretty cold fish"; "The low level men in this business have charming
personalities. They spend too much time charming people. You can't
afford to be too charming when you're sitting on top"; "I have a quick
answer for that. Top level men have flexible personalities. Low level
men have fixed personalities"; "Top level men are magnetic extroverts.
Low level men are submissive introverts"; "Top level men can sell them-
selves through their personalities. Low level men are so sold on them-
selves they can't sell their personalities"; "Low level men lack self-
control and situational personality manipulation and projection"; "The
ability to attract the confidence of others is the main personality
difference. Low men don't attract people to themselves"; "The two big
personality differences are tolerance versus intolerance and broadness
versus narrowness"; "Top level men have more selflessness, low men more
selfishness. One level has human warmth, the other is self-centered."

The obvious inference in the above illustrative excerpts is that,
however stated, executives and supervisors do differ markedly on per­
sonality characteristics. The most important differences are probably
in personality control, manipulation, flexibility, projection, and situ­
tional adaptability.

Willingness and Capacity for Hard Work. The general consensus
of executive opinion was that their level was much more willing than
the lower management level to work hard, long hours. Since they work
more with their minds than with their hands, their work capacity was also
considered generally greater. Executives were described as being willing
to and capable of working hard and long both on and off the actual job,
while supervisors were described as having a willingness and work capacity
exercised only during job hours. While executives were referred to as
being blind to the clock and deaf to the quitting whistle, supervisors
were accused of being "clock-watchers" and "whistle-listeners."
The fol­
lowing are illustrative excerpts: "Top men don't care about hours and
carry a heavy load. Low level men watch the clock and carry a limited
load"; "Top executives inspire in others a willingness and capacity to
work hard and long. Many supervisors are deficient in this"; "Top
people have both the willingness and capacity. The lower people usually
have the capacity but lack the willingness"; "You often see top men so
absorbed in their work that they forget to eat. You never see lower
management missing meals"; "Top men do directionalized long range work.
Low level men are wheel-spinners"; "Part of the executive job is to
read widely and study to keep up with the big picture. Thus, top men
carry their job home with them while lower level men leave their job
at the plant"; "Top men never ask for raises or overtime for extra
work. Most lower level men do"; "Top men carry the load regardless of
time and effort. Lower men dump the load after minimum time and effort";
"Now listen and I'll admit something. It's the people who are still am­
bitious to move up that do all this long hard work. When you've arrived,
you don't have to be around to watch the clock or hear the whistle blow;" 

The inference in the above is that executives do work harder and
longer than lower level individuals. Actually, this is probably more a
question of differential job requirements and expectations than of dif­
ferential willingness and capacity for hard work. It will be interest­
ing to compare later the opinions of supervisors concerning this factor.

_Initiative and Creativity._ There was an almost unanimous agree­
ment among the executives that their level had more of these qualities
than the lower level. Part of it was attributed to more foresight and
vision on the executive level, a better grasp of the big picture and more
problem-solving ability. Another part of it was attributed to a tendency
on the lower level to resist innovations which would not make job proce­
dures easier. Another part of it was attributed to a lack of flexibility
in low level thinking — too much of a tendency to go by the rule book
and to think like machines. Still another part of it was attributed to a
tendency never to do more than the job called for and not to begin needed work in the absence of instructions. Typical illustrative comments were: "Low level men pass the buck instead of starting the ball rolling"; "Low level men have to be prodded, they lack imagination"; "Low level men do have initiative and creativity, but they don't show them until you hang prize money on the idea box"; "Low level men are afraid to take the initiative, afraid they might do something wrong"; "As soon as you find creative men you put them in key spots. That's why there are so few left on the lower level"; "You have to watch low level men — their ideas may be screwy"; "Top men have more initiative but tend to resist change just as much as low level men do"; "I consider this the $64 question and the key differences between the two levels"; "There is as much difference as daylight and dark. You can only motivate lower people to show initiative and be creative when you offer them extra money"; "Let's put it this way — top level people are flexible men with inquiring minds. Low level thinking is channelized!"

There is the obvious inference that executives believe their level has more initiative and creativity than lower level management. If this implication is correct, it is probably due to two conditions on the lower level: (1) A comparative lack of opportunities to display initiative and be creative; (2) A comparative lack of motivation and a preference for the status quo.

Decision-Making in Changing Situations. This is another capacity which executives believe their level possesses to a greater degree than it is possessed by lower managers. In fact, supervisors were described
as tending to avoid the responsibility for making decisions not routine in nature and "passing the buck" upward in an emergency. The fear of making incorrect decisions was assigned as the primary causative factor. As one executive put it, "Low men don't want to get caught short, so they call you up for advice in the middle of the night"!

Other illustrative excerpts follow: "People in lower levels haven't the judgment and foresight to make correct decisions so they just don't make decisions at all unless they are in the rule book"; "The decisions of top level men are open to scrutiny and they better be right. When company policy is vague, they pass the buck up just as much as supervisors do"; "Low level men can't roll with punches in making decisions. Low level men are baffled by unforeseen circumstances"; "The decisions of the top side are based on collective judgment, foresight and long range planning. They are bound to be better than the snap judgment decisions of supervisors"; "It is because they are better at decision making that top men are up there"; "Low level men flounder around in the midst of confusion. Top men rise above confusion and make some kind of a decision. Somebody has to, and it's up to them"; "I think it is a question of the courage of convictions. Low level men lack the courage of their convictions"; "The difference is this — both levels, being human, make wrong decisions, but low level men repeat their mistakes while top level men make the same mistake only once"; "It is this capacity that is the earmark of the top man. That is what he is for. Low level men lack flexibility and adaptability, so they won't make non-routine decisions"; "Low level men follow precedents. High level men make precedents"; "The differential decision-making
ability depends on the size of the corporation and resultant job re-
quirements. You don't find much decision making by low level men in
big corporations"; "I know two top managers who were fired because they
were hesitant in making decisions. You've got to make decisions and
accept the responsibility. Low level men don't want to get fired so
they avoid the responsibility for making decisions"; "Who is there to
question the correctness of executive decisions? If they are afraid of
making wrong ones, they pass the buck up. If they make wrong ones, they
pass the buck down. Who is there for supervisors to pass the buck down
to? Nobody. So they pass the buck up;"

Caution should be observed in making implications here. While
executives do tend to consider their level superior to the supervisory
level in decision making, it seems logical to assume that the real dif-
ference is in job expectations and the scale on which decisions are
made. More evidence on decision making will be brought out later.

**Seeking Opportunities for Development and Advancement.** In gen-
eral, executives believed that their level possesses this quality to a
greater extent than the supervisory level. Many executives, however,
state that it was not so much a question of seeking opportunities as
it was a question of recognizing opportunities when they appeared. As
several executives put it: "Executives seek and recognize opportunities.
Low level managers wait for opportunity to knock and often don't hear the
knocking"; "Top men create opportunities. The lower ones sit around com-
plaining there aren't any"; "Opportunities are always there. I know of
many low level men who have turned down opportunities because they didn't
want added responsibilities"; "The difference is that top men are constantly studying and keeping themselves informed"; "Top men recognize opportunities, prepare themselves, train their replacements and manage to be in the right place at the right time"; "We hear about luck and breaks. But they don't count unless you are qualified when they occur. Top men qualify themselves. Lower men don't. If they did they'd get more of the breaks"; "I think it is a question of the ability to discriminate between what is and isn't an opportunity"; "The difference is between seeking and waiting. If you wait around you either get frustrated or self-satisfied"; "It is the ability to recognize opportunities which exist. I don't go for this notion of creating your own opportunities. Top men look around, recognize opportunities, prepare for them and seize them. Low level men don't know opportunities when they see them"; "I don't think many lower level men spend much time preparing for opportunities. Most of the old timers are pretty well satisfied where they are"; "Low level old timers feel that the selection process has already operated and that they've had their opportunities."

The inference is that, while both levels probably seek opportunities, the executive level is better at recognizing and preparing for them. While there are other factors contributing to this difference, the most likely ones are differential motivations and levels of aspiration.

**Ability to Organize and Coordinate Ideas, People and Things.**

Executives were in almost unanimous agreement that this was the specific attribute which distinguished their level from the lower level more than
any other. Typical comments were: "There's no question about this
difference"; "Ideas, people and things must not only be organized but
also coordinated and implemented. Top level men do this much more
efficiently"; "This question answers itself. This is the ability that
puts top men where they are"; "This is the teamwork idea and the top
man is captain of the team;"

The implication here is so obvious that it hardly needs further
comment. Some executives were asked to rank-order in importance the
specific factors listed. This ability headed the list of differentiating
factors almost invariably. There can be little question but what
this fundamental leadership attribute is more prevalent on the top executive level than it is on the supervisory level.

**Informal Factors Influencing Career Progress**

The questions in this section were designed to bring out the
relative importance of informal factors as determinants of occupational
ascent. The various executive interviewees were not asked to contrast
their level with the supervisory level on these factors but rather to
evaluate their importance in executive success. These questions grew from
implications in the literature that, where the objective criteria for
promotion are dimly defined, other considerations not necessarily related
to meritorious job abilities and capacities, *per se*, are often taken
into account as secondary criteria when the promotability of individuals
is considered. Most of these factors operate in the social system paral-
leling the formal organization. Granting satisfactory abilities and
capacities, it was presumed that some of these informal factors would
operate favorably in career progress.
As opposed to personal attributes and job capacities which directly influence career advancement, these informal factors were presumed to have more or less important indirect influence. There was a general admission in the executive group that some of the informal factors were important, though they attached only slight or no importance to others.

**Boyhood Training and Ideals.** The influence of boyhood training and ideals had previously been mentioned by most of the executives in their accounts of their personal success. They now tended to give them additional emphasis as factors in character building and the acquisition of early motivation. Most executives considered the family the most important agency for instilling idealistic images. Others described the church, school and peer groups as important corollary agencies. While many executives thought that the modern family was deficient in performing its traditional functions, a surprisingly large number attributed the deficiency to the larger society and the modern tempo of living. In almost every case, however, ideals acquired as a result of boyhood training and influences were credited with being very important factors in eventual executive success.

**Family Social Standing and Connections.** The consensus in executive opinion was that these factors had considerable influence in determining occupational opportunities and occupational choices. They were also mentioned as important motivating factors in some cases, insofar as they determined social standards to be lived up to and "styles-of-life." More importance was attached to these factors in affording occupational
opportunities than in implementing career progress. Exceptions, however, appeared in the answers of business executives, where family social standing and connections appeared to be more important in later life than in the case of industrial executives. A typical comment was, "A man can't continue to get by on family connections alone. He must have some ability to go with them."

**Nationality Origins.** This factor was considered to be of local rather than general importance. It also was considered as influencing career opportunities and choices more than career progress. Less discrimination on this factor was seen in the present than in the past. Nevertheless, nationality origins were said to have some bearing in particular enterprises. (For example, no Italians were found in the executive group of large industrial corporations, although there is a considerable Italian element in the community).

**Religious Affiliation and Activities.** There was a tendency among the executives to maintain that some religious affiliation was a role expectation of the successful executive. Particular religious affiliation was said to be more related to occupational placement than career progress. For example, Jews were said to choose entrepreneurial types of family enterprises over careers in industrial corporations. Religious affiliation was said to be relatively unimportant in business and the professions. (Curiously, few Catholics were found in top level executive positions. There is a considerable Catholic element in the community and many were found on the supervisory level. The speculation is that Catholics of French and Italian extraction find or prefer occupational opportunities in
entrepreneurial enterprises, white collar jobs and the professions). In general, executives said there was probably less discrimination on religion than formerly.

Belonging to "Behind the Scenes Cliques". Some executives assumed an air of moral indignation that such memberships should influence career progress. "Not in my company, not in my business;" was a frequent answer. Yet many executives admitted that clique memberships do operate favorably despite the fact that they considered them a "sore subject." Some executives smilingly admitted their importance with remarks such as these: "Definitely so. Particularly in big industry. Several large corporations I know of are clique-ridden"; "Of course they operate. Anybody who says differently is just kidding"; "They help. Sometimes it isn't what you know, but who you know"; "They are less important than popularly believed, but I know of a big industry broken down into three definite cliques"; "Some big organizations change executives in terms of the changing power of cliques"; "Clique membership can help career progress but it also can boomerang." The implication is that the effect of clique memberships is probably more localized than general, although it would be a natural role expectation for most executives, who have already risen, to deny their existence.

Political Affiliations and Activities. This factor was considered to be a definite liability by most executives. There was the almost unanimous agreement that too much overt political activity can do more to harm than to help executive careers.
Memberships in Fraternal Organizations. These memberships were not regarded by executives as helpful in furthering executive careers except through contacts on a purely local basis. One of the executives illustrated this point by saying, "In one of the largest automotive corporations in the country, almost all of the top executives you meet are Masons." Other interviewees indicated that membership in fraternal organizations by top level executives was becoming a "thing of the past."

Membership in Community and High Level Social Organizations. More importance was attached to membership in community organizations than in social organizations as factors in furthering executive careers. Both types of organizations, however, were considered as providing very helpful contacts. Most executives considered participation in community organizations not only helpful in career advancement but also an essential top level role expectation. Interesting variations from this pattern were: "These memberships follow from rather than contribute to executive success. The same qualities that make for organizational leadership make for community leadership"; "The industrial atmosphere does not demand as much community participation as does the business atmosphere"; "Community organizations can be very broadening. But attempting to control community affairs is dangerous." Despite implications to the contrary, the chances are that participation in high level community organizations by top executives is used more for company purposes in line with role expectations than as a means for furthering personal career advancement. There are indications in the previous analysis of background characteristics that this is the case and that lower level participation in community organizations is on a delegated
basis. It seems reasonable to speculate that memberships in top community and social organizations are as much instruments of management as they are factors in personal career advancement.

**Informal Social Activities and Recreation.** There was a general admission among the executives that these activities were valuable means of acquiring helpful business contacts and that informal social behavior patterns contributed to the ability to "get along with people." While not explicitly stated by executives, there was the inference that such social behavior patterns and contacts do, in many cases, influence career advancement.

**Membership in Professional Organizations.** Practically all executives agreed that this type of membership does contribute favorably to career advancement by affording helpful contacts, new ideas and prestige. To be accepted in a professional organization was generally considered a symbol of managerial status. Their utility in sharing information and solving mutual problems was also mentioned. While many business and administrative executives suggested that such memberships could hardly be over-exploited, several industrial executives warned that over-activity in professional (and community organizations) could interfere with efficient job performance. These latter expressions are indicative of a desire on the part of top level industrial executives to control not only their own community and professional memberships, but also those of lower level executives and to convert their use as much to company purposes as to individual purposes.
**Being Some Influential Person's Protege.** The notion of the "fair-haired boy" idea was scoffed at by many executives. Those who admitted that it did favorably influence career progress said that it might implement a good career start, but that it could "boomerang in the long haul" unless there was considerable ability to accompany it. On the other hand, some executives pointed out that there were several ways to get to be a "fair-haired boy," one of them being by the demonstration of considerable ability in the first place. The inference is that the protege factor does operate to favorably influence career progress on a local basis rather than with any degree of generality. Otherwise, it would be difficult to explain the "accent on youth" often observed in executive management.

**Seniority.** There was a practically unanimous agreement among the executives that this factor usually operated only where abilities were equal. Exceptionally, however, old timers were given symbolic titles as rewards for long and faithful service.

**Adopting the Behavior, Attitudes, Activities and Standards of Successful Superiors.** After ruling out the "copy cat," "yes man" idea, most executives considered this a very important learning process and therefore an important factor in career progress. Some executives spoke of the natural tendency for superiors to select their own images as their successors. Those who viewed this factor favorably, however, recommended discrimination and judgment in its exercise. Typical comments were: "This is extremely important and too infrequently done. Top level men are always looking for their own images"; "The smart young executive
studies his superiors and adopts selected traits; "This is not only important but almost indispensable. I used to know what the boss was going to ask and got the answers ahead of time"; "Don't compromise your standards, but the other factors are bound to help"; "It is as important to avoid the qualities of poor superiors as it is to emulate those of good ones"; "This is very important if sincerely done. I think our head man reflects himself down the line"; "This is vitally important. Why else would we read the biographies of great executives?"; "There's nothing wrong in this. It's commendable and you're a fool if you don't do it judiciously;" "Don't be a mimic. Be yourself. But it certainly does make you more promotable"; "In our company we train our replacements in our behavior, attitudes and activities"; "I've even seen some up-and-comers imitating their boss's handwriting and adopting his manner of speech"; "I believe in this. I've done it in the past and I'm still doing it."

From the above the importance of this generalized factor in career progress is clear. There can hardly be a better way to learn appropriate executive behavior.

**Striving to Attain Higher Level Friendships and Group Memberships.**

Like the preceding generalized factor, this process was also considered by most executives as favorably affecting career progress, provided it is exercised unobtrusively. Judicious social behavior was viewed as important in making favorable impressions on those who control promotions. As one executive put it, "Higher level contacts and confidences never hurt." Other comments were: "If you can make good impressions on people who are going places, you are apt to go places too"; "This is quite important to
calculating people. A lot of them use this very shrewdly"; "It defi-
nitely helps. The secret is to make the higher level groups seek you"; "This broadens one's knowledge and contacts and pulls him upward"; "If done tactfully, it's bound to help"; "A favorable reputation in high levels outside the company reflects credit on the company and therefore puts the individual in a favorable light"; "Why, of course. This pins a higher label on a man"; "This is very important and a part of the ambitious man's tools"; "To be brutally frank and nail it down, this is absolutely essential to career advancement"; "Surely it helps. What's the use of arguing about it?"

Since no executive denied the importance of this factor, when exercised judiciously, the implication is obvious.

Keeping Lower Level Friendships and Group Memberships. The consensus in executive opinion was that it is extremely important to retain the loyalty of former friends as one climbs the career ladder, but that lower level group memberships were discarded more or less automatically. The retention of low level group memberships was not considered to be a role expectation, but the loyalty of lower level individuals was considered a very important "push" factor. Typical comments were: "You have to move out of the lower groups and into the higher ones, but old friends should never be discarded"; "You outgrow but you don't discard groups of friends"; "Discard the radicals, negativists, gossips and loafers, but keep the loyal ones. You need them to tell you when you're off the beam"; "Don't get high hat. You may meet some of your old friends when they pass over you"; "Drop the self-satisfied people. They have a bad effect. Latch on to the people going
higher”; "Keep all your loyal friends. Simply discard negative use­less groups."

The implication is that the loyalty of old friends is a "push" factor comparable to the "pull" factor of higher level friendships.

Our analysis of the executive appraisals of factors in the careers of others is now complete. We will turn in the next section to a comparable analysis for the supervisory sample.

**Supervisory Appraisals of Others**

Like the appraisals of others by the executive group, the supervisory appraisals fall naturally into three categories: (1) Main distinctions between supervisors and executives, (2) Contrasts in personal capacities and attributes, (3) Informal factors influencing career progress. The questions in all three categories were designed to "have a look at the other side of the coin" so to speak. The categories chosen will facilitate direct comparisons later between executive and supervisory appraisals and, therefore, a better understanding of the differences between the two groups as managerial types.

**Main Distinctions Between Executives and Supervisors.**

The supervisors were asked to bring out the main distinctions between executives whom they had known through the years and their own contemporaries on the supervisory level. Surprisingly, there was much more of a pattern of similarity in the answers of the supervisors than there had been in the corresponding answers of executives. Environmental differences were not as apparent as individual differences in answers, and
usually these individual differences were reflections of the differential amounts of esteem in which particular executives were held. In addition, many of the main distinctions which supervisors made between their level and the executive level were similar to those which executives had previously made. Among the characteristics which supervisors generally mentioned as being more prevalent on the executive level were: better education; more judgment and foresight; understanding human nature better; more ability to handle large numbers of people; more knowledge of and experience in the "big picture"; more aggressiveness and confidence; better rounded personalities; higher level attitudes and values; more alertness and initiative; more ability to solve problems and make long range plans; more willingness to delegate authority and make decisions; more level-headedness and control of tempers; more poise and tact; better social background; more ambition and motivation in line with higher life-goals.

The following quotations are typical of the various supervisors:

**Ind. Sup. A.** You wouldn't suspect that most of the top men I've known were big men, if you met them outside of the plant. Their secret is an ability to select good men, delegate authority and let them go to town in getting the big job done.

**Ind. Sup. B.** The three main distinctions are: (1) Differential education and training, (2) Differential judgment and foresight and (3) Differential ability to handle people.

**Ind. Sup. C.** Top level men have better overall personalities, remember people, like people and get the most out of them.

**Ind. Sup. D.** I'd take my troubles to a top man before I'd confide in a supervisor. They have a better understanding of human problems, are level headed and know more about the facts of life.

**Ind. Sup. E.** Top men are totally different. They have better education and social backgrounds. They have different abilities and different goals. Supervisors want to get just so
high and then they don’t want anymore big responsibilities. They just want to carry out instructions and not make decisions.

Ind Sup. F. In addition to different education and training, different ability, different handling of people, it’s just plainly different life-goals. Top level men want power and authority. Supervisors want happiness and security.

Ind. Sup. G. Top men are better educated, have better personalities and handle people better. Supervisors get narrow-minded and egotistical. They get stuck up, don’t realize their own ignorance and can’t lead people except by the boss’s orders.

Ind. Sup. H. The top level are less domineering. They encourage rather than drive people. They accept advice and information instead of claiming they know everything like supervisors do. They have a better attitude toward the job and their fellow men, better control of their tempers and better personalities.

Ind. Sup. I. Top level men are like Army Generals. They sit down, make the plans, and issue the orders. But, in doing so, they are thoughtful, courteous, understanding and helpful.

Supervisors carry out orders like Army Sergeants. Some are hard boiled, some are soft. Some are drivers, others are leaders.

Bus. Sup. A. Top men have better education and judgment and more psychological "know-how" in understanding and handling people.

Bus. Sup. B. The top level is better at getting jobs done through group effort. They are better planners, coordinators and administrators. They are better mixers socially and have more flexible, magnetic personalities.

Bus. Sup. C. Top level men are more alert mentally, are better oriented and have better memories for details. They want the power to control and organize. Supervisors don’t want to organize and plan. They are just satisfied to do their jobs.

Bus. Sup. D. Because top level men have better personalities they have better connections and know the right people. You can wind up washing dishes if you don’t know the right people.

Bus. Sup. E. The secret of the top man is getting other people to do all the work while he runs around the country making contacts. Or else he runs around the store coordinating everybody and keeping them busy.
Adm. Sup. A. The difference is in education and social background. This is why top men can understand and handle people better.

Adm. Sup. B. Top flight men are policy makers and are more dynamic. Supervisors simply administer policy, manipulate details and are passive about it.

As has been mentioned, it is apparent that most supervisors hold successful executives in rather high esteem. They tend to be aware of their own educational handicaps and feel that those on the executive level have better social backgrounds than those on their levels. They seem to agree, in general, that executives excel their level in judgment, foresight, human understanding and the ability to organize and coordinate the efforts of people on a grander scale. They also seem to impute to executives more motivation and ambition. It seems safe to make implications from the above that are similar to those made in the corresponding analysis of executive appraisals, i.e., supervisors and executives differ markedly in educational and social backgrounds, in personal capacities and abilities, in personality characteristics, in attitudes and values, and in motivation and levels of aspiration.

Contrasts in Personal Capacities and Attributes.

Even though several contrasting personal capacities and attributes had already been brought out by the various supervisors in making the main distinctions between their level and the executive level, the supervisory interviewees were next asked to make definite contrasts on specific factors. Individual differences in emphasis were again more apparent than environmental influences. There follows a factor by factor analysis of the supervisors' evaluations of specific contrasts.
Ability to Get Jobs Done Through Others. The consensus of supervisory opinion concerning this factor was that executives do excel their level in the ability to delegate authority and to coordinate the big jobs. There was a tendency, however, for supervisors to maintain that their level was just as good as the executive level at getting jobs done which were within the scope of their authority. Typical comments were: "The difference is in the scale on which this is done. Top men do it on a larger scale"; "Top men are more aggressive in getting the big job done"; "The top man is the planner and coordinator. The supervisor gets done what is planned and coordinated"; "Why sure. The top man is the boss, why shouldn't he be able to make others do the jobs"; "Top men have more know-how in this respect. It takes know-how to get big jobs done"; "Top men do this persuasively and with minimum effort. Supervisors do a lot of horsing around"; "The secret of success is to get other people to do the work while you do the coordinating. Of course, the top level is better in this"; "This ability depends on personality. On either level, without personality, authority is resorted to"; "Executives do know how to delegate and operate more through others".

The implication is that supervisors, in general, do recognize the superior ability of executives to get jobs done through group effort and impute to them superiority in this basic leadership attribute.

Getting Along With and Handling People. Most of the supervisors thought that their level was just as good as the executive level at getting along with people. The differential quality they imputed to executives was more ability to handle large numbers of people. Simply "getting
along" was not considered to be as significant as directing, coordinating and manipulating people. As one supervisor put it, "You can get along with people just being soft-hearted. But that doesn't mean you can handle them!" Illustrative of supervisory comments were the following excerpts: "Me, I get along with everybody. The top man doesn't have to get along with everybody. They have to get along with him"; "Foremen know how to handle the workers. Top men know how to handle the superiors"; "I get along with the top side better than with some of those loafers under me. They don't appreciate soft-boiled supervisors"; "Supervisors are the backbone of everything. They have to get along above and below"; "Things have changed a lot because of the unions. Up and down you have to lead people instead of driving them"; "The top side uses different methods. They are more formal. Supervisors are more informal"; "It is a question of degree. Supervisors are better at handling the little people. Executives are better at handling the big people"; "Top men know more about psychology. They have more people to handle and know how to handle them better"; "In retailing it's the big boys who have the biggest bag of tricks. They can manipulate anybody and make him like it"; "The people you have the most trouble with are women. If you don't look out they'll be handling you!"

The inference is that the ability to get along with and handle people is another attribute of individual and situational leadership. Supervisors, in general, imply that the difference between their level and the executive level is largely a question of scale.

Ambition and Motivation to Advance. While most supervisors maintained that almost everyone on both levels was ambitious, they tended to
admit that many individuals on their level were not highly motivated. They agreed, in general, that more personal motivation was found on the executive level. Illustrative comments were: "Low level men get satisfied where they are. Some don't even want to be foremen. They don't want the responsibilities and figure they can make as much money as operators"; "The average old time supervisor is either self satisfied or frustrated. Most of them are willing to stay put"; "Suppose executives and supervisors have already climbed as far as they can. Then they are both satisfied and there is no difference at all. You find the difference in the young fellows"; "Although most supervisors are satisfied they get jealous of others. This is a lot of sour grapes"; "Let's nail it down. Most good supervisors realize their limitations and don't want to go any higher. The good ones like to see young fellows climb"; "I've heard some supervisors scream when they were transferred to higher jobs"; "What supervisors want is a bigger sounding title without more responsibility"; "When a supervisor gets off shift, he's got it made. He don't want to go much higher"; "60% of people without college educations have no desire to climb. 90% of people with college educations keep on striving. That's the difference"; "If you aren't well up the ladder when you are forty you have missed the boat and that's that!!"

The implication is simple. The passage of time and the realization of personal limitations have negatively conditioned the motivation and levels of aspiration of most supervisors.

**Differential Personality Characteristics.** Although individual differences were expressed, it was the general consensus of opinion that
executives have better-rounded, more flexible personalities than do supervisors. There was a tendency, however, for most supervisors to describe the personalities of ideal types of executives and to mention departures from these ideal types rather scornfully. As one supervisor put it, "The successful executive of the future is one who can sell himself to people. He must be a good mixer and a good talker who can convince people. The bully type is disappearing in favor of the type that can make friends and influence people." Other illustrative comments were: "Top level men have more adaptable personalities and better personality control. There are exceptions, but the ability to inject a magnetic personality into situations is what encourages people to get things done"; "The older you get the mellower you get. That's why top men seem to understand people better"; "A lot of people have several personalities. I think the top men may be better at controlling theirs"; "In some of our top level people, the personality just isn't there. They have some other qualities to make up for it, I guess"; "To the worker, the top man's personality means very little. It's his supervisor's personality that counts"; "Top level men are like chameleons. They are past masters at changing the color of their personality to suit the situation. You don't see many bright colors on the supervisory level"; "Some top men like Mr. X get up there without any personality at all. They were scraping around the bottom of the barrel when they found him. You take Mr. Y. and Mr. Z who went to the big board. Boy, they had wonderful personalities!"; "There are plenty of s.o.b.'s on the top level whose personalities are not so hot. They just know how to hide them better"; "Generally speaking, top level men have broader, more magnetic and contagious personalities."
They understand people better and their personality puts them over"; "The top level personality is basically more pleasant and magnetic. He understands people better and can forecast reactions"; "I think supervisors often affect personalities which are not their natural ones. This is because the boss's personality tends to reflect itself down the line"; "Top level men are broad-minded and understanding. Supervisors tend to be narrow minded and have fixed opinions".

Although, as was pointed out, individual differences of opinion were expressed by supervisors, the implication is that the most important personality differences between the two levels are in control, manipulation, flexibility, projection and situational adaptability.

**Willingness and Capacity to Work Hard Long Hours.** There was a surprising amount of agreement among the supervisors that executives, generally, are more willing to work hard, long hours and have greater capacities to do so than people on their level. This consensus of opinion was not expected, and seemed to result from a general admission that executive job requirements demand a greater application of this factor. Typical illustrative comments were: "Top men work all the time. Lower men work eight hours and want to go home"; "Top men take work home with them. Supervisors just don't have to"; "It is so right. Top men are much more willing. Only the sorehead claims he works harder than the boss"; "It used to be that everybody took off when the whistle blew. Now things are so complex, executives work overtime planning ahead"; "Yes. Top men do things now because it is a must. Supervisors want to put things off until tomorrow"; "Why sure. Supervisors usually work the eight hour day and just do what's expected"; "There is more willingness on the top but
not more capacity. It's a question of what's expected"; "It's a question of different goals. The top men are always striving. They think they have to show up on Saturday and Sunday to make impressions"; "On the average, higher responsibility means harder work!"

Interesting variations in individual opinion were: "There is a big difference between banking and industry. That stuff about banker's hours is nonsense. In banks everybody works hard, long hours"; "A good top man can get things organized so he spends most of his time shaking hands"; "That's a lot of hooey about the top man being more willing and capable of hardwork. That's for the climbers, not the boss. The boss makes others work long hours so he can take off. Lots of times I see our top boss sneaking out of the back door and he always gives me a wink!"

Despite these interesting variations, the implication is that differential job requirements and job expectations do operate to definitely distinguish executives and supervisors on this factor.

**Initiative and Creativity.** While most supervisors imputed to executives more initiative and creativity on a grander scale, some of them maintained that there was a great deal of unutilized creativity, if not initiative, on the lower level. These latter individuals maintained that a lack of authority operated negatively on initiative but did not prevent "many new ideas originating down below." (This type of comment came from supervisors in companies known to sponsor "coin your ideas" programs). Comments illustrative of the consensus of opinion were: "Supervisors in our business are just cogs in the wheel and are not expected to disturb the normal routine"; "The top level is more creative because it is in better touch with the public pulse"; "Sure the top side is more creative."
They even create new jobs and put their friends in them"; "The average supervisor is more interested in putting in time than in creating improvements"; "Supervisors may be creative but don't take the initiative without getting permission"; "They hire the bug-eyed specialists to dream up the creativity and feed it to the bosses"; "Initiative and creativity are matters of scope. How can you show more than fits your hole?"; "Lots of low level men do have creative ideas but some of them are screwy. You have to know the big picture to be really creative"; "Top men are very receptive to creative ideas. They know how to evaluate them"; "You know what the top men do? They take your ideas and sell them."

The implication is that lack of authority may often stifle initiative and creativity on the supervisory level. The difference in these qualities between the two levels is probably a question of scale determined by differential job expectations.

Decision-Making in Changing Situations. The supervisors were almost unanimous in agreeing that executives excel in this. Typical comments were: "No question about it. When the situation changes, supervisors run to the boss for a decision unless it's an emergency"; "Many supervisors want to avoid decision-making and responsibility as much as possible"; "Lots of supervisors simply won't make decisions not covered by the rule-book"; "What's the use of supervisors making decisions when most of them get reversed?"; "Supervisors aren't paid to make decisions, the bosses are"; "The average supervisor not only can't make decisions but won't. He gets scared and runs to the boss"; "Big decisions and responsibilities are a function of top management"; "I know a guy who would have gone all the way if he had been willing to make decisions and accept
responsibility"; "Some supervisors even turn down promotions to jobs which require decision making and responsibility;"

The inference is that there are two main conditions which make executives better decision-makers than supervisors: (1) Differential job requirements and expectations, (2) Differential motivation.

Seeking Opportunities for Development and Advancement. Again there was a consensus of opinion that executives excelled supervisors, not so much in seeking, but in taking advantage of opportunities. Typical comments were: "Top men have sense enough to look around and find opportunities. That's one reason why they are up there"; "The top men recognize opportunities. The fellows down below just keep looking"; "There is more social development on the top-side. What they take every opportunity to develop is their social skills"; "I know some supervisors who wouldn't know an opportunity if they saw one"; "If we were talking about young supervisors, I'd say they try their best to improve themselves, but the old timers not much"; "Ours is a company where you write your own ticket. If you are still down low, it means you haven't written your ticket"; "Most supervisors want to get just so high and no higher"; "Lower levels do not devote themselves as much to off the job study"; "The upper boys have more incentive and ambition."

The inference is that differential motivations and levels of aspiration operate on the supervisory and executive levels.

Organizing and Coordinating Ideas, People and Things. There was an almost unanimous agreement that executives excel supervisors in this ability. The usual comment was, "This is what top management does best."
This is the main difference. This is the top side's main function. Coordinating is top level second nature. If supervisors could organize and coordinate like top men do, they'd be up there too.

The implication is so obvious as not to need restatement. Undoubtedly this leadership attribute is more outstanding on the executive level than on the supervisory level.

**Informal Factors Influencing Career Progress**

As in the case of the executive interviewees, the supervisors were no longer asked to contrast the two levels but to evaluate the relative importance of specific informal influence on executive success. In other words, they were asked to state how much importance they attached to these factors in facilitating the individual's climb up the executive ladder.

**Family's Social Standing and Connections.** There seemed to be general agreement that this factor operated very favorably in securing occupational opportunities and that, if the individual had ability as well, he was likely to climb very high. Several industrial supervisors, however, mentioned that family influence would not over-ride the cold-blooded competition for jobs in the large plants and thought it was more important in smaller companies. More relative importance was attached to this factor by supervisors in business organizations. Typical of the latter were these comments: "Don't kid yourself. Sure it helps"; "This is one of the big things in getting to be a big-shot business man"; "This counts more in retailing and banks than in industry"; "People figure who you know and assume you've got good character or not." Not much importance
Nationality Origins. Most supervisors considered that this factor had more local than general importance. For example, some companies were said to discriminate against Italians and Germans in offering job opportunities. However, it was agreed that adverse nationality origins could be overcome by an individual of ability.

Religious Affiliation. According to most supervisors the persons who were most adversely affected by this factor were those who had no religious affiliation at all. Some supervisors in business pointed out that the "top side" liked to mix the religions on the lower level because doing so would attract customers. Industrial supervisors pointed out that religious discrimination was a thing of the past in corporations, though they mentioned that Jews tended to seek employment in business rather than industry. Some supervisors in business indicated that religious affiliation operated favorably on a purely local basis only.

Belonging to "Behind the Scenes Cliques." While most supervisors felt that clique memberships had little affect in small companies, they tended to view them as fairly important in the large corporations. While some supervisors in large industrial corporations denied their existence, there were others who frankly stated that they not only existed but had operated favorably in the careers of executives they had known. As one industrial supervisor put it, "There's nothing like being in the right crowd, in the right place, at the right time!" As another industrial supervisor put it, "Being able to rub elbows with the right crowd
is a wonderful help." A third industrial supervisor said, "Birds of a feather flock together even on the big board." In one large industrial corporation, several supervisors expressed the belief that their top management was divided into two main cliques which jockeyed for power. Several business supervisors expressed the belief that clique memberships operated favorably in their organizations. Typical of this group was the remark: "You've got it made if you're in the right clique and you're in bad shape if you're not."

The implication is that clique memberships operate on a local basis and most favorably (or unfavorably) in large organizations.

**Being Some Influential Person's "Fair-Haired Boy."** This question evoked wry smiles on the faces of many supervisors. Few of them denied the influence of the fair-haired boy idea in career progress. Typical comments were, "If you've got ability to go with this you've 'got it made'"; "Sure this works. I've even seen some characters bringing the boss's lunch"; "Sure it helps. People stop squawking if a man shows he's got something on the ball"; "Hell yes! This is just as important as being in the right clique"; "In business, this is strictly a big factor"; "We have some obscene expressions for this but it does operate"; "Just look around the big plants and you can pick out the fair-haired boys. They belong to the right cliques too."

The implication is that, like clique memberships, the fair-haired boy factor operates on a local basis and has the most effect in large organizations.

**Membership in Fraternal Organizations.** While most industrial supervisors did not attach much importance to this factor, there were exceptions. One industrial supervisor spoke of the influence of "the ring gang"
in another department. Other industrial executives said, "If the boss belongs, yes. If not, no." There were business supervisors who thought that lodge memberships afforded good business contacts and indirectly influenced career progress. Generally speaking, however, supervisors thought that fraternal memberships as factors in career progress were not as important as formerly and operated on a purely local basis.

Membership in Community Organizations and High Society Clubs." There was a trend toward agreement among the supervisors that this factor had been an important influence in the career progress of executives whom they had known. However, more importance was attached to this factor by business supervisors than by industrial supervisors. The former thought these "contacts" were very important in business careers. Some industrial supervisors tended to equate this factor as much with the role expectations of executives as with career advancement. Those who held this view said in effect, "I think these memberships do the company as much good as the individual. Certain executives in our plant are expected to be in the community and social whirl."

Membership in Professional Organizations. There was an almost universal agreement among the supervisors that this factor operated very favorably in executive careers by affording helpful contacts, new ideas and prestige. They seemed to regard this factor as a symbol of executive status. A frequent comment was, "This is the way to meet the really big people." One business supervisor illustrated this point by inferring that his new general manager had been selected at a national professional convention.
Seniority. The majority opinion of supervisors was that this factor operated in management only when abilities and other factors were equal. The typical comment of industrial supervisors was, "In the unions 100%. In management seldom." Business and administrative supervisors also attached little importance to managerial seniority.

Adopting the Behavior, Attitudes, Activities and Standards of Successful Superiors. After referring scornfully to the mimics, "copy cats" and "yes men," supervisors tended to agree that this was a very important learning process and thus a favorable factor in career progress. Typical comments were: "Most bosses like this and will promote you if you do it"; "Be yourself, but you can learn a lot if you keep your eyes open"; "Sure it helps to adopt the customs and behavior of the executive environment"; "If you mean copy catting, no. But being shrewd about it puts you in a very favorable light"; "Don't go running around like an actor and dramatizing but, if you keep your mouth shut, they think you're a comer"; "Don't emulate improper, unethical behavior but choose the good points"; "This has worked like a charm in several instances I know of. Look at our top manager's right hand man. He behaves exactly like him. Even has the same kind of personality"; "Of course this operates favorably. Top men are always looking for people like themselves"; "How can you learn to be a big boss except by acting like one shrewdly?"; "They hire you, they fire you or they promote you. You better behave like them."

The implication is clear that most supervisors do consider this factor as a favorable learning process which implements promotion.

Thinking Like the Bosses. Most supervisors also considered this a
factor favorably affecting career progress. Typical of this group were remarks like these: "If you can think like the bosses you can stay one jump ahead of them"; "It sure is important to be able to figure your bosses out. It's the guys who can't do this that don't get promoted"; "You just try to do too much independent thinking and you get accused of not being on the team"; "Listen, even the top bosses worry about what the big shots on the big board are thinking."

In the minority group who recommended independent thought, these were typical comments: "It is important to know how the boss thinks. But if you have logical reasons for disagreeing he'll admire you for it"; "Not all the time. Some bosses like sound independent thinking"; "You don't want to think like the boss when you know he's got the belly-ache"; "I don't recommend too much of this. It might become a crutch."

The inference is that "thinking like the boss" is not as important as "knowing how the boss thinks" and anticipating his reactions. This, essentially, is the ability to take the role of the superior other.

Striving to Attain Higher Level Friendships and Contacts. This factor was regarded as extremely helpful to career progress by practically all supervisors, provided it was exercised judiciously and unobtrusively. Curiously, most supervisors seemed to attach more importance to this factor than either of the previous two factors. Typical comments were: "Provided an individual keeps his sense of values this is very important"; "This is the best question on the list so far. This is where you demonstrate whether you've got the personality or not"; "Not only is this helpful but almost essential to weed you out of the crowd in a big corporation"; "I even think if you can go fishing with the boss, it will help."
That's where you get sized up on social behavior"; "Be shrewd about this and it will pull you right up if you have ability"; "If you are not a pusher and can make yourself socially acceptable, you are in there!" "High level friends tend to pull you up as far as your ability will allow!"

Such a unanimity of opinion in the supervisory group probably represents a universal belief on the lower level in the validity of this "pull" factor.

**Keeping Lower Level Friendships.** Almost as much importance was attached to this "push" factor by the supervisors as was attached to the "pull" factor previously mentioned. Several supervisors warned against snobbishness as a result of success, and tended to emphasize their belief that the loyalty of old friends was what kept a man up after he had arrived because, as one supervisor put it, "Your old friends won't do a good job for you if you get high-hat on them. Then, if you lose your pull upstairs, you go into a tail-spin!

Our analysis of the supervisory appraisals of factors in the careers of others is now complete. We will turn in the next section to comparing the executive appraisals with those of the supervisors in attempting to bring differential capacities and attributes into clearer focus and in evaluating the relative importance of informal factors in career progress.

**Comparisons and Implications**

Prior to comparing the respective appraisals of others and making general implications, it is appropriate to recall certain of the
findings in our review of the literature. These are: (1) Carson McGuire's analysis of the conditions and motivations which must be present if vertical mobility is to occur (pp. 8-11, supra); (2) Warner's and Lunt's reference to family, clique and organizational contacts as factors implementing mobility (p. 11, supra); (3) Warner's and Mills' emphasis on education as a factor in occupational opportunity and mobility (pp. 13-16, supra); (4) Miller's and Form's reference to personal motivation, hard work, plus a network of interrelated social factors as determinants of career progress (pp. 22-23, supra); (5) Moore's concern with the informal, unofficial activities, attitudes, sentiments and symbols influencing mobility (pp. 24-25, supra); (6) Caplow's emphasis on social factors which influence hierarchic promotion (pp. 27-29, supra); (7) Dalton's empirical exposition of informal factors in career achievement (pp. 29-31, supra); (8) Mills' discussion of the so-called "new middle class ideology of success" (pp. 34-36, supra); (9) Mills' exposition of the "competitive personality" (pp. 37-38, supra); (10) Gardner's and Henry's studies of the personality attributes of executives (pp. 39-43, supra); (11) Pellegrin's emphasis on adoption of higher level norms and activities as determinants of leadership roles (p. 46, supra); (12) Mace's emphasis on the ability to get things done through group effort as an outstanding executive attribute (pp. 47-48, supra); (13) Merton's and Kitt's application of reference group theory as it affects promotion (p. 58, supra). The questions included in the executive and supervisory appraisals of others were designed, in large part, to bring out empirical evidence supporting or refuting the above listed findings.
in the literature. We feel that considerable evidence has been offered in support of them and very little, if any, in refutation.

When we compare the main distinctions which executives made between their level and the supervisory level with the corresponding main distinctions which supervisors made between their level and the executive level, we find a surprising amount of agreement. In this pattern of agreement we see the obvious implication that executives and supervisors differ in educational backgrounds and occupational opportunities over the years. Other main distinctions apparently are: differential judgment and foresight; differential ability to handle people; differential attitudes and values; differential willingness to accept responsibilities and make decisions, differential social participation patterns; differential resourcefulness and initiative; differential personality attributes; differential motivation and life-goals. There is evidence here in support of the Columbia University research team's assumption that highly successful and moderately successful individuals differ in the interactive effects of three important complexes: capacities (abilities), opportunities for development and personality. (pp. 60-61, supra).

There is also additional evidence of differential attitudes and values and levels of aspiration.

When we compare distinctions made by the executive and supervisory samples on specific personal capacities and attributes we find, in general, that:

(1) Executives claim their level has greater ability to get jobs done through others by the delegation, coordination and supervision
of authority and responsibility. Supervisors appear to concede the superior ability of executives to get jobs done through group effort and thereby impute to them superior leadership attributes.

(2) Both levels agree that handling people is more important than merely "getting along with people". While there is probably little differential on "getting along with people", there is probably considerable difference between the two levels in handling people. This difference is apparently associated with both differential job requirements and differential leadership attributes.

(3) The two levels appear to agree that the executive group is more ambitious and motivated to advance their careers further. In fact, most supervisors admit that the passage of time has negatively conditioned the motivations and levels of aspirations of their group.

(4) While executives impute to their level better organizational and community attitudes, there is less evidence to support this contention than there is to support the inference that organizational attitudes often over-ride community attitudes on the executive level and that community activities on both levels are a function of role expectations. The role expectations of executives apparently demand that community activities serve company purposes as well as personal purposes.

(5) Executives claim and supervisors generally agree that most individuals on the executive level have better rounded, more flexible, more magnetic, more adaptable and more projective personalities. Supervisors seem to concede that executives are the better "personality salesmen".
While executives claim and supervisors generally concede to them more willingness and capacity to work hard, long hours, the evidence points to differential job requirements and expectations as the actual differentiating factors.

The evidence seems to impute more initiative to the executive level as a result of more authority. Differential creativity on the two levels is probably a matter of scale. That supervisors are creative within limits appears to be recognized by management, which exploits this source of creativity through "coin your idea" campaigns.

Executives claim and supervisors concede to them superior decision-making on the higher level. This differential is not only a function of different job expectations and requirements, but also results from a general unwillingness on the part of supervisors to accept the responsibility for making decisions in changing circumstances.

Executives claim that their level constantly seeks and recognizes opportunities for personal development and advancement. Supervisors admit that their level is less adept at recognizing and taking advantage of opportunities. The implication is that there are differential motivations and levels of aspiration operating on the two levels concerning this factor.

Executives claim more ability to organize and coordinate ideas, people and things. Supervisors concede to them this superior ability not only as a role expectation but also as a functional necessity.

From the above, the general implication that executives and supervisors have differential personal capacities and attributes seems to be warranted.
In turning next to a comparison of the executive and supervisory evaluations of the relative importance of informal factors in career progress we find, in general, that:

(1) Considerable importance is attached by executives to boyhood training and ideals as factors influencing character building and early motivation. The family is credited with being the primary developmental agency.

(2) Family social standing and connections are considered by both the executives and supervisors as important factors in securing occupational opportunities. Both levels emphasize the importance of some ability in implementing subsequent career progress.

(3) Nationality origins are considered by both levels to have more local than general influence on occupational opportunities. Less discrimination is seen by both levels in the present than in the past.

(4) Both executives and supervisors consider some religious affiliation a role expectation. Religious affiliation is considered to exert more influence on occupational choices and placement than on career progress. Less discrimination is seen by both levels in the present than in the past.

(5) Executives are less inclined to admit the influence of belonging to "behind the scenes cliques" than supervisors are to emphasize its importance. However, sufficient evidence was obtained to substantiate the implication that clique memberships do operate very favorably, though more on a local than a general basis.

(6) The protege or "fair-haired boy" factor is more or less scoffed at by many executives. By contrast, the supervisors attach considerable importance to it. The implication is that this factor does
operate on a local basis and is more effective when accompanied by ability.

(7) Fraternal memberships are considered relatively unimportant by both executives and supervisors, though both groups point out local exceptions. These memberships are generally considered to be much less important in the present than in the past.

(8) Both executives and supervisors generally agree that memberships in community organizations and high level social clubs favorably influence career progress through broadened business and social contacts. However, there is evidence that many memberships in community organizations are on a company-delegated basis.

(9) There is a general admission in the executive group that informal social activities and recreation often exert positive influence on career progress through favorable business and social contacts.

(10) Memberships in professional organizations are considered by both groups as symbols of managerial status and as providing ideas and contacts favorably influencing career progress.

(11) There is agreement on both levels that judicious adoption of the behavior, attitudes, activities and standards of successful superiors is a very effective method of acquiring appropriate executive behavior. In addition, it is generally agreed that shrewd exercise of this process favorably influences promotability.

(12) Similarly, there is general agreement that judicious striving to attain higher level friendships and contacts can operate very favorably in career progress. This is considered a decided "pull" factor by both the executive and supervisory groups.
There is likewise a general agreement in both the executive and supervisory groups that retaining the loyalty of lower level friends is an extremely important factor in continued career success. This is generally considered an almost essential "push" factor in career progress.

In making an overall general implication from the above evaluations of informal factors, it must be recalled that both the executives and supervisors were asked to evaluate their importance in executive success. The general implication is that these informal factors operate more favorably in the careers of executives than they do in the careers of supervisors.

In conclusion, we desire to partially restate and rephrase the general hypothesis developed in our frame of reference and approach (pp. 58-59, supra):

Individuals in management who have achieved high level executive positions and outstanding career success through time have differential educational qualifications and occupational opportunities, differential personal attributes, abilities and capacities, differential attitudes, values and beliefs, differential motivations and levels of aspiration; differential social and community participation patterns and differential formal and informal behavioral images from individuals who have not achieved comparable managerial positions and career success.

We consider that we have offered additional evidence favorably supporting our partially restated and rephrased general hypothesis.
CHAPTER V

IMAGES OF GENERALIZED OTHERS

In Chapters III and IV considerable evidence has been offered toward the identification of factors which implement vertical occupational mobility, as opposed to those which limit such mobility and result in comparative occupational stability through time. Real-life constants and variables have been investigated as they operate to implement or limit movement upward, from managerial positions of low status, prestige and functional importance, to executive positions of high status, prestige and functional importance, i.e., the implementing and limiting factors in the process of climbing the executive ladder. Stated otherwise, patterns of similarity within and differences between two comparative samples of high and low level individuals in management have revealed many factors resulting in differential levels of achievement of objective career success over the years. Practically speaking, the specific purpose of our study may seem to have been accomplished. However, the general purpose of our study has not yet been fully accomplished since, as we stated in the beginning, we also wish to investigate generalized attitudes, values and beliefs which may be directly or indirectly related to leadership, occupational mobility and the achievement of career success. We consider that many of these attitudes, values and beliefs are related to the ideology of success in general and that some of them are products of social and economic change through the years, more particularly the recent years.
In the present chapter, the answers to the questions in the last portions of Section III of the respective interview schedules and those in Section IV will be analyzed. Although the questions asked the executive sample in the last portion of Section III were somewhat more elaborate than those asked the supervisory sample, the same method of illustrative comparative analysis previously employed will be used in the present chapter. When the analysis of the executive answers has been completed, an analysis of the supervisory answers will be made. Although immediate inferences will be drawn as the respective analyses proceed, general comparisons and implications will be reserved for the last section of the chapter.

Executive Images of Generalized Others

Since the questions asked the executives were varied in nature, the answers do not fall naturally into main categories as they did in the previous two chapters. For this reason, separate sub-sections will be devoted to each question topic. There are, however, six types of images of generalized others which are common in the evaluations of both executives and supervisors. These will be analyzed first in order to facilitate comparisons later. They are: (1) Rugged Individualism, (2) Human Relations Mindedness, (3) Security Mindedness versus Achievement Mindedness, (4) Organizational Loyalty, (5) Conspicuous Consumption, (6) Self-imposed Mobility Blockage. Although there are intermediate image topics discussed by executives only, there is a seventh type of image of generalized others common to both executives and supervisors: True and False Personalization. This type of image is derived,
in large part, from the questions and corollary queries in Section IV of the interview schedules. For the purpose of emphatic contrast, an evaluation of this image will be reserved for the end of each respective analysis.

Rugged Individualism.

In responding to the question of whether successful individuals are as "rugged" as they are alleged to have been formerly, the executives agreed almost unanimously that, with few exceptions, they are not as rugged. Many executives gave lip-service to the concept of "enlightened managerial leadership" which now prevails and to the democratic personality of today which prevails over the authoritarian personality of yesterday. Typical comments were: "They carried out Sewell Avery in his high chair and there aren't many like him left"; "Not only has ruggedness diminished with an increasing awareness of social values, but there are even laws against too much ruggedness"; "Why be rugged when you can get people to do things through persuasive leadership?"; "The bull of the woods is gone. Nowadays you inspire people. The old authoritarianism doesn't get the job done as well"; "Not nearly as much ruggedness. We've moved away from pioneer days and the survival of the fittest"; "Definite change. Rugged bosses will soon be as extinct as dodo birds"; "The rugged type is a vanishing American in our transition from the entrepreneur to the professional executive"; "No. The new emphasis is on team effort. As a result, top men are sometimes out-argued and talked down"; "Business
executives are not only more altruistic, they are very much shrewder"; "Although top men are individualistic, ruggedness is no longer a mark of distinction"; "You see less ruggedness even in the military. It is a result of changed social values"; "The rugged individual of today is making an ass of himself when the better way is leadership"; "Things are so complex the rugged man finds himself all alone. These days people get together and cook up deals. The thing is to outplan the other fellows, not to outshout them"; "Ruggedness is an authority delegated to the labor bosses. You don't see executives behaving like John L. Lewis"; "Ruggedness goes with power over people. Unions have curbed this power"; "Management has gotten wise to the idea that labor is a part of their capital"; "Now listen. Management is just as rugged as it can afford to be. They simply are more suave and shrewd about it. Unions, laws and government regulations have forced a change. Human nature has not changed!"

The inference is that decreased "rugged individualism," while undoubtedly a result of social change away from authoritarian and toward democratic processes, is a quality associated with leadership and executive success in the new managerial ideology.

**Human Relations Mindedness**

Executives were asked to evaluate the relative importance of "getting the job done" and "keeping people happy and contented" and how one affects the other. The consensus of executive opinion was that the two factors were inseparable with shifting relative importance. Typical comments were: "Keep your people happy and contented and you'll get a better job done. But they shouldn't be too satisfied or they'll
do a poor job"; "In the short range get the job done. But in the long
range, people must be happy and contented. If you don't attend to that
you'll have trouble with the unions"; "Look out for over-emphasis on
happiness and contentment. Getting the job done is a must"; "Happi­
ness and contentment should not mean appeasement. But if your people
are contented they'll do a better job"; "The important thing is team­
work. If you don't get the job done there isn't teamwork. So both fac­
tors balance each other"; "If your people are happy and contented, it
is easy to get the job done. Conversely, if they are not, it is difficult
to get the job done"; "The answer is that you get jobs done through
happy and contented people. But the reverse is also true since you get
happy and contented people through getting a good job done"; "This is
related to your previous question. You don't ruggedly drive people to
get jobs done any more. The new enlightened managerial leadership gets
jobs done through leadership, which means team effort and contented
people.""

The inference in the above is similar to that drawn from the
question concerning rugged individualism. Increased human relations
mindedness on the part of management in getting jobs done is also a re­
sult of social change away from authoritarian and toward democratic pro­
cesses. The ability to get jobs done through group effort is an essential
attribute of leadership. The ability to keep groups happy and contented
while getting jobs done is undoubtedly an important factor in executive
success.

Security Mindedness versus Achievement Mindedness.

The executives were in almost unanimous agreement that, in general,
people are much more concerned with security than they were in the past and far less willing to take chances. Many executives expressed concern with the long range effects of this factor on the larger society and the American character. Typical comments were:

**Ind. Ex. A.** In the last ten years there has developed a great interest in pensions and social security. Young men are indoctrinated with this philosophy by the time they get out of college. While these goals are legitimate, I believe they may tend to decrease initiative and the desire for achievement.

**Ind. Ex. B.** There is very much more security consciousness today. Society is indoctrinated this way. People are much less willing to take chances with their careers. They are more fearful of the opinions of others and the trend is toward more "yes men." The depression started this and inflation continues it.

**Ind. Ex. C.** Yes, definitely. Why? Because of our inflationary standard of living. People want security guaranteed in advance so they can indulge in high living on the installment plan.

**Ind. Ex. D.** This security stuff is ground in by the government. The unions yell for it and the corporations brag about their security plans. This exerts a negative effect on achievement mindedness for society as a whole but there are many individuals who want to achieve their own security, thank goodness!

**Ind. Ex. E.** Job applicants, in general, don't want to know what they can do for the company. They want to know what the company will do for them. I chase these out of my office and hire the exceptions who want to do something for the company.

**Ind. Ex. F.** It's much harder to get potential executives from the ranks because so many think they are secure where they are. They don't want to gamble through accepting big responsibilities.

**Ind. Ex. G.** Industry has brought a lot of this on itself. Even top executives preach security. It is creeping Socialism.

**Ind. Ex. H.** These days most people want white collar jobs with guaranteed security. Even blue collar people want their security guaranteed. The G.A.W. is the next big issue for the labor unions. Watch it.
Old timers get so deep in security rights, they begin to feel like "kept men" who just aren't willing to take chances on leaving and achieving more elsewhere.

The masses are very security minded. It is the depression, the New Deal, and the atomic age. It is the minority of achievement minded people who are running the country. The rest of the population thinks the world owes them a living.

This is the Industrial Evolution following the Industrial Revolution. It is the trend of the times. In management, however, you reach a point when you don't have to worry about security. You've achieved it, so you worry about achieving something else.

There is more and more security mindedness. There is little use trying to make a killing when the government takes most of it in income tax, so why take chances? Industry itself is security minded because it wants less turnover and more stability.

People have always been security minded. It is the method of achieving it that has changed. In these days of high taxes, people rely on the company or the government rather than on their own initiative. Tax-free security becomes a goal.

In many cases security mindedness is so all consuming that it burns like a fire and consumes initiative and ambition. People are less willing to take chances because there is less incentive to take chances. This is robbing us of many of the qualities that made our country great and is a real national problem.

People are not necessarily more security conscious of their own accord but because the federal government has written it into social expectations.

This is so prevalent that it takes all sorts of fringe benefits to motivate the majority of people to do an outstanding job.

It is the ambitionless majority who worry about security. They are afraid machines will take their jobs. Potential executives don't worry about security because they know no machines can replace them.

We need another depression to straighten out people's thinking. Too many people are living too high off the hog. If people were hungrier maybe they'd get their ambition back.
Bus. Ex. F. People won't give up jobs with security to take jobs with a challenge. Consequently a lot of challenging jobs are going begging and are being filled by unqualified people.

Bus. Ex. G. Our sales people want a secure salary. We give them a security "draw" but if they were on straight salary instead of commission, they wouldn't sell nearly as much.

Bus. Ex. H. F.D.R. wrote a sad chapter in American history in sharp contrast to those written by the Pilgrim fathers and the pioneers. As a result, security mindedness is stamped indelibly in our society.

Bus. Ex. I. Let me illustrate. The other day there was a young man in my office looking for a job. He had all of the earmarks of a potential executive. Toward the end of the interview he wanted to know where he'd be five years from now. He was security minded to start with. I told him where he'd be depended on how he took advantage of opportunities and how many new ones he created. If young people don't continue to create opportunities instead of waiting for them, some day there won't be any. We presently enjoy a wonderful American way of life. Our problem is to teach young people to keep it that way through creativity. We've got to fight this security mindedness before young people start their careers. What are you educators doing about it?

Bus. Ex. J. The national mind is so oriented toward security that many people expect charity and are willing to accept it. Part of this is due to society itself and part of it is due to disintegrating family life.

Adm. Ex. A. I think young people today have an almost pathetic desire for future security in a world in which security exists only in the present. It is due to unsettled world conditions in the atomic age. It is hard to plan one's life.

Adm. Ex. B. There is much more of this. Foremost in people's minds is "What is the job security and the pension?" People don't want to take chances on doing better because they are afraid they might do worse. Since people can't control their own destiny, they are not operating at maximum capacity because they are too security minded instead of achievement minded.

Adm. Ex. C. Security mindedness causes people to get in a rut and become self-satisfied. Then their levels of aspiration are lowered and they lose their desire for higher achievement. Success to them means nothing but security.
Rather profuse illustration has been used in connection with this generalized image of others because it is considered to have important implications for the ideology of success. The inference is obvious. Socio-economic changes and uncertainty have apparently brought about a general security consciousness which, in many cases, operates to negatively influence ambition, motivation and levels of aspiration.

Organizational Loyalty.

Executives were asked to describe the factors which make individuals loyal to enterprises which they do not own. A variety of factors related to organizational loyalty were mentioned, among them being: love of the type of work; pride in accomplishment; feeling the company is a part of him and he a part of it; gratitude for security benefits; the feeling of being "on the team"; the satisfaction of individual and company accomplishment; one's life success being keyed to organizational success; being so sold on the company that one feels he owns it even though he doesn't; achieving status, recognition and prestige; pleasant group associations and environment; the company "getting in one's blood"; the overpowering desire to be associated with a prosperous, happy, going concern; the interest shown by the company in the individual as a person.

As one executive expressed it, "You grow with the enterprise. It becomes a part of you as you see your ideas take root and bear fruit. Then you feel good all over in contemplating your accomplishments and contributions!" As another executive put it, "They are the
same factors which make a soldier loyal to his unit, a man to his
country and a student to his college. You feel you are wearing a
badge of distinction?!

However expressed by the executives, the factors which make
for organizational loyalty are apparently the same factors which posi­
tively or negatively influence individual morale, motivation and
career satisfaction.

Conspicuous Consumption.

The executives were asked to evaluate the importance of exter­
nal display on career progress in general. Typical comments were:
"Not much. You can be criticized for too much conspicuous consumption.
Most people know the artificial from the real"; "In moderation, you
are expected to live and act according to your position in life. But
don't be too ostentatious"; "If you display symbols above your sta­
tion in life, you may be accused of being crooked"; "Status symbols
result from rather than result in career progress"; "It is important
to maintain an acceptable style of living but it is equally important
not to overdo it"; "Some people living in mansions have been lucky
enough to strike oil but they haven't achieved any career progress.
Some of them aren't even socially acceptable"; "A neat personal ap­
pearance, a moderate home in a decent neighborhood and a medium priced
car are all that counts!"

From the above it is apparent that most executives do lip-ser­
vice to middle and upper middle class levels of living, and consider
that overly conspicuous consumption may negatively influence career
progress.
Self-imposed Mobility Blockage.

To bring the image of self-imposed mobility blockage into sharper focus, the executives were asked to give the principal reasons why many apparently qualified persons never achieve substantial career progress. Among the most frequently mentioned reasons were: a lack of initiative and creative thinking; the mistake of being afraid of making mistakes; not attempting enough and therefore achieving little; a basically wrong attitude toward their work; a lack of desire to put in the time and effort necessary for substantial success; ceasing to grow mentally; inability to adapt to new ideas and changing situations; being unable to get along with people; not taking care of their physical health; narrow mindedness and low level ambition; personality characteristics which rub people the wrong way; lack of tact and poise; being overly critical of others; having a wife who talks "too damned much"; laziness, lack of dependability and poor judgment; getting bogged down in details (unwillingness to delegate authority); failure to adjust to the work environment and other persons in it; inability to sell ideas and convince people; lack of tolerance and an understanding of human frailties; unwillingness to make personal sacrifices; working in a job just to make a living; double-dealing and lack of trustworthiness; allowing limited success to go to his head (inability to stand up under prosperity); inability to adjust to a pressure situation; an attitude of complacency; failure to prepare properly for higher jobs; unwillingness to accept responsibility and make decisions; fear of changing jobs and forfeiting security benefits; intemperance in personal habits; adopting a defeatist attitude and thinking success
is a question of luck; inability to combine job knowledge with an understanding of people; failure to set-up early goals; opinionated "bull-headedness"; blaming others for their mistakes.

The inference is that many of the above faults which tend to block mobility are the result of passive or negative attitudes, values and personality attributes which most individuals could probably overcome.

Images of the Influence of Wives.

The various executives were asked to describe the presumed influence of wives, in general, on career success. The images which this question evoked were either positive or negative, but rarely neutral. Wives were pictured as either decided assets or decided handicaps to individuals and sometimes to the individuals' organizations. Typical comments were: "The right kind of a wife can make a man and the wrong kind break him"; "If a wife does not provide her husband with a happy, tension-free home, his career is bound to suffer"; "The kind of a wife who accuses her husband of being out with a blonde when he has to work late is not willing to see her husband get ahead"; "I know of cases where careers were impeached over the bridge table"; "A successful executive can't completely leave his work at the office. His wife must be tolerant and understanding"; "I had a promising young man whose wife called him up every fifteen minutes. How could he do a good job when she brought up her problems during working hours?"; "Not only can a wife ruin an individual, but fighting wives can disrupt an organization. Often wives are appraised quietly in the hiring process";
"I know of a big furniture manufacturing company that went out of business because the wives started fighting and the husbands chose up sides"; "If the women try to constitute themselves a junior board of directors, things start getting rough"; "The trouble with husbands is they don't have enough time on their hands. The trouble with wives is they have too much time on their hands"; "Too socially ambitious a wife can hurt as much as the nagger. The ideal is the understanding help-mate"; "There are more wives that wreck careers than there are that help them. When a wife stakes a claim on a man's time and energy he's lost"; "Not only is it important to have a helpful wife but also a helpful secretary. She can be very important in his career progress"; "Very few men are completely self-motivated. That is why wives are either positive or negative influences. Seldom is there no influence"; "There are two ways in which a wife can contribute to career success — by providing a satisfactory home atmosphere and by making herself socially acceptable"; "In retailing it's a good practice to try out your ideas on your wife and her friends for size to get the feminine reaction"; "The wife who butters up the boss or his wife too much may be throwing a boomerang"; "We have social gatherings at which we quietly appraise the wives of our junior executives"; "I know of three cases where wives have definitely blocked promotion"; "It is a lucky man who has the right kind of a wife. He gets married before he or she knows what it's all about"; "What wives do or say reflect the man himself. Executives are often judged in terms of their wives"; "God bless the women. But God save the men from socially ambitious hussies!"; "How often we hear that a man would be a
comer except for his wife! Sometimes, we hear that a man's wife is making him click. Then we think maybe we've got some potential there."

There were other variations of this generalized image which, however, bore likenesses to the above. The importance of the positive or negative influence of wives on career progress suggests that it would be of empirical research interest to evaluate the influence of wives by studying directly the attitudes and values of comparative samples of wives themselves, if proper rapport could be established.¹

The Executive Philosophy of Life.

Executives were asked to describe their image of the executive philosophy and outlook on life as opposed to those of other groups of people in general. There was a tendency to claim that executives differed from other groups in the following respects: broadness of vision, better grasp of socio-economic situations; general optimism; broader perspective and knowledge of the interrelation of parts to the whole picture; more tolerance of people and their problems; better informed because better advised; more foresight into the future; better orientation toward reality; better feel of the public pulse; better balanced judgment; more concern with long range goals; more awareness of social responsibilities; keener intellectual interests; more intensive search

¹One of the few, if not the only, empirical study of the wives of management is described in William H. Whyte, Jr. and the Editors of Fortune, Is Anybody Listening? New York: Simon and Schuster, 1952, Chapters 8 and 9, pp. 145-205.
for wider horizons; less happy-go-luckiness and more achievement mindedness; more awareness of the relationship between the material and human aspects of life.

It is apparent that some executives use rather rosy hues in painting the philosophical image of their kind. Since other executives saw little difference in philosophy and outlook between their group and other groups, and since other groups might paint the executive image in more subdued hues, the genuineness of some executives' generalized self-image may be open to question.

It is also significant to note that executives tended to confuse personality attributes with philosophical outlook in giving their images and that nothing was said about economic or political conservatism or liberalism.

Selection, Development and Judgment of Potential Executives.

The purpose of this question was not to investigate the selection, developmental and judgment procedures in use in any particular plant, but to get a general picture of how executives believe these procedures should be employed. Composite images follow:

Selection. Watch for the man who will assume responsibility on his own initiative and is willing to make decisions. Size up his personality and his ability to handle people (A high level education is not enough). Look for aggressiveness, honesty and integrity. Consider the merit of past job performance. Evaluate the respect, esteem and loyalty which follow workers hold for him. Load him with novel tasks and watch his reactions. Investigate his social background and
educational training. Look for a sense of perspective in getting at the heart of problems. Look for the ability to express himself well orally and in writing. Watch him try to sell himself and his ideas. See if he can get jobs done through group effort. Quietly size up the influence of his wife. Watch him coordinate ideas, people and materials. Look for a combination of ability, ambition and personality.

Consider his personal appearance and habits. Equate attitudes and cooperation with ability. Observe his reactions under pressure. Determine the condition of his health. Consider what he has done with previous opportunities. Watch him adapt to new situations. Observe his social and community activities. Submit him to scientific psychological tests. Plant ideas in him and see if he can sell them. Take him out fishing with some high level people and get their reactions.

**Development.** Give him constant coaching, encouragement and advice. Rotate him from job to job to round him out. Pour on responsibilities and give him the authority to make decisions. Send him to special training courses. Deliberately withhold information so he'll learn to make decisions. Put him in stress situations purposefully. Throw opportunities at him. Send him to the civic meetings. Send him to staff conferences. Send him to national conventions. See how he reacts to criticism when you put obstacles in his way. Give him a chance to put his points across. Inject him into situations where both technical and social skills are required. Thoroughly indoctrinate him with company policy and let him know you have confidence in his judgment. Praise him for jobs well done and offer constructive criticism when necessary.

Although not so stated, it was apparent that executives were indirectly describing the desirable attributes in their images of the successful executive, with an emphasis on developing and judging social as well as technical skills.

Advice to the Potential Executive.

As was expected, there were individual differences in the advice which executives said they would give to an imaginary potential executive. Typical illustrations follow:

Ind. Ex. A. Don't be too impatient for promotion. Don't be too easily satisfied. Do your job better than it has ever been done before. If you're not satisfied with your career progress do something about it or get another job.

Ind. Ex. B. Look at your job from the standpoint of its potentialities for achievement. Do not use salary alone as a yardstick. Broaden your job knowledge in every way you can. Cultivate people and learn how to understand and deal with them. Cultivate an alert, inquiring mind and take care of your physical health. If you like people and they like you, they'll help you to climb if you help them.

Ind. Ex. C. If you are not interested in your job, quit. If you are interested, quit watching the clock. Bury yourself in your job. Take the time to listen to people and respect their dignity. Always be willing to accept constructive criticism.

Ind. Ex. D. Take a look at your competitors and out-perform them on and off the job. Do home work. Broaden your knowledge. Broaden your social contacts with the right kind of people.
Ind. Ex. E. Do your present job to the best of your ability. Don’t worry too much about consequences. Avoid complacency and cultivate progressive friendships. Always know what you are talking about or keep your mouth shut. Spot someone in the organization you admire, study him, find out his rules for success and adapt them to your own purposes.

Ind Ex. F. You can be your own worst enemy if you aren’t careful. Have an honest, fair approach to your job, don’t just try to get by. Be fair to the people you’re working with and for. Work hard, think straight and prepare for the next higher job.

Ind. Ex. G. Be earnest, conscientious and reliable. Endeavor to inspire the confidence of the people you work for and with. Study and know your job thoroughly and find out ways to do it better. Study people and learn to anticipate their reactions. Do extra work after hours and at home. It is often said that these "extras" are the price a person pays for promotion.

Bus. Ex. A. Study constantly your business, your job and the higher jobs. Develop a reputation for hard work, dependability and integrity. Learn how to deal with people. Be willing to assume the other fellow’s viewpoint. Adopt the good points of your superiors. Demonstrate your loyalty or leave.

Bus. Ex. B. If you don’t like your job get one you do like. Then work hard, long hours. Be openminded. Associate with people who know more than you do. Ask questions and accept advice. Work with people, learn to like people and be courteous to everybody. They’ll give you a push upward if you do. Display your energy, cultivate your personality, do an outstanding job and success will come naturally.

Bus. Ex. C. Be honest with yourself when you look in the mirror. Be your own toughest taskmaster. Constantly observe and learn from top people in your field. Be loyal to your company and devoted to your job. Try to get along with people, even if you don’t like them.

Bus. Ex. D. Find some area the company needs to develop. Get others to help you and give them due credit. Be easy to adjust to new situations and don’t take yourself too seriously. Learn to make influential friends and show them your ability. Make friends with your fellow workers and show them your loyalty. Do more than the job requires, prepare yourself for higher jobs and never watch the clock.
Adm. Ex. A. Periodically take inventory of yourself. Know your qualities, admit your weaknesses and try to overcome them. Match your qualities with your inclinations and interests. Get all the additional training you can. Sacrifice immediate gains for long range objectives.

Adm. Ex. B. Cultivate the art of speaking well and writing well. Go to work and learn the fundamentals. Then learn the niceties of finesse. Don't stall. Get things done. Utilize free minutes of spare time. Cultivate people and learn from them. Display imagination, creativity, initiative and willingness to work hard.

While there were other variations of the above quotations, their general theme was similar. Although executives were again describing the desirable behavioral attributes in their images of the successful executive, they were also indirectly illustrating the application of Cooley's "looking glass self" and Mead's "taking the role of the (successful) generalized other."

The Specialist versus the Rounded Individual.

Some of the executives were asked a corollary question not appearing on the interview schedule, "Who has the best chance of becoming a successful executive, the highly educated specialist or the flexible man with a rounded education?" The answers developed generalized images which may have important implications for educators. Typical quotations follow:

Ind. Ex. A. The highly educated specialist is apt to become channelized and may not understand human problems. By the same token, the so-called human relations expert may not understand technical problems. Somewhere in between there is an ideal balance. The technical expert must be able to handle human problems and the human relations expert must be able to handle technical problems.

Ind. Ex. B. These days you can hire plenty of specialists. But it is hard to find individuals who are expert at handling people. Potential executives need a broader, less specialized
education. I'd put my chips on the man with the broad foundation rather than the channelized specialist.

**Ind. Ex. C.** I'd prefer the man with a technical education and some human relations training. But the specialist must also know how to handle people. That's why we train them in it. They lack this ability when we get them.

**Ind. Ex. D.** I don't know whether you can train a man who lacks the personality in how to handle people. Maybe we ought to try to develop his personality, but how can we do it? Perhaps the professors can help.

**Ind. Ex. E.** It is possible to climb past the specialists if you excel them in the ability to handle people. Give me the man with a rounded education and a flexible inquiring mind.

**Ind. Ex. F.** The man with the best chances of becoming an executive is one with a broad knowledge of many things. Broaden him out with Economics, Business Administration, Labor Relations, Psychology, Sociology and the ability to manipulate the English language. If he can't sell himself and his ideas, his chances of becoming a successful executive are much less.

**Ind. Ex. G.** I think the Chemical Engineer should minor in courses in the social sciences like Philosophy, Psychology and Sociology.

**Ind. Ex. H.** To courses in the technical skills there should be added courses in Business Administration, Applied Psychology, Sociology, Labor Economics and Labor Law.

**Ind. Ex. I.** We send some of our potential executives to do post graduate work in the Harvard School of Business Administration. This shows that something is needed in addition to a specialist's degree and on-the-job training.

**Ind. Ex. J.** Executives need both technical training and training in human relations. The engineer with human relations training can get ahead faster.

**Ind. Ex. K.** Potential executives need more training in the social sciences and the social graces too. They need to know Business Administration, History and English. What's needed is more flexibility.

**Ind. Ex. L.** Some specialists suffer from managerial nearsightedness. The top executive needs to be versatile and not a narrow specialist. A good personality makes up for a lack of technical training.
The potential industrial executive should have a sound technical education but he should also be adept in handling the written and spoken English language. I think a B.A. in Engineering, an M. A. in Business Administration with minors in Speech, Industrial Psychology and Industrial Sociology is a good combination.

Bus. Ex. A. I wouldn’t pay 10¢ an hour to one of those human relations experts from New York. The real one must come from within the organization. Otherwise he won’t understand the company and its people. That’s why it’s best to send potential executives to graduate school.

Bus. Ex. B. The trouble with the specialists is they want to start too high. I think there ought to be business apprenticeships for potential executives in the last year of college, to learn the practical application of knowledge. I’d prefer the rounded man to the channelized expert.

Bus. Ex. C. There should be less theory and more real-life facts taught in college. This is why the specialist needs training in the Social Sciences.

Bus. Ex. D. Many technical experts get in a hole. They become indispensable and get skipped over when executives are picked. Some of them aren’t interested in handling people. Some of them don’t know how.

Bus. Ex. E. Some colleges are trying to add Public Speaking, Business English and Psychology to their technical courses. A man has to know more than $Y = X^2$ to deal with people. Our company president didn’t graduate from college but he is an outstanding talker. People listen to him and think.

Bus Ex. F. It is usually best to be a specialist first. This is the age of specialists but some training in the Social Sciences would be helpful.

Adm. Ex. A. Technical knowledge is a necessity but so is social knowledge. I think the ideal education is wide and broad. Much of it is obtained through experience in extracurricular activities and not in the classroom.

Adm. Ex. B. I think the technical specialist needs corollary training in Business Administration, Finance, Social Sciences, and Statistics.

Adm. Ex. C. There is not so much need for technical specialists in my particular field. Potential executives need more Business Administration, Economics, Personnel Psychology, Group Psychology, and Business English. These days, even industry isn’t taking the top engineer in his class. They are looking for the lower man who is fair in engineering but who has had some
electives in college. I think a man with a good well-rounded education will go further up the executive ladder than the channelized specialist.

While these images do not necessarily represent the opinion of the majority of the executives and since there is some division of opinion, there is, nevertheless, the important implication that something is needed in educational preparation for executive success.

**Differences Between Industrial and Business Executives.**

Some of the executives were asked the corollary question, "Are there any essential differences between business and industrial executives?" The following interesting images resulted:

**Ind. Ex. A.** Industrial executives are more interested in the production of objects from materials. Business executives are more interested in selling these objects to the public. This is a difference in function.

**Ind. Ex. B.** Whether in business, industry or administration, I think the same secrets of executive success apply. If you get along with company people you'll get along with customers and the public just as well as the bankers and business men do.

**Ind. Ex. C.** I am a combination business-industrial executive. I think most industrial executives are channelized in their thinking. Business executives have a lot more generalized knowledge about other types of businesses. The industrial executive is primarily interested in public relations for the good of the company. He is not interested in the welfare of the community as a whole but in the role of his organization in the community. He wants to minimize criticism of his organization. The executive in the large industrial corporation is oriented toward the policies of his big board and is directed by others. The business executive is much more prone to make the policies and be self-directed.

**Ind. Ex. D.** Business executives make themselves more conspicuous in public due to their customer consciousness. In the big industrial corporations, certain executives are appointed to handle all public relations.
Ind. Ex. E. Once there was a difference in public and customer relations. But in the competitive industrial world of today this is changing. The industrial executive is becoming much more interested in good customer and public relations.

Ind. Ex. F. There is less need for industrial executives to be public and customer conscious. Certain industrial executives are designated to handle all of this whereas all business executives are concerned with it.

Bus. Ex. A. I think industrial executives are less individualistic and there is less individual decision making. They are less adept at manipulating the public and more adept at manipulating men and materials. The industrial executive is not a forceful leader but is forced to lead. I think the popular belief that industrial executives are forceful leaders is a myth. They are more apt to become the push button type, lacking in human warmth and as cold as some of their machines. You see production curves, not human curves, on the walls of their offices.

Bus. Ex. B. I think industrial executives are more ruthless because they are more concerned with material production and competition.

Bus. Ex. C. You mustn't confuse the human relations minded executive with the public relations minded executive. The public relations minded one thinks only of putting his company in a good light, the other type is interested in people. The large industrial corporations put on a big show of human relations chiefly because it is good public relations.

Bus. Ex. D. The big industrial executive thinks that as his company grows so will the community. The business executive thinks that as the community grows so will his company. I think that business executives are more genuinely community-minded than industrial executives are.

Bus. Ex. E. Despite all their propaganda, industrial executives are more production-minded than concerned with human values. Their concern with human values is designed to increase production.

Bus. Ex. F. Executives in large industrial organizations are a different breed of cats because they don't have to deal with the public. They can be more ruthless and less imbued with human warmth, less community-conscious and engage only in social activities which benefit their company. They are also more jealous of each other and it is much more important that their wives get along. They also have a constant fear of
making wrong decisions. Everything they do must be in line with company policy determined on a higher level.

**Bus. Ex. C.** Business executives get headaches from within and without the company. Industrial headaches come from within the company. Industrial executives are always concerned with company policy when making decisions. Before they'll even talk to you they wonder what the big boss will think of what they say. The bigger the industrial bureaucracy the more fear there is of big shots on the top level.

**Bus. Ex. H.** You think the top men in these big plants are their own boss? They are not. They have a lot of absentee bosses and they are afraid to make an unusual decision without consulting them. If anything out of the ordinary occurs they pick up the phone and call New York for advice. This sort of behavior is prevalent locally too since the rest of them are afraid of the top man in the plant. Everybody is looking for top-side clearance.

**Bus. Ex. I.** The big industries preach "getting along with people," but the people the big executive wants to get along with are the top brass on the big board. He is more ruthless with those below him because he is essentially production-minded.

**Bus. Ex. J.** No executive in one of the largest industrial corporations here who wants to amount to anything will take any action without thinking to himself, "What will the top side think about this?" If he doesn't think like this, he is either unconcerned with his career or else a damned fool! An industrial executive once told me, "It must be nice to make a decision without having to consult with about 18 other people." An industrial executive can take a strong stand and win his point but then the rest of them start taking pot shots at him. It takes a lot of courage to depart from customary routines and practices. You may be accused of not adhering to company policy instead of being praised for showing initiative.

The inference in the above series of images is that industrial executives are essentially production-minded and are more company-conscious than community-conscious when compared to business executives. By comparison, industrial executives also appear to engage in public relations on a delegated basis for company purposes, whereas practically all business executives are individually concerned with public
relations. In addition, industrial executives appear to be much more "other-directed" when making decisions. This is probably the result of a greater extent absentee of absentee ownership of the large industrial corporations and keen within organizational competition for higher level good will.

Decision Making as a Group Process.

The popular image of the high level, independent decision-maker in large enterprises was somewhat shattered by the trend of the executives' responses concerning this factor. There was a general agreement that, the larger the organization, the more tendency there is for decisions to be a result of group processes, although it was maintained that some one person usually had to make the final decision. This image of the decision making process was generally held to be more prevalent in large industrial corporations than in business enterprises due to the greater complexity of the former. Typical illustrations follow:

Ind. Ex. A. This is absolutely correct. A group can think things out better than any individual in large, complex, modern industry. Although individuals make the final decision, it is based on group thinking. This way there is less chance of making wrong decisions.

Ind. Ex. B. The top executive never makes big decisions without some advice. Fear of the consequences of wrong decisions leads to more and more group participation. Group participation also tends to develop team-work.

Ind. Ex. C. This is a rational development in big industry because one individual simply does not have all the knowledge. The group "kicks ideas around" until everybody "goes along". At this point, the chairman bangs the table and announces the decision. It is a logical result of democratic professional management and is also used to spot potential executives and
develop teamwork. The authoritarian entrepreneur didn't operate this way because no one could afford to disagree with him.

**Ind. Ex. D.** Big decisions have so many consequences, the chances of error must be eliminated. The specialists are called in for opinions, then the group argues things out. The top man makes the final decision but it is based on group thinking. If the group is wrong no individual gets the blame.

**Ind. Ex. E.** This is the age of conferences and committees because everything is so complex. Ike operates this way and so does the military. It develops teamwork and makes for sounder decisions. It also lessens the fear of making wrong decisions.

**Ind. Ex. F.** Right. There is much more group participation. Nobody trusts a single man's judgment. This is because of increased industrial complexity and the fear of making mistakes. Soon, however, it becomes a question of agreeing with the top man. He chooses the conference members and picks those he thinks will agree with him. Many meetings are also rigged up ahead of time by some clique. The others are fooled into thinking they are in on things. The decision has already been made before the meeting is called to order.

**Bus. Ex. A.** The group decision is much more prevalent in big industry than in business although the bigger the business, the more of it. We use the group process not only to get the benefit of group thinking but also to develop the feeling of teamwork and group morale.

**Bus. Ex. B.** The shrewd top executive may have made the decision beforehand. Then he calls a conference and makes the others think they made the decision. He has to operate this way to make his decisions more effective. Suppose a conference comes up with a good idea and the top man agrees with him. The top man manipulates the others until everybody agrees. The idea man is happy and so is everybody else. When everybody says, "I'll go along with that;", the decision is made.

**Bus Ex. C.** It is important to get the opinions of others even if the tentative decision is already made. Perhaps the top man already knows the opinions of individuals but group participation makes everybody feel important. Then they willingly accept the delegation of responsibility for carrying the decision out.

**Bus. Ex. D.** It isn't group decisions as much as group discussions. Some one person has to make the decision. Conferences are called because the top man is afraid of making wrong decisions and accepting full responsibility.
Bus. Ex. E. I'll tell you about the group meetings in a certain large industrial corporation. Few big decisions are really made in them. The real decisions are made by the top level in New York.

This corporation's executives are insecure and operate in constant tension. They often meet after work for cocktails in a certain rendezvous. There is much joviality and camaraderie, but it is mostly pretense. They watch each other out of the corners of their eyes, fearful they'll miss out on some conversation or intrigue and wondering whose throat is getting the knife. There is much mutual distrust in spite of all this back-slapping.

The individual executive may be a big shot in the plant but he is subservient to his masters up above. He may officially encourage creativity and initiative among his subordinates but he is not in a position to be creative or show initiative himself since he must ask the absentee top level for clearance. In other words, many of the prized traits of the big decision-maker are myths.

The desire to be a big wheel who makes decisions and, in general, plays the role of the entrepreneur is great. But it is a hollow desire, for the top executive has neither the satisfactions nor the power of the entrepreneur. He knows deep in his heart he is not independent but he must suppress this feeling and show at least the outward appearance of power.

Adm. Ex. A. This is the age of conferences and committees. I think that executives everywhere are prone to call conferences and appoint committees when faced with big issues. People, including high level people are definitely more "other-directed" today.

Adm. Ex. B. The group decision process started growing when the human relations conception began to spread. Teamwork is the byword. However, I think some one person still has to make the final decision even though it is a result of group discussion.

The implication in the above is that there is a definite trend toward "other-directedness" in the decision making process. While most group discussions probably take place on the advisory and staff level and someone individual makes (or rather, announces) the final decision, the increased complexity of modern big business, industry and administration makes the group process the rule rather than the exception.
A large part of this "other-directedness" is undoubtedly due to an apprehensive fear of making wrong decisions, a constant orientation toward company policy and a continual desire to maintain the goodwill of higher authority and absentee boards of directors. It is also interesting to note that the group discussion is used to spot potential executives. Not only is creativity demonstrated there but also, and with more probable importance, conformity to group norms and expectations.

True and False Personalization.\textsuperscript{2}

The images evoked in connection with this topic were a result of the questions in Section IV of the interview schedule and related exploratory queries. Here the executives were asked to describe the behavior pattern of an imaginary young man who was so intent upon becoming a successful executive that nothing else really mattered to him. In elaborating the image, the respondents were asked to suppose that this hypothetical individual was not only ruthless, but also self-centered, shrewd and calculating. All of the executives stated that they had observed this type of individual in action. Most of the executives found the descriptive adjectives "ruthless," "unscrupulous" and self-centered" distasteful and associated them with "insincerity" and "false

\textsuperscript{2}As used herein "true personalization" is defined as sincere though shrewdly calculated behavior on the part of an aspirant to an executive position. By contrast "false personalization" is defined as insincere, ruthless, self-centered, unscrupulous, shrewdly calculated behavior on the part of an executive aspirant.
They tended to take a dim view of the chances of long range success of an individual like this. Some executives, however, suggested that the distasteful descriptive adjectives be struck out and that the hypothetical individual be described as sincere, shrewd and calculating. These latter executives associated sincerity with "true personalization," and estimated that the chances of success of such an individual were fairly bright.

**False Personalization.** Since most of the executives' images were those of the ruthless, insincere, self-centered, shrewd and calculating person, they will be illustrated first.

**Ind. Ex. A.** I don't think this individual would be really successful unless he could overcome his ruthlessness and insincerity. If he were self-centered and shrewd, he'd be a big idea stealer who was always buttering up the boss. He'd try to muscle in on everything, blow his own horn and try to get his name in the newspapers. He'd be a big social climber, thinking it would show he was executive material. Such phonies don't get very far these days. They get found out quicker than they used to.

**Ind. Ex. B.** A young man who uses ruthless tactics to get ahead ruins his chances for success in a couple of years. Nobody can become so unpopular as a pusher obviously on the make. There are no short cuts and no substitutes for genuine qualifications. This kind of behavior has practically disappeared. It belongs to the anti-capitalism of Marx and Engels. Aroused public opinion has practically finished the ruthless corporation and with it the ruthless, self-centered executive.

**Ind. Ex. C.** I have seen this type and he runs smack into trouble. He talks a big job, butters up his fellow workers, superiors and subordinates, steals ideas and always claims they are his own. He'd try to join all the organizations that would accept him. This kind of behavior is generally ineffective in democratic management.

**Ind. Ex. D.** This kind of character would sabotage the efforts of his associates in the eyes of his superiors but try to keep it under cover. He doesn't give a damn about his subordinates, just uses them. He is always buttering up the bosses.
and rendering them lip-service. He tries to secure membership in those organizations in which his supervisors participate. But these phonies are disappearing like the cigar store Indian.

Ind. Ex. E. I've never seen this type really get by. The ruthless individual is a self-centered egotist and nobody will accept this trait these days. A man can be self-centered but not ruthless.

Bus. Ex. A. This kind of man would butter up everybody. He'd never let a chance go by to prove he was a potential executive. He'd talk a good job and keep himself in the boss's eye. He is aloof from the lower levels and tries to tie in with the higher levels. He uses organizational memberships purposefully, joining those he thinks will give him contacts and prestige. He demonstrates his superiority by stealing ideas and taking the credit. He is a crafty stool pigeon.

Bus. Ex. B. This is an unhappy route to success but it can be travelled. This man is even ruthless with himself. He takes advantage of the mistakes of others and uses them as stepping stones. He finds out what his superiors want and makes himself valuable. He joins the organizations he thinks can pull him up and cultivates the people who can do things for him. He knows when to roll out the red carpet. He may rise until he has to depend on the loyalty of others and then he is stuck. Success this way is rare these days.

Bus. Ex. C. He'd suppress his honesty and integrity, and take advantage of all sorts of contacts — social, political and otherwise. He'd completely disregard the feelings of his fellows and subordinates and boot-lick and butter-up his superiors, while being friendly and formal with everyone else. He'd get in cahoots with some other shrewd characters and get himself recommended if he could do it. This is only partially effective in the long haul.

Bus. Ex. D. I have seen some people short cut their way up the career ladder. This type hobnobs with the boss and caters to important customers. He poses as an expert on everything and puts up a big false front. He boot-licks everybody, is a big joiner and a big talker. Unfortunately this kind of behavior sometimes succeeds provided the man has some ability.

Bus. Ex. E. This kind of a person will never be any kind of a success except a financial success. You can buy your way into a lot of things in business and that includes organizational memberships. But you can't buy happiness, genuine friends and wholesome respect.
Bus. Ex. F. He spreads false rumors and tries to frame his competitors. He tries to get some stooges to spread favorable rumors about himself. To his fellows he is tops on the surface but a snake in the grass at heart. He tries to muscle into organizations with false impressions. Unless he is extremely shrewd he is usually found out and his behavior boomerangs.

Bus. Ex. G. I know one character like this and he is successful too. He was shrewd enough to beat out some other ruthless people. He used people not to get the job done but to further his own advancement. He'd make them promises, then discard them. Sometimes he'd act as though he was superior to everybody and sometimes he'd act as if everybody was superior to him. He used the chameleon approach. He was definitely the big joiner and big organizer and made most of the motions. He'd try to get people into fights, then he'd step aside. Sure this works all the time. Sometimes ruthlessness is necessary to achieve immediate goals.

Bus. Ex. H. I think this kind of behavior is more prevalent in big industry than in business. I've heard of a lot of this in one of the big plants here. This type tries to use pull, influence, goes over heads and cuts throats. He steals the ideas of his subordinates, acts superior to his fellows, flatters and boot-licks his superiors. He'd try to be his own press agent and it does work in industry. These are short range tactics which must be discarded for continued success.

Bus. Ex. I. This kind have brains and let everybody know it. They have plenty of "brass" and are aggressive to the nth degree. They try to keep on good terms with everybody. They advertise what they have for sale. They are big joiners, particularly if the bosses also belong. This kind of behavior, however, is not as effective as it used to be.

Bus. Ex. J. Today ends not means seem most important. Money and position seem to be preferred over how one gets them. Many war profiteers are now big shot business men. They politic like hell, indulge in conspicuous consumption, try to make influential marriages, put up a big front, cultivate profitable friendships, get to know the right people, take Dale Carnegie courses and learn to talk in public. This type discredits those below him to his superiors and vows his loyalty to them. Unfortunately, some get away with it.

Adm. Ex. A. Such persons would do anything to get ahead. They are back-biters and professional liars. They try to build themselves up by tearing others down. They are completely insincere and try to use anybody to their own ends. They manage
to muscle into some organizations through gall and nerve but they soon get found out in a human relations minded outfit. In an authoritarian atmosphere they can get by with this stuff by slicking up the boss, but this doesn't work in a democratic atmosphere.

Adm. Ex. B. I don't believe in this but it does operate. These people grasp everything in sight they think is useful. They have a sort of selfish shrewdness. They even step on their best friends. They lie about other people, butter up the boss, build themselves up, steal the ideas of others and sell them as their own. They are the big joiners who use these memberships to sell themselves. They even try to buy into clubs and churches. I'm sorry to say this kind of behavior does work sometimes. I know some complete phonies who have gotten there. Look at Joe McCarthy, for instance. He is the all-American hood-winker. Fortunately, phonies get exposed in the long run.

There is evidence in the above images that, although the exception rather than the rule, success is sometimes attained by means which deviate from normal expectations in the success ideology. There seems to be evidence here of an insincere "other-directedness" which, in many cases, borders on duplicity and double-dealing.

True Personalization. There were some executives who preferred to disregard the adjectives ruthless, insincere and completely self-centered and to give their images in terms of a hypothetical, sincere, shrewd and calculating individual. To them such behavior was not only acceptable but also productive of accelerated success. Typical illustrative images follow:

Ind. Ex. A. The sincerely shrewd, calculating individual ties in with people who can help him. He has a cool friendliness with others, but he does not undercut them. He always has his eye on the ball, is willing to tackle tough problems and knows how to get people to help him. He helps others so they'll want to help him. He starts favorable whispering campaigns about himself and gets his name in favorable print. He studies the organizations and clubs and chooses the helpful ones. This sort of behavior is very effective, but not very prevalent.
Ind. Ex. B. The really shrewd calculator tries to be a perfectionist. He knows as much as possible about the company and everybody's job. He is conscious of being on the team and is careful not to step on people's toes. He is never underhanded and when calculating his goals, is preparing for them through study. This fellow is shrewd enough to ingratiate himself and make himself valuable.

Ind. Ex. C. What I call the shrewd, calculating type talks, lives and promotes his job 24 hours a day. He keeps himself in the boss's eye and works overtime to do it. Of course he boot-licks, but he does it to the right people at the right time. He even coaches his wife in this technique. Sure, he would join in useful clubs and organizations. If he could, he'd play golf with the boss too. But, mind you, he's got something on the ball. If he is ruthless, he won't appear to be. He waits until he's up there to be ruthless. Yes, this kind of behavior is very effective.

Bus. Ex. B. The shrewd fellow works like the devil. He is kind, polite, trustworthy, cooperative and alert. He is cordial and friendly — warmly calculating, not coldly calculating. He shrewdly avoids making enemies. He tries to get into influential organizations but doesn't make himself conspicuous and flamboyant. He hides his ruthlessness until he gets to the top, but once he's up there ruthlessness can be damned effective.

The above images can also be classified as the exception rather than the rule. There is, however, evidence here of sincere "other-directedness" and an avoidance of duplicity. These seem to be images of "true personalization" in accordance with acceptable role expectations.

We have now completed our descriptive analysis of the executives' images of generalized others. We will turn next to a comparable descriptive analysis of the supervisors' images of generalized others.

Supervisory Images of Generalized Others

As previously pointed out, there are six types of images of generalized others which are common in the evaluations of supervisors and
executives and which will be analyzed first to facilitate comparisons later. These are: (1) Rugged Individualism, (2) Human Relations Mindedness, (3) Security Mindedness versus Achievement Mindedness, (4) Organizational Loyalty, (5) Conspicuous Consumption, (6) Self-imposed Mobility Blockage. A seventh type of image was developed by supervisors only: Differential Life-Goals, Rewards and Satisfactions. There is an eighth type of image developed by both samples: True and False Personalization. This will be evaluated last for purposes of more emphatic contrast.

**Rugged Individualism.**

In responding to the question as to whether top level managerial executives are as "ruggedly individualistic" as they are alleged to have been formerly, the majority of the supervisors agreed that, with few exceptions, they are not as rugged. Typically, the industrial supervisors gave the labor union movement credit for having softened the ruggedness of industrial management. Illustrative of the remarks of the industrial group were: "Handling labor today is quite different from the early days. Diplomacy and man-to-man relationships are now necessary"; "They are down to earth human beings now. The unions have made Christians out of the rugged bosses"; "In these days and times, you can't get much done being rugged"; "It isn't like the old days. Top management is educated to the fact that the lower classes are human beings"; "Even though the unions caused a lot of it, I think management is better educated and just naturally more human"; "Top men don't think about being rugged. Most of them are college men who have been taught human cultural values"; "Nowadays
they aren’t the driving kind. They have bags full of tricks for keeping people happy and contented in getting the job done"; "Management simply found out that it’s good business to be human"; "Twenty years ago we supervisors were just as rugged as anybody else. Society has changed since the depression"; "The country has outgrown the rugged characters"; "If it wasn’t for the unions, they’d be just as rugged as ever. The unions forced them to be leaders instead of drivers"; "In the old days, the bosses were uneducated practical men. These days, educated bosses hide their ruggedness"; "Management is much more concerned with public opinion. The unions forced them to be"; "The rugged bosses used to make a brickmason lay 1500 bricks in a day. Today they are satisfied if he lays 800;"

Typical of the remarks of the business group were: "No. It's leadership these days instead of slave driving"; "It isn’t so hard to quit working for a rugged boss and he knows it"; "Not nearly as much. People are treated like humans and not like machines as in the old days"; "It is a change in attitude toward working people all over the world"; "Everybody is getting better educated. The rugged boss is considered to be a crackpot when it’s so much easier to get things done through leadership"; "It’s the changing times and changing business philosophy"; "Complex business today depends much more on the little man and ruggedness doesn’t work"; "No indeed. Those rough guys don’t get anywhere unless they own the place and then they have trouble getting people to work for them"; "There’s a new way of bossing people these days. You get more done leading instead of driving"; "Management is just as exacting as ever. It is just more understanding of human dignity".
Exceptions to the image held by the majority were: "I don't think human nature has changed. Some bosses are even more rugged than formerly. I don't think they have the right attitude and they ought to get off their high horse"; "In banking, the top side is just as rugged as ever. I don't see much difference"; "In retailing, the bosses are just as rugged. That's why there ought to be a clerks' union"; "Yes. The bosses are just as rugged as ever. You just don't notice it as much since there are more people in the chain of command."

Despite the exceptions, the general inference is that "rugged individualism" is not nearly as prevalent as formerly. Labor union pressure, the desire for good corporative public relations and changes in social values have forced a trend away from authoritarian and toward democratic processes in management. Leadership appears to be the rule and ruggedness the exception in the achievement of executive success in corporations.

**Human Relations Mindedness.**

Supervisors were asked to evaluate the relative importance of "getting the job done" and "keeping people happy and contented" and how one affects the other. The consensus of supervisory opinion was that the two factors were inseparable with shifting relative emphasis. Typical comments were: "Happy and contented people will get a good job done"; "They are equally important. Top management makes every effort to do both"; "These things go hand in glove. The job comes first but you have to keep people happy and contented"; "You can get a job done with discontented people but it will be a bum job"; "These two go together more than ever. The emphasis is on treating everybody like you'd want to be
treated"; "You can't keep everybody happy and contented so the thing to do is to keep as many as possible that way while putting the emphasis on the job"; "Top level likes to give the impression that happy and contented workers are more important. But when the chips are down, the job is more important"; "Listen, if a man excels in doing both of these, he'll wind up in top management"; "There was a time when the boss wouldn't even speak to the workers. There is much more emphasis on contentment these days"; "In retailing, happy and contented people will do a much better job"; "If you have contented people, you can take off and leave the job up to them"; "Getting the job done is not enough. The job must be kept done or it will be undone. So keep people happy and contented"; "Keeping the people contented gets the job done. You can't drive them any more"; "Happy and contented people give the job the extra push that makes it a good job"; "You better have a happy and contented bunch or they'll foul the job up."

Two deviations from the above image were: "In retailing, it is getting the selling job done. They don't care about the rapid turnover of people. They'd just as soon the old ones quit so they could hire young ones cheaper"; "I said retail bosses were rugged and they are. All they care about is the sales dollar. To hell with the people." These two respondents are probably victims of a lingering entrepreneurial attitude in retail business.

Despite the two deviant images, the inference in the above is similar to that drawn from the question concerning rugged individualism. Increased managerial concern with the happiness and contentment of workers in getting jobs done, while probably resulting from social and economic
pressures, is an important factor in leadership and executive success.

**Security-Mindedness versus Achievement-Mindedness.**

The supervisors were in almost unanimous agreement that, generally speaking, people are much more concerned with guaranteed security and far less willing to take chances. As a result, a number of problems were visualized by the supervisors. Typical comments were:

**Ind. Sup. A.** Our company started its people being security-minded 30 years ago. Big industry teaches it to people. They are much less willing to take chances. When the C. I. O. tried to muscle into our plant, the 15-year men ran them off. Now the problem is to convince the men that increased production means more security.

**Ind. Sup. B.** Educational programs have taught people to be security-minded. The company teaches it, the union teaches it and the government teaches it. I wouldn't be surprised if the University teaches it. The problem is to motivate people to achieve something.

**Ind. Sup. C.** A lot of men are quitting construction work and going to the plants to get security. Nowadays, if the company doesn't provide security, people look to the government to provide it. A lot of this comes from the unions who holler about job security all the time.

**Ind. Sup. D.** You can blame this stuff on the depression and the New Deal. Few people want to achieve their own security these days. The government sponsors the whole thing with the social security program.

**Ind. Sup. E.** I'll tell you what people want. They want their security guaranteed so they can live on the installment plan as fast as possible. It is the uncertainty of the times and inflation that cause this.

**Ind. Sup. F.** Definitely. The kids even start talking about it. People get educations and look for something soft. The government and the companies preach security all the time. It's the fear of another war and depression.

**Ind. Sup. G.** Positively. People think you ought to mail them a check and let them stay home. It's the union's fault.
Ind. Sup. H. Yes, sir! The whole society is drunk on security-mindedness. The government and industry teach it. Companies convert part of their income tax money to security benefits and the government approves.

Ind. Sup. I. The working people are living on credit. They want some agency to guarantee their security on a silver platter. They used to worry about unemployment but now that we have inflation and pensions they spend their money right and left.

Ind. Sup. J. Hell yes! Security is what everything is all about now. It's world security, national security, individual security. The guys with ambition soon get soft. Everybody is looking for a soft job with guaranteed security.

Ind. Sup. K. I don't think most people today have any particular goals in life except security and leisure. They want their living handed to them on a silver platter.

Ind. Sup. L. Definitely, yes! People worry about two things: getting bumped off in an atomic war, or their increased life expectancy. They want someone to guarantee security.

Ind. Sup. M. People are very much security-conscious. As a former Sunday School Superintendent, I think this attitude violates the principle: "It is better to give than to receive". Those who want security without working for it think it is better to receive than to give. This is contrary to Christian ethics.

Ind. Sup. N. People think the world owes them a living on a silver platter. The New Deal caused it. I'm a devout Catholic and I think this attitude is a violation of Christian principles.

Bus. Sup. A. A low level man looking for security in the retail business would be about as successful as a man hunting tigers with a BB gun. It's all he can do to make a living. So he looks to the government for security.

Bus. Sup. B. Security-mindedness grew from the depression and is nourished by the threat of war. How to motivate people to provide their own security is the problem.

Bus. Sup. C. These days people want guaranteed security so they can go out and enjoy themselves. Actually, they live on the installment plan and go out gambling with their lives in fast cars on the highways.
Bus. Sup. D. People are more security-conscious because of greater life expectancy. They see the problems of old age and want somebody to guarantee to take care of them. Families don't take care of the old folks like they used to.

Bus. Sup. E. Some years ago people were willing to go out and look for new job opportunities. Now, they are scared to death to forfeit their security benefits. They just stick around dreaming about retirement and want somebody to guarantee to take care of them. Pensions, pensions, that's all you hear.

Bus. Sup. F. I don't think times have changed regarding security. The method of getting it is different. People used to want to go out and get it. Now they want to sit down and wait for it.

Bus. Sup. G. As a nation we have become security-conscious. Either the government, the company or insurance is expected to take care of us. Religious leaders are concerned with this kind of thinking. It isn't in keeping with good Christian principles. I never heard of what you describe as Max Weber's Protestant Ethics, but look at the sixth chapter of Matthew in the Bible.

Bus. Sup. H. Security-mindedness is why so many people stick to jobs they don't like. They are afraid to jump from the frying pan into the fire. Their ambition gets smothered.

Bus. Sup. I. People expect the government to take care of their security and are living as fast as they can in the present. "Get it now"; "Live it up"; are the watchwords. How can you expect people to be achievement-minded when they can buy all sorts of stuff on the installment plan? Something is happening to ambition in this country.

Adm. Sup. A. This has been a nation-wide conditioning process and is a violation of Christian principles. God helps those that help themselves. Good Christians provide their own security rather than demanding it from society, the government or their organization. How can you expect the young people to be achievement-minded when they are conditioned otherwise?

Again, rather profuse illustration has been used in connection with this generalized image of others because it is believed to have important implications for the ideology of success. Most supervisors themselves appear to some extent to be victims of security-mindedness since they almost invariantly included "security" in their previous definitions of
"career success." It is significant to note the remarks of the four supervisors who referred to the negative effects of an over-concern with unachieved security on Christian principles. These images are the antithesis of Max Weber's "Protestant Ethic." The inference is obvious. Social change and economic uncertainty appear to have brought about a general emphasis on security in American society which, in many individual cases, operates to influence negatively ambition, motivation and levels of aspiration.

Organizational Loyalty.

Supervisors were asked to describe the factors which make individuals more loyal or less loyal to enterprises for which they work but do not own. A variety of factors related to organizational loyalty were mentioned, among them being: liking the type of work and fellow workers; pleasant working conditions; fair treatment by management; stake in security benefits and pension plans; owning shares of stock; feeling of belongingness; response to company loyalty to the individual; praise and recognition; feeling one is "on the team"; being called an "associate" instead of an employee; having delegated responsibility in recognition of trustworthiness. Typical comments were: "When you've been around a long time you get to feeling like you own part of it"; "It is a reflection of the way top management treats its people. Loyalty comes

from the top down, not from the bottom up"; "Most loyalty is purchased by the company. Companies buy your loyalty in competition with the unions"; "Sometimes you are more loyal to personalities in top management who have looked out for you. You'd leave with them or stick with them"; "If the bosses respect and trust you, you'll be loyal. If you're discriminated against, you'll be disloyal"; "Loyalty is a temporary thing. Let the company policy change and so does loyalty"; "Loyalty, like discipline, is a result of fear — fear of disapproval by your fellows, fear of losing face"; "Two things make people loyal: material rewards and having the same philosophy as the boss. If you are a s.o.b., you'll be loyal to a s.o.b. if he pays you enough."

Negative influences on loyalty were generally stated as the reverse of the above. However stated, the inference is that the factors which make for organizational loyalty or the lack thereof are essentially the same factors which positively or negatively affect individual motivation, morale and career satisfaction.

**Conspicuous Consumption.**

The supervisors were asked to evaluate the importance of external display on career progress in general. Typical comments were: "As a man progresses he ought to acquire things associated with moderate, not conspicuous, living"; "If you see a foreman riding in a Cadillac, you suspect him of running a racket on the side. You make a public fool of yourself trying to show off"; "Just be decent. Don't be sloppy. Dress neatly, that's the main thing"; "A guy gets things as he progresses, but they don't help him to progress higher except in his own mind"; "These
days you can't tell a working man from a big shot out on the street, so what's the use of showing off?"; "You just have to be decent. One of our foremen lived with a woman in a bum neighborhood and got fired"; "If you live and dress like a bum, you'll be a bum before long. You're expected to live and dress in decent moderation"; "Good manners is the thing. You find a lot of rotten books with flashy covers"; "Clothes may make the man, but that's about all"; "Which comes first, progress or status? I think status symbols result from but do not cause progress"; "Don't kid yourself. In the business world, external display counts a lot"; "A good neighborhood and personal appearance do affect career progress, let's admit it"; "Too many Americans are hopped-up on new cars, new homes and social climbing. I think career progress can be achieved without this. All this is, is compensation for a lack of real progress"; "Over-display classifies you as a suspicious character. Be moderate"; "I don't recommend the false front, but it does count in business!"

While there are a variety of answers above, the inference is that most supervisors are oriented toward acceptable middle class levels of living. Only the business supervisors attached any particular importance to conspicuous consumption in career progress.

**Self-imposed Mobility Blockage**

To clarify their images of self-imposed mobility blockage, supervisors were asked to give their opinions as to why some apparently qualified people in management never rise to the top level. Among the most frequently mentioned reasons were: rubbing people the wrong way; becoming satisfied to rise just so high and considering it their life station;
failure to adapt to new situations; getting indifferent; trying to undercut others; developing superiority complexes; lack of initiative and enthusiasm; inability to get along with people; no sense of teamwork and cooperation; trying to "bull" their way up the ladder; becoming nothing but "yes men"; going off half-cocked; unwillingness to accept responsibility and make other than routine decisions; plain damned laziness; violating the "Golden Rule"; failure to exercise good judgment; inability to put across ideas; never praising others; unwillingness to accept advice.

As one supervisor put it, "Granting educational handicaps and the scarcity of higher positions, it is the inability to get along with people that stops them all." As another supervisor put it, "They forget the people who helped them up to where they are, they can't understand people and adopt a defeatist attitude, they can't express their ideas well and they have inflexible personality characteristics. These guys ought to study Dale Carnegie." As another supervisor put it, "I said it before. They just sit on their back end, that's all." As still another supervisor expressed it, "Most of these birds have a false sense of values. They think their past will take care of their future." Still another supervisor had this thought, "You see these people you think will go a long way. Then they and their wives try too much social climbing. They get in with the wrong crowd and then they're sunk."

The inference is that many of the above faults which tend to block mobility are self-imposed attitudes, values and personality attributes which most individuals could probably overcome.
**Differential Goals, Rewards and Satisfactions.**

In this area, the supervisors were asked to give their images of the differential life-goals, rewards and satisfactions which they believed top level executives and low level individuals in management have. This question was designed to set the levels of aspiration of top executives and supervisors in sharper contrast and it accomplished its purpose very well. The supervisors' images of the life-goals, rewards and satisfactions of top executives usually included the executives' desire for wealth, authority, power, glory, status and prestige. Contrarywise, their images of the life-goals, rewards and satisfactions of supervisors usually included supervisory satisfaction with security, respect and personal and family happiness. Generally speaking, the images of executive goals held by the supervisors were at variance with the executives' own definitions of "career success"; while the images the supervisors held of supervisory goals were in accord with their own definitions of the term.

There were, of course, some variations. Illustrative of these were: "It is the middle level that is the happiest. They have some of everything and are well satisfied"; "Top level men put their careers ahead of their families. Most low level people realize limited goals are the only ones possible and include their families in them"; "On top it's the constant drive for more and more power and status. Low level men are satisfied with happiness and security"; "I don't think there is too much difference about money — both levels want to reach peak earning capacity. The difference is in the desire for power"; "Percentage-wise
the supervisors want happiness and security. Personally, I'd like to stop short of the top so people wouldn't take pot shots at me"; "On the top level, some are power crazy, some are money crazy, some are both. I never saw one who didn't want one or the other. The low level man may be crazy, but he's no fool. He knows his limitations and wants happiness and security for himself and his family"; "To be a big wheel in the community with a lot of power and glory is what the top men want. The low level man is satisfied if his family thinks he's a big shot."

However pictured, these images are related to differential definitions of career situations. There seems to be considerable evidence here that goals, rewards and satisfactions are so defined as to differentially condition levels of aspiration in the executive and supervisory groups.

**True and False Personalization.**

The images evoked from the supervisors in connection with this topic were a result of the questions in Section IV of the interview schedule and related probing queries. Here the supervisors were asked to describe the behavior pattern of a hypothetical young man who was determined to become a top level executive at all costs. In elaborating the image, the respondents were asked to suppose that this individual was ruthless, self-centered, shrewd and calculating. All of the supervisors stated that they had observed the behavior patterns of individuals of this type. While many of the supervisors took a dim view of the chances of long range success of an individual like this, a surprisingly large number of them, particularly those in business, scornfully cited cases
where such individuals had actually achieved considerable progress up
the executive ladder. While most supervisors tended to associate the
descriptive adjectives "ruthless," "self-centered," "shrewd" and
"calculating" with "insincerity" and "false personalization," there were
a few supervisors who suggested that the individual be described as
sincere, shrewd and calculating. These latter supervisors associated
sincerity with "true personalization," did not refer to such an image
scornfully, and estimated that he who was possessed of sincerity along
with calculated shrewdness would go a long way up the executive ladder.

**False Personalization.** Since most of the supervisors' images
were those of the ruthless, insincere, self-centered individual, they
will be illustrated first.

**Ind. Sup. A.** Yes, we had a character like that right here.
He started like a cyclone but in 40 days he was "gone with his
wind." He carried tales, started rumors, bragged and talked a
big job. He tried to be the boss's pet and flattered his secre­
tary. He acted superior to his fellow workers and cool to his
subordinates. He would have been a big joiner if he could have
but he got the can.

**Ind. Sup. B.** Yes, sir. I've got one like this under me
right now. He says, "I don't care who I step on, I'm going to
the top." The supervisor who has a guy like this as his assis­
tant has a hard time. The guy is out for his job and says so. He
claims the plant manager is his best friend, knows all the answers
and is a self-appointed big shot. He apple-polishes the top bosses
and flatters their secretaries. He treats everybody else like a
cold fish. He is apt to become a big joiner. He may make it in
the short run but not in the long haul. Somebody is going to cut
off his water.

**Ind. Sup. C.** We had one in our department but managed to get
rid of him. He "brown-nosed," talked about us, rifled our desks,
went over our heads, started rumors and carried tales. He was a
genuine s.o.b. He acted superior to everybody except the bosses.
He would polish apples and try to get intimate with their secre­
taries. (I know another guy like this who bought a house next door
to the boss). He is the big joiner type. In fact, he and his wife
think they are society, not a part of it. Such behavior boomerangs after a while because people get fed up with it.

_Ind. Sup. D._ This is the big idea stealer. He steals them and sells them to the boss. He carries tales and starts rumors. He acts snobbish to everybody except the boss and his secretary, whom he boot-licks and flatters. He's a big joiner and publicity hound. "He'll walk, ride, slip or slide _—any way to get inside_." With education, it's much easier to get up the right way and not take chances on getting your throat cut.

_Ind. Sup. E._ This type does anything to knock his competitors, steal credit, talk big and apple-polish. Sometimes, they cultivate make-believe friendships, sometimes they get high hat. You know Z. Z. out at the plant. Well take him. He uses people at will, either treating them good or ignoring them, whichever suits his purpose. If you go to him with a good idea, he'll slap you on the back and then steal it. Instead of being the big joiner, he muscles into the inside cliques. Has parties at home for the big boys. Yes, this kind of behavior does work sometimes.

_Ind. Sup. F._ This kind sells management on himself and his ideas. He pretends to be very enthusiastic about their viewpoints. He's always asking for and admiring top level opinions. He's a good fellow and a glad hander. He butters up everybody, cowtows, flatters and boot-licks. He is the big joiner, always looking for contacts and limelight. This kind of behavior _often works_ but, if he doesn't change it later, he'll get exposed as a fraud.

_Ind. Sup. G._ This type doesn't care what happens to anybody else. He talks himself up and runs others down. He acts superior to his fellow workers. He disdains his subordinates while trying to use them for his own purposes. He's always trying to sell himself to the bosses and playing up to their secretaries. If they kick him out the front door, he comes back in through the side door. He's the biggest joiner you ever saw. I saw a lot of this in the old days and some of them climbed. These days you can get further by acting like a human being.

_Ind. Sup. H._ Oh, brother! People learn this in the Army and there's a lot more of it since the war. Characters like this are mitt-floppers, hand-shakers and stool pigeons. They try to associate with top management, are know-it-alls, fast talkers and blame mistakes on other people. They are superior to their fellows and look down on their subordinates. They are definitely the social climbers. This _sometimes works_ on a receptive boss who himself is a weak sister.
Bus. Sup. A. This kind tries everything legitimate. He double deals, back slaps or shakes hands as the occasion calls for. He's a big talker and promoter. Things could always be done better his way. He cultivates false friendships with his fellows and subordinates. If they'll do him some good, he'll do them some good. He boot-licks the bosses and does favors for their secretaries. He joins everything he can get into and is a big publicity hound. This is where he and his wife play up to the boss and his wife. If they are shrewd enough not to get exposed, they go somewhere too. There's much more of this these days. Everybody is a schemer always trying to "cook up a deal."

Bus. Sup. B. There are plenty of operators like this but, unless they are extremely shrewd, they wind up in a tailspin. They high hat their fellow workers and run to the boss with everything while stepping on their subordinates along the way. They try to join everything. This works if the top man is the same kind of guy. There is just as much of this as ever. The business world is full of "smart cookies."

Bus. Sup. C. Yes, I've seen this kind often. He is two-faced and will agree with anybody if it is to his advantage. But he'll cut throats without batting an eye. He tries to gain the confidence of his fellow workers and then carries tales about them. He gives the boss the big build-up. He's a big talker and knows about everything and everybody. He thinks he is the boss's stooge. He'll try to muscle into the organizations the bosses are in. I think there is more of this kind of behavior than formerly. These days a man's word isn't worth what it used to be. The business world is full of professional liars. I can spot liars a mile off because I'm on the Draft Board. You ought to see some of these young business men wiggle when they are about to get drafted.

Bus. Sup. D. Sure, I know this kind. Everything they do is at someone else's expense. They put up a big false front and try to use people. They put up a good front to the boss and talk a big job. They are big joiners and spotlight seekers. This stuff sometimes works at the loss of respect of their fellow workers, but they don't mind that. This kind of operator is very prevalent these days when people want to live their lives so fast. To get there quick is the big idea.

Bus. Sup. E. These double dealers are pretty shrewd at sizing up the situation. They're strictly business, carry tales, undercut, go over heads and don't care who they hurt as long as they help themselves. They seek ideas and opinions from their fellows, then push them around. They're always praising and playing up to the bosses. They play up to their subordinates and work them to their own ends. They're the biggest joiners in town and try to run everything. If they are smooth enough, this kind of behavior is
very effective. In retailing, where the proper channels of advancement are circumvented, slick operators are very prevalent.

Bus. Sup. F. This type looks for the bad decisions people make and figures out the correct solutions. He puts his emphasis on hindsight. He is very selective in his relations with his fellow workers because he doesn't want to tip his hand. He showers his superiors with favorable reports on himself and he is solicitous of the good opinions of his subordinates. Up and down the line, he is afraid of the unfavorable opinions of others so he tries to put himself in a favorable light socially too. He is a "yes man" and he likes "yes men"! This sort of behavior commenced to be prevalent in business five years ago and I think it is spreading.

Bus. Sup. G. This kind drops all moral ethics in order to run a big sales book. He lies to other people's customers and lies to the bosses. Management thinks he is aggressive. He finds this out so he volunteers his services to the boss as a secret informer. He magnifies the truth and minimizes his lies, just so his stock rises with the bosses. In my field, this kind of behavior is very prevalent.

Adm. Sup. A. I have seen them and some of them go right past you but many of them fall by the wayside. They are shrewd big-talkers who brag and act superior. They praise people then stab them in the back. They bow down, scrape and even worship the bosses. They are big joiners and social climbers. This kind of behavior is much more prevalent than formerly. There are more scheming people and morals have decayed.

Adm. Sup. B. This type tries to ingratiate himself at the top and cultivates only important people. Some of them are educated but have little polish and culture. They have no codes of ethics. They are loyal only to those among their fellow workers whom they can use. They do lip-service to their superiors and flatter their bosses' secretaries. They are civil though condescending and superior to their subordinates. They are the big joiners always looking for the limelight and try to be social climbers. But they usually trip themselves up when people discover their real attitudes. Unfortunately, there are more "smart alecs" with questionable ethical standards than there used to be.

In the above images, there is evidence that supervisors tend to believe that there is much more ruthless, self-centered, insincere, and even unscrupulous behavior on the part of young aspirants to executive positions today than there was formerly. Although the exception rather than the rule, supervisors, particularly those in business, appear to
believe that "other-directed" behavior involving duplicity and double-dealing is sometimes productive of short-range, if not long-range success. There is, of course, the possibility that such images on the part of supervisors may be partially flavored with "sour grapes." Nevertheless, such images are real in their consequences to those supervisors who think they are real and, as such, may serve to condition negatively their own levels of aspiration.

**True Personalization.** As previously mentioned, there were a few supervisors who preferred to strike out the descriptive adjectives "ruthless" and "self-centered" and to give their images in terms of a sincere, shrewd calculating individual. Illustrative of these images were:

**Bus. Sup. A.** This type would equip himself with short cuts by learning the jobs ahead of him. In doing this he would make sure the top level notices him. He would develop a cooperative relationship with his fellow workers and capitalize on their joint effort. He would try to maintain a close relationship with his superiors and convince them that he is qualified. His relationship with their secretaries is one of respect. He would try to demonstrate his character and ability to his subordinates so that they would look up to him. He would use his organizational memberships wisely and see that they reflect credit on his firm. This kind of behavior does not work as well in family controlled enterprises as it does in corporative businesses. In corporations, it is job knowledge and the shrewd ability to sell one's self that counts.

**Adm. Sup. A.** There are two types of individuals like this — the sincere ones and the hypocrites. The hypocrite's chief weapon is starting rumors and gossip about his competitors. The sincere ones get along well with their fellow workers. Naturally, they earnestly solicit the goodwill of their bosses and their secretaries. While the hypocrites are scornful of their subordinates the sincere ones are helpful to them. Shrewd participation in community organizations, social clubs and fraternal orders is definitely helpful. The hypocrites soon run out of gas but the sincere ones go a long way before running out of gas.
The above images are, of course, the exception rather than the rule. These are images of the sincerely "other-directed" individual and are illustrative of "true personalization" in accordance with acceptable role expectations.

We have now completed our descriptive analysis of the supervisors' images of generalized others. We will turn in the next section to comparisons of the executives' and supervisors' images in an attempt to bring general implications into sharper focus.

Comparisons and Implications

It will be recalled that at the beginning of this chapter, it was stated that we wished to investigate generalized attitudes, values and beliefs which may be directly or indirectly related to leadership, occupational mobility and career success. We also stated that we considered many of these attitudes, values and beliefs related to the ideology of success in general and that some of them were products of social and economic change through the years, more particularly the recent years.

Inasmuch as immediate inferences and implications have already been made as the analyses of images of generalized others proceeded, the following comparisons and broad implications will be fairly brief.

When we compare the images which executives and supervisors hold of the so-called "rugged individualist" of by gone days, we find the two groups in general agreement that high level rugged individualism in corporative enterprises is rapidly disappearing. To borrow from a popular phrase, "Rugged bosses never die, they just fade away!" Social and economic pressures have undoubtedly operated to force a trend away from
authoritarianism and toward "enlightened" leadership in professional management. Leadership appears to be the rule and ruggedness the exception in the achievement of executive success in corporative management.

Both the executive and supervisory groups were in general agreement that "keeping workers happy and contented" was almost as important as "getting the job done!" Happy and contented workers were described by both groups as doing a better job. This image is similar to the previous image of disappearing rugged individualism. The new "human relations mindedness" in professional management, while probably accelerated by social and economic pressures, is also a result of an increasing awareness of the effectiveness of teamwork and group effort in getting jobs done. As such, it is an important factor in leadership and the achievement of executive success in bureaucratically structured organizations.

That both groups would agree that people, in general, are more "security-minded" and less "achievement-minded" than formerly was not unexpected. Not only were important implications for the ideology of success revealed by this image, but also the inference of a growing socio-cultural expectation of guaranteed security which, in many individual cases, may negatively influence motivation, ambition and levels of aspiration. (It is significant to note how the desire for unachieved security deviates from the image of the capitalistic Protestant Ethic as brought out by several supervisors).

As was immediately implied previously, the factors in the images of both the executives and supervisors concerning organizational loyalty
are essentially the same factors which positively or negatively condition motivation, morale and job satisfaction. Where career success, however defined, results from affiliation with a particular enterprise, organizational loyalty increases — and vice versa.

Neither the executive nor the supervisory group held a particularly bright image of conspicuous consumption as a factor in career progress. They tended to associate such consumption with the effects of rather than the causes of career success. There seemed to be an apparent orientation toward upper or upper-middle class levels of living in the executive group, while the supervisory group seemed to be oriented toward middle class levels of living. There was the general feeling in both groups that overly conspicuous consumption might exert a negative influence on career progress. However, in the sample of business supervisors, there appeared to be considerable feeling that conspicuous consumption does operate favorably in business career progress.

The images of self-imposed mobility blockage held by both the executives and supervisors revealed personal faults which appeared to be the results of passive or negative attitudes and values, undeveloped or unapplied capacities, or personality deficiencies (particularly the failure to get along with people). These presumably are correctible. Obviously the persistence of such individual faults negatively influences career progress.

Only the executives were asked to give their images of the influence of wives on career progress. They unanimously considered that the influences of wives were an extremely important positive or negative influence in career progress. Several executives suggested that wives
who failed to get along as a group could be disruptive not only of career progress but also of organizational morale and efficiency.

The executives tended to maintain that individuals in their profession had broader and more philosophical outlooks on life than other groups of people. If correctly described, the effects of such outlooks on career progress are probably more indirect than direct.

In describing their images of how potential executives should be selected, developed and judged, the executives seemed to be oriented toward the desirable attributes of successful executives in general. The interactive relationship between opportunities for development, capacities and abilities and personality characteristics in executive success was apparent. There appeared to be an emphasis on the development and judging of social as well as technical skills. References to rotational job assignment in the developmental process were indicative of an awareness of the influence of situationally transferable leadership potential on executive success.

In discussing the advice that they would give to young potential executives, the executives were again apparently oriented toward their images of successful executives in general. They also appeared to be unwittingly illustrating the importance of Cooley's "reflection upon the self" and Mead's "taking the role of the (successful) generalized other".

In estimating the chances of executive success of the specialist versus the well-rounded individual, there seemed to be some division of opinion among the executives. The most desirable combination appeared to be sound specialized education and/or training plus rounding education
and/or training in areas which would develop social skills. There thus seemed to be the important implication that some revision in educational preparation for executive success (though not necessarily success as a specialist) might be advisable.

When executives were requested to develop their images of the differences between industrial and business executives, they tended to differentiate between the two groups on the basis of production-mindedness in the industrial group versus customer-consciousness in the second. In addition it was held that, whereas industrial executives tend to engage in public relations on a delegated basis for company purposes, business executives tend to engage in public relations on an individual basis. Business executives seemed to hold that top level industrial executives are more oriented toward higher level authority and "other-directed" in making decisions because of the relatively greater prevalence of absentee ownership and boards of directors in large industrial corporations. An orientation toward and a competition for absentee good will would therefore appear to be important factors in executive success, probably more so in industrial than in business organizations.

The popular image of the independent high level decision-maker in large enterprises was somewhat shattered by the executives' description of the decision making process. It was held that, the larger the corporation, the more tendency there is for group participation in the decision making process, though some one person is charged with making (or announcing) final decisions. The increased complexity of big business, industry and administration was thought to cause the group process to be the rule rather than the exception, at least as far as decisions not
covered by organizational policy are concerned. This can be considered as indicative of a trend toward "other-directedness" in the decision making process because of a fear of making wrong decisions and a desire to maintain higher level good will. (It is also interesting to note the use of the group discussion process as a means of spotting potential executives).

Only the supervisors were asked to give their images of the general differences in the life-goals, rewards and satisfactions of executives as contrasted with those of supervisors. The majority of the supervisors tended to make the distinction on the basis of the long range desire for wealth, status, prestige, authority, power and glory on the executive level as opposed to the long range desire for personal and family security, respect and happiness on the supervisory level. Thus supervisors, in general, appeared to believe that the executive level is oriented toward upper class life-goals, while their own level is oriented toward middle class life-goals. To supervisors these differential images are real in their consequences if they are thought to be real. Although supervisory images of executive life-goals differed considerably from the executives' own previous statements of them, while supervisory images of their own level's life-goals tended to conform to their previous definitions of the term "career success," there is the definite implication that such subjectively held images differentially condition motivation and levels of aspiration.

---

*Cf.* Bernard M. Bass and Charles H. Coates, "Forecasting Officer Potential Using the Leaderless Group Discussion?*

*Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII, April, 1952, 321-325.*
The comparative images which executives and supervisors held concerning "true personalization" on the one hand and "false personalization" on the other, as related to executive success, have already been rather profusely illustrated and immediate implications discussed. Executives tended to associate ruthless, insincere, self-centered, shrewd and calculating executive aspirants with "false personalization," duplicity and double-dealing. They considered the achievement of executive success through such behavior the exception rather than the rule. By contrast, a surprisingly large number of supervisors, particularly those in business, considered the achievement of success through such behavior almost as much the rule as the exception. Granting the flavor of "sour grapes" in many such supervisory images, there is, however, considerable evidence of the attempted achievement of success through false personalization and duplicity. A minority of both the executives and supervisors chose to disregard the adjectives "ruthless," "insincere," "unscrupulous" and self-centered" and preferred to describe the less frequently occurring sincere, though shrewdly calculating, individual. The chances of the actual achievement of executive success by such an individual were held by the minority in both groups to be fairly bright.

We have now completed our comparisons of and implications in the images of generalized others held by executives and supervisors. In concluding this chapter, we wish to once more restate and refine the general hypothesis developed in our frame of reference and approach (pp. 58 - 59, supra):

Individuals in management who have achieved high level executive positions and outstanding career success through time, define their career
situations differentially and have differential personal attributes, abilities and capacities, differential attitudes, values, beliefs and life-goals, differential motivations and levels of aspiration, differential social and community participation patterns, differential explanations of mobility blockage and differential images of successful executive behavior patterns from individuals who have not achieved comparable managerial positions and career success.

We consider that, in this chapter, we have offered additional evidence favorably supporting this hypothesis. We also consider that certain socio-cultural changes in generalized attitudes, values and beliefs related directly or indirectly to leadership, occupational mobility and the ideology of success have been revealed. We therefore suggest that the specific and general purposes of our study are nearing accomplishment.
Prior to summarizing and drawing conclusions from the inferences and implications in our research study up to this point, we wish to introduce several concepts, the applicability of which to the achievement of career success was not immediately apparent at the time the literature was surveyed and our frame of reference and approach developed.

Although we explored and exploited concepts which we believed would have direct relevance, as the evidence was developed, additional concepts seemed to become pertinent. These will be introduced fairly briefly for the purpose of facilitating the understanding of our research findings. Their application will be explained as they are introduced.

**Manifest and Latent Functions.**

Among the better known theoretical concepts in research concerning social systems is that of Robert L. Merton which bears the above title.\(^1\) Merton defines these functions as follows:

**Manifest functions** are those objective consequences contributing to the adjustment or adaptation of the system which are intended and recognized by participants in that system;

---

Latent functions, correlatively, being those which are neither intended nor recognized.

Basic query: What are the effects of seeking to transform a previously latent function into a manifest function (involving the problem of the role of knowledge in human behavior)?

In further explaining the difference between manifest and latent functions Merton says:

This is the rationale for the distinction between manifest and latent functions; the first referring to those objective consequences for a specified unit (person, subgroup, social or cultural system) which contribute to its adjustment or adaptation and were so intended; the second referring to unintended and unrecognized consequences of the same order.

Concerning the significance of this concept Merton says, "There is some evidence that it is precisely at the point where the research attention of sociologists has shifted from the plane of manifest to the plane of latent functions, that they have made their distinctive and major contributions." (As an example of the foregoing statement, Merton calls attention to the discovery of latent functions during the famous Hawthorne studies). Merton further says, "This raises the interesting problem of the changes occurring in a prevailing pattern of behavior when its latent functions become generally recognized (and thus are no longer latent)."

Broadly speaking, it is precisely because the manifest functional

\[2\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 51.}\]
\[3\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 63 (underscoring supplied).}\]
\[4\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 66.}\]
\[5\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 70.}\]
organization of every bureaucratically structural enterprise is accompanied by a latent, informal social system, that we consider this concept has application to our present research. Within the functional organization, the demonstration of manifestly functional abilities and capacities favorably influences promotability and career success. Likewise, within the accompanying informal social system, the demonstration of latent personality attributes related to getting along with and manipulating people, favorably influences promotability and career success.

Concerning the basic query posed by Merton, one logical answer would appear to be: It is the transformation of the latent functions of personalities into the manifest functions of leadership that results in group effort and organizational teamwork. It follows that, in the broad sense, "human relations mindedness" and programs for the development of executive potential are aimed at implementing such a transformation. It also follows that an individual, possessed of manifest functional abilities and capacities, whose latent personality attributes have been transformed into the manifest ability to manipulate people, will climb a long way up the executive ladder.

Conversely, it follows that an individual, possessed of manifest functional abilities and capacities, who lacks the latent personality attributes associated with manipulating people, will have his climb up the executive ladder slowed or blocked. Such individuals have been described in the present research as "rubbing people the wrong way" and "failing to get along with people."

Latent leadership and executive potential become most manifest when they are evident in a variety of social situations. Thus the
inflexible technical specialist, possessing considerable manifestly functional ability and capacity, is at a disadvantage in climbing the executive ladder when compared to the flexible individual, possessing less manifestly functional ability and capacity but more latent and situationally transferable leadership and executive potential.

Merton also invites attention to the relationship between "the unanticipated consequences of purposive social action" and "latent functions." He describes one type of unintended consequences of purposive social action as, "those which are dysfunctional for a given social system and these comprise the latent dysfunctions." The present research has revealed, among other influences, the negative effect on career advancement of indifference to getting along with people, overly conspicuous consumption, quarreling wives and false personalization bordering on duplicity. These four kinds of purposive social action illustrate behavior which is dysfunctional in a given social system, results in unanticipated consequences for individuals and negatively affects occupational mobility and career success. Related to latent dysfunctions is Veblen's concept of "trained incapacity" in which an individual's abilities earmark him as a specialist and serve as inadequacies for promotion in the executive hierarchy.

---


7See ibid., p. 153.
The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy.

Another of Merton's better known theoretical concepts is that which bears the above title. This is a variation of W. I. Thomas's famous theorem previously cited, "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences." According to Merton:

The self-fulfilling prophecy is, in the beginning, a false definition of the situation evoking a new behavior which makes the originally false conception come true. The specious validity of the self-fulfilling prophecy perpetuates a reign of error. For the prophet will cite the actual course of events as proof that he was right from the very beginning.

To illustrate the application of this concept, it will be recalled that many supervisors in the present research defined their career situations negatively with such qualifying phrases as "To rise higher in this occupation than I have been able to, one has to have a better education." That such a conception was at least partially false is demonstrated by the fact that 11 of the 50 executives studied in this research did not graduate from college, and 4 of these 11 did not graduate from high school. The implication is that such falsely defined career situations (opportunities negatively defined) may have evoked a new behavior pattern on the part of some supervisors which lowered their levels of aspiration and caused them to cite the actual course of events through the years as proof that they were right from the very beginning.

---

8Ibid., pp. 179-195.
9Ibid., p. 181.
Levels of Aspiration and Hierarchies of Needs.

We have mentioned frequently the implication that one of the main distinctions between executives and supervisors is differential motivations and levels of aspiration. A. H. Maslow offers a theory of motivation which may be helpful in further understanding this distinction.10

According to Maslow:

The most prepotent goal will monopolize the consciousness and will tend itself to organize the recruitment of the various capacities of the organism. The less prepotent needs are minimized, even forgotten or denied. But when a need is fairly well satisfied, the next prepotent (higher) need emerges in turn to dominate the conscious life and to serve as the center of organization of behavior, since gratified needs are not active motivation.11

The tendency of executives to deny the accumulation of material wealth and power as career goals can be accounted for in terms of Maslow's theory of motivation. These needs having been well satisfied through the years, they were displaced in the executives' conscious life by the more subjective needs for prestige, status, esteem, the good will of others and pride in accomplishment. In fact, increased "human relations mindedness" on the part of executives in general can be logically accounted for in these terms.

In the case of supervisors, once a fair income and security had been achieved, other more subjective needs, such as the need for personal and family respect and happiness became more prepotent. The end


11Ibid., p. 394 (underscoring supplied).
product through the years became a stabilization of levels of aspiration at a point when further advancement in management was no longer intensely sought for.

**Decision-Making as a Group Process.**

One of the better studies of leadership in the large corporation is that of Robert A. Gordon, published in 1945. Concerning group action in decision-making Gordon says:

Two tendencies are particularly important in this connection: the wide use of the committee system and the increasing emphasis which the chief executive places on the co-ordinating aspects of his job.

As a matter of fact, the prevalence of group, instead of individual, action is a striking characteristic of management organization in the large corporation. Even where formal management committees do not exist, group action frequently takes place through the medium of informal conferences, out of which emerge decisions which are the product of no single individual.

Gordon goes on to emphasize the co-ordinating function of the chief executive when he says, "With the diffusion of decision-making in the large firm, the chief executive must above all be a co-ordinator." And Gordon further says, "The element of personal leadership as a factor in co-ordination does not call for extended discussion.... Personal leadership consists in good part of avoiding personal frictions and inspiring loyalty. When this function is not exercised effectively, the

---


job of decision-making by both the chief executive and his subordinates suffers.15

The findings of our present research are in general agreement with the above citations from Gordon. We have shown that the group process in decision-making is the rule rather than the exception in the large corporation. We have also shown that one of the main distinctions between executives and supervisors is in "the ability to organize and co-ordinate ideas, people and things." In addition, we have mentioned that the group process is often used to spot potential executives. What interests us most is Gordon's assertion that the personal leadership and co-ordinative skills of the chief executive in the group process "consist in good part of avoiding personal frictions and inspiring loyalty." We consider that these skills are just as often used to inspire conformity to group thinking, and we venture to hypothesize that an individual who demonstrates conformity to group thinking has a better chance of further executive success than one who does not. Perhaps some group members see in the co-ordinative function of the chief executive an invitation to "other-directedness," the prevalence of which our evidence has supported. We also venture to hypothesize that the group process often is used to teach conformity to higher level thinking and organizational policies. Thus, the career progress of potential executives may be affected as much by the demonstration of conformity to higher level thinking and policies as by individual initiative and creativity. When group creativity and teamwork are the watchwords, too much individualism may hang the red label of "deviationist" on the offender.

15Ibid., p. 112 (underscoring supplied).
Groupthink.

In connection with the preceding discussion of a prevailing tendency toward conformity in the group process, we wish to mention a provocative thesis of William F. Whyte, Jr. and associates with the above title. Whyte maintains that our whole society has, in recent years, been "socially engineered" into a tendency toward conformity and becoming expert group members. He says, "In recent years, there has been a disturbing amount of evidence to indicate that among the oncoming generation the impulse to group values is fast maturing into a firm and plausibly logical new ethos .... Hence the overriding importance of becoming an expert group member." It is difficult to visualize what could contribute more to an individual's becoming a very successful corporation executive than his becoming an expert member of the executive group.

Whyte further says, "The remarkable feature of this new double talk is its use of the old concepts of individualism to justify the opposite. By letting others decide, one decides. By subordinating one's self to the group, one becomes an individual." Again Whyte says: "It is precisely this smothering of the individual that the social engineering drift seems to be making more and more imminent."

---


17 Ibid., p. 226.

18 Ibid., pp. 234-235.

19 Ibid., p. 236.
We consider that Whyte has offered us valuable clues as to why our present research found so much "other-directedness" in the answers of respondents to various queries. Like "human relations mindedness" and "security consciousness," "other-directedness" and conformity are possibly, even probably, being "socially engineered" into the very fabric of the American ethos.

Finally, Whyte says:

The answer is not a return to a "rugged individualism" that never was. Nor is it a slackened interest in social science and "human relations." We need, certainly, to find ways of making this bewildering society of ours run more smoothly and we need all the illumination social science can give us to do it. But we need something more. Lest man become an ethical eunuch, his autonomy sacrificed for the harmony of the group, a new respect for individualism must be kindled. A revival of the humanities, perhaps, a conscious effort by large institutions to accommodate dissent — possible approaches to a problem so fundamental cannot easily be worked. Only the layman can do it.

While Whyte has apparently flung a challenge to the layman, it would seem more appropriate, in the light of the present study, to fling this challenge to the educators, more particularly those preparing individuals for careers in executive management.

The Changing American Character.

As shown in the previous sub-section, Whyte maintains that the American character is being "socially engineered" into a new mold of conformity to group expectations. David Riesman and associates offer a

---

similar premise in their provocative book, *The Lonely Crowd*. 21

The general hypothesis of Riesman's book is that there has been a change in the character of the American people; that where once men whose character was "inner-directed" dominated our society, the tendency is now toward the dominance of the "other-directed" character. 22 Inner-directed persons are defined as those who internalize authority -- the pioneers and the individualists, rugged or not. Other-directed persons are those whose character is molded chiefly by the examples of their peers and contemporaries. There is the intermediate type of tradition-directed persons among whom conformity is for the sake of traditions, principles and customs, whereas, in the other-directed type, conformity is for the sake of conformity itself. Thus, to other-directed persons, conformity becomes as much an end in itself as it is a means to an end.

Other-directedness begins with the emphasis on "social adjustment" in childhood play and family groups and is nourished in adolescence and adulthood by peer groups and the mass media of communication. Other-directed persons have a diffuse and constant anxiety for the good opinions of generalized others.

In the other-directed society, the individual achieves status by participation in group activities and conforming to group expectations.

---


22Acknowledgment of having borrowed previously the terms "other-directed" and "other-directedness" from Riesman is hereby made.
In illustrating this, Riesman says:

The frontiers for the other-directed man are people; he is people-minded.... Today it is the "softness" of man rather than the "hardness" of material that calls on talent and opens new channels of social mobility.23

Thus, whereas the inner-directed individual of yesterday was guided by the hardness of the "invisible iron hand" of Adam Smith, the other-directed individual of today is oriented toward the softness of the visible "glad hand". Success for such an individual depends upon his ability not only to conform to group expectations, but also to manipulate people in group situations. His ability to manipulate people depends upon his personality skills and he is, as often as not, other-directed into "false-personalization"24 in doing so.

Riesman relates "false-personalization" to "the spurious and effortful glad hand" and he sees it as "a principal barrier to autonomy in the sphere of work."25 Thus, the other-directed false personality attempts to become a combination self-appointed vice-president in charge of shaking hands, pseudo psychoanalyst, "big wheel" manipulator of people and master salesman of insincere platitudes.

We consider that we have adequately shown previously the application of Riesman's concepts of "other-directedness" and "false-personalization" to evidence derived in the present study and there is no need to

23Ibid., pp. 151-152.

24We are indebted to Riesman for his coinage of this term, which has been borrowed previously.

25Ibid., p. 302.
dwell upon them further at great length. If the American character is changing, as Riesman hypothesizes, it follows logically that he who is adept at conforming to group expectations and skillful in manipulating others toward conformity has an excellent chance of achieving leadership status and career success, providing he is either sincere or skillful in disguising his false personalization.

Before leaving Riesman there is another of his premises which it is appropriate to mention. He sees a transition from craft skill to manipulative skill when he says:

The pressure toward social competence, with its concurrent playing down of technical competence suggests... the emergence of a new pattern in American business and professional life: if one is successful in one's craft, one is forced to leave it.... (Successful) men must bury their craft routines and desert their craft companions. They must work less with things and more with people.26

This premise of Riesman's is essentially similar to one derived from evidence in the present study: Successful executive behavior increasingly depends as much upon social skills in manipulating people as it does upon technical skills in manipulating ideas and materials.

Duplicity.

Related to Riesman's concept of "false-personalization" is Arnold W. Green's discussion of "duplicity" in the attempted achievement of career success.27 Although Green preceded Riesman's first publication of

26Ibid., p. 154.

The Lonely Crowd by seven years, he was concerned, even then, with the "flood of books, magazine articles, and radio addresses, dedicated to the 'improvement' of the inept citizen's personality;" and with the implication therein that "sacrifice of integrity to achieve material and social advancement has been taught the general public by many educational media;" and with the inference that "the strength of moral prohibitions against the use of unsavory means to acquire wealth and power has been vitiating."^p28

Specifically, Green expresses his concern as follows:

Deception, crooked dealing, have in some measure afflicted all societies in all periods of recorded time... And yet duplicity, or the manipulation of others to satisfy privately defined goals at variance from the goals expressed, has historically been associated on a wide scale only with powerful institutions wielding dreaded sanctions, such as the Church and the State. In the past few decades, duplicity in personal relations has burgeoned at an unprecedented rate.29

In continuing to illustrate his concern with duplicity, Green says:

The main concern here is with occupational social relations.... One of these is status-adulturated friendship, which differs from "real" friendship in that it is motivated by hope of personal material advantage rather than enjoyment of the other's personality. Two orders of behavior are covered by the term status-adulterated friendship: personality manipulation and duplicity....

The techniques of personality manipulation are today sanctioned, more than that, lauded, throughout modern society. The person who has "personality" — euphemism for adeptness in charming others to his own advantage — is admired, envied, and emulated....

Duplicity and failure are perhaps equally deprecated by society, but duplicity may be hidden from the world; failure, never.30

28Ibid., p. 411.
29Ibid., p. 412 (Underscoring supplied).
30Ibid., p. 414.
Green implies that there is a narrow dividing line between personality manipulation and duplicity which is often crossed. He says that, essentially, the technique of using other people to further one's own ends consists of anticipating the others' personality wants and needs and adjusting one's overt responses to supply them. According to Green, the successful manipulator of others preserves a flexible social awareness and has innumerable roles and approaches which he can adopt as the occasion demands.\footnote{Ibid., p. 415.}

Within an organization, says Green:

\begin{quote}
... the inferior's personality inevitably dances to the tune played by the superior's. For career purposes, the inferior allows his superior to invade his ego. He consults, he defers, he flatters.... Above and beyond presenting his work in as favorable a light as possible, the inferior intrudes himself socially, to the upper limit of the given situation and his superior's attitude toward him. Always, however ... the inferior must pretend it is the friendship of his superior he is seeking....\footnote{Ibid., p. 416.}
\end{quote}

The above quotation sounds familiarly like a response elicited from one of our interviewees concerning the "modus operandi" of a hypothetical executive aspirant.

In emphasis, Green reminds us that, "I have said that the most effective technique evolved by modern society for achieving personal success is the simulation of friendship for one's associates while retaining private goals — status-adulterated friendship....\footnote{Ibid., p. 420.}"
At first reading, Green's previous assertions seem somewhat startling even though the present study has revealed evidence in at least partial support of them. Apparently realizing that his assertions might be considered somewhat startling, Green qualifies them as follows:

This is by way of introducing several needed qualifications to the foregoing analysis. All persons in Western society have not been equally affected by the forces described. All do not equally practice duplicity on their associates. And of those who manipulate others, all are not equally aware of doing so; and of those who are aware of doing so, all do not equally suffer personality disturbances as a result. Many view the manipulation of others as a game, paying off to those exhibiting the most ... skill; they enjoy meeting the challenge to their ingenuity....

It is quite likely that the present discussion of manipulation and duplicity as a means of acquiring individual success has a limited temporal applicability....

Within the above qualifications, considerable evidence has been found in the present study in support of Green's premises. While our evidence implies that attempted success through duplicity in the manipulation of others may be fairly prevalent, actual success through such means is the exception rather than the rule. Nevertheless, since duplicity can be shrewdly concealed, as Green has said and we have found in our evidence, and since it is a game played by many and enjoyed by most, its existence in the achievement of career success is difficult to deny. Only the extent of its prevalence is open to debate.

We have now completed the introduction of additional concepts which we considered would facilitate the understanding of our research

---

Ibid., p. 422.
findings. We will turn in the next section to summarizing these findings and drawing conclusions from them.

Summary and Conclusions

The present study has compared factors and patterns in the career progress of samples of high level and low level individuals in executive management through time, in a representative metropolitan community, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Fifty outstandingly successful executives in business, industry and administration, with fairly long occupational histories, were selected for study and comparison with fifty only moderately successful individuals in the same or similar occupational environments, also with fairly long occupational histories. Factors and patterns of similarity within and difference between groups were identified, which implemented the achievement of outstanding objective career success by one group and limited the achievement of objective career success by the other group. In addition, generalized attitudes, values and beliefs, directly or indirectly related to leadership, occupational mobility and the ideology of success were investigated.

The relevant literature was surveyed in Chapter I. From this survey an essentially sociological and socio-psychological frame of reference and approach was developed in Chapter II. Emphasis was given to identifying the social skills as well as the technical skills associated with career success. Considerable focus on the informal factors influencing career progress and promotability was evident. Within this frame of reference and approach, the study was designed and a study procedure adopted in Chapter II. The method shown for studying individuals in the comparative samples was the
For purposes of simplicity, we chose to refer to our two comparative samples as "executives" and "supervisors," and we will continue to do so. When, in the last section of Chapter II, we compared the descriptive backgrounds of the executives with those of the supervisors, we found that:

1. Through the years, executives tended to experience not only more vertical mobility but also more horizontal mobility than did supervisors.

2. Five of the fifty executives had risen from the lowest ranks to presidencies of their organizations, showing that, even in this small sample, the American Dream has some basis in fact and is not altogether a mere fantasy.

3. The social origins of executives tended to be middle class and they had risen through the years to upper middle and upper class levels of living. The social origins of supervisors tended to be working class and they had risen through the years to lower middle and middle class levels of living.
(4) From an inter-generationa standpoint, both executives and supervisors tended to rise well above the occupational status of their fathers and their fathers-in-law.

(5) Executives and their wives tended to be better educated than supervisors and their wives. Such differential educational attainments tended to differentially influence occupational opportunities and choices.

(6) Education, per se, did not tend to be the sole determinant of occupational mobility. This was demonstrated by the fact that eleven of the fifty executives had not graduated from college, two of the eleven had not graduated from high school and two others had not finished grammar school. It was apparent that social skills as well as technical skills acquired through education are important determinants of career success.

(7) Some religious affiliation tended to be a role expectation of executives. Many more Protestants than Catholics or Jews were found among them. Religious activity tended to provide channels for compensatory status striving for supervisors rather than to be a role expectation. Almost as many Catholics as Protestants and no Jews were found among the supervisors, indicating that Jews tend to affiliate themselves with entrepreneurial enterprises.

(8) Executives tended to maintain selected memberships in high level social, civic and professional organizations, to use them as much for company purposes as for personal purposes. Supervisors tended to maintain memberships in middle level social and fraternal organizations, to use them for social purposes, and to consider them channels for compensatory status striving.
(9) Executives tended to use their recreational activities for organizational purposes as well as social purposes. Supervisors tended to use their recreational activities for social purposes only.

When, in the last section of Chapter III, we compared the self-appraisals of executives with those of supervisors, we found that:

(1) There was additional evidence of differential social origins, differential socio-economic backgrounds, differential educational attainments and differential occupational opportunities between executives and supervisors. These differentials tended to appear as fundamental distinctions between the two samples.

(2) While executives tended to be acutely conscious of their technical skills acquired through education and/or training, supervisors tended to be acutely conscious of their educational handicaps. These latter tended to exhibit pride in having risen "the hard way."

(3) While executives tended to attach considerable importance to their ability to handle and manipulate people, supervisors tended to be unaware that any lack of this primary leadership skill had negatively influenced their career progress.

(4) Differential career progress between executives and supervisors tended to result from the interactive effect of differential boyhood and adolescent experiences, differential influences of families and friends, differential social origins and socio-economic backgrounds, differential educational qualifications, differential occupational opportunities, differential aptitudes and interests and differential technical abilities and social skills.

(5) Executives tended to attribute their success, in large part,
to the commonly accepted virtues of ability, integrity and hard work but they also tended to emphasize the importance of getting along with, handling and manipulating people; being willing to accept responsibilities and make decisions; being willing and able properly to delegate, supervise and coordinate authority; developing personality attributes commensurate with technical skills.

(6) Both executives and supervisors tended to have had short range career plans and goals material in nature. Having attained objective goals through the years, executives tended to become more oriented toward subjective goals. Comparably, there was little tendency for the goals of supervisors to shift with the passage of time.

(7) Executives, having achieved financial security through the years, tended to define their career satisfactions in subjective terms such as pride in the growth of their organizations, pride in their development of others and the acquisition of recognition and prestige. (Power was never mentioned as a career satisfaction). Comparably, supervisors tended to define their career satisfactions in terms of personal and family security, respect and happiness and better occupational opportunities for their children. Thus executives and supervisors tended to have different conceptions of personal rewards and satisfactions.

(8) Executives tended to be oriented toward the present in describing personal sacrifices associated with their careers, such as: working in a pressure atmosphere, lack of time for recreation and family life, suppression of personal desires and disruption of personal plans, etc. Comparably, supervisors tended to be oriented toward the past in describing dissatisfactions with their careers, rationalizing their career
limitations, and retrospectively projecting their levels of aspiration into other career fields and into their career preferences for their sons. Thus, executives and supervisors tended to differentially define their career situations.

(9) Executives and supervisors definitely tended to include different elements in their definitions of the term "career success." While it cannot be said that executives tended to define the term more or less objectively or subjectively than did supervisors, the respective general definitions obviously tended to differentially condition motivations and levels of aspiration in the two samples.

When, in the last section of Chapter IV, we compared the executives' appraisals of factors in the career patterns of others with the corresponding appraisals by the supervisors, we found that:

(1) Both executives and supervisors tended to agree that the two levels differed mainly in the interactive effect on individuals of differential abilities and capacities, differential opportunities for development and differential personality attributes. Related main distinctions on which the two samples tended to agree were: differential educational backgrounds, differential occupational opportunities; differential judgment and foresight; differential ability to handle people; differential attitudes and values; differential willingness to accept responsibilities and make decisions; differential social participation patterns; differential resourcefulness and initiative; differential personality attributes; differential motivation, levels of aspiration and life goals. Considerable evidence was found here in support of the general hypothesis with which the present study began (pp. 58-59, supra).
(2) Executives tended to claim and supervisors tended to concede to them more ability to get jobs done through group effort. This is a fundamental difference in leadership qualities.

(3) Both groups tended to agree that handling people is more important than merely "getting along" with them. The difference between the two samples on this factor tended to be on a scale associated with differential job requirements.

(4) Executives tended to claim and supervisors tended to concede to them more mobility drive. In fact, supervisors tended to admit that the passage of time had negatively conditioned their motivation and levels of aspiration.

(5) The evidence tended to indicate that organizational attitudes over-ride community attitudes on the executive level and that community activities on both levels are a function of role expectations. Executives are expected to participate in community activities on a delegated basis for company purposes as well as personal purposes. No such expectations are associated with supervisory roles.

(6) Executives tended to claim and supervisors tended to concede to them better rounded, more flexible, more adaptable and more projective personalities. Supervisors also tended to concede that executives are the better "personality salesmen."

(7) The evidence tended to indicate that executives and supervisors differ in willingness and capacity to work hard, long hours as a function of differential job requirements. In complex organizations, after hours work is a role expectation of executives.

(8) The evidence tended to impute to executives more initiative
as a result of more authority. Since many creative ideas flow upward from the supervisory level, differential creativity appeared to be a matter of scale.

(8) Executives invariantly claimed and supervisors tended to concede to them superior decision-making ability. This distinction appeared to result not only from differential job requirements and expectations but also from a general unwillingness of supervisors to accept the responsibility for making decisions in changing circumstances. (Executives also tend to look to higher levels for decisions in changing circumstances, particularly in absentee-owned corporations, since they must be sure unusual decisions are in accord with company policy. This illustrates corporate other-directedness).

(10) Executives tended to claim and supervisors tended to concede to them more seeking and recognizing of opportunities for personal development and advancement. This distinction appeared to result from differential mobility drives and levels of aspiration.

(11) Executives invariantly claimed and supervisors tended to concede to them more ability to organize and coordinate ideas, people and things. This differential ability appeared to be not only a role expectation but also a functional necessity.

When, in the last section of Chapter IV, we compared the executives' and supervisors' evaluations of the relative importance of informal factors in career progress, we found that:

(1) Executives tended to attach considerable importance to boyhood training and ideals in building character and providing early motivation and considered the family the primary developmental agency.
(2) Both executives and supervisors tended to consider family social standing and connections an important factor in securing occupational opportunities, though some ability was considered necessary for further career progress.

(3) Both executives and supervisors tended to consider nationality origins, religious affiliation and fraternal memberships minor influences in career progress and of more local than general importance. Less discrimination on these factors was seen presently than formerly.

(4) While executives tended to deny the importance of belonging to "behind the scenes cliques" and being a "fair-haired boy;" supervisors tended to emphasize their importance. However, sufficient evidence was obtained to show that these factors do operate on a local basis and are most effective when accompanied by ability.

(5) Both executives and supervisors tended to agree that memberships in community organizations and high level social clubs favorably influence career progress through broadened personal contacts. However, there was evidence that many memberships in community organizations are on a company delegated basis.

(6) Executives tended to admit that informal social and recreational activities often positively influence career progress through establishing favorable personal contacts.

(7) Both executives and supervisors tended to view memberships in professional organizations as symbols of managerial status and as providing ideas and contacts favorably influencing career progress.

(8) Both groups tended to consider judicious adoption of the behavior patterns, attitudes, values and standards of successful superiors
a very effective method of learning appropriate executive behavior and, when shrewdly exercised, a favorable influence in career progress. (Here was found considerable evidence of other-directedness and conformity to higher level group values).

(9) Similarly, both groups tended to agree that judicious striving to attain higher level group friendships and contacts often operates very favorably in career progress. This was considered to be a decided "pull" factor. (Here was found evidence of another form of other-directedness).

(10) Likewise, both groups tended to agree that striving to retain the loyalty of lower level groups is an extremely important factor in continued career success. (Here was found evidence of still another form of other-directedness, akin to human relations mindedness).

When, in the last section of Chapter V, we compared the executives' and supervisors' images of generalized others, which focused on attitudes, values and beliefs directly or indirectly related to leadership, occupational mobility and the ideology of success, we found that:

(1) Both executives and supervisors tended to agree that "rugged individualism" in executive management is rapidly disappearing. This has apparently been due to social and economic pressures and a trend away from authoritarian and toward "enlightened" democratic leadership. By implication, this trend has resulted in increased group mindedness and human relations consciousness.

(2) Both samples tended to agree that "keeping workers happy and contented" is of great importance in "getting the job done;." By implication, an awareness of the value of group effort in getting jobs done was
expressed. Here was found additional evidence of group consciousness and human relations mindedness, resulting from social and economic pressures.

(3) Both executives and supervisors invariantly agreed that people in general are more "security-minded" and less "achievement-minded" than formerly. This growing socio-cultural expectation of guaranteed security has important implications for the ideology of success, since it may operate in many individual cases, to lower ambition, motivation and levels of aspiration.

(4) Both executives and supervisors tended to state the factors that make for organizational loyalty as essentially the same factors that make for career satisfaction. Where career success, however defined, results from affiliation with a particular organization, loyalty increases and vice versa.

(5) Both groups tended to consider conspicuous consumption an effect of career progress rather than a cause of it. Overly conspicuous consumption was viewed as being latently dysfunctional in career success. However, conspicuous consumption in business careers appeared to be as much the rule as the exception. Executives tended to be oriented toward upper and upper-middle class levels of living, while supervisors appeared to be oriented toward middle and lower-middle class levels of living.

(5) Both executives and supervisors tended to view self-imposed mobility blockage as resulting from passive or negative attitudes, values and levels of aspiration, undeveloped or unapplied capacities, and correctible personality deficiencies (particularly, indifference to getting along with people).
(6) Executives invariantly referred to the positive or negative influence of wives as extremely important in career progress. Wives who fail to get along as a group were considered to be disruptive, not only of career progress, but also of organizational morale and efficiency.

(7) In discussing how they would select, develop and judge potential executive talent, executives tended to emphasize the interactive relationship between opportunities for development, capacities and abilities, and personality attributes. There appeared to be an emphasis on developing situationally transferable social as well as technical skills.

(8) In describing the advice they would give to a young executive aspirant, executives tended to be oriented toward their images of successful executives in general. They also appeared to be unwittingly advising Cooley's "reflection upon the self" and Mead's "taking the role of the (successful) generalized other."!

(9) In estimating the chances of executive success of the technical specialist versus the well-rounded individual, executives tended to consider the most desirable combination to be sound technical training plus training in areas which would develop social skills. They appeared to consider that some revision in educational preparation for careers as executives (though not necessarily for careers as specialists) would be advisable.

(10) In describing the differences between industrial executives and business executives, the executive group tended to make the distinction on the basis of production-mindedness in one group versus customer-consciousness in the other. In addition, industrial executives appear to
engage in public relations on a delegated basis for company purposes, whereas all business executives appear to be directly concerned with public relations. Business executives tended to claim that industrial executives are more "other-directed" in making decisions and are engaged in keener competition for absentee goodwill.

(11) Executives tended to admit the prevalence of the group process in making decisions; the larger and more complex the organization, the more prevalence of the group process. It was claimed, however, that some one individual is charged with making (or announcing) the final decision. There was evidence that the group process is also used to avoid making wrong decisions, to maintain good will and to develop teamwork and executive potential. (There is a thin dividing line between teamwork and conformity to group expectations). Here was found evidence of corporative "other-directedness."

(12) Supervisors tended to define the life-goals of executives in terms of the desire for wealth, status, prestige, authority, power and glory, whereas they tended to define their own life-goals in terms of the desire for personal and family security, respect and happiness. Such differential definitions of life situations on the supervisory level obviously serve to negatively influence their levels of aspiration. There was evidence here of the probable orientation of executives toward upper class levels of living and supervisors toward middle class levels of living.

(13) The comparative images which executives and supervisors tended to hold concerning "true personalization" on the one hand and "false personalization" on the other in the attempted achievement of executive
success, stood out in rather sharp contrast. While executives tended to consider the attempted achievement of success through ruthless, insincere, self-centered, shrewd and calculated behavior much more the exception than the rule, supervisors, particularly those in business, tended to consider it as much the rule as the exception. Granting the flavor of "sour grapes" in the supervisory images, considerable evidence of the attempted achievement of success through "false personalization" and duplicity was obtained. A minority of both executives and supervisors tended to consider sincere, though shrewd and calculated, "true personalization" much more productive of actual career success. Nevertheless, considerable evidence was found of the existence of as much spurious as genuine "personality manipulation" at least in the attempted achievement of career success in executive management.

We have now completed the summary of our research findings and have stated, restated and refined the general hypothesis with which our study began (pp. 58-59, p. 126, p. 180, pp. 238-239, supra). We consider that substantial evidence has been offered in favorable support of this hypothesis. We also consider that considerable evidence has been offered toward the identification of factors which implement vertical occupational mobility, as opposed to those which limit such mobility and result in comparative occupational stability through time. Real-life constants and variables have been investigated as they operate to implement or limit movement upward, from managerial positions of low status, prestige and functional importance, to executive positions of high status, prestige and functional importance, i.e., the implementing and limiting factors in the process of climbing the executive ladder. In addition, we have investigated
generalized attitudes, values and beliefs directly and indirectly related to leadership, occupational mobility and the ideology of success, some of which are products of social and economic change through the years, more particularly the recent years. We suggest that the specific and general purposes of our research study have been accomplished.

In retrospect, we recall the statement of the Columbia University research group to the effect that any research investigation focused on explaining the differences between top performers and moderate performers in a field of endeavor must provide within its design for a study of the interaction of three important complexes: those of capacity, of opportunity for development and of personality (p. 60, supra). To these we consider that a fourth complex should be added, that of motivation, without which we do not believe superior performance will occur. We therefore offer this hypothesis: Superior performance and career success tend to result from the interaction of four important complexes: those of opportunity (a complex of education, training, development and occupational contacts), of capacity (a complex of technical abilities and skills), personality (a complex of manipulative social skills) and motivation (a complex of mobility drives).

The author, with one career in a bureaucratically structured organization behind him, is well aware of the influence of, even the necessity for, conformity to group expectations in the achievement of career progress. For twenty-five years he was oriented toward demonstrating satisfactory technical abilities and capacities and toward maintaining the good will of his superiors. In his observance of the transition from authoritarian to democratic leadership in this organization, he
became more and more concerned with maintaining, as well, the good will of his fellows and subordinates. He thus became increasingly aware that successful executive behavior must be, not only functionally appropriate, but also situationally and socially appropriate. From personal experience, then, and from evidence obtained in the present research study, the following final hypothesis is offered:

Granting an individual in executive management opportunity, capacity, personality and motivation, if he demonstrates conformity to the attitudes, values and expectations of higher level groups, he will be accepted in those groups; such an individual who, through the projection of his personality, is able to manipulate other group members and influence group action will be considered an expert group member; such an expert member of the executive group will achieve outstanding career success.


*While all of the references listed are believed to be relevant, some of them have not been mentioned directly in the body of this dissertation. Many other references of fringe relevance have been excluded purposefully.
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Jones, Thomas Roy. "So You Want to be an Executive?," Delta Sig of Delta Sigma Pi, November, 1954.
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APPENDIX A

INVITATION AND INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

FOR USE WITH

TOP LEVEL INDIVIDUALS IN MANAGEMENT
The Sociology Department at L. S. U. is making a study of how outstanding success is achieved by managerial executives in business, industry, and administration. We know that you enjoy the reputation of having had a very successful career in your particular field and we are very much interested in your opinions concerning how real-life career success is achieved. This is not a study of any particular organization but is a study of successful individuals. We believe that successful individuals themselves are the persons who know the most about the factors involved in real-life success.

As you know, a great deal of theorizing has been indulged in, both in writing and verbally, about the avenues to career success in modern America. Most of it glorifies the good old American dream of ambition, ability, hard work and equal opportunity for all. This, of course, is a general or theoretical ideal which has become a part of American tradition. But, our research background leads us to believe that more knowledge is needed concerning what actually happens in modern, everyday, real-life to make some executives more successful than others. Stated simply, we are looking for real-life clues to leadership and executive success. As our end goal, we hope to obtain information, more related to actual reality than theory, which should be valuable in selecting, advising, and developing potential executives of the future.

Because you have been so successful, we would like to invite you to participate in our study by granting us the privilege of interviewing you informally, at your convenience, concerning the factors which have operated to make your career pattern so outstanding. If you accept our invitation, we will guarantee you absolute anonymity. Whatever you tell us will be held in strict confidence. In anything we publish, your identity and affiliations will be completely disguised.

Hereewith is a time-saving standardized interview schedule which we would like you to look over. It is in four parts. Part I, the first two pages, provides for biographical information which will be used for purely background purposes. The other three parts contain questions which we think are thought-provoking and require considered answers. These parts concern your own career, the careers of others you have known, and the imaginary career of a hypothetical individual. Please fill in the Biographical Section I at your leisure. Then, we would like to interview you informally after you have had a chance to organize in recollection your probable answers to the remaining questions. We prefer to fill in these answers ourselves during our informal discussion in order that we may be sure we understand your intended meanings. Please do not discuss the questions with others, since we want your answers to be uninfluenced by their opinions.

Thank you very much.

Charles H. Coates, Col. U. S. A. (Ret)

Sociology Department, L. S. U.
Tel. 8-6511, Ex. 88 or 224
ACHIEVEMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL SUCCESS BY EXECUTIVES

Interview Guide

Number ______ Date _______ Interviewer _________________________

I Biographical Information

1. Name ___________________________ Age _________

2. Present Position __________________________

   Years held _______ Number years with organization _______

3. Previous Positions, same organization:

   Position ___________________________ Years held ______

   Position ___________________________ Years held ______

   Position ___________________________ Years held ______

   Position ___________________________ Years held ______

   Position ___________________________ Years held ______

4. Previous Positions, other organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Years Held</th>
<th>Reason for leaving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Occupation and Position of Father

6. Education:

   HS _____ College _____ Field of Specialization _______ Degree _______

   Fraternity _______ Athletics _______

7. Family Data: S M W U D Education of wife ____________________________

   Work experience of wife (if any) ____________________________

   Occupation and Position of wife's father ________________________

8. Church Affiliation ____________ Active member? ____ Lay Leader? ___
9. Present Organizational Memberships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Years in Org.</th>
<th>Present Offices Held</th>
<th>Past Offices Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Past Organizational Memberships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Years in Org.</th>
<th>Offices Held</th>
<th>Reason for Dropping Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What are your recreational activities and hobbies? 

Who are the persons who share these with you?

____________________________________________

____________________________________________
II. Personal Career

1. Sir, in terms of any standards for measuring occupational success, you have certainly been successful in your chosen field.

(A) How, in general, do you account for your career success?

(B) Are there any personal rules for achieving success which you have tried to follow in your career? If so, what are they? Have these changed in any way during your career? If so, why?
(E) Compare your original short range personal plans or goals with your eventual long range ones. When and why did you decide on these? After you had made your long range plans, did they change with the passage of time? If so, how and why?

2. (A) How have your actual career experiences fitted in with the conceptions you had as to how success could be achieved when you first began working? (Compare your present ideas with former ones. Why have your ideas changed, if they have?)

(B) Has the passage of time changed your conception of the personal rewards and satisfactions of being an executive? If so, how and why? (Compare your original conception of rewards and satisfactions with your present one.)

(C) Now that you have climbed the executive ladder, what is your definition of "career success"?
III. The Careers of Others

1. While witnessing and participating in various situations with various groups of people, and having wide experiences and contacts over a period of years, you have undoubtedly seen many cases of achievement of outstanding success as contrasted with many other cases of limited success.

(A) Defining executive success objectively in terms of relative levels reached on the executive ladder, what are the main distinctions between those who have reached the top level and those who have remained at a low level through time?

(B) Contrast the highly successful and the moderately successful on the following factors:

(1) Ability to do his job. Other jobs. To get jobs done.

(2) Getting along with people. Attitudes toward and personal relationships with fellow workers, superiors, subordinates.

(3) Ambition and motivation to advance. To see others advance.

(4) Attitude toward the organization in which he works. Toward his community. (Do the two levels differ? If so, how?)

(5) Formal organizational memberships and activities.

(6) Informal social activities, recreation, and hobbies.

(7) Personality characteristics. (Do the two levels differ? If so, how?)
(8) Willingness and capacity for hard work.

(9) Initiative and creativity.

(10) Capacity to make correct decisions in spite of changing circumstances or varying situations.

(11) Seeking opportunities for development and advancement.

(12) Ability to organize ideas, people, and things.

2. How important to the success of executives are the following:
   (A) Boyhood training and ideals. (If important, how and where are this training and these ideals obtained?)

   (B) Family's social standing and connections.

   (C) Nationality origins.

   (D) Religious affiliation and activities.

   (E) Belonging to influential "behind the scenes cliques".

   (F) Political affiliations and activities.

   (G) Membership in secret societies and fraternal organizations.

   (H) Membership in community organizations. Social organizations.
(I) Membership in professional organizations.

(J) Being some influential person's protege (Having "pull").

(K) Seniority within his company.

3. (A) How important to the success of a young executive is adopting the behavior, attitudes, activities, and standards of his successful superiors?

(B) How important to him is striving to attain higher level friendships and group memberships as he moves upward? (Ones useful to the furtherance of his career?)

(C) What kinds of friendships and group memberships should he discard as he moves upward? Eventually seek to permanently retain?

4. (A) The "rugged individualist" of former days was allegedly primarily concerned with getting the job done regardless. Are successful men as ruggedly individualistic as they were when you began your career?

(B) What seems more important today: getting the job done, or keeping people happy and satisfied? How does one affect the other?

(C) Nowadays, are people more interested in security than they were in the past? Less willing to take chances? If so, why? What problems result, if any?
6. Some people claim that decision-making is becoming more of a group process than an individual function like it once was. What is your opinion on this matter?

7. How would you go about spotting potential executives? Developing them? Periodically judging their performance?

8. Do the general outlook and philosophy of life of executives differ from those of other groups of people? If so, in what ways?
10. Since most managerial executives do not own the enterprise, what are the factors that tend to make them loyal to it?

11. It is sometimes said that men's wives have some influence on their career success. Do wives affect the careers of executives? If so, how?

12. Some people say that a person's career progress is influenced by such things as driving the right kind of car, having the right kind of house in the right neighborhood, wearing the right kind of clothes, etc. How important are such factors?

13. Suppose you were asked to give your advice on achieving success to some ambitious young man just starting out. What would you tell him? What would you tell him would be the main obstacles in his path? The main avenues of success?
What, in your opinion, are the principal reasons why many persons never achieve substantial career progress? (That is, never climb high on the executive ladder?) What kinds of mistakes do they make?

IV. A Hypothetical Situation: A young man is just starting out on his career, and he is intent on becoming a very successful executive. Let us further suppose that this young man is completely ruthless, and that nothing really matters to him except achieving success.

1. What could he do to speed up his career advancement? (Are there any short-cuts?)

2. What type of personal relationships would he try to develop with his fellow workers, superiors, and subordinates?

3. Could he use active participation in community organizations, social clubs, and other organizations to speed up his success? If so, how would he go about doing this?

4. How effective is ruthless self-centered behavior in executive careers?

5. Is such behavior more or less prevalent than formerly?
APPENDIX B.

INVITATION AND INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

FOR USE WITH:

LOW LEVEL INDIVIDUALS IN MANAGEMENT
AN INFORMAL INVITATION

The Sociology Department at L. S. U. is making a study of the occupational career patterns of individuals at various managerial levels in business, industry and administration. This is not a study of any particular plant, company or enterprise but is a study of anonymous individuals. We believe that most previous studies of this nature have been too theoretical in nature and the purpose of this particular study is to add to our knowledge of the real-life factors operating in these related career fields.

To date we have informally and anonymously interviewed a sample of approximately fifty top-level managerial executives concerning the real-life factors operating in their own career fields. As a result we are convinced that they have not fully painted the overall big picture. We believe that the best way to fill in the big picture is to ask a group of dependable old timers, such as yourself, to tell us more about it. As a retired Regular Army officer, I am convinced that one cannot get the big picture of the military service as a career from interviewing a group of generals only. The old time sergeants and civilian supervisors may and often do know as much or more about the real-life side. The same thing undoubtedly applies to supervisors and foremen in other career fields and this is why we think your considered opinions would be valuable contributions to our research.

We would like to invite you to sit with us informally, at your convenience, off the job, and discuss some questions which do not pertain to your particular organization or to your private affairs. We repeat that your identity and affiliations will be held in confidence, for only in this way can we expect our interviewees to give us unbiased answers.

We hope you will sit with us and we thank you very much.

Charles H. Coates

Telephone
Office 8-6511 Ext. 62
Home 3-7594
Interview Guide

Number ______ Date __________________________ Interviewer ____________

I. Biographical Information

1. Name ________________________________ Age ____________

2. Present Position ____________________________________________

   Years held _______ Number years with organization _________

3. Previous Positions, same organization:

   Position ____________________________________ Years held ___
   Position ____________________________________ Years held ___
   Position ____________________________________ Years held ___
   Position ____________________________________ Years held ___
   Position ____________________________________ Years held ___

4. Previous Positions, other organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Years:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Occupation and Position of Father __________________________

6. Education:

   GS ______ HS ______ College ______ Specialization ______ Degree ______

   Fraternity ____________________ Athletics ____________________

7. Family Data: S M W D  Education of wife ______________________

   Work Experience of wife (if any) ____________________________

   Occupation and Position of wife's father ___________________

8. Church affiliation ______ active member? ______ Lay Leader? _____
9. **Present Organizational Memberships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Years in Org.</th>
<th>Present Offices Held</th>
<th>Past Office Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Past Organizational Memberships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Years in Org.</th>
<th>Office Held</th>
<th>Reason for Dropping Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What are your recreational activities and hobbies? ________________________________________________

Who are the Persons who share these with you? ________________________________________________
II. Personal Career

1. Recalling your various jobs or occupations through the years, what were the factors which influenced your early choice of an occupation? If you changed occupations what were the factors influencing you in making the change?

2. What were your career plans or goals when you first started out? How have these fitted in with your actual experiences?

3. What do you think are the main factors that make a man satisfied with his occupational career?

4. What do you think are the main reasons why some individuals are dissatisfied with their occupational careers?
5. If you had to start over again, would you choose a different occupation? If so, why? If not why not?

6. If you could start over again, would you like to become a top level executive? If so, why? If not, why not?

7. Suppose you had a fifteen year old son.
   (A) What kind of an occupation would you like to see him enter? Why?

   (B) What kind of education or training would best prepare your son for this occupation?

8. In the light of what you have said above, how do you define the term "career success"?
III. The Careers of Others

1. Throughout your career you have undoubtedly had many experiences and contacts with top level executives and persons on the supervisory, foreman or equivalent level. In general, what are the main distinctions between the two levels of men as types?

2. Contrast top level executives with supervisors, foremen, or the equivalent on the following specific factors,

(A) Ability to get jobs done through others.

(B) Getting along with and manipulating fellow workers, superiors and subordinates.

(C) Desire to climb the management ladder. Willingness to see others climb the management ladder.

(D) Personality characteristics (How do the two levels differ in adapting their personalities to varying situations?)
(E) Willingness and capacity to work hard long hours.

(F) Initiative and creativity (getting and selling new ideas.)

(G) Making decisions and accepting responsibility in changing situations and circumstances.

(H) Taking advantage of opportunities for personal development and advancement.

(I) Organizing and coordinating ideas, people and things.

3. From your own observations, how important to achieving a top level executive position are the following?

(A) Family's social standing and connections.

(B) Family's nationality origins.
(C) Religious affiliation and activities.

(D) Belonging to influential "behind the scenes cliques."

(E) Being some influential person's fair-haired boy.

(F) Membership in fraternal organizations.

(G) Membership in community organizations and "high society" clubs.

(H) Membership in professional organizations.

(I) Seniority within his company.
4. How important to an individual trying to climb the executive ladder are the following?

(a) Emulating the generalized behavior, attitudes, activities and standards of his top level superiors.

(b) Trying to "think like the bosses" when making decisions and carrying them out.

(c) Trying to make friendships and contacts on a level higher than his own.

(d) Keeping his lower level friendships and contacts as he moves upward.

5. (A) The "rugged individualist" of former days was allegedly primarily concerned with getting the job done regardless. Are top level managerial executives as ruggedly individualistic as they were when you began your career? If not, why not?

(B) What seems more important to top level management today: getting the job done or keeping their people happy and contented? How does one affect the other?
(C) Nowadays, are people in general more interested in security than in the past? Less willing to take chances? If so, why has this happened?

(D) Since most employees at all levels do not own the enterprise, what are the factors that make them loyal to it? On the contrary, what factors may decrease their loyalty?

(E) Some people say that a person's career progress is influenced by such outward symbols as driving the right kind of car, having the right kind of house in the right neighborhood, wearing the right kind of clothes, etc. How important are such factors?

(F) What do you think are the principal reasons why some people in management never get to the top? What kinds of mistakes do they make?

(G) In summary, do you think that top level executives and low level executives have different conceptions of life goals, rewards and satisfactions? If so, what are the differences?
IV. A Hypothetical Situation: A young man is just starting out in your occupational field and he is determined to become a top level executive at all costs. Let us suppose that he is ruthless, self-centered, shrewd and calculating.

1. What would he try to do to speed up his advancement: (What sort of short-cuts would he attempt?)

2. What types of personal relationships would he try to develop with:
   (A) His fellow workers?
   (B) His superiors? Their secretaries?
   (C) His subordinates.

3. Could he use participation in community organizations, social clubs and fraternal organizations to speed up his advancement? If so, how?

4. How effective is ruthless, self-centered behavior in climbing the executive ladder?

5. Is such behavior more or less prevalent than formerly? Why?
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Receiving his elementary education in the public schools of Baton Rouge, he graduated from the University High School in 1918. Enrolling in Louisiana State University, he left at the completion of his sophomore year in 1920 to enter the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York. Graduating from West Point with the degree of Bachelors of Science in 1924, he served as an officer in the Regular Army of the United States for twenty-five years until his retirement, in 1949, as a Colonel.

Reentering Louisiana State University in 1950, he received the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Psychology in 1952. Continuing in the University in the Department of Sociology, he is currently a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in that department.
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