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ABSTRACT

This is a study of the psychodynamics of leadership among 350 business and military elites. The participants in the study are mid-career corporate business executives (presidents, vice-presidents, general managers) who attended a development program at the Harvard School of Business in 1977, and two samples of mid-career officers currently attending the Air War College and the Air Command and Staff College (majors, lt. colonels and colonels).*

The study has been carried out through the use of survey research and a multi-method, multi-trait approach.

Framed in the typological tradition, it shows how four type-specific clusters of "personality" attributes lead to four particular visions of the world and four distinct ways of grappling with the world as reconstructed by those visions.

*The business elite represent about 35 national and multi-national corporations.
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By tracing the internal dynamics of each of our four leadership "types" (the rational, existential, administrative and entrepreneurial men), we have been able to empirically demonstrate how some important elements of leadership style (particularly the taking of initiatives and innovation attempts in large bureaucracies) derive from "personality."

The study show that the extent to which initiatives are taken and success pursued is the result of the interface between the way one feels about himself, and the way in which one views the world. A combinatorial pattern which permits externalization is characteristic of the leader who attempts system transformation; the interface of worldview and self which promotes internalization is characteristic of the manager who feels most secure promoting system maintenance.

The study concludes by systematizing the psychological differences which characterize leaders and managers. These differences are then placed into three analytic formulas which derive from Lasswell's famous explanation of political man.

Lucian W. Pye, Thesis Supervisor
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CHAPTER ONE

Classifying Political Men

Why is it that some men are marked by qualities which make them worthy of leadership, others by qualities which destine them forever to be followers? In trying to answer this keynote question, thinkers have been led to classify men, attributing to them some ideal or distinctive characteristic which distinguishes them from the common man. Few have been so vivid as Plato, or more prosaic:

"Citizens we shall say to them in our tale, you are brothers, yet God has framed you differently. Some of you have the power of command, and in the composition of these he has mingled gold, wherefore also they have the greatest honor; others he has made of silver, to be auxiliaries; others again who are to be husbandmen and craftsmen he has composed of brass and iron...and God proclaims as a first principle to the rulers, and above all else, that there is nothing that they should so anxiously guard, or of which they are to be such good guardians, as of the purity of the race.... For an oricle says that when a man of brass or iron guards the state, it will be destroyed."

Following Plato, some powerful and picturesque classifications focusing on leadership "types" have been developed. During the Renaissance, Machiavelli envisioned a world inhabited
by lions and foxes whose cunning and prowess enabled them to rise above (if not wile their way around) the common man. During the late 19th and 20th centuries, Pareto sought to classify powrholders or elites, and while he was hesitant to animate his "types" of leaders with the instincts of the lion or the fox, his typology was remarkably similar to that of Machiavelli--Pareto maintained that the ruling elite governed by "cunning" or "force."  

While the "types" of men described by Plato are cast of gold, silver, iron and brass, modern thinkers have been less ready to cast their "types" of men in such pure or solid forms. Ignoring the wisdom of the oracle, modern social scientists no longer ask the same guiding or keynote question. The nature of our inquiry has changed, our level of ignorance reflected in perhaps the more appropriate and current question which guides our work: "What is leadership?" Is it a unique personality characteristic as the ancients have suggested, a structurally determined role, or a special combination of personality, opportunity and fate? 

There is at present little agreement on whether "leadership" is any or all of the above. While psychologists have often viewed leadership as a personality variable, sociologists have viewed
leadership as somehow structurally determined. Political scientists, depending on their persuasion, have viewed it as either one or the other, or some combination of both, steering a safe and perhaps reasonable middle ground.

As the debate continues, it is becoming more and more apparent that further research will not yield a ready set of answers to the problems raised in posing the current question. Nevertheless, through the years many thinkers have analyzed the "leader" and considered his acts of leadership (and the style by which he exercises his "power") as deriving from "personality."

Since Lasswell's famous trichotomy of agitators, administrators, and theorists first published in 1930, a series of attempts at understanding not only the behaviors exhibited by different types of political leaders, but their private sources of motivation as well, have been generated. In a more or less empirical vein, Spranger, Barber, Maccoby and others have sought to distinguish types of leaders by not only examining salient patterns of behavior, but the psychological preconditions thought to actuate that behavior. McClelland has sought to understand a special type of modern man, the "entrepreneur," much as did Schumpeter and Weber before him.
Man is a complex animal living in a complex world. "Leadership" as a phenomenon reflects this complexity, and one way in which leadership may be analyzed is to simplify its variegated forms. Typology-building, which seeks to embrace a whole range of disparate behaviors in a systematic and organized fashion, is an appropriate tool of analysis. Max Weber, in his Methodology for the Social Sciences, has succinctly described the power of the typology, an analytic tool at least as old as Plato:

"The construction of abstract ideal types recommends itself not as an end but as a means. [The ideal-type] is a conceptual construct (Gedankenbild) which is neither historical reality nor even "true" reality.... It has the significance of a purely ideal limiting concept with which the real situation or action is compared and surveyed for the explication of certain of its significant components. Such concepts are constructs in terms of which we formulate relationships by the application of the category of objective possibility. By means of this category, the adequacy of our imagination, oriented and disciplined by reality, is judged." ⁹

(1.1) Leadership and Power in Bureaucracies

The present study is a direct examination of the needs, drives, and private motivations of an American business and military elite. Shaped in the typological tradition, it will focus on leadership style through examination of more than 350
de facto powerholders. The typology with which the reader will be presented has been designed not only as a social-psychological classificatory schema, but as a vehicle by which a series of leadership behaviors and general traits of style may be explicated and understood.

"Organization Man" and the "Self-Starter" in Bureaucracies

Many bureaucratic leaders are effective norm enforcers, "organization men" who nimbly execute organizational directives and established policy. An inertia of habituation characterizes their leadership style. A select few, however, are deft at initiating directives and policy, and in so doing, perhaps even create norms.

Of central concern to us is the leader who takes initiatives. The "self-starter," as we shall call such a leader, is a self-directed and continuously motivated man who takes initiative for the betterment of his organization. Not coincidentally, some self-starters may take initiatives for the betterment of themselves—to acquire more prestige, to enlarge their domain of power, or even to compensate for some real or perceived inadequacy. It is evident that both the "organization man" and the self-starter" are needed by the organization because both serve important functions.
The designations "organization man" and the "self-starter" are, of course, ideal-types or pure forms, but they are surely more fluid than Plato's men of gold, silver, brass or iron. There is some "self-starter" and some "organization man" in every bureaucratic elite.

The "organization man" and the "self-starter" are different kinds of leaders, marked by qualitatively different characteristics. While the self-starter acts on impulse from within, the organization man reacts to imperatives framed outside himself—imperatives, or perhaps force of habit generated by the norms of his organization and its attendant role expectations.

But what makes the self-starter "tick"? Does the self-starter as differentiated from the average bureaucratic leader take initiatives because he is comfortable with his place in the organizational hierarchy, confident of his abilities, and supported by superiors and subordinates alike? Is he a man who is psychologically distantiated from the anxieties tied to leadership, free to act on his creative impulses? Or does the self-starter, much like Weber's entrepreneurial man, take initiative, seek to have impact, and attempt to bring about organizational change because of some insecurities he
may be harboring--insecurities which may "cause" him to act? Is it possible that the self-starter is driven to act on his environment out of fear that it will act on him, and with negative consequences? Could it be (as Lasswell suggests) that a personal sense of insecurity or anxiety, a sense of weakness, could provide the psychological impetus for taking forms of action which could be of benefit to the organization (personal benefits accruing to the self-starter not withstanding)? Does the self-starter, the man who takes initiative, the leader who strays from the normative path laid before him by his organization, take risks that the organization man avoids, even fears? Can we equate such risk-taking with attempts at innovation?

Throughout this work attempts will be made to answer these and related questions about leadership personality and behavior in complex organizations.

Traditionally bureaucracies have been criticized as being the natural habitat of people who wish to avoid risks and are fearful of taking initiatives. Equally uncomplimentary has been the popular view that those who are the most successful in climbing bureaucratic ladders are usually overly-ambitious, power-conscious people who are primarily concerned
with their own interests. Psychologically oriented research about people in bureaucracies has tended to parallel these layman views, often dwelling on the presumed "crippling" effects of success in hierarchical organizations. What has not been adequately studied is why some leaders are motivated to take initiatives and expend their initiatives for creative purposes. What are the psychological characteristics of such motivated people? How do they differ from those who are less successful, and less prepared to be activists?

Before answering these questions and developing both our typology and the theory of the self-starter, let us take a brief look at the leaders who are the subjects of this study.

The sample of leaders who have been analyzed for this work are recent graduates of a mid-career executive program at the Harvard Business School and mid-career Air Force officers currently attending the Air War College and the Air Command and Staff College.*

*Within the framework of our basic concern with identifying the characteristics and motivations of the activist organizational leader, comparisons between business and military groups will be made. The study as a whole, however, will not be a general descriptive comparison of the two groups.
The rigorous screening procedures employed by these two institutions, coupled with corporate business and Pentagon appointment procedures, allow us to predict that a large proportion of executives and officers attending these institutions will very shortly join the American business and military elite. Many are already part of these elites.\textsuperscript{10}

Business executives currently enrolled in the Program for Management Development at Harvard University have a mean age of about 37. About 97 percent are men, and most are married. About 28 percent of all students entering the program already have an M.A. or Ph.D in their field(s) of specialization, and they have worked professionally for about 12 years. On the average, mid-career people have worked in over three separate positions in their sponsoring organizations, and earn a salary well over three times the national average. Some of the older participants earn over $100,000 per year.\textsuperscript{11}

In total, 31.5 percent of the executives are one level away from the Chief Executive Officer position in their companies, 31.2 percent are two levels away, and about 20 percent are three levels away. The average number of subordinates reporting to the typical program participant is
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171, while for a handful it is greater than 1,000. These elites represent over 39 industries, with large numbers coming from banking, the chemical industry, the electronic machine industry, the oil industry, and other concerns whose decisions greatly affect the everyday lives of the mass public.

Follow-up data on past program members clearly indicate that participants have been carefully pre-selected by sponsoring organizations, and will attain some of the most powerful positions possible in their respective industries. Many are already vice-presidents and general managers for multi-national conglomerates.

(Table 1.1) The Business Elite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Industry</th>
<th>Position Within Industry (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>utilities</td>
<td>petroleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction</td>
<td>government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing</td>
<td>electronics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banking</td>
<td>computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemicals</td>
<td>transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foods</td>
<td>steel/mets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insurance</td>
<td>land development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aerospace</td>
<td>engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=71)
Now let us briefly describe the military elite who participated in this study.

A study of military elites in transition by Margiotta\textsuperscript{12} has shown that a major compositional shift has taken place within the last two decades. During all but the last few years in United States history, military elites have come largely from rural Southern backgrounds, and have had less formal education than other elite segments of society. Within the last two decades, however, the composition of the officer class has changed, so much so that a majority of our military leaders are now coming from the Northern industrial states. Concurrently, a strong emphasis has been placed by the military on technical and educational skills, and therefore many officers now have advanced degrees (65 percent as compared with 28 percent for our business population). The social and psychological implications of such a shift are multiple, and affect not only intra-military relations, but relations between the military and society at large. Let us take a look at the composition of military elites which have participated in this study.
(Table 1.2) The Military Elite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Management Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major (155)</td>
<td>Air Command and Staff College</td>
<td>Mid-level Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Colonel (76)</td>
<td>Air War College</td>
<td>Upper-mid-level Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel (29)</td>
<td>Air War College</td>
<td>Executive-level Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=261)

These officers are rigorously selected out of a much larger pool of their colleagues. Only 16 to 22 percent of all Major selectees attend intermediate schools (such as the Air Command and Staff College) and only between 12 and 18 percent of those selected for Lt. Colonel attend senior schools (such as the Air War College). On-time Colonel promotees (or Colonels who have not been promoted in an accelerated fashion) do not attend senior service schools. Our military sample then is composed of proven mid-career elite officers. Many, especially among Colonels and Lt. Colonels, will move into decision-making capacities in the Pentagon.

Though many of the military elite will assume staff positions upon completion of their intermediate and senior school training, the three most important shared character-
istics of the group are the following "heroic attributes": 1) aeronautical rating as a pilot; 2) combat experience; and 3) experience in a command position.\textsuperscript{14}

Empirical data have been derived from samples of two divergent elite populations because the following analysis seeks to describe types of elite self-starters and their leadership style. This study will thus be largely limited to \textit{intra-elite} comparisons. However, a number of measures which have been used in the survey research instrument which all respondents have completed have generally been widely tested with non-elite groups. Comparative reference will therefore be made to non-elite groups where baseline data are available.

Within our elite sample we will identify the "self-starters" both by psychological measurement, and by career advancement records. Among the Air Force Officers we have records of those who are "above the zone" (that is, promoted ahead of their peer class), "in the zone" (promoted with their peers), and those "below the zone" (those promoted more slowly than the majority of their peers). These official promotional classifications will be referred to throughout the work.
The Importance of Psychology in Explaining Elite Behavior

Possibly the dominant school in administrative theory has been the one which stresses structural imperatives and communications patterns in decision-making and problem-solving. While some scholars of this school have sought to minimize, if not completely deny, the importance of personality, most have recognized in varying degrees that personality can be an important and at times decisive factor in administrative behavior. Herbert Simon in the preface to Administrative Behavior states that "the central concern of administrative theory is with the boundary between the rational and the non-rational aspects of human social behavior." Similarly, Amitai Etzioni in his classic study A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations states that elites differ according to the "source of their power," which may be derived from "the actual organizational office, his personal characteristics, or both."

A second major school in the mainstream of administrative theory attempts to apply the findings and methods of social psychology to organizational behavior. Katz and Kahn deal primarily with human relations within organizations, but they also treat the problem of leadership, which is the concern of this work. Their typology of leadership styles, much like
that of Downs,\textsuperscript{20} revolves around types of strategies and
cognitive skills employed by leaders, but to the extent
that they treat affective considerations it is largely in
the context of inter-personal relationships and not basic
human motivations.

A third tradition which this study utilizes is that
of the "elite theorists." This is a tradition which has
been strongly sociological in that attention has been drawn
to the background or demographic characteristics of elites.\textsuperscript{21}
It is true that one of the earliest elite theorists, Gaetana
Mosca, did try to identify the distinctive inner quality of
elite classes, but he could say little more than that the
individuals of which these classes were comprised had greater
"vigor" and "drive" than the common man. Similarly, Pareto
attempted to identify an elite model personality, but as
Carl Fredrich has said, Pareto failed "to show that 'elites'
as defined by him possess a distinctive group characteristic."\textsuperscript{22}
Indeed, in general it can be said that this sociological
tradition has acknowledged the importance of psychological
variables, but at Bottomore has commented:

"...little or no attempt is made to establish
by exact methods of investigation that the...
kinds of personality which are alleged to
determine
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the characteristics of...elites actually exist, or to describe them precisely in psychological terms, or to show that there are no other varieties of political personality." 23

Although the present study relates in varying degrees to these essentially structural, social psychological and sociological elite traditions, it is above all a study of the disparate motivations and worldviews experienced by successful elites. As such, it belongs to a long and theoretically strong tradition which has not received as much attention as many students of organizational behavior now say it should have. In a sense, this study begins, as did David McClelland in his classic study, The Achieving Society, with Max Weber who uniquely combined an interest in psychological motivation and the nature of modern bureaucratic organizations. The theory of the "self-starter" posited in the present work is very much influenced by David McClelland himself and the pioneering work of Harold Lasswell, which we feel has not been adequately followed up with rigorous testing and systematic revisions.*

*The explanatory power of Lasswell's theory was derived from a tradition (the psychoanalytic) which does not readily permit the aggregation of mass data. While this study utilizes mass data on leadership personalities, it does indicate that there is a conceptual meeting-ground for these two distinct traditions of inquiry.
The importance of individual psychology in explaining elite behavior in complex organizations has been acknowledged by exponents of all traditions of organizational behavior analysis. As has already been noted, the structuralists Simon and Etzioni both emphasize the critical place of personality. Janowitz, after a detailed analysis of military organization (which may be called sociological in nature), admits to the impressive fact that only one percent of American pilots accounted for 30 percent to 40 percent of all enemy planes shot down in World War II\textsuperscript{24}—thus identically trained men in standardized organizations and with equal opportunities had tremendously different rates of performance which can only be explained by variations in "personality." Similarly, with respect to business organizations, Renesis Likert, after reviewing 25 studies conducted by the Institute of Social Research, has concluded that the "most effective managers and supervisors are using procedures and practices which differ in important ways from those advocated by their companies;"\textsuperscript{25} that is to say, success is not apparently correlated with adherence to standardized norms but with individual, personal qualities.

Various contemporary theorists have sought to identify the key characteristics of the psychological dynamics of successful managers and leaders. Argyris suggests (in the spirit of Lasswell's classic formulation about political man) that
successful executives "use" the organization for their personal needs (just as the organization "uses" the individual executive for its needs), and that the most salient personality factors seem to be "self-control," powermindedness," "problem-solving mindedness" and "self-motivation." McGregor has selected among all personality variables, "self-control" as being the most important for leadership, but again he does not seek to describe this variable in any rigorous psychological depth. In his most recently published work, McClelland has given theoretical impetus to the study of organizational leadership and a theory of motivation, though no aggregate data have been collected to test his most recently formulated hypotheses.*

The analysis presented here begins with a theoretical understanding of the self-starter that is a modification of both Weber's and Lasswell's concepts of the basic motivations for economic (entrepreneurial) man and political man. It views the self-starter, the effectively motivated leader, as an individual characterized by different combinations of self-esteem, insecurity, and belief in the ability to control one's

*This research has explored some of McClelland's major hypotheses concerning "combinational motive systems" and organizational leadership, and has examined through the use of mass data, the need systems of people characterized as high in need for power, need for affiliation, need for achievement and inhibition, and the relevant combinations thereof.
fate. Yet other psychological and structural variables have been analyzed with respect to these key personality attributes so that an analysis may be presented not only of different "types" of self-starters and their leadership styles, but of other organizational leaders as well, and the structural contexts which are most conducive to effective "activist" leadership.

Psychological Issues

The first objective of this study has been to develop a typology of organizational leadership personalities. The typology, as indicated, will be based on a series of psychologically significant variables which experimenters in the past have had relatively good success in measuring, and which may now briefly be described.

(1.3) Self-esteem and Insecurity--How do They Affect Leadership?

Max Weber, in his classic, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Captialism*, noticed that the successful entrepreneur seemed to have a strange blend of wanting to be of the elect but having considerable anxieties as to whether he was. The combination of some elements of self-assurance and some degree of insecurity appeared to him to be a powerful motivating force. Since Weber's insights, social psychologists have refined many concepts which seem to get at the phenomenon Weber was describing. In part, Weber was concerned with one's
estimation of self-worth, as perceived through earthly activity. We now call this estimation self-esteem, though of course, self-esteem can entail much more than self-evaluation and validation through activity.

A person's level of self-esteem affects the evaluation he places on his performance in any task situation, and the manner in which he behaves in interaction with others. Self-esteem encompasses the amount and type of value an individual attributes to various facets of his person and is affected by the incremental successes and failures he has experienced in attempting to satisfy any of his central needs. Self-esteem is thus a function of the coincidence between an individual's aspirations and his achievements. That is to say, task-evolved feelings of success or failure become generalized to one's self-concept. Self-esteem has been viewed as a stable personality dimension, though in a real sense it is a process which can continuously evolve over time and with respect to changes in levels of goal attainment.

The foregoing implies that persons of high self-esteem would differ from those who are low in self-esteem in their reactions to situations relevant to the satisfaction of their personal and professional needs. Individuals of high
self-esteem can be expected to react to new situations with expectations of success, since characteristically they have been successful in the past in satisfying their aspirations and needs. From this behavioral configuration it has been shown that persons high in self-esteem both attempt to exert more influence than persons of low self-esteem, and are less susceptible to being influenced.  

Like all measures which the present study shall report, the measure of self-esteem is contained within a questionnaire* which all respondents were asked to complete. This particular measure consists of a ten-question scale that has been "normalized" so that respondents may score between 0 and 100. Throughout the work judgments concerning respondents' levels of self-esteem will be made with regard to their relative score on this index.

Manifestations of power arise with those who are able to generate influence. Not all elite professionals, however, are influence generators (see for example the "technician" described in Maccoby's The Gamesman). What is involved in this posture of influence is more than just

*See Methodological Appendix I.
self-esteem, for there is also the question of whether the individual believes that he can control fate himself or whether his fate may be determined by extrinsic forces.

(1.4) Belief in the Ability to Control One's Fate--How Does It Affect Leadership?

"Internal-external locus of control" refers to the extent to which persons perceive "contingency relationships" between their actions and their outcomes. People who believe that they have some control over their destinies are called "internals," while "externals" believe their outcomes are attributable to extrinsic forces or agents such as fate, luck, chance, or other perhaps unknown forces.

It should be noted immediately that those who believe that they themselves control their own destinies may be either high or low in self-esteem. To believe that one is the master of one's fate is not the same as being self-confident; it is a belief that very secure people may have to struggle with.
Similarly, people who are "externals" may be either high or low in self-esteem. A person high in self-esteem may also believe that events are decisively determined by external forces, which somehow he can get along with or marginally manipulate.

For the business and military elite who participated in this study, a moderately strong inverse relationship was found between self-esteem and locus of control (\(-.28, p<.001, n=300\)); yet the relationship between locus of control and self-esteem varied widely from leadership "type" to leadership "type," and between business and military groups treated separately.

A great portion of the fate-control literature has shown that "internals" and "externals" occupy different positions on the "instrumental-expressive" behavior dimension. While internals engage in more instrumental, goal-directed activity, externals more often manifest emotional non-goal-directed responses. This study has revealed that in order to attain a high level status position within an organizational milieu, one may or may not consistently engage in instrumental, goal-directed activity in a manner which minimizes affect, as called for by the functional demands of organizational-
bureaucratic structure. Other strategies are available. Goal-directed instrumental traits of style characterize only one of many operative strategies available to the organizational elite. Its' utilization is the sole property of the man who perceives an internal locus of control, whether he is also high in self-esteem or not.\textsuperscript{27}

A Note on Scoring of the Fate-Control Construct

The locus of control measure (also referred to as "I-E") employed in the questionnaire used for this research is the original 29-item scale devised by Julian Rotter.\textsuperscript{28} Respondents theoretically score between 0 and 23, with one point being given for every "external" response. Six questions (or scale items) are "fillers" having no locus of control value. While "internality-externality" is a relative measure, a high score would indicate a perceived external locus of control, and a low score, a perceived internal locus of control. Baseline data will be presented so that the reader may compare our elites with people who have been tested in the population at large.

As the I-E construct has recently been factor-analyzed and seen to be of a multi-dimensional nature (see Footnote 27*) this study has treated whole locus scores and its decomposed factors as separable. Belief in control with regard to the

*Also see Chapter Three, Footnote 1.
self will be referred to as "personal control" (or Factor I), and belief in control with regard to the environment will be called "system control" (or Factor II). Belief in the ability to control one's actions need not be related to one's belief in the ability to control one's environment. For example, many of the business executives in this study believed strongly in their sense of personal control, yet doubted their ability to influence more remote extrinsic forces such as "the economy," which inevitably affect their important goal outcomes. Personal and system control can, of course, have interactive effects, yet they need not be intimately related, or vary concomitantly.

Although the great majority of studies employing the I-E measure do show internals to be more goal-directed and instrumental, at least three studies\(^\text{29}\) have shown that externals participate in system-changing modes of behavior. A substantial number of business and military elites are in fact relatively external in their perceived locus of control. This study will conclusively illustrate that a sense of externality is not incompatible with positions of leadership and power. Since the vast majority of the literature dealing with the I-E construct utilizes non-elite populations
(children, students, and minorities), the potential compatibility of an external orientation and formal positions of power and status has not been previously tested. Instead, an inferential error has pervaded thinking on this subject. Because powerless groups have been found to be on the whole relatively external, it has been reasoned, and erroneously so, that powerful groups must be internal. Such is clearly not the case. While the average locus score of the business and military elite who participated in this study is quite close to the average locus score of the typical college student, a large intra-elite variance exists. As will be illustrated through the presentation of non-elite baseline data, a significant number of powerful elite individuals do not believe they are in complete control of their fate. While this sense of externality does not limit the attainment of formal positions of power and influence (and in fact may actually enhance it), it strongly affects its expression.

Let us now look at the leadership typology and the way in which we have sought to understand the relationship between character and leadership style.
Footnotes to Chapter One


10. It was of great import to analyze the social-psychological processes which have impelled these chosen few into
positions of power while they were amenable to systematic investigation. Social scientists cannot readily administer psychological tests and detailed questionnaires to people who are currently powerful and busy leaders. Indeed, because of the relative inaccessibility of high status leaders, previous studies of the behavioral configurations of elites have generally had to rely on secondary psychobiographical data, descriptive cross-national data, and other essentially demographic information. The sample upon which this study is based represents the nearest potential-elite we have been able to identify from whom we can also gather "hard" psychological data. The War College and the executive program at Harvard are for us convenient stopping points which bring together many leaders whose disparate and often unrelated career paths would never cross. It is this junction which permits us to gather our data.

11. I am indebted to Professor Chuck Gibson of the Harvard School of Business for making these and other data available.


26. Carl Hovland and Irving Janis, eds., *Communication and Persuasion*, Yale Press, 1953, and Hovland and Janis, *Personality and Persuasion*, Yale Press, 1959. It is significant to the purpose of this study that research on the relationship between personality and persuasibility has identified self-esteem as an important determinant of the individual's responsiveness to influence from both social interaction and the mass media. People of high and low self-esteem, as measured by feelings of personal adequacy, differ in their responsiveness to persuasive communications--those with low self-esteem are more easily persuaded than are those with high self-esteem. It is our hypothesis that one type of elite will be an influential persuader who is able to resist influence.

27. A series of studies have indicated that as internal-external locus of control is of a multi-dimensional nature, internals and externals exhibit characteristic
differences in their reactions to and perceptions of influential others. Employment of the fate-control instrument within this overall research design will yield information about at least three relevant factors: 1) the subjects' belief about the extent to which people have control generally (this affects one's evaluation of generalized others and provides a general perceptual framework out of which one may select strategies for "treating" others); 2) the extent to which the subject believes in personal control; and 3) the extent to which the subject believes he has control over proximate systems of ideology (such as race relations) or his immediate environment.


CHAPTER TWO

The Leadership Typology

Thus far we have outlined the meaning of self-esteem and fate-control, and have briefly indicated how these two very powerful personality constructs can affect the behavior of leaders. What we must now be concerned with is the interactive effects of self-esteem and fate-control and the personality "types" which their juxtaposition suggests.

Intuitively, and with considerable evidence, it may be argued that it is only when one has feelings of personal efficacy that an individual will seek to change his environment, communicate freely with his peers, participate in decision-making processes, and seek to initiate leadership role behaviors. Coupled with the belief that one is able to control his destiny, such an individual would believe his actions will make a difference. But personal effectiveness (or the desire to rise toward elitehood) may not always originate in the active personality driven by high self-esteem and the ever-present belief in the ability to control one's fate (see for example the many writings of Harold Lasswell). The pursuit of elitehood may be the manifestation of doubts about the ability to achieve continued success. Lasswell has shown how such
doubts or a general sense of insecurity may gain prepotency over all other personality needs and drives creating anxiety-ridden, yet "effective" leaders.

In the present study we will typologize the active elite personality as one of high self-esteem or one of low self-esteem, in combination with a subjective perception of control--that is, whether one believes he controls his fate, or whether one believes he is controlled by it. This typology delineates four faces, or minds of influence (see Table 2.1): the first face of influence is certain both of his ability to achieve, and of the fact that his destiny resides within (he is found in Quadrant I of the typology); the second face of influence is certain of his ability to achieve, yet at the same time is unable to claim mastery over his fate (Quadrant II); the third face of power, while convinced his destiny lies in his own hands, harbors doubts concerning his ability to make that destiny a desirable one (Quadrant III); the fourth face of power represents the man who is both uncertain of his fate and his ability to achieve continued success. The critical and profound point of convergence for the four ideal-types lie in their common active posture toward their environment.

The operational strategy of this study has been to examine how a particular cognitive configuration or internal state of mind (as schematized in the typology) provides a
type-specific view of the world which in turn predicts a series of behaviors bound up with leadership style and general traits of action--particularly the taking of initiatives for creative purposes within elite organizational structures:

CHARACTER—> WORLDVIEW—> STYLE

(2.1) The Four Types

Let us now briefly sketch each of the four types.

Quadrant I of the typology contains those leaders we have called "rational men."* This type of leader is active and certain; the self-assured, persuasive person who is a high need achiever and is generally resistant to outside influences. Much akin to the classic utilitarian, the rational man experiences an ordered world. As rational man experiences it, the world is not only understandable, but it is predictable. As the "rational" world is one of order and reducible to understanding, rational man seeks control through highly analytic, achievement-oriented activity. As a utilitarian, this type of leader prefers calculation to impulsivity.

*If the typology developed in this work were used to describe general personality "types" found outside, as well as inside, the organization, it might well be that in this first quadrant we would find not only rational men but "passive-certain" men as well. The passive-certain is not common to American society but has been spawnsd far more in Eastern cultures, often in the form of the guru--the self-confident, contemplative, constantly working for inner self-improvement person who is generally content and unconcerned with events in the world around him.
The table which follows schematizes the primary nexus of personality variables which serve as the basis for this study:

(Table 2.1) The Leadership Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fate-Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Locus of Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I. &quot;Rational Man&quot;</th>
<th>II. &quot;Existential Man&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Self-Esteem</td>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>Seeking to manipulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High need for achievement</td>
<td>Decisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistant to influence</td>
<td>Places high value on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>concept of &quot;time&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficacious</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A &quot;utility maximizer&quot;</td>
<td>Persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comfortable with his high status</td>
<td>Has a &quot;command identity&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As a &quot;reality-tester&quot;--fair</td>
<td>Bold risk-taker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insecurity</th>
<th>III. &quot;Administrative Man&quot;</th>
<th>IV. &quot;Entrepreneurial Man&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very high need for achievement</td>
<td>Inhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong need for approval</td>
<td>Seeks personal confirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong &quot;hope of power&quot;</td>
<td>Goal-directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong need for affiliation</td>
<td>Mistrustful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustains norms</td>
<td>Highly uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displays reformist sentiments</td>
<td>Strong sense of duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes organization's goals as own</td>
<td>Self-improving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong sense of responsibility</td>
<td>Needs recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Successfully completes, but does not enjoy tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is alienated from the organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The psychological freedom enjoyed by our rational man allows him to act on his creative impulses. But his acquisition of formal organizational power evolves not from a love (or a need) for working on challenges. Rather, this leader achieves success because the successful accomplishment of challenges gratifies him and provides him with rich rewards. He is not process-directed as is our administrative man, but outcome-oriented.

While the rational man is no less, and perhaps even more a capable worker and leader than the organizational leaders schematized in Quadrants II and III, he is less likely to conform to our model of the self-starter—for he experiences no discomfort concerning his ability to achieve continued success or his capacity to control his professional fate. He is both active and certain; he is goal-directed, comfortable with his high status and success, happy in his work, and feels quite content with his proven "formula" for success. An expectancy of succeeding characterizes and drives this man's leadership style.

**Existential Man**

It has been generally recognized since the writings of Harold Lasswell that people who actively pursue elite
status are likely to be anxiety-driven and have feelings of inadequacy which dominate but do not inhibit their other personality needs and drives. Thus it is to Quadrants II, III and IV that we naturally look to find leaders who are also likely to be self-starters. These may be the gifted few who take immediate command in the absence of outside stimulus, who seek information through subtleties in their environment, and who are perpetually self-actuating. Perhaps it is they who can move from thought to consummation of the act with unusual rapidity. As active leaders perhaps they are somehow able to block out the inhibitions of anxiety, fear and doubt surrounding decision, though they are, of course, profoundly anxious and in need of reassurances.

Upon completion of a long and arduous task, the self-starter will feel little contentment--rather, task completion will only serve to make him cognizant of new, as yet unresolved, problems which require his attention. When confronted with new and complicated tasks, the self-starter needs no outside stimulus to effectively and imaginatively carry out his work. Continuously self-motivated, he feels discomfort with stagnancy and shows a great concern over the use of time. What is it that maintains and defines the nature of this type of drive?
The answer, we have hypothesized, lies with ambiguity.

In the case of individuals falling in the second quadrant, ambiguity concerning the ability to control one's fate drives the leader with high self-esteem into continuously acting on his environment—to secure both his organizational responsibilities and his self-esteem. He is flexible, opportunistic, and decisive. Paradoxically, he is an emotional, highly ego-involved man. As he is uncertain about his ability to control the world, time is of essence. While he is decidedly active, he is uncertain—not about his proven ability to achieve, but about his ability to control. This sense of uncertainty drives the existential man and encourages a leadership style which makes use of interpersonal power tactics. More than any of the other leadership types, the existential man assumes a "command identity." At the same time, he expresses very little inhibition. Seeking to be "in the right place at the right time," the ambiguity which this type of leader experiences concerns not the ability to produce, but the capacity to control movements of individuals and process-outcomes in the organizational milieu. That he is uncertain of his fate, but high in self-esteem, makes for an interesting paradox.
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Administrative Man

While the leader schematized in Quadrant II is unable to reconcile ambiguities in his environment, the active self-starter schematized in Quadrant III is driven by an uncertainty concerning his inherent ability to achieve. He very much believes in himself as an achiever, yet constantly struggles with his propensity to produce. While he is quite competent occupationally, he feels less comfort in having to deal with people-associated problems. While he expresses an inordinately strong "need to achieve," these expressions are, in part, derived from a lack of confidence when facing others. Because he experiences some interpersonal anxieties, this leader tries very hard to relate to others in a positive manner. His handling of power often engages the affects, inhibiting decisive, detached strategems for getting ahead. He is thus the most affiliation-oriented of all our leadership types, seeking the approval of others, and not power over them. This type of man is well suited for leadership in organizational structures—he is psychologically equipped for enforcing, rather than creating normative courses of action.

Entrepreneurial Man

While individuals falling in Quadrant II are driven by ambiguities concerning their ability to control, and
individuals falling in Quadrant III are driven by experiential anxiety concerning their ability to achieve, people who fall in the last quadrant (IV) experience more complex (and perhaps more interesting) feelings concerning both their ability to achieve and their capacity to control.

Both locus of control theory and research in the area of self-esteem would predict that individuals who are both insecure and uncertain of their fate would be unfit for leadership in organizational structures. They would more often than not fall prey to their affects, become non-goal-directed, deferential or hostile, mistrustful, anomic and withdrawn. Certainly they would be ill-equipped as leaders of men in an organizational context which demands continued attention to a sharply defined ethos.

Yet the data which we shall present in Chapter Six clearly shows this need not be the case. Entrepreneurial men as a group have significantly less control than our whole business and military elite as well as the general population at large.* And as a group, they are significantly more insecure than either our rational or existential men or our whole business and military populations. Yet within this

*Baseline statistics will be presented in Chapter Six.
group of people we find fourteen Lt. Colonels, two full Colonels, five directors or general managers of large corporations, one president, one vice-president and a host of other luminaries. *

The cognitive configuration of these people has clearly not prevented them from attaining formal positions of power. Rather, it has strongly affected the ways in which their power has been both accumulated and expressed.

Entrepreneurial man is an insecure leader dwelling in an uncertain world. He is an inhibited man who attempts to control his impulses through self-discipline. For the entrepreneur, his "calling" is a duty.

Although most Americans today are preoccupied with finding "meaning" in their lives and in their work, the entrepreneur completes the task with which he is faced not out of any special intrinsic love of his work but because he feels it has to be done. He seeks confirmation, is constantly testing and is ever in doubt about proving his self-worth.

Unlike the rational man, entrepreneurial man does not take initiatives in order to maximize his self-interest. Unlike the existential man he does not take initiatives as a manifestation of a need to control others. And unlike our administrative man, he does not take initiatives in order to

*Among the military officers in this group there are six who have been promoted in an accelerated fashion.
receive the approval or favorable evaluation of others. Entrepreneurial man takes initiatives in order to validate or prove his sense of worth. And not coincidentally, he is a capable worker. And why shouldn't he be--the entrepreneur is the embodiment of the Protestant Ethic.

(2.2) Weber and Modern Psychology at the Crossroads

Our fourth type of leader, entrepreneurial man, exhibits a cluster of personality and leadership style attributes which accentuate the tensions inherent in the two schools of thought which have most influenced this work. On one hand, and largely utilizing a neo-psychoanalytic approach, we have the work of Max Weber and Harold Lasswell. Both these great social scientists believed that leadership was inextricably bound up with, indeed caused by, varieties of personal insecurity. Indeed, Lasswell's homo politicus acted to compensate for feelings of inadequacy, and Weber's entrepreneur pursued innovation and wealth as the surest means of proving self-worth and eradicating doubt. Both Weber and Lasswell viewed leadership as essentially compensatory in nature.

In contrast to the tradition of Weber and Lasswell stands what may very loosely be called modern-day psychology. It views the leader and the innovator as essentially free...
from insecurity. Insecurity or anxiety, while not viewed as aberrant, is seen as somehow militating against, or interfering with the creative impulse and leadership effectiveness. Both personality theory and social-psychology strongly suggest that insecure individuals are unfit for positions of leadership. Such individuals are more likely to be alienated, anomic or merely uninterested. The dialogue between the two schools looks something like the following:

Weber: "The genesis of the entrepreneur's anxiety is his doubt about whether he can affect (i.e., control) his future. This concern with control creates a unique motivational state which provides for the (secular) "spirit" of capitalism. Anxiety, we may conclude, creates the psychological foundation for the activist, acquisitive impulse."

Modern-day psychology: "The individual who believes in luck, fate, chance or other exogenous forces to the exclusion of "personal causation" (as does Weber's famous God-fearing entrepreneur), is one who is likely to experience a lack of accord between his intentions and his desired outcomes. This incongruity, we may safely say, brings anxiety. Anxiety, we may conclude, causes social quietism, ineffectiveness, and oftentimes, withdrawal."
The two traditions thus agree that the man who believes he lacks control of his fate is a man who is insecure. The critical and profound point at which the two traditions diverge concerns the effects of this insecurity.

The following diagram illustrates the presumed effects of personal insecurity and "external control" as posited by the two schools of thought:

(\text{Table 2.2})

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (weber) {\textbf{Weber's Man}};
  \node (psych) {\textbf{Social Psychology}};
  \node (sect) at (weber -| psych) {Asceticism (private realm)};
  \node (call) at (weber -| sect) {The "calling" (public realm)};
  \node (insec) at (weber -| call) {Personal insecurity};
  \node (extern) at (weber -| insec) {External control \nodepart{two} Social activism};
  \node (insec2) at (psych -| insec) {Personal insecurity};
  \node (alienv) at (psych -| insec2) {Alienation, withdrawal (private realm)};
  \node (ineff) at (psych -| alienv) {Social ineffectiveness (public realm)};
  \node (quiet) at (psych -| extern) {External control \nodepart{two} Social quietism};
  \draw[->] (extern) -- (extern); \foreach \name in {sect, call, insec, extern, quiet, insec2, alienv, ineff} \node[below=0.5em] at (\name) {\textit{\name}};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

While Weber's entrepreneur and Lasswell's homo politicus act in the public interest to allay private anxieties, social-psychology envisions the insecure man as self-defeated and
socially quietistic. The dialogue of the two schools thus raises two distinct questions: (1) is insecurity the "cause" of, or somehow bound up with leadership; and (2) does the experience of exogenous control produce an activist or quietistic orientation toward the world.

Implicit in our presentation of the fourth leadership type is a test of the Weber thesis. In this test we will attempt to ascertain which of the two schools is most correct. But for now, the reader is asked to examine what follows as against this theoretical dissensus.

(2.3) The Meaning of Anxiety In This Study

Anxiety has been viewed by many as one of man's most "compelling drives." Yet anxiety as a concept is rather vague and hard to pin down. Because it has yet to be adequately defined, it is not surprising that it cannot easily be identified and "measured." Harry Stack Sullivan has said that "anybody and everybody devotes much of his lifetime, and a great deal of his energy...to avoiding more anxiety than he already has, and, if possible, to getting rid of some of this anxiety."² Both Sullivan, Horney and others believe that anxiety is the "cause" of many kinds of behavior. Similarly, Presthus has remarked, "the internalization of approved values creates a built-in capacity for anxiety as the desires of the individual collide with society's expectations."³
We all very often feel in a very unspecific and fuzzy way, uneasy or uncomfortable when we lack adequate control of situations that are important to us (or perhaps even situations that are unimportant to us). For example, many of us have experienced the uneasiness associated with being lost while driving on unfamiliar roads. A compulsive or neurotic anxiety is obviously of a different magnitude and kind from the commonplace anxiety which results from lack of control. In the present work when we make reference to anxiety or uncertainty resulting from either incomplete control or doubts surrounding the ability to achieve, we are referring not to any necessarily neurotic anxiety, though it may be more deeply rooted than the anxiety which arises when lost on uncharted roads. Thus, when a number of observers have noted that successful businessmen often harbor a "fear of failure" they are not necessarily implying that such businessmen are abnormally neurotic (though of course some actually may be so).

All of us invoke mechanisms for reducing our feelings of uncertainty and tension. The ways in which we do attempt to lessen our anxieties, however, are of critical importance and of great value in trying to understand why we behave the way we do.
(2.4) The "Motivational Determinants" of Activism

The questionnaire employed in this research has been designed primarily to measure the key personality variables of the basic typology (and a series of leadership and initiative-taking correlates which will be discussed in the following chapters). Yet it is equally important that an attempt be made to understand the underlying motivations which drive and direct the organizational behavior predicted by the typology. The questionnaire thus includes a thematic apperception protocol (or T.A.T.) specifically designed to tap subconscious motivations (or "motive dispositions") which help us understand the personal need systems of business and military leaders.* By making use of a growing body of research which has utilized the T.A.T. instrument, the analysis of our leadership types is enriched by making reference to behavior not immediately testable when dealing with busy and powerful elites.

The Motives To Be Utilized: The Power Motive

The power motive is associated with a distinctive personal history and certain traits of style which have been exhibited by a significant number, though not a majority of elites in this study. People who have a high need for power tend to seek visibility through expressive modes of participa-

*The three-picture protocol used in the questionnaire may be found on pages of this work.
tion, have a capacity to form alliances when attempting to solve difficult problems, are competitive toward others, will nurture interpersonal relationships for instrumental gain, act aggressively, are attached to large payoffs, and show unusual concern for maintaining influence over other people. 4 Chapter Four of this work will center around a discussion of the need for power and the way in which it affects most influentially, the existential type of leader.

For our purposes of relating power motives to the self-starter it will be appropriate to distinguish between two forms of the power motive. First observed by Freud, 5 Adler and Horney, is positive or "social" power, which originates in the integrated ego; the second form of power is negative of "personal" power which stems from ego-related weaknesses. People who need personal power (or P power as it is sometimes called) try to dominate others from a fear of being dominated, while people driven by social power (or S power) show a strong concern for group goals and have great faith in people. 6 Winter has reached the conclusion that a high need for personal power is associated with movements and professions that emphasize norms, but do not require the changing of values. This would suggest that self-starters
are less likely to be people with a strong need for personal power, and more likely to be people who express more socialized forms of the power motive.

Contrary to our expectations, it was the insecure leader who most often expressed power imagery of a socialized nature. Chapters Four and Five of this study will explore the fundamental paradox that positive action can be taken for the betterment of the organization, though its motivational basis includes a component of basic insecurity.

The Need to Achieve

More than twenty years ago McClelland formulated the hypothesis that societies rise and fall as the psychological determination of its peoples to achieve grows or declines. Since that time literally thousands of studies have been published using the "need for achievement" construct as measured through thematic apperception. Let us very briefly outline what the need for achievement entails (the concept will be further explicated in Chapter Four, "The Administrative Man").

Like the other motivational determinants (need for power and the need for affiliation which we will turn to shortly), the need to achieve is what could be called a
psychological precondition or motivation* leading to a certain range of behavior. This behavior has been called entrepreneurial in nature and includes a propensity for innovative or energetic activity of an instrumental nature, problem-solving, personal feedback, individual responsibility, moderate risk-taking and social mobility. Assessing the need to achieve among our leadership types will round out our understanding of the strivings which the types exhibit, will allow us to predict modes of risk-taking and will tell us which types are most likely to be "innovators." It will also be of interest to us to examine whether bureaucracy provides adequate opportunity for the high need achiever to express himself.

The Need for Affiliation

In addition to the power motive and the need for achievement, the self-starter expresses in varying degrees, a need to be liked. A strong desire for "affiliation" is associated with conformity to the desires of others and the tendency to yield to social influence of all types. Individuals high in the need for affiliation exhibit an unusually strong fear of rejection, especially when in the public eye, yet are

*Motivation is defined as internalized to the extent that it is independent of externally mediated sanctions and is hypothesized to occur to the extent that role performance is relevant to the maintenance of an individual's identity and the need to express himself.
self-assertive, confident and perceived by others as being egotistical. High levels of sociality and a need affiliative behavioral orientation may provide the communicative skills requisite of one who is a successful "organization man"--the man who rises to the top of the pyramid. On the other hand, the fear of rejection which the need affiliative leader expresses and his high level of intense affective involvement often inhibits a detached style and the rational handling of power requisite of the successful leader. Evidence to be presented in this work will illustrate how the need for affiliation can mitigate initiative-taking.

(2.5) The Concept of "Worldview": Its Importance In Understanding Leadership Behavior

The first task of this work has been to develop a leadership typology comprised of the most powerful personality characteristics with which we are familiar and which we may measure with some degree of confidence. This effort has been described in the previous introductory sections and will be elaborated throughout this work. Our second task has been to predict a series of leadership style traits that cluster about each of the types. The critical task which unites the first and second tasks of the research process is the positing of distinct worldviews (and perceptual styles) for each of the types. It is the worldview which brings together character and behavior.
Many traditions of social inquiry have investigated the relationship between worldview and behavior. In the phenomenological tradition Wittgenstein and Mannheim have noted how the impreciseness and non-universality of language contribute to misunderstanding and a general inability to comprehend the variety of cultures which surround us. Drawing from similar phenomenological sources of inspiration, Merleau-Ponty stated:

"Our whole perception is pervaded by a logic which assigns to each object all its properties in relation to those of others, and which excludes as unreal any non-fitting information."\(^{10}\)

For these writers worldview is inextricably bound up with, indeed dictated by, our perceptual style, or the way in which we perceive the world.

Lippmann conjures up images of Plato's "Simile of the Cave" when he speaks of man's proclivity for processing incomplete, oft incoherent and refracted bits of reality through the adaptive cognitive process of stereotypy. Lippmann incisively states:

"In untrained observation we pick recognizable signs out of the environment. The signs stand for ideas and these ideas fill out with our stock of images...the subtlest and most pervasive of all influences are those which create and maintain the repertory of stereotypes. We are told about the world before we see it. We imagine most things before we experience them. And these preconceptions...govern deeply the whole process of perception. They mark out certain objects as familiar
or strange, emphasizing the difference, so that the slightly familiar is seen as very familiar, and the somewhat strange as sharply alien. They are aroused by small signs, which may vary from a true index to a vague analogy. Aroused, they flood fresh vision with older images, and project into the world what has been resurrected in memory."

For Lippmann, man uses his opinions to mediate inner demands with outer experiences. By stereotyping or categorizing new information, we need not relive our original experience with that information nor do we need to understand it as something unique. The world outside creates "pictures in our heads." These pictures are for us our image of reality (however distorted) and our experience of the world.

In a different but not unrelated tradition, Harry Stack Sullivan has written extensively on the nature of perception and the many different socialization factors which color our view of the world. For Sullivan, each of us contains a dynamic or "instrumentality" by means of which experiences which are incongruous with our established mental framework become ignored, selectively inattended or dissociated.12 This instrumentality he called "anti-anxiety."

The point is that Sullivan reserved a central place in his mature works for the notion that we all contain steering mechanisms which point us this way and that, diverting us from
some thought, feeling, or overt action to a different one more congruent with the self. Our perceptive capabilities therefore define and delimit our understanding and our experience of the world.

In the present study worldview may be defined quite broadly as our internalized picture of the world and the set of "givens" we take with us through life and invoke as mechanisms of understanding. As Robert Lane has written in Political Ideology, the notion of ideology (or worldview as we have here used the term), "entails a normative system of values, implies an empirical theory of cause and effect, and a theory of the nature of man."^{13}

A central goal of this study will be to characterize the worldview of each of our leadership types by examining their unique conceptions of cause and effect, and their beliefs about the nature of man. But, in order to conceptualize the worldview which distinguishes each of the four leadership types, we must identify the internal dynamics of each and demonstrate how these internal dynamics differ both quantitatively and qualitatively. Much of the following chapters will be devoted to this end.

(2.6) Personality: An Interactive, Holistic Approach

Our data strongly challenges the mass of simple bivariate monocausal studies which suggest that an experience of
exogenous control produces ineffective, quiescent human beings. Our greatest activist and taker of initiatives, and perhaps our greatest leader, the existential man, is highly external. And too, our greatest conformist (the administrator) is also our greatest need achiever. How are these seeming contradictions reconciled?

As we will show, a person is not just a "need achiever," a "power seeker," "externally located," "trusting" or any single quality. He is all these and much, much more that we do not know, in varying degrees. The existential leader experiences a feeling of being somehow controlled by outside forces, yet he is highly self-confident. Our administrative man experiences a strong need to achieve but he is also motivated by affiliation needs and plagued by personal insecurity. Human beings and their cognitive structures represent complex interactions of sometimes seemingly contradictory patterns. It is the interactive nature of the whole ensemble of personality relations which yields both explanatory and predictive power.

From the start we have viewed the task of this research as one of creatively reconstructing limited fragments of information. Conceptually, the task has been akin to placing together pieces of a very complicated puzzle. The puzzle is complicated not so much because of the dizzying pattern of the known pieces, but because of the large (and unknown) number of "missing pieces."
Simple monicausal explanations may be viewed as simple puzzles. Let us use as an example simple locus of control research.

While most researchers typically see the whole of personality as being either (and only) "internal" or "external" (as seen in Figure 1), "internality" or "externality" is in reality but a fragment of personality (see Figure 2). How can we predict a whole range of behaviors from looking at a fragment of personality?

The typical empirical view of personality is not holistic, but fragmented. It does not acknowledge the large number of unknown pieces, or even tacitly admit that such pieces exist. Such a view as that taken in the above is responsible for perpetrating the myth that "externality" equals an inability to
function ineffectively in American society. *

McClelland's most recently published book which stresses "combinatorial motive systems" comes closer to a more holistic view of human motivation as a determinant of behavior. It sees the personality puzzle as consisting of these parts:

PERSONALITY

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 3**

But the motive system itself is only part of the whole personality.

*Other disciplines have long stressed the need for viewing persons and their relations by a "holistic approach." Erikson, for example, sees no other way to understand human development. And similarly, Raymond Aron has called it "imperative" to study historical developments as "whole ensembles of relations."
An even more holistic approach, the one advocated in this work, stresses multi-variate interactions between motivations, self-image and worldview. It seeks to put more of the puzzle together by interconnecting more of the largest (and most meaningful) pieces:

PERSONALITY

Figure 4

The increase in available pieces and their logical placement in the schema of the whole picture yields a significantly greater and more holistic view of that picture, even though we are still missing an unknown number of pieces.

In attempting to predict ranges of behavior by looking at the puzzle we must therefore account for our missing pieces and the place where each of our known pieces shall go.*

*Statisticians merely say, "Let's account for more of the variance."
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By mapping the interrelations of a logical series of personality attributes we have attained greater explanatory power. Only when such a holistic approach is utilized can social scientists better understand the nature of man and the complex relationship between personality and behavior.
Footnotes to Chapter Two

1. Weber as sociologist devoted much attention to the institutional mechanisms which promoted leadership. Thus he was interested in the concept of "legitimacy" and its legal, charismatic and historical forms. Only in the Protestant Ethic does Weber centrally concern himself with the psychology of leadership.


6. McClelland and Steele, Ibid., and Winter, Ibid.


CHAPTER THREE
Rational Man

The bureaucratic elite who is self-confident and experiences a near-total sense of certainty is both active and certain. His near-total sense of certainty as it is projected toward his environment, and as introjected toward the sense of self, actuates a particularly "rational" style of leadership. This chapter will examine the character, worldview and behavior of our first leader, the rational man. We will discuss (1) the elevated sense of self-esteem experienced by rational man; (2) the interactive effects of that self-esteem with the experience of strong control; (3) the rational man's strong sense of trust and his flexible orientation toward others; and (4) the ways in which the rational man resembles our ideal-type of the self-starter.

Introduction

Our first type of leader, the man who experiences both strong control of his environment and high self-esteem is a man who is motivated by moderately strong "achievement" and "power" needs. This type of leader lives in a world comprised of logical, predictable, and rational relations. The daily problems with which he is faced have solutions--his primary task is to find them.
In contrast to other kinds of power-oriented leaders (such as our existential man), our rational man does not often use "strong-arm" or interpersonal influence tactics. His leadership style reflects a friendly but strongly goal-directed orientation. His amiable relations with others are an outgrowth of his basic orientation toward the world: "Trust your fellow workers and be trusted. Together, we shall both attain success."

The rational man does strive for success, and does so intensely. Yet unlike other kinds of leaders, he does not allow his stab at success to run rampant over other concerns. Above all, he dwells in an altruistic and logical world. The rational man believes that analytic attempts at problem-solving rather than people-directing is the surest strategy for the attainment of success. A world of order need only to be understood to be conquered.

(3.1) The Rational Man: His Sense of Self

The rational man thrives in an intrapsychic world of relative comfort. He experiences no dissonance concerning his ability to achieve, for there is a strong coincidence between his aspirations and his achievement of those aspirations. Being very high in self-esteem, he reacts to new situations with expectations of success, since characteristi-
cally he has been successful in the past with achieving his goals. It is this "expectancy of success" which is the guiding principle of the rational man.

The rational man experiences a very strong sense of personal control—that is, control both over his own impulses and his work environment. Since he believes he can, and does, exercise control over his world, he believes his actions will make a difference. He therefore enjoys his work and believes it has meaning. Confidence in the ability to achieve continued success coupled with confidence in the capacity to control allow this type of leader to act with certainty. His actions are thus purposive, his goals far-reaching.

Table 3.1 illustrates the elevated sense of self and the perceived locus of control which is characteristic of the rational man:

(Table 3.1) Rational Man: His Self-esteem and Locus of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>84.90</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>71.94†</td>
<td>8.295**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>73.32*</td>
<td>8.281**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001; **p < .01.

†Throughout this work, a "Student's t" has been used to test the difference of means (pooled variance estimate). In the above table, the single asterisk beside the self-esteem mean for the whole business elite indicates that the difference in self-esteem for the rational man was significantly greater than that for the whole business elite at the
As is apparent from the above table, the rational man experiences significantly more self-confidence and control than either the business or military elite as a whole. And we must here remind the reader that these elites are successful professionals marked by an abundance of these two qualities.

Let us now take a brief look at the behavioral correlates of high self-esteem and "internal" control as established by other published work.

**High Self-esteem and Internal Control: Other Investigations**

The following summary tables (3.2 and 3.3) illustrate some important personality correlates of high self-esteem and internality as reported by other researchers:

**Table 3.2) Correlates of High Self-Esteem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to persuade others, resist influence attempts by others</td>
<td>Hovland and Janis, 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Hamilton, 1971; Gough, 1956, and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>Rosenberg, 1965, and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for high status</td>
<td>Gough, 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater leadership potential</td>
<td>Bills, et al., 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychic health</td>
<td>Fitts, 1964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.001 level. Similarly, the single asterisk beside the self-esteem mean for the whole military elite indicates that the difference in self-esteem between the rational man and the whole military elite group was also significant at the .001 level.
(Table 3.3) Correlates of an Internal Locus of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentality, goal-directedness</td>
<td>Robinson and Shaver, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>Fish and Karabenick, 1971; Ryckman and Sherman, 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for resisting influence attempts by others</td>
<td>Hjelle, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Hersch and Scheibe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use less coercive power</td>
<td>Goodstadt and Hjelle, 1973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A series of studies conducted by Hovland and Janis have revealed that persons high in self-esteem are better able to resist influence attempts than are people of low self-esteem. Consistent with these early findings are later studies which have shown that persons of high self-esteem tend to be more assertive and domineering, and at the same time have a desire for prestige. While literally thousands of studies have utilized some form of the locus of control (or "fate-control") construct, very few behaviors have consistently and reliably been found to correlate with either an internal or external locus of control. Internals may be said to be more goal-directed, higher in self-esteem, more dominant, sociable, and capable of resisting influence attempts by others.
What does our own data tell us about the rational man and his twofold sense of control and self-confidence?

Our findings indicate strong congruence with the literature. Our measures indicate that the rational man is at the same time dominant, active, persuasive, extroverted,* and as we shall see, goal-directed.³

What is striking about our group of rational men is that each and every person within this group believes not only that he has the capacity to control his environment, but that he does control it. Not a single rational leader perceives systemic forces as significantly affecting his movement through the organization.⁶ Opportunity for such movement, he believes, is based solely on personal motivations and capabilities to the exclusion of chance, luck, fate, or other indeterminate and fatalistic unknowns.

The consequences of this orientation are twofold: First, rational man is not influenced, or otherwise significantly affected by the possibility of unknown forces acting against his desired outcomes. The belief that personal

*While introversion-extroversion is perhaps the most stable and conceptually valid of all known personality constructs⁴ its relationship to leadership behaviors is unclear. Mann, after reviewing twenty-two studies of introversion-extroversion and leadership performance in small groups, found a median correlation of .15 and concluded that "those individuals who tend to be selected as leaders are more sociable and outgoing, although the process of inferring such a characterization is tenuous at best."⁵ We have found that extroversion characterizes but two of our four leadership types, the Rational Man and the Existential Man.
causation is paramount together with a very strong sense of self-confidence allows this leader to assume an unwavering and unremitting posture of certainty. His reasoning behind this posture is rational: "For me success is determined by the extent of my desires and capabilities. I have been successful at all I have done in the past, and if I try hard enough, I will continue to achieve success in the future."

The second consequence of this high self-esteem-internal orientation is that the rational man does not experience an anxiety-ridden or threatening world. His world is constant, logical and rational. He need not worry about unknown exogenous forces which may act against his wishes. Since the rational world is penetrable by understanding, it is not threatening or conspiratorial. The fates, if they do exist, are fully under his control.

(3.2) Motivational Determinants

As measured through use of a three-picture Thematic Apperception Test protocol, the rational man displayed only a moderate need for power. This type of leader relies not so much on interpersonal power tactics (such as controlling or distorting information, displaying interpersonal aggressiveness, etc.) as he prefers a complex pattern of both
trust and compliance-expectation based on his own personal history of goal accomplishment. The rational man anticipates and expects that others will carry out his directives—recourse to power tactics is not "needed."

Consistant with our findings that the rational man fears not for the loss of his formal power (a potentially great motivator), our projective measures indicate that he displays very little subconscious fear of powerful others in the organization. At the same time he experiences less "hope" of gaining power than any of our other leadership types. Comfortable with his high status and secure in the knowledge that he will attain even more, the rational man is a leader who displays no preoccupation with personal strivings for power.*

(Table 3.4) The Rational Man and His Need for Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whole N Power</th>
<th>Hope</th>
<th>Fear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>3.51*</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .02

*The very fact that he resides among the elite of his profession of course indicates that he has strived for the attainment of that end. In comparison to our other "elite" types, he has few subconscious strivings which take the form of the "need for power."
Need for Power and Subsequent Occupations of Harvard Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and Clergy</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Journalism</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Two Dimensions of the "Need for Power": Other Investigations

As we noted in Chapter Two, the need for power has been viewed by McClelland and Winter as a Janus-faced construct containing two distinct components, one positive and one negative. (Although Winter attempts to be more value-free in his lexicon describing the "negative" component, the behaviors associated with it are clearly much less preferred and socially acceptable.) Decomposing the power motive as a dichotomous drive is essential in that such a view correctly assumes that creating impact through strong action (i.e., manifestations of the "need for power") may not only have significantly different meanings for different actors, but the processes which have shaped such behaviors contain a multiplicity of socialized antecedents. Table 3.5 illustrates the two dimensions of the need for power:
(Table 3.5) Two Aspects of N Power*

**Generic Definition:**
Concern with creating impact through vigorous, strong action, through concern with reputation, or through arousing and focusing the strong emotions of others.

Leads to a domain of power-related actions: organized social power and expressive subjective power.

Related to a strong father-identification. Possible pathologies of aggression and paranoia.

**Differential Description:**

**Positive**
Hope of getting power and creating impact.

**Negative**
Fear of losing power.

**Fantasy Pattern:**
Concern with creating effects in others through strong acts: also concern with means of influence. Prestige, dramatic settings; positive expectations; positive feelings aroused in others; instrumental actions.

Explicit concern with own reputation; also mention of superior-subordinate relation. Negative anticipation emotions about outcomes, low prestige and view of self, threats, organization.

**Action Characteristics:**
Organized power within a social structure. Holding office, competitive sports, (prestige possessions).

Expressive, subjectiv: "potency" behaviors, Drinking, exploitative, sex, vicarious experience, prestige possessions.

*Source: David McClelland, et al., The Drinking Man.*
Through use of our T.A.T. protocols we have been able to assess the structure of rational man's need for power. He shows a slightly stronger need for personal power than does our business and military elite, and at the same time, slightly less social power.

We may infer then that the rational man does not utilize interpersonal tactics associated with the need for power in his relations with superiors and subordinates, or in his general leadership style. At the same time, the rational man displays only moderate affiliation imagery. This type of leader would choose to work with experts rather than friends in occupational problem-solving (as such a choice would maximize his chances for a successful solution), yet the rational man does not eschew friends and loved ones when off the job. There is little to indicate that he suffers from afflictions of the heart as does Maccoby's "gamesman." 7

What is distinctive about the motivational system of the rational man is his strong need to achieve coupled with his need for power. The need for achievement is associated with (and perhaps derives from) his strong sense of control, and his great confidence in his ability to impact or change his environment.*

*His experience of personal causation (or his internality) and his need for achievement correlate at .35, p<.03.
The personal need system of our first leadership type, the rational man, looks like this:

(Table 3.6) The "Personality Cluster" of Rational Man

```
High Self-esteem ← .08 → Internal Locus of Control
   \        /                         /   \.29
- .23 /                          / .26
Need Power ← .38** → Personal Power \-.36**→ Strong Need for Achievement
   \        /                         / .43***
- .47****                                / .08
```

His very strong belief that he alone is in full control of his fate relates strongly to his need for achievement. The belief that the outcome of his actions are directly related to the content of those actions alone and not to the influences of some intervening exogenous force apparently strengthens feelings of efficacy and encourages goal-directed achieving behavior. At the same time this sense of fate-control mitigates power strivings. When one is certain that his actions will produce his desired outcomes, he need not use force for the attainment of that end. It is only when one is unsure (as is the case with our existential man) that forceful efforts
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must be expended to create a situation of certainty.

And finally, the internal control-personal power orientation reveals again how a sense of control lessens the need for personal power strivings and the (compensatory) enhancement of one's reputation.*

What kinds of behaviors can such a configuration of personality characteristics predict? How does such a configuration both affect leadership style and the taking of initiatives in the organizational milieu?

(3.3) The Rational Man and Superior-Subordinate Relations

Upon entering a profession many people have an idea of what it is they would like to become. Other people do not, and just make the most of opportunities that "come their way." When our rational man was asked, "Upon entrance to your profession, did you have a clear picture of what position or rank you wanted to attain," more than 30 percent said they had "a very clear picture." Another 55 percent said they had a picture, though it was "unclear." As a group, the rational man shows the greatest number of leaders who reported such clarity of vision.

An interesting sign of the rational man's occupational aggressiveness, however, comes when he is asked if he has

*The reader may want to contrast the above personality configuration with that of the military and business elite as a whole. A glance at this data (to be found in Appendix II) may help us further understand how (as Lesswell predicted) high self-esteem mitigates strivings for power.
already attained his desired position—less than one in four say they have. This becomes particularly meaningful when we note that among this group of leaders we find seven directors of large corporations and twelve colonels. While the rational man maintains an expectancy of future success, he does not sit idly by in the hope of somehow attaining it without purposive action. He vigorously pursues success through goal-directed, rational activity.

This drive toward the attainment of high status manifests itself in the everyday work of the rational man. As predicted by his unwavering self-confidence, the rational man scores higher than all other leadership types on our measure of "activity-passivity." And as a reflection of his sense of comfort with his place in the organization, the rational man feels most confident that the content of his actions would be recognized as congruent with organizational goals. As consistent with his active and achievement-oriented nature, the rational man presents superiors with unsolicited recommendations more often than any other leadership type (save the existential man), and most often feels that these recommendations will be acted upon (another manifestation of his strong self-confidence and his "expectancy of success").
(Table 3.7) "I present superiors with unsolicited recommendations..." (%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 3.8) "When you do present superiors with unsolicited recommendations, usually how certain are you that these recommendations will be acted upon?" (%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the rational man is both "dominant" and "persuasive," his leadership style is by no means authoritarian or unusually inflexible. More than any other leadership type, the rational man believes that a good leader expects his subordinates to decide for themselves what they should be doing. As we shall see, some kinds of leaders believe it imperative that a good leader makes it clear to his subordinates precisely what they should be doing.

Again, we see that while the rational man is concerned with facilitating organizational goals, his strategy for the attainment of those goals does not normally involve the mani-
pulation or purely instrumental "use" of others.

The rational man does encourage political conversation while on the job. More than any other type he exhibits "opinion leadership," having tried most often to convince others of his political convictions.\(^{10}\) It is safe to say that the outgoing and confident nature of our rational man creates an image which superiors and subordinates alike could admire. His altruistic world, his "rationality" (and not his emotionality) as well as his trusting nature, encourages people to see this leader as one who is always willing to give sound advice. It is therefore not surprising that our evidence reveals that the rational man is queried often as to the nature of his personal political convictions.\(^{11}\)

As we have previously stated, the rational man exhibits relatively great trust both in his superiors and subordinates, and his style of leadership reflects this sense of trust.*

---

*Both business and military groups displayed what would be considered a great sense of interpersonal trust. In a sample of 350, not a single leader felt superiors or subordinates primarily "looked out for themselves." These feelings are, of course, in part derived from the prevailing ethos of the respective organizations.
(Table 3.9) The Rational Man and His Sense of Trust*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Index of Interpersonal Trust</th>
<th>Trust In Subordinates</th>
<th>Trust In Superiors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>67.60</td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td>65.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>65.30</td>
<td>67.90</td>
<td>62.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>62.90**</td>
<td>64.90**</td>
<td>60.64**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All indexes have been normalized so that respondents may score between 0 and 100.

**p < .05.

An interesting view of the nature of trust has been developed by Riker, who believes that trust involves risk, since the people in whom one has decided to depend may or may not prove worthy. "Prior to the trusting decision," states Riker, "we have necessarily...assessed the risk of trusting and have decided that the risk is worth taking."¹² The rational man experiences an interpersonal environment of comparatively low risk in that (1) he has the utmost confidence in his ability to elicit complaint behaviors from his subordinates (an "expectancy of success"), and (2) like all formal organizational powerholders, the rational man holds official powers of authority which accrue to him by virtue of his position in the chain of command, and which he may utilize in the
form of official sanctions and rewards. Both private perceptions and public sanctions act in concert to mitigate the need for both risk-taking and the domination of others.

The Need for Encouragement

The rational man views his superiors and subordinates not only as trustworthy, but as trusting. Rather than displaying behaviors aimed at satisfying personal interests, the rational man believes his superiors and subordinates are generally responsive to organizational needs and goals. Paradoxically, the rational man needs and receives little encouragement from the associates in whom he places his trust, and prefers to be encouraged (however infrequently) by his friends made outside the organization. This aspect of his need system is consistent with the theory of the self-starter. Yet the rational man does have an elevated sense of self, and he does feel that his accomplishments must be recognized by his colleagues. This rather strong desire for recognition (which may be construed as a need for being viewed as trustworthy rather than want of status) is another piece of evidence which, while it does not detract from his "activity-certainty," does limit his capacity as
a driven self-starter. The true self-starter, we must remember, is one who is continuously and automatically self-motivated. The differing kinds of cues he may receive from others (either before, during or after the initiative-taking endeavor) does not affect the nature of his behavior.

It can be seen that while the rational man is not interpersonally cold or aloof, his style is one which minimizes affectual and power-oriented entanglements. His primary motivation is the attainment of organizational goals and not the attainment of purely personal power. But this leader is not a conformist; this leader is an "organizational loyalist" whose duty to his "organization" supercedes affective ties to individuals. Said one rational Major, "At work, the important thing is the job, not who does it." Goal-directedness and an abiding faith in the organization which has served him well thus displaces the emotional involvement displayed by our administrative man and other kinds of leaders. To a very large extent it can be seen that the rational man resembles Anthony Downs' conception of a "utility maximizer." He very much fits the "rational man" model of bureaucratic leadership, his utilitarianism as a guide to action.
such, however, he falls prey to the irrational pitfalls of "rational" men. (We shall explore this theme more fully at the close of this chapter.)

(3.4) The Rational Man As Self-Starter

In chapters one and two the notion of the self-starter was briefly developed. It was hypothesized that the self-starter was driven either by ambiguities and uncertainty concerning the self and the ability to achieve, or ambiguities and uncertainty concerning the capacity to control, especially with regard to the environment (ambiguity or anxiety we reasoned, would serve as a drive factor, or a catalyst for action). The rational man, it was hypothesized, could not be a true self-starter—for he experiences no discomfort with his ability to achieve nor his capacity to control. The rational man then is comfortable with his success and is secure in the knowledge that he will continue to be successful. His general sense of comfort, we hypothesized, would distill any compulsion to innovate or take initiative where such behaviors have not been successful in the past. In effect, the rational man reasons, "Why tamper with a winning combination?"
Throughout this work we will be interested in this central question: Is initiative-taking the result of active attempts at eradicating either uncertainty (about the self and the ability to achieve) or anxiety (about the capacity to control). In the present section of this chapter we are in effect interested in testing our "null hypothesis": can initiative-taking and attempts at bureaucratic innovation be associated with (or derive from) high self-esteem and a general state of psychological "health" which can "free" one from potentially debilitating anxieties. Let us now examine this null hypothesis more closely.

Psychological "Freedom" to Act

Almost 55 percent of our rational men said they enjoyed competition "very much." This was well above the combined norm for all our business and military elites, professionals who are competitive by nature. As well, the rational man is a great seeker of challenges. Available evidence so far indicates that challenge-seeking (one very important self-starter behavior) need not be the manifestation of perceived ambiguity or uncertainty. As the literature in self-esteem and locus of control theory would predict, an
elevated sense of self in combination with strongly perceived control of one's fate apparently does encourage frequent attempts at acting on the environment—challenge-seeking is but one part of this active orientation toward the world:

(Table 3.10) "About how often do you actively seek challenges?" (%)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The availability of challenges to be sought can differ from organization to organization, and with regard to current assignment or position held within the organization. Such structural irregularities will certainly affect responses to this question. However, we see that there is a significant difference between the propensity of the rational man to seek challenges and the frequency of challenge-seeking among the business and military groups, treated both as a whole and as differentiated by type of organization. Despite possible disparities then with respect to the availability of challenges to be sought, it is clear that the rational man spends a good deal of his time seeking out challenges. His perception is
that these challenges are **worth** seeking, that challenges can have useful results, and that these results will be recognized by the organization. The rational man pursues action because he feels particularly efficacious--he believes he has the power to produce effects.

Frequent challenge-seeking is a salient aspect both of rational man's leadership style and his "strategy" for getting ahead. Yet there is a great difference between seeking out challenges in the environment, and **creating** one's own challenges. For example, it is common lore among professional athletes that one of the greatest differences between players who "make it" and those who do not is that the successful athlete creates his own opportunities. Great ball players don't only exploit opportunities that come their way, but they **make** breaks come their way. Similarly, the organizational leader may respond primarily to challenges that come across his desk, or he may, if ambitious enough, seek out challenges which others do not even conceive of.

Does the rational man create challenges for himself, or does he respond primarily to challenges offered him by his environment?
(Table 3.11) "Would you consider yourself a person who actively looks for challenges or someone who becomes motivated primarily through challenges that appear on your desk?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;I actively look for challenges&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;I become motivated by challenges that appear on my desk&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note the frequency with which both business and military leaders as a whole actively attempt to create challenges. This, of course, is a key to their organizational success. While there are differences between the two populations (as well as differentials in opportunity and disparate reward structures), the greater initiative displayed by the rational man is primarily due to the configuration of personality attributes that have been schematized in the previous sections (see Table 3.6). Or in psychological terms, the style that the rational man utilizes in the pursuit of initiatives is the result of his acting on private and type-specific needs—his very experience and view of the world enable him to pursue power by utilizing rational, goal-directed strategies.
The rational man achieves and controls. He feels his actions will make a difference. His purposiveness is not distorted by a wordview of encroaching subordinates, jealous superiors, fear of failure or fear of success. The problems which he encounters have solutions. Both superiors and subordinates can be trusted to work with him in finding those solutions. The ease with which the rational man relates to others and the respect they apparently show him,\(^\text{13}\) allows us to infer that this leader is capable of effective alliance-building and group goal facilitation.\(^\text{14}\)

Our theory postulates that the self-starter needs little encouragement in the course of his work. He is continuously self-motivated and therefore needs little recognition. The impulse to do (while subject to differing ecological reward structures) is continuously manifest despite the organization to which the self-starter belongs, and whether at work or in leisure. How well does the rational man conform to our ideal image of the continuously motivated self-starter?

Perhaps an examination of why the rational man seeks and enjoys new challenges may provide us with an answer. Both Maccoby\(^\text{15}\) and McClelland\(^\text{16}\) have noted that different kinds of managers adopt problem-solving modes which are congruent with their general perception of reality. For example, McClelland has found that people high in the need
for power attempt solutions to challenges (or problems) which can create "impact," or provide a strong impression on others. Their risk-taking behavior as well is oriented toward creating impact, or securing the "big payoff."

Similarly, when given a choice to win money by either gambling or solving paper and pencil problems, people with a strong need for achievement would prefer to solve problems. Individuals thus exhibit a proclivity for selecting a problem-solving mode which is consistent with their most basic personality needs (or dispositions).

The rational man seeks out challenges because the successful accomplishment of the challenge gives him great pleasure. Unlike some need achievers and some technicians, the rational man does not particularly enjoy the problem-solving process. He does not derive any special satisfaction from merely making inroads in pursuit of a difficult solution. He cares little for incremental gain. The rational man is gratified purely by the culmination of the act. The solution itself, and not the search for the solution, is the essence of his professional satisfaction.

The rational man does not enjoy working on challenging problems for any intrinsic reason. At the same time, and
consistent with his personality needs, he doesn't especially enjoy the prestige of being confronted with tough challenges that others would shy away from (the existential man, on the other hand, does). In order of importance then, the rational man enjoys new problems (1) because the successful accomplishment of the problem gives him great pleasure; (2) the process of problem-solving (for its own sake) is personally rewarding; and (3) the prestige which accrues to one who responds to tough challenges or problems is satisfying.¹⁷

Unlike other types of self-starters, the rational man feels no compulsion to do or continuously self-actuate. While he does act on his environment, his actions are determined not so much by motivations which can be conceived of as process-oriented, as by a meaningful sense of accomplishment which he enjoys upon completion of the goal-directed task.

The rational man does not take initiative because of some inner compulsion to either reshape his environment or reconcile some private inadequacies. The rational man is much the utilitarian. The successful completion of the challenge is an end in itself. Initiative-taking is a
strategy by which his present position of status may be maintained and his future enhanced. (For our other three leadership types initiative-taking is a means to reduce or otherwise distill personal anxieties and insecurities.) The seeking of challenges is thus not for our rational man a compensatory behavior deriving from some perceived inadequacy; it is a premeditated, instrumental, and rational strategy to get ahead—it is not an "impulse" to do.

The rational man is therefore not psychologically driven to act—he will do so only when he believes that his actions will result in instrumental gains (as we shall soon see, it is the true self-starter who feels compelled to act in spite of the perceived positive or negative consequences of that act—for the true self-starter the accomplishment itself is less important than the psychological meaning of the act).

Situational Ambiguity

While the rational man does often present superiors with unsolicited recommendations and suggestions and while he is extremely confident that these recommendations will be acted upon, curiously enough, this leader does not feel particularly comfortable in making decisions about which there exist no organizational groundrules or precedents.
(Table 3.12) "How comfortable do you feel in making decisions about which there exist no organizational groundrules?" (%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Slightly Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Not at all uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This feeling of discomfort is consistent with the portrayal of the rational man as being very much the organizational loyalist, comfortable with his achievements and believing in the ethos of the organization which has treated him so well. While we must point out that this leader is a loyalist, he is not a conformist (as are other bureaucratic managers). All respondents were asked whether "conformity" was a phase to end, characteristic only of low- to mid-level management. While our group of rational men as a whole were evenly split between their views of conformity as "always a necessity" and a "phase to end," a smaller percentage felt it was "always a necessity" than either both parent populations treated separately or as a whole, or the other taxonomic "types" in this study.
Rather than making a bold, perhaps risky decision (our evidence indicates he is a rather conservative or realistic risk-taker), the rational man goes with his proven formula of success and its well-tried operational code.

**Meaning and Duty**

While he is quite satisfied with the number of challenges he faces, he rarely feels overburdened by his work. As he feels that it is only when an individual devotes himself to an ideal or a cause that life becomes meaningful, the rational man finds his work to be rife with meaning. Less than any other type does he consider his occupation tied to a strong sense of duty.*

His overall feelings of comfort, both with himself as a person and as a leader do not "cause" the rational man to be quietistic. At the same time the motivations which drive his initiative-taking behavior do not have their foundation

*All respondents were asked to answer the following question: "Americans today are preoccupied with "finding meaning" in their jobs. How often do you find your work personally meaningful, and how often just a duty?" The rational men as a group contained the greatest number of leaders who felt their work was personally meaningful and the smallest number who saw their work as a duty. A strong relationship is found between the rational man's sense of self as a "success" and the perception of his existence as personally meaningful (.37, p < .007). For the population as a whole, the correlation was neither strong nor significant.
in a sense of anxiety or insecurity as is the case with other kinds of self-starters. Because the rational man fears neither success nor failure or powerful others, he is psychologically "free" to act on his creative or instrumental desires.

The evidence presented in this chapter is not wholly supportive of our initial self-starter hypothesis—that is, that self-starters are leaders who are driven by some form of anxiety. Anxiety, we hypothesized, was the impulse behind self-actuation. Yet as we have seen, the rational man is much the self-starter—he selects his own goals, he enjoys competition, he seeks challenges very frequently and actively creates challenges. As well, he presents superiors with unsolicited recommendations, and as inferred from his motive-system, he displays goal-directed, achievement-oriented behavior. But the rational man is an initiative-taker only when it will result in some instrumental (material) gain.

Anxiety then (among some kinds of leaders) appears not to be the necessary psychological precondition for the taking of initiatives. Initiative-taking activity for our rational man is not compensatory—it is more the result of a healthy desire to achieve more success through oft-proven and organizationally (as well as socially) approved and valued strategies.
The Rational Man: Is He a Leader or a Manager?

While we are not yet able to determine if leaders and managers differ with respect to personality, it is apparent that the rational man is a "leader." Let us speculate for a brief moment as to some possible differences between leaders and managers.

The extroverted, confident, and apparently likable manner which characterizes our rational man, his "opinion leadership" qualities and his ability to facilitate organizational goals without having to use others, indicates he is very much a leader (his formal status of course indicates he is a "manager" of some kind). The rational man feels very comfortable directing others and feels more strongly than all other leadership types that his subordinates respect him in his decision-making role.¹⁸

Perhaps leaders are uninhibited, men of expansive egos who are able to act out, or live out, their personal needs. Managers, by contrast, may be people whose sense of self-control make them especially adept at concentrating on the ongoing organizational process and expediting extant policy by reinforcing existing norms. Managerial self-control, we may hypothesize, inhibits innovative or risk-taking behavior requisite of the dynamic leader.
We have by no means fully developed this distinction. Drawing more explicit differences between leaders and managers will be a task of later chapters.

(3.5) The Paradox of Rational Man: Rational Man as "Reality-Tester"

Like all people the rational man "selects" signals in his environment which are consistent with strongly held beliefs both about himself and his vision of the world. Yet the ubiquitous sense of certainty and control experienced by rational man contains an illogical and irrational element.

The rational man has been shown to be a leader with an exceptionally strong sense of faith both in himself as an achiever and as a leader of men. His faith results both from a history of previous accomplishment and an expectancy of future accomplishment. He expresses little anxiety concerning his abilities, and believes that his movement through life is directly related to his personal capabilities and ambitions. In contrast to the leader who experiences a sense of futility or dependence on powerful others, luck, chance, fate, or other unpredictables such as the great complexity of forces surrounding him, the rational man experiences a profound sense of control. He is certain both of himself and his ability to affect and control his environment.
Other studies of powerful executives have noted an element of irrationality which has its basis in very high self-esteem and the experience of near-total control. For example, Bartolomé has noted that among business executives, "the desire to avoid or ignore experience which the (executive) unconsciously perceives as damaging to his concept of himself appeared to be quite strong."¹⁹ in the group that Bartolomé studied as in our group of rational men, a strong sense of certainty produces a potentially blinding "coping mechanism" --that of ignoring either the element of chance or information which conflicts with the rational sense of self.

A series of studies²⁰ has shown that persons high in self-esteem most often employ avoidance defense mechanisms in the face of unpredictable or unanticipated outcomes. Such persons respond to failure in ways that either avoid self-evaluation, or actually enhance their self-image. Through the use of these mechanisms, persons high in self-esteem are able to maintain their self-confidence and their psychological equilibrium.

These people have, therefore, been shown to reject the assimilation of knowledge which can actually improve performance. This mode of rejection is the price of sound
"health"; for an enhanced or maintained view of the self as efficacious even in the face of occasional failure contributes to one's stability.

We have little reason to believe that the rational man's boundless certainty is based on a lifelong success rate significantly different from that of the other elite professionals which we have studied. His notion of certainty is based on a purely subjective perception of success and the effective distortion of any incoming information which can contradict this perception.

As an exceptionally elevated sense of self-esteem can blind a person from recognizing his human frailities, so too can a very strongly held belief in the ability to control one's fate.

The element of chance has long been recognized as key to the success of man. Machiavelli, following the ancients, reserved a central place in both the Discourses and The Prince for the concept of "fortuna." And Mosca, author of The Ruling Class, probably the most complete treatment of elites ever written, was forced to conclude that the role of chance was critical to the rise of elites:
"Many contingent factors show their influence in the choice of a particular individual for a high position, and they operate at given moments only. Such would be the prevalence of this or that political doctrine, or the way the few who already occupy high positions happen to feel about this or that person. Always in the offing is the element that may be called 'chance,' which is merely another name for the unforeseeable."22

Or, continues Mosca,

"...the game of life, after all, is not so different from an ordinary game of cards, where winning depends now on blind chance, now on the skill of the player, now on the mistakes of the adversary."23

In our own study we may cite the example of the president of a rather large electronics firm. He would be foolish to believe that only his expertise or continued attention could prevent marketplace or even political forces from acting on his product (computers). Similarly, in a clearly delineated chain of command such as is found in the military, a ranking officer may continually be subject to tour changes despite personal desires, likes, or dislikes.

A factor which may serve to inhibit the development of strongly held beliefs in the ability to control (as well as an exceptionally elevated sense of self) is "cognitive complexity."24 One officer in this study (who is not a rational man) attributed "a few lucky breaks" as a primary
source of his occupational success (this attribution would normally be viewed as indicative of a sense of "externality"). He went on to explain that if it were not for his assignment to a particular post, he never would have had the opportunity to finish his advanced degree, and perhaps he never would have been selected for command school, his entre to the highest eschelons of his organization. Another officer, when asked if good leaders are born and not made, replied, "Maybe good leaders are born, but good managers are made." This officer too is thus readily able to attribute what would be called "externality" to some persons and their object relations, and not to others, depending on the circumstances of the particular case in question.*

And finally, Julian Rotter has said,

"While it seems likely that the individuals at both extremes of the internal versus external control of reinforcement dimension are essentially unrealistic, it is not as likely that the people toward the middle of the distribution are less confident. We do have indications, however, that the people at either extreme of the reinforcement dimension are likely to be mal-adjusted by most definitions, and, to the extent that ego control is another type of definition of maladjustment, it would bear some curvilinear relationship to the variable we are concerned with here (locus of control)." 26

*This ability to differentiate is much akin to Rokeach's conception of the "open mind" which displays a "healthy" proximity between belief and disbelief systems. 25
It is surely possible that circumstances beyond our control or our immediate field of vision can affect our greatest achievements. Inability to recognize this can distort a "realistic" appraisal of reality, and limit our scope of vision. In short, it is not clear that powerholders who experience strong control of their environments are indeed in tune with the nature of the real world. While some leaders are better able than others to impose control where there exists disorder, it is clear that the elements of chance and timeliness are of significant import. The rational man runs the risk of "blinding" himself to that slice of reality (however thick or thin) which is subject to unknown forces and which may affect his field of vision both as a person and as an organizational leader.

(3.6) Overview of the Rational Man

The following table offers the reader a convenient summary of some of the more salient characteristics of our first leadership type, the rational man:
The rational man displays a configuration of personality attributes which encourages the active seeking of challenges, the active creating of challenges, an overall orientation toward "activity," and a propensity for using interpersonal skills based on an expectancy of success for the attainment
of organizationally defined rather than personally satisfying needs and goals. The rational man enjoys competition, can be persuasive, and uses his "winning combination" (or personal history of success) in his goal-selection process. His goals are auspicious, self-selected and beyond (or "higher" than) his present condition.

Our portrait of this leader has caused us to examine in more detail our original hypothesis about the personality of the organizational self-starter. It has shown that anxiety alone is not a sufficient "cause" of initiative-taking behaviors.

We may now ask, what are some of the other psychological determinants of initiative-taking behavior, and what kinds of personality attributes are characteristic of our other leaders as self-starters?

Let us turn to our next leader, the existential man, and see why he takes initiatives. Perhaps this will allow us to examine in more detail how type-specific character structures lead to differing experiences and views of the world, and ultimately, differing leadership styles.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

1. As was explicitly brought out in Chapter One, belief in the ability to control one's actions need not be related to one's belief in the ability to control one's environment. A sense of personal control can, of course, affect belief in system control, and vice versa, yet it is clear that these concepts (as they have been measured by psychologists) are separate "factors" within one's overall belief system. It is of import, therefore, that we examine both dimensions of the locus of control construct to see how each component, both separately and in tandem, can affect leadership style and the taking of initiatives.

The factor analytic research done by the Gurins (1970), Mirels (1970) and others represents an attempt to analyze the locus of control construct as multidimensional and bears significance to our discussion of the rational man and his style of leadership. Using the conceptual framework developed by these researchers in their factor analyses of the fate-control construct, we found that Factors I (personal control) and II (system control) have a Pearson correlation coefficient of .28, p < .001 (n=300). It is therefore quite probable that a sense of personal control (or belief in the ability to control actions regarding the self) and a sense of system control (or belief
in the ability to control one's environment or the larger social system) need not vary concomitantly (though they oftentimes may).

2. Research in the area of self-esteem has been plagued with inconsistency concerning both reliability and construct validity. Reviews of the literature (e.g. Wylie, 1961) indicate that self-esteem has been related to almost every variable at one time or another. I have listed a small sampling of only those characteristics which have been shown to be replicable and relevant to the typology.

3. We have inferred that the rational man is "goal-directed" from his very strong need to achieve. Need achievers have repeatedly been shown to be highly "goal-directed."


6. Breaking down the whole locus of control construct into its constituent factors we see that the rational man scores a mean of 0.767 on Factor I (personal control), and 0.00 on Factor II (system control). What this means is that among our rational men, not a single person believed that exogenous forces act (to any measurable degree)
against their control of the system.


8. The activity-passivity" measure which we utilized is a modified semantic differential to be found in Appendix I. The rational man scores higher on the activity dimension than all other types.

9. All respondents were asked to agree with one of these two statements: "A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do"; "A good leader makes it clear to everyone what their jobs are." Of our group of rational men, 65.1 percent agreed with the latter statement—this was the smallest percentage of all our types.

10. In this study we asked each of our participants the same "opinion leadership" questions which have been utilized over the years by the Survey Research Center. Forty-eight percent have tried to convince others of their political beliefs.

11. Fifty-three percent report that others have recently sought their advice on political matters. This is slightly higher than the average for our military population, but slightly less than for our businessmen. It is about the norm for our other three types.

13. On this point we can only rely on self-report measures. All respondents were asked, "When you are required to direct the activities of others, how often do you receive their personal respect?" Over seventy-nine percent of our rational men answered, "always" or "very often." This was a greater percentage than for all other leadership types.

14. We have drawn this inference from his motive system (especially his need for achievement) and its behavioral correlates as demonstrated in other research (this research will be cited in full in Chapter Five, The Administrative Man).

15. Maccoby, *Op. Cit.* Throughout his work, Maccoby discusses how each kind of manager takes risks or solves problems in ways which are consistent with his general "view" of the organization. The "company man," for example, while a hard worker, lacks the capacity to take the big risk which can open new vistas for his company.


17. All respondents were asked to rank order the following: "I enjoy new challenges because... (1) I enjoy working on a challenging problem for its own sake; (2) I enjoy the
prestige of being given tough challenges that others
would shy away from; or (3) the successful accomplish-
ment of the challenge gives me great pleasure." Our
data indicates that among rational men 64.3 percent en-
joy new problems because the accomplishment gives them
great pleasure; 19 percent enjoy the problem for its
own sake, and 11 percent enjoy new problems for prestige
purposes.

18. See footnote 16.
19. Fernando Bartolome, "Executives as human beings,"
20. See Carl Hovland, I. Janis and H. H. Kelley, Personality and
21. See N. Machiavelli, The Prince, Chapter 23; The Discourses,
inter alia.
23. Ibid., p. 457.
24. See the published work of O.J. Harvey.
25. Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind, Basic Books,
1968.
26. Julian Rotter, "Generalized Expectancies for the internal
vs. external control of reinforcements," Psychology Mono-
graphs, (whole) 80, 1966, p. 4.
CHAPTER FOUR
Existential Man

Introduction

The leader who has great self-confidence but is external in his locus of control is uncertain about his ability to master environmental processes and outcomes. This uncertainty, deriving from a sense of subjective ambiguity, drives the existential man to seek control of an irrational world.

Though he experiences a world which is not fully understandable, the existential man is still able to achieve success; for his sense of self is not threatened by his perception of being controlled by extrinsic forces.

The experience of being controlled by forces outside the self coupled with high self-esteem provides a unique perceptual frame of reference by which others are viewed, and a set of principles by which all incoming information is received and catalogued.

Psychodynamically, the rational man and the existential man offer not only a quantitative contrast in like personality attributes or characteristics, but a qualitative contrast in
whole cognitive systems and thus fundamental worldviews. They offer a contrast in internal states of mind.

While the rational man views the world and the manifold problems with which he is faced as reducible to comprehension through prolonged rational activity, the existential man experiences a world comprised of irrational social forces. Because the existential man accepts and uses as a "given" the essential incomprehensibility (or uncontrollability) of the forces which shape his life, his behavior is not directed toward the unwavering consideration of wholly "rational" solutions. Rather, the existential man is visceral. The preoccupation with activity in the face of uncertainty is the essential paradox of existential man, and the subject of this chapter. It is the central paradox of the self-starter among the existential elite.

(4.1) The Existential Sense of Self

Like the rational man, the existential man has a highly elevated sense of self.¹ Both types of leader experience a healthy coincidence between their aspirations and achievements, but the aspirations of the existential man are tempered by the interactive effects of an external sense of control. While the rational man envisions a world which offers an unlimited number of challenges, the existential man perceives the world
as much more finite in its challenge-laden offerings. The existential man views himself as not less efficacious, or capable, but as less omnipotent. Outcomes for this leader are not always the result of personal ambition, but of the uncontrolable "outside" forces which exercise their power over the individual.

Let us cite a few outstanding examples of the contrasting ways in which our rational and existential men experience the world: All respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the following questionnaire items:

(Table 4.1)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existential Man (%)</th>
<th>Rational Man (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dis-Agree Agree</td>
<td>Dis-Agree Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me&quot;</td>
<td>27.3 72.7</td>
<td>2.3 97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Without the right breaks one cannot become an effective leader&quot;</td>
<td>18.2 81.8</td>
<td>2.3 97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings&quot;</td>
<td>90.9 9.1</td>
<td>27.9 72.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlike the rational man who dwells in a world reducible to understanding, the existential man experiences what some philosophers have called the "absurd":

"The absurd is a confrontation between the individual and his world. It is not the world which is absurd, nor is it man. The absurd is the lack of correspondence between the two. It is an anxious consciousness of the divorce between the individual and his world. The individual is not absurd; he simply is what he is in his longing for clarity, for a meaningful response to his existence. The world is not absurd; it is what it is in its irrationality, in its ultimate lack of unity and coherency. [Existential] man and his world are what they are each in its own right; one cannot be ignored or reduced to the reality of the other, and in this confrontation of two realities the absurd emerges as the divorce which exists between those two."² [Emphasis supplied.]

This leader is especially sensitive to the seeming incongruence between his intentions and outcomes. He never underestimates the role of fortune or misfortune. He often feels he is a captive of circumstance:
(Table 4.2) "As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are victims of forces we can neither control nor understand..." (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How does the existential sense of being controlled by outside forces affect the elevated sense of confidence experienced by this leader? Shouldn't the perception of exogenous control mitigate one's self-confidence, one's ability to impact his environment?

While this seems to be the case for our whole elite sample treated as one,* it does not appear to be necessarily so among our existential men. Self-esteem and the sense of being controlled by external forces here have a strong positive relationship (Pearson correlation = .27) indicating that the existential sense of self-esteem is associated with the perception that the environment cannot be modified only by the individual (his elevated and successful self-image notwithstanding.) 3 In other words, for the existential man

*Self-esteem and locus of control have a correlation of -28, p < .01.
an elevated sense of self-esteem does not produce belief in the ability to control environmental processes and outcomes, seemingly compatible attributes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>83.90</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>84.91</td>
<td>4.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>71.94*</td>
<td>8.295**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>73.35**</td>
<td>8.281**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.001;  **p<.05

The existential man does, however, attempt to exercise influence over his environment, even knowing that his efforts may not be effective in shaping important outcomes. Uncertainty or anxiety concerning the effectiveness of his control renders an interesting and idiosyncratic leadership style which includes frequent use of interpersonal influence tactics aimed at strengthening the perceived improbability of effective, total control.

While we must postpone our examination of the interaction between the existential man's sense of self-esteem
and his formal motivational system, the kinds of stories he writes in response to T.A.T.'s illustrates the nature of the relationship about which we have been speaking (that is, the relationship between his high self-esteem and his experience of external control). Let us cite one example of a story written by an existential executive in response to our picture which we call "Two Women in Lab" (all three T.A.T. pictures used in this study may be found in Chapter Six):

"A laboratory director had given a task to one of her technicians and the technician, after embarking, encountered a point of uncertainty and called the director over for assistance. The director is demonstrating an approach to resolving the uncertainty. The director is confident, yet careful about her procedure. The technician is also confident of her own work and ability, but is listening to the director she had sought. The technician resumes her work and, using the new approach, completes her task." [Emphasis supplied.]

Note the explicit confrontation between uncertainty and self-confidence.* Other stories written by existential men contain the same dialectic—positive self-regard as against a vision of an uncertain world. The reconciliation

---

*A content analysis of all T.A.T. protocols reveals that the existential man depicts characters expressing manifest uncertainty more than twice as often as our rational or administrative men.
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of this uncertainty by purposive action is the central paradox of existential man.

(4.2) Motivational Determinants

The "Need for Power"

The existential man expresses an extremely high need for power, whether compared with other elites who took part in this study, or to various groups who have been tested in the population at large. This need for power is perhaps the most potent force underlying the expression of leadership for the existential man. It permeates superior-subordinate relations, the handling of formal power, the taking of risks and initiatives, his strategy employed for "getting ahead," problem-solving modes, and the general style by which the existential man attempts to relate to others whether at work or at play.*

The Power Motive: Other Investigations

What exactly is meant by the need for power? Does it mean that an individual wishes he had power? Does it mean that he likes to influence other people? Do people with a

---

*The existential man greatly enjoys competition not only at work but in leisure as well. 75 percent have participated formally in competitive sports.
strong need for power come to occupy formal positions of power and status? Are they attracted to powerful, high status positions, or do they become motivated toward the exercise of influence by virtue of their formal position?

"The status of having power," states David Winter, "is the goal of the (power) motive." A person's formal power status, and his expressed need for power as a "motive," are different concepts. Whether an individual with a high need for power brings with him that need into high status positions, or whether that need has been "socialized" through the acquisition of high status is still uncertain. The literature suggests, however, that the power motive is fostered long before the attainment of formal power positions. As such, it is thought to precede the acquisition of formal power.

In Chapter Two (Table 2.5), the power motive was broken down to illustrate its positive and negative components. While "personal power" (P power) was characterized as being associated with a need to dominate, "social power" (or S power) was characterized as being associated with leadership and the fostering of group goals. The power motive may be further decomposed to include "hope of power" and "fear of power," distinct constructs measurable in thematic apperception. Hope of power represents the unconscious expression
of a strong desire for high status. Fear of power, the expression that power may be harmful (either the power that one has, or the power that another may exercise over the individual). Both measures are important for understanding the nature of the strivings for power exhibited by our business and military leaders. Such a distinction allows us to state why the power motive is expressed—out of hope for its attainment, or out of fear of its harmful effects. The implications for the translation of the need for power into actual power tactics are thus markedly different.

The sense of externality, or personal causation as developed by de Charms, can also be distinguished from the need for power. A person who experiences fate-control or internality may feel power, precisely because he believes he is the master of his fate. A strong sense of internality, however, "strongly suggests autonomy, while power seems more akin to 'control of the fate of others.'" This distinction gets to the heart of the difference between locus of control and the need for power as expressed through thematic apperception. "The power motive suggests a striving toward a
goal or incentive; such striving could occur in the presence as well as the absence of the goal itself."

A strong need for power represents a state of readiness, a propensity to act in a certain way if given the opportunity to express that propensity. The need for power is thus distinct from the actual expression of power, or the utilization of power tactics. Need for power is a psychological precondition for actions which utilize power tactics, many of which are part of leadership style.

What makes a particular action or outcome attractive to a person high in the need for power is the amount of power that he gains, feels or displays in that outcome.

*Winter reports a .13 product-moment correlation for I-E and the need for power. Minton (1967), however, hypothesizes that externality would produce a need for control, or power, and Goodstadt and Hjelle (1973) have suggested that externally oriented individuals use "coercive" forms of power. Evidence gathered in this study show that they may all be correct, in varying degrees. While for the business and military elite as a whole, the locus of control/need for power correlation was weak (.08, n.s.) as Winter hypothesizes, the apparent relationship between internality-externality and the need for power appears to be more complex, and perhaps even less stable than has been thought. Among some "types" of leaders, the strength of association is weak (thus consistent with the Winter theory) while among others (e.g., the existential man) it is extremely strong. This suggests that the relationship is not universal, but tied to other cognitive characteristics.
"In general," states Winter, "two things contribute to the amount of power one feels: the domain, or the number of people over whom one has power, and the range, or the set of behaviors which one can cause in these people." ⁹

Some of the more important behaviors which other research has found to correlate highly with the power motive are found in Table 4.4.

People who exhibit a high need for power as measured through thematic apperception often attempt to impress others. When taking part in group discussions they are very expressive and attempt to be influential. When placed in a potentially competitive situation, the individual high in need for power will often become aggressive, and attempt to control other's actions and decisions. People high in the need for power often nurture relationships for specific, and personally rewarding reasons. They do not often express a genuine concern for people as people. When given the opportunity to take risks, the high need power individual has been found to seek impact through bold attempts at securing large, rather impressive (and often improbable) payoffs. He displays an unusual concern for his reputation (so he may be viewed by others as being
"powerful"), enjoys being able to "call his own shots" with regard to career paths, often holds offices in organizations, and is unusually concerned with acquiring prestige possessions, symbolic of his stature. Evidence accumulated through the observation of small groups has further illustrated that people high in the need for power often display actions which draw attention and attract followers. Such people have been found to gain positions of social influence. Sociometrically, need power individuals are viewed as highly ego-involved and influential. Excessive power motivation, however, especially without affiliative concerns, may lead people to become too highly structured and preoccupied with intensified efforts to control, thus eventually mitigating effective leadership of the small group.

The following explanation has been offered by Winter as the basis of the fear of power component:

"Fear of power seems to result from a reversal in the Oedipal stage. Here the boy identifies with his mother and becomes thereby a sexual object for the father (Freud, 1921). In other words, at the level of fantasy, the boy has submitted to his father, perhaps taking him as
a love object. Such an impulse, either overtly or symbolically homosexual, arouses anxiety at a later age, and is therefore repressed. What we observe as fear of power in an adult male would thus be an anxious concern about power which is based on an earlier association of power with (possibly homosexual) submission. It is still not clear whether power or homosexuality is primary (Ovesey, 1955)."10
[Emphasis supplied.]

Other, perhaps more tenable explanations may be offered. For example, fear of power as being the manifestation of other childhood and adult experiences such as living in a punitative environment (perhaps in the presence of a strong and imposing father), or actual failure of accomplishment resulting in continued fear of failure (or power imposed on the self by others), or fear of success (power attained at the expense of others). It remains unclear whether homosexuality has anything at all to do with the fear of power. In any case, fear of power, as a distinctly measurable component of the power motive, is associated with a strong preference for autonomy, and the avoidance of other powerful people.

While Winter has not attempted to speculate as to the antecedents of a strong "hope of power," its behavioral attributes have been included in Table 4.4.
(Table 4.4) Behavioral Correlates of the "Power Motive"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The seeking of impact</th>
<th>Distorting information (information control)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The seeking of high visibility</td>
<td>Unusual concern with personal reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive modes of participation (in small groups)</td>
<td>Desire for autonomy or personal control (especially with regard to career)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to form alliances when problem-solving</td>
<td>Holding offices in organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal competitiveness</td>
<td>Acquiring prestige: having credit cards, driving highly maneuverable (sports) cars, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nurturance of interpersonal relationships for instrumental gain</td>
<td>Watching sports and reading vicarious &quot;power&quot; magazines (e.g., Playboy, Sports Illustrated, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal aggressiveness</td>
<td>A preference for unassertive, dependent wives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attraction to large payoffs when risk-taking</td>
<td>Verbal hostility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bold risk-taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual concern for maintaining influence over others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of Power</th>
<th>Hope of Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preference for independence of autonomy</td>
<td>Minimal interpersonal competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of structure (especially when imposed by powerful others)</td>
<td>High level of organizational participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General state of physiological arousal (general activation or stress as measured by Thayer, 1967)</td>
<td>More participation in less directly competitive sports (sports involving man against himself or the clock)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress during gaming behaviors</td>
<td>More acquisition of prestige objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumption of alcoholic beverages (to enliven power fantasies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A general feeling of being strong and powerful (as measured by a semantic differential)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the need for power is central to the motive system of the existential leader, other dispositions too manifest themselves, advancing and receding with respect to certain areas of concern. An analysis and comparison of the other motive dispositions (need for achievement, need for affiliation and inhibition) will round out our understanding of the existential personality cluster. While he is quite low in his need to achieve, the existential man is as we have indicated, extremely low in his need to affiliate with others.

The rational and existential leaders share a number of important attributes. Neigher have a strong "hope of power" or "fear of power," though as the following table indicates, the existential man fears powerful others more than does our rational man. Of special significance is the fact that both of these leaders are essentially uninhibited.

The relatively weak need to achieve (by comparative intra-elite standards) indicates that the existential man is not preoccupied with "entrepreneurial" activity. He is, in all probability, not strongly drawn toward the
(Table 4.5) The Existential Man and His Motive Dispositional System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Hope of Power</th>
<th>Fear of Power</th>
<th>N Ach</th>
<th>N Affiliation</th>
<th>Inhibition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.10*</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>2.84**</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .13; **p < .05; ***p < .09
acquisition of wealth (though he is drawn toward the acquisition of other forms of prestige). Similarly, he is not likely to be strongly concerned with creating practical innovations or whole new enterprises (behavioral correlates of the very high need achiever).¹² As we shall see, need achieving behavior need not be prerequisites for organizational leadership which emphasizes norms and role models rather than the creation of new enterprises.

The rather weak need to affiliate with others expressed by our existential man strongly suggests leanings toward a desire for personal autonomy.* Individuals low in the need for affiliation do not experience a special propensity "to be part of a larger social setting," nor do they readily yield to the desires of others, being generally resistant to social influence (this is consonant with this leader's very high level of self-esteem which in turn predicts a general resistance to persuasion). And as consistent with the existential man's propensity to utilize power tactics, his rather low need to affiliate with others indicates he will not easily become emotionally involved in interpersonal relations.

*As we will show, it also relates to his relative mistrust of others.
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Less than any of our other leadership types does the existential man display "activity inhibition." Activity inhibition indicates the opposite of impulsivity; namely, self-control. While low activity inhibition would characterize the leader who is impulsive and expansive in his fantasies of power, the inhibited leader often envisions negative anticipations concerning the consequences of powerful action. That the existential man is both high in his need for power and low in his need for affiliation, as well as uninhibited, lends further credence to our portrayal of him as one whose general traits of action are influenced by a "command identity."

As he is high in self-esteem and the need for power, he is active; as he believes his fate is controlled or otherwise determined by extrinsic forces, he is uncertain; as he is uninhibited, he is highly expressive and apt to live out his private strivings for power.

The personality of our existential man is as follows:
(Table 4.6) The Existential Personality Cluster

Self-esteem
- .09

External Control
- .54*

Inhibition
- .26

Need for Power
- .25

Need Affiliation
.28

Trust
.32****

System Control
- .13

Need for Achievement
.10

Personal Control
.27

-.53*

-.51**

*p < .01; **p < .05; ***p < .06; ****p < .08

It is of interest to note that self-esteem and Factor II (which we called "system control") have a moderately strong correlation. It is of further interest to note that the elevated sense of self and the high need for power expressed by the existential man seem not to be related. The reader may note that inhibition and self-esteem are rather strongly associated, while contrary to the Winter thesis (see the footnote on Page 128 of this chapter), locus of control and the need for power bear a strong inverse relationship (-.54,
p < .05). What is perhaps most remarkable about the locus of control data presented in this table, is that belief in personal control (Factor I) and belief in the ability to control the system or the environment (Factor II) are related rather strongly in an inverse manner (−.53, p < .01). (This, most psychometricians would agree, rather strongly contributes evidence to the notion that the 29-item locus of control measure employed in this study and the vast majority of the literature is multidimensional, containing two, not necessarily related factors. This study has assumed this throughout, as indicated in Chapter One.) While some would consider the apparent unrelatedness of the two factors or dimensions to be undesirable, it does not seem necessarily so. In fact, one could argue quite the contrary. For simply, these data indicate that the locus of control instrument measures two distinct aspects of belief in the ability to control one's fate, and these aspects sometimes do, and sometimes do not, relate to each other.

Another finding which the reader may find of interest is the relationship between need for affiliation with others and belief in personal control. The more strongly one believes he can control his outcomes, the less he needs to affiliate with others. This perhaps indicates that the need
to affiliate characterizes a need to be dependent on others. It is, of course, known that people who exhibit high affiliation imagery do not readily seek personal autonomy. The rather strong positive relationship between the need for personal power and trust (.69, p < .01) seems quite baffling. Perhaps among existential men trusting others represents a form of utilizing others for the establishment of personal goals. The organizational leader who desires success "needs" his superiors and subordinates to attain success, thus the strong positive relationship.

(4.3) Superior-Subordinate Relations

In the last chapter the rational man was described as a type of leader whose "expectations of success" grew out of a personal history of prolonged accomplishment. The existential man has also enjoyed a successful career, though "expectancy" of future success does not activate a particular style of leadership or a way of thinking about the world. For the existential man the ideal of future success is lessened by an experience of incomplete control and the perceived inability to influence important outcomes. When belief in the capacity to master the environment exists, one becomes confident that "success" will be attained.
When an individual believes decisive events in his life are influenced or determined by extrinsic forces, "success" is not expected, for the element of chance can always work against man's best designs. As Machiavelli has exhorted, "fortuna" cannot be understood—"she" must be beaten, controlled. 13

In order to combat the uncertainty and irrationality of a world controlled by chance, the existential man seeks to impose structure. By placing boundaries on all work situations, by making it clear to subordinates what their roles shall be, by imposing control over his own life-space and that of others, by forcing order upon chaos, the existential man hopes to limit the opportunity for the unforeseeable to rear "her" fickle head.

In order to combat the effects of chance, the existential man closely follows the course of his desired outcomes all the way to their conclusion. Because he must closely follow the course of all important outcomes, the existential man has a strong desire for structure.

Because he is unsure that he can exercise control over events he seeks to influence, this type of leader
desires an ordered work milieu and (as we shall soon see), assumes a "command identity." He continuously strives for the elusive control which he believes escapes him, and seeks to initiate structure for his associates, whose otherwise successful achievements would invalidate his external sense of the world. A strong "need for power" is the psychological precondition for his "command identity" and utilization of influence tactics ensures him of an enhanced experience of control. The interaction of this leader's character and worldview gives us a special glimpse of how unconscious motivations affect practical conduct in everyday life.

While our first type of leader, the rational man, was portrayed as both trusting and trustworthy, our second type, the existential man, remains skeptical not only about his own sense of control, but of the sense of control held by others. Because he doubts the ability of any man to have mastery over an irrational environment, he is never certain that the tasks which subordinates and superiors undertake will be successfully accomplished. The existential man therefore closely supervises his subordinates, and attempts to control the nature of their work through the
imposition of structure. All respondents were asked to indicate agreement or disagreement with the following questionnaire items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existential Man</th>
<th>Rational Man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.&quot;</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A good leader makes it clear to everyone what their jobs are&quot;</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existential man believes that in the absence of clear directives subordinates fail to successfully accomplish the tasks required of them.* The skepticism inherent in one who experiences an external sense of control and a highly elevated sense of self-esteem produces an orientation of relative mistrust. Of all our leadership types portrayed

*When asked, How often do you think that most subordinates would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance," almost 10 percent answered, "Very often," while 23 percent answered "Often." This may be contrasted with the rational man whose responses were 4.5 percent and 14 percent, respectively.
in this study, only our entrepreneur feels less interpersonal trust both generally, and with respect to superiors and subordinates.\textsuperscript{14} While it is important to point out the relative magnitude of his mistrust is not great, it does affect his behavior in the organization.\textsuperscript{15}

Consistent with the personality attributes analyzed in the foregoing sections, the existential man assumes a commanding posture over the subordinates in whom he places relatively little trust, and of whom he is highly uncertain. Not only is this leader power-oriented and in need of control, but as our self-report measures indicate, he is both "domineering" and "persuasive."\textsuperscript{16} Our projective measures lend additional credence to this assertion. Our content analysis of

\*The relative mistrust in subordinates jibes with the need power orientation in a complex fashion. While the behavioral correlates of the need for power may be viewed as consistent with a lack of trust, there is a very strong positive relationship between need for power and trust. Among rational men the association between power and trust was slightly negative (-14). Among existential men, a group very high in the need for power and relatively low in trust, the correlation is .45. This suggests that among this group of (high need power) leaders, the higher the need for power, the higher the sense of trust. The relationship between power and trust is curvilinear, with an effective threshold, above which trust and power covary. For the entire parent population (business and military combined) there is no apparent relationship.
all T.A.T. protocols shows that existential men depict characters who exert influence attempts or use force to get their own way between two and three times as often as do our other leadership types.

The impending sense of uncertainty and the power-dominant, low affiliation motivational field defines and delimits the way in which the existential man relates to others. While we have no direct evidence that this leader attempts to control and initiate structure through the manipulation of power symbols (a specialized administrative language, specialized access to information, etc.), Winter does provide us with evidence that such a person may attempt to control the dissemination of information within the organizational network. Control of information in bureaucracies is generally recognized as a key to the control of organizational power. Information control (or distortion, see Table 3.4) has particular relevance in the military organization where certain types of information are "classified," and generally not available to subordinate others.

(4.4) The Existential Man As Self-Starter

The theory of the self-starter states that ambiguity either about the self and the ability to achieve or about
the self and the capacity to control, create a level of anxiety which is the necessary psychological precondition for initiative-taking. We saw, however, that in the case of the rational man freedom from anxiety did encourage much self-starter behavior. The rational man's rather strong need for recognition, however, his moderate need for approval by others, his general state of contentment, and his instrumental and premeditated initiative-taking style indicates that though he is an effective leader who very often takes initiatives, he is not continuously driven to act—he is not a true self-starter. But then who is?

The existential man, we saw, displays a syndrome of cognitive characteristics marked by a relatively high degree of uncertainty concerning the ability to control outcomes which are important to him. This uncertainty or anxiety concerning fate-control is a catalyst for initiative-taking in complex organizations. It creates psychic tension or uneasiness, and promotes both a type-specific style of leadership (the "commanding" style), and a unique style of action. Let us examine the ways in which the existential man seeks to control others through the initiation of self-starter behavior.
Taking Initiatives as a Strategy to Gain Influence

The existential man is to a high degree motivated by a power-dominance orientation. He not only mistrusts, but fears his associates. Does this orientation prohibit him from stimulating their ambitions? It appears that it does not. The existential man frequently reports that he both tries to stimulate the ambitions of his associates (95.5 percent report doing so "very often" or "often"), and presents his superiors with unsolicited recommendations. Although our rational man also stimulates the ambitions of his associates and presents his superiors with unsolicited recommendations, he does so for instrumental reasons and especially for the facilitation of group (or organizational) goals. The existential man takes initiatives both as a strategy to gain influence, and as a way of gaining personal control.

From the evidence presented thus far it is unclear whether (as we claim) the existential man stimulates the ambitions of his associates and frequently presents them with unsolicited recommendations as a form of influence-building, or whether they result from a sense of obligation to the organization, aimed at improving the job and the overall quality of his performance.

The existential man expresses a moderately strong sense of obligation to the job, and he feels more strongly than any of our other leadership types that life becomes meaningful only
when one devotes oneself to an ideal or a cause:

(Table 4.8) "It is only when one devotes himself to an ideal or a cause that life becomes meaningful." (%) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One possible interpretation of these data is that the existential man presents recommendations and attempts to stimulate the ambition of his associates out of a sense of duty, perhaps deriving from the ethos of this leader's particular organization. But let us review the existential character: he is preoccupied with strivings for power and is unusually concerned with maintaining his position of influence. The imagery he projects via the T.A.T. indicates he is more concerned with the larger group than with himself. He has very little trust in his superiors (with whom he rubs elbows daily), yet he reports a strong sense of "duty" to (the more psychologically remote) "organization." He rarely needs to socialize with his associates (nor does he seek nurturance from them), yet he believes that it is only when
he devotes himself to an "ideal" or a "cause" that his life becomes meaningful.

A very interesting picture emerges of the existential sense of hierarchic space.* Subconsciously the existential man views the "organization" and its human members as discrete phenomena. Spatially, the existential man views the "organization" as above himself and above its leaders (in whom he places comparatively little trust). It need not matter that these leaders actually direct the "organization" and help to make it what it is. His superiors are proximate subjects. They are "real" objects toward which he may direct his uncertainty and disquietude. The "organization," "ideal," "duty," and "cause" are separate, and above, the workaday world of the busy leader. They are more distant phenomena, above human relations, and of a quality clearly superior to and different from their human components. While the existential man can never be sure of his outcomes, his superiors and subordinates, he can be certain of the "organization," the

*Our content analysis of all T.A.T. protocols vividly illustrates this leader's sensitivity toward hierarchic relations. The existential man depicts characters expressing manifest concern with superior-subordinate relations about twice as much as our rational and administrative men, and about one-third more than the entrepreneur.
one constant in a psychic world strongly influenced by external forces.

Diagram 4.9 schematizes the existential sense of hierarchic space. As reconstructed from our data, it illustrates how the existential man views the "organization" as above himself, and the organization's human parts:

(Table 4.9) Existential Man and His Sense of Hierarchic Space

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The &quot;Organization&quot; (+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ideals&quot; (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Duty&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Cause&quot; (+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

```
Existential Man
```

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Components of the Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-) Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) Subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(--) Superiors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Robert Presthus has also noted the way in which members of large bureaucracies differentiate between the "organization" and organizational men:

"Big organizations often become a psychic reality, reflecting our tendency to reify abstractions such as the "church" or the "nation"....When the retiring clerk says, 'the corporation has been good to me,' we may suppose that he actually thinks of the 'corporation' as an entity distinct from those who represent it. The significance of such myths, of course, is not that they are illogical but that they influence behavior."

We have strayed some from the theme that the existential man presents superiors with unsolicited recommendations, and stimulates the ambitions of his associates in order to enlarge his organizational sphere of influence. Let us return to our examination and see if other forms of initiative-taking constitute (among existential men) strategy to gain influence.

Challenge-Seeking

In Chapter Three, it will be remembered, we sought to understand initiative-taking by examining both the quantity
and quality of the challenge-seeking behavior exhibited by our rational man. We sought to understand how often this leader attempted to actively seek out challenges in the course of his work, but we also sought to understand the source of his challenge-seeking—did he primarily respond to challenges with which he was presented, or did he actively seek to create challenges? It is of import for us to understand not only how often the active elite responds to challenges, but whether or not he attempts to initiate or create them, an important characteristic of the self-starter.

Frequent challenge-seeking is a salient characteristic not only of leadership style, but of a general strategy for acquiring prestige or status. Of course, if the challenges being sought are not successfully met, a loss in prestige is likely to occur. But the successful accomplishment of the challenge could enhance the leader's prestige. In the case of the existential man it is suggested that challenge-seeking is largely an attempt at proliferating power.

While the locus of control literature would predict that externally oriented people are not seekers of challenges,\textsuperscript{22}
our data indicates that it is the interaction of an external locus of control (the belief that extrinsic forces or agents act on important outcomes) and high self-esteem which produces a strong activity orientation among this type of leader. All respondents were asked:

(Table 4.10) "About how often do you actively seek challenges?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First it is clear that despite his belief that external forces determine challenge outcomes, the existential man seeks challenges well above the norm for all our elites. And we should bear in mind that our leadership "types" have been extracted from two groups which are comprised largely of initiative-takers. Upon close inspection of Table 4.10, the reader will notice that the existential man, more than the rational man, reports he actively seeks challenges "always"
or "very often" (81.8 percent vs. 72.1 percent). In addition, less than the rational, administrative or entrepreneurial types does the existential man report he actively seeks challenges "not very often," "infrequently," or "not at all."

The existential man is a frequent seeker of challenges. When we attempt to locate the source of his challenge-seeking behavior, it will become evident to the reader that he does not pursue challenges (as was just suggested) "in spite of" his experience that outcomes are influenced by extrinsic forces--rather, the existential man frequently seeks challenges precisely because of his sense of being controlled by extrinsic forces, and its attendant level of anxiety. For the existential man, challenge-seeking represents an attempt at both increasing the uncertain sense of control, and enlarging his prestige or domain of power.

(Table 4.11) Source of Challenge-Seeking Among the Existential Man (%)

"Would you consider yourself a person who actively looks for challenges, or someone who becomes motivated primarily through challenges that appear on your desk?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(Self) Actively Look</th>
<th>(Environment) Respond To Challenges Presented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is perhaps striking about the comparative data presented thus far is not the difference in frequency and kind of initiative-taking behavior displayed by our rational and existential men, but the similarity. Both leaders, more than either the administrative or entrepreneurial men, are great seekers of challenges. The rational man is highly "internal" and anxiety-free--the existential man highly "external" and imbued with anxiety. How is it that they both take initiatives? Doesn't the existential experience of being controlled by forces foster a fatalistic and quietistic approach to life?

The rational man, as we have suggested, is a utilitarian. He takes initiatives because by doing so he does his job better. The outcomes of his initiative-taking behavior are what makes him happy. Not coincidentally, these outcomes (more often successful than not), enhance his position in the organization. The rational man does not need to seek challenges--he does so because he wants to.
The meaning of challenge-seeking behavior is quite different for the existential man. More than any other leadership type the existential man feels a need to actively seek out new challenges. His actions derive from a strong need to control processes and outcomes which are seemingly irrational yet important to him. His motivation for control is strong and is informed by a "need for power." The uncertainty inextricably bound up with the experience that forces outside of him control his fate produces a need to impose structure, or a need to impose order where there is chaos. It is only through the imposition of structure that this type of leader may hope to control outcomes and reduce the anxiety which emanates from his experience of a disordered world. The experience of being controlled by exogenous forces when accompanied by a lack of inhibition produces an active orientation toward the world, and a need to bring it under reign.

The existential man, then, takes initiatives as a means to bring an uncertain world under control. The existential man does not take initiatives because he wants
to; the existential man takes initiatives because he must. It is his essentially uninhibited character which allows him to act out his personal need for control and externalize rather than repress that need. The existential leader imposes his goals upon his environment.

The existential man is together with our rational man, the greatest seeker of challenges. And together with the rational man he reports more often than our administrative or entrepreneurial men that he attempts to create challenges. This finding, while consistent with a number of literatures which suggest that anxiety or uncertainty can be a spur to positive forms of action,\textsuperscript{23} departs from a number of findings presented in the locus of control literature\textsuperscript{24} which suggests that people who believe they are not in complete control of their fate will not attempt to act on their environment.*

*There are primarily two reasons for this finding as posited in the locus of control literature: (1) because the "externals" which the literature has studied are "powerless" by social definition (i.e., they are children, minorities, students, and people outside formal positions of power) and thus are unable to articulate potential courses of action, or mobilize resources for that end, and (2) the typical locus of control study reported in psychology journals is bivariate and mono-causal. For example, the typical study will investigate the direct relation between I-E and need achievement, or I-E and I.Q., or I-E and insecurity. It will rarely be a multi-trait study which examines the interactive effects of large numbers of personality variables.
Our data suggest that it is precisely because of the uncertainty generated by incomplete control that action is taken. Whether the motives behind the actions are selfish or altruistic depends on a congeries of other interrelated personality factors such as the need for personal and social power, and an equally important host of situational factors or determinants such as the opportunity for the expression of personal needs. This is not to say that insecurity or uncertainty is a necessary and sufficient cause for the taking of initiatives. The reader may be reminded that the rational man, free from control-related insecurities, was a great taker of initiatives. The existential man, even greater still.

The form and extent of initiative-taking behavior differs among the various leadership types because the interpretation of important events and the worldview itself is different. The meaning of the challenge is different. A secure man, comfortable with his sense of achievement and believing in his ability to control outcomes which are important to him, will often act because he is free to express both his curiosity and his intentions. In the organizational context, this man will not fear adverse
reactions from his superiors. The man who is uncertain either of his ability to achieve, or his ability to control outcomes may act to validate his sense of self to compensate for perceived inadequacy (or insecurity),\textsuperscript{25} or merely to improve his current condition which he may find unsatisfying. Yet he \textit{does} act.

Again, it appears that this leader is able to project or externalize his personal needs--especially the "need for power."

At this juncture I would like to suggest that only when one is able to \textit{externalize} private needs can the expression of private motives in practical conduct be paramount. Only then can private motives replace the imperative of organizational norms.

When in Chapter Four we compare the character of our existential man with that of the entrepreneur (his "external" counterpart), we will see that there is a great difference in the \textit{behavior} of the leader who lacks control and wants it, and the leader who lacks control and thinks he can never get it. It is inhibition which here plays a central role. The leader who lacks control but is uninhibited \textit{wants} control and \textit{tries} to get it. The leader who experiences external
When a leader is faced with an important decision, he must consider a range of potential outcomes. In the case where there are no clear guidelines to action, no precedents or groundrules by which to frame judgments, hence make decisions, taking action is particularly difficult. In fact, many leaders are excellent "game players" or norm enforcers, yet they are unable to free themselves from the imperatives or organizational norms and make decisions about which there exist no groundrules or precedents. Indeed, Daniel Katz has said that "innovative and spontaneous activity in achieving organizational objectives which go beyond...role specifications, is essential for a functioning organization."\textsuperscript{26}

Ordinarily the leader faces three possible strategies in deciding how to act in the face of incomplete, or altogether missing guidelines for action. First, he may seek to obtain more information about his possible alternative courses of action. The leader may feel uncomfortable about making his decision without this additional information and may feel dependent on this (or a clearly delineated set of norms) for a "rational" decision to be made. A second available strategy
would be to refrain from acting, for such action could be considered hasty, irrational or chancy. Here too the leader may feel discomfort with decisiveness, or he may feel particularly inhibited by the absence of groundrules which at least function to limit alternatives, if not completely govern the course of action to be taken (this "strategy" is characteristic of our administrative man). And third, the leader could act, in spite of the uncertainty involved. While the reader may think the final strategy to be foolish or impetuous, there are many conditions under which a decision must be made, whether groundrules for that decision have been laid or not. The battlefield can be such a situation.

The theory of the self-starter outlined in Chapter One postulates that decisiveness in the face of uncertainty is a particular talent, not common to all men, or even all effective leaders of men. While the "organizational man" transposes extant norms into action, the self-starter initiates action upon which future norms are based. The self-starter is thus able to function effectively without guidance from the existing
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control and is inhibited, accepts his other-directedness and copes with his anxiety in other (more private) ways.

The Existential Man and Situational Ambiguity

Thus far we have seen that the existential man displays a number of self-starter behaviors: he is highly "active" (as measured by semantic differential), he very often attempts to stimulate the ambition of his associates, he often presents superiors with unsolicited recommendations, he is a frequent seeker of challenges, and he attempts to create challenges more than any other leadership type. He is a taker of initiatives. The commanding style which characterizes the existential man indicates the ways in which those self-starter behaviors are initiated. We have already noted that the existential man has a strong sense of duty, and a belief that one should be devoted to a cause to find life meaningful. These feelings too relate to the existential man as a self-starter. With respect to his initiative-taking behavior, a sense of uncertainty has been shown to be a catalyst for action from within. Now let us examine how the existential man as self-starter fares in situations which lack a clear definition of norms.
normative system. He is able to formulate courses of action by direction from within.*

The existential man has been said to act. His worldview is existential and visceral, his mien domineering, his identity "commanding," take charge. His motivations, of course, may not always be constructive, or his goals congruent with those of his organization. But by all available indicators, the existential man acts. How does he feel about acting where no groundrules or organizational precedents exist—where he must display personal initiative? All respondents were asked:

(Table 4.12) "How comfortable do you feel about making decisions about which there exist no organizational groundrules, precedents?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Not At All Uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All bureaucratic leaders are, of course, largely bound to the norms of their respective organizations. When the opportunity arises for personal initiative-taking (however frequently or infrequently), the self-starter is able to formulate courses of action from within. He is not dependent on others, or a set of proscribed rules for action. In this sense he is an "innovator."
As is evident from Table 4.12, the existential man feels more comfortable than either the rational man or the business and military elite as a whole in making decisions about which there exist no organizational ground rules or precedents. We would like to suggest an interpretation of these data which is consistent with the existential view of the world and the character which informs that view.

Being faced with situational ambiguity does not present the existential man with a unique or especially challenging situation. He lives in an ambiguous world. The capacity to find order in experience is the classic existential coping strategy. It might well be that the creative (or active) existential leader could not tolerate ambiguity or "a wild profusion of ideas and experiences" if he did not have a profound confidence in his capacity to bring some new kind of order out of this chaos. The existential man, as contrasted with our more insecure leadership types, does have profound self-confidence and in Carl Rogers' terms, "uncon-
ditional positive self-regard." This positive self-regard and a state of mind which accepts habitual disorder makes the existential man uniquely capable of handling situational ambiguity. It is the world which, by its nature, is in a state of disarray. The successful leader must cope with this disarray if success is ever to be achieved. The existential man is a leader who can cope, whether there is a clear course of action or situational ambiguity. In contrast with the rational man he is visceral; action-oriented first, contemplative second.

Goal Selection

The self-starter, we hypothesized, initiates action from within. He needs little reliance on others for his sense of direction.

"The creative individual has the capacity to free himself from the web of social pressures in which the rest of us are caught. He doesn't spend much time asking, 'What will people say?' The fact that 'everybody's doing it' doesn't mean he's doing it."27

What evidence do we have for the assertion that the existential man as self-starter selects and follows his own goal paths? While we can offer no evidence that the existential man is "inner-directed" with regard to daily decisions made on the
job, we can present the reader with evidence that with respect to important life goals, this leader is a man of his own choosing:

(4.13) "To what extent do you believe your life's goals are truly your own, and how much the result of others' expectations?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely My Own</th>
<th>Very Much My Own</th>
<th>Largely My Own</th>
<th>Not So Much My Own</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation of these data is not a simple matter. A number of viable explanations may be offered. It is evident that a significant number of existential men report their life's goals to be completely their own. Many readers may find this surprising when it is remembered that the existential leadership type is comprised of persons who feel that their desired outcomes are decided by factors extrinsic to their personal motivations, abilities, and actions. Yet as self-starters, this group had more leaders report that their
life's goals were completely their own than any other leadership type (or business and military elite populations as a whole).

Upon inspection of Table 4.13, however, the reader will notice an equally large number of existential men who report that their life's goals are only "largely their own." And here we say "only" because in making intra-elite comparisons most leaders report their goals to be even more self-selected than that (although, of course, "largely" selecting one's goals may be noteworthy in itself). Perhaps one possible explanation for this complex finding is that for some existential men the need for power and its primary expression, the need to create impact, often determines the selection of important life's goals. In order to impress others, one must aspire to goals valued by others. While the existential man as self-starter may initiate and direct activity by stimulus from within, the objects of his activity, the goals he pursues, may be, and probably are, influenced by external considerations such as the way others view the self. This interpretation is consistent with the emphasis which this work has placed on differences in leadership style or operational codes, which are dictated by larger
worldviews and derived from type-specific cognitive makeups.

Initiative—Taking Outside the Organization—Running for Office

One way in which a highly motivated person may seek to bring about change, or impose his will on important issue-outcomes, is to run for either public office or office in various student of professional organizations, clubs, or associations. Because people who have a strong need to express themselves through the use of power tactics need a forum through which these tactics may be expressed, Winter has shown that such persons readily hold positions of office. The existential man, however, is not a great seeker of official office. This may be because the high status which he holds within his respective organization affords him the necessary means by which he may express and fulfill his power needs.*

Similarly, while the existential man has been found to be the most "dominant" and "persuasive" of all leadership types, he expresses little "opinion-leadership." He very infrequently tries to convince others of his political beliefs:

*Our military respondents have an extremely limited opportunity to run for public office. Even if an officer was highly motivated, it would be very difficult to gain office. These data reflect lack of opportunity, not any special lack of ambition.
(Table 4.14) "Have you tried to convince anyone of your political beliefs lately?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esistential Man</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, the existential man does report more than any other leadership type, that other people frequently ask him advice on political matters. This finding is consistent with the existential man's highly elevated self-esteem. His belief is that others often solicit his advice, for he is a "commander."

While we can offer the reader no direct evidence that the existential man is not a seeker of office because his high occupational status offers him the opportunity to express

*The two opinion-leadership questions used in this study are those used by the Survey Research Center. On such self-reports it is admittedly difficult to assess whether the data is valid. Generally speaking, we believe it is. Yet among certain kinds of people (and perhaps the existential man is one) answers reflect ideal perceptions, not necessarily perceptions others would have of the respondent.
his personal needs (especially the need to generate and maintain influence and enhance his personal prestige), we can examine how generally content and satisfied this leader is with his job. It is reasonable to assume that a major determinant of "satisfaction" with one's job is the extent to which performance of the job satisfies a variety of personal needs.31

(Table 4.15) "How much do you enjoy yourself on a typical workday?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Not So Much</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 4.16) "Are you satisfied with the amount of challenges presented you by your work environment?" (\%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Completely Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Not At All Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the existential man enjoys his "typical" workday less than the rational man, he enjoys his day considerably more than either the whole business or military elite. This we believe to be a strong indicator that the organization satisfies the personal needs of the existential man.* We may also presume that the number of challenges offered by the job is an important determinant of job satisfaction among ambitious elites. Here too the existential man appears to be not at

*A number of observers have stressed that job satisfaction is related not only to how well the job satisfies personal needs, but how thoroughly the worker internalizes the norms and goals of the organization and makes them congruent with, or even identical to, his own. It is, of course, possible that the existential man has done this, hence his general sense of satisfaction.
all unhappy.*

The Self-Starter Needs Little Encouragement

In order to be a true self-starter one must not only take initiatives and act on impulse from within, but one must also be able to do so with little encouragement from others. It is not the environment which spurs the self-starter to action, but the self-starter which spurs on members of his environment. The self-starter stimulates the ambitions of his associates, he presents his superiors with unsolicited recommendations, he seeks challenges and creates situations where he may take initiatives of many kinds. The existential man as self-starter, however, does not conform perfectly to our ideal vision of the "self-starter." While he is perhaps more of self-starter than any of the other leadership types, alas he is human, and he too needs encouragement. But together with the rational man, the existential leader needs less encouragement than either of our other two leadership types or the business and military elites as a whole. Less than 5 percent report they need encouragement "very often,"

*The author hypothesized that self-starters would be less content with the amount of challenges offered by the job. While the existential man is less satisfied than any of the other types, the magnitude of that dissatisfaction does not appear to support the hypothesis.
while almost one quarter (the largest percentage of all types) report they "rarely" or "never" need encouragement. (It is of interest to note that the need for encouragement and this leader's experience of being controlled by exogenous forces correlate at -.39, p.<.03. The external sense of control does not demand "other-directed" support. Rather, it encourages personal autonomy.)

The Need for Recognition

Though the existential man as self-starter needs little encouragement, he does have a strong need to be recognized for his accomplishments. And that is because the need for recognition (i.e., the need to have impact) is consonant with (and nearly identical to) the "need for power" as measured through our T.A.T.'s.

The self-starter who needs no recognition may indeed be a great taker of initiatives or even a great innovator. Yet can such a self-starter be a great leader? I think not. Such a man would be more akin to Maccoby's "technician;" unconcerned with maintaining control over men, or with creating impact. While the existential man is driven to do, to act, and to acquire prestige, he must be recognized for his efforts. Only the technician derives pure satisfaction
from the process of working on the challenge. Only he need not be recognized for his accomplishments. The need to create impact, the need to impress others, the need to bring others under one's control, and under one's persuasion marks the effective leader of men. In fact, one way in which David McClelland believes we can transform the "average" business executive into a highly motivated and dynamic leader of men is to raise his need for power, or his motivation to influence and impact others.  

While the existential man as self-starter does have a relatively strong need to be recognized for his accomplishments and while he does report he is satisfied with his job, this does not mean that the existential man would be content with either his job or himself if he was for some reason unable to move into a higher position of status and power within his respective organization. The self-starter, we said, is continuously motivated to do, to act. Upon the successful accomplishment of an important goal, he does not rest, but becomes cognizant of new, as yet unresolved, challenges. If for any reason the existential man was prevented from obtaining more status, more prestige, more power, his most dominant need-system would be shut down.
This type of leader needs an expansive organization, flexible enough to accommodate his continuous activation in all its forms. The following table offers some striking data:

(Table 4.17) "If it became apparent that you could not move into a higher position in your sponsoring organization, would you remain content with your present job?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existential man as self-starter must be able to move—to obtain more, to remain active. The self-starter never rests. Not a single existential man would be content if he was prevented from moving onward and upward.

(4.5) **The Paradox of Existential Man**

The focus of tension, the inherent paradox of the existential man revolves around his need to be active. While the existential man as leader and as self-starter believes that he has incomplete control of his fate, he does not diminish his level of activity or assume a quietistic posture. In no
way does his perception of being controlled by external forces inhibit the existential man from taking initiatives.

That his preoccupation with activity takes the form of a quest for certainty is not surprising. The remarkable ability of such a man, to be fully able to act in the face of uncertainty, to be able to impose order on a world conceived of as being in disorder, is the central paradox of the classic existential man, and that of our second leadership type. It is because of his remarkable resiliency and strength and his devotion to a cause that the existential man is not only an effective leader and a motivated self-starter, but an effective leader of men.* Of all leadership types in this study, the existential man contains the largest percentage of military officers with an accelerated promotional record. Existentials are not only men who need to act, but they are leaders who act out their needs.

*Lenin was just such a man. He did not trust the determinism of orthodox Marxism—that the revolution would be the logical outgrowth of antagonisms inherent in his society. Lenin could not leave it up to the fates to determine his outcome, and the outcome of the revolution. He sought to make certain his fate through purposive revolutionary activity. Those orthodox Marxists like Karl Kautsky who refused to act on history were labeled "passive renegades." Lenin imposed structure on the revolution by a vanguard (from above), and controlled the vanguard by imposition of structure from within. He called this "discipline."
While the existential leader believes he can never be sure of his future, of important outcomes, he strives nevertheless. While he is unsure of his ability to control the future he seeks to control it through a "commanding" leadership style. And while a general sense of fate-control eludes him, as a leader he functions more effectively than any other "type" in situations where precedent, groundrules and "control" are absent.

In a study done almost thirty years ago, long before empirical notions of "internality" and "externality" had been developed, W. E. Henry said of over one hundred business executives who had taken part in a series of depth interviews:

"In spite of their firmness of character and their drive to activity, they also harbor a rather pervasive feeling that they may not succeed and be able to do the things they want to do. It is not implied that this sense of frustration comes only from their immediate business experience. It seems far more likely to be a feeling of long-standing within them and to be only accentuated and reinforced by their present business experience." 35

It would seem more likely to say that the long-standing sense of uncertainty results not so much in frustration, as it does in anxiety, uneasiness. This anxiety about controlling future outcomes, and its interaction with the belief that one is capable, distinguishes the existential man and powers his ceaseless need to act.
Overview of the Existential Man

The existential man is a remarkably resilient leader, high in self-esteem, yet uncertain of his fate. He has been shown to have a stronger "need for power" than any of the leadership types in this study. While this need for power is the distinctive mark of the existential man, and while the existential man exhibits relatively little trust in superiors and subordinates, he is a firm believer in the higher ideals of his organization.

His "command identity" informs all aspects of his leadership style, from the handling of power and superior-subordinate relations to the taking of initiatives which he does (without bold self-assurance), in order to enlarge his domain of influence. The existential man is not only an effective organizational leader or a driven self-starter, but he is also a leader of men.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Character</strong></th>
<th><strong>Behavior</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High self-esteem</td>
<td>Imposes structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of external control</td>
<td>Closely supervises subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domineering</td>
<td>Takes initiatives as strategy to gain influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong need for power, moderate need for achievement</td>
<td>Actively seek challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low inhibition</td>
<td>Actively creates challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low affiliation</td>
<td>Comfortable making decisions when there exists no organizational groundrules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-high anxiety</td>
<td>Stimulates ambitions of associates, presents superiors with unsolicited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrusting</td>
<td>recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Command identity&quot;</td>
<td>(Military) are promoted in an accelerated fashion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footnotes To Chapter Four

1. See Table 4.3 of this chapter, Page 123. An interesting aspect of the existential man's elevated sense of self is his estimate of his I.Q. While we felt it was important to know about differences in intelligence which could affect leadership style, getting this data was not possible. We therefore used a modified semantic differential measure to examine our respondents' own estimate of their I.Q.'s. Of all leadership types, the existential man had the highest self-estimate. This may or may not be based on "real" I.Q.


3. Over three times as many existential men felt they were "always" successful than did our rational man, leaders marked by very positive self-regard.

4. One may, for example, compare the need for power scores of the existential man with those presented in Chapter Three, Table 3.4, or with the various groups tested in McClelland's, The Drinking Man. The T.A.T. scoring system is that used both by Winter and McClelland, corrected for word length. Because of differing test conditions, differing protocols, an even number of pictures (normalization of word-length notwithstanding), comparisons between our respondents and those of other studies should be made with caution. These comparisons
will yield only rough comparative estimates.


6. Richard deCharms, Personal Causation, Academic Press, 1968, deCharms develops a technical theory concerning belief in personal causation, but the underlying assumptions are not strictly grounded in learning theory as is Rotter's locus of control construct.


8. Ibid., p. 18.

9. Ibid., p. 204.


11. These correlates have been culled from a series of studies using the power motive as it has been measured in this study. The studies were either The Power Motive, The Drinking Man, or Human Motivation, A Book of Readings, or reported in those works.

12. Behavioral correlates of the need achiever may be found throughout the following major works: The Achieving Society, Motivating Economic Achievement, and Human Motivation, A Book of Readings. Probably the most recent (and complete) review of need achievement research can be found in Stephen Fineman, "The Achievement Motive Construct and Its Measurement: Where Are We Now?" British Journal of Psychology, 68, pp. 1–22, 1977.

14. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Index of Interpersonal Trust</th>
<th>Trust In Subordinates</th>
<th>Trust In Superiors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>63.01</td>
<td>65.23</td>
<td>60.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>67.60*</td>
<td>69.02**</td>
<td>65.58***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .13; ***p < .16

15. The existential "fear of power" which is moderate, indicates that this leader fears powerful others. It is possible that the existential man mistrusts superiors because he is fearful of them. Whether this sense of fear has been fostered out of "a reversal of the Oedipal stage" as Winter suggests, or because of relations with a punative or stern father as we would suggest, is unknown. But the uncertainty which leader experiences extends itself toward the elevation of other powerful people, and provides a general framework by which such people may be treated. While it may be exaggerated to say that the existential man is suspicious of superiors, he does report markedly less trust in them than he does in subordinates.

This evidence lends support to the notion that for the existential man, trust in superiors represents a very special case of general interpersonal trust, perhaps tied to the life history.
16. Measured on a self-report five-point continuum (to be found in the Appendix) our existential man is more persuasive than all other types, and more dominant than our administrative and entrepreneurial men, though slightly less so than our rational men.

17. At least eight separate published studies have shown that "externals" are more anxious than "internals" and/or that they are anxious when compared to the population at large. Some of the more frequently cited are: Hountras, P. J., and M. C. Scharf (1970); Platt and Eisenaman (1968); Ray and Kathahn (1968); Watson (1967).

18. 9.1 percent report doing so "always," while another 81.8 percent report doing so "very often" or "often." Only our rational man reports presenting superiors with recommendations this frequently.

19. 63.6 percent "strongly agree" that "it is the duty of each person to do his job the very best he can." The other 36.4 percent "agree."

20. This imagery has been formally measured as a need for "personal" power component and a need for "social" power component. As we indicated in Chapter One, strong social power needs indicate that the individual is more concerned with larger group goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Power</th>
<th>Social Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


22. Perhaps the most common finding in the literature is that "externals" are quietistic and stressed. They are neither activists nor need achievers.

23. This is the major theme of social contract thinkers like Hobbes, who believed that the fear and anxiety of primitive society was what induced men into "social contracts." It also receives currency in the work of Lasswell and Weber, and more recently Rollo May (1977).

24. For example, Seeman equates powerlessness with Rotter's sense of external control (c.f., M. Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," *American Sociological Review*, 1959, 24, pp. 873-91); similarly, Strickland showed that black activists were more internal than non-activists (this finding has helped perpetrate the inferential error alluded to on p.36 of this work).

25. There is a large literature on "self-validation" and compensating behaviors. One of the more interesting discus-
sions can be found in Robert Lane's *Political Thinking and Consciousness*, Chapter 7, where he discusses acquisition of status as a compensating behavior.


29. 4.5 percent have reported running for public office, although over 72 percent have run for office in clubs, associations, student groups, etc. This is about the norm for all leadership types.

30. About 55 percent (more than any other type) report that other people ask them advice on political matters.

31. This is a major theme in the work of Argyrus. Browning and Jacob (1964) illustrate how opportunity interacts with motivational need systems. They found that politicians in offices of power and achievement potential were more strongly motivated toward satisfying power and achievement needs than were a matched group of politicians in low power and achievement offices. The implication is that high-potential offices attract people with relatively strong need power and achievement orientations.
32. 18.2 percent "strongly agreed" that "after successfully completing a long and arduous task it is very important to me that people recognize me for my accomplishments." 59.18 percent "agreed" and only 4.5 percent "disagreed."


34. N. Lenin, *What Is To Be Done,* International Publishers, 1969. For a psychoanalytic examination of party discipline, the reader may also want to see Nathan Leites, *A Study of Bolshevism,* Free Press, 1953, where in Chapter Five he develops the theme that discipline entailed "control of feelings" and the "control of sponteneity."

CHAPTER FIVE
The Administrative Man

Introduction

The administrative man experiences a strong sense of control. He lives in a world governed not by unknown forces or the whim of chance, but by man's capabilities and passions. Despite his belief that he is the master of his fate this leader is insecure. His experience of personal control does not effectively enhance his sense of self-worth. This leader is anxious because he is uncertain about his ability to achieve continued success in the organization.

The administrative man is more reliant than self-reliant, more a norm enforcer than a creator of norms, and more a follower than his formal leadership status would encourage us to predict. The psychological struggle of this leader concerns his self-image.

His Self-Image

The way in which other people regard us is central to our image of ourselves. The boldest statement of this theory was made by Cooley who felt that the central determinant of a person's self-concept is how he thinks other people think of him. Thus the famous "looking-glass" self. While we have stressed the notion that self-esteem is not wholly founded
upon the opinions of others, the concept of the "looking-glass" self is important for understanding how some kinds of people behave. Administrative man is such a person. His psychological struggle centers around his perception of how he is viewed by others. The administrative man is constantly riddled with doubts about his "looking-glass" self. He wonders, "Do my colleagues like me... do they have faith in me?... do they respect me?" When the world looks at him, administrative man worries about what it sees.

While he is highly oriented toward problem-solving and analytic behaviors, this type of leader struggles with his "need to achieve". It is not so much production per se or the solving of difficult problems which cause the administrative man to be anxious, it is how others will receive and evaluate what he produces that causes anxiety. The task or the problem itself is less the hurdle than is the private anxiety created over public acceptance of the solution. Because he is anxious about being evaluated by others he tries very hard to relate to people in a positive manner. He often tries too hard. His continued attempts to be liked only fail, and the administrative man is often viewed as self-centered, even egotistical.

Our rational man, both active and certain, pursued success through an elevated sense of self and an "expectancy" of succeeding. Our existential man, active yet uncertain,
but also sure of his self-worth, succeeded because of the enormous efforts he generated toward controlling his environment and its outcomes. The administrative man succeeds for two reasons: (1) because his personal goals are congruent with the expectations of his organization, and; (2) because his organization provides the type of environment which satisfies and allows him to express his personal needs.

Goal-congruence provides him with a set of norms and a sense of direction which serve to minimize the natural conflict which arises when personal needs and professional expectations collide. And while the organization "needs" the norm enforcer in order to maintain itself and further its goals, the administrative man uses the environment provided him by his organization to satisfy deeply embedded needs—in particular, the prepotent "need to achieve." Administrative man is akin to William Whyte's famous "organization man," yet he is less the passive instrument of the organization. The administrative man and his organization have a deeply symbiotic relationship.

His Worldview

We saw in Chapter 3 how the rational man experiences a rational worldview. His rationalism penetrates all aspects of his leadership style from his formal handling of power relations to his preference for choosing experts rather than
friends in problem-solving. His gut-level feeling, his gestalt view of the world is that it is comprehensible. He believes the world and its problems can be understood, controlled.

In marked contrast to the rational man stands the existential man, an active-uncertain whose worldview embraces a feeling of resignation, of incomprehensibility. The world as our existential man experiences it moves in strange and oftentimes unfathomable ways. Continued recourse to contemplation in favor of action would serve little purpose. The existential man feels compelled to act in the face of uncertainty. For him, this gives life meaning.

In the present chapter we shall examine the worldview and the internal "state of mind" of the administrative man. It is a worldview wrought with tension and blended with resignation. Administrative man knows he can reap great rewards if and only if he assimilates himself into the normative system laid before him by his organization. If he takes the organization's goals as his own, success will be his. The assimilative process involves extraordinary self-discipline and a sense of compromise. In company policy-making and political realms, the administrative man expresses reformist sentiments. He displays little of the detached instrumentalism which marks the rational man, even less the anxiety-driven boldness which characterizes the existential leader. The administrative man does not employ power tactics and strategems of manipulation in his attempts at getting ahead, for his world has no need of
manipulation. His world is relatively stable, governed by clearly defined normative courses of action which provide for predictable sanctions and rewards.

Administrative man is anxious about how often and how much he should direct his achievement-related efforts toward the attainment of organizationally defined and rewarded goals. The point of uncertainty is not, as it is for the existential man, the point at which the forces of the world impinge upon the goals of the individual; but it is the point at which the individual's capabilities and sense of compromise collide with the world's expectations.

While we shall show the reader that there is much self-starter in the administrative man, it shall become evident that this type of leader attains success primarily because he is especially deft at translating extant policy into action. He is a leader who sustains rather than creates norms. From the view of the organization, his role as an "administrative man" is irreplaceable.

(5.1) The Administrative Man and His Sense of Self

The rational man lives in a world of psychic comfort. He is comfortable with his high status, with what he has achieved and how, and he is at ease when relating to others. He treats his fellow-workers with respect and trust and expects that his trust will be returned. It will, for his world is a benevolent one. He is extremely happy in his work
and expresses little concern over his future. He is certain he will continue to enjoy the fruits of a successful professional life. The existential man is driven not by an "expectancy of success" but by a vision of failure—failure to control people and outcomes that are important to him. His experience of an unstable world necessitates the pursuit of control. The pursuit is carried on through the imposition of structure and a posture of "command."

We will now turn to the administrative man and examine his self-image. How does his sense of self-esteem interact with and delimit his vision of the world?

When asked questions about his sense of self-worth, the administrative man consistently shows his insecurity. Though he is by all objective measures a great success,* he does not view himself as such:

(Table 5.1) "How often do you feel you are a successful Person?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always/Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Among the group of administrative men we find three directors or general managers, two vice-presidents, three colonels, and two majors who have been promoted in an accelerated fashion.
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The administrative man, unlike the two leadership types we have already presented, suffers from a lack of self-esteem. Even though he has proved throughout his successful career that his is capable of solving most problems that come his way, he has doubts about his ability:

(Table 5.2) "How certain are you of your ability to accomplish the tasks which will be required of you in the job role(s) for which you are now training?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Certain</th>
<th>Certain</th>
<th>Slightly Certain/Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 5.3) "How often do you feel that you can do everything well?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always/Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not Very Often/Infrequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The insecurity which this type of leader experiences derives not only from his achievement-related anxiety. Other infirmities of his self-image are apparent. Of particular significance is his fear of dissapproval by others.

(Table 5.4) "When you have to talk in front of a class or a group of people your own age, how afraid or worried do you usually feel?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Worried</th>
<th>Worried</th>
<th>Slightly Worried</th>
<th>Not Worried At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite*</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only does the administrative man score consistently lower on questionnaire items directly intended to measure his "self-esteem," but he also expresses insecurity in less direct ways. For example, when asked to rank-order a number of characteristics which contribute to his occupational success, the administrative man typically ranks "self-confi-

*It is interesting to note that this is one of the few cases where the whole business and military populations differ markedly. The military elite score higher on the self-esteem index, and it is our belief that "self-esteem" may be more important, more highly valued by military personnel.
dence" lower than does all other leadership types. Similarly, when asked how he feels when required to direct subordinates, the administrative man most frequently reports feelings of discomfort.

How does the experience of insecurity interact with his strong sense of internal control? Wouldn't it seem that belief in the ability to control one's fate would strengthen feelings of insecurity? Would it not seem reasonable to assume that people who believe they are in control of their environment would also believe themselves to be personally efficacious?6

For administrative man, such is not the case. This type of leader envisages a world of order and understands the benefits of a career played by the rules of the game. Luck, fate, chance and other exogenous forces are insignificant factors in his stab at a successful life. Personal ability and a sense of willingness to do what one must to succeed are the sole determinants of his fate. Because the administrative man knows he can succeed if he meets the expectations of his organization, he painfully accepts all responsibility for his ultimate success and failure. Unlike the existential leader who believes his fate is controlled by forces outside himself, the administrative man
cannot absolve himself of his destiny. As his capabilities, his sense of willingness and ardor determine his future, it is he, and not some force extrinsic to himself which must bear the responsibility of his future. It is this knowledge, the knowledge that fate lies only in his hands, which creates the principal psychological burden of the administrative man (see table 5.5).

When compared to other elite professionals in this study or to the population at large, it is evident that this type of leader experiences a strong perception of control. Compared with either the rational man or the existential man, the administrative man is insecure. Unlike the insecurity which marks the existential man, and which derives from his belief that he is the victim of forces which he can neither control nor understand, the insecurity which drives the administrative man is twofold: First, his is anxious about whether his personal capabilities can provide him with the means to achieve success, a state of affairs determined only by "personal causation" and second, he is insecure about how others view him and his accomplishments.

How does this twofold sense of insecurity interact with other important personality characteristics which determine leadership style? An examination of the motivational determinants of the administrative man should deepen our
(Table 5.5) Self-esteem and Locus of Control
For Administrative Man†

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Whole I-E</th>
<th>Personal Control</th>
<th>System Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>61.83</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>84.91**</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>83.90**</td>
<td>11.50**</td>
<td>3.360*</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>71.94**</td>
<td>8.29**</td>
<td>2.604</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>73.05**</td>
<td>8.23**</td>
<td>2.202</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .001

†We would like to remind the reader that the self-esteem index reported in this and all other tables is a ten-question index normalized so that respondents may score between 0 and 100.
understanding of what drives and directs his behavior. Let us now turn to his "motive system" and examine his dominant needs--that of "achievement" and the need to be liked.

(5.2) Motivational Determinants

In the last chapter we portrayed the existential man as a leader dominated by a strong "need for power." This need was described as a state of readiness or a propensity for pursuing certain classes of actions whose goal was the creation of impact. The need for power was analyzed as a psychological pre-condition for behaviors which favor interpersonal influence tactics. Such tactics we maintained, was existential man's response to an experience of an unstable world which had to be brought under reign.

In the present chapter we shall want to show how "the need to achieve" dominates the need system of the administrative man and informs all aspects of his leadership style. We shall do this by first briefly describing the need for achievement as it has been used in other research, and then analyzing it as it has been expressed through thematic apperception by administrative man. We shall conclude this section by mapping the internal dynamics of his personality.
"The Need for Achievement"—Other Investigations

Over twenty years ago, David McClelland wondered what it was that caused cultures to rise and fall. His understanding of human motivation led him to hypothesize that the growth and decay of cultures was primarily due to the "personality" characteristics of its peoples. Specifically, it was due to the presence or absence of a peoples' achieving disposition. In search of evidence in support of his hypothesis, McClelland undertook an ambitious journey through history. By sampling traces of long-decayed cultures through examination of various artifacts, folktales and novels, McClelland hoped he could illustrate the effect of the "achieving personality" on the march of history. The result of McClelland's efforts was a fascinating account of personality and culture. Entitled The Achieving Society, McClelland's heuristic work spawned literally thousands of investigations into the nature of the achievement motive.

We shall endeavor only to broaden our understanding of the ways in which need achievement can affect leadership in complex organizations by briefly summarizing the dominant characteristics associated with the need to achieve. This has been done in Table 5.6.
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(Table 5.6) Basic Characteristics of the Achievement Motive

Innovative, energetic activity
Instrumental activity
Desire for personal feedback (need for knowledge of results of actions)
Upward Mobility
Long-range planning
Responsiveness to feedback
Problem-solving mindedness
Moderate risk-taking behaviors
"Rational" goal-setting
Try out new things, travel more:
  show great interest in researching the environment

Sources of Need Achievement

Mothers encourage and expect self-reliance
Parents place few restrictions on the need achieving child
Parents encourage child to master something at an early age
Non-punitative upbringing

The high need achiever displays energetic, innovative activity. He has been said to personify the inventiveness imparted by the "spirit of capitalism"--he seeks to build a bigger and better mousetrap. The high need achiever prefers situations in which he may employ skill to the exclusion of luck or chance. He is strongly oriented toward problem-solving activities and readily desires responsibility in his place of work. The strong need achiever often displays a willingness for long-range
planning and prefers taking risks of a moderate, realizable nature. He sets high goals for himself, but these goals are realistically within his grasp. He works hardest when the chances of succeeding are only moderately great as such a situation stimulates his competitive edge. Finally, there is evidence that strong need for achievement is associated with upward social mobility.

A glance at the "sources of need achievement" listed in the above table yield few surprises. Much as the socialization literature indicates that permissive, encouraging forms of child-rearing produce well adjusted adults, the need for achievement literature indicates that similar child-rearing forms encourage the nurturance of a strong need to achieve. As well, the child achiever is encouraged to master some activity at an early age, though not too early as this could cause duress. The need achieving child has been found to be relatively free from the anxiety created by excessive restrictions and/or punishments. In short, the child who most readily develops a strong need to achieve is one who is gently but firmly encouraged to master or control some form of activity at an early age. This mastery has been shown to be associated
with innovative, even entrepreneurial behavior in adults.*

Administrative Man as a Need Achiever

Whether compared with the business and military elite of this study or various professionals tested the world over, the administrative man displays an extraordinarily high need for achievement. In order to provide the reader with some sense of comparison Table 5.7 has been assembled to include need achievement measures elicited both by our leaders and by professional leaders tested in the United States and three European countries:11

(Table 5.7) The Administrative Man as Need Achiever and Levels of Need Achievement Among Professionals in Four Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our Study</th>
<th>Other Professionals Tested**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man 11.08</td>
<td>U.S. Managers 6.74 Age 42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man 7.66***</td>
<td>Professionals 4.77 Age 42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man 5.12**</td>
<td>Italy Managers 4.18 Age 27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite 3.74</td>
<td>Professionals 2.31 Age 21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite 7.74*</td>
<td>Turkey Managers 1.76 Age 33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionals 3.52 Age 27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores have been normalized in this table only to provide a very rough sense of comparison.

* p < .05; ** p < .07; *** p < .19

**Source: David McClelland, The Achieving Society, P. 262.
It is interesting to note that the administrative man, presumably encouraged as a child to master some form of activity, has not only a very strong need to achieve, but he also displays a very strong sense of control. The nurturance of these perceptions may originate in common upbringing experiences. For both the business and military elite groups tested, an internal locus of control and need achievement correlate at .15, p<.01.

The administrative man is strongly oriented toward need achievement activity. Such a leader is dominated by the desire to produce and the desire to problem-solve for innovative change. Yet, it is paradoxical that this need, so constructive by nature, has its roots in a sense of basic insecurity. The administrative man is insecure. He does not think of himself as a success, though by all objective measures, he is successful. As we have seen, he is anxious when speaking in front of his peers, and his especially uncomfortable when relating to others or being evaluated by them. Yet, he always experiences a sense of personal control—-that is, he believes that he alone is responsible for his future.

What is the basic connection between insecurity, a sense of responsibility and a strong need for achievement? Can the need for achievement, a constellation of psychological pre-conditions linked with innovation and the rise of cultures be produced by insecurity? Can achievement activity by compensatory in nature?
It appears that this leader's excessive concern with achievement-related activity arises out of feelings of insecurity. These feelings of anxiety or insecurity arise because the administrative man sees himself as the sole agent of his destiny. Only he is responsible for his fate, for he knows that "fate" is due to the actions of man alone. Little or nothing is left to "chance." Berift of responsibility, devoid of the knowledge that man acts alone, there can be no anxiety. For the man that absolves himself of his destiny, is a man who can blame others for his failures.

The administrative man preoccupies himself with need achievement activity because he is insecure. Such activity leads to eventual mobility within his organization and a set of rewards commensurate with the achievements of a mobile and successful man. The need to produce provides the administrative man with the symbols of success, symbols which serve to bolster his "looking-glass" experience of self-worth.*

*Just how very important these symbols of success are cannot be overestimated.

Presthus remarks, "In business, status acquisition and reinforcement have become the subject of rational calculation. Standard Oil of California, for example, classifies executives from type 1, who merit drapes, wall-to-wall carpeting, private offices, wallnut desks, etc., to type 4, with no private office or oak desks...Some executives, it seems, have developed to a fine art the skill of being the first to acquire new status indexes, thus acquiring for themselves a sense of distinction."
The Affiliation Need As Insecurity: Other Investigations

Abraham Maslow has noted that all people experience the need to be liked. But an individual whose need to be liked runs rampant over all other personality needs is a person who is dependent on others. In Maslow's terms, such a person is unlikely to be "self-actualized." Maslow relates,

(The person with a strong need for safety, belongingness and love relations)..."must be to an extent 'other-directed' and must be sensitive to other people's approval, affection and good will. This is the same as saying that he must adopt and adjust by being flexible and responsive and by changing himself to fit the external situation. He is the dependent variable; the environment is the fixed, independent variable."\(^{13}\)

In a similar vein, Shiply and Veroff\(^{14}\) have maintained that the "need for affiliation" arises from a need for security, and Atkinson and his colleagues\(^{15}\) have viewed the affiliation motive as arising from a strong concern for social acceptance. Later research has tended to support the notion that affiliation motivation as measured through thematic apperception identifies "fear of rejection."\(^{16}\)

McClelland and his associates have found that the need for affiliation is associated with a behavioral syndrome which represents the "need for approval."\(^{17}\) This syndrome includes a tendency for conformance (to group pressure), a
preference for cooperative rather than competitive climates, a lack of concern for task accomplishment unless it is instrumental in building interpersonal relations, a strong concern for how others view the self, and cautious goal-setting in risk-taking situations.

Administrative Man and His Need to Affiliate

In the previous section we portrayed the administrative man as preoccupied with the need to achieve. This achievement activity was viewed as deriving from a two fold sense of insecurity. The first element of insecurity concerned administrative man's strong belief in personal causation and the attendant sense of personal responsibility which that belief implies. This type of leader reflects, "I alone am responsible for my future, my success and failure. Can I make it?"

The second element of insecurity which plagues the administrative man is an outgrowth of the first. Here the administrative man asks of himself, "how do I look to other people?...Do they think I can make it?" The administrative man experiences anxiety not only when he evaluates himself and in his organizational stature, but also when he thinks about the ways in which others evaluate him.
(Table 5.8) "When you are required to direct the activities of others, how often do you receive their personal respect?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

His struggle is clearly not (as is the case with our existential type of leader) a struggle for power with powerful others. His struggle is fought within himself. It is primarily a struggle for self-acceptance.

The lack of self-esteem and his experience of anxiety when being evaluated by others would lead us to hypothesize that this type of leader constantly concerns himself with the need to be liked. Expressions of a strong need to affiliate would provide us with some convergent evidence in support of this hypothesis.

This is indeed the case. The administrative man displays significantly more affiliation motivation than any of our leadership types or the business and military elite as a whole.18
The concern which the administrative man displays for others comes out not only when we examine his thematic apperception, but also when we describe his feelings about achievement-related activity. A colonel was asked, "Please describe your feelings and thoughts after attaining a long sought-after goal..." His response: "I am happy and ready to share with those who contributed." This concern that others be recognized for their contributions is alien to many kinds of leaders. The existential man we may remember, is such a leader. He displays concern only for his reputation, and fears public recognition of others. It would surely be anathema for him to actually encourage the recognition of others, for he must create impact.

**Personality Cluster of Administrative Man: Summary**

The following diagram will present Pearson correlation coefficients for some of the more salient personality variables which comprise the "character" of administrative man:

(Table 5.9) **Personality Cluster of the Administrative Man**

```
Low Self-Esteem ← .08 → Internal Experience of control
                  -.32
Hi Affil .14
        .62**
Strong N Achievement ← .14

                 -.30
Inhibition

Low Power ← .58*
              -.40
Trust ← .60*

                      -.21
Fear of Power
```

* p < .01; ** p < .02; *** p < .11; **** p < .14
The strong need for achievement expressed by our administrative man arises not out of a sense of self-esteem or the need to create impact through innovative behavior. The need for achievement is strongly bound up with affiliation needs, or the desire to be positively evaluated or held in esteem by others. The achievement motive then, is here not an expression of intrinsic motivation nor does it appear to derive from a sense of personal efficacy or self-confidence. It is an outgrowth of the need to be liked.

Similarly, his sense of trust is not bound up with his experience of control, which would indicate that the administrative man trusts others because he is sure of the nature and content of their actions (i.e., he trusts them because he can count on them, or that they are predictable, and therefore not threatening). Correlation analysis reveals that the administrative man trusts his colleagues primarily because he fears them, because he fears their potential for rejection.

(5.3) Administrative Man and Superior-Subordinate Relations

Because he is fearful of the way in which he is viewed by others, we would predict that the administrative
man relates to people in a cautious, concerned fashion. His tendency to become entangled in the emotions of others allows us to further predict that he relates to his colleagues in a manner almost diametrically opposed to the powerful, detached style which characterizes the existential man. This is so...

(Table 5.10) Administrative Man: His Sense of Dominance, Extroversion and Persuasiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th>Extroversion</th>
<th>Persuasiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>2.41*</td>
<td>2.50*</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>2.14**</td>
<td>2.74***</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.43***</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.42***</td>
<td>2.93**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .02    **p < .05    ***p < .001

The administrative man is less extroverted and less dominant than his peers. He is also less apt to try and persuade others than either the rational or existential leader types (though he is more "persuasive" than many of his associates).

This evidence is quite consistent with the
imagery he expresses via thematic apperception. Here, the administrative man shows he is not concerned with maintaining influence over others, nor does he seek to create impact. When he does express visions of power, the administrative man does so not out of fear, but purely out of hope (the correlation between his need for power and hope for power is .93, p < .001). His anxiety does not emanate from a fear of powerful others or the need to bring an incomprehensible world under reign. His need system seeks the approval of others and not control of them.

His Sense of Trust

The existential man mistrusts his fellow workers both because he fears their power (or their potential acquisition of his power) and because their actions lay outside his domain of control. The administrative man, however, has little reason to mistrust his fellow workers because his anxiety is centered around his own capabilities rather than the imposing capabilities of others. At the same time,

*Coding for incidences of verbal hostility, use of force, influence attempts and concern with hierarchic relations a content analysis of all T.A.T. protocols has shown that the administrative man is only marginally power-oriented. While our existential leaders write stories which involve incidences of power-related themes over 36% of the time, administrative man expresses such themes at a rate of only 15%.
he is also concerned about the way in which he is viewed by others. He imagines that expressions of hostility, mistrust or even impoliteness would undermine fulfillment of his strong need for approval. He, therefore, appeals to group sentiments and expresses a desire to belong.\textsuperscript{19} The administrative man does not express any unusual fear of others, nor does he mistrust them. In fact, of all leadership types, the administrative man expresses both the least "fear of power"\textsuperscript{20} (both his own and that held by others) and the most trust in superiors.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\hline
\textbf{Index of Inter-Personal Trust} & \textbf{Trust in Subordinates} & \textbf{Trust In Superiors} \\
\hline
Administrative Man & 67.07 & 67.52 & 66.52 \\
Existential Man & 63.01\textsuperscript{***} & 65.23 & 60.23\textsuperscript{**} \\
Rational Man & 67.60 & 69.02 & 65.58 \\
Whole Business Elite & 65.30 & 67.90 & 62.90 \\
Whole Military Elite & 62.90\textsuperscript{*} & 64.90 & 60.64\textsuperscript{*} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{itemize}
\item * p \textless .01; ** p <.07; *** p \textless .09
\end{itemize}

The sense of anxiety experienced by the administrative man is not caused by a clash with exogenous forces which in-
tervene and act against the attainment of personal goals. (This, of course, was true of our existential leader.) It derives from a struggle which we all face, but one which figures most prominently in the life of the leader who strives for approval—"how much, and how often must I compromise myself so that I may be accepted by others? How closely allied should my personal and professional goals be, and how closely allied are they? Must I conform to get ahead?"

(5.4) The Administrative Man As Self-Starter

The traditional and rather uncomplimentary view of bureaucratic man is that of a conformer. His duties are routinized, his dress homogenized. His efforts are duplicated by dozens of others so they must be unoriginal. His pre-fabricated home reflects his blandness and lack of originality. His conspicuous consumption is interrupted only by his struggle with crabgrass. He is a pitiful creature if every there was one, a faceless "cog in the machine." His strategy to get ahead involves conformity:

"These are the men who keep alert, look smart, avoid missteps, and attempt to show up well on assignments or in group policy discussion. They have ideas if requested and otherwise find cogent reasons for supporting the wisdom of the boss's ideas. They learn golf, join the right clubs, think the right thoughts. Their wives are attractive, but not brazen, entertain the right people, and suggest that John is brilliant as well as hard-working, a dedicated corporate servant, but also a wonderful husband and father." 21
However, true this stereotypical characterization may be, the traditional view suffers from oversimplification and a general lack for understanding and empathy. There are, of course, bureaucratic leaders who are only efficient at obeying the instructions of superiors. And it is obviously true that many "organization men" play strictly by the rules of the game forever emphasizing company policy and precedent. But the "bureaucratic virtuoso" (as Merton calls this type of leader) is a real person struggling with the same problem which we all face: how do we resolve the descrepancy between our private goals and desires, and our professional expectations and aspirations.

In the case of the powerful leader, the struggle becomes greatly intensified. The powerful leader commands great responsibility for people and scarce resources. His decisions affect not only himself and his family, but hundreds, even thousands of others. The powerful leader is a symbol, both to himself and to the people who surround him. His office stands for something greater than the man. People expect more because he is the "president" or the "commanding officer." He expects more and demands more of himself because he is the "president" or the "commanding officer" ("I am the 'president,' I must therefore act like
one"). The leader is aware of his symbolic stature and aware of the increased demands placed upon him both by himself and others.

In trying to resolve the natural contradiction between private needs and professional expectations many powerful leaders feel compelled to accept organizational norms. The combination of rewards received for system maintenance and the risks to be taken for disrupting a system governed by habituation make it very difficult for bureaucratic leaders to be great innovators. It is only the exceptional leader who is willing to risk his stature and stability for innovative change. The administrative man is not such a leader. He specializes in system maintenance though on occasion he does take initiatives. For this type of leader, the risk associated with initiative-taking is greater than the reward. This very young and powerful leader has risen to the pinnacle of his profession, yet he does not seek to alter his organization or its basic values. Why should he? The values of his organization make him what he is.

The existential leader only in part derives his identity from the organization. As he is controlled by outside forces his failures are blamed on outside agents. In times of dismay, he believes it is the organization which has failed him, and not he the organization. The intensification of the struggle with personal goals and pro-
fessional expectations is most striking with the administrative man. This leader is not controlled by outside forces. The consequence is a compelling sense of personal responsibility. Should the organization fail it will be due to his own inadequacies and not the whim of chance.

Conformance and Worldview

In Chapter 1 it was stated that there is some "self-starter" and some "organization man" in all bureaucratic elites. "Self-starter" and "organization man" are ideal-characterizations. In the flesh and blood they are not pure forms. All leaders must take initiatives at some time or another, and this is one important way in which they get ahead. But the variagated ways in which they do take initiatives and the reasons they take initiatives, differ greatly from leadership type to leadership type. The assumption of this work has been that leaders act in ways which are congruent with their view of the world and their experience of reality. Leadership styles represent a way of coping with the bureaucratic world as dictated by differing internal states of mind. As Barber has written in the introduction to Presidential Character,
"Man copes. To each situation he brings resources from his past, organized in patterns which have helped him cope before. He copes with a situation not only as a structure of realities, but also as a construction of his perception (of that reality)." 22

The rational man lives in a stable and ordered world. He can maximize his chances of success through rational problem-solving, instrumental coalition-building, and general attempts at deciphering the nature of a comprehensible reality. Existential man dwells in an irrational and absurd world governed by uncontrollable and incomprehensible forces. His intentions and his outcomes seem not to be related, thus his actions are not wholly "rational" in the classic sense of the word. Reason is not enough -- the existential leader is immured by the need to control the chaotic world in which he dwells.

Not unlike our rational man, administrative man experiences a comprehensible and ordered world. It all makes sense. Yet this leader is not certain whether he has the capacity, the where-with-all to succeed.

His leadership style reflects the ways in which he copes with his version of an uncertain self in a certain world.

Initiative-taking is a vehicle by which leaders satisfy personal needs. Rational man takes initiatives in order to satisfy his need to solve and understand the problems of
his world. Existential man takes initiatives in order to exercise his need for control. The initiative-taking of administrative man is compensatory in nature. He takes initiatives in order to validate his sense of self-worth, and improve his uncertain image as viewed through the eyes of others.

The Need Achiever in Bureaucratic Structures

At this juncture it is necessary to discuss an apparent contradiction which may have crossed the mind of our reader. The contradiction is this: the high need achiever has been characterized by McClelland and dozens of others as goal-directed and problem-solving orientated. He will experiment with change, he will travel more than the individual with a low need to achieve, and he will try out new things. He has often been viewed as an innovator.

The administrative man, marked by a pre-potent need to achieve has been portrayed as a scion of the organization. (We have hesitated to call him a conformist for that would be inappropriate. He is however, an organizational loyalist.) Is it not contradictory for us to portray this need achiever (if we may use the word now to emphasize a point) a "conformist"?
A simple monocausal explanation might conclude that it is. But as we have tried to show, a person is not just a "need achiever", a "power seeker", "externally located", "confident", "trusting" or any single quality. He is all these and much, much more that we do not know, in varying degrees.* Leadership style is a function of multiple causative factors. The administrative man is a very high need achiever, but he also expresses strong fears of rejection. "Administrative man" is an umbrella label used to convey an image of a class of leaders whose more or less shared personality characteristics are highly complex. The point is that if we examine the whole ensemble of personality relations, we could see that though he does express need achievement behaviors, they are tempered by other personality influences and especially the need for affiliation.**

*This has been tacitly recognized by McClelland. Rather than studying single motives and their effects (such as need achievement), his most recent published work stresses the importance of viewing "combinatorial motive systems" and their multiplicative effects. The approach of this work has been quite the same.

** For administrative man need achievement and need affiliation have a correlation of .62 < .01.
Conformance As a Strategy to Get Ahead

The self-starter we hypothesized, initiates action from within. He needs little reliance on others for his sense of direction. The really bold self-starter, our existential man, rarely even needs a clear set of norms to establish the bounds of his initiative-taking behavior. He can create norms where they do not exist and function quite effectively in situational ambiguity. To this extent he is an innovator.

There is some self-starter in the administrative man. Initiative-taking for him is a vehicle by which he resolves his personal insecurity. The initiatives which he takes are based on his interpretation of reality. By this we mean that he is a conservative risk-taker. His goals are those of the organization, and his efforts are directed toward satisfying those goals . . .

(Table 5.12) "To what extent do you believe your life's goals are truly your own, and how much are the result of other's expectations?" (%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely my own</th>
<th>Very much my own</th>
<th>Largely my own</th>
<th>Not so much my own</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is interesting to note that the administrative man believes his goals are less his own than does existential man, a type of leader whose fate is perceived as being determined by outside forces. Table 5.12 offers some striking evidence that in spite of his strong need to achieve, the administrative man selects goals which are consistent with the expectations of others. Still, it is important to point out that though he does base many of his goals on the expectations of others, almost 40% claim their goals are either "completely" or "very much" their own. This is something not many of us could claim.

There is little reason to believe that the administrative man responds to the expectations of others in the way that the traditional literature suggests -- as an automata, unaware of his sense of personal compromise. It is our belief that the elite respondents in this study, a highly educated, interigent, and perceptive group of people, are aware of the clash between personal goals and professional expectations, and the magnitude of their compromises. The need to compromise is not without its attendant frustrations.
Duty: A Variant of Conformance?

As the administrative man has a great sense of responsibility, he is often apt to expend effort working on tasks which he neither finds meaningful nor enjoyable. But because of his organizational allegiance and because many uninteresting tasks must (by role definition) be done, he does them. The administrative man does not firmly believe that it is the duty of everyone to do their job the very best they can.

(Table 5.13) "It is the duty of each person to do his job the very best he can." (%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But when we ask the administrative man how often his work has meaning and how often his work is just a duty, it's another story:
"Americans today are pre-occupied with finding meaning in their lives and in their jobs. How often do you find your work personally meaningful and how often just a duty?" (%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>3.1*</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Just a duty"  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Not very often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>9.2*</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These data are by no means dramatic. But taken together with what we know about this leader's psychological make-up it is apparent that the impulse of personal responsibility is salient. We do not mean to equate duty with conformance though some writers have,23 nor do we mean to imply that only the "average elite" (our administrative man) values duty. Duty to

*This is one of the few questions that a great majority of the respondents did not answer. It seems to be a gauge of its sensitivity. It is also one of the few questions where business and military groups differed markedly.
one's organization can assume a multiplicity of forms as one can loyally serve one's organization in a congeries of ways. The cognitive characteristics of the administrative man, and in particular his need for social approval, provide this leader with a strong sense of duty.

We have seen that this type of leader selects goals which are consistent (if not congruent) with, the expectations of others. He is also apt to engage in his work not because it has any special meaning but because to do otherwise would be irresponsible. Can we present any evidence that the administrative man believes in the inevitable necessity of conformance? Can the private need for personal responsibility be publically dressed in the guise of organizational conformity?

(Table 5.16) "It is a popular notion that in order to achieve success in an organization one must conform to the expectations of others. Is this conformity only necessary at lower levels, to end when higher positions are reached, or will conformity always be a necessity?" (%)*

*A phase to end; top management can be creative and expressive*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative man</th>
<th>13.6</th>
<th>63.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This also was not answered by all respondents. Again, it seems to be a gauge of its sensitivity.
It is clear that the administrative man, unlike his colleagues, believes strongly that conformity is a necessity, and not a phase to end. For administrative man, duty, a sense of loyalty, and ultimately conformism have interrelated meanings; first, they represent the transformation of the psychological need for personal responsibility into a socially accepted and organizationally valued form; and second, it represents a proven strategy to get ahead. For this type of leader the institutionally sanctioned notion of duty becomes a reified mechanism by which private needs are satisfied. While the "conformist" is the object of social dissapprobation, the dutiful "loyalist" is many a splendorous thing. For the administrative man, a type of leader who is especially sensitive to the clash between private goals and personal expectations, "duty" (sometimes seen by his colleagues as conformance) is an anxiety-reducing mechanism.

In the first chapter we theorized that a sense of insecurity or anxiety is the necessary psychological precondition for elite initiative taking. Our rational man however, demonstrated that initiative-taking may be a "utility function" and the outgrowth of a healthy, well integrated personality. We may now ask, does the twofold sense of insecurity which plagues administrative man actuate the taking of initiatives or inhibit them?
The following sections of this chapter will show that because he is insecure the administrative man takes initiatives in a style which directly seeks to enhance his weak self-image. In Lasswell's terms, initiative-taking does represent the displacement of private motives onto public objects. There is no apparent reason however, for us to suggest that the magnitude or frequency of initiative-taking is directly related to the magnitude of insecurity. There are at least two reasons for this: first, there is a point at which insecurity reaches an effective threshold -- at this point, insecurity transposes itself into debilitating anxiety; and second, as Sullivan and dozens of others have noted, anxiety assumes a multiplicity of forms. The psychological mechanisms we use to reduce our levels of anxiety reflect this multiplicity. Initiative-taking is but one of many insecurity-related by-products. Since the particular groups from which our typology has been constructed are composed of elite bureaucratic initiative-takers, the style by which they take initiatives is more directly related to their personal anxieties than is the type of initiatives they take.

Initiative-Taking and Interpersonal Relations

In our discussion of administrative man and his sense of trust, we noted that this type of leader was both generally
trusting and especially trustful of superiors. This trust does not apparently encourage the administrative man to present superiors with unsolicited recommendations. It is within the realm of possibility that this sense of trust (which is especially strong with regard to superiors) is really "courteous deference", an interpersonal strategy intended to flatter and as well enhance this leader's personal position.\(^{24}\)

(Table 5.17) "I present superiors with unsolicited recommendations . . ." (%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a non-power-oriented, non-dominant high need achiever, this type of leader does not direct his initiative-taking efforts toward powerful others. He has no compelling need to impress or outperform his colleagues, and his looking-glass sense of self only seems to inhibit the presentation of unsolicited recommendations.\(^{25}\) We have no evidence that the administrative man is for any reason unable to formulate such recommendations, but he suffers from anxiety when bringing these recommendations to the attention of others. His fear of rejection and dissapproval strongly attenuate initiative-taking--his fear is not taking the initiative or making the recommendation--it is the fear of negative evaluation by others . . .
(Table 5.18) "When you do present superiors with unsolicited recommendations, usually how certain are you that these recommendations will be acted upon?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Usually very certain</th>
<th>Somewhat certain/ uncertain</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, this type of leader does not take initiatives in other interpersonal realms where negative evaluation by others could increase his basic sense of insecurity.

(Table 5.19) "I try to stimulate the ambition of my associates . . ." (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Infrequently Very Infrequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In realms of initiative-taking where the administrative man must directly influence or interact with others, he is uncertain and consequently less a self-starter then either the rational or existential leadership types (men characterized as dominant, extraverted, and power-oriented).*

The affiliative leadership style leads to strain in interpersonal relations. The administrative man fears that attempts at stimulating the ambitions of associates will be misinterpreted by his colleagues as attempts at personal gain. And to a large degree he is correct (see footnote 3 of this chapter). Characterized by high (avoidance) affiliation this leader (1) seeks the approval of others; (2) attempts to care for and help others as a way of making himself important to them; (3) seeks to be with others who are perceived as being similar to himself in an attempt to build his sense of self-worth; and (4) seeks to evaluate himself through comparison to others.26

Typical of this affiliative style is one corporate vice-president who said, "I have a strong need to succeed. And a very strong need to be accepted by people. I feel some

*His high level of need achievement here does not come into play. Nor does it with the elite group as a whole. The correlation for stimulating the ambitions of associates and need achievement is -.10 p < .05 (n=263).
insecurity and some self-doubt about how competent I am. I want to play the game if I can win and gain respect . . . Winning is not really it -- it's not the right thing to say. "It's really the need for respect from my peers." 27

The administrative man is tentative and cautious when relating to others. His excessive concern with the approval of others deters him from assuming the bold, decisive, powerful, and detached posture maintained by the existential leader. His looking-glass sense of self prevents him from being inflexible or unyielding in his decision-making role. As he is extra-sensitive to other people's approval, he must be malleable and responsive to other's demands. He must master the anxiety reducing and socially valued vehicle of compromise.

While the conflict arena provides the existential man with the opportunity to show his mettle and display his wares (to exercise his power-dominant needs), the administrative man must (in order to satisfy his needs), practice conflict avoidance*. An independent measure of "activity-passivity"

*In technical terms, the power motive which characterizes the existential leader is an approach disposition. The affiliation motive which characterizes the administrative man is one of avoidance.
indicates that indeed the administrative man is significantly less "active" than is rational or existential man. Barber views the "active-passive" dimension as the single most important determinant of leadership style.

As the administrative man fears the disapproval of others he chews personal competition and especially its most extreme public form, interpersonal confrontation. The administrative man is a careerist. He wants no part of losing and at the same time, he shys away from exacting loss from others. This would violate his need for their positive evaluation and regard, and thus the enhancement of his weak self-image.

Process-Directed Initiative-Taking

The initiative-taking style of administrative man is not people-directed but "process-directed". Where initiative-taking must include motivating, persuading, stimulating, or enhancing others' performance or esprit d'corps or in any way making others feel powerful or integral to the decision-making process, administrative man is deficient. Properly speaking, he is not a leader, but a manager.
(Table 5.20) "How much do you enjoy competition while on the job?" Their responses: "I enjoy competition . . ." (%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Not so much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important again to remind the reader that we are making intra-elite comparisons. Over 90 percent of our administrative men enjoy competition. The administrative man represents a sub-group of energetic and competitive professionals. Compared with rational or existential leadership types, the administrative man does not enjoy competition and especially its most extreme public form, interpersonal confrontation.

The initiative-taking style of administrative man centers around improving and innovating in the process of decision-making. He rarely attempts to directly impact the individuals who make the decisions. His excessive concern with the approval of others coupled with his strong need for achievement makes the management of people less psychologically satisfying than the management of ideas.
Challenge-Seeking.

We have postulated that the administrative man is a self-starter primarily in the realms which emphasize the process of decision-making. While there is substantial evidence that the high need achiever directs his efforts toward energetic and creative challenge-seeking, we have little direct evidence that the administrative man seeks challenges more frequently in the private technical realm (i.e., the realm of the problem-solving craftsman). What is apparent is that the frequency with which the administrative man seeks challenges is less than that of our other two leadership types.

(Table 5.21) "About how often do you actively go out and seek new challenges?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not certain whether these data reflect challenge-seeking in the problem-solving or interpersonal realms (or some combination of both). But the evidence is cumulative and consistent with our portrayal of this leadership type and indicates that high need achievement alone is not directly related
to the taking of challenges in the bureaucratic milieu.*

We do have evidence that this type of leader responds primarily to process challenges, or challenges which crop up in the normal course of his daily workload. This may be contrasted with non-process challenges or challenges which must actively be created in spite of the routinization of the daily workload. We have stressed that it is the active pursuit of challenges which characterizes the real self-starter. How does the administrative man match up against the self-starter in the rational and existential elite?

(From Table 5.22) "Would you consider yourself a person who actively looks for challenges or someone who becomes motivated primarily through challenges that appear on your desk?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;I actively look for challenges&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;I become motivated by challenges that appear on my desk&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent from Table 5.22 that the administrative man both actively creates challenges and becomes motivated by

*For the entire sample there is in fact a negative relationship between need achievement and the taking of initiatives. ($r_{.09}$, p < .05, n=263)
process challenges (or those which appear on his desk). But it is significant that almost half of our administrative men primarily respond to challenges placed before them in the course of their daily work. This leader, like our other leaders, takes initiatives in a style which is supportive and congruent with his fundamental need-system. He does what is expected of him for such behaviors are congruent with and essential to the healthy functioning of his need for approval which in turn is necessary for the enhancement of his looking-glass sense of self. As he is dependent upon others for the satisfaction of his prepotent personality needs, he cannot risk the bold maneuver. It may lead to failure and social disapproval.

Situational Ambiguity

The bureaucratic leader who becomes intimidated under conditions of risk is not likely to feel comfortable making decisions about which there exist no organizational ground-rules or precedents. The administrative man is such a leader. His cautious manner when relating to others, his reliance on socially accepted norms and cues and his fear of disapproval makes a detached, decisive posture difficult to maintain. We would predict that this type of leader is especially apt to feel anxiety when having to deal with situational ambiguity.
(Table 5.22) "How comfortable do you feel in making decisions about which there exist no organizational groundrules or precedents?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Slightly Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Not at all Uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational man</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential man</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business elite</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military elite</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surprisingly, the administrative man is not all that much more uncomfortable than many of his colleagues. He certainly shows less anxiety than we hypothesized. Over 85 percent of this group feel only slight discomfort or no discomfort at all in making decisions about which there exist no organizational groundrules or precedents. Not a single administrative man reports feeling "very uncomfortable". The reader may want to contrast these figures with those of our rational man -- the evidence is surprising.

The Self-Starter Needs Little Encouragement

The outstanding feature of the self-starter in the existential and rational leadership types was their meager need for encouragement from others. These leaders neither rely on their colleagues for goal-direction nor do they need their colleagues' support for goal-attainment. Their lack of need for encouragement indicates self-reliance. Does the administrative man as self-starter need encouragement? We would predict that he does.
(Table 5.23) "It is very often hard for many people to go on with their work if they are not encouraged. How often do you feel you need encouragement?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, the results are somewhat surprising and not easily interpretable. Almost one-third of the administrative group "rarely" or "never" need encouragement. What this, of course, suggests is that there is some self-starter in the administrative, as well as all other types of bureaucratic elites. For the administrative man, however, we would suggest that this is especially true in problem-solving realms where he is much more confident of his technical abilities than he is in the interpersonal realm where he experiences a fear of disapproval by others.

It is becoming evident that the administrative man is not as reliant as perhaps he is often made out to be. As a craftsman or technician this careerist needs relatively little encouragement. When encouragement is needed, this type of leader seeks it most frequently from superiors and least
frequently from friends and loved ones outside the organization. Compared without other leadership types, he is also very peer-oriented.

(Table 5.24) "When I do need encouragement, I prefer it from..." (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Superiors</th>
<th>Friends and Loved Ones</th>
<th>Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The need for encouragement from superiors is over twice as strong as the need for encouragement from friends and loved ones. This runs counter to the unified pattern of need for encouragement displayed by all other leadership types and the business and military elite as a whole. While all other leaders prefer encouragement from friends and loved ones, the administrative man needs encouragement from superiors and peers, people who reside inside the organization. This idiosyncratic pattern of need for encouragement is a reflection of professional insecurity. It is essential that the administrative man be reminded of his importance through the continued attention and mutual respect of the people with whom he works. The interactive and affective process which
provides interpersonal encouragement is one (of many) mechanisms by which this need may be satisfied and his insecurity buoyed. To receive encouragement indicates that one is important to the continued functioning of the group. To be encouraged is to be part of the group. Ultimately it represents the granting of approval by valued others.

Goal Attainment

The self-starter is never content with his accomplishments. He is perpetually reaching for a professional condition which is "above" the self. Immediately upon completion of an arduous task or the successful attainment of a long sought-after goal, the self-starter reaches out for new, as yet unresolved challenges. His general sense of uneasiness prevents him from resting. He ceaselessly acts to take on more and more. It is not the successful completion of the task that gratifies him, but the successful meeting of the challenge. Satisfaction comes from sheer accomplishment rather than from the glory of the accomplished goal. The self-starter has no defined point at which to stop, though he always has a place to go. In a study of over 100 business executives, W.E. Henry has seen the "need to keep moving" as one of the group's most important shared features. Unfortunately, wrote Henry, the constant motivation of these executives could not be shut off.
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We have mixed evidence for the assertion that the administrative man ceaselessly pursues challenges never stopping to "shut off" his general sense of activation. In an attempt to examine how motivated leaders feel directly following goal attainment, all respondents were asked to describe their thoughts and feelings upon completion of a long sought-after goal. The administrative man respondents to the question in a manner which is consistent with our model of the self-starter. Some examples follow:

"I am fulfilled, satisfied with the accomplishment, but consider the next goal."

"I am emotionally drained, I feel a sense of withdrawal, and (I am) unable to focus on detail."

"I have even more confidence in my abilities and gain inertia."

"I feel relief and I am happy with myself."

"I enjoy it for a period of time and face up to the next task."

"I feel extensive relief of pressure."

"I am happy that I endured to the conclusion, (was) persistent and didn't give up."

"I feel relief and have an urge to begin something new."

"I question whether the success was worth the effort, and whether I can exploit the success to gain further goals."

"I am relieved that the long struggle has ended, then go on and seek another goal."
A number of themes emerge. Perhaps the two most prominent are relief of some kind of unspecified pressure, and the sense of having to "face up to" or otherwise pursue new goals (over 21 percent of this leadership type mentioned the need for seeking new goals as part of their response to this question). The experience of having released some reservoir of energy in pursuit of the goal is common. The belief that this signifies only temporary satisfaction is also common. Goal-attainment apparently does not have an enduring effect on the administrative man's level of activation, or as one colonel said, his "urge" to begin anew.

The most important aspect of this type of leader's feelings upon goal accomplishment is his experience of relief. To be relieved implies freeing oneself of something uncomfortable. To lessen or alleviate, to rid oneself or release oneself from something which produces stress, disquietude or anxiety. The self-starter builds up, or somehow sustains an intense level of anxiety while pursuing his goals. Upon goal-completion, he experiences ephemeral relief, momentarily freeing himself from his discomfort. Yet he always maintains an urge to accomplish more, to build up his reservoir of pressure, his constructive impulse once again, only to find short-lived solace upon its release.
And the next goal has its attendant anxieties. And so on. It is goal accomplishment which brings relief.

Taken together with what we know about the administrative man's personal need-system, this is convincing evidence that anxiety is related to (though not necessarily a "sufficient cause" of) initiative-taking.

Despite his continuous urge to accomplish new goals, the administrative man feels less compelled than his colleagues to seek new professional plateaus. He is generally content with the position he now occupies in his organization:

(Table 5.25) "If it became apparent that you could not move into a higher position in your sponsoring organization, would you remain content with your present job?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While only about one out of five administrative men would be content with their present job, this represents the highest percentage of all leadership types. In addition, about 30 percent claim they have already reached the professional plateau they had set for themselves upon entering
professional life. This feeling of professional contentedness runs counter to our general theory which states that the self-starter is never content -- either with his short-range technical successes, or his professional accomplishments. He must always search for something "higher" than his present condition.

(5.5) Overview: The Administrative Man

What has clearly emerged in this chapter is a consistent picture of the administrative man as an insecure but technically competent and energetic careerist hampered by a weakened ("looking glass") self-image. His very strong need for achievement provides him with an energetic motive disposition which he directs toward problem-solving and initiative-taking in "process" realms. Yet his prepotent need for approval attenuates initiative-taking in the interpersonal domain.

What we have shown is the merging of personality and leadership style. The character of this type of manager is directly and systematically related to his perception of the world and the way he behaves in that world. The following table brings together some of the diverse themes we have discussed and illustrates the intimate relationship between personality, world-view and style.
### Table 5.26: Administrative Man: His Character and Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Experience of Control</td>
<td>Strong Sense of Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Dislike of Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not domineering or extroverted</td>
<td>Process Rather Than People-Directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong Affiliation</td>
<td>Approval-Seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High N Achievement</td>
<td>Problem-Solving Mindedness, Technical Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Anxiety</td>
<td>Introverted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>Deferential*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is of interest to note that trust and fear of power (or powerful others) correlate at .60, p.< .02.

The individual "uses" the organization to satisfy his needs while simultaneously the organization "uses" the individual to satisfy its demands. This conflicted yet symbiotic relationship represents the reconciliation of discordant personal and organizational goals. The successful and growth-oriented organization cannot afford to satisfy its needs only. To do so would be to neglect the self-actualization of its member-parts.
Conclusion: The Administrative Man and the Theory of the Self-Starter

The self-starter is a hybrid of Lasswell's political man. The theory of the self-starter predicts that challenge-seeking and other forms of initiative-taking are the result of personal drives which seek the satisfaction of private needs.

We saw in Chapter 4 how the need for control actuated a commanding style of initiative-taking. Does administrative man's personal and two-fold sense of insecurity somehow propel him to self-starterdom?

With regard to the frequency of those initiative-taking behaviors measured in this study, it appears not, at least in comparison to the self-starter in the rational and existential elites. On the other hand, it is quite possible that this type of man is strongly motivated toward initiative-taking and innovation in the realm of policy formulation rather than inception.

We do have evidence that he responds primarily to process challenges, or challenges which crop up in the normal course of his daily affairs. Yet it does seem reasonable to conclude that the administrative man's experience of anxiety is perhaps more debilitating than constructive.
The need affiliative-low self-esteem characterological cluster prevents this type of man from being either a bold leader of men or a cool risk-taker. Neither a leader nor an entrepreneur, this manager expresses himself through process-oriented tasks, and receives satisfaction only through the explicit (rather than tacit) approval granted by others. This dependence upon other people both for satisfaction and positive self-regard render this type of elite generally incapable of assuming positions which require a strong, commanding disposition, or an innovative style.

The insecurities experienced by this man promote a strong need for achievement making him an ideal technician or manager, but at the same time, they inhibit the assertive expression of leadership.

In the final chapter of this work, we will return to this theme and offer the reader a more complete discussion of the character differences which mark leaders from managers.
Footnotes to Chapter Five


2. As the reader will soon see, the administrative man is by far the highest "need achiever" of all leadership types. Problem-solving mindedness is an important expression of the need to achieve (see citation in footnote 8).


4. The conflict between personal goals and professional expectations is a central theme in the works of Chris Argyris. In at least two of his major works (Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness, 1962; Personality and Organization, 1959) this theme receives a place of prominence. From the view of the organization it is essential to try and bring personal and organizational goals together. This makes work more satisfying for the manager while increasing productivity.

5. The process of the individual "using" the organization to fulfill his needs and simultaneously the organization "using" the individual to achieve its demands has been called the "fusion process" (see E.W. Bakke, The Fusion Process, Yale Press, 1955).
6. A more than tacit assumption of the locus of control literature is just this--people who are internally located are thought to be personally efficacious. Yet the published evidence for this assertion is rather sketchy and our own data on existential man seems to indicate that the presumed link is rather tenuous.

7. A glance at the norms presented for "normal" populations in the published literature will reveal that the administrative man's locus of control is significantly more internal. The population norms hover around 8.0, much the same as our whol business and military populations.


9. Virtually the whole literature agrees on this point.


10. Table 5.7 is intended to give a very rough comparison. Differing test conditions, T.A.T. pictures and protocol lengths make a "true" raw comparison impossible. What is essential for the present study is intra-elite comparisons.


18. The Administrative Man and His need to Affiliate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Man</th>
<th>3.38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>2.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05


20. The Administrative Man and His Fear of Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Man</th>
<th>0.133</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>1.070*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .10


23. In trying to generalize from Milgram's famous Obedience to Authority, a number of writers have equated duty with obedience and conformity. The relationship between duty and conformance seems to be much more complex.


25. The consistancy of our findings with both projective and self-report measures strengthens the concurrent validity of this proposition.


28. The administrative man's self-report measure of "activity-passivity" on a five-point continuum is as follows (1 = "active," 5 = "passive")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>1.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>1.90 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>1.91 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01; **p < .005; ***p < .15

CHAPTER SIX

Entrepreneurial Man:

Testing Weber's Thesis

Introduction

Our fourth type of leader, the entrepreneur, is at the same time both personally insecure and unable to experience control. He is motivated by a strong need for personal power and gain, though he harbors few achievement needs or a desire to affiliate with others. Like the classic Weberian entrepreneur, he shuns the constraints imposed by formal organization, and remains distantiated from, and dissatisfied with his fellow colleagues. In a true sense, this type of leader may be called an anomic man.

While the entrepreneur experiences a striving for personal power he is essentially inhibited. The sense of inhibition imposed by a strong superego prevents him from acting out his power strivings or creating the person-to-organization symbiosis which was experienced by our administrative man -- his inhibition prevents the entrepreneur from using the organization to satisfy his most salient personality needs, and his alienation prevents the organization from using the entrepreneur to achieve its goals. There
is no "fusion process".

The entrepreneur is not a self-starter as Weber would predict. His achievements are not the result of intrinsic motivations. In this chapter we shall want to find out why.

The three previous chapters have been devoted to the construction and analysis of three specific leadership types. In the present chapter, we not only fill out our typology with the development of our fourth leadership type, but at the same time we test a theory of man. Specifically, we have set out to ascertain whether the entrepreneur of Max Weber indeed behaves as Weber theorized. We will thus be comparing our fourth type with the rational, existential, and administrative types, as well as the ideal-type of Weber's entrepreneur.

In this chapter we test a controversial thesis about the nature of man. Says Eisenstadt,

"Weber's famous "Protestant Ethic" thesis, which attributed the rise of modern, as distinct from pre-modern, types of capitalism to the influence of Protestantism . . . has provided, probably more than any other single specific thesis in the social sciences, a continuous focus of scientific controversy."1
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Our fourth leadership type is especially interesting because it offers striking convergence with Weber's controversial model of the entrepreneur. Both our fourth type and the ideal-type of Weber (presented in the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism) share a number of critical personality attributes. Both feel in some sense controlled by outside forces, both feel insecure and both are inhibited. The theoretical and substantive convergence of the two types provide us with the opportunity to empirically test Weber's thesis while satisfying our main goal of presenting the worldview typology and developing notions about the interconnected nature of character, worldview and behavior in complex bureaucracies.

Let us now examine Weber's entrepreneur and see how his personality and acquisitive behavior compares with that of our fourth leader.

(6.1) **Weber's Entrepreneur**

Max Weber's famous work *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* portrayed the modern entrepreneur as driven by deeply-rooted anxiety and doubt. This doubt arose because Weber's man was uncertain of his "other-worldly" destiny. Efforts to mitigate the anxiety which followed from such doubt were, Weber believed, the most powerful force in the rise of the "spirit" of capitalism.
As his namesake implies, the entrepreneur is one who organizes, manages, and takes the risks associated with running an enterprise. Yet he is plagued by doubt. He is anxious because his life is a test, the outcome of which determined his ultimate fate for all eternity -- his place in heaven or hell. The psychological burden of Weber's entrepreneur was that of proving his self-worth.

In an attempt to make himself worthy of salvation (thereby eradicating his deeply-rooted sense of doubt) the entrepreneur was driven to pursue asceticism in his private life and the (methodical and rational) accumulation of wealth in his public life. Asceticism, or self-denial was a way of demonstrating how he was capable of resisting temptation, the first and most pernicious of obstacles blocking the path to salvation. The rational accumulation of wealth was a way of demonstrating that he had fulfilled his obligation in the world:

The pursuit of wealth

"as a fruit of labor in a calling was a sign of God's blessing. And even more important: the religious valuation of restless, continuous, systematic work in a worldly calling, [was] ... the highest means to asceticism, and at the same time the surest and most evident proof of rebirth and genuine faith, [and] must have been the most powerful conceivable lever for the expansion of that attitude toward life which we have here called the spirit of capitalism."
As his namesake implies, the entrepreneur is one who organizes, manages, and takes the risks associated with running an enterprise. Yet he is plagued by doubt. He is anxious because his life is a test, the outcome of which determined his ultimate fate for all eternity — his place in heaven or hell. The psychological burden of Weber's entrepreneur was that of proving his self-worth.

In an attempt to make himself worthy of salvation (thereby eradicating his deeply-rooted sense of doubt) the entrepreneur was driven to pursue asceticism in his private life and the (methodical and rational) accumulation of wealth in his public life. Asceticism, or self-denial was a way of demonstrating how he was capable of resisting temptation, the first and most pernicious of obstacles blocking the path to salvation. The rational accumulation of wealth was a way of demonstrating that he had fulfilled his obligation in the world:

The pursuit of wealth

"as a fruit of labor in a calling was a sign of God's blessing. And even more important: the religious valuation of restless, continuous, systematic work in a worldly calling, [was] . . . the highest means to asceticism, and at the same time the surest and most evident proof of rebirth and genuine faith, [and] must have been the most powerful conceivable lever for the expansion of that attitude toward life which we have here called the spirit of capitalism."
Fulfillment of the obligations imposed upon him by his position in the world (or his "calling") was the primary motivation of Weber's entrepreneur. And for the entrepreneur wealth was the most tangible sign that his worldly obligations had indeed be fulfilled. Not coincidently, the accumulation of wealth was viewed as a just reward.

Entrepreneurial man has been a focal point in the works of Weber, Schumpeter, Sombart, Troeltsch and many other scholars of European intellectual descent. As the exemplar of capitalist culture, entrepreneurial man is fascinating not only because he represents the personification of the capitalist ethic, but also because he is a blend of some of the most intriguing and counter-intuitive paradoxes.

Among some of the more interesting relations of Weber's entrepreneur are these: (1) he can not in any rational way acknowledge the existense of God -- through an act of faith he believes in Him, and His capacity to somehow "select" those worthy of salvation; yet at the same time his behavior is guided by rational calculation, (2) he is personally insecure and plagued with doubt, yet he labors with certainty, (3) the entrepreneur believes that the accumulation of wealth is the sign of salvation -- yet wealth is at once the most demonstrable and illusionary of symbols, and (4) most importantly, his basically irrational
fears imbedded in faith promote the systematic and essentially rational pursuit of wealth. Thus, it was the entrepreneur's faith and not his reason, which led to the methodical and systematic (i.e., scientific) organization of labor.

In short, the paragon of modern culture is an anxiety-driven mystic; and capitalism, embodying the most rational elements of organization, is the product of irrational man.

A reading of the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism reveals that Weber's entrepreneur was distinguished by three important personality attributes. First, he believed that he lacked complete control of his fate. It was God and not he who determined his destiny. Second, the experience of being controlled by a powerful, extrinsic force fostered personal insecurity and doubt, and third, this insecurity in turn fostered a sense of personal repression or inhibition.

The entrepreneur was plagued by anxiety for he was never certain of his fate. The absence of fate-control coupled with personal insecurity produced an unfulfilled and anxiety-driven man whose purpose in life was to demonstrate his worth before God.

The presumed effects of entrepreneurial man's unique personality and his anxiety-ridden vision of the world were three-fold: (1) self-discipline or asceticism (attempts
at proving self-worth through self-denial); (2) an active
orientation toward the world (attempts at proving self-
worth through fulfillment of worldly obligations) and
(3) the rational pursuit of wealth (attempts at procuring
the symbolic "currency" of God's acceptance by the most
effective, efficient, and quickest way possible).

Self-denial, worldly activity through a "calling",
and the accumulation of wealth were thus intended to
demonstrate the entrepreneur's worth before God and
release the entrepreneur from his agonizing sense of doubt.

The plausibility of the Protestant ethic theses (and
at the same time a source of its confusion) arises from
Weber's implicit use of a powerful explanatory device --
that of "reification." Weber maintained that the worldview
and ethos of the entrepreneurial class had, in its first
instance, a religious foundation, and that this foundation
was Protestant in nature. * But Weber believed that somehow
this ethos had become reified (i.e., a material part of
daily Life) and secularized. The secularization of initially

*Weber states, "We are interested in . . . the influence
of those psychological sanctions which, originating in
religious belief and the practice of religion, gave a direction
to practical conduct and held the individual to it."7
religious sentiments and fears created new roles which allowed man to legitimately accumulate wealth. The imperative of the "calling" which was initially inculcated into Protestant peoples had over time lost its divine implications and had acquired its own dynamic. Weber believed that now the calling "is thought of so purely as

an end in itself, that from the point of view of the happiness of, or utility to, the single individual, it appears entirely transcendental and absolutely irrational. Man is dominated by the making of money, by acquisition as the ultimate purpose of his life."  

And as Tawney has remarked, (for Weber) "labor is not merely an economic means, it is a spiritual end."  

This is the key to understanding Weber's theory: Weber did not maintain that each entrepreneur consciously feared the might of God and His ability to "select" those worthy of salvation. He did believe that the secularization of initially religious imperatives created the historical and phychological precondition (or spirit) of the modern capitalist ethos.

**Testing Weber's Theory**

As dictated by our initial leadership typology (see Chapter 1), we isolated those leaders who both believe they lack control of their fate and are personally insecure. But
we must now: (1) see if it is this leadership type which experiences the greatest sense of inhibition as predicted by the Weber theory; (2) ascertain whether the absence of fate-control is indeed the "cause" of the entrepreneur's insecurity (as Weber theorized), or whether (like our administrative man) he is insecure for other reasons; and finally (3) we must see if the unique personality-cluster which we have called "entrepreneurial" is indeed the psychological substructure for an activist and acquisitive ethos as Weber believed.

Put most simply, we wish to investigate whether the unique constellation of "A" personality attributes "causes" "B" behaviors:

Table 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;A&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;B&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Fate-Control</td>
<td>Self-Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Insecurity</td>
<td>Rationalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibition</td>
<td>Activity Orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first part of this chapter we will test the Weber thesis by examining the internal dynamics of our entrepreneurial man (or the interrelations of "A"). We wish to see if (1) his lack of self-esteem derives from his experience
of external control, and (2) whether his insecurity fosters inhibition. In the second part of this chapter we will investigate whether "A" "causes" "B" (i.e., whether the entrepreneurial man is indeed an activist -- a taker of initiatives within the organization).

Let us now turn to our entrepreneur and see if he behaves as did Weber's famous man.

(6.2) Our Entrepreneur: His Worldview

Our rational man dwelled in a world of psychic comfort. His world was one of order, it was understandable, it was predictable, and moreover, it was altruistic.

Our existential leader dwelled in a world governed not by man's capabilities and intentions but by the whim of chance. The existential world is one of incomprehensibility yet existential man has the inner strength to successfully resolve the seeming disparity between his intentions and his desired outcomes.

The administrative man lives in a stable world governed not by the whim of chance but by clearly defined norms which provide for distinct rewards and deprivations. The point of uncertainty is not, as it is for the existential man, the point at which the forces of the world impinge upon the goals of the individual; but it is the point at which
the individual's capabilities and sense of compromise collide with the world's expectations.

Entrepreneurial man is uncomfortable. His world is uncertain. The entrepreneur feels more strongly than all other leadership types that his future is controlled by forces outside him.* Not only is he personally affected by these extrinsic forces, but his organization too works in ways which defy his understanding.

Unlike our other leadership types the entrepreneur does not derive his identity from the organization. He is adrift, distantiated. Like Weber's entrepreneur who pursued innovation and wealth through work in small businesses and independent crafts, our entrepreneur eschews the organization and the structure which it imposes.**

* Weber's entrepreneur was originally fear-struck by this manifesto: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death."10

**It is important to point out a generic difference between our entrepreneur and that of Weber. That is, his economic relationship with the organization. While our entrepreneurs are salaried by large bureaucracies, the classic entrepreneur operated in the small-business profit-motive milieu.
The entrepreneurial man mistrusts others and experiences a general sense of discomfort with his "place" in the organization. The world of entrepreneurial man is not benevolent, but threatening. His life is a trial.

His Sense of Self

One of the most striking features of the existential leader was his belief that he had little control over his future. What made him really unique however, was that in spite of his experience of being controlled by forces exogenous to himself, his feelings of self-esteem were not effectively diminished. In fact, what made the existential man so special, so resilient, was his ability to believe in himself and his leadership capacities despite his experience of being influenced by those forces.

Our entrepreneurial man, like that of Weber, also believes that his fate is exogenously determined. Over 75 percent agree with the statement", I often have little influence over the things that happen to me". One entrepreneurial leader was asked, "describe your feelings upon completion of a long sought-after goal". His response vividly illustrates how important the extrinsic sense of control figures in his life: "I feel a sense of relief that
I have been able to achieve the goal without unforeseen circumstances having prevented it".

Not only does the entrepreneur experience little mastery over his personal fate, but likewise he feels powerless in influencing less proximate social affairs:

(Table 6.2) "As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither control nor understand . . . (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>45.5*</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out entrepreneur, like Weber's, feels that his life is somehow influenced by forces which are beyond his control. Personal capabilities and intentions seem not to be consistently related to his desired outcomes. Whether our entrepreneur indeed experiences the kind of exogeneous intervention felt by Weber's entrepreneur is uncertain.

*A majority of the existential leaders still felt that by taking an active part in political and social affairs we could control those affairs.
The point is not that these feelings are logically isomorphic, but that they are psychologically similar. Forces outside the self, whether they be luck, chance or God act to change the desired effects of this man's actions. (In the second part of this chapter we will see how this experience affects his behavior.)

In contrast to our existential leader (his "external" counterpart) and as the locus of control literature would predict\textsuperscript{11} the experience of external control is accompanied by a diminished level of self-esteem, and as we will soon show, increased levels of anxiety:

(Table 6.3) Entrepreneurial Man: His Level of Self-esteem And His Experience of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whole I-E</th>
<th>Personal Control</th>
<th>System Control</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>3.670</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>60.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>4.09*</td>
<td>0.767*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>84.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>11.50***</td>
<td>3.360</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>83.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>4.45*</td>
<td>1.190*</td>
<td>0.090*</td>
<td>61.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>8.29**</td>
<td>2.604</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>71.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>8.28**</td>
<td>2.202**</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>73.32*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\textsuperscript{p} < .001; **\textsuperscript{p} < .005; ***\textsuperscript{p} < .03

Compared with either the business or military elite of this study, the entrepreneurial man perceives himself to
be both under the control of outside forces and insecure. It is important however, for us to determine whether this insecurity derives from this leader's experience of being controlled by outside forces or whether it has its basis in other infirmities of the self-image. Our administrative man remember, was highly insecure yet he experienced a very strong belief in personal causation. Does the entrepreneur as Weber would predict, become insecure as a result of his experience of being controlled by outside forces?

The Source of His Insecurity

The insecurity of entrepreneurial man is not as Weber hypothesizes, primarily related to his experience of being controlled by outside forces. The Pearson correlation of external control and personal insecurity is only .09 (n.s.). More important is the fact that his insecurity is related to, or bound up with other weaknesses of the self-image.

For example, when asked to estimate his own I.Q.* our entrepreneur ranks it lower than do all leadership types.

*There is no reason for us to believe that there should be (objective) systematic differences with respect to I.Q. across leadership types. Both self-esteem and locus of control have been found to be unrelated to conventional measures of intelligence.**
Or, when asked the role which self-confidence has played in the attainment of his organizational success, he answers, "very little" (less in fact than all other leadership types). More than any of our leadership types (save the administrative man) does the entrepreneur feel discomfort when directing other men. And less than any other leadership type does the entrepreneur claim to have the "will to lead." Moreover, our entrepreneur has serious reservations about his ability to accomplish the tasks for which he is now training.

But if the entrepreneur's experience of being controlled by outside forces does not cause him to be insecure, what does?

It appears that the power orientation of the entrepreneur (which, as we will soon show is highly "personalized" in nature), is the most significant "cause" of his insecurity.

(Table 6.4) The Relative Influences of the Need for Power, Locus of Control and Personal Control (Factor I) on the Insecurity of the Entrepreneur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Need for Power</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Experience of</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Control (Factor I)</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p < .001 \*\*p < .07
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A multiple regression\textsuperscript{13} indicates that the entrepreneur's fear of powerful others and their potential control over him, coupled with this leader's lack of personal control, "cause" the entrepreneur to be insecure.*

This finding, that our entrepreneur is insecure primarily because he fears the power of others and not because he fears being controlled by extrinsic forces, is significant for two reasons. First, it represents a major departure from the personality dynamics of the classic entrepreneur (and as we shall see it provides our entrepreneur with a different reaction formation); and second, it shows that an external sense of control need not be the "cause" of insecurity, as the locus of control literature has long maintained.

It is difficult to understand why someone with a professional history of success would perceive himself as unsuccessfully (one entrepreneur, when asked, "to what do you attribute your occupational success"), penciled out the

*This is one of the few cases in this work where we have a theoretically compelling reason to treat some personality variables as "independent" and another as "dependent". Throughout we have treated all personality variables as interactive. But the Weber theory asserts that an experience of external control causes the entrepreneur to be insecure. We must therefore test that assertion.
survey question and wrote in, "what success?"). Our entrepreneur, much like Weber's, apparently labors as an end in itself. As we will show in the next section, our entrepreneur neither gains satisfaction from his work nor does he find it particularly meaningful. Our entrepreneur, like Weber's, seems to be the victim of his own inertia.

The Source of His Unhappiness

While our existential leader has been portrayed as something of a hero because of his inner strength and his refusal to submit to the forces which act against him, the entrepreneur is uncertain of his ability to achieve continued success in the organization (though as with our administrative man, he is by all objective measures a "success");* he is uncertain of his personal capabilities and unlike the classic Weberian man, exudes a general sense of alienation, meaninglessness and even at times, despair.

The multiplicative affects of low self-esteem and the experience of being controlled by outside forces contribute to this leader's sense of detachment. He often wonders whether it is all worth the effort . . .

*Among our group of entrepreneurial men, we find two assistant general managers, five directors and general managers, two full colonels, and fourteen lt. colonels.
(Table 6.5) "Do you ever feel so discouraged with yourself that you wonder whether anything is worthwhile? (%)\n
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data strongly inform our understanding of the way in which this leader experiences his world. They are especially significant when we consider that our group of entrepreneurs have by all objective standards achieved success in American society. These are not people experiencing classical forms of alienation. The source of their discontent must be found in the more subjective realm of the senses.

**Life As a Trial**

That our entrepreneur often questions whether it is all worthwhile strongly suggests dissatisfaction with his work and his "place" in his organization. We do have more direct
evidence that this type of leader neither enjoys his work nor finds it meaningful:*

(Table 6.6)"How much do you enjoy yourself on a typical work day?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Not So Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparative lack of enjoyment we believe derives from a lack of purpose, a lack of direction and a lack of meaning:

*It is important to remind the reader once again that we are primarily concerned with intra-elite comparisons. Compared with his colleagues our entrepreneur finds his work to be less meaningful. Yet inspection of table 6.6 reveals that not unlike our administrative man, his work does have meaning "most of the time".
(Table 6.7) "Americans today are preoccupied with finding meaning in their lives and in their work. How often is your work meaningful, and how often just a duty?" (%)  

"I find my work personally meaningful..." (%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Most of the Time</th>
<th>Sometimes/Not Oft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The experience of external control does not cause insecurity as we know it, but a lack of optimism and hope. Unlike the Weberian entrepreneur who believes that his actions can affect his place in eternity, our entrepreneur feels despair. It is the consistent direction and perhaps not the magnitude of our findings which is of significance. Tables 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7 show that (1) by far more than any other type the entrepreneur feels so discouraged that he wonders whether anything is worthwhile; (2) that the entrepreneur enjoys his work significantly less than our other types; and (3) that he often finds his work meaningless. As we will
show in a few moments, our T.A.T. analysis provides us with convergent validity for this assertion--less than any other type does the entrepreneur depict positive story outcomes. He anticipates the worst.

(6.3) Entrepreneurial Man: Motivational Determinants

Our rational and administrative men, both "internals," projected strong achievement imagery in their responses to our T.A.T.'s. Rational man was portrayed as psychologically "free" to act on his creative impulses. It was therefore no surprise to us that he exhibited a strong need for achievement and valued instrumental, creative behaviors.

One of the more interesting paradoxes of administrative man was his tendency to conform in spite of his strong need for achievement. These conformist tendencies were explained by the prepotency of other more salient interactive personality attributes and in particular, the need for affiliation.

Our entrepreneurial man has been portrayed as insecure and uncertain; his motivational system as measured through thematic apperception lends support to this characterization. His projective imagery indicates he shows both the least need for achievement, the greatest need for personal power, and most critically, the greatest inhibition. (The inhibition
or self-control component insures the "future orientation"
of the classic entrepreneur. Such a man must be capable
of investing in his future and deferring immediate gratifica-
tions for the sake of long term rewards.) This combinatorial
pattern is highly congruent with the pattern exhibited by
Weber's entrepreneur.*

Not all of these findings reach statistical significance
but the evidence is cumulative and offers a consistent,
cohesive pattern:

(Table 6.8) Entrepreneurial Man: His Need for Achievement and
Power, and His Level of Inhibition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N Ach</th>
<th>N Power</th>
<th>Personal Power</th>
<th>Inhibition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td><strong>2.79</strong></td>
<td>.324**</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>5.54*</td>
<td><strong>1.70</strong></td>
<td>.333****</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>3.87*</td>
<td><strong>2.84</strong></td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>1.09**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*States McClelland in his most recently published book,
"... for years people have been mistakenly interpreting my
studies of achievement motivation as meaning that people
with high n Achievement represent the Protestant work ethic.
They don't. They like to do things more efficiently and
get out of work. Apparently it is people with high n Power,
low n Affiliation and high control (inhibition) who like to
work for its own sake because it is a form of self-discipline."14
Compared with our other leadership types, the entrepreneurial man shows little concern with achievement behaviors. But this leader does have very strong power needs and like the classic entrepreneur, the nature of his need for power is primarily "personalized" (for our entrepreneur need for power and its "personalized" component correlate at .62, p < .001). The entrepreneur exhibits almost twice the need for personal power as do the other leadership types. This means that the entrepreneur is driven by an explicit concern with the enrichment of his own reputation (to the exclusion of that of his group), and at the same time a fear of losing power to others. Remember, this leader mistrusts his superiors more than any other leadership type.

This orientation is consistent with (although not identical to) that of Weber's entrepreneur. He too was motivated by an explicit concern with enhancing his own reputation or boosting his symbolic sense of self-worth. While the classic entrepreneur enhances his worth through the accumulation of monetary wealth, we will hypothesize that the organizational entrepreneur would enhance his worth through the accumulation of organizational wealth (i.e., prestige, status and power). But we must defer our test of this hypothesis until the second part of the present chapter.

Our entrepreneurial man, despite his need for power, is highly inhibited. Unlike the existential leader who is
apt to live out his fantasies of power, the entrepreneur represses his power needs and maintains self-control through self-discipline. As we have mentioned, the inhibition component of the entrepreneur's need system is critical. Weber maintained that the man who was both insecure and unable to control his fate was inhibited. But what Weber did not maintain, was that inhibition would promote social withdrawal, and a disposition toward social quietism. The great failing of Weber's theory was his inability to recognize that inhibition causes internalization and repression of power needs (and the activist impulse), rather than externalization and activity. Weber underestimated the significance of the superego. This we shall show when we discuss the entrepreneur as self-starter.

Motives and Worldview

A glance at the kinds of stories our entrepreneurial man writes in response to our T.A.T. protocols contributes to our portrayal of this leader as essentially an unhappy fatalist. Note the recurrence of themes expressing doubt, hope rather than expectancy, lack of fulfillment, disappointment and a general lack of positive affect.

(All participants in the study were asked to examine the following three pictures and write down what they thought was happening.)
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Park Bench Picture:

"The couple are lovers and have had a quarrel. The girl is the injured party and judging by the plaintive look on the man's face, I'd say he is trying to apologize. Right now, however, his apology is falling on deaf ears.

"...the girl...feels resentment due to some disappointment in her job. After several meetings, the girl tried to back out, but her [boss] would not allow that. The gray of the sky matches her mood."

Women in Lab Picture:

"The two scientists have been working to isolate a virus. A critical experiment in nearing an outcome. They are anxious and hoping for success soon. The experiment was inconclusive and had to be redone."

"The women made a mistake and is redoing the experiment. The people are working to see if the experiment will be a success this time. Both are feeling nervous and hoping that it will be successful."

Ship's Captain Picture:

"The admiral...is hoping to get funds through the congressman's sub-committee. The congressman has shown skepticism and doubts the sincerity of the words he is hearing...the result is no funds, a disgruntled admiral, and a congressman wondering if he did the right thing.

"The captain is trying desperately to persuade the [other party] that there is no truth to his allegation but he's worried as hell."
A content analysis of all T.A.T. protocols brings into sharper focus the way in which the entrepreneurial man views himself and his world. We have coded for instances of the following themes as expressed in all three pictures: (1) story outcome (whether our respondents portrayed their story as having a positive or negative outcome); (2) instances of a character or characters expressing manifest uncertainty; (3) instances of a character or characters expressing concern with hierarchic relations; (4) instances of hostility, use of force or influence attempts by story characters; (5) overt expressions of confidence as expressed by story characters; and (6) instances of a story character expressing insecurity through cognitions or actions (see Table 6.8 on the following page).

Our content analysis tells us some very important things about our entrepreneur. First, it is apparent that story outcomes for our entrepreneur are less frequently depicted as positive than for all other types. While the magnitude of the difference is not very great, the evidence is cumulative; it does contribute to our representation of entrepreneurial man as pessimistic and disconcerted. As consistent with his perception of being controlled by extrinsic forces, the entrepreneur frequently portrays characters who express feelings
of uncertainty.* As predicted by his need for personal power the entrepreneur shows concern with hierarchic relations (his "place" in the scheme of things), and he frequently portrays characters who use force and hostility (either verbal or physical). And as predicted by his low self-esteem, our entrepreneur's characters show little self-confidence.

*The reader may have noticed that these feelings are expressed about as frequently as they are for the existential leader, his "external" counterpart.
(Table 6.9) Entrepreneurial Man: A Content Analysis of Our Three-Picture T.A.T. Protocol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Story Outcome +</th>
<th>Story Outcome -</th>
<th>Neutral N.O.G.*</th>
<th>Uncertainty</th>
<th>Hierarchical Relations</th>
<th>Hostility</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Insecurity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No outcome given.

**The reader may want to take note of the evidence in Table 6.9 which supports our characterizations of the previous three leadership types: (1) Rational man and his altruistic, certain world: our content analysis reveals he creates fewest stories with negative outcomes, hostility, uncertainty and insecurity. This is consistent with our portrayal of rational man; (2) Existential man and his "command identity"--most uncertainty (as consistent with his "externality"), most concern with hierarchic relations and expressions of hostility; (3) Administrative man--little uncertainty (as consistent with his "internality"). Perhaps the only finding which runs counter to our four portraits is the administrative man's relatively frequent expression of confidence. As we know, this leader is highly insecure.
The data we have gathered thus far indicate there is strong congruence between the personality dynamics of Weber's man and that of our own entrepreneur. As Weber predicted, inhibition marks the man who is uncertain of his fate. And too, our entrepreneur experiences a worldview much like that of Weber's man--imposing, threatening, and uncertain.

Our entrepreneur displays a motive dispositional system which of all our leadership types comes closest to what McClelland has called the system of the "Empire Builder"\textsuperscript{15}--high in the need for power, low in the need for affiliation, and high in inhibition. It is obvious that the appellation "empire-builder" could also be used to describe the quintessential (Protestant) American entrepreneur. The Morgans and the Rockefellers were empire-builders. The strong need for prestige, power, personal recognition and stature, coupled with what social scientists would describe as an imposing superego (which demanded self-control and a disciplined, goal-directed channeling of energy) together with weak social approval needs is believed both by Weber and McClelland to produce entrepreneurial, or empire-building behaviors.

Weber believed that the motive system we have been describing was cultivated by a sense of doubt and the experience of being controlled by outside forces. These are central
characteristics of our entrepreneur. What remains to be demonstrated is the alleged causal connection between this motive system and entrepreneurial behaviors. This is the task of the second part of this chapter, "the entrepreneur as self-starter."

(6.4) The Entrepreneur As Self-Starter

Weber's thesis asserts that our fourth type of leader would be bold, somehow capable of surpressing his control-related anxieties and able to take the necessary risks associated with innovation. In our lexicon, Weber would predict that our fourth type of leader would be much the self-starter.

Our theory of the self-starter asserts that ambiguity either about the self and the ability to achieve, or about the self and the ability to control, create a level of anxiety which is the necessary psychological precondition for initiative-taking or attempts at innovation in bureaucracy. We must now test this assertion and the final component of the Weber thesis. We must ascertain whether our entrepreneur feels compelled to take initiatives as a strategy to gain power (the "currency" of every leader), or whether his sense of anxiety is debilitating in nature, producing professional quietism or personal withdrawal. In short, we must see if this leader is a self-starter.
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Taking Initiatives As a Strategy To Gain Influence

While our entrepreneur has a distinct need to enhance his reputation,* he is not especially aggressive or assertive. He is essentially inhibited, and this inhibition interferes with, or attenuates the acting out of his desire for prestige. The entrepreneur is unable to assume the "command identity" which characterized our power-oriented, but essentially uninhibited existential leader. The entrepreneur does not attempt to impact other people in order to satisfy his desire for prestige, for his power needs are tempered by some inner impulse which demands moderation (psychologists like to call this impulse the superego). As the following table indicates, the basic personality configuration of our entrepreneur leads him to withdraw from initiative-taking behaviors when they are people-oriented in nature.

(Table 6.10) Entrepreneurial Man: The Relationship Between His Personality and People-Oriented, Initiative-Taking Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present Superiors With Unsolicited Recommendations</th>
<th>Stimulate Ambitions of Associates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Experience of Control</td>
<td>-.10 n.s.</td>
<td>-.33 p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibition</td>
<td>-.30 p &lt; .03</td>
<td>-.15 n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As predicted by and consistent with his personalized power orientation.
Fear of Powerful Others  
.01 n.s.  
-.27 p < .05

Mistrust of Others (general)  
-.26 p < .04  
-.20 p < .09

Because the entrepreneur feels he is the object of forces outside him, because he fears and mistrusts others, and because he is an essentially inhibited man, it is no suprise that he rarely takes initiatives when they require stimulating the ambitions or motivations of others or otherwise enhancing the performance of people he regards as potential rivals. To stimulate the ambitions of others would be tantamount to feeding fuel to a fire—the entrepreneur fears others; he does not try to empower them. To do so would be contrary to one of his most fundamental personality needs.

(Table 6.11) "I present my superiors with unsolicited recommendations..." (%)
Like the Weberian entrepreneur who was a loner and not a socialized bureaucrat, our fourth leadership type shys away from interaction with his associates. His inhibition prevents the acting out of his purely personal power drive.

Because the entrepreneur fears others and because he is inhibited, the entrepreneur tends toward withdrawal. Rather than seeking control of his environment as did the
existential leader (his "external" counterpart), the entrepreneur turns within. He does not present superiors with recommendations unless they are expressly solicited. He does not gravitate toward, or otherwise come to acquire visible positions of command.

He is not a leader of men but a manager. His initiative-taking, like that of our administrative man, is process-oriented and not people-oriented. Whether it be because his superiors perceive that the entrepreneur mistrusts them and thus find him difficult to work with, or because he is not attracted to visible positions of power, the entrepreneur refrains from a posture of command. Much like Maccoby's "craftsman" he may seek to build a "bigger and better mousetrap," but he does not have the will to lead other men. His ethos may be acquisitive, but it does not involve the domination of others.

**Challenge-Seeking**

It has been our assumption throughout this work that the successful initiative-taker acquires power and success. Taking initiatives is a visible strategy for impacting the organization. Those that take initiatives we have seen (our rational and existential men) believe strongly in themselves and their capabilities and do not fear the evaluation of their performance by powerful others. By contrast, the
administrative man perceives the initiative-taking endeavor as a risk. He fears the negative evaluation of his initiative, and therefore tends to become psychologically attracted to tasks which emphasize system maintenance rather than system transformation.

The Weber theory asserts that the entrepreneur is the product of unique cultural conditions. He is one who is somehow willing, or somehow by inner compulsion able to take the risk which will enhance his worth and eliminate his sense of doubt. The Weber thesis therefore predicts that the entrepreneur will not only be a frequent seeker of challenges, but as well he will be one who creates challenges. He is one who is singularly adept at exploiting the confluence of situational circumstances which others would ignore and which could make him a more powerful, worthy man.

Again, however, our data does not seem to support the Weber thesis. A glance at the following tables reveal that the man who is both insecure and unable to experience control is not a great seeker of challenges:

(Table 6.13) "How often do you actively go out and seek challenges?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not Very Often/Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>18.3</th>
<th>63.6</th>
<th>18.2</th>
<th>4.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 6.14) "Would you consider yourself a person who actively looks for challenges or someone who becomes motivated primarily through challenges that appear on your desk?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>51.1</th>
<th>48.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"I actively Look for Challenges" "...that appear on desk"

The entrepreneur, contrary to the Weber thesis, chooses not to grapple with the risk associated with initiative-taking. He does not in any way feel compelled to personally seek out challenges, or actively create challenges. When he does have
the compulsion, his inhibition prevents him from acting on it.

The entrepreneur is unable to create challenges because he does not have confidence that these challenges will be met successfully. His low self-esteem acts against the taking of personal initiative and his sense of being affected by exogenous forces encourages social withdrawal. The multiplicative effects of low self-esteem and the sense of being controlled by outside forces promotes not the activistic orientation of Weber's entrepreneur, but an orientation of comparative social quietism.

What is apparently critical for the nurturance of an initiative-taking impulse is a sense of personal efficacy. Because the existential man retains a strong belief in himself as a leader (even in the face of uncertainty), he is able to act against that uncertainty with an expectation, or at least a hope, of affecting change through personal causation. The entrepreneur does not believe in himself and his leadership capabilities. His strong sense of personal insecurity and his lack of self-esteem promote passive resignation to the forces which act upon him, and those which are beyond his control. Unlike Weber's man, he does not harbor a compulsion to act. His sense of being controlled, more often than not, results in
the internalization of his anxieties. Unlike the existential man, he does not externalize his needs and seek control of the forces which act against him. His behavior does not appear to be compensatory in nature.

When a leader believes in himself, he can overcome the greatest of obstacles. Even those that are self-imposed may be conquered. When the leader can no longer believe in himself and his capabilities he loses a sense of efficacy and purpose. And there can be no effective, innovative leadership without purpose.

The Entrepreneur and Situational Ambiguity

Some kinds of leaders operate well under situational constraints. They know well the rules of the game, and nimbly exploit these rules for their own ends. Robert Merton has called this type of organizational leader the "bureaucratic virtuoso."\(^{18}\)

The classic Weberian entrepreneur is one who is able to exploit situational ambiguity to suit his own needs. Indeed, he desires a lack of formal structure for structure only imposes limitations on his expansive imagination. When he is not constrained by organizational groundrules or the force
of precedent, the activistic leader may innovate. He may pursue organizational goals in a manner consistent with his (creative) needs, and he may be in a position to originate novel strategies for the attainment of "success."

A lack of formal structure creates latitude for improvisation. In such a situation the nature of (professional) social interactions are not specifically predefined either in terms of content or timing. Opportunity for improvisation is not usually great in formal bureaucracy but it may exist more often than classical sociology would have us believe.*

The Weberian entrepreneur should be one who operates well under conditions of ambiguity. Yet we have seen that this type of leader shys away both from risk-taking endeavors and the creation of challenges.

(Table 6.15) "How comfortable do you feel about making decisions about which there exist no organizational groundrules, precedents?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat Not At All Comfortable</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Our respondents were asked if they thought opportunity for creativity was greater at higher or lower eschelons of the organization. Their answers indicate there is no consensus on this point. Many feel that high level positions inhibit creativity as they are more visible to other members of the organization who expect the enforcement of extant norms. Others, however, felt that the greater one's power base, the greater the opportunity to be creative.
Existential Man 4.5 0.0 27.3 68.2
Administrative Man 0.0 13.0 65.2 21.7
Whole Business Elite 11.3 5.6 36.6 46.5
Whole Military Elite 5.4 3.4 49.0 40.2

As our data indicates, our fourth type of leader is less comfortable than most of his elite colleagues. Correlational analysis reveals that his experience of being controlled by outside forces, his mistrust of others in the organization, and again, his personalized power orientation, all contribute to a (comparative) sense of discomfort when having to make decisions where there exists little external structure.  

Goal-Selection: (1) Long-Range

The classic entrepreneur is one who is able to defer gratifications. His sense of inhibition allows him to pursue long-range goals, but with the necessary modicum of restraint which allows return on investment. The entrepreneur is able to play his cards "close to the vest" without having to give away his "trump" card. His active superego which imposes tendencies of moderation lends a special evenness to his pursuit of power. He attains success not through "fits and
starts," but through steady, purposive, goal-oriented activity. He is both a long and short range planner. His successes are not accidental but the result of careful calculations. Is our entrepreneur an avid planner?

Our data is limited, but they do suggest that the entrepreneur displays no special propensity for long-range career planning. Only about a quarter of our entrepreneurs had a clear picture of what they wanted to attain when they entered their respective professions, and it is likely that even fewer had a clearly defined course of action by which such a position could be attained. Yet this is the norm among all our business and military elites, and this norm does not change significantly with respect to our other leadership types.*

It is quite possible that the entrepreneur's experience of being controlled by outside forces lessens the importance of long-range planning. For this kind of leader there is always a strong possibility that the fates will intervene with his plans. Being the fatalist that he is (and of course the classic entrepreneur believed in predestination), long-range planning has little meaning.

*Those entrepreneurs who did have a plan for what they wanted to become set their sights highly. 70 percent still feel that this plan has yet to be realized. And when asked if they would remain content with their present position in their organizations if it became apparent that they could not move into a higher position, less than 10 percent said they would.
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A manifestation of the entrepreneur's fatalism is the large number of people who believe that leaders are "born and not made" (30 percent). The entrepreneur feels powerless to act against what already is.

(2) Short-Range Planning

One of the interesting things about our administrative man was his use of conformity to get ahead. Despite his very strong need for achievement, his goals were often the result of others' expectations. In this sense, and because of the prepotency of his need for affiliation, the administrative man may be thought of as "other-directed." Other-directedness, however, need not be incompatible with self-starter behaviors. The powerful leader may initiate action from within to fulfill the expectations of others. (There may be such an anomaly as the "other-directed self-starter" though we of course have been interested in the "true" self-starter--the leader who initiates action from within in order to satisfy private needs in the organizational or self interest.)

Goal-selection then can result from other's expectations. A number of organizational psychologists would even argue that virtually all of our leader's goals are dictated by the needs of superiors or their organizational agencies. They would
argue that the mark of the efficient leader* and the true self-starter (given the structural constraints of ongoing bureaucratic organization) would thus be initiating creative actions for the attainment of organizational goals.

But this tells only half the story. It is true that the leader pursues organizationally developed and defined goals, but the means by which these goals are achieved may be both original and creative. As Greenstein has noted in *Personality and Politics*, "even when there is little room for personal variability in the instrumental aspects of actions (such as standardized bureaucracy), there is likely to be variability in their expressive aspects." 20 This variability constitutes the essence of leadership style.

The "pure" self-starter may actually pursue personal goals in the organizational context and convince his associates that these goals are needed by the organization. If such a person exists, he should be either the existential leader or the entrepreneur. We have already seen that the existential leader is bold and detached. He has a strength of conviction and a breadth of vision unmatched by our other leadership types. How does our entrepreneur fare when compared with the existential,*

*Manager* may be a more appropriate label. In the final chapter we will discuss the differences between leaders and managers.
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and other leadership types?

Again, our data reveals that his life's goals are more his own than are the goals of our affiliation-oriented administrative man. Yet they are less his own than the bold existential leader and the ever-confident rational man:

(Table 6.16) "To what extent do you believe your life's goals are your own and how much are the result of others' expectations?" (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Largely</th>
<th>Not So Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The double-edged sword of low self-esteem and "externality" hangs precariously over the head of our entrepreneur and strongly militates against his initiative-taking, or activistic, impulses.

The true self-starter does not pursue the goals of others -- he does not need the approval of others for the satisfaction
of his personality needs or the reconciliation of his personal conflicts. He formulates goals from within and pursues these goals with inner-directed strategies.

It is by now apparent that the self-starter must have confidence in himself as a person and as a leader. When anxiety is present, as in the case of our existential man, the leader must believe that his actions will be respected both by others and his organization. Only then will the taking of initiatives be a truly effective anxiety-reducing mechanism. The fatalism of our entrepreneur inhibits the working out of his inner anxieties through purposeful professional activity.

The Entrepreneur and His Need for Encouragement

The classic entrepreneur needs no prodding. He is literally driven to act. His compulsion is the effort to extinguish his doubt (though, of course, he never does). His single-minded determination precludes a need for encouragement by others.

Our entrepreneur, however, needs more encouragement than his colleagues. Only our administrative man surpasses the entrepreneur in this need area. It is interesting to note that in spite of his relative lack of trust in superiors, the entrepreneur actually prefers encouragement from them when
encouragement is needed. Very few entrepreneurs prefer encouragement from friends and loved ones, and more often than not, the entrepreneur seeks encouragement from peers in his immediate work group.

This relatively strong need for encouragement contributes further evidence to our characterization of the entrepreneur as less a self-starter than either the rational or the existential men, both marked by strong self-confidence. Again, the twofold sense of insecurity, both about the self and the fates which act against the self, make this leader dependent upon others for the satisfaction of his most salient personality needs. This leader is unable to pursue success purely by initiating action from within. The nature of his pursuit of power is largely shaped by his environment—yet he is distanced enough from his organization that he is not a conformist.

Hedonism

The classic entrepreneur pursues wealth in a vigorously rational manner. His inhibition and his need to prove his worth frame a posture of what Weber has called, "this worldly asceticism." Asceticism may be thought of as the antithesis of hedonism.

In order for us to test the hypothesis that entrepreneurs are ascetic, we asked our respondents, "If as a young man you
had inherited a great fortune, would you have pursued your present career?---if not what would you have done." Our reasoning was that the true entrepreneur was driven by a "calling"---the need to work as an end in itself, and as fulfillment of this-worldly obligations. The entrepreneur, more than any other leader, should say, "yes, I would have pursued my present career," or he would choose another professional pursuit as demanding as his present one. He would not, we reasoned, choose to spend his life in a hedonistic manner, spending frivolously his good fortune. This would be counter to the ascetic ethos of the classic entrepreneur.

(Table 6.17) "If you had inherited a great fortune as a young man, would you have pursued your present career?" (\%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No Data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 60 percent of our entrepreneurs who would not have pursued their present careers, about one-quarter would have sought
vocations consistent with the Protestant Ethic. Most importantly, many said they would have owned their own businesses, and quite a few would have chosen to be lawyers, physicians or engineers. A small number would have been writers or involved themselves in the performing arts or "humanistic goals."

About one-fifth of the group would have led what could be called a hedonistic existence. One man claimed he would seek adventure through car racing, one would merely "sit back and enjoy," the two others would just "spend money," and one openly proclaimed he would lead a purely "hedonistic" life.

But our other leadership types tell very similar stories.* A little less than half would have pursued their present career (which by the way, indicates strong dedication and a general sense of satisfaction), and of those that would not have, most would have gone into other professions. We can offer little evidence in support of Weber's assertion that the entrepreneur is a true ascetic.21 The business and military elite as a class apparently have internalized the Protestant ethic. These are people who enjoy, or otherwise need to work as professionals.

*The rational man appears to be least hedonistic. Only three claimed they would live such an existence.
(6.6) Overview: The Entrepreneurial Man

There are few objective methods which we may utilize in ascertaining whether our entrepreneur has pursued organizational power more intensely than his colleagues. (Remember, the Weber theory maintains that the entrepreneur labors intensely as an end in itself.) We do, therefore, have a theoretically compelling reason why this should be so.

While we have assessed the need structure of our entrepreneurial man and concluded that he does have a strong concern with protecting and expanding his organizational base of power, it does not necessarily follow that he acts toward the attainment of that end. The entrepreneur, as we have said, is a highly inhibited man.

Inhibition acts to surpress this leader's urge to take initiatives. While he does desire the accumulation of power, by his own admission (and when compared with our other leadership types) he does not act toward that end. It is likely that our entrepreneur fears reprisals from powerful others and this fear effectively militates against the taking of initiatives. The entrepreneur believes that ambitious people create enemies.

Our entrepreneur tempers his needs. While our existen- tial leader (an essentially uninhibited man) acts out his
strivings for power, the entrepreneur surpresses and even restructures his strivings. This process is a function of the superego.

Because the entrepreneur cannot act to satisfy his most desired personality need (that of power), we may infer that he is essentially unfulfilled.*

From the data we have presented in this chapter we may infer that this type of leader does not pursue power more intensely than does his colleagues. As we shall show in the next chapter, our military personnel do not gravitate toward, or somehow come to acquire command positions, but they more often than not retain positions as mid- to upper-level staff. They are essentially managers and not "leaders."

Our entrepreneur is the type of man who is most likely to acquire anonymous power, or that type of power which can be exercised behind the scenes. He has neither the "expectancy of success" enjoyed by our rational man, nor the "command identity" of our existential leader. He has neither the disposition nor the temperament to be the visible leader of men that are the rational and existential leaders, his high self-esteem associates.

*Our self-report measures support this notion. Remember, our entrepreneurial men find the least amount of meaning in their jobs, and as well, they enjoy themselves least on a typical work day.
(6.6) Conclusion

(1) Our Entrepreneur

This chapter has shown that there exists a type of bureaucratic elite who is essentially inhibited, insecure, mistrusting, fearful of power, and detached from the ethos of his organization. Such a leader is not a self-starter in the true sense of the word. He neither feels compelled to take initiatives, nor is he able to bear the risks associated with innovation. This type of leader is in effect not a leader at all, but a manager.

(Table 6.18) Entrepreneurial Man: His Character and Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Sense of Control</td>
<td>Does not take initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Does not seek control of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong need for Personal power</td>
<td>Social quietism (by comparative intra-elite standards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Achievement needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverted</td>
<td>Seeks enhancement of own reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibited</td>
<td>Seeks to prove self-worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>Does not stimulate associates, motivate subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrustful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) The Weber Thesis

While developing our fourth leadership type we have tested a controversial thesis about the nature of man. We have of course, not settled this controversy, but we do have strong evidence that the Weber thesis* is too general. As well, it is apparent that Weber underestimated the power of inhibition, and the multiplicity of ways in which it can affect human behavior.

Insecure men who experience the belief that their fate is somehow predetermined, or otherwise affected by outside forces are insecure, but they are not (as Weber maintained) unusually activistic. Their inhibited nature serves only to militate against goal-directed professional activity. It does not provide a unique drive, or a special psychological need for that activity.

In a piece which is highly supportive of the Weber thesis, Stanislav Andreski has said,

"The weakest point in the (Weber) argument... is the assertion linking predestination with the acquisitive drive. It is difficult to see how an earnest belief that one's fate is determined by something absolutely beyond one's control could stimulate anybody to exert himself. Fatalism... is generally considered to be one of the greatest obstacles to economic development... It appears therefore that this tenet... provided neither stimulus nor obstacle to the growth of capitalism."22

---

*We have been concerned with that aspect of the Weber thesis which centers on the entrepreneur as the transformative principle in the change from feudalism to capitalism. We have not focused on the larger question of whether Protestantism as a religious form, has "caused" the growth of capitalist organizations.
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2. Webster's Dictionary. For a good discussion of the types of entrepreneur which have been developed over the years see John W. Atkinson and B.F. Hoselitz, "Entrepreneurship and Personality," in Explorations in Entrepreneurial History, 1958, 10, pp. 107-112. The authors maintain that historically the entrepreneur has had three major roles. They are: (1) risk-bearing; (2) managing; and (3) innovating.

3. Weber believed that asceticism together with mental concentration and a feeling of obligation to one's job "provides the most favorable foundation for the concentration of labor as an end in itself, as a calling which is necessary to capitalism..." Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, p. 63.

4. Ibid., p. 172.

5. Ibid., p. 54.
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9. The Entrepreneur and his sense of Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interpersonal trust</th>
<th>Trust in Superiors</th>
<th>Trust in Subordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Man</td>
<td>59.76</td>
<td>56.66</td>
<td>62.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>67.60*</td>
<td>65.58**</td>
<td>69.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td>63.01*****</td>
<td>60.23</td>
<td>65.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>67.07*</td>
<td>66.52****</td>
<td>65.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Business Elite</td>
<td>65.30****</td>
<td>67.90*</td>
<td>62.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Military Elite</td>
<td>62.90**</td>
<td>64.90</td>
<td>60.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.001; ** p<.003; *** p<.002; **** p<.01; ***** p<.15


11. Most, but not all of the literature agrees on this point. For example, Platt, et. al., (1970) found no significant relationship, but Fish and Karabenick (1971) do report a Pearson correlation coefficient of .28 between self-esteem and "internality," and many other studies follow suit.

12.

13. The whole regression equation included the following variables and yielded the following coefficients (just under 50% of the variance is explained):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor I</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor II</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Affiliation</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Power</td>
<td>-.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Power</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Power</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


19. **Discomfort In Making Decisions Without Precedent**
   - Locus of Control  $-.19$ (n.s.)
   - Interpersonal Trust $-.13$ (n.s.)
   - Need for Personal Power  $-.18$ (n.s.)


21. For an interesting discussion of asceticism and self-discipline, see Bruce Mazlish, *The Revolutionary Ascetic*, Basic Books, 1976. Mazlish maintains that leaders are able to control and displace their libidinal impulses. In Chapter Seven, we develop a similar kind of argument. However, it will be shown that leaders displace their impulses whether or not they feel full control of them.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusion:

Self-esteem and Insecurity
Among a Business and Military Elite

This final chapter will be a discussion of some of the more important themes which have emerged in the body of this work.

Implicit throughout has been a methodology which stressed the interrelations of character, worldview, and leadership style. As well, we have been trying to ascertain the behavioral effects of insecurity and self-esteem. We have also raised the question of whether it would be meaningful, or indeed necessary, to distinguish between "leaders" and "managers."

In this chapter we shall treat each of these themes, and offer some general conclusions about the nature of leadership in complex bureaucracies.

(7.1) Four Portraits: The Interconnectedness of Character, Worldview and Behavior

The typology which has been developed in this work stresses the logical flow from character to worldview to behavior. Our supposition has been that type-specific configurations of personality attributes lead to a particular
vision of the world. This vision or worldview is a lens through which all incoming information is filtered, interpreted and understood. It is the central axis around which each man revolves, and it defines and delimits each man's very experience of the world.

By mapping the interactive cognitive relations of our four leadership types, we have traced the genesis of four distinct worldviews.

Our first leader, because of his high self-esteem and his belief in personal causation, perceived a comprehensible, predictable, rational and controllable world. Our second leader, because he felt he was susceptible to control by outside forces, but at the same time because he believed strongly in his worth as a person, embraced an existential worldview. His personal vision of the world was one of incomprehensibility.

Our third leader, like the rational man, believed that the world was comprised of logical and orderly relations. Yet the administrative man viewed the world with trepidation because he doubted whether he had the physical and mental presence to penetrate, understand, and control those logical relations.
And our fourth type of leader, the entrepreneur, was both under the spell of exogenous forces and personally insecure. Doubts about the self and the ability to achieve continued success coupled with doubts about the ability to control his environment fostered a pessimistic, fatalistic view of the world. **Worldview and Behavior**

These four distinct visions of the world led to four distinct ways of grappling with the world as reconstructed by those visions.

A rational world could best be grappled with through a logical calculus of analytic behaviors aimed at solving problems which **have** solutions.

The problems framed by an existential world cannot be solved; they must be overcome, brought under reign through purposive, bold activity. Even if the problems posed by an existential world are not fully understood, they must be **controlled**.

The private world of our administrative man beheld insecurities which made **accepting** his world more attractive than **changing** it. The world of our administrative man demanded much in the way of personal compromise. It was most easily grappled with through quiescent, rather than combative, activity.

And the entrepreneurial world is both controlable and **threatening**. This world is best dealt with through
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escape. Only by withdrawing from this world can our entrepreneur deal with the anxieties and fears which it creates.

**Needs and Motivations: Behavioral Antecedents**

The rational man was strongly motivated because he had both a personal history of success and because his self-confidence engendered an "expectancy" of succeeding.

The existential leader was strongly motivated to take initiatives because of his desire to exercise control of his uncertain world. His expectancy of succeeding was not as great as that of our rational man, yet his incentive was--he needed, indeed **had** to have personal power.

Both the administrative and the entrepreneurial leaders were motivated to take initiatives (the administrator to enhance his "looking-glass" sense of self, the entrepreneur to eradicate his sense of doubt) but they suffered from a vision that they would in some way fail. Their expectancy of succeeding was therefore weak, and their incentive to achieve success was imbued with risk. The frequency of initiative-taking for these two leaders was therefore less than that of their high self-esteem counterparts. Because the administrative and the entrepreneurial men could not overcome their sense of risk, they positioned themselves in roles which called for system maintenance rather than system transformation.
We have seen how the motivational system of each leadership type leads to a specific style of action, and how the unique need structure of each type leads to differential expectancies of succeeding.

The nature and frequency of initiative-taking for each of the leadership types may be predicted by the interaction of their motivational system and their attendant worldview. (Worldview perceptions influence action by arousing motivational states.\(^1\)) Thus the rational man moved from task to task with an "expectancy of success" and the firm conviction that all problems are solvable. The existential man initiated structure as a manifestation of his striving for power. He continuously sought to bring his uncertain world under reign. The administrative man was driven by a fear of failure—he was therefore governed by what we called an "inertia of habituation." And our entrepreneur was marked by distantiation—he was inhibited both by internal and environmental constraints.

**Fate-Control and Insecurity**

Both the existential and entrepreneurial leadership types experience a sense of being controlled or somehow manipulated by forces outside themselves. Yet there is a remarkable discrepancy in the ways in which they view themselves and their worlds. While our bold existential leader
exhibits strong self-confidence, our entrepreneur suffers from an anxiety-provoking lack of self-esteem.

The locus of control literature assumes that the experience of "externality" produces low self-esteem, is associated with debilitating anxiety, and is intimately bound up with (if not the cause of) a general inability to function effectively in American society. Clearly our data challenges these findings. The perception that one's actions are mediated by outside forces may be latent, manifesting itself only now and again, receding and advancing with respect to certain areas of concern. Our existential man has shown that an experience of "externality" need not interfere with, and can indeed be the impulse for, initiative-taking and the acquisition of organizational power. It may be argued in fact, that the notion of externality may be central to leadership effectiveness. Only when one realizes that he cannot control the forces of the world, will realistic goal-setting become possible. Only then will a leader realize, and not exceed, his personal limitations.

At the same time we have seen that the personal insecurity which plagued our entrepreneurial man was not significantly bound up with his experience of being controlled
by outside forces. We must conclude therefore that the experience of an external locus of control is at best a sufficient though not a necessary "cause" of insecurity. Our existential leader is higher in self-esteem than all other types. Our entrepreneurial man is lower in self-esteem than all other types. Both experience virtually identical notions of control, and both offer a striking contrast in the ways in which they experience the world. The existential man has an expansive reach. He is visceral, domineering. The entrepreneur, his external counterpart, is quietistic, anomic and withdrawn.

It is neither one's level of self-esteem nor one's experience of control which provides us with explanatory power. It is the particular combination of both.

Let us now look more closely at what an examination of combinatorial patterns may tell us by trying to draw psychodynamic distinctions between "leaders" and "managers." 

(7.2) Leaders and Managers

It became evident in Chapter Six that not all elites (as we have called our respondents) are "leaders." That is, not all of our elites are people who initiate action and
mold the energies and ambitions of other men.² More often than not, career bureaucrats (both because of situational norms and professional expectations) are technocrats or managers. They are specialists who are proficient at enforcing or expediting present policies and completing process-oriented tasks. But they are not motivated (or compelled) to take the risks associated with creating norms and transforming existing policy into exciting strategies for change. Managerial effectiveness and leadership effectiveness are not synonymous.

One colonel who is now involved in teaching courses in military leadership has told this writer that the military tries to inculcate leadership qualities in their officers. Yet they know full well that only a fraction of these men can ever be leaders--most are simply managers.³

Can leaders and managers be differentiated by distinct sets of personality attributes? This is a difficult question. As was mentioned in Chapter One, social scientists cannot even agree what leadership is!

*In one scholar's review of over 200 "leadership" studies only three personality factors emerged as common.⁴
While we are not able to enumerate a whole range of systematic differences which distinguish leaders from managers, our findings are suggestive. As we have demonstrated, our two "leaders" (the rational and existential men) are great initiative takers. Not only are they marked by positive self-regard, extroversion, dominance, persuasiveness, activity (vs. passivity) and power-oriented qualities, but as well, our leaders are more likely to be promoted in an accelerated fashion, and have a significantly greater number of subordinates reporting to them in their present positions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent Promoted In Accelerated Fashion</th>
<th>Average Number of Subordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rational Man)</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>66.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Existential Man)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Administrative Man)</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>28.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Entrepreneurial Man)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .001

*This data has been abstracted from the promotional classification record of each War College and Air Command and Staff Officer who took part in the study.
Leaders are people who believe in themselves and their ability to impact others. Despite radically different experiences of control, both rational and existential men exert efforts to alter their environments—for they believe that their efforts can (in the case of the existential man) or will (in the case of the rational man) make a difference.

Fear of failure and abject fatalism are not part of the effective leader's cognitive makeup, though they may be present in some kinds of managers.

Let us place this notion in an analytic perspective.

Our theory maintained that only certain leaders are somewhat able to overcome the sense of risk associated with taking initiatives in bureaucratic structures. These leaders we called "self-starters."

We further postulated that an experience of anxiety was intimately bound up with initiative-taking behavior. Anxiety, we reasoned, makes men feel uncomfortable and stressed. Only by taking some positive action could that stress be alleviated or diminished. Consistent with the writings of Weber and Lasswell, anxiety was viewed as a drive factor.

Yet the development of our four leadership types
illustrates that the nature of initiative-taking, and ultimately leadership style, is perhaps more complex than our original theory suggested.

While some men dwell in worlds which encourage them to act or externalize their insecurities and needs, other men live in worlds which cause internalization of these needs.

Having a sense of anxiety, either about the self and the ability to achieve, or about the self and the capacity to control, is not enough to provide us with an understanding of the activistic or initiative-taking impulse.

Anxieties are mediated by a dynamic interaction of worldview and the sense of self. The nature of the worldview (that is, whether it be threatening or altruistic), as well as the nature of the self (whether it be secure or insecure), delineates a range of ways that these personal and control-related insecurities will be managed. Anxiety-reduction or the management of insecurity need not, and often cannot, result in initiative-taking behaviors.

Initiative-taking (or activism) does not occur simply as a reaction to an uncontrollable world or the experience of personal insecurity. Nor does it occur solely as a natural manifestation of the "healthy" (secure) personality. Then how does, we may ask, initiative-taking occur and what is the
relationship between insecurity and leadership?

At least since the appearance of\textit{Psychopathology and Politics}, social scientists have been trying to figure out what role insecurity plays in the life of the leader. As ingenious as Lasswell's famous explanation is, we have seen that is suffers from overgeneralization. The p\textit{d}r formula\textsuperscript{5} should not be invoked as an explanatory device in the analysis of all \textit{leaders} (or for that matter, all "political men"). It is only appropriate in the case of those individuals whose vision of the world enables them to harbor a reasonable expectation that their actions will make a difference. Only then will private motives be displaced onto \textit{public} objects. Threatening worldviews promote not the displacement, but the \textit{repression} of private motives--\textit{internalization} is the process-outcome.

By employing Lasswell's famous formula and two additional variants, we may be able to draw some important psycho-dynamic distinctions between "leaders" and "managers":

\begin{enumerate}
\item p\textit{d}r = Leaders
\item p\textit{R}p = \textit{Managers}
\item p\textit{R}i =
\end{enumerate}

In the first instance private motives are displaced onto private objects and rationalized in the public interest.
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This displacement process characterizes the activist leader; the man who lives out his fantasies of power and control. It characterizes the man who fears not the consequences of his actions, and who hopes in some way to mold the energies or thoughts of other men.

In the second case, private motives are repressed (or internalized) and only then are they rationalized in the public (or corporate) interest. This process is characteristic of some kinds of managers, and in particular, the "administrative man;" the manager who avoids acting out his fantasies for fear of negative consequences. Here the anticipation of negative outcomes produces the repression of private motivations. Unlike Lasswell's man who rationalizes his actions in the public interest, it is the administrator's proclivity for avoidance which is rationalized in the public (or corporate) interest. Says our administrative man, "I must control my power strivings for the sake of the organization. I must channel my achievement strivings so that the goals of the organization may be realized. If everyone did as they pleased there would be no organization...only chaos."

Of course, what is happening is that the administrative man is afraid to act out (or displace) his most strongly held motive dispositions. The manager lacks the courage to fail;
but his fear is cloaked in the guise of "self-control," "responsibility" and "duty."

In the third case private motives are simply repressed. Discomfort, anxiety and unhappiness\(^6\) flow from self-imposed repression. Strongly held motives are not acted out or lived--they are continuously frustrated in their search for practical expression.

The repressed power-holder bears resemblance to the classic entrepreneur. He is a loner, distantiated from the organization, and unable to accept the norms imposed by formal structure. Yet his superego exerts a more powerful influence than Weber suggested. Introjection rather than displacement is here the process outcome.

The following three tables illustrate how leaders may be differentiated from managers. Our four leadership types have been fitted into the formulas presented on Pages 326-28.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SUBTYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Man</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character (Private Motive)</th>
<th>Displaced Onto Public Objects</th>
<th>Rationalized In the Corporate Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Control</td>
<td>Acts With Confidence</td>
<td>Takes Initiatives (As a Strategy To Gain Influence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Control</td>
<td>Extroversion &quot;Activity&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Runs a 'tight ship'&quot; (When Really Imposes Structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High self esteem</td>
<td>Need to Control</td>
<td>&quot;Innovates&quot; (When Maximizing Gains or Imposing Will)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate N Power</td>
<td>Closely Supervises Subordinates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong N Power</td>
<td>Lives Fantasies of Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Dominance&quot;</td>
<td>Competitive Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 7.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SUBTYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>p)R)p Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>(Repressed) (Rationalized in the Corporate Interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Private Motive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Control</td>
<td>Personal Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Responsibility&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>&quot;Self-control&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong N Achievement</td>
<td>Dislike of competition, confrontation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Technical Competence&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong N Affiliation</td>
<td>Problem-solving mindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Trust</td>
<td>&quot;Loyalty&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Duty&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval seeking, conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deference*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is of interest to note that for administrative man, trust and fear of power correlate at .60, p < .02.
(Table 7.4)

TYPE
Entrepreneurial Man

SUBTYPE
p)R}i
Manager

Character
(Private Motive)
External Control
Insecurity
Inhibition
High Personal Power
Low Trust

[Introversion "Passivity"
Fear of Failure
Fear of Powerful Others
Avoidance Orientation

Introversion Rather Than Displacement

(Repressed)
Withdrawal
Alienation

(Introjection)
Unhappiness
Detachment (not "loyalty")
We can see from this juxtaposition that the rational and the existential men act much as Lasswell's formula would predict. They harbor strong private motives which they displace onto public (or corporate) objects. This behavior is then rationalized in the corporate interest. The existential man seeks the control of others, frequently takes initiatives and is not at all fearful of competition, confrontation, or the potentially negative consequences of his actions. Both the rational and the existential men **approach** life's challenges rather than avoid them. They are not dependent upon others for their personal satisfaction or their goals; their motivations are intrinsic, their achievements deriving from sheer force of will. They believe that their actions can make a difference. What's more, they have the courage to fail.

Our administrative man **represses** rather than displaces his private motives. He then rationalizes them in the public (and not coincidentally, his own) interest. The critical psychological activity is the repression of personal motivations. Repression induces a quietistic, avoident orientation. Rather than seeking the control of others (an "approach" orientation), the administrative man seeks their approval. He is dependent upon others for the satisfaction of his most salient personality needs. His motivations are thus extrinsic, and masked in the guise of the "public interest": he is
"responsible," "technically competent," "loyal," "dutiful," and most importantly, he is needed by the organization.

The entrepreneurial man also represses his private motives, but doesn't even bother to rationalize them in the public interest—for they never become displaced. The entrepreneur is plagued by an agonizing sense of doubt; he fears and mistrusts powerful people, and actually withdraws from social interaction. His behavior is avoidant, even escapist. He is unconcerned with, or unable to focus in on the public interest. His sense of inhibition is central to his personality.

Initiative-taking may occur either as a reaction to an irrational or a rational world, only when the initiative-taker retains a strong belief that it is at least possible his actions will make a difference. People who believe that their actions matter may be secure or insecure, but they are somehow able to project, or displace, or externalize their anxieties. In Lasswell's words, they are able to work out their private anxieties by displacing them onto public objects. Without a sense of hope, immured of despair, a rational and logical world will do little to promote action. Just because a world is understandable does not mean it is changeable, or worth changing.
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The leader who lacks the element of efficacy and hope represses, sublimates, or otherwise manages his anxieties through the process of **internalization**. This type of leader we may safely say is not a leader at all. He may be an "administrator" or even a "theorist," but he is likely to be a **manager**—he is not a leader of men.

The extent to which initiatives will be taken is the result of the interface between the way one feels about himself and the way in which one views the world. A combinatorial pattern which permits externalization is characteristic of the leader who attempts system transformation; the interface of worldview and self which promotes internalization is characteristic of the manager who feels most secure promoting system maintenance.
Footnotes to Chapter Seven


2. The mainstream of organizational psychology does not effectively distinguish between leaders and managers. Nor has it attempted to demonstrate that leaders and managers can be distinguished by differing personality characteristics. Typically organizational psychology views leadership as a function of role demands. See for example Petrulo and Bass, Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, or Hare, the Handbook of Small Group Research.


4. R. D. Mann, "A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups," Psychology Bulletin, 1959, 56, pp. 241-70. The three factors were intelligence, extroversion, and dominance (though they were measured differently from study to study). By contrast, Couch and Carter (in Sherif and Wilson, Group Relations at the Crossroads, 1953) showed by factor analysis that small group leaders had these three factors as common: group goal facilitation, individual prominence, and group sociability (task ability, individual assertiveness, and social acceptance). It is no surprise that different factors
were found to be significant. Differing test conditions alone insures this.


6. A national study of life satisfaction has reported that unhappiness and insecurity are highly related (.53) (see Bachman, et. al., *Youth in Transition*, Vol. I, Institute for Social Research, 1968). And as well, in *Power and the Corporate Mind*, Chapter 6, "Power and Politics in Organizations," Abraham Zaleznick and M.F.R. Kets De Vries, the authors maintain that entrepreneurial types of managers suffer through a kind of "purgatory" before they are recognized. The authors also note how frequently the themes of unhappiness and loss appear in the autobiographies of great entrepreneurs.
APPENDIX I

The Questionnaire

1. Your age is ________

2. Your religion is ________

   Military only (questions 3-8)

3. You are attending... Air War College______

   Air Command and Staff College______

4. The number of subordinates you supervised in your last
   assignment was_______

5. Your rank is ________

6. Are you rated?----- Yes, a pilot____ Yes, a navigator____
   No____

7. Have you ever been promoted "below the zone?"
   ____Yes, one time ____Yes, twice; two successive ranks
   ____Yes, twice; but not two successive ranks
   ____Yes, three times ____No

8. What level of education had you achieved before you entered
   your current P.M.E. school? __________

9. The educational level of your father was?________

10. The educational level of your mother was?________

11. Your father's occupation________

12. Please rank by age, yourself and any brothers and sisters in
    your family (please list youngest first)

   1._______  3._______  5._______
   2._______  4._______  6._______
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13. Where would you place yourself on an extroversion-introversion continuum?
   Extroversion/----/----/----/----/----/Introversion

14. When trying to tackle a new and difficult job, I often need encouragement from (please rank order)
   ____Superiors
   ____Friends and those I love
   ____Work peers
   Other____

15. To what extent do you believe your life's goals are truly your own, and how much are the result of others' expectations?
   Completely my own____ Very much my own____ Largely my own____
   Not so much my own____ Not at all my own____

16. Where would you place yourself on an active-passive continuum?
   Active/----/----/----/----/----/Passive

17. Would you consider yourself a person who actively looks for challenges, or someone who becomes motivated primarily through challenges that appear on your desk?
   ____I actively look for challenges
   ____I become motivated by challenges that appear on my desk

18. I am... Dominant/----/----/----/----/----/Firm
   Encouraging/----/----/----/----/----/Persuasive

19. I believe... My I.Q. is
   Far above average/----/----/----/----/----/Somewhat above average
20. It is a popular notion that in order to achieve success in an organization one must conform to the expectations of others. Is this conformity only necessary at lower levels, to end when higher positions are reached, or will conformity always be a necessity?
   ___A phase to end; top management can be creative and self-expressive
   ___Always a necessity
   Other__________________

21. How often are you overburdened by work you don't enjoy?
   All the time___ Very often___ Often___ Not very often___ Not at all___

22. Are you satisfied with the amount of challenges presented you by your work environment?
   Completely satisfied___
   Very satisfied___ Satisfied___ Not very satisfied___
   Not satisfied at all___

23. How often do subordinates try to be helpful, and how often do they mostly just look out for themselves? They try to be helpful...
   All the time___ Very often___ Often___
   Not very often___ Infrequently___ Not at all___
   They mostly look out for themselves...
   All the time___ Very often___ Often___ Not very often___ Very infrequently___ Not at all___
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24. Have you tried to convince anyone of your political ideas lately?  ____Yes  ____No

25. Has anyone asked your advice on a political question recently?  ____Yes  ____No

26. How often do superiors try to be helpful, and how often do they just look out for themselves?

   They try to be helpful...  All the time____ Very often____
   Often____  Not very often____  Infrequently____
   Not at all____

   They mostly look out for themselves...  All the time____
   Very often____  Often____  Not very often____
   Infrequently____  Not at all____

27. When you have to talk in front of a class or a group of people your own age, how afraid or worried do you usually feel?  Usually very worried____  Worried____
   Slightly worried____  Not worried at all____

28. To what do you attribute your occupational success? (Please rank order: 1 = highest)

   ____Peer support      ____Connections
   ____Hard work         ____Self-confidence
   ____A few lucky breaks    ____Family encouragement
   ____Being in "the right place at the right time"

- 337 -
29. How much do you enjoy yourself on a typical work day?
   Very much____  Much____  Not so much____  Not at all____
30. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or
    a cause that his life becomes meaningful...
   Strongly agree____  Agree____  Slightly agree____
   Slightly disagree____  Disagree____  Strongly disagree____
31. How often do you present superiors with unsolicited re-
    commendations, suggestions?  Always____  Very often____
    Often____  Not very often____  Almost never____
32. When you do present superiors with unsolicited recommend-
    ations, usually how certain are you that these recommend-
    ations will be acted upon?  Usually very certain____
    Usually certain____  Somewhat certain____  Somewhat un-
    certain____  Uncertain____  Very uncertain____
33. It is the duty of each person to do his job the very best
    he can...  Strongly agree____  Agree____  Slightly
    agree____  Disagree____  Strongly disagree____
34. Good leaders are born and not made...  Strongly agree____
    Agree____  Slightly agree____  Slightly disagree____
    Disagree____  Strongly disagree____
35. How often do you think that most subordinates would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, and how often would they try to be fair?

Try to take advantage... All the time__
Very often__ Often__ Not very often__ Infrequently__ Never__

Try to be fair... All the time__ Very often__
Often__ Not very often__ Infrequently__ Never__

36. In which of the following high school or college varsity sports did you participate?  ____Baseball  ____Basketball
____Crew  ____Football  ____Golf  ____Gymnastics  ____Hockey
____Lacrosse  ____Tennis  ____Other

37. If as a young man you had inherited a great fortune, would you have pursued your present career?  Yes__ No__
If not, what would you have done? ____________________________

_________________________________________________________

38. About how often do you actively go out and seek challenges (in the course of your work)?  Always__ Very often__
Often__ Not very often__ Infrequently__
Not at all__

39. An ambitious person... (please check the most appropriate)

____Is admired
____Creates enemies
____Both
47. It is very often hard for many people to go on with their work if they are not encouraged. How often do you feel you need encouragement?  
   Always___  Very often___  
   Often___  Sometimes___  Rarely___  Never___

48. In your spare time, do you prefer to relax (by reading, watching T.V., etc.) or participate in some activity (jogging, card playing, etc.)?  
   ___I prefer to relax  
   ___I like to participate in some activity

49. Do you ever feel so discouraged with yourself that you wonder whether anything is worthwhile?  
   Always___  
   Very often___  Often___  Not very often___  
   Very infrequently___  Never___

50. When you are required to direct the activities of others, how often do you feel that you receive personal respect from those directed?  
   Always___  Very often___  Often___  
   Sometimes___  Rarely___  Never___

51. How comfortable do you feel in making decisions about which there exist no organizational precedents, groundrules?  
   Very uncomfortable___  Uncomfortable___  
   Slightly uncomfortable___  Not uncomfortable at all___

52. How often do you have the feeling that you can do everything well?  
   Always___  Very often___  Often___  
   Not very often___  Very infrequently___  Never___
53. Americans today are preoccupied with "finding meaning" in their lives and in their jobs. How often do you find your work personally meaningful, and how often just a duty?
   Personally meaningful... Always___ Most of the time___ Sometimes___ Not very often___ Never___
   Just a duty... Always___ Most of the time___
   Sometimes___ Not very often___ Never___

54. How often do you feel you are a successful person?
   Always___ Very often___ Often___ Not very often___
   Very infrequently___ Never___

55. How often do you think that most superiors would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, and how often would they try to be fair?
   Try to take advantage... All the time___
   Very often___ Often___ Not very often___
   Infrequently___ Not at all___
   Try to be fair... All the time___ Very often___
   Often___ Not very often___ Infrequently___
   Not at all___

56. After successfully completing a long and arduous task, it is very important to me that people recognize me for my accomplishments... Strongly agree___ Agree___
   Slightly agree___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___
57. Upon entering a profession, many people have an idea of what it is they would like to become. Other people do not, and just make the most of opportunities that come. When you entered your profession did you have an idea, a picture of what position, rank you wanted to attain?
   A clear idea/picture____
   An idea/picture, though unclear____
   No picture or idea____
   Has this position been attained? Yes____ No____
   Has this position been surpassed? Yes____ No____

58. Some people have said that it is possible to be TOO ambitious. Do you agree? Strongly agree____ Agree____
   Slightly agree____ Disagree____ Strongly disagree____

59. How certain are you of your ability to accomplish the tasks that will be required of you in the job role(s) for which you are now training? Very certain____ Certain____
   Slightly certain____ Uncertain____ Strongly uncertain____

60. I try to stimulate the ambition of my associates...
   Very often____ Often____ Infrequently____
   Very infrequently____ Never____

61. Have you ever run for any public office, or office in a club, fraternity, student association, etc.?
   Public office... Yes____ No____
   Other office(s)... Yes____ No____
62. Please place an "X" by the word which best describes your political beliefs...

_ Extreme liberal
_ Liberal
_ Moderate liberal
_ Extreme conservative
_ Conservative
_ Moderate conservative

Other_____________________

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE CIRCLE THE LETTER ("a" or "b") ALONG-SIDE THE STATEMENT IN WHICH YOU BELIEVE MOST STRONGLY.

1. a. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
   
   b. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   
   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run, people get the respect they deserve in this world.
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. People who don't do well in life often work hard, but the breaks just don't come their way.
b. Some people just don't use the breaks that come their way. If they don't do well it's their own fault.

6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot become an effective leader.
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Knowing the right people is important in deciding whether a person will get ahead.
b. People will get ahead in life if they have the goods and do a good job; knowing the right people has nothing to do with it.

9. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There is really no such thing as "luck."

10. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
11.  a. It is hard to know whether or not a person likes you.
    b. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.

12.  a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
    b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

13.  a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
    b. It is difficult for people to have much control over things politicians do in office.

14.  a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
    b. A good leader makes it clear to everyone what their jobs are.

15.  a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
    b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

16.  a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
    b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people; if they like you, they like you.
17. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what one is like.

18. a. The racial situation in America may be very complex, but with enough money and effort, it is possible to get rid of racial discrimination.
   b. We'll never completely get rid of discrimination. It's part of human nature.

19. a. Becoming a success is really a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
   b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

20. a. The average citizen can have an influence on government decisions.
   b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

21. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
   b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

22. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
   b. There is some good in everybody.
23. a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.

   b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

24. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.

   b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability luck has little or nothing to do with it.

25. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither control nor understand.

   b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world affairs.

26. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in our society.

   b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

27. a. What happens to me is my own doing.

   b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

28. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave in the way they do.

   b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as local level.