CONTENTS

1.	RESEARCHING THE SCIENTIST	
2.	FREEDOM: Is coordination compatible with freedom? Best performance occurred when both were present.	8
3.	COMMUNICATION: Effective scientists both sought and received more contact with colleagues.	35
4.	DIVERSITY: In both research and development, the more effective men undertook several specialties or technical functions.	54
5.	DEDICATION: Several simple questions showed that high-performing scientists and engineers were deeply involved in their work.	80
6.	MOTIVATIONS: Among various motives characterizing high performers, an outstanding trait was self-reliance.	90
7.	SATISFACTION: Effective scientists reported good opportunities for professional growth and higher status but were not necessarily satisfied.	112
8.	SIMILARITY: Colleagues of high performers disagreed with them on strategy and approach but drew stimulation from similar sources.	140
9.	CREATIVITY: Creative ability enhanced performance on new projects with free communication but seemed to impair performance in less flexible situations.	154
10.	AGE: Performance peaked at midcareer, then dropped, but less among inner-motivated scientists and those in development labs.	174
11.	AGE AND CLIMATE: As age increased, performance was sustained with periodic change in project, self-reliance, and interest both in breadth and depth.	200

xii	Contents	
12.	COORDINATION: In loosely coordinated settings the most autonomous individuals did poorly—perhaps because they were isolated from stimulation.	214
13.	GROUPS: Groups declined in performance after several years, but less if the members became cohesive and intellectually competitive.	240
Appe	endices	
A.	Evaluations of Performance	261
B.	Output of Scientific Products	271
C.	Adjustment of Performance Measures	275
D.	Interrelationships Among Performance Measures	284
E.	Job Grades and Career Levels	286
F.	The Questionnaire	290
G.	Construction of Indices	294
H.	Classification of Departments	297
I.	Sources of Additional Information	303
Index		309