The present investigation was undertaken to study Executive Effectiveness, and its relationship with Personality, Self-Perception, Values and Achievement Motivation of the executives.

The total sample of 200 executives comprised of:

(a) 50 I.A.S. executives  (b) 50 I.P.S. executives
(c) 50 I.K.S. executives  (d) 50 Defence executives

Only those officers were included who were regular and direct recruits in the above mentioned services.

They were administered:

(i) Basic Style Indicators (Heddin, 1970),
(ii) Eysenck's Personality questionnaire (EPQ),
(Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975),
(iii) Activity Vector Analysis (AVA) (Clarke, 1963),
(iv) Study of Values (Allport et al., 1960), and
(v) Achievement Motivation questionnaire (Kay, 1975),

to yield scores on Executive Effectiveness, Extraversion, Neuroticism, Psychoticism, Lie (Social Desirability) Scale, five vectors of Self-Perception viz., Aggressiveness ($V_1$), Sociability ($V_2$), Emotional Control ($V_3$), Social Adaptability ($V_4$), and Social Intelligence ($V_5$), six Values, viz., Theoretical, Economic, Aesthetic, Social, Political, and Religious and a score on Achievement Motivation respectively.

Means, SDs, t-ratios, intercorrelations, factor analysis and regression equations were computed to analyse the raw data.
The I.A.S. executives had the highest mean score on Executive Effectiveness followed by I.P.S., Defence and I.R.S. executives. Only the difference between I.A.S. and I.R.S. and between I.P.S. and I.R.S. executives emerged to be statistically significant.

A look at the mean scores revealed that the Defence officers were found to be the most extraverted followed by the I.A.S., I.P.S. and I.R.S. executives. The t-ratios were not found to be statistically significant. The I.A.S. executives emerged to be significantly higher on Neuroticism, in comparison to the I.P.S. executives. The I.P.S. executives emerged to be significantly lower on Neuroticism in comparison to I.R.S. and Defence executives. On Psychoticism differences between the I.A.S. and I.R.S., between the I.P.S. and I.R.S., and between the I.P.S. and Defence executives were found to be statistically significant. Both the I.A.S. and I.P.S. scored significantly lower than the I.R.S. executives on Psychoticism. The I.P.S. executives scored significantly lower on Psychoticism in comparison to the Defence executives. The trend revealed by mean scores indicates that the I.P.S. executives were found to be the highest on Lie (Social Desirability) Scale followed by the I.A.S., Defence and I.R.S. executives. The difference among the I.P.S. and the I.R.S. executives was found to be statistically significant.

The I.A.S. executives obtained the highest mean score on Aggressiveness (V.), in comparison to the Defence, I.R.S. and I.P.S. executives. The difference between I.A.S. and I.P.S.
and between I.A.S. and I.R.S. executives was found to be statistically significant. The Defence executives emerged to be significantly higher on Sociability (V_2), in comparison to the I.P.S. and I.R.S. executives. The differences among the I.A.S., I.P.S., I.R.S. and Defence executives on Emotional Control (V_3) emerged to be insignificant. The I.A.S. executives obtained the highest mean score on Social Adaptability (V_4), followed by Defence, I.P.S. and I.R.S. executives. Only the difference between the I.A.S. and I.R.S. executives emerged to be statistically significant. On Social Intelligence (V_5) too, the I.A.S. executives obtained the highest mean score followed by Defence, I.P.S. and I.R.S. executives. Only the difference between the I.A.S. executives and the I.R.S. executives was found to be statistically significant.

On Theoretical Values the difference between the I.P.S. and the Defence executives emerged to be statistically significant. The I.P.S. executives scored significantly lower on this Value in comparison to the Defence executives. No statistically significant differences emerged between the other groups. The differences between the I.A.S., I.P.S., I.R.S., and Defence executives on Economic, Aesthetic, Social and Religious Values were statistically insignificant. On Political Values the I.P.S. scored significantly higher than the I.A.S. executives.

The trend revealed by the mean scores indicates that the I.A.S. executives emerged to be the highest on
Achievement Motivation, followed by the I.A.S., I.R.S., and Defence executives. However, the t-ratios between I.A.S. and I.R.S. executives, and between I.A.S. and Defence executives were found to be statistically significant.

In addition to this, extreme groups on Executive Effectiveness were chosen using $P_{.75}$ and $P_{.25}$ as the cutting points from each of the 4 services. Thus a total of 50 highly effective and 50 least effective executives were taken, from the entire sample of 200 subjects. From the four sub-groups 12 highly effective and 12 least effective executives were taken. Least effective executives were found to be significantly higher than the highly effective executives on Religious Values. The highly effective I.R.S. executives were found to be significantly higher than the least effective executives, on Achievement Motivation. Further the least effective Defence executives were found to be significantly higher on Religious Values in comparison to the highly effective executives.

Correlational analysis was conducted for the total sample ($N=200$) as well as for each sub-group ($N=50$). Executive Effectiveness was found to have a significant negative correlation with Neuroticism and Religious Values, and a significant positive correlation with Achievement Motivation, for the total sample. In case of the I.A.S. executives Executive Effectiveness was found to have a significantly and negative correlation with Aggressiveness ($V_1$) and Emotional control ($V_3$). In case of the I.P.S. and I.R.S. executives,
Executive Effectiveness was found to have no significant correlation with any other variable. In case of the Defence executives, Executive Effectiveness was found to have a significant negative correlation with Religious Values.

Factor analysis was conducted for the total sample, as well as for the sub-groups. Seven factors were extracted for the total sample. Seven factors were extracted for the I.A.S. executives, six factors each were extracted for the I.P.S., I.R.S. and Defence executives.

Regression equations were further computed. In all there were five regression equations, one for the total sample and four for the four sub-groups respectively.

This study is limited only to the four categories of services and based on data provided by 50 subjects in each category, so it has its limitations with regard to the smallness of the sample. Any broad generalization has the possibility of exaggeration, though similar patterns of results might be obtained with different groups. It is suggested that work on other categories of All India Services may be taken up.

Present investigation is remarkable, considering the outcome that Executive Effectiveness is in itself an independent dimension of behaviour and this study provides an interesting insight into the psychological make-up of the executives of the major central services in India.