Recent years have witnessed an unprecedented concern for understanding and analysing Executive Effectiveness in various areas of human endeavour. This has been receiving greater attention in the government sector as well. The concept of management in the government sector as a single phenomenon that bridges different functional areas is not only surviving but thriving. Developments in this area over the past several decades increasingly indicate that government sector management is an interdisciplinary field of study germane to all large complex public organizations and enterprises.

The management task is borne by the executive, who must be capable of planning, formulating and executing jobs and taking decisions in his specific milieu and environment. The executive in the administrative set-up is expected to be a "change agent in an environment of complexity" with a talent for consensus and with a tolerance for ambiguity. The increasing complexity of the executive's work is evidenced from the problems generated from social, scientific, technical, educational and economic conditions.

Here it becomes imperative to point out that the terms - officers, managers, civil servants and executives - shall be used interchangeably; managerial effectiveness and Executive Effectiveness, shall be used synonymously; government sector,
administrative set-up and bureaucratic set-up shall be used as equivalent in the present study.

DEFINITION OF EXECUTIVE - GOVERNMENT POINT OF VIEW

The general definitions of the executive in the government sector are illustrated. At times the term "executive administrative personnel" is used to describe them. Another definition describes them as "officials in administrative agencies and administrative organizations of socio-political communities at all levels except political officers who are in charge of administrative agencies." Yet another definition encompasses in its fold the executives in both public and parastatal sector. Another point of view covers executives of private enterprises in which state has substantial participation.

In some countries these executives play a strong role in policy making, in others, the political arm of the government predominate the process. The executive inevitably plays the role of a mediator, either to filter downward policy decisions already taken, at the political level or conversely to strengthen the hand of the politicians by formulating clear and concise policy alternatives.

The manager in the administrative set-up must project an image of an actor and not a reactor. He must determine potential sources of problems and sensitive situations, evaluate the probability of alternative actions,
by the parties involved, take action himself to the greatest extent possible. He must be flexible while at the same time keep his ability to say 'NO' at appropriate times. He must know his job thoroughly and cannot afford to ignore good public relations (Johnson, 1973).

Singhi (1974) pointed out that the executive must be an administrator, an organizer, leader, pathologist, specialist, politician, expediter, a change agent, reformer, all rolled up in one.

Executives in the government sector are those individuals in the civil service system who spend majority of their energies and time in the tasks of leading an organized activity. Englebert and Koning (1983) maintained that the executives in the bureaucratic set-up are not just top level administrators, but they also have responsibilities to facilitate management of some public service in a leading or supporting role.

Metcalfe and Richards (1983) upheld that management in government viewed in a normative sense, can be defined as "where the buck stops." The civil service operates with an impoverished concept of management which over-emphasizes routine controls and understates other dimensions. It is an executive function i.e., it presupposes the clear definition of objectives, policies and if possible corresponding performance measures. Management is an intra-organizational process, i.e., it is what goes on within organizations, it is concerned with how
work is done within organizations and with internal routines and procedures.

Nef and Dwivedi (1985) opined that public managers are those whose responsibilities and tasks involve formulation, planning, direction and implementation of any public service, they work closely with political officials and groups in the formulation of developmental objectives and programme.

BUREAUCRACY AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

However traditional bureaucratic structures restrict the ability of managers to new and demanding managerial situations. Various scholars consider bureaucracy a necessity in a state. It plays a central and critical role in nation building in modern societies, and on its performance capacity depends the success or failure of various crucial programmes of socio-economic development. The present administrative structure in India is a continuation of the legacy of the British administrative apparatus which was built on the Weberian characteristics of bureaucracy. Therefore, the Indian bureaucracy exhibits some characteristics of Weber's concept of bureaucracy.

Max Weber's "ideal type" construct of bureaucracy depicting the structure of bureaucratic system of administration has been the most important conceptual framework in the study of administration. Blau and Scott (1962) reported that
Weber believed bureaucracy to be the most efficient form of administrative organization, because of its technical superiority over any other form of organization. Weberian form of bureaucracy is characterized by the existence of hierarchical arrangements of officers, division of duties, observance of rules and procedures, selection of personnel on merit and meticulous recording of the administrative decisions in writing.

However, the adaptation of bureaucracy to change has been rather slow. On the other hand, Bhambri (1980) is of the view that as a catalytic agent of change bureaucracy can become a powerful social institution in developing countries.

Karl Marx looked upon bureaucracy as an integral part of the exploitative social system. According to Marx, society borne out of the proletarian revolution will do without bureaucracy, which symbolizes alienation for the toiling masses. He did not view bureaucracy as an apparatus of modern society detached from and, independent of the society (Datta, 1981).

While ideal type of bureaucracy is a dream world, the actual bureaucracy is much more maligned and stigmatic.
Bureaucrats rarely provide leadership in the matter of administrative modernization, even though they possess an unquestioned mastery over the minutiae of administration (Maheshwari, 1981). It is a cluster of vested interests which officials zealously protect and even promote. They have become a socially exclusive and privileged class, far removed from the common man (Jain, 1984). In the last decade or more an area of considerable public controversy and debate has been the field of bureaucratic behaviour. Ultimately it is the behaviour of the civil service that will make for the success or failure of public policies and developmental plans.

Research in Bureaucracy

Much of the earlier writings on bureaucratic behaviour were impressionistic, often descriptive and exhortative. More recently, however, bureaucracy and bureaucratic behaviour have been subjects of academic research. The focus of such studies was on the motivation, beliefs, perceptions of civil servants which have a significant bearing on their work performance. Such studies began in 1960’s with a profile of civil servants, followed by several other researches (Rao and Trivedi, 1960). Some research dealt with values and attitudes (Pai Panandikar, 1966), as well as the relationship between the civil service and the citizen clientele (Eldersveld, Jagannadhan, and Barnabas, 1968).

More recently such studies of bureaucratic behaviour have sought to broaden the sociological phenomenon or to be related to developmental administrative models. These studies try to
discover the bureaucrat, his personality, his motivation, as well as to understand the broader bureaucratic phenomena, especially group attitudes, responses, and role perceptions. Studies of bureaucratic behaviour are faced with conceptual problems, whenever behavioural studies have sought to examine the adaptation of bureaucrats to new roles and functions or to test administrative models, of which bureaucracy is an integral element. The problem of research methods has been more pronounced in developing proper measurement scales and appropriate tests etc. The need for psychological appraisal of executive behaviour using standard measurement tools and procedures and with specific aim is the very purpose of the present endeavour.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT OF STUDY OF MANAGEMENT

Management denotes both a function and the people who discharge it. It denotes a social position and authority, but also a discipline and field of study. It is regarded as the process of organizing men and materials and ideas in order to make something useful happen effectively and efficiently. It represents the conscious and full use of the potentialities of incentives, decentralization, reduction in detailed controls, professionalization and development of improved managerial techniques (Tyler, 1964).

It concerns itself with the choice of purpose, the definition of what needs to be done and the mobilization of resources, so that an organization might attain its goals in the face of a changing environment. It integrates the
organization with the environment, by using its available functional expertise and resources to exploit environmental opportunities. There is then

(a) Formulation of strategy, and
(b) Its implementation.

"It is the development of people, not the direction of things." (Batten, 1970). Management is multidimensional. It is risks. It is a discipline, in its own right. Indeed it is the specific work of a modern society, the work that is specific to modern organization. It has its own skills, its own tools, its own techniques. Management is getting things done through people (Appley, 1981).

Management and executives are the specific need of all institutions, from the smallest to the largest. They are the specific organs of every institution.

Dimensions of Management
1. To think and define the specific purpose and mission of the institution.
2. To make work productive and the worker achieving to manage.

Management Process
1. Planning.
2. Organizing.
3. Executing.
5. Controlling.
6. Involvement and commitment.
7. Results planning or Management-By-Objectives (MBO).
8. Results Measurement.
9. Accountability.
10. Reduction of intergroup and individual conflict.

The Roots of Management

The roots of the discipline of management go back as far as 150 years. But Management as a function and as a discipline - is primarily a product of this century. The popular interest in management - what is sometimes called the 'Management Boom' - is fairly recent. But management, both as a practice and as a field of study has a long and circuitous history in many different countries going back to almost two centuries.

It was the Comte de Saint Simon (1760-1825) and Fourier (1772-1837) who anticipated developments and "discovered" management before it actually came into being. In America Alexander Hamilton (1757-1804), laid emphasis on the constructive, purposeful and systematic role of management.
He saw in management, the engine of economic and social development. A little later, Owen (1771-1858), an industrialist in Scotland, actually became the first executive. He first tackled the problems of productivity and motivation. With Owen the executive emerged as a real person.

The Emergence of Large Scale Organization

It was Towne (1844-1924) in the United States, who outlined what might be called the first programme of management. He raised basic questions viz. effectiveness as against efficiency.

At roughly the same time in Germany, George Siemens (1839-1901) first designed an effective top management.

In Japan, Shibusawa (1840-1931) tackled management education systematically. He first envisioned the professional executive.

In the 1880's Frederick W. Taylor felt that productivity and efficiency could be increased if workers followed specific methods. He considered employees as purely economic men to whom money and materials meant everything. His approach strove to fit the "right" man to the right job, and thereby improve his effectiveness. Frank, Gilbreth, Gantt were the proponents of this scientific management approach along with Taylor mainly in the industrial field.

Managerial accounting, operations research, decision theory are largely extensions of the German concept of Betriebswissenschaft (literally, the science of enterprise).
In America Muensterberg (1863-1916) first tried to apply the social and behavioural sciences, and especially psychology to modern organization and management.

The First Management Boom

After World War I there came what might be called the first management boom. It was sparked by Hoover (1874-1964) and Masaryk (1850-1937). These two men founded the international management movement and tried to mobilize management as a social force. In the twenties and thirties work for the management discipline was carried on by du Pont (1870-1954) of France, Sloan Jr. (1875-1966), Wood (1879-1969), Follett (1868-1933), Barnard (1886-1961) of the United States, Burt (1883-1972) of England and Elton Mayo (1880-1949) the Australian, who was working at Harvard in the field of industrial psychology and human relations and applied these to enterprise and management.


The interest and activity in management gave rise to different points of view and theories of management.

The Management Process School

This approach to management theory perceives management as a process of getting things done through and with people working in organized groups. It aims to analyse the process, to establish a conceptual framework for it, to
identify principles underlying it, and to build up a theory of management from them. It regards management as a universal process. Often referred to, especially by the critics, as the "traditional" or "universalist" school, this school has been fathered by Fayol.

The basic approach of this school is to look first, to the functions of executives, the nature of the function, purpose of the function, structure of the function and the process of the function.

The Empirical School

Typical of this school are those who see management or "policy" as the study and analysis of cases, who identify management as a study of experience, sometimes with intent to draw generalizations but usually merely as a means of teaching experience.

This approach is based on the premise that if experience of successful executives or mistakes made in management are studied, then one can learn to apply the most effective kinds of management techniques. Dale (1960) is a proponent of this school.

The Human Behavior School

This approach to management is based on the viewpoint that since managing involves getting things done with and
through people, the study of management must be centered on interpersonal relations. Variously called the "human relations," "leadership," or "behavioral sciences" approach this school brings to bear "existing and newly developed theories, methods, and techniques of the relevant social sciences upon the study of inter and intrapersonal phenomena, ranging fully from the Personality dynamics of individuals at one extreme to the relations of cultures at the other."

The scholars in this school are heavily oriented towards psychology and social psychology. Their primary focus is the individual as a socio-psychological being and what motivates him. Human relations are thought to be an art that the executive should understand and get the best from people by meeting their needs. There are those scholars who focus attention on the executive as a leader and sometimes equate management to leadership, thus, in effect, tending to treat all groups as "managed" situations. Elton Mayo was its proponent.

The Social System School

Heavily sociological in flavour this approach to management identifies the nature of the cultural relationships of various social groups and attempts to show these as a related, and usually an integrated system. Barnard (1938) is
regarded as the father of this school. He developed a theory of cooperation grounded in the needs of the individual to solve, through co-operation, the biological, physical, and social limitations of himself and of his environment. He then carved out of it one set of interrelationships which he defined as "formal organization."

This school has made many noteworthy contributions to management. The recognition of organized enterprise as a social organism, subject to all pressures and conflicts of the cultural environment has been helpful to the management theorist. Among some of the more helpful aspects are the awareness of the institutional foundations of organization authority, the influence of informal organization, as those Bakke (1950) has called the "bonds of organization." Likewise many of Barnard's helpful insights, such as his economy of incentives and his theory of opportunism, have brought the power of sociological understanding into the realm of management practice.

The Decision Theory School

The theorists here concentrate on a rational approach to decision - the selection from among possible alternatives of a course of action or of an ideal. This approach is an outgrowth of the theory of consumer's choice with which economists have been concerned since
the days of Bentham, early in the 19th century. It has arisen out of economic problems as utility maximization, marginal utility etc. This school has tended to expand its horizon considerably beyond the process of evaluating alternatives. When the decision theorists study the small, but central area of decision making, they are led by this keyhole look at management to consider the entire field of enterprise operation and its environment. Thus the decision theory becomes no longer a neat and narrow concentration on decision, but rather a broad view of the enterprise as a social system.

The Mathematical School

The abiding belief of this group is that, if management, or organization, or planning, or decision making is a logical process, it can be expressed in terms of mathematical symbols and relationships. The central approach of this school is the model, for it is through these devices that the problem is expressed in its basic relationships and in terms of selected goals or objectives. This approach forces upon the researcher, the definition of a problem, or problem area, it conveniently allows the insertion of symbols for unknown data, and its logical methodology, developed by years of scientific application and abstraction, furnishes a powerful tool for solving or simplifying complex phenomena. By bringing the tools and techniques of the physical sciences to the concept of management the theorists of this school have made an immense
contribution by way of orderly thinking, to see problems more clearly, they have pressed on scholars and practitioners the need for establishing goals and measures of effectiveness, they have been extremely helpful in getting the management area seen as a logical system of relationships, and they have caused people in management to review and occasionally reorganize information sources and systems.

Yet another approach has been propounded by Bologna, President of Management Consulting Firm of George Odiorne Association.

According to him there are 4 distinct areas of management philosophy:

(i) Personality Trait Era: This began during World War II with an emphasis for selecting the right personality for the right jobs.

(ii) "E" School Approach: Here executives were judged by their academic achievements.

(iii) Technical Skill Approach: Here executives were chosen for their ability to apply skills in planning, organization, etc.

(iv) The Present-Result Oriented Approach: Here the emphasis was on production.
Some other psychologists have traced the development of major concepts in management, in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Major Exponents</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving job performance by analysis (Job efficiency)</td>
<td>F. Taylor</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational climate improving human relations</td>
<td>Elton Mayo</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems and work design (Sociotech)</td>
<td>Tavistock group, Kurt Lewin</td>
<td>1940-1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating participating management and Organizational Development (Power Sharing)</td>
<td>Mag Griffin, Bennis, Likert and others, McClelland</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing structure of organizations and job design</td>
<td>Woodward Burns, Larsca and others</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value system and organizational culture</td>
<td>Japanese Management</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholistic concern and Values</td>
<td>Indian Philosophy</td>
<td>2000 (B.C.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THEORIES OF MANAGEMENT AND MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT HUMAN MOTIVATION

Many theories of management have been proposed which have deep roots in the motivational concepts and theories.

Maslow's Need Hierarchy

Studies about human behaviour have shown that there is a hierarchy of needs which are at the bottom of all cultural drives or motivation for work amongst all human beings. These needs are basic and common to all men and arise one after the other in a given order. When the more basic needs are satisfied they no more remain the basis of motivation. The next higher order of needs would arise and dominate the will do the extra work, and so on, up the ladder. Maslow (1943) classified the needs into five primary categories, as can be seen clearly from Fig. 1.

In this hierarchy, according to Maslow a less basic need does not provide motivation unless all lower basic needs are satisfied. But once a lower need is satisfied it no longer motivates. Hence management must shift its emphasis to the higher ones, in the interest of continued motivation which in turn will accelerate performance and enhance Executive Effectiveness.

McGregor's Theory X and Y

The conventional concept of management as pointed out by McGregor (1957) is that, it is through the use of authority management that makes persons work. Hence he sees a basic conflict
FIG. 1. MASLOW’S HIERARCHY OF NEEDS

between the needs of the individual and needs of the organization. He believes that neither can achieve all its wishes, but that moving towards a perfect state should be an objective for managers.

His theories X and Y are essentially sets of two types of assumptions managers have about people. Managers who are motivated by higher-order-needs will tend towards self-control and tend to come under theory Y.

Theory X
1. The average man is by nature indolent, he works as little as possible.
2. He lacks ambition, dislikes responsibility, prefers to be led.
3. He is inherently self-centered, indifferent to organizational needs.
4. He is by nature resistant to change.
5. He is guillible, not very bright, the ready dupe of the charlatan and the demagogue.

Further McGregor points out that conventional conception of management's task in harnessing human energy to organizational requirements can be stated broadly in terms of 3 propositions:

(1) Management is responsible for organizing the elements of productive enterprise, money materials, equipment people, in the interest of economic ends.
(2) With respect to people, this is a process of directing their efforts, motivating them, controlling their actions, modifying their behaviour to fit the needs of the organization.

(3) Without this active intervention by management, people would be passive, even resistant to organizational needs. They must therefore be persuaded, rewarded, punished, controlled and their activities must be directed.

This X type theory is close to the autocratic style of executives (Reddin, 1970).

**Theory Y**

(1) People are not by nature passive or resistant to organizational needs. They have become so as a result of experience in organizations.

(2) The motivation, the potential for development, the capacity for assuming responsibility, the readiness to direct behaviour towards organizational goals are all present in people. Management does not put them there. It is a responsibility of management to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves.

(3) The essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts towards organizational objectives.
Likert's View Point

The managers whose performance is impressive appear to be fashioning better systems of management. Based on the principles and practices of the managers who are achieving the best results, a newer theory of organization and management can be stated. Research findings indicate that the general pattern of operations of the highest producing managers tends to be different from that of the managers of mediocre, low-producing executives, by more often having a favourable attitude towards superiors, subordinates, work and organization. Ego motives, security motives, curiosity, creativity and the desire for new experiences are used to enhance effectiveness. Techniques of participation are used by the highest producing managers. Their organizations are resulting highly coordinated, highly motivated and cooperative social systems. These executives strive to have interactions between the members of their organizations, of such characteristic, that each member feels confident in his potentialities and believes that his abilities are being used well. The principle of supportive relationships is an important one. It points to a dimension essential for the effectiveness of every organization, namely that the mission of the organization be seen by its members as genuinely important (Likert, 1961).

Viewpoint of Maier and Hayes

Managers caught in the ideological no man's land and between Man and the organization are frustrated by the social and economic consequences of conflict between
two opposing need systems. They find themselves resorting to the endless search for influence and authority to control subordinate behaviour and reduce the costs of attitudes and restrict the work practice. The authority proceeds from assumptions that human relations concerns are irrelevant in business and that most people are naturally dependant, indolent, self-centered and uncooperative. They are assumed to require strong direction.

Democratic theory of organization proceeds from assumptions that mature, intelligent executives are capable of managing their own affairs, react positively to opportunities for expressing their natural human attributes and react negatively to deprivation of such opportunities. However, limits are put on individuals as well as group autonomy in democratic organizations. Participation then can be used as a unique concept of organization where every executive has a meaningful response and personal investment in success. This can pave way for Executive Effectiveness (Maier and Hayes, 1962).

Leavitt's Concept

Leavitt (1962) maintained that human beings have strong and apparently natural tendencies to programme themselves. Challenge is a motivational impetus, which also stems from this need to develop a general programme.
However programming itself may lead one out of a challenging and novel situation. For Executive Effectiveness two criteria are creativity and flexibility. In organizations (Fig.2) where the networks of communication are egalitarian or decentralized, performance seems to be very effective. Further differentiation of influence among the members of the organization is another criterion of executive as well as organizational effectiveness.

**Argyris' Approach**

Argyris (1962) dealt with the question of sustaining, continuing, self-directing and creative process in managerial executives which is of prime importance when one deals with their effectiveness. Argyris believed that training groups can help expand managerial horizons beyond the traditional concepts of managers. The training group should have 3 desired outcomes:

(i) have members explore their values and their impact on others;

(ii) have members determine the extent to which they wish to modify previous values as well as develop new values to guide their actions; and

(iii) show how groups can inhibit or facilitate human growth and decision making.

**Myers' Approach**

Myers, manager of personnel research at Texas Instruments and an industrial psychologist by training
FIG. 2. NETWORKS OF COMMUNICATION
sought to explain as to what motivates managers to work effectively. Myers on a motivational approach to managerial effectiveness questioning that "Who Are Your Motivated Workers?" maintained that some executives are (Fig.3):

(i) Maintenance Seekers; and
(ii) Some Motivation Seekers.

(i) **The Maintenance Seekers** are motivated by environment. They avoid motivation opportunities and have little satisfaction from accomplishment. They have negative attitudes towards work and have little interest in quality work. They seldom profit from professional experiences. Their values blow with the wind.

(ii) **Motivation Seekers** are motivated by the task. They have high tolerance for environmental factors and have great satisfaction from work. They possess positive attitudes towards work and strive for quality work. They benefit from experiences professionally and their values are self chosen and developed.

Managers tend to remain permanent members of maintenance - or - motivation-oriented groups. However, a maintenance seeker in an achievement environment tends to adopt the traits of motivation seekers. Likewise motivation seekers in a nonachievement climate tend to adopt the traits of maintenance seekers (Myers, 1964).
At a broader and more objective level, one can view managerial effectiveness in terms of how well management does in both formulating and achieving organizational goals. In the long run, Executive Effectiveness does entail the growth, adaptability, health and viability of the organization (Richman and Farmer, 1975). Further, Kirchoff (1977) pointed out that "organizational effectiveness emerges as the ultimate outcome of a combination of managerial effectiveness and factors not under organizational control." Improving organizational effectiveness is the foremost function of management. Since overall Executive Effectiveness results in broader organizational effectiveness, it would be imperative here to cast a glance at some of the various approaches to organizational effectiveness.

Various management styles and systems are associated with good and bad organizational performance. Etzioni (1960) defined effectiveness as a pattern of interrelationships among the elements of the system. Argyris (1974) opined that when an organization meets its objectives without any strain on its members, then it is effective.

Korman (1974) upheld that for achieving organizational effectiveness, 3 things are of great importance:

1. Achievement - achieving on tasks.
2. Creativity - the capacity to be creative and to change if the environment calls for it.
(iii) Non-aggression - Keeping interpersonal conflict and aggression towards others under sufficient control so that such behaviours will not become debilitating and consume so much time and effort that one cannot achieve goals.

There seem to be 4 distinctive characteristics generally associated with high organizational performance (Rangnekar, 1977). They are:

1. Wide sense of purpose,
2. Alertness,
3. Concern for human resources, and

Sharma (1978) opined that effectiveness of an organization is the sum total of the impact of its behaviour and performance that add to the overall attainment or enhancement of the desired objective. Dayal (1981) opined that if organizational problems are diagnosed properly, it can go a long way in making organizations effective.

The various approaches which provide a knowledgeable insight into the study of organizational effectiveness are:

**Goal-oriented approach**

Barnard conceived of organizations as 'cooperative systems' and contended "what we mean by 'effectiveness' of a cooperation is the accomplishment of the recognized objectives of cooperative action. The degree of accomplishment indicates the degree of effectiveness," (Barnard, 1938).
The goal-oriented approach then defined effectiveness in terms of the goal attainment of an organization (Gouldner, 1959; Campbell, 1976).

Natural systems approach

The systems theorists in defining effectiveness of an organization reveal that there are significant differences in what constitutes a strong system. They would have some a priori notions of what the characteristics of a strong system are, and would center their questioning around those (Campbell, 1976).

For Georgopoulous and Tanenbaum (1957) effectiveness of an organization is "the extent to which an organization as a social system, given certain resources and means fulfills its objectives without placing undue strain upon its members."

Bennis (1962) viewed effectiveness in terms of organizational health which is characterized by an organization's adaptability, sense of identity, capacity to test reality.

Katz and Kahn (1966) maintained that "maximization of return to the organization by economic and technical means and by political means" can be an index of its efficacy.

Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) viewed organizational effectiveness in terms of the organization's bargaining position, as reflected in the organization's ability to exploit its environment in order to acquire scarce valued resources.
Mott (1972) upheld that organizational effectiveness is seen by way of the organization's production, availability, reliability of the members of an organization to mobilize their centres of power to produce, adapt and handle temporarily unpredictable loads of work. Evans (1976) defined effectiveness in terms of the efficiency of the organization's 4 systematic processes, namely inputs, transformations, outputs and feedback.

**Societal-oriented Model**

This model views organizations as being created to meet societal needs, hence states that their effectiveness should be evaluated with these needs as base of reference. It further suggests that criteria of effectiveness should include broad social values (Davis 1940; Parsons, 1956).

**Organization-oriented Model**

This model on the other hand asserts that while society places its demands on organizations, organizations too have their own demands and the extent to which they meet their needs determines effectiveness. Thus this approach necessarily takes a managerial view of effectiveness.

However, Etzioni (1964) and Webb (1974) strove to synthesize both these approaches viz. Societal and Organizational by maintaining that the goals of the organization are seen as synonymous with the primary societal missions or functions, performed by the organization which give it its legitimacy and uniqueness.
Past-orientation vs Future-orientation

The predominant approach has tended to be past-oriented, with an emphasis on measures of organizational performance, such as productivity, efficiency, growth etc. (Caplow, 1964; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Friedlander and Pickle, 1968; Price, 1968; Negandhi and Reiman, 1973). Such an approach tends to emphasize whether an organization has been effective and therein lies its major limitation for it does not address itself to the issue whether an organization that has been effective will continue to remain so.

A few theorists attempt to approach effectiveness as being the potential of an organization to succeed in the future, over a long period of time. Bennis (1962) and Schein (1970) gave greater credence to potential for the future rather than past performance in their emphasis on an organization's ability to 'test reality' and cope with the environment. Thus they stressed the characteristics necessary for an organization to remain effective in future.

Weihrich and Rigny (1980) in their paper on 'Toward System Four Through Transactional Analysis', upheld that effectiveness of an organization depends on its people. Rensis Likert developed a model which can be used for moving an organization from an ineffective one to an
Likert identified four executive systems:

SYSTEM I. Exploitative-Authoritative.
Here the leadership is autocratic, there is no trust in subordinates, goals are set through orders, decisions are mostly taken at the top of an organization.

SYSTEM II. Benevolent-Authoritative.
The attitude of the executive is condescending, motivation is mainly through rewards, goals are ordered, decisions are taken at the top level but some delegation is there.

SYSTEM III. Consultative.
There is confidence in subordinates, control is moderate, goals are set after discussions.

SYSTEM IV. Participative Group.
Here subordinates are viewed with too much confidence, well-integrated decisions are taken and control is shared by the group.

Studies have shown that organizations become more effective when they move towards System IV.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SERVICES

Indian Administrative Service (I.A.S.)

The term 'Civil Service' was first used by the East India Company and its non-military, civilian employees. Employees of the Company were called Servants of the Company and those who conducted trade overseas were known as Civil servants.

The development of the service is divided into 3 periods:

(i) 1601-1740

At this time the Company was at the helm of affairs, and was only concerned with trade and incidentally with administration. In 1674 the Company introduced for the first time something like a regular service, specifying rules etc.

(ii) 1741-1833

During this period the administration assumed importance for the Company.

(iii) 1834 onwards:

Administration became the sole concern.

It was Lord Cornwallis who reorganized service on the principle of separation of functions making the Civil Service a purely Europeanized concern excluding Indians completely. The Charter Act of 1793 provided that all vacancies occurring in any of the offices in India were to be filled only by the
Civil Servants of the Presidency. It was (Civil Service) then called "Covenanted Civil Service", because its members entered into covenants with the East India Company and afterwards with the Secretary of State-in-Council. Later on Covenanted Civil Service gave way to Indian Civil Service (I.C.S.). Surendra Nath Banerjee was the first Indian to join the Indian Civil Service in 1864.

The Constitutional Act of 1935 provided that appointments to I.C.S. and I.P.S. (Indian Police Service) were to be made by the Secretary of the State until otherwise determined by the Parliament. It was only after the formation of the Dominion of India under the Indian Independence Act, that India (Provisional Constitution) Order of 1947, introduced structural changes in the Constitution of Civil Service. The Indian Civil Service (I.C.S.) was replaced by the Indian Administrative Service (I.A.S.), for new recruits. Other services like Police, Forest, Survey of India, Public Health were created for managing various specialized departments (Puri, 1982).

Indian Police Service (I.P.S.)

The Indian Police can claim its origin from the ancient times. It is mentioned in Kautilya's Arthasastra and in the memoirs of the early Greek and Chinese travellers. Despite continuing changes in the political map of India and its resultant effect on the administrative apparatus the basic indigenous character of Indian Police System with appropriate local characteristics continued till the advent of the British.
Lord Hastings described the village watchman as the foundation of all possible police force in the country. The period of British Rule saw the emergence of a centralised police force based on provinces and aided by the armed components of the same force (Nath, 1978). Madan (1980) opined that the first recognizable form of the Indian police was by way of the "Indigenous Mughal Police System". Its organization in the British period is a record of transition from the local forces under the 'Kavalgar', or 'Zamindar' or the village headman, and 'Fauzdar' - varying in provinces to a centralized police hierarchy from the Inspector General of Police downwards to the police station officer, popularly known as the 'thanadar' or 'daroga' (as was known during the time of Cornwallis) to the 'Kotwal' of big cities wielding considerable powers in his police jurisdiction.

Police has functioned in this country particularly since the establishment of the Raj as a symbol of state authority. It functioned as the sole channel of expression of the colonial regime, known for its thoroughness and effectiveness in maintaining the stranglehold over a country, which was considered the brightest jewel in the British Crown. It was to maintain law and order and to detect crimes.

Unlike the armed service, the police is a civilian force, unlike the civil service, it is a disciplined service. The police service has thus a flavour of its own.
On 17th of August, 1860, Government of India appointed a Police Commission, as it was realized that duties of the Police were entirely civil not military, further that the police must be completely divorced from the judicial functions. The police organization in Indian states is primarily governed by the Police Act of 1861, which was based on the recommendations of the Police Commission of 1860 (Sharma, 1976). Section 4 of this statute lays down the principles on which the organization of police force rests till today. The section inter alia states "the administration of the police throughout a general police district (now called states) shall be vested in an officer to be styled the Inspector General of Police and in such Deputy Inspector General of Police and Additional Inspector General of Police as the State Government shall deem fit." The Napier model of Sindh constabulary constitutes the bedrock of the Indian Police Act of 1861. The first open competition for recruitment into the Police Service was held in 1893. The Indian Police Service has been rendered yeoman's service by General Sir Charles Napier. On March 21, 1905 it was laid down that the police force would now consist of an imperial branch, recruited in Europe and a provincial one recruited in India. It was in the year 1912 that the Islington Commission for the first time officially used the term Indian Police Service (Puri, 1982). The dawn of independence has not resulted in any basic changes in the structure of the Police. To the Police Act of 1861 have been added the recommendations of the Police Commissions of 1903, and 1907 and these have continued to
fashion the destinies of the police force in India. Features of the I.P.S. are that it is aided, guided and supported by the Central government. The recruitment, training and cadre management too is with the central government.

Indian Revenue Service (I.R.S.)

In the earlier days land revenue was the main source of state's income. However, with the advent of technology and mechanization, land revenue ceased to be the sole source of income. Other sources by way of income tax, customs, duties, cesses, levies etc. came up. It was to deal with the latter that a new service was constituted viz., the Indian Revenue Service (I.R.S.). Its recruitment, training, and cadre management is with the central government.

In India, there are 3 main sources of tax revenues viz., Direct taxes, Excise and Customs. The law relating to direct taxes was first consolidated and amended in 1922 and its administration transferred to newly created Income Tax Department. In 1939 the law was practically rewritten. A Wealth Tax was introduced in 1957 followed by Expenditure and Gift Taxes a year later.

A Central Board of Revenue was constituted in 1924 to be the Chief Revenue Executive Authority to concentrate on the management and administration of all Central Tax Laws. Two Boards have been constituted from 1st January, 1964.
(a) Central Board of Direct Taxes as responsible for the management of income-tax, estate duty, wealth tax, gift tax, and other forms of direct taxes.

(b) The Central Board of Excise and Customs covers the administration and management of Excise and Customs duties, Opium and Dangerous Drugs Act, Stamp Duties and other residuary work in the Central Tax sphere.

At the apex of the administration is the Central Board of Taxes which is also the Department of Revenue of the Central Ministry of Finance. Three attached Directorates of Inspection at the Board's Headquarters function as advisor to the Board and undertake special tasks connected with investigation of tax evasion, avoidance and vigilance. The superintendence and control of the field administration is entrusted to 20 commissioners located in State Capitals and other important towns. Below the Commissioners are Inspecting Assistant Commissioners and Income Tax Officers (I.T.O.).

Customs

Organised thinking in relation to Custom levies in India has existed since long before Christ.

A Board of Revenue set up by the British in 1786 managed all revenue including customs duties.

The Customs Houses at the major ports these days, are headed by Collectors of customs. Their administration is
organized under 3 main departments:
- for appraisement, including valuation and assessment;
- for prevention of smuggling; and
- for accounts, audit and statistics, manifest clearance and ancillary work.

The executive cadres include besides Assistant Collectors controlling the Departments of their Branches, Principal Appraisers, Appraisers, and Examining Officers in the Appraisement Department and of Preventive Officers.

Central Excise

The beginning of the modern excise system in India which has developed from the levy by the British of salt duty in the 18th century may be said to have been made in 1894 with the imposition of the duty on yarn of finer counts and in 1896 on fine cloth. These were abolished in 1924-25. Meanwhile duties on kerosene and motor spirit were levied in 1917 and 1922.

While the right to levy taxes on sales vests under the Constitution with the States, there is no bar to the administration of their levies being centralized. At the Centre, the Central Board of Excise & Customs has three attached offices of the Director of Inspection, Customs and Central Excise who is also the Vigilance Director, the Central
Revenues Control Laboratory and the Statistical and Intelligence Branch.

The field force is organized in 15 Collectorates of Central Excise and Customs, each headed by a Collector. The Collectorates are organized in Divisions and Ranges, which is the primary revenue unit.

DEFENCE SERVICES

Major Stringer Lawrence is considered the father of Indian Defence Services. This service has taken more than two centuries to evolve. As it was based on a purely foreign pattern, its history is punctuated by a number of reforms and reorganizations from time to time.

Until 1947, the Indian State Forces formed an important adjunct of the defence forces in India. They originated with the implementation of the Subsidiary Alliance by Lord Wellesley. Sepoy system enabled the British to employ Indians as they would their own manpower. Until 1810 sepoy regiments were raised haphazardly before each battle by an individual British Officer who led the unit. Later these came to be known as the Imperial Service Troops (Sharma,1979).

After independence further changes were introduced. In August 1947, the position of Commander-in-Chief was abolished (Cohen,1971). The President of India became the supreme commander of the Defence Forces. The three service heads,
viz., (army, airforce, navy), were designated the Chief of the Army Staff, Chief of Air Staff, Chief of Naval Staff. Now each service is separately responsible to the Defence Minister. The title "Royal" awarded to the Indian Navy, Air Force and all other units was dropped, on 26th of January, 1950. The army is now the senior of the three services. The Defence Committee of the Cabinet deals with all important policy matters relating to defence. The chiefs of the 3 services are also members of this committee.

The present investigation attempts to study Executive Effectiveness in relation to Personality, Self-Perception, Values and Achievement Motivation of the executives in the Indian Administrative Services (I.A.S.), Indian Police Service (I.P.S.), Indian Revenue Service (I.R.S.) and Defence Services.