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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the potential usefulness of the Biographical Information Blank (BIB) in the selection of college seniors with managerial talent. From a population of 150 executives employed by a medium-sized Southern utilities company, 30 highly successful and 30 less successful executives were selected on the basis of the following criteria: (1) salary level, (2) company job title, (3) job number (as listed in the Hayes salary survey), and (4) appraisal performance ratings. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), and a specially constructed BIB were administered to all 60 

Sixty BIBs were selected from 350 male college seniors at Louisiana State University on the basis of their conformity to the two executive groups with regard to college major and personality profile. Thus, 30 students were selected because they resembled the successful executive group and 30 because they resembled the less successful group. The BIB constructed by the experimenter was then administered to the 60 college students.

Personality data on the two executive groups were analyzed by means of t-tests. The successful executives made significantly higher
scores than did the less successful executives on Dominance, Hetero-
sociability, Aggression, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social
Presence, Self-acceptance, Intellectual Efficiency, Psychologica-
aimlessness, and Flexibility and scored significantly lower on Refer-
ence, Order, Self-control, and Femininity.

A chi-square analysis was utilized to determine those EIB items
that discriminated between successful and less successful executives
and between students resembling the two executive groups. One hundred
ten items significantly differentiated successful and less successful
executives, while 99 items discriminated the two groups of college
students. Eighty-seven items were significant in both populations.

Ten open-ended questions were asked solely of the college popu-
lation, all ten of which differentiated the two groups. The data
showed that students resembling successful executives earned better
grades in college, were more competent socially, displayed better
leadership potential, and were in greater demand by industry.

Overall, results showed a definite relationship between personal-
ity and EIB data. However, EIB data seemed to have certain advan-
tages. In conclusion, this study has clearly indicated the utility
of biographical information in the selection of college seniors with
managerial potential.
INTRODUCTION

Industrial expansion in the United States is increasing at a
faster rate. Moreover, there is every indication that the pace
will continue to increase. One of the primary problems that has
resulted from this rapid growth is that of the dwindling supply of
managers. The need for able managers far exceeds the supply, and the
deficit appears to be growing (Meggison, 1967). Furthermore,
managerial slots that must be filled today are far more complicated
than they have been in the past. These and other similar problems
have created a greater need for intensive training and development
of future managers. Early identification of management potential, a
prerequisite to successful management development, has consequently
come into focus as an extremely crucial factor in the long range suc-
cess of an organization.

The recognized importance and economy of effective managerial
selection is reflected in the growing search for predictors of
managerial effectiveness for use in managerial staffing and selection
decisions. Much of the relevant research has been concerned with the
validation of standard aptitude, achievement, interest, and person-
ality tests within a particular organization. Unfortunately, few
investigators have met with more than moderate success (Mahoney,

Little research has been conducted in the area of identification
of managerial talent at the college or entry level of management. One of the major problems has been that of finding valid criteria that are common both to successful managers and to potentially successful managers still in college. Perhaps this is why most campus recruiters rely mainly on interviews to select potential management trainees (Carnell, 1966). Carnell found that recruiters most often emphasized grades, extracurricular activities, interview impression, appearance, age, maturity and work experience. As they are presently used, many of these data are highly subjective in nature, and most are difficult to systematically record. However, biographical data of this kind collected by means of a Biographical Information Blank (BIB), have proven to be among the highest correlates with managerial success (Owens and Henry, 1966).

It may be possible that a BIB can be successfully utilized to select college students with managerial potential. Before this can be accomplished, however, some immediate criteria is needed which can be measured in the college population that is, at the same time, related to success in management. At least initially, it may be that personality characteristics can aid in bridging the gap between the two populations. Thus, it may be that biographical data can be found that will isolate college seniors with the same personality characteristics as successful executives. It would seem likely that college students with college majors, personality characteristics, and life history antecedents similar to those of successful executives could also perform effectively as managers.
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Although there appears to be a paucity of literature directly related to managerial selection at the college level, a considerable amount of data are available that are relevant to managerial success. For clarity, studies will be reviewed under the following headings: Personality Variables Related to Managerial Success, Biographical Data Related to Managerial Success, and Relationship of EHP Data to Personality Data.

**Personality Variables Related to Managerial Success**

The general conviction that much of the variance in managerial performance is somehow due to "personality" has resulted in considerable emphasis in the literature upon such measures (Ogilve, 1967). Although numerous personality variables have been explored, few investigators have met with such success (Hicks and Stone, 1962).

Ternopol (1958) found no significant differences on any of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) scales between supervisors rated as good leaders and those rated as poor leaders. However, a total of 40 MMPI items did differentiate the two groups, indicating that leaders are characterized by responsibility, toughness, good adjustment, lack of defensiveness and hostility, and non-authoritarianism. In correlating the Edwards Personal Preference Scale (EPPS) and the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) variables with first line managers' leadership ratings, Rychick (1962) found leaders
to be typified by dominance and aggressive needs, an achievement orientation, and a preference for orderliness and organization in daily routine. Leadership was negatively correlated with absenteeism, success, and nurturance.

The relationship of position in the management hierarchy to personality scores has also been investigated. Porter (1961) suggested in a recent study that the same traits are important in lower level managers as are important to the success of middle management personnel. Guilford (1952), on the other hand, in an extensive study of personality differences between top level executives and lower level supervisors, found significant differences between the two management levels. The executive was significantly more sociable, emotionally stable, free from depression, assertive, self-confident, agreeable and cooperative than was the supervisor.

In studying hundreds of subjects at five job levels from factory workers to company presidents, significant trends for higher social dominance scores, lower detail scores, lower emotionality scores, and better adjustment scores were observed with hierarchy ascendance (Meyer and Freseel, 1956; Meyer and Fradian, 1959). In addition, Meyer and Fradian found significant positive trends in independent achievement, judgment, and social consideration with higher job levels. In two separate investigations Ghiselli (1951; 1963) found top management to be distinctly superior to middle management in initiative and self-assurance. These traits also differentiated top management from lower management. In an attempt to determine the perceived importance of
personality traits as a function of job level, Porter and Henry (1964) found that hundreds of managers regarded inner-directed traits (forcefulness, independence, imagination, and decisiveness) as more important for higher levels of management, and other-directed traits (cooperative, adaptability, agreeableness, and tactfulness) as more important for lower levels of management.

Several investigators have studied the personality characteristics of "typical" top level executives. On the basis of numerous observations, Apgar (1954) concluded that executives possessed the ability to work under more frustrating situations without blowing up, to more readily accept loss or hostility from others without "personality shattering," and to express hostility more tactfully. Utilizing a projective instrument, Miner and Culver (1955) showed that executives, as opposed to college professors and other men of similar age, intelligence and education, were characterized by (1) a generalized fear of illness and (2) a dependency upon others for the solution of business problems. On the other hand, self-made company presidents were found to have a "standard syndrome of temperament" characterized by aggressive, socially dominant and independent behavior (Moreno and Clark, 1939).

Rosen's (1939) extensive analysis of over 200 executives in more than a dozen companies lends support to the conclusions of both Miner and Culver (1955) and Moreno and Clark (1939). Consistently higher than average scores on both dominance and social dependence (MMPI and Bernreuter) led Rosen to conclude that the executive is a curious blend of independence and dependence on others. Rosen's findings also upheld
Argyris' contention that executives possess strong self-control, are
teachful and considerate, have a high frustration tolerance and, in
addition, are optimistic, self-confident and highly extroverted.

A number of investigators have attempted to differentiate success-
ful from less successful executives on the basis of personality
variables. In analyzing the BAT protocols of over 400 executives,
Gardner (1948) found 11 traits (including achievement and mobility
drives, decisiveness, work-channeled aggressiveness, fear of failure,
ability to accept authority and identify with superiors, etc.) to be
common in the personality structure of the more successful executive.
Hicks and Stone (1963), utilizing a structured, objective Rorschach,
described the more successful managers as individuals who showed a
great deal of emotional strength and avoided over-involvement in
detail.

Similarly, Thompson (1947) found managers with superior perfor-
ance records to score higher on the firmness, frankness, stability and
tolerance dimensions of the Personal Audit. Masculinity on the Strong
Vocational Interest Blank (Williams and Harrell, 1964), and dominance
on the California Psychological Inventory (Mahoney, Jordan and Nash,
1960) have been shown to be significantly related to managerial success.
Utilizing the MMPI, Rosen and Rosen (1957) found more successful union
business officials to be lower in depression, higher in suspiciousness
and have greater ego strength.

Within a group of top level executives, Guilford (1952) found
highly rated job performance to be related to cooperativeness, lower
extraversion, greater masculinity, and freedom from inferiority feel-
ingse. Hustner, Levy, Rosen, and Stepol (1959) have indicated that more
effective executives are less anxious, more optimistic and trusting,
and more aggressive (in a controlled way) than their less effective
colleagues.

Goodstein and Schneider (1963) derived a 206-item key for the CPI
which significantly correlated with ratings of success within a total
management group and within top and middle management subgroups. More
successful managers were described as being non-authoritarian, achieve-
ment oriented, dominant, self-acceptant, communicative and nonfeminine.

Biographical Data Related to Managerial Success

Although biographical data have been used in industry since the
early 1930's for predictive, diagnostic and counseling purposes, only
in recent years has there been an attempt to focus on personal history
antecedents, as well as personality characteristics, of successful
managers and executives (Owens and Henry, 1966). Objective or score-
able biographical data are typically secured by use of some more or
less standardized form—a Biographical Information Blank (BIB), an
Application Blank, an Individual Background Survey, or something
similar.

Skelley (1936; 1957) found 68 of 200 personal history items to
discriminate more successful from less successful managers. In a study
of service station managers, Soar (1936) discovered 14 of 39 personal
history items to be significantly correlated with success. Similarly,
Mahoney, Jordan, and Nash (1960) and Williams and Harrell (1964) found a few biographical items to predict managerial success.

In summarizing the more extensive Standard Oil of New Jersey studies, Owens and Henry (1966) reported correlations of .14 to .64 between a BIB predictor and various criteria of managerial success. Cassese (1966) has recently factor analyzed BIB data which were highly related to managerial success and effectiveness in three different cultures. The factors were:

1. Upward mobility through the means of educational achievement.
2. Self-description in terms of the world of reality and concrete areas.
3. Self-perception of personal ability and achievement in more abstract areas.
4. Attitudes toward family.
5. Interpersonal relations in social activities.
6. Attitudes and orientation toward tasks.
7. Self-sufficiency—capacity to take care of one's self and personal life.
8. Achievement through the use of conforming behavior.
9. Rate of maturing.
10. Physical and mental health.

These same basic factors were found to hold over groups of young, middle-aged and older executives (Schmuckler, 1966).

Cassese's data suggested that there are life history antecedents which go back to the earliest stages of an individual's life which shape the motivational forces that develop the individual's style of
life. He concluded that executives have the same general pattern of life history antecedents, which results in their becoming managerial leaders.

**Relationship of BIB Data to Personality Data**

Many personality theorists and social scientists have long recognized the extreme importance of life history antecedents in shaping the adult's personality and resulting style of life. Freud (1930) was the first to integrate the developmental approach as a basis for understanding personality and predicting behavior. It was his contention that the basic personality was formed very early in life, and that later developments were merely recapitulations of what was learned in childhood.

Probably the most succinct statement of this relationship was made by Guthrie (1944, p. 66) when he stated that a person's "past affiliations . . . offer better and more specific predictors of his future than any of the traits that we usually think of as personality traits."

In spite of much theorizing, there has been very little attempt to systematically investigate the relationship between past experience and personality (Hearn, Charles and Wollin, 1962).

The BIB has been demonstrated to be a very promising predictor of criteria heavily saturated with interest or motivation (Thompson and Owens, 1964; Owens and Henry, 1966). The results of both Chaney and Owens (1964) and Klineberg and Owens (1960) indicate the predictability of certain Strong (SVIB) scores from the BIB.

Siegel (1956a; 1956b) constructed a Biographical Inventory for
Students (BIS) which has been shown to correlate with scholastic achievement, vocational choice, values, and personality inventories. Kaesler and Trapp (1958), working with Siegel's BIS, found the dependency subscale (Dep) to be related to the motivational variable of anxiety.

Morrison, Owens, Clemon and Albright (1962) have shown BIS factors to be related to group differences in such characteristics as favorable self-perception, inquisitive professional orientation, utilitarian drive, tolerance for ambiguity and general adjustment. The desire for security in vocational choice has been shown to be significantly related to personality and background (Blum, 1961).

Bogard (1960) demonstrated that significant personality differences exist between union and management trainees. He further indicated that behavioral data which significantly differentiated the two occupations were closely related to their present-day personality.

The Dominance Scale (CPI) and certain biographical experiences occurring prior to the age of 25 have been shown to be significantly related to managerial success (Mahoney, Jordee and Nash, 1960).

The most elaborate attempt to clarify relationships existing between particular personality characteristics and specified life experiences was that carried out by Hearst, Charles and Wolins (1963). A biographical inventory and the EPPS were administered to college males. EPPS personality variables were then correlated with early life experiences and typical behavior of the individual. Parental behavior and personality, socioeconomic level and education, and subjects'
identification with parents were shown to be important factors influencing personality.

An Overview

In reviewing the literature on management selection and development, it is clear that most of the investigators in this area agree that personality characteristics contribute to the success or failure of men in executive and other managerial positions. It is also apparent that the combination of traits accounting for effective executive performance is not yet known. Furthermore, knowledge of the importance of any particular trait is lacking. There are several possible explanations for the inconsistencies reported in the literature pertaining to executive personality characteristics:

(1) Many investigators have defined the problem differently and, as a result, have obtained somewhat different results. For example, some of the studies reviewed have attempted to determine the personality characteristics of successful as opposed to lesser successful managers or executives; others have determined personality characteristics as a function of the level attained in the managerial hierarchy; still others have reported an overall picture of "the executive personality." Since success and managerial level in the company are not necessarily highly correlated, investigators who focus on one or the other, or on neither, will likely obtain somewhat different pictures of the personality characteristics of managers.

(2) There is very likely no one overall criterion of success in management. Few studies have utilized the same criteria of success,
which is not surprising in light of the fact that few organizations define success in the same manner.

(3) There is some indication that there are differences in personality characteristics of executives as a function of age, managerial function, and company size (Rotter, Levy, Rosen and Stopol, 1959). One would tend to confirm the results of large scale cross-industry studies of executive personality traits.

(4) Our present techniques cannot measure all personality traits with any degree of reliability. In addition, most investigators have utilized different personality tests or inventories. This practice has resulted in different verbal descriptions of executives who may well have possessed the same traits.

(5) Personality inventories suitable for use in personnel selection contexts have generally been found to be subject to "fakability" (Humally, 1959; Humally, 1963; Barrett, 1963).

In summary, it appears that many of the inconsistencies reported in the literature as to the nature of a successful executive can be attributed to inadequately defined and measured criteria of success, the use of personality tests with questionable or low reliability, and the failure to control for managerial functions, the managers' level in the organizational hierarchy, and size and value orientation of the company.

Even so, it does seem probable that within a particular organization successful executives and managers will have personality characteristics in common, and that these characteristics will be different from
the personality traits common to the less successful executives. It is also likely that the successful performance of duties required for a given executive position is largely dependent upon these differentiating personality characteristics and resulting style of life of the performer. The identification of personality traits that differentiate successful from less successful executives would, thus, contribute to more effective recruitment and selection of persons with personality traits similar to those of successful executives.

How can these traits be identified? It has already been mentioned that, on the whole, the typical personality questionnaire, test or inventory has not proven to be very highly useful in industrial settings (Barret, 1943; Norman, 1943; Guilford, 1952; Ghiselli and Barthol, 1953; Dailey, 1960; Gullon and Gettier, 1965). One possible alternative would be the use of a BIB for the identification of the personal history antecedents that are felt to develop and structure the personality.

Why the BIB?

Life history data, systematically collected by means of a BIB, have been suggested as potentially the most valid measure of "personality" presently available for selection programs (Nunnally, 1959; Super, 1959; Dailey, 1960). Dailey (1960) proposed that life history data reveal personality most thoroughly and accurately—that the life history is the personality, from an operational point of view.

There are two widely held assumptions in psychology that afford
a firm logical footing for the use of biographical information in the
study of personality: (1) The person is as he responds to his environ-
ment, and (2) The best predictor of a person's future behavior is his
past performance (O'Nally, 1959; Super, 1959; Bailey, 1960).

Although it is not certain what kinds of specific personality
characteristics the EIB measures, EIB items have been shown to corre-
late with the CPI and the EPPS (Maerz, Charles and Welin, 1963; Mebanev,
Jordis and Nash, 1960). In addition, recent studies have found factor
structures or dimensions related to interpersonal relations that appear
to be common to a variety of investigations in widely diverse situa-
tions (Thompson and Jones, 1963; Morrison, 1962; Cassens, 1966;
Schumacher, 1966). Furthermore, comprehensive reviews of test utility
indicate that the EIB is an excellent predictive device (Barrett, 1963;
Goss and Henry, 1965; O'Nally, 1959).

The EIB has a number of other advantages over typical personality
inventories:

(1) EIB items have "face validity." Looking much like an appli-
cation blank, they are innocent in form and are reportedly non-
effective to the applicant.

(2) It is relatively easy to construct meaningful and unambigu-
ous EIB items. It is also apparently easier to hypothesize and construct
valid biographical items than other self-description items.

(3) Since both items and scoring keys are empirically derived,
only job-relevant questions are included in the final EIB. In other
words, answers are evaluated only in terms of their relationship to
subsequent job success. Consequently, there is little or no ground for complaint of invasion of privacy.

(4) BB items are less affected by "faking." Klein and Owens (1963) indicated that a BB validated against a transparent criterion tends to be transparent itself, whereas one validated against a more or less opaque criterion tends to be opaque.

(5) The BB is easier to validate than are existing personality inventories. It can apparently be transferred to "new groups," i.e., groups different in certain aspects from the criterion groups. For example, inappropriate items could quite easily be changed or dropped from the inventory without affecting the overall predictive ability of the test.

(6) In general, BB's are less costly, and easier to administer and evaluate than are typical personality inventories.

(7) Examination of BB data (discriminating item responses) can provide insights as to why people respond as they do.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the usefulness of BB data in the identification of college seniors with managerial potential. More specifically, the present research was undertaken to determine whether or not a specially constructed BB could discriminate between two groups of college seniors, one resembling a group of successful executives, the other resembling a group of less successful executives with regard to their undergraduate majors and personality characteristics. The specific hypotheses to be tested were: (1) Successful versus less successful business executives have differing
personality characteristics as measured by the BFPS and the CPI. (2) College students can be identified who possess personality characteristics similar to those of successful or less successful executives. (3) Many of the same personal history antecedents that differentiate successful and less successful executives will discriminate between college seniors possessing the same personality characteristics as successful or less successful executives. (4) College students who have different personality characteristics and life history antecedents will also differ in their behavior in college.
METHOD

Phase I

Phase I was directed toward the construction of a Biographical Information Blank (BIB) that could be used to isolate college seniors who possessed the same personality characteristics and life history antecedents as successful or less successful executives. Items included in the BIB were obtained from the following sources:

1. A review of the literature revealed a number of personal history items that had been shown to discriminate successful from less successful managers. Only those items that appeared relevant to the present study were included. More specifically, since the present BIB was to be administered to college students, as well as to a group of managers, all organizationally bound items and items related to current jobs were omitted.

2. Items that had already demonstrated their capacity to predict personality characteristics on the SPPS, CPI and similar inventories were obtained from the literature.

3. Items that appeared to have potential predictive value were also selected from existing BIB's, viz., Standard Oil of New Jersey and Ohio, and BIB item pools, e.g., A Catalog
of Life History Items. Of particular interest were those items related to maturity, achievement orientation, success in interpersonal relations, etc.

The final trial HIS consisted of 179 multiple-choice items. Both discrete and continuous items were utilized, and where all alternatives were not covered, "escape" options were provided (e.g., "something else," "other," etc.). In addition, 10 open-ended questions were included for the college population only. These items were designed to assess the student's grade point average, extra-curricular activities and job interviewing experience. The 189 item questionnaire is presented in Appendix A.

Phase 2

The purpose of Phase 2 was to identify a group of adjudged successful and a group of less successful executives. More specifically, criterion groups were established so that subjects resembling the executive groups could later be compared in a college population.

Subjects. The subject population was comprised of 30 highly successful and 30 lesser successful executives selected from a total of 150 executives employed by a medium-sized Southern utilities company. All 150 executives served at a level that allowed them to formulate and implement policy in the corporation.

1Gleason, J. R., Albright, L. H., and Owens, W. A. A Catalog of Life History Items. For the Scientific Affairs Committee, American Psychological Association, Division 14.
Procedure. Highly successful versus lesser successful executives were selected on the basis of the following criteria: (1) salary level, (2) company job title, (3) job number (as listed in the Heyes salary survey), and (4) appraisal performance ratings (mean ratings by superiors; i.e., each person had been rated by at least three former superiors). Age and length of service with the company served as control variables. The control variables were used to determine those individuals who attained the higher levels on the four criteria in the shortest period of time. For example, the younger person or the one with the shortest service with the company was adjudged the more successful of two individuals at the same level.

The experimenters and a member of the company’s personnel department ranked all 150 executives from most to least successful using the above criteria. Any executive that was not ranked by both judges as being among the 40 most successful or among the 40 least successful was not included in the subject population. Final subject selection included 60 executives, 30 of whom fell at each extremity of success.

Phase 3

Phase 3 was undertaken to determine the personality profile and personal history antecedents of the more successful executives as compared to the less successful executives. This was done so that subjects in the college population could be matched with successful and less successful executives with regard to personality profiles and compared on AIB data.


Subjects. The subject population was composed of the 30 highly successful and 30 less successful executives identified in Phase 2.


descriptions. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) were administered to all 60 subjects in order to determine the personality characteristics of the more successful as compared to the less successful executives. In addition, the EPI constructed in Phase 1 was utilized to find out what personal history antecedents would differentiate the two groups.

Phase 4

The aim of Phase 4 was to select college seniors with college majors and personality characteristics similar to the successful or less successful executives identified in Phase 2. This was undertaken in order to determine whether college students so selected would also possess life history antecedents similar to those that differentiated the two groups of executives.

Subjects. Subjects in Phase 4 were selected from 350 male college seniors at Louisiana State University. Only those seniors with college majors comparable to the 30 highly successful and 30 less successful executives selected in Phase 2 were included in the population. For example, most of the executive population were found to have college degrees in engineering (electrical or mechanical) or business administration, while a few had majors in liberal arts. Thus, the college population was selected so as to consist of the same number of
subjects with majors in engineering, business administration and liberal arts.

Procedure. The EPFS and the CPI were administered to all potential college subjects. Only those scales that significantly discrimi-
nated between successful and less successful executives in Phase 3
were scored. The final college subject population was selected on the
basis of the following criteria:

(1) Only subjects falling within plus or minus one standard
deviation of the mean of a criterion group (successful or less success-
ful executives) on each of the 15 significant scales of the EPFS and
the CPI were included.

(2) An additional criterion for selection was necessary because
of the fact that there were overlapping group distributions on several
of the significant scales. Subjects falling between the group means
and within one standard deviation of the mean of both distributions on
e given scale were categorized according to the group mean to which
they were closest. When a subject was within one standard deviation
of the mean of a given criterion group on all scales but was closer to
the mean of the opposite criterion group on no more than two of the 15
scales, he was still included in the final population.

The final college subject population consisted of 60 subjects,
half of whom were selected because of their conformity to the “person-
ality profile” of the successful executive and the other half because of
their conformity to the “personality profile” of the less successful
executive. A $t$ test analysis indicated that the two groups did not
differ significantly in age. Subjects in the college population were
compared with their counterparts in the executive population on each
of the 19 personality scales that discriminated the successful and less
successful executive population. Analyses by $t$ tests indicated that
these were no significant differences on any of the scales. As a
final step of Phase 4, the 139 item EIB constructed in Phase 1 was
administered to the 60 college students.

Phase 5

The purpose of Phase 5 was twofold: (1) to determine the dis-
criminating characteristics in biographical data between the successful
and less successful executives and between the students resembling the
successful versus the less successful executive groups, and (2) to
determine which items that discriminated the two executive groups also
differentiated the comparable groups in the college population.

Subjects. The subject population was composed of the 30 highly
successful and 30 less successful executives identified in Phase 2 and
the 30 students resembling successful executives and 30 students re-
ssembling less successful executives identified in Phase 4.

Procedure. Successful versus less successful executives were
compared to determine which EIB items could significantly differentiate
the two managerial groups. Next, college students resembling the suc-
cessful executives were compared to students resembling less successful
executives in order to determine which BIB items could discriminate among the college population. The executive and college populations were then compared to find which of the 179 BIB items were significant in the same direction in both populations. Finally, the two student groups were compared on the 10 open ended questions involving grade point average, extracurricular activities, and job opportunities.
RESULTS

Personality data on the two executive groups were analyzed by means of $t$ tests. Using standard scores on the CPI and percentiles on the EPPS, successful and less successful executives were compared on each of the sub-scales of the two personality inventories. Five of fifteen scales on the EPPS and ten of the eighteen scales on the CPI were significant at the five per cent level or beyond. The scales significantly differentiating the two groups are presented in Table 1. The successful executives made significantly higher scores than did the less successful executive group on the Dominance, Heterosexuality and Aggression scales of the EPPS and on the Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence, Self-acceptance, Intellectual Efficiency, Psychological-mindedness and Flexibility scales of the CPI. Less successful executives, on the other hand, scored significantly higher on the Reference and Order scales of the EPPS and on the Self-control and Femininity scales of the CPI.

A chi-square analysis was utilized to determine those EIB items that discriminated between successful and less successful executives and between students resembling successful executives and students resembling less successful executives. Each option of every item was analyzed to determine its capacity for differentiating the two groups in each population.
TABLE 1

PERSONALITY SCALES SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENTIATING SUCCESSFUL AND LESS SUCCESSFUL EXECUTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Edwards Personal Preference Schedule</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X Percentile Successful</td>
<td>X Percentile Less Successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectures</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>California Psychological Inventory</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X Standard Score</td>
<td>X Standard Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Less Successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Status</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Presence</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Efficiency</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-mindedness</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peniness</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 110 of the 179 items had one or more options that significantly differentiated the 30 successful and 30 less successful executives at the 5 per cent level or beyond. Ninety-nine of the 179 items had options that significantly discriminated at the 5 per cent level or beyond between the 30 students resembling successful executives and the 30 students resembling less successful executives.

Twenty-three items had one or more options that were significant in the executive population but failed to reach significance in the college population. Twelve items, on the other hand, had one or more options that were significant in the college population but not in the executive population.

A total of 87 of the 179 items had one or more options that were significant at the 5 per cent level or beyond in both the college and executive populations. Although a large number of options were involved, none was significant in the opposite direction. Appendix B shows a comparison of the two populations by options. Based upon the items that were significant in both populations, a verbal description of successful and less successful executives and their counterparts in the college population is presented in Table 2. Table 3 gives a verbal description of items significant only in the executive population while Table 4 provides a verbal description of items significant only in the college population. It should be noted that each statement in the three tables represents a significant option. That is, each option or statement in the tables was answered by a significantly greater number of successful or less successful executives and/or their student counterparts.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Less Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father had a high school (executive population) or college (student population) education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers' occupation was business work or supervisory work (executive population) or professional or scientific (student population)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got along with their parents about as well as other teenagers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were usually punished physically when they were children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents allowed them about as much independence as the rest of their friends when they were in high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Childhood Background and Family Relations**

More often lived on a farm or in a rural area while growing up

Mother and father had a junior high school education

Fathers' occupation was subprofessional (bookkeeper, pharmacy, drafter, etc.)

Parents were very seldom concerned with social matters

Got along very well with their parents during their teens—agreed on almost everything

Parents usually gave them no special attention for commendable behavior

Parents allowed them as much independence as they wanted when they were in high school
### TABLE 2 (Cont'd.)

#### Childhood Background and Family Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Less Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learned to swim before they were 10 years old</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonged to the Boy Scouts. (Executives reached a higher rank, that of Star, than did students, who attained the rank of 2nd Class.)</td>
<td>Had no opportunity to join a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned their first money on a regular job when they were 12 years of age or younger (both populations) or when they were 13 to 15 years old (student population)</td>
<td>Earned their first money on a regular job when they were 16 to 18 years old or when they were over 18 years of age (student population)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Personal Habits and Attitudes

| Told jokes frequently | -- |
| Have read 10 or more fiction books in the past year | Have read fewer than 3 fiction books in the past year |
| Read one or more newspapers thoroughly each day | Read parts of more than one newspaper each day |
| Devote 4 to 10 hours per week to religious activity | Observing sports is their favorite leisure activity |

Participating in sports (student population) or social recreation with others (executive population) is their favorite leisure activity.
### TABLE 2 (Cont'd.)

**Personal Habits and Attitudes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Less Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy fishing, hunting and camping</td>
<td>Enjoy building things, woodworking and crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally or frequently play golf</td>
<td>Rarely (executive population) or never (student population) play golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feel that their major accomplishment, outside of work, has been something other than family activities, community activities, development of themselves, or development of social activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely feel discouraged</td>
<td>Are reluctant to express their views, although they are usually well received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally feel discouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In presenting a new idea, they hold it back for a while to see if it will work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express opinions differing from others regardless of the status of the other person(s)</td>
<td>Express differing opinions only to associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely feel self-conscious</td>
<td>Occasionally feel self-conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never tell other people their troubles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tend to condemn themselves for making a mistake regarding a difficult decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 (Cont'd.)

**Personal Habits and Attitudes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Less Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Generally take risks (executive population) or feel that they are gamblers at heart (student population)
- Feel quite confident of themselves in most phases of activity
- Feel that they have done their best in competitive situations
- Find failure to do their best to be the most annoying thing about themselves
- Describe themselves as being aggressive
- Obtain the greatest satisfaction from being told that they have done a good job (student population) or helping people solve their problems (executive population)
- Consider prestige (both populations) or coming up with something new (executive population) to be the major motivating force in their lives
- Eadily ever take risks
- Feel self-confident about intellectual abilities but not about social abilities (student population) or lack self-confidence in both intellectual and social abilities (executive population)
- Feel that they never let their temper get the best of them
- Find a tendency to worry to be the most annoying thing about themselves
- Describe themselves as being occasionally aggressive, but typically not
- Obtain the greatest satisfaction from having free time to use as they please
- Consider security to be the major motivating force in their lives
### Table 2 (Cont'd.)

**Personal Habits and Attitudes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Less Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>A pleasant home and family seem most important to them, while professional status or authority is least important to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Could best judge a man by knowing his political and/or religious affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Have been hospitalized for illness 3 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Their attitude toward health affects their recreational activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer Relations and Social Attitudes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are usually at ease in a social situation</th>
<th>Are generally at ease, but occasionally feel uncomfortable in social situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to talk or visit with a small group</td>
<td>Feel that they can be best described as socially introverted (not joiners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get together with friends one or more times a week</td>
<td>Prefer to talk or visit with a close friend (student population) or a large group (executive population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an average number of close friends and make friends about as well as most people</td>
<td>Get together with friends once or twice a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a few close friends and do not meet people as easily as most people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE 2 (Cont'd.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Relations and Social Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Successful:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Less Successful:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have 7 or more close friends</td>
<td>Have 1 or 2 close friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belong to 2 or 3 (student population) or 4 to 6 (executive population) social organizations, clubs, etc.</td>
<td>At the present, belong to no social organizations, clubs, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have held leadership positions in groups 6 or more times during the past 5 years</td>
<td>Have never held leadership positions in groups during the past 5 years (student population) or have held leadership positions only 2 or 3 times during the past 5 years (executive population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have held several important offices in organizations to which they belong</td>
<td>Felt they never had an opportunity to organize or assist in organizing any kind of club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always enjoy talking to people they don't know</td>
<td>Do not wish to hold a position of importance in organizations to which they now belong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were 14 to 16 years old when they went on their first date</td>
<td>Were 17 to 19 years old when they went on their first date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were 20 years of age or older when they first &quot;went steady&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (Cont'd.)  

Peer Relations and Social Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Less Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not usually go out (evenings) while in high school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Less Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyed shop courses the least (high school)</td>
<td>Enjoyed English, literature and foreign language courses the least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced through high school much more rapidly than most (executive population) or a little faster than most (student population)</td>
<td>Advanced through high school a little slower than most (executive population) or about the same as most (student population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall that teachers regarded them as able to get things done with ease in school</td>
<td>Recall that teachers regarded them as hard workers in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their most outstanding positive experience in school was academic achievement (executive population) or popularity with the boys (student population)</td>
<td>Their most outstanding positive experience in school was achievement in sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feel that they would have been only a little above average in school if they had done the very best they could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feel that general cultural knowledge is the most important thing a person should get out of college</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel that personal maturity is the most important thing a person should get out of college
### TABLE 2 (Cont'd.)

**Educational Background**

**Successful:**

- Obtained the greatest pleasure in high school from participation in organized school activities or from social interaction with other students (exclusive population only)

- Participated the most in extracurricular activities such as the student paper, clubs, band, drama, etc. when in high school

**Less Successful:**

- Did not participate in extracurricular activities in high school

- Spent more than 20 hours per week in study outside of class during their last year in college

- Classified themselves as average students in college

- Earned more than 50% of their college expenses

- Earned less than 10% of their college expenses

- Feel that the most desirable distance between one's own home (parents) and college would be less than 25 miles

- Held no elective offices in college

- Felt they were among the most active and popular students when they were in high school
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Less Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would directly ask a fellow worker to stop his annoying personal habits.</td>
<td>Would ignore a fellow worker with annoying personal habits (executive population) or just hope they would improve (student population).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel that their decisions are better, in most instances, than those with whom they work.</td>
<td>Feel that their decisions are about the same as the decisions of others with whom they work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel that decision making (on the job) is right down their alley.</td>
<td>Can take or leave decision making (on the job) or like to narrow things down to 2 or 3 alternatives and let someone else take it from there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel that they would be among the top 5% in the kind of job they can do best.</td>
<td>Feel that they would be in the upper third in the kind of job they can do best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel that they are, or could be, good enough to be in the top 5% of managers.</td>
<td>Feel that they are, or could be, good enough to be in the top 20% of managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would most dislike resistance to new ideas in their next job.</td>
<td>Would most dislike poor planning of work in their next job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike jobs requiring routine operations, but would take one if necessary.</td>
<td>Do not mind jobs requiring many routine operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (Cont'd.)
Occupational Background and Attitudes

Successful:

- Feel that an ideal job is one in which a great deal of interaction with other people is allowed.
- Their primary goal in planning a career was excitement and opportunity or personal satisfaction (executives only).
- During the next 10 years would like to become an executive or attain a position where they can be free to work on ideas that interest them (executives only).
- Expect to attain a top salary of over $30,000.
- Expect to reach top executive level in their company or to become president or chairman of the board.
- Prefer primarily administrative work, with some technical work.

Less Successful:

- Their primary goal in planning a career was economic security.
- Expect to attain a top salary of $15,000 to $20,000 or $20,000 to $30,000 (executives only).
- Expect to reach a top managerial position (below the executives) (executive population) or the next level below (student population).
- Prefer a job equally divided between administrative and technical work or a primarily technical job (students only).
TABLE 3

DISCRIMINATING CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL VS. LESS SUCCESSFUL EXECUTIVES*

**Childhood Background and Family Relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Less Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt that they had a strict but fair upbringing</td>
<td>More frequently had parents who lived together all the time they were growing up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents indicated the hour of the evening they should be in</td>
<td>Lived in 1 to 3 towns and cities while growing up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When they were children, they confided in their father or a brother or sister</td>
<td>Felt that their upbringing was not very strict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents rarely gave them material rewards for good grades in school</td>
<td>Parents placed no restrictions on their evenings or how they were spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending money in high school consisted of both allowance and earnings</td>
<td>When they were children, they confided in some person other than their father, brother or sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started drinking alcoholic beverages at an earlier age (17 to 20 years of age)</td>
<td>Were seldom punished when they were children, but were warned not to do it again</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These items did not discriminate in the college population
### TABLE 3 (Cont'd.)

**Childhood Background and Family Relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Less Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were younger than 10 years of age when they first went on a trip (of over 100 miles) alone</td>
<td>Were 13 to 15 years of age when they first went on a trip alone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Habits and Attitudes**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When eating out, usually order foods they generally don't have at home</td>
<td>When eating out, order foods they are acquainted with and know they like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently feel dissatisfied with themselves</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In presenting a new idea, they realize that someone else's changes may be good</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read almost every issue of, or subscribe to, 6 or more periodicals</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel that their general athletic ability is above average</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom tell others their troubles</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When they made a wrong choice regarding a difficult decision, they felt they had made the best choice they could at the time</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have 3 or more hobbies</th>
<th>Have 2 hobbies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
TABLE 3 (Cont'd.)

Personal Habits and Attitudes

Successful:                Less Successful:

Want people to feel that they are tough
but fair                                --

Have generally tried to take advantage of
any opportunities that have been presented
to them                                  --

Have organized or assisted in organizing
financial or charity campaigns to raise funds
                                                    --

Feel they could best judge a man by knowing
his educational background               --

Health has been excellent in recent years   Were sick in bed 1 to 2 days last year

Educational Background

Held 1 or 2 elective offices in college     --

Classified themselves as above average students
in college                                --

Usual load in college was heavier than average    Usual load in college was about average
**TABLE 3 (Cont'd.)**

**Occupational Background and Attitudes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful:</th>
<th>Less Successful:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were more often veterans</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would rather supervise the manufacture of a new machine</td>
<td>Would rather determine the cost of a new machine or teach others its use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When working on a project, they only occasionally do it over and over until it expresses what they mean</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel that working with others on the job helps by providing new ideas</td>
<td>Feel that working with others on the job makes the work more pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In work assignments prefer to have many things &quot;on the fire&quot; simultaneously</td>
<td>Prefer to work on one thing at a time (student population) or on a couple of things at a time (executive population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Feel that the most preferred goal on the job is to earn a large amount of money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer a job in which they can be free to experiment and try new methods</td>
<td>Prefer a job in which they can be given broad supervision, with details left up to them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4

discriminating characteristics of students resembling successful executives vs. students resembling less successful executives

Childhood Background and Family Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students resembling successful executives:</th>
<th>Students resembling less successful executives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As youngsters, were frequently leaders in their groups' activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were leaders of a clique or gang while in high school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In childhood they were usually rewarded with praise for good behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went steady at an earlier age (14 to 16 years of age)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal Habits and Attitudes

| Feel that development of themselves has been their major accomplishment, outside of work | |
| Feel free to express their views to a group of associates and sway the group considerably | |
| Make broad and general plans, not detailed ones, about their present and future activities | |
| Smoke over a package of cigarettes each day | |

*These items did not discriminate in the executive population
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Resembling Successful Executives</th>
<th>Students Resembling Less Successful Executives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When angry they &quot;let off steam&quot; by stomping around for awhile</td>
<td>Plan to save only 5% or less of their yearly income (as head of a family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When angry they &quot;let off steam&quot; by talking it over with someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Find speaking before a large group difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel that they can be best described as &quot;unconventional--not much influenced by precedent&quot;</td>
<td>Feel that the least accurate description of themselves is &quot;a dreamer--would rather speculate than plunge into action&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel that the least accurate description of themselves is &quot;socially introverted--not joiners&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider a challenging and exciting job to be most important to them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider religion to be least important to them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider their health only to the extent of obtaining a periodic physical exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4 (Cont'd.)

Peer Relations and Social Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students resembling Successful Executives:</th>
<th>Students resembling Less Successful Executives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Try to please other people if it doesn't go against their own feelings</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (outside their immediate family) go to them occasionally for advice</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy talking with friends (more than spending time with family, physical activities or reading)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Feel they were not quite as active and popular as most students when they were in high school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Background

| Enjoyed physical science, chemistry and math courses the least | -- |
| Consider the most desirable distance between one's home and college to be 100 to 500 miles | -- |

Occupational Background and Attitudes

<p>| Feel that personality is the most important factor for success in their profession | Feel that interest is the most important factor for success in their profession |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Resembling Successful Executives</th>
<th>Students Resembling Less Successful Executives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would rather interest the public in a new machine or sell it</td>
<td>Would rather determine the cost of a new machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe they would like to have a good deal of responsibility in their job</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience little or no difficulty in talking to an interviewer</td>
<td>Experience some difficulty in talking to an interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prefer a job in which they can follow a relatively set procedure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 10 open-ended questions that were administered solely to the student population were analyzed separately. A \( \chi^2 \) test analysis was utilized to determine whether the two groups of students differed in terms of grade point average (item 180). Answers to the remaining questions were categorized (e.g., into none, 1-2, 3 or more) and were then subjected to chi-square analysis. All 10 questions significantly differentiated the two student groups (see Appendix C).

Students resembling the more successful executives in terms of personality and college major had higher grade point averages (\( P < .02 \)), belonged to more fraternities (social and professional) and other organizations and held more offices than students resembling less successful executives. In addition, members of the "successful" student group were more frequently affiliated with the Student Government Association, were more often members of the Reserve Officers Training Corp, attended more job interviews, received more invitations to make visits to various firms and got more job offers than did the "less successful" student.
Results of the present study showed five scales on the EPPS and ten scales on the CPI to significantly differentiate successful from less successful executives. Utilizing these scales to formulate a profile of the two executive groups, successful and less successful executives can be described as follows.

In general, the successful executive tended to be better informed and more efficient in his work; more self-reliant, independent, and imaginative; and more flexible and adaptable in his thinking. He appeared to be more responsive to the inner needs and motives of others, to be more persuasive, and, consequently, to have greater leadership potential and initiative. The successful executive was seen as more ambitious, competitive, dominant, aggressive, manipulative and opportunistic in dealing with others. It appeared that the successful executive was more prone to emphasize personal pleasure and self-gain, to be more impulsive, and somewhat rebellious toward rules. The successful executive seemed to be more forward, outgoing, and self-confident in personal and social interaction. Finally, he appeared to have a greater number of heterosexual interests.

The mean profile of the less successful executive indicated that he was somewhat lacking in self-confidence and more likely to get suggestions from others and to accept the leadership of others. He tended to be orderly, organized, and methodical in his work, stereotyped in
his thinking, and restricted in his interests. The less successful executive appeared to conform to custom, to do what was expected of him, and to be respectful and accepting of others. Overall, it seemed that the less successful executive was less ambitious than the successful executive and somewhat lacking in self-direction and self-discipline but, at the same time, dependable and conscientious.

The results just cited are consistent with those of a number of other investigators with regard to specific personality characteristics of the more successful executives. The most consistently reported traits of the more successful executive were dominance and aggressiveness (Guilford, 1952; Meyer and Pressal, 1954; Meyer and Freidin, 1954; Metzner, Levy, Rosen and Stope, 1959; Mahoney, Jorden and Bask, 1960; Goodstein and Schrader, 1963). Dominance and aggressiveness have also been attributed to the "typical executive" (Herr and Clark, 1959; Rosen, 1959) and to managers described as better leaders (Rychlak, 1963).

The present study also supported the results cited by investigators who have found more successful executives to have greater self-confidence or freedom from inferiority (Guilford, 1952; Argyria, 1954; Rosen, 1959; Chiselli, 1959; 1963); to show more initiative and independence (Herr and Clark, 1959; Chiselli, 1959; 1963); and to be more masculine (Guilford, 1952; Goodstein and Schrader, 1963; Williams, and Barrett, 1964), more cooperative and considerate (Guilford, 1952; Argyria, 1954; Rosen, 1959), more self-accepting (Goodstein and Schrader, 1963), more sociable (Guilford, 1952; Meyer and Freidin,
1959; Rosen, 1959), and less concerned with order or detail in their work (Nicks and Stona, 1962).

The results of the present study and those of other similar studies indicate that there are personality characteristics which discriminate successful and less successful executives within a particular organization. It appears that some characteristics are likely to lead to success or at least make it easier to attain success, and conversely, that some characteristics will probably be a hindrance in becoming successful.

If possession of certain personality characteristics increases the likelihood of success in industry, then the same generality should hold with regard to success in college. Looking at the ten open-ended BIB questions asked of the college population, this would seem to be the case. All ten questions discriminated between the two student groups. Those students resembling successful executives had higher grade point averages, belonged to more professional fraternities, were more often members of social fraternities, more often held offices in social and professional organizations, were more frequently in the student government association, and were more often officers in ROTC. They were more frequently interviewed for jobs, were more often invited to visit firms, and received more job offers. In other words, these students earned better grades, were more competent socially, displayed greater leadership potential, and were in greater demand in industry. In short, students resembling successful executives in personality characteristics looked as though they had a more well-rounded and more
successful college career than did those resembling the less successful executives.

With regard to the remaining BIB data, a total of 110 of the 179 items had one or more options that significantly differentiated successful and less successful executives. Ninety-nine of the 179 items had options that significantly discriminated the two groups of college students selected on the basis of one group being similar in personality characteristics to successful executives and the other resembling less successful executives. Eighty-seven of the 179 items had one or more options that were significant in both populations.

On the basis of these data it would appear that the BIB can be effectively utilized to discriminate between individuals differing in certain personality characteristics. Close scrutiny of the BIB data indicated that many of the same adjectives could be used to describe successful executive and college groups as were used in the verbal description from the personality scales. For example, on the basis of their scores on the two personality tests the successful groups were described as better informed, self-reliant, self-confident, forward, ambitious, confident in social interaction, dominant and aggressive. Utilizing BIB data, successful groups read more books and newspapers (better informed), felt more confident in most areas (self-reliant, self-confident), expressed their opinions freely (forward), expected to make more money and attain higher levels in the organization (ambitious), were at ease in social situations (confident in social interaction), and felt they were more aggressive (aggressive, dominant).
It thus appears that the information obtained from the two measures is highly correlated. This supposition is supported by Hean, Charles and Welling (1965) and Mahoney, Jordae and Nash (1960), all of whom found BIB items to be correlated with the CPI and the EPPS. In fact, it may be as Hunnally (1959), Bailey (1960) and others have suggested, that the BIB is potentially the most valid measure of personality, broadly conceived, that we possess. If it is, then there seems to be no reason why the potentially more valid BIB should be used to predict a less valid score on a personality questionnaire. Instead, we should proceed directly to the prediction of the criterion.

The BIB was not constructed nor intended specifically for the measurement of personality. Its primary assumption is that past behavior can be used to predict how an individual will behave in the future. If it measures personality in the process, all well and good. It should be pointed out, however, that the BIB is not just a measure of personality, but is more.

The following are among the several advantages that the BIB would seem to have over the standard personality inventory. It is very easy to construct meaningful and unambiguous biographical items. In fact, a large number of relevant items are already available in existing item pools, e.g., A Catalog of Life History Items. Once selected, these items can then be validated and cross-validated with relative ease.

---

The result is that only job relevant questions (items empirically related to job success) are included in a given BIB. Items can be added or deleted in order to "streamline" instruments for different jobs or to increase prediction accuracy in a specific job. As a consequence of this standardizing procedure, the data are meaningful, the instrument is less subject to complaints of invasion of privacy, the items have greater "face validity" and they are less susceptible to "falsability" (Owens and Henry, 1966).

There is yet another advantage in the output of BIB information over that of personality inventories. BIB results turn out concrete information in the form of specific instances of behavior. Personality inventories, on the other hand, report results in a highly abstract manner. That is, personality inventory results are in the form of a profile, a profile which places an individual somewhere on a continuum of a given hypothetical construct (compared to the normal population). So far as making practical use of the data is concerned, there is no doubt that a superior's knowledge of what a subordinate can or can not do, has or has not done, would be more meaningful than a scale score on psychological-mindedness, for example.

Because BIB results are reported in terms of specific instances of behavior, the data make it possible to achieve real understanding quite beyond the unvarnished fact of empirical prediction. An examination of discriminating items can tell a great deal about which kinds of things a particular employee can do or would prefer to do best. Furthermore, BIB data are often able to explain why an employee can or
can not do a particular thing. Personality inventories do not have the capacity at this point in time to meaningfully answer the question "Why?"

Finely, and a most important consideration to industry, is the matter of cost. Personality inventories must be purchased as a unit. It costs the same amount of money per booklet regardless of whether 100 items or two items are shown to be valid predictors, and the unit must be purchased before it can be determined if any predictors are present. The EID, on the other hand, is tailor-made. There is no waste. In addition, EID's can readily be reproduced and are inexpensively scored.

Implications of This Research

All hypotheses of the present study were confirmed:

(a) Successful versus less successful business executives within an organization were found to have differing personality characteristics.

(b) College students were identified who possessed personality characteristics similar to those of the successful or less successful executives.

(c) Many of the same personal history antecedents that differentiated successful and less successful executives also discriminated between college seniors who possessed the same personality characteristics as the successful or less successful executives.

(d) College students who had different personality characteristics and life history antecedents also differed in their behavior in college.

This study has clearly indicated the utility of biographical information in the selection of college seniors with managerial potential. Secondly, results show a definite relationship between personality and EID data. It would seem that either could have been predicted from the other. These data also show both personality and
DE data to be capable of overcoming gross differences between the
college and executive populations (age, work experience, family roles,
status differences, etc.). Finally, these data suggest that not only
are characteristics related to success in management of a given company
be identified before a person is an employee of that firm, but that
these characteristics can apparently be identified early in life.

Future Research

The results of the present study were most encouraging. However,
before these findings can be utilized to their optimal effectiveness,
further research is needed. The areas of childhood background and
rate of maturing, personal habits and attitudes, interpersonal rela-
tions, educational background and occupational attitudes have been
shown to be very important in the development of a personality pattern
of someone who is likely to become a successful executive. Extensive
study of these areas may not only uncover additional predictors, but
may contribute to the understanding of how and why certain develop-
mental factors shape the behaviors of an individual in a given way.

Although there were a surprising number of items that discrimi-
nated both between successful and less successful executives and
between their counterparts in the college population, there were a
number of items that differentiated one population but not the other.
Reevaluation of these items may turn them into valid predictors.

Since these data were collected in a single corporation, gener-
alization of the findings is limited at this point. Consequently,
replications are needed in companies of various types and sizes.

The greatest need for future research is for longitudinal study. The present study utilized an immediate criterion of personality similarity with the result that its findings might well be spurious. Consequently, follow-up studies utilizing long range criteria which mirror the actual attainment of success in management are essential. Only then can the true value of these predictors be known.

If the generality of these data holds up under extensive replication and longitudinal study, questionnaires could be constructed that would be of untold value to industry in managerial selection. Instruments could be streamlined for optimal effectiveness in individual firms. In addition, predictive accuracy could be increased by weighting options on the basis of frequency and/or factor loadings.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

NAME________________________ AGE______ COLLEGE MAJOR____________________________

INSTRUCTIONS

Please read the questions carefully and answer each one as accurately as you can. Circle the number of the answer which is most nearly true for you. Some of the answers may not describe you exactly. In such cases, circle the number of the answer that comes closest to describing you. Be careful to circle only one answer for each question.

Please answer all of the questions.

1. What is your height?
   1. 5' to 5'4"  
   2. 5'5" to 5'7"  
   3. 5'8" to 5'10"
   4. 5'11" to 6'1"
   5. 6'2" or over

2. What is your weight?
   1. Under 150 lbs.  
   2. 151 to 170 lbs.  
   3. 171 to 185 lbs.  
   4. 186 to 200 lbs.  
   5. over 200 lbs.

3. What is your present marital status?
   1. Single  
   2. Married, no children  
   3. Married, one or more children  
   4. Widowed  
   5. Separated or Divorced

4. What is your present military status?
   1. Veteran  
   2. Member of the reserves  
   3. Member of the R.O.T.C.  
   4. Member of the national guard  
   5. None of the above

5. In how many different cities, towns, or townships have you lived during the first 18 years of your life?
   1. 1 to 3  
   2. 4 to 6  
   3. 7 to 9  
   4. 10 to 12  
   5. 13 or more

6. The place in which you spent the most time during your early life was:
   1. Farm  
   2. Town of less than 2,000  
   3. Town of 2,000 or more but less than 20,000  
   4. City of 10,000 to 100,000  
   5. City larger than 100,000
7. How often do you tell jokes?
   1. Frequently
   2. Occasionally
   3. Rarely
   4. Never

8. About how many fiction books have you read in the past year?
   1. None
   2. 1 or 2
   3. 3 or 4
   4. 5 to 9
   5. 10 or more

9. What do you feel has been your major accomplishment, outside of work?
   1. Family activities
   2. Community activities
   3. Development of yourself
   4. Development of your social activities
   5. Something else

10. How do you usually react in an unpleasant situation?
    1. Generally try to react immediately and figure out the best solution
    2. Most of the time you put off a decision for a little while so you can think it over
    3. Often waste time on it or put off a decision for quite awhile
    4. You don't worry about it, things will take care of themselves

11. When you go out to eat, what do you usually order?
    1. Foods that you are acquainted with that you know you like
    2. Foods that you are familiar with, but generally don't have at home for one reason or another
    3. Foods that you have never tried before

12. Which one of the following activities would you enjoy most?
    1. Develop the theory of operation of a new machine, e.g., automobile
    2. Supervise the manufacture of the machine
    3. Determine the cost of operation of the machine
    4. Sell the machine
    5. Prepare the advertising for the machine
    6. Teach others the use of the machine
    7. Interest the public in the machine through public speeches
    8. Other

13. Which one of the following factors do you believe to be the most important in determining whether a person in your profession will be successful or not?
    1. General intelligence
    2. Interest
    3. Personality
    4. A special "knack" for the work
    5. Ability to understand how other people feel
    6. Something else
14. How do you usually behave in a group of your associates?
   1. You feel free to express your views, and sway the group considerably
   2. You feel free to express your views, but the group doesn’t always share them
   3. You are reluctant to express your views, but they are usually very well received
   4. You are reluctant to express your views and unsure of their reception
   5. You don’t usually participate

15. How comfortable are you in a social situation?
   1. Always at ease in a social situation
   2. Usually at ease in a social situation
   3. Generally at ease, but occasionally feel uncomfortable in social situations
   4. Only occasionally at ease in a social situation, and quite often feel uncomfortable

16. How often do you feel dissatisfied with yourself?
   1. Frequently
   2. Occasionally
   3. Rarely
   4. Never

17. When you need an excuse to avoid doing something, what excuse do you usually use?
   1. A conflicting date
   2. A reasonable illness (e.g., headache)
   3. Some other work to do
   4. Don’t want to do it
   5. Something else

18. How often do you feel discouraged?
   1. Frequently
   2. Occasionally
   3. Rarely
   4. Never

19. In presenting a new idea, what do you generally do?
   1. See it through yourself
   2. Realize that someone else’s changes are pretty good
   3. Hold it back for awhile to see if it will work
   4. Turn it over to someone else to carry through

20. At what age did you start drinking alcoholic beverages?
   1. 13 to 16
   2. 17 to 20
   3. 21 or over
   4. Never drank

21. To what extent do you read daily newspapers?
   1. Read one or more newspapers thoroughly each day
   2. Read parts of more than one newspaper each day
   3. Read parts of one newspaper each day
   4. Read a newspaper two or three times per week
   5. Seldom read a newspaper
   6. Never read newspapers
12. The period during which I definitely decided on my primary undergraduate college major was:
   1. The first two years of high school or earlier
   2. The last two years of high school
   3. My freshman year in college
   4. My sophomore year in college
   5. My junior year in college or later

23. To how many magazines and periodicals do you subscribe (or read almost every issue)?
   1. None
   2. One
   3. 2 or 3
   4. 4 or 5
   5. 6 or more

24. At what age did you begin to smoke?
   1. 12 or younger
   2. 13 to 16
   3. 17 to 20
   4. 21 or over
   5. Never smoked

25. When your opinions differ from others, do you generally:
   1. Keep them to yourself
   2. Express them only to associates
   3. Express them regardless of the status of the person differing with you

26. How much of your time is devoted to religious activity?
   1. None
   2. 1 to 3 hours per week
   3. 4 to 10 hours per week
   4. 11 or more hours per week

27. Which of the following is most likely to make you feel uncomfortable or unhappy?
   1. Having a friend not speak to you
   2. Making a mistake in your work
   3. Being laughed at when some circumstance makes you look silly (accident, practical joke, etc.)
   4. Having to introduce yourself to someone you don't know

28. Concerning your present and future activities, do you:
   1. Make rather precise and detailed plans
   2. Make broad and general plans, but not detailed ones
   3. Make few plans, let "nature take its course

29. When you have an humiliating experience, how long do you worry about it?
   1. It doesn't bother you at all
   2. It bothers you for a little while but not for long
   3. You occasionally worry about it too long
   4. You quite often worry about it too long
30. How often do you feel self-conscious?
   1. Frequently  3. Rarely
   2. Occasionally  4. Never

31. When working on a project, do you do it over and over until it really expresses what you mean?
   1. Frequently  3. Rarely
   2. Occasionally  4. Never

32. How many cigarettes do you usually smoke each day?
   1. None  4. Over a package
   2. Half a package  5. Smoke cigars or pipes
   3. A package

33. In comparison with most of the other fellows your age, your general athletic ability was:
   1. Near the top  4. A little poorer than most
   2. Above average  5. Much poorer than most
   3. About the same as most

34. How often have you been sufficiently ill to require hospitalization?
   1. Never  4. Three times
   2. Once  3. Four or more times
   3. Twice

35. In recent years, your health has been:
   1. Excellent  4. Poor
   2. Good  5. Sometimes good and sometimes bad
   3. Fair

36. On the average, how much sleep do you require to feel really good?
   1. Less than 3 hours  4. 7 to 8 hours
   2. 3 to 6 1/2 hours  5. More than 8 hours
   3. 6 1/2 to 7 hours

37. How many serious illnesses have you had?
   1. None  3. 3 to 4
   2. 1 to 2 4. 5 or more

38. How many accidents or injuries have you had in the last 10 years?
   1. None  4. 5 or 6
   2. 1 or 2 5. 7 or more
   3. 3 or 4

39. How many days were you sick in bed last year?
   1. None  3. 3 to 5 days
   2. 1 to 2 days 4. 6 or more days
40. What is your attitude towards your health?
1. You never think about it
2. You consider it only to the extent of obtaining a periodic physical examination
3. It affects your recreational activities somewhat
4. It concerns your family, but not you
5. It handicaps you slightly

41. When you were ill as a child, what action did your family generally take?
1. Called a physician
2. Applied home remedies
3. "Let nature take its course"
4. None of the above

42. How many colds do you have each year?
1. None
2. 1 to 2
3. 3 or more

43. What have you done (or would you do) if a fellow worker had personal habits which you strongly disliked?
1. Be friendly and hope he would improve
2. Ask him directly to stop, if he were annoying you
3. Try to help him to improve his bad habits by pointing them out to him
4. Ignore him and his habits as much as possible
5. Try to get one of you transferred
6. None of the above

44. How often do you get together socially with friends?
1. Once or more times a week
2. Once or twice a month
3. Few times during a year
4. Almost never spend time socially with friends

45. Which of the following best describes your feelings towards most people?
1. I have very few close friends. Generally I do not meet people and make friends easily
2. I have a few close friends. Generally I meet people and make friends fairly easily although probably not as easily as most people
3. I probably have a little less than average number of close friends since I generally do not have the time or the interest to spend with them
4. I have about the average number of close friends, and I meet people and make friends about as well as most people
5. I have many close friends, and I try to take an interest in most of them. I meet people and make friends easier than most people
66. How well do people like you in a social group?
   1. I am well liked by practically everyone
   2. I am fairly well liked by most people
   3. I am not very well liked by most people

67. How often do you find that your first impression of a person is the right one?
   1. Frequently          3. Rarely
   2. Occasionally        4. Never

68. In your relations with other people do you try to:
   1. Please other people at any cost
   2. Please other people if it doesn't go against your own feelings
   3. Act according to your own feelings without regard to others' feelings

69. When you have a chance, how do you lead people?
   1. By driving them
   2. By showing them
   3. By kidding them into going along
   4. By setting an example

70. How often do younger people, outside of your immediate family, come to you for advice?
   1. Frequently        3. Rarely
   2. Occasionally      4. Never

71. How often do you tell other people your troubles?
   1. Never
   2. Not very often; prefer not to burden others with them
   3. Occasionally, to a few people
   4. Occasionally, to a number of people you can trust

72. When you made a wrong choice regarding a difficult decision, did you:
   1. Forget it because there was nothing you could do about it
   2. Try to forget it, but it kept popping up in your mind
   3. Condemn yourself for making such a mistake
   4. Feel you made the best choice you could at the time
   5. Something else

73. How many very close friends do you have today?
   1. None that fit that description 4. 5 or more
   2. 1 or 2                     5. 7 or more
   3. 3 or 4

74. Please indicate which of the following betting situations you would prefer if you were to wager $300 of your own money:
   1. 1 chance in 6 to win $1,000
   2. 3 chances in 6 to win $500
   3. 3 chances in 6 to win $600
   5. 3 chances in 6 to win $600
   6. You would prefer not to bet
55. What is the largest amount of money (not including home mortgages and automobile loans) that you have ever owed at one time to banks, individuals, or companies?
   1. Less than $100
   2. $100 to $999
   3. $1,000 to $4,999
   4. $5,000 or more

56. How much life insurance do you carry on your own life?
   1. None
   2. $1,000 to $7,500
   3. $7,500 to $12,000
   4. $12,500 to $25,000
   5. Over $25,000

57. Where did most of your spending money come from during the years you were in high school?
   1. Allowance from your family
   2. Your own earnings
   3. Partial allowance, partly earnings
   4. Other sources
   5. Had no spending money

58. Under normal conditions, how much of your yearly income do you plan to save as the head of a family?
   1. 5% or less
   2. 6% to 10%
   3. 11% to 15%
   4. 16% to 20%
   5. 21% or over

59. How many times during the past five years have you held a position as president, captain, or chairman of any clubs, teams, committees, or study groups?
   1. Never
   2. Once
   3. Two or three times
   4. Four or five times
   5. Six or more times

60. Do you now belong to any civic organizations, clubs, or social organizations? (Any group which has regular meetings and a definite membership)
   1. None
   2. One
   3. 2 or 3
   4. 4 to 6
   5. 7 or more

61. How many elective offices have you held in college?
   1. None
   2. One or 2
   3. 3 to 5
   4. 6 to 10
   5. 11 or more

62. To how many honor societies or fraternities have you belonged while in college?
   1. None
   2. One
   3. Two
   4. 3 or 4
   5. 5 or more
63. Which of the following have you ever organized or assisted in organizing?
1. Athletic team or sports competition
2. Financial or charity campaign to raise funds
3. Literary, debating, choral, or social clubs
4. Some other than the above
5. Have never had an opportunity to organize or assist in organizing any kind of club

64. In organizations you belong to, which best describes your participation?
1. Am not very active
2. Am a reliable member, but do not wish to hold a position of importance
3. Would like to hold an office, but have not been appointed to one
4. Have held at least one important office
5. Have held several important offices
6. Do not belong to any organizations

65. How many hobbies (including sports) do you now have?
1. None
2. One
3. Two
4. Three or more

66. Which of the following leisure activities do you like most?
1. Social relaxation with others, such as going to parties, dances, etc.
2. Reading, listening to records, or other things of this sort where you can be alone
3. Participating in sports
4. Observing sports
5. Pursuing a hobby
6. Attending performances of plays, concerts or other art events

67. What did you usually do during your school days when you found problems hard to understand?
1. Asked parents or teachers for help
2. Asked schoolmates for help
3. Solved the problem through your own efforts
4. Never had trouble understanding

68. Which school subjects did you enjoy the most?
1. Physical science, chemistry, physics, math
2. Natural science, biology, zoology
3. History, economics, civics
4. English, literature, foreign language
5. Shop courses
69. Which school subjects did you enjoy the least?
   1. Physical science, chemistry, physics, math
   2. Natural science, biology, ecology
   3. History, economics, civics
   4. English, literature, foreign language
   5. Shop courses

70. How often did you seriously consider quitting college?
   1. Never
   2. Once
   3. Occasionally
   4. Frequently
   5. Did quit one or more times

71. During your senior year, how did you compare with others of your own
    sex in rate of progress through school?
   1. Advanced much more rapidly than most
   2. Advanced a little faster than most
   3. About the same as most
   4. Progressed just a little slower than most

72. How would you classify yourself as a student in college?
   1. Considerably above average
   2. Somewhat above average
   3. Average
   4. Below average
   5. Poor

73. How did your teachers generally regard you in school?
   1. As able to get things done with ease
   2. As a hard worker
   3. As having highly developed interest in particular courses
   4. As not interested in school subjects
   5. As something of a "problem"

74. What percent of your college expenses did you earn?
   1. Less than 10%
   2. Between 10% and 25%
   3. Between 25% and 50%
   4. More than 50%

75. What do you feel has been your most outstanding positive experi-
    ence in your school life?
   1. Popularity with boys
   2. Popularity with girls
   3. Popularity with teachers
   4. Close friendships
   5. Achievement in sports
   6. Academic achievement

76. About how often did you change your mind about future vocational
    plans since the time you entered high school?
   1. Have not changed them
   2. Only once
   3. Two or three times
   4. Too many times to remember
   5. Have still not decided
77. When you were a high school student were you:
   1. One of the most active and popular students
   2. More active and popular than most students
   3. About as active and popular as most students
   4. Not quite as active and popular as most students
   5. Not very active and didn't have very many friends

78. How many hours a week did you spend on a part-time job while a senior in high school?
   1. None
   2. Less than 5 hours
   3. 5 to 10 hours
   4. More than 10 hours

79. During your past schooling, how would you compare yourself academically if you had done the very best you could?
   1. You would have been at the top of your class
   2. You would have been in the top 10%
   3. You would have been way above average
   4. You would have been above average
   5. You would have been average

80. What do you think is the most important thing a person should get out of college?
   1. Training for a profession
   2. General cultural knowledge
   3. Personal maturity
   4. Social polish

81. Do you feel that your grades in college are (were) equal to your capabilities?
   1. Yes, they were about as good as you could do
   2. No, they were poorer than you could do
   3. No, they were better than you really deserved

82. Which of the following best describes your attitude toward school work in college?
   1. Somewhat compulsive; you worried a good bit about it
   2. Of moderate concern; you worried to a minor extent
   3. Rather carefree; you seldom worried about it

83. In college, does (or did) it bother you not to have completed a class assignment on time?
   1. Yes, considerably
   2. Yes, somewhat
   3. Only slightly, or not at all

84. How heavy is (was) your usual course load in college?
   1. Heavier than average
   2. About average
   3. Lighter than average
85. Comparing yourself to others you work with, how do your decisions seem to stack up on quality?
   1. In most instances, your decisions are better
   2. About the same as decisions of others
   3. In most instances, your decisions are poorer
   4. Rarely make decisions

86. If you have a difficult decision to make what do you typically do?
   1. Make it just as soon as the evidence has been weighed
   2. Sleep on it and decide in the morning
   3. Think it over for two or three days
   4. Powder it carefully for a week or more

87. With regard to taking risks, which best describes you?
   1. Hardly ever take a risk
   2. Sometimes take a risk
   3. Generally take risks
   4. You're a gambler at heart

88. Decision making as a major part of a job:
   1. It right down your alley
   2. You can take it or leave it
   3. You like to narrow things down to two or three alternatives, but prefer someone else to take it from there
   4. Definitely not for you

89. How do you most want people to feel about you? (Mark one)
   1. Feel that you are capable
   2. Feel that you are tough but fair
   3. Feel that you are a "nice guy"
   4. Feel that you have a sense of humor
   5. Feel that you are exceptionally intelligent
   6. None of these

90. How have you reacted to the advantages and opportunities that have been presented to you?
   1. You have taken advantage of every opportunity
   2. You have generally tried to take advantage of any opportunity
   3. You have taken advantage of some and not of others
   4. You have not had too many opportunities, but have taken advantage of the ones you have had
   5. You have failed to take advantage of most opportunities presented

91. How do you feel about your self-confidence?
   1. You are very confident of yourself in any phase of activity
   2. You are quite confident of yourself in most phases of activity
   3. You have quite a bit of self-confidence about your social abilities, but you are not so self-confident about your intellectual ability
   4. You have quite a bit of self-confidence about your intellectual ability, but you are not so self-confident about your social ability
91. 3. You lack some self-confidence in both intellectual and social abilities

92. How do you usually act when you are angry?
1. Steam around for awhile letting off steam
2. Try not to show that you are angry at all
3. Never let your temper get the best of you
4. Talk it over with someone
5. Try to keep away from everybody for awhile
6. Something else

93. Which of the following is the most difficult for you to do?
1. Writing reports
2. Selling ideas to someone
3. Representing an employee
4. Speaking before a large group
5. Selling others on the importance of getting a job done

94. Where would you belong in a list of 100 typical people in the kind of job you can do best?
1. In the best 5%
2. In the upper third (but not the best 5%) 
3. In the middle third
4. In the lowest third

95. How good do you think you are, or could be, as a supervisor or manager?
1. In the top 5%
2. In the upper 20% (but not the top 5%)
3. In the upper half (but not the top 20%)
4. In the lower half

96. In the past, how have you reacted to competition?
1. Have done your best in competitive situations
2. Have been unaffected by it
3. Have done all right, but haven't liked it
4. Undeterred
5. In some unspecified way

97. Which of the following do you find most annoying in yourself?
1. Inability to remember names
2. Irritability
3. Distractability
4. Tendency to "daydream"
5. Tendency to worry
6. Failure to do your best

98. Which of the following best describes you?
1. Socially introverted—not a joiner
2. A dreamer—would rather speculate than plunge into action
3. Unconventional—not much influenced by precedent
4. Physically lazy—intrigued with all labor saving devices and techniques
5. Dislike routine or detailed work
99. Which of the following least describes you?
   1. Socially introverted—not a joiner
   2. A dreamer—would rather speculate than plunge into action
   3. Unconventional—not much influenced by precedent
   4. Physically lazy—intrigued with all labor saving devices and techniques
   5. Dislike routine or detailed work

100. Viewing yourself as objectively as possible, would you describe
     yourself as:
     1. Aggressive
     2. Occasionally aggressive but typically not
     3. Passive

101. If you have thought about something and come to a conclusion, how
     hard is it for someone else to change your mind?
     1. Not difficult at all
     2. Somewhat difficult
     3. Very difficult
     4. Impossible

102. In the matter of religion, how would you classify yourself?
     1. Strongly religious
     2. Moderately religious
     3. An agnostic
     4. An atheist

103. Do you consider yourself as:
     1. Very nervous or tense person
     2. Fairly tense person
     3. Relaxed person except when there are many home, school or work
        problems
     4. Relaxed person on most occasions
     5. Person with an unusually low boiling point

104. In the course of a week, which of the following gives you the
     greatest satisfaction?
     1. Being told you have done a good job
     2. Helping people solve their problems
     3. Being with your family and close friends
     4. Having free time to use as you please
     5. None of these

105. Which of the following do you enjoy most?
     1. Talking with friends
     2. Spending time with your family
     3. Physical activities
     4. Reading
     5. None of the above

106. How disturbed are you if something is left unfinished?
     1. Slightly
     2. Moderately
     3. Considerably
     4. Highly
107. **How do you regard puzzles?**
   1. As interesting
   2. As frustrating
   3. As absorbing
   4. As tiring
   5. As time wasting

108. **Do you prefer to talk to or visit with:**
   1. One close friend
   2. One or two casual acquaintances
   3. A small group
   4. A large group
   5. Members of your immediate family

109. **Which of the following do you like most?**
   1. Outdoor sports, football, baseball, etc.
   2. Fishing, camping, hunting
   3. Reading, stamp collecting
   4. Building things, woodworking, crafts
   5. None of the above appeals to you

110. **What do you consider to be the major motivating force in your life?**
   1. Prestige
   2. Material gains
   3. To keep up with something new
   4. To gain a position of security
   5. To help others
   6. Something else

111. **Which of the following seems most important to you?**
   1. A pleasant home and family life
   2. A challenging and exciting job
   3. Getting ahead in the world
   4. Being active and accepted in community affairs
   5. Making the most of your particular ability

112. **How enjoyable do you find it to talk to people you don’t know?**
   1. Almost always enjoy it
   2. Usually enjoy it
   3. Occasionally enjoy it
   4. Do not usually enjoy it
   5. Almost never enjoy it

113. **What is social prominence to you?**
   1. A matter of extreme importance
   2. Moderately important in your life
   3. Something which concerns you very slightly
   4. Something to be ignored

114. **Which of the following is most important to you?**
   1. Professional status or authority
   2. Money
   3. Family and friends
   4. Religion
   5. Recreation
115. Which of the following is least important to you?
1. Professional status or authority
2. Money
3. Family and friends
4. Religion
5. Recreation

116. Do you think you could best judge a man from knowing his:
1. Taste in clothes
2. Choice of recreations
3. What his wife is like
4. Educational background
5. Political and/or religious affiliation

117. In what section of town did your family live longest while you were growing up?
1. Lived in one of the most exclusive sections of town
2. Lived in a good but not the best section
3. Lived in an average section of town
4. Lived in one of the poorer sections of town
5. Lived in a rural area

118. When you were in high school, the money which your family had was:
1. Less than most of the families of your classmates
2. About the same as the families of your classmates
3. A little more than the families of your classmates
4. Considerably more than the families of your classmates

119. Would you describe your father as:
1. A "pal" who was more like an older companion than a parent
2. A formal sort of person
3. A dominating person who gave you close attention and supervision
4. A person with other interests that seemed to detract from his attention to the family
5. None of the above

120. Using your own interpretation of what success means, do you feel that your father has been successful?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Partly
4. Not sure

121. To approximately how many clubs and social organizations did your father belong?
1. None
2. One
3. 2 to 4
4. 5 or more
5. Don't know

122. How much independence do you feel your parents allowed you while you were in high school?
1. Quite restrictive
2. About as much as the rest of your friends
3. Quite lenient
4. As much as you wanted
122. Practically none
6. Did not live with your parents while you were in high school

123. How old were you when you had the first major responsibility for choosing your own clothing?
1. In junior high school
2. In high school
3. In college
4. While in the service

124. How old were you when you first learned to swim?
1. Under 10 years old
2. 10 to 12 years old
3. 13 to 16 years old
4. 17 or over
5. Never learned to swim

125. As a youngster, how did you "let off steam" when you got angry?
1. By fighting
2. By kicking or throwing something
3. by "cussing"
4. By talking it over with someone
5. I didn't--I tried to hide my anger
6. Other

126. Looking back on the days you spent in your family or childhood home, how happy were you?
1. Very happy
2. Quite happy most of the time
3. Neither very happy nor very unhappy
4. A little on the unhappy side
5. Very unhappy

127. What kind of upbringing did you have?
1. Strict but fair
2. Strict and unfair
3. Inconsistent
4. Not very strict
5. Almost no discipline

128. As a child, to whom did you confide in most?
1. Your father
2. Your mother
3. A brother or sister
4. Some other person
5. You usually confided in no one

129. While you were growing up how often did your parents entertain friends?
1. Frequently
2. Occasionally
3. Rarely
4. Never

130. How did your parents feel about social activities?
1. Very active in social matters
2. Usually engaged in some social function
3. Normal if not very active
4. Very seldom concerned with social matters
131. What is the largest number of people your father employed or supervised at any one time during his most active years?
1. More than 100
2. 25 to 100
3. 5 to 24

4. Less than 5
5. None, or don't know

132. Religion in your home was considered as:
1. An integral part of your home life
2. One of several factors which were important
3. A relatively unimportant factor
4. Something to be left out of your family life

133. As a young person, when you did something well, whose praise did you value most?
1. A friend
2. A teacher
3. Your parents
4. Someone else
5. Did things well for your own satisfaction

134. When you were a child, did your parents give you any material rewards for bringing home good grades from school?
1. Frequently
2. Occasionally
3. Rarely
4. Never

135. As a youngster, how often were you a leader in your group's "gang" activities?
1. Frequently
2. Occasionally
3. Rarely
4. Never
5. You were not a member of a group

136. In high school, did you:
1. Lead a clique or gang
2. Belong to a clique or gang
3. Know the members of a clique well, but did not join
4. Keep to yourself
5. None of the above

137. Which of the following activities gave you the greatest pleasure while you were in high school?
1. Participation in or attending organized high school events
2. Social interaction with other students (dancing, dating, etc.)
3. Participation in organized school activities including play, band, and student government
4. Participating in athletics
5. Achieving academic success and recognition
6. None of the above

138. Between the ages 12 and 15, did you belong to:
1. The Boy Scouts
2. Some other adult sponsored group
3. An organized group of children of your own age without adult sponsorship
4. None of the above
5. You had no opportunity to join a group
139. What was your father's chief occupation?
1. Unskilled work
2. Semi-skilled or skilled work
3. Business man (sales work, office work, etc.)
4. Supervisory work
5. Sub-professional (bookkeeper, pharmacist, draftsman, surveyor, etc.)
6. Professional or scientific (lawyer, doctor, minister, teacher, chemist, engineer, etc.)
7. Executive of large business or industry
8. Owned own business and employed others

140. How much education did your father have?
1. 0 to 6 years--grade school
2. 7 to 8 years--junior high school
3. 9 to 12 years--high school
4. Some college
5. College degree
6. A graduate degree (M.A., M.S., Ph.D.)

1.1. How much education did your mother have?
1. 0 to 6 years--grade school
2. 7 to 8 years--junior high school
3. 9 to 12 years--high school
4. Some college
5. College degree
6. A graduate degree (M.A., M.S., Ph.D., etc.)

142. While you were growing up how much freedom did you have concerning your evenings?
1. None
2. Could go out on weekends only
3. Your parents only indicated the hour by which you should be in
4. Your parents only restricted you as a disciplinary matter
5. No restrictions at all were placed on your freedom

143. During your grammar and/or high school days, in which type of activity did you participate the most? (Mark one)
1. Athletics
2. Boy Scouts, 4-H club, FFA, YMCA, etc.
3. Student government, school politics
4. Student paper, science clubs, band, glee club, drama, etc.
5. Worked or studied most of the time and did not participate

144. When you first were alone on a trip of over 100 miles, your age was:
1. Younger than 10 years
2. 10 to 12 years
3. 13 to 15 years
4. 16 to 18 years
5. 18 or older

145. When you earned your first money on a regular job (other than from members of your family), your age was:
1. 12 years or younger
2. 13 to 15 years
3. 16 to 18 years
4. over 18 years
5. never earned money on a regular job
146. The most desirable distance between one's home and college would be:
   1. Less than 25 miles
   2. 25 to 100 miles
   3. 100 to 500 miles
   4. More than 500 miles

147. Would you describe your mother as:
   1. A well-intentioned but overly-possessive person
   2. A formal sort of person
   3. A domineering person who gave you close attention and supervision
   4. A person with other interests that seemed to detract from her attention to the family
   5. A flighty and unpredictable person
   6. A very consistent person
   7. None of the above

148. What is the highest rank you attained in the Boy Scouts?
   1. Was not in the Boy Scouts
   2. Tenderfoot
   3. Second Class
   4. First Class
   5. Star
   6. Life
   7. Eagle

149. Did your parents live together all of the time you were growing up?
   1. Yes
   2. No, because one died
   3. No, because they both died
   4. No, because they separated
   5. No, because they divorced

150. For commendable behavior as a child, how were you usually rewarded?
   1. Praised
   2. Given a present
   3. Allowed a special privilege
   4. Given no special attention
   5. Something else

151. How were you usually punished as a child?
   1. Punished physically
   2. Reprimanded verbally, or deprived of something
   3. Told how you should have acted
   4. Warned not to do it again, but seldom punished
   5. Sent to bed
   6. None of the above

152. How old were you when you went on your first date?
   1. 13 or younger
   2. 14 to 16
   3. 17 to 19
   4. Over 19

153. How old were you when you first "went steady?"
   1. 13 or younger
   2. 14 to 16
   3. 17 to 19
   4. 20 or older
   5. Never went steady
154. While in high school, about how many evenings a week did you go out?
   1. Did not go out at all while in high school
   2. One 4. 3 or 4
   3. Two 5. 5 or more

155. How often have you been in love?
   1. You have never been in love
   2. You have been in love only once
   3. You have been in love twice 4. You have been in love three times
   5. You have been in love four or more times

156. During my teens my parents and I got along:
   1. Very well; we agreed on almost everything
   2. Better than most
   3. About average; as well as other family groups
   4. Not very well; we had many disagreements
   5. Not at all; we almost never agreed

157. During my last full-time year of undergraduate college, the number of hours per week that I spent in study outside of class was about:
   1. 5 or less
   2. 6 to 10
   3. 11 to 15
   4. 16 to 20
   5. More than 20

158. How often do you need to take sleeping aids in order to get a good night's rest?
   1. Frequently
   2. Occasionally
   3. Rarely
   4. Never

159. How frequently do you play golf?
   1. Frequently
   2. Occasionally
   3. Rarely
   4. Never

160. How many hours per week of physical exercise (golf, bowling, swimming, yard work, etc.) did you average during the past three or four months?
   1. None
   2. 1 to 2 hours
   3. 3 to 4 hours
   4. 5 to 6 hours
   5. 7 or more times

161. In comparison to your friends, how do you think your appearance is regarded by the opposite sex?
   1. Your friends are all better looking
   2. You are not quite as good looking as most of them
   3. You are equal to most of them in appearance
   4. You are better looking than most in appearance
162. How old were you when you had a reasonably accurate understanding of sex and sexual relations?
   1. 12 years or younger
   2. 13 to 15 years
   3. 16 to 18 years
   4. 19 years or older

163. Which of the following conditions do you think you would dislike most in your next job?
   1. Incomplete explanation of policies
   2. Poor pay
   3. Lack of cooperation between employees
   4. Poor planning of work
   5. Poor working conditions
   6. Lack of recognition
   7. Resistance to new ideas

164. For what reason did you choose your particular profession (or college major)?
   1. Interest in the area
   2. Influence of parent(s)
   3. Influence of friends or relatives other than parents
   4. Opportunities available in the field
   5. Other

165. When you need to solve a tough work or school problem, what do you usually do?
   1. Sit down and figure it out yourself
   2. Talk it over with friends or your wife
   3. Talk it over with some of the fellows at work or school
   4. Talk it over with your boss or teacher
   5. Let it ride for awhile, then tackle it with a fresh view
   6. Other

166. How do you feel about jobs requiring many routine operations, calculations, etc.?
   1. Rather enjoy routine once you get the hang of it
   2. Do not mind them once in awhile
   3. Indifferent, take it or leave it
   4. Dislike them, but would take one if necessary or advantageous
   5. Would not take one under any circumstance

167. Would your choice of an ideal job be one which:
   1. Allowed a great amount of interaction with other people
   2. Would require working with a small group
   3. Would allow you to work closely with one other person
   4. Would allow you to work by yourself

168. Which of the following strikes you as the most important feature about a job?
   1. The kind of work you actually do
   2. The amount of money you make
168. 1. What others think of people who do this job
    4. The security the job can give you
    5. The ways in which you can use the job to eventually get a better one

169. As you planned your career, what was your primary goal?
    1. Personal satisfaction
    2. Excitement and opportunity
    3. Economic security
    4. Pleasant living for you and your family
    5. Something else

170. Working with others on the job:
    1. Makes the work more pleasant
    2. Increases tensions
    3. Interferes with getting the work done
    4. Helps by providing new ideas and giving support
    5. Does not make much difference

171. Generally, in your work assignments would you prefer:
    1. To work on one thing at a time
    2. To work on a couple of things at a time
    3. To have many things "on the fire" simultaneously

172. Regarding responsibility in your job, would you:
    1. Like to have a good deal of responsibility
    2. Like to have some responsibility but still have someone responsible over you
    3. Prefer a minimum of responsibility
    4. Rather not have any responsibility

173. Which one of the following goals would you most like to reach during the next ten years?
    1. Earn a large amount of money
    2. Become a top-flight professional in your field
    3. Be in a position where you can be free to work on ideas that interest you
    4. Become an executive
    5. Something else

174. When being interviewed for a job, how much difficulty do you experience in talking to the interviewer?
    1. Very much
    2. Some
    3. Little
    4. None

175. Which one of the following statements best describes the usual condition of your desk or work place?
    1. Quite orderly
    2. Neither orderly nor disorderly
    3. Rather disorderly
    4. Very disorderly
    5. No particular pattern
176. What is the top salary you eventually expect to attain?
1. $5,000 to $10,000  
2. $10,000 to $15,000  
3. $15,000 to $20,000  
4. $20,000 to $30,000  
5. Over $30,000

177. You would prefer a job in which you would:
1. Be free to experiment and try new methods  
2. Be given broad supervision with the details left up to you  
3. Follow a relatively set procedure and always know what to do  

178. Without any false modesty, the position you expect to attain in the company that employs you is:
1. President or chairman of the board  
2. The top executive level (vice president, director, or a principal office)  
3. The top management level below the executives (head of a major function or area)  
4. The next level below (a division of a major function or area or a top staff position)  
5. The next level below (a supervisory or staff position)  
6. A non-supervisory or operating position  

179. In thinking about your abilities in administrative and supervisory activities on the one hand and in technical and scientific activities on the other, you believe that you have the greatest chances for success in positions which area:
1. Entirely administrative and supervisory  
2. Primarily administrative with some technical work  
3. About equally divided between administrative and technical work  
4. Primarily technical with some administrative work  
5. Entirely technical and scientific  

180. What is your present grade point average? ________________

181. Are you a member of a social fraternity? ________________ Which one:

182. What professional or honor fraternities do you belong to?

183. What other organizations are you a member of?

184. What offices do you hold (or have you held) in any of the above?

185. Are you in R.O.T.C.? ________________ What is your rank?
186. Are you affiliated with the student government association?____
   Were you ever elected to an office?____ Which one(s)?________

187. How often have you been interviewed for a job in recent months?___

188. How many visit offers have you received?__________________________

189. How many job offers have you received?__________________________
APPENDIX B

COMPARISON OF OPTION SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
IN COLLEGE AND EXECUTIVE POPULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Option Number</th>
<th>Executive Population</th>
<th>College Population</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &lt; *</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &lt; *</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.005 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.005 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.005 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.005 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In reading Appendix B, frequency is always compared with the successful group. Thus, when the successful group has the greater frequency " > " is used, and when the less successful group has the greater frequency " < " is used.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Option Number</th>
<th>Executive Population</th>
<th>College Population</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.005 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.005 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.005 &lt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.005 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Option Number</th>
<th>Executive Population</th>
<th>College Population</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.005 &lt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.005 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.005 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.91 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.005 &lt;</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Option Number</th>
<th>Executive Population</th>
<th>College Population</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>.005 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>.005 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.005 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.003 &gt;</td>
<td>.003 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.003 &lt;</td>
<td>.003 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>.025 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.005 &gt;</td>
<td>.005 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.005 &lt;</td>
<td>.005 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>.05 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>.01 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Option Number</th>
<th>Executive Population</th>
<th>College Population</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Option Number</th>
<th>Executive Population</th>
<th>College Population</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>0.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.001 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.01 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.025 &lt;</td>
<td>0.05 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.001 &gt;</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.05 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001 &lt;</td>
<td>0.05 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.001 &gt;</td>
<td>0.005 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>0.005 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>0.005 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01 &lt;</td>
<td>0.05 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.05 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.001 &gt;</td>
<td>0.001 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.005 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>0.21 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.025 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05 &lt;</td>
<td>0.001 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.001 &lt;</td>
<td>0.005 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.001 &gt;</td>
<td>0.001 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.005 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.05 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001 &gt;</td>
<td>0.05 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.001 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.01 &gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01 &gt;</td>
<td>0.025 &gt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.001 &lt;</td>
<td>0.01 &lt;</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.01 &lt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX C**

**OPTION SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL IN THE COLLEGE POPULATION, ITEMS 181-189**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.001 &gt;*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>.001 &lt;**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>.001 &lt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In reading Appendix C, frequency is always compared with the "successful group." That is, when the "successful group has the greater frequency of responses" '>' is used, and when the "less successful group has the greater frequency of responses," '<' is used.*
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