CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Effectiveness reveals itself as crucial to a man's self-development, organizational development and to the fulfilment and viability of modern society. It can be regarded in terms of attainment of goals and adaptability. At the organizational, institutional levels its managerial applications are inclined to be haphazard and diffused. At the more concrete level, it shades quickly into either the limited vocabulary of efficiency or the worth but not very rigorous framework of management appraisal. At the strictly conceptual level, its utility and meaning are sometimes questioned. It can be talked of in relation to performance and task objectives, between achievement assessed against goals and purposes. This view of effectiveness is in line with Reddin's (1970) concept viz., "There is only one realistic and unambiguous definition of managerial effectiveness - the extent to which a manager achieves the output requirement of his position." Drucker (1977) pointed out that effectiveness is the extent to which the desired result is achieved. It is a result oriented phenomenon. It is one of those potentially powerful concepts whose edge tends to become blunted in use (Brodie and Bennett, 1979).

Effectiveness/Efficiency

Effectiveness and efficiency are often used interchangeably though they are different concepts in reality. Reddin (1970) has compared the two concepts as follows:
Drucker (1975) opined that effectiveness focuses on opportunities to provide revenue, to create markets, and to change the economic characteristics of existing products and markets. Therefore, effectiveness is conceptually higher than efficiency. Effectiveness, Drucker maintained is the very basis of success, whereas efficiency is a minimum condition for survival after success has been achieved. Efficiency is concerned with doing things right, effectiveness is doing the right thing. According to McConkey (1976) effectiveness questions "were the objectives achieved?" Whereas efficiency questions "How were the objectives achieved?" Bobbitt, Breinholt, Doktor and McHaul (1978) maintained that efficiency concerns itself with the input of effort into all areas of activity, or a measure of how well resources are being used to produce output. Effectiveness on the other hand is the extent to which an executive achieves the output requirements of his position.

The determinants of effectiveness and managerial
performance constitute a complex amalgam of organizational and personal factors, with the organization setting the context within which the individual does his work. For the individual executive, significant determinants involve previous education, experience, values and motives that govern personal choices, behaviour and aspirations.

The Executive

The focus of management and of executive effectiveness is the executive, the pivot around which the entire managerial world revolves. Early in the history of management, an executive was defined as someone who was "responsible for the work of other people". This definition made clear that managing was a specific kind of work which could be analysed, studied and improved systematically. Yet another way of defining the executive was to take into account all those people who performed management tasks and view them as executives, whether or not they had power over others.

An executive is often considered pre-eminently a man of action. Williams (1956) held the opinion that critical executive behaviour includes utilization of knowledge, services of subordinates, understanding capabilities and limitations of his associates and a major behavioural category concerned with technical competence. There are 5 basic operations in the work of the executive:
(i) He sets objectives.
(ii) He analyses the activities, decisions and relations needed.
(iii) He motivates and communicates.
(iv) He establishes targets and yardsticks. He thus analyses, appraises and interprets performance.
(v) The executive develops people including himself.

Mintzberg (1973) has produced a full volume thesis on the nature of the executive's work and functions. Mintzberg (1973) opined that the most prevalent view of the executive's functions comes from the classical school. The executive does - PODSCORB - Planning, Organizing, Directing, Staffing, Coordinating, Reporting, Budgeting. The Great Man School, the Entrepreneurship School, the Leader-Effectiveness School, Leader Power School, Leader Behaviour School, The Work Activity School of Management, all outline four aspects of executive work, i.e., characteristics, contents, variations and programming of the executive work.

Dempsey (1973) maintained that executives have capacity for judgement, fairness, stability, persistence and initiative. The truly great executive is the one who can think and decide. Further Johnson, Monsen, Knowles and Saxberg (1976) opined that a truly effective executive needs to be concerned with the values of society, which express the essential spirit of an age. Every achievement of the management is the achievement of an executive, every failure is the failure...
of an executive (Drucker, 1977).

Appley (1981) maintained that an executive is supposed to:

1. determine what he wants people to do;
2. select and train the most qualified people he can to do it;
3. check periodically to see how well they are doing it;
4. see that methods are found by which they can do better;
5. discipline them.

**TYPOLOGY, LEVELS, STYLE AND PROFILE OF EXECUTIVES**

Mant (1969) maintained that executives can be thought of as the following types:

1. **Mobile Managers (Internal).** He is likely to be deeply committed, politically sensitive and trusted in high places.
2. **Mobile Managers (External).** He is often known as "the hopper" or the "wheeler dealer" and characterized thus. He has loyalty primarily to himself.
3. **Thwarted Manager:** In a bureaucratic organization such a man has or had drive and ambition but is now getting too good at his job.
4. **Specialist/Technocrat Manager:** He is an expert and must
resolve the choice of career paths between a future based on technical or managerial expertise.

5. Recessional Manager (The Hidden Redundant): He does just enough to get by.

6. The Old Boy Manager: He is rather slow and has woolly objectives.

7. The Backbone Manager: He is responsible and willing. He is past his first flush of ambition, but is not yet on the "run home".

In a perfect world all executives would be Mobiles and Backbones (Mant, 1969).

LEVELS

There are mainly three levels of executives:

(A) The Top or Senior Executive: He is invested with the onerous task of involving broad goals, objectives and plans; he is keenly alive to the social responsibilities of his business and has a general awareness of the social, technological world around him.

(B) The Middle Executive: He is involved with the translation of corporate goals and objectives and long-term plans into a short-term and medium-term foundation. He should be well conversant with system approaches pertaining to administration, technology, etc.
(C) The Junior Executive: He is a task-oriented person. He has to transform short-term tasks mostly on a daily and mostly on a weekly basis.

Every executive must make a proper assessment of information, reports, procedures, and evaluate his task from time to time.

**STYLE**

Pinder and Pinto (1974) found that most of the executives adopted a more interpersonal humane style, with some adopting the consultative style and few adopting the autocratic style. Bradford (1976) put forward four management styles that the executives adopt - relinquishing, developmental, controlling and defensive.

Singh and Das (1977) put forward the following styles as have been reported by various psychologists:

(a) In the late 1940's and early 50's Caroll Shartle at Ohio State University reported that managers tended to either adopt the initiating style or the consideration style. The contingency model of managerial styles assumes that managerial effectiveness is partially contingent upon three variables:

(i) Manager-Subordinate relations
(ii) Task structure
(iii) Manager's position power
(b) Lopez says executives assume different styles viz., those of the entrepreneur (profit-oriented), leader (good supervision), controller (accurate record keeping), storekeeper (easy-going).

(c) McKinsey is of the view that managerial styles are many and varied e.g., that of the operator, analyst, technical, creator, administrator.

(d) Hague Shell Group pointed out that executives can adopt the style of innovator, realist and reveal helicopter quality (to look at the problem from a higher vantage point).

Ganguli (1978) opined that management style is the style or fashion in which the executive manages his men, leads his people. It is the manner how one utilizes or applies the inputs in the process of management. Any style of management generally aims at broad compliance to the decisions at a certain expected behavioral pattern. There are various management styles adopted by executives. These are:

(i) Authoritarian style
(ii) Participative style
(iii) Socialistic Style

Reddin (1980) opined that executives in an organization are the managers of the material resources of a country. They are solely responsible for combining resources in useful ways. They alone are responsible for added values. They must work
within the boundaries, the government sets. Resources are wasted and the country is poor if executives are not effective.

Gurumani et al. (1981) upheld that profile of the young executive can be drawn up thus in terms of his:

(i) Basic commitments.
(ii) His knowledge, skill, and abilities.
(iii) The work he does in the organization.
(iv) For whom he works.
(v) His organizational position.
(vi) His age.

His achievement can be analyzed thus:

(a) As contribution to improvement of middle management quality.
(b) Impetus to productivity orientation.
(c) Evolution of managerial style.
(d) Impetus to certain functions.
(e) Promotion of management development as an accepted process in an organization.

The young executive is as much a resource as technology, machine and know-how. He is a resource that is animate with a great potential.
VARIOUS THEORETICAL ISSUES ON EXECUTIVE EFFECTIVENESS

MANAGEMENT STYLES

Blake, Jennings are some of the important proponents of this approach. These theorists explain Executive effectiveness on the basis of Personality variables. They focus on styles and imply that the executive is seen primarily as responding to subordinates or situations, rather than changing them. The approach is essentially a psychological one.

Katz's Administrative Skills

Katz (1955) proposed that effective administration rests on three basic developable skills (Fig. 4):

1. Technical skill: This signifies an understanding of, and proficiency in a specific kind of activity, particularly one involving methods, processes, procedures or techniques.

2. Human skill: This is an ability to work effectively as a group.

3. Conceptual skill: It is an ability to see the enterprise as a whole.

While the amount of technical and conceptual skills needed at these different levels of management varies, the common denominator that appears to be crucial at all levels is human skill (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977).

Though emphasis on human skill was laid in the past, today it is regarded more strongly as an important skill.
FIG. 4. GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF SKILLS NEEDED BY AN EXECUTIVE (KATZ, 1955)
The contributions of Cartwright and Zander (1960), Miles (1965), Bennis (1966), claimed that group objectives fall into one of the following categories:

(i) the achievement of some specific group goal,
(ii) the maintenance or strengthening of the group itself.

According to Cartwright and Zander (1960), the type of behaviour, involved in goal achievement is illustrated thus: the manager initiates action .... keeps members' attention on the goal .... clarifies the issue and develops a procedural plan.

Main stress was laid on the issue that organization should strive to eliminate subordinate-boss roles, propagating instead the roles of coworkers. This could go a long way in furthering effectiveness at the executive as well as organizational level.

**Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid**

This is based on concern for production (task) and concern for people. Blake and Mouton (1964) concluded that the best and most successful, effective executives are both people and task-oriented. They explained their approach with the help of their Managerial Grid. (Fig. 5).

The grid comprises of a horizontal axis which shows concern for task (production) and a vertical axis shows concern
for people. Each axis is divided into a 9 point-scale with one representing the lowest concern and 9 representing the highest concern. In the upper left corner is found 1, 9 style (Country Club Management) which represents a minimum concern for production, but a maximum concern for people.

In the lower right corner is shown 9, 1 style (Exacting Task Master Style) which represents a high concern for production and a low concern for people.

In the upper right corner is the 9, 9 style, the "ideal" or "team" manager. This style maintains that there need be no conflict between organizational objectives and personal goals of employees. It emphasizes a high concern for people and production. 1,1 style (Impoverished Management) indicates low concern both for people and production. People expect little from the executive, and this is what they get. The executive is frustrated and discouraged.

5,5 style (Middle of the Road Management) is in the centre of the grid.

The executive's philosophy is to find a position about half-way between concern for people and for production. Some emphasis is placed on production and some consideration is given to people.
High

Country Club Management - (1,9)
Production is incidental to lack of conflict and "good fellowship"

Team Management - (9,9)
Production is from integration of tasks and human requirements into a unified system of interplay towards organizational goals

Middle of the Road - (5,5)
Push for production, but don't go "all over". Give some, but not all. Be fair, but firm

Impoverished Management - (1,1)
Effective production is unobtainable because people are lazy, apathetic and indifferent. Sound and mature relationships are difficult to achieve because human nature being what it is, conflict is inevitable.

Task Management - (9,1)
Men are a commodity just as machines. A Manager's responsibility is to plan, direct and control the work of those subordinates to him.

Low

Team Management - (9,9)
Production is from integration of tasks and human requirements into a unified system of interplay towards organizational goals

Middle of the Road - (5,5)
Push for production, but don't go "all over". Give some, but not all. Be fair, but firm

Impoverished Management - (1,1)
Effective production is unobtainable because people are lazy, apathetic and indifferent. Sound and mature relationships are difficult to achieve because human nature being what it is, conflict is inevitable.

Task Management - (9,1)
Men are a commodity just as machines. A Manager's responsibility is to plan, direct and control the work of those subordinates to him.

THE MANAGERIAL GRID.

REDDIN'S APPROACH - THE 3-DIMENSIONAL THEORY

This theory deals with effectiveness, management style, the situation and the technology. It could be referred to as a situational theory of management. (Reddin, 1971).

Effectiveness Emphasis

Effectiveness is the extent to which a manager achieves the output requirements of his position. Close attention is given to effectiveness areas and effectiveness standards. The common effectiveness areas are:

- Subordinate effectiveness area
- Innovative effectiveness area
- Project effectiveness area
- Development effectiveness area
- Systems effectiveness area
- Coworker effectiveness area

Effective standards are subdivisions of effectiveness areas which incorporate measurement criteria explicitly or implicitly.

Further Reddin distinguished sharply between

(a) Executive Effectiveness
(b) Apparent Effectiveness
(c) Personal Effectiveness

(a) Executive Effectiveness

Reddin distinguished Executive Effectiveness from
Personality. It is not a Personality trait. It is something that the executive has. It is best seen as something an executive produces from a situation by managing it appropriately. In current terminology, it represents output, not input. It is not so much what an executive does, but what he achieves.

(b) Apparent Effectiveness

This concept refers to effectiveness qualities viz., making quick decisions, which while important to some job may be irrelevant in another. Such qualities give an air of apparent effectiveness in whatever context they may appear.

(c) Personal Effectiveness

This merely means the satisfying of personal goals and objectives rather than objectives of the organization.

Reddin maintained that executives, in order to be effective should (i) be able to perform services required of them (ii) be able to perform services with a minimum of expenditure.

Management Style Emphasis

To gain a deeper insight into the study of Executive Effectiveness, one must discover what executives are like. Eight managerial styles are defined by Reddin (1975), on the basis of 3 characteristics. The characteristics are:

(1) Task Orientation (JO): It is the quality of wanting to get a job done.
(2) **Relationship Orientation (HO)**: It is the quality of being interested in individuals.

(3) **Effectiveness**: It is the ability to obtain high productivity.

The eight styles of executives are as follows:

1. **Deserter**: He has none of the above mentioned characteristics.

2. **Bureaucrat**: He has only the characteristic of effectiveness in him.

3. **Missionary**: He has only the characteristic of relationship orientation (HO).

4. **Developer**: He has both the characteristics of relationship orientation (HO) and effectiveness.

5. **Autocrat**: He embodies in himself the characteristic of task orientation (TO).

6. **Benevolent Autocrat**: He has the characteristics of both effectiveness and task orientation (TO).

7. **Compromiser**: He has both task orientation (TO), and relationship orientation (HO).

8. **Manager**: In him are found all the 3 characteristics viz., Relationship Orientation (HO), Task Orientation (TO) and effectiveness.

The Bureaucrat style is the most predominant among Indian executives, followed by Benevolent, Autocratic
Developer styles (Pinder & Pinto, 1974; and Das and Singh, 1977).

**Situational Emphasis**

An executive is a part of a network of relationships with others and with the technology and organisation. This is explained more clearly with the help of Figure 6.

**The Technology Emphasis**

"Technology" refers to the way work may be done to achieve Executive Effectiveness. Making widgets, making decisions and making inspections are forms of work that could be done in ways, different from each other. Their technology is different.

**Management-By-Objectives (MBO) Approach**

Reddin (1971) maintained that the concept of effectiveness is the only sound basis of the MBO approach.

Bhatia (1976) upheld that MBO is a powerful management technique which focusses on the accomplishment of well defined objectives rather than on talks and activities. Basically it involves identification of organizational, divisional, group and individual objectives, the formulation of effective management strategy, policies, procedures and measurement of performance in terms of objectives.

Todes, McKinney and Wendell (1977) further gave the major characteristics of an MBO programme as follows:
FIG. 6. THE SITUATION A MANAGER IS IN
(i) Identify goals of the organization.
(ii) Clarify the working organization chart.
(iii) Set objectives for the period agreed upon with each individual.
(iv) Check periodically on the progress towards goals.
(v) Measure results against goals at the end of the period.

The MBO concept was first introduced by Peter Drucker and is a major theoretical formulation into the area of management and Executive Effectiveness.

**Systems Approach to Effectiveness**

Raman (1977) opined that this model can be used to improve overall performance, decision making, development of human skills. The System Model of Effectiveness has been described vividly with the help of a diagram (Fig. 7) by Shatia et al. (1977), entitled 'Effectiveness of Young Professional Managers'.

**Skill Mix for Management**

Douglas (1980) propounded a skill mix model for management. According to him, managerial skills include such functions as setting objectives, structuring an organization, interpersonal leadership skills like motivation, understanding of human behaviour, and these are essential for Executive Effectiveness. His viewpoint has been conceptualized in the following diagram (Fig. 8).

Since the area of Executive Effectiveness is indeed vast, thus for the sake of brevity and convenience the review of literature on Executive Effectiveness has been dealt with thus: firstly by defining it and secondly by outlining the qualities and characteristics which executives must embody, for them to enhance their effectiveness.
Stogdill and Coons (1957), Bass (1960) defined Executive Effectiveness in terms of the group's output, its morale, the satisfaction of its members.

Nambiar (1965) opined that a human organization can be effectively and efficiently run, if the human talents employed therein are developed, leadership is evolved, human passions are satisfied.

Katz and Kahn (1966) maintained that criterion of effectiveness lies in systematic efficiency.

Likert (1968) maintained that criteria for effectiveness appear to lie in the evaluation of management styles.

Donovan (1970) suggested that:

Effectiveness = Ability x Motivation x Opportunity

where, Ability is skills and other attributes.

Motivation is interaction of personal needs and environmental conditions compounded of Opportunity which signifies a man's position and expected behaviour pattern, the amount of authority and responsibility delegated to him and the nature and the extent of the facilities and management support he can command.

Negandhi and Prasad (1971) emphasized the fact that external conditions affect Executive Effectiveness.

Drucker (1973) regarded effectiveness as the extent to which the desired result is achieved. Drucker (1974) maintained that effectiveness is the very essence of the job.
of the executive. Effectiveness comes out of inner and outer training within an organization.

Chandra (1973) upheld that effectiveness is something an executive produces from a situation by managing it appropriately. It represents output, it is what an executive achieves.

Johnson, Monsen, Knowles and Saxberg (1976) indicated that "effectiveness is the ability to accomplish the objectives of the system".

Mishra and Sahay (1976) suggested that Executive Effectiveness is the vital force behind all achievements, since it can gear the organization towards the attainment of its predetermined objectives.

Ray (1976) added a fourth dimension to the already existing three characteristics of effectiveness viz. personal effectiveness, apparent effectiveness, managerial effectiveness, the new dimension being environmental effectiveness. The author keeping the Indian context in view, put forth three propositions regarding managerial effectiveness which is a function of

(i) Ownership, real or conceptual;

(ii) the ability to promote an atmosphere in which specialists thrive and can offer advice on relevant issues;

(iii) generating relevant details at all levels.

According to Piparaiya, Ram and Dutt (1977) effectiveness is the achievement of goals which contribute to the overall
objectives of the organization through optimum utilization of resources.

Penrathur and Sekaran (1977) upheld that the make up of an effective manager entails leading people at work, issues of authority, power and influence.

Katnam (1977) maintained that Executive Effectiveness can be looked upon and analysed in terms of the three facets of an executive:

(i) executive as an organizational man,
(ii) executive as an individual,
(iii) executive as a member of the society he lives in.

For Morse and Wagner (1978) Executive Effectiveness entailed strategic problem solving, conflict handling, resource management, organizing, information handling, motivation, providing for growth and development, coordinating and managing the organization's environment.

Hill (1979) upheld that effectiveness does not just happen. It takes effort in the right direction. Being effective is being busy doing the right things.

One of the greatest thinkers in the area Heddin (1979) expressed that Executive Effectiveness should be linked directly to organizational philosophy, induction training and organizational development. Effectiveness area should be the basis for describing jobs and of linking one job to another. Effectiveness standards should form a basis for job specification. Heddin (1980) further added
that Executive Effectiveness is not a one-sided concept. It is a value that one can embrace and expect others to do the same. It is a lifetime asset.

Nanjanath (1980) advanced two components of Executive Effectiveness:

(i) effectiveness of the individual, and

(ii) effectiveness of the management team.

For increasing the effectiveness of the managerial team, various steps such as objectives, systems and controls, creation of right atmosphere for decision making are a must. The effectiveness of the individual executive depends upon the recruitment of the right man for the right job, a study of leadership qualities, experiences etc.

Presnick (1980) upheld that the latest approach of viewing Executive Effectiveness is in terms of production.

Lim (1982) presented modules for improving Executive Effectiveness. They are self-discipline and tolerance.

Jobson and Schenck (1982) regarded Executive Effectiveness as a multidimensional and not a unitary concept.

Mathias (1966) has concluded that Executive Effectiveness has four important factors which have emerged after factor analysis. They are:

(i) Consideration (i.e. smooth human relations, personnel policies, employee welfare).
(ii) Ability to cope (i.e. creativity and innovation, allocation of job responsibility).

(iii) Leadership (i.e. participative management, initiative enterprise).

(iv) Control (i.e. discipline and concern for development).

According to him the causes for effectiveness among Indian executives are to be sought in internal factors such as personnel relations, inadequate coordination, etc.

**Essential Requisites for effective executives**

The effectiveness of the executive depends upon:

I. **Information**: What he has learnt in his academic career.
   
   This covers 3 types of information:
   
   (a) **Functional information**: which relates to particular area of his work.
   
   (b) **Organizational information**: which relates to organization he works for.
   
   (c) **Environmental information**: which relates to social, political environment in which his organization is located.

II. **Skills which include**:

   (a) **Functional skills**: which relate to the particular area of his work.

   (b) **Interpersonal skills**: which is the ability to deal with people.
III. **Vision**: which covers:

(a) **Insight**: which makes him aware how his job contributes to objectives of his organization.

(b) **Foresight**: which makes him aware how his job is likely to develop in future.

IV. **Character**: The executive must get the trust of his superiors and subordinates. This gives impetus to his effectiveness.

Most of the literature outlines the above mentioned requisites for an executive to be termed as effective. However a review is needed for the purpose of obtaining a clearer insight into the concept.

Maier (1952) opined that executives should always look at the merit of an idea and not at its source.

Anderson (1959) opined that the most important skill in administration is to "oppose an idea without opposing the man".

Kapre (1961) discussed various desirable and undesirable qualities of executives that facilitate or impede effectiveness.

Sreenivas (1962) maintained that an effective executive must allocate his time to various important functions in a planned manner.

According to Row (1965) effective executive should have breadth of vision.
Katzell, Barrett, Vann and Hogan (1968) in a study on army executives found those executives to be more effective whose roles emphasized administrative more than technical features and those who received higher performance ratings from supervisors.

According to Batten (1970) the effective executive does not wait for things to happen, he makes them happen. For achieving true effectiveness, the executive must reduce complex to simple, get worthwhile things done. His actions should be based on facts. The qualities of an effective executive are: courage, firmness, candour, empathy and insight. As an individual he must exercise self discipline in terms of behavioural and ethical rules of conduct.

According to Ray (1970), the effective executive's style should be a blend of ideology, pragmatism, intellect and sympathy.

Muthuchidambaram (1972) maintained that Indian executives are: rational, realistic, and positive in their thoughts.

Reddin (1972) opined that an effective executive must spend more time in making the right decisions than in implementing them. He should work for changing attitudes of those who work for him, e.g., colleagues, subordinates, superiors. By improving effectiveness of his subordinates, he in turn, will improve his own effectiveness too (Reddin, 1981).
Cleveland (1972) regarded an effective executive to be full of resourcefulness, willingness to accept responsibility, and energy.

Sinha (1973) compared private and public sectors and found public sector to be less effective and efficient, because of political interference, presence of bureaucratic red tape, overall climate being less conducive to production and efficiency.

Hampton (1973) opined that a successful and effective executive is the one who creates a good impression develops strong interests, has frustration tolerance, is highly motivated, sets high standards, is socially oriented, can sell himself to his employees, controls his emotions, is tenacious, takes the initiative, and demands freedom of action.

Carter (1975) indicated that an executive in order to be effective and successful should be able to represent the interests of his superiors, as well as be able to satisfy motives of his subordinates.

Mohan (1975) opined that an effective executive must have drive, education, stability, mental alertness and analytical skill, breadth of knowledge and understanding, good judgement, willingness to take risks, loyalty and dedication to purpose, toughness, ability to stand up under pressure and take action even though the action is unpopular and he must be unselfish.
Mishra and Sahay (1976) upheld that it is only an effective executive who can gear the organization towards the attainment of its predetermined objectives. To achieve effectiveness - the executive must set objectives, do first things first, make performance review and work for the development of self.

Irwin (1976) stressed the need for enthusiasm on the part of the executive vis-a-vis his work to enable him to be effective.

According to Rangnekar (1976), the executive in order to be termed as effective has three major functions to perform.

(a) He should be able to render the service he is intended for.

(b) The services are rendered with a minimum of expenditure.

(c) He should have a public image of being good, i.e., he is alert to the responsibilities of his work.

Nayak, Krishnan and Sunderasan (1976) indicated certain attributes of an effective executive, which are:

- those that can be developed through formal education of some kind;
- those that are induced by demands made by the superiors;
those that are acquired by close association with those already possessing them;
- those that are acquired only by experience;
- those that are inherent.

Badami (1976) desired an executive to develop a clear vision, a sense of responsibility and play the dual role of a leader and a follower, to become effective.

Piparaiya, Ram and Dutt (1977) identified Arjuna as the epitome of the effective executive for he symbolizes mastery over many skills, willingness to listen to advice from elders, ability to analyse situations, is capable of selfless action.

Thus they defined the qualities of an effective executive which enable the executive to:

- anticipate problems and takes corrective actions before they occur,
- be alive to today's needs and also have contingency plan for tomorrow,
- have a good grasp of problems, quick reactions,
- have wide interests,
- be alive to the environment around him,
- to know his task,
- to set the right direction,
- strive to achieve results,
- pay attention to details,
- to be self-propelled, show perseverance, be honest, and strive for perfectionism.

Further Piparaiya et al. (1977) reported the Life Style Grid of Atkins and Katcher which outlines the effective executive as being:

(a) supporting - i.e. giving.
(b) controlling - i.e. taking.
(c) conserving - i.e. holding.
(d) adapting - i.e. dealing.

Nanjanath, Raghupati and Rajaram (1977) explained that effectiveness is a result oriented phenomenon and traditionally means that: the executives' results fall in line with the objectives agreed upon by his superiors. He is faced with situational constraints and must possess attributes required by the job. He is faced with organizational constraints, which is the culture of the organization. He is faced with personal constraints by way of the personal goals he sets for himself.

Iyar (1978) opined that the police in order to be effective must emphasize contact behaviour and not structural organization and must improve public interaction.

Bhattacharya (1978) upheld that the police must respond to changes brought about by urbanization. Vaidyanathan
(1978) viewed police executive as an agent of change. He was of the opinion that the police executive must overcome bureaucratic habits to become effective.

Sharma (1978) viewed that managerial competence for police effectiveness necessitates (a) revamping of the structure (b) reorientation towards the personnel (c) redrawing of the procedures. However, the difficulty with the concept of police effectiveness is that when the goal of the police organization seem so well defined, their "interpretative operationalisation" can always bring the community, the political masters, the civil administrators and the police into honest conflicts of an irreconcilable nature. Further he has presented the managerial concept of police effectiveness in Fig. 9.

Reddin (1979) regarded effectiveness as the very job of the executive, which he can achieve by being quick and smart, and by optimizing resource allocation.

Hill (1979) stressed that in administration effective executives must regard their organization as both a formal, technical and informational social system, get people together, value them as individuals and not just a pair of hands, allow employees discretion in achieving objectives, provide feedback to subordinates based on their performance and provide them with recognition and opportunity to maximize their performance.
FIG. 9. CHART PRESENTING THE MANAGERIAL CONCEPT OF POLICE EFFECTIVENESS

Appley (1981) sought to outline what an executive should do to enhance his effectiveness. He must determine what he wants people to do. He must select and train the most qualified people for this, and review their performance periodically, seek methods to better their performance and strive to discipline them (Reddin, 1981).

Desai (1980) pointed out that improving interpersonal relations and developing the spirit of teamwork between executives can go a long way in enhancing their effectiveness.

For Patwardhan (1981) self-development, self-critique, self-propulsion and logic are the hallmarks of an effective executive.


Srivastva and Kumar (1984) in their study conducted on central government officers found most executives to be on high task high relationship style, and found middle level officers to be more effective than junior officers.

Srikantia (1985) has a valid point to make, when he opines that, the objective of improving effectiveness, of
Manpower in government organizations deserves a lot of attention, since the government is the nation's biggest employer, and it is also responsible for executing a wide spectrum of activities that are necessary for the welfare of society.

Review of literature on executive effectiveness revealed certain additional findings, agreed upon by various psychologists. For instance, the need for personal qualities like integrity, ethical obligations, and morality as the requisites of an effective executive have been stressed upon by Kapur (1963), Row (1965), Mathur (1972), Irwin (1976), Nagarajan (1986).

Kapur (1963), Row (1985), and Mines (1980) have opined that an effective executive must be brimming with self confidence.

Effective executives ought to be intellectuals preferably from democratic backgrounds, embodying in themselves the qualities of courage, competence (Row, 1965, Jurgensen, 1966; Ray, 1970; Mathur, 1972; Irwin, 1976).

Effective executives plan change, engineer change and are change agents within the organization (Kapur, 1963; Reddin, 1972; McFarland, 1979; Reddin, 1981; Nagarajan, 1986).
Jurgensen (1966), Cleveland (1972), Hampton (1973),
Kuper (1974), Mohan (1975), Singh (1985), have identified
effective executives as being creative, imaginative,
innovative, possessing originality and initiative.

Kuper (1974), Irwin (1976) regard commitment on the
part of the executives, as being indispensable for their
effectiveness.

Effective executives are ambitious (Batten, 1970;
Piparaiya et al. 1977), are willing to take risks and
challenges (Kapur, 1963; Batten, 1970; Hampton, 1973; Hill,
1979).

The executive to be effective must improve his time
management (Mishra and Sahay, 1976; Reddin, 1979; Khetan,
1979; Reddin, 1981).

Mohan (1975), McFarland (1979), Mines (1980), and
Nagarajan (1986) have pointed out that the effective
executive must provide viable communication networks, for the
quick and efficacious solution of problems.

Effective executives emphasize cordial interpersonal
relations (i.e. with superiors on one hand, and with
subordinates on the other) (Mohan, 1975; Crockett, 1981;
Ansari, 1984).
Modern management and psychological literature suggests that an executive with high flexibility is likely to be effective in every situation (Reddin, 1972; Chandra, 1973; Hampton, 1973; Mohan, 1975; Hill, 1979; Reddin, 1981; Garen, 1982; Hambleton and Gumpert, 1982).

Row (1965); Mathur (1972); Muthuchidambaram (1972); Reddin (1972); Mohan (1975); Mishra and Sahay (1976); Badami (1976); Garen (1982); Ansari (1984) regard managerial effectiveness as being dependent on executing quick and effective decisions.

The effective executive must be able to plan things in depth and detail (Kapur, 1963; Hampton, 1973; Mishra and Sahay, 1976; McFarland, 1979; Singh, 1985). He should be able to accomplish organizational goals (Kapur, 1963; Carter, 1973). He should be a leader of men (Row, 1965; Badami, 1976; Garen, 1982; Hambleton and Gumpert, 1982). He has in him analytical capabilities (Hampton, 1973; Kuper, 1974). He has a great deal of fairness and sense of equity in him (Hill, 1979; Singh, 1985).

In short, Executive Effectiveness has emerged as an important and complex phenomenon.
PERSONALITY - THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The rise of the behavioural sciences, particularly of psychology and the awareness to update and modernize management and administrative science has brought the study of Personality to the fore (Pareek, 1969).

The quest for delving into the realms of Personality solely with the purpose of understanding it can be traced back to the Greek physician Galen. He propounded the doctrine of the four temperaments namely melancholic, sanguine, choleric and phlegmatic. Wundt pointed out that choleric and sanguine both possess the characteristics of changeability, whereas phlegmatic and melancholic possessed the characteristics of unchangeability. By substituting extraverts and introverts for changeable and unchangeable respectively, he gave birth to the modern theory of Personality. Gross attempted to give a physiological basis of Personality dimensions of extraversion-introversion. Kretschmer and Sheldon insisted on the importance of constitutional factors in the study of Personality.

McDougall (1929) opined that Personality is extremely complex, it comprises factors of many distinguishable classes.

According to Murphy (1947) Personality is a structured organism - environment field, each aspect of which stands in dynamic relation to the other aspect. There is organization within the individual and there is an organization within the environment, but it is the cross organization of the two that is investigated in Personality research.
Woodworth and Marquis (1947) maintained that Personality is the quality of the individual's total behaviour.

McClelland (1951) upheld that Personality is the most adequate conceptualization of man's behaviour in all its details. This definition is of great significance for human relations and organizational behaviour, since the individual participants in formal organizations are human beings who are always striving for self-actualization, while behaving as agents of the organizations (Argyris, 1957).

According to Burgers and Harvey (1953), Personality is the interpretation of traits which determine the role and status of a person in society.

Eysenck (1960) defined Personality as the more or less stable and enduring organization of a person's character, temperament, intellect and physique which determines his unique adjustment to the environment. Eysenck's definition of Personality revolves around four behaviour patterns; cognitive, conative, affective and somatic. Thus to Eysenck Personality is the sum total of actual or potential behaviour patterns of organisms as determined by heredity and environment, it originates and develops through the functional interaction of the forming sectors into which these behaviour patterns are organized. Eysenck (1947, 1952, 1960 and 1965) used types in categorizing the people. His approach to Personality is two-fold. One is from the individual differences point of
view and the other from the general experimental psychology point of view. The latter provides insight into the dynamics of Personality, and the former provides understanding of the structure of Personality.

Allport (1961) gave a suitable definition of Personality when he defined it as the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychological systems that determine his characteristic behaviour and thought.

Singer and Singer (1971) viewed Personality as a self and a set of enduring and complex dispositions, which differentiate one person from another and which also give each of us some sense of uniqueness as well as commonality with the human race. Hence the fact that Personality is mainly concerned with enduring characteristics of the individual, i.e., traits rather than states emerges clearly (Wilson, 1977).

According to Pervin (1980) Personality represents those characteristics of the person or set of people that generally account for consistent patterns of response to situations. Pervin (1980) explained the nature of human Personality thus:

(a) the human organism has characteristics different from those of other species that are particularly important for the study of Personality. Compared to members of other species human beings are less dependent on biological influences and more dependent on psycho-social factors. We are less dependant than members of other species on primary sources of motivation,
such as hunger and thirst. Our considerable ability for conceptual thinking and language means that we can communicate and transmit learned patterns of behaviour (culture) to a degree unique among the species. This ability also means that we have a lengthened perspective of past and future and therefore, we need not be bound by immediately present stimuli. Further, it means that we can reflect upon ourselves.

(b) Human behaviour is complex. An understanding of Personality must include an appreciation of the complexity of human behaviour.

(c) Behaviour is not always what it appears to be. There is no fixed relationship between a certain behaviour and its causes; there may be different causes for the same behaviour shown by two individuals at one time or by the same individual at different times. To understand the significance or meaning of an act of the individual, we must know something about that individual and about the situation in which the act occurred.

(d) We are not always aware or in control of the factors determining our behaviour. This follows from the concept of the unconscious, although it is not necessary to accept all aspects of the Freudian view of the unconscious or to agree with it. This simply suggests that at times people cannot explain why they act contrary to their expressed wishes. Whether these acts are significant or minor, frequent or infrequent, they occur and remain to be accounted for in some way.
Thill (1982) defined Personality as not a specific constellation of invariable traits, but rather as a system of potential actions and reactions, that is conditioned by the interrelationship between the individual and his surroundings.

Other notable contributions to the study of Personality have been made by Jung, Spearman, Cattell, Guilford, Teplov, Gray, Maslow, Spence and Taylor. Siegel (1980) has given a cognitive theory of Personality.

EYSENCK'S THEORY OF PERSONALITY

As early as 1947 Eysenck came up with two dimensions of Personality which he labelled as Introversion/Extraversion (I/E) and Neuroticism (stable-unstable). The Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI) developed by Eysenck (1959) was assumed to provide an adequate measure of each of the two principle dimensions of Personality - Extraversion and Neuroticism. But even among the normal subjects the Extraversion and Neuroticism scale of the MPI were negatively correlated. This negative correlation between measures led Eysenck and Eysenck (1964) to construct a revised version of the MPI called the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI). The Extraversion and Neuroticism scales in the EPI are said to be uncorrelated. Eysenck added a third dimension - Psychoticism, to these two dimensions of Personality. The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) thus was developed to measure Psychoticism, by Eysenck and Eysenck
Further in Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) Extraversion scale has been advanced as an improved version of the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) item subset (Block, 1978a).

**Extraversion**

Talking about the theoretical basis of this Introversion/Extraversion dimension Eysenck (1967) suggested that individual variations in Introversion/Extraversion reflect differences in neurophysiological functioning. There is evidence that introverts are more easily aroused by events and more easily imbibe social inhibitions than extraverts. Hence they are more restrained and inhibited. They respond more to punishment during the learning process, whereas extraverts are more influenced by rewards. It has been hypothesized that individual differences along the Introversion/Extraversion have both hereditary and environmental origins. Several studies conducted on identical and fraternal twins suggest that heredity plays a major role in accounting for differences between individuals' scores on this dimension (Shields, 1976).

According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) a typical extravert tends to be outgoing, impulsive, uninhibited, has many social contacts and frequently takes part in group activities. He thus is a social person, likes parties, has many friends, needs to have people to talk to and does not like reading or studying by himself. He craves for excitement, takes chances,
often sticks his neck out, acts on the spur of moment, and is generally an impulsive individual. He is fond of practical jokes, always has a ready answer, and likes change. He is carefree, easygoing, optimistic and likes to "laugh and be merry". He tends to be aggressive and often loses his temper quickly. His feelings are not under tight control, and he is not a reliable person always.

On the other hand, the typical introvert is a quiet, retiring sort of person, is introspective, fond of books rather than people, he is reserved and distant except with few friends. He tends to plan ahead "looks before he leaps", does not like excitement and has a serious outlook towards life, and desires a well-ordered mode of existence. He keeps his feelings under control, seldom behaves in an aggressive manner and does not lose his temper easily. He is reliable, somewhat pessimistic and places a great value on ethical standards.

It has been reported that excitement enhances performance of the extraverts, but interferes with the performance of introverts, and they tend to be more careful but not as fast as extraverts (Wilson, 1979). Introverts are more sensitive to pain than are extraverts (Pervin, 1980). In addition, some more differences between introverts and extraverts are reported below:

(1) Introverts do better in school than extraverts, particularly in more advanced subjects. Students who are dropouts from college due to academic reasons tend to be extraverts,
whereas, those who withdraw for psychiatric reasons tend to be introverts.

(ii) Extraverts prefer vocations involving interactions with other people, whereas introverts tend to prefer solitary vocations. Extraverts seek diversions from job routine while introverts have a lesser need for novelty.

(iii) Extraverts enjoy explicit sexual and aggressive humour, whereas introverts prefer more intellectual forms of humour such as puns and subtle jokes.

(iv) Extraverts are more active sexually, in terms of frequency and different partners than are introverts.

(v) Extraverts are more suggestible than are introverts (Pervin, 1980).

Neuroticism

High scores on Neuroticism (N) indicate emotional tension, lability and over responsiveness. They tend to develop anxiety and symptoms of depression, and have difficulty in returning to a normal state, after an emotional experience. A tendency towards instability, unadaptability, lack of concentration, self-consciousness, physical discomfort and proneness to break down under stress are generally correlated with high scores on Neuroticism. Such individuals frequently complain of vague, somatic upsets of a minor kind, such as headache, digestive trouble, insomnia, backache etc.
Neuroticism is associated with autonomic drive (Furneaux, 1961), and considered as a general factor in motivation (Hall and Lindzey, 1962). According to Eysenck and White (1964) it is energizing and directing. Neuroticism has a neurophysiological basis, so on the causative side, the dimension of Neuroticism is associated with autonomic drive (Spence, 1964; Eysenck, 1967b).

Eysenck and Eysenck (1968) revealed that individuals having high scores on Neuroticism, may work adequately in work, family and society since in neurotics higher cortical arousal has motivational potentials equivalent to "drive".

**Relationship of Extraversion and Neuroticism**

Carrigan (1960) reviewed and supported the mutual independence of Extraversion and Neuroticism, and upheld that almost every analysis which has produced an Extraversion like factor has also yielded a factor identifiable with some aspects of adjustment. The Neuroticism factor variously known as ego-strength, general adjustment, anxiety etc. appears to be essentially independent of Introversion/Extraversion.

Eysenck's (1953, 1957) claim of orthogonality of Extraversion and Neuroticism has been disputed on account of some factorial studies wherein it was deemed that independent factors have not emerged. Some negative correlations have been obtained between Neuroticism and Extraversion which do not
reach significance on some occasions. Eysenck (1959a) ... 
opined that on the whole, where the groups have been taken 
from the normal population correlations have not been 
significant. One can then agree with Carrigan (1960) that 
"according to the criterion of uncorrelated factors Introversion/ 
Extraversion and Adjustment (N) appear to be independent."

On the other hand, the range of correlations between 
Neuroticism and Extraversion of -.10 to -.20 for the normal 
group and reaching upto -.40 for the neurotic group is a 
discrepancy which according to Eysenck (1964) is not due to 
lack of independence but due to "choice of questions", for the 
inventory used.

Earlier Eysenck (1959) had said that, "this finding 
(Hysterics i.e. Extraverts scoring lower on Extraversion 
than expected) may be connected with the fact that regression 
line of Neuroticism and Extraversion is significantly bent at 
the extreme introverted end, showing a marked tendency both 
in normal and neurotic groups." This standpoint has been 
reiterated by Eysenck (1959a) especially when the groups under 
consideration are extreme. This failure of orthogonality 
at the extreme ends would imply that whenever the groups are 
skewed on either dimension, the effects on various behavioural 
variables would not be quite independent.
PSYCHOTICISM

A high scorer on Psychoticism (P) may be described as being solitary, not caring for people, he is often troublesome not fitting in anywhere. He may be cruel, inhuman, lacking in feeling and empathy and altogether insensitive. He is hostile to others, even to his own kith and kin, and is aggressive even to loved ones. He has liking for odd and unusual things and a disregard for danger; he likes to make a fool of others and to upset them. Eysenck and Eysenck (1977) described Psychoticism as a third major dimension of Personality. Psychoticism fits a geometric model identical to the determinant of Schizophrenia.

Measurement of Extraversion, Neuroticism and Psychoticism

Objective techniques like tests of reminiscence, figural after-effects, autokinetic movements, classical conditioning, subjective devices like the rating scales, questionnaires and inventories have been used for measuring the Extraversion and Neuroticism dimensions.

The Maudsley Personality Inventory (Eysenck, 1959) has been the most popular result of many years of developmental work designed to give a rough and ready measure of the two dimensions. The reliability of the Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI) as measured through various standardization techniques ranges from 185 to .90 for Neuroticism and from .75 to .85 for Extraversion.
In 1964, Eysenck remodified the MPI, by introducing a Lie Scale in it and also by trying to eliminate some of the drawbacks in the set of questions. This resulted in a new scale - the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1964).

Test-retest reliability of the EPI ranges from .80 to .97 for both Neuroticism and Extraversion and is indicative of the high dependability of these scales.

Eysenck added a third dimension viz. Psychoticism (P) and thereby developed the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975).

Eysenck's three major dimensions of Personality viz., Psychoticism, Extraversion, and Neuroticism have found support in a number of studies starting with very different premises and hypotheses using different methods of analysis and rotation. Such studies have found major dimensions corresponding to Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Psychoticism (Eysenck and Eysenck, in press; Royce and Powell, 1983).

Evidence shows that these dimensions can be identified in animals as well as human beings (Chamov, Eysenck, and Harlow, 1972; Broadhurst, 1975), and that they can be identified in many different countries and cultures from Hong Kong to Uganda and from Japan to India (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1983).

Lie-Scale (Social Desirability)

The Lie (L) scale which was first incorporated in the EPI attempts to measure a tendency on the part of subjects to "fake good". A series of factorial studies have been carried out to investigate the nature of this scale in some
detail (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1971). The scale possesses a considerable degree of factorial unity, with individual items having high loadings on this factor and on no other. This scale measures some stable Personality factor which possibly denotes some degree of 'social naivete'.

An exhaustive review of literature on the L-Scale (Verma, 1977) seems to support the view that this is a powerful and independent factor which needs to be studied in its own right and not as mere response bias to be corrected.

Eysenck and Eysenck (1964) maintained that generally any subject scoring more on the Lie Scale is to be rejected. However, in the present study the subjects scoring more on this scale were not rejected, but included in the sample. This was done because of the following reasons:

(i) Studies have indicated that the Lie Scale of the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1963) is useful in detecting faking (Braun and Gomez, 1966). Most subjects could either "fake good" or "fake bad" on this inventory upon demand (Gorman, 1968). The Lie Scale has been said to be valid in detecting social desirability (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1968; Gorman, 1968).

(ii) The only available norms for Extraversion and Neuroticism scales did not exclude higher lie scores. (Knowles and Kreitman, 1965; and Orwin, 1971). "Rejection of Liars" would necessitate re-establishing standardization norms since presumably both honest and dishonest subjects contributed to the norms. Further, it shows that even invalid records are useful because they reflect a certain Personality type.

The present study emphasizes the analysis of executives from the point of view of Eysenck's Theory of Personality.
EXECUTIVE EFFECTIVENESS AND PERSONALITY

The measurement as well as qualitative evaluation of various aspects of Personality have travelled from the caveman's doodles to the computerized artificial intelligence. All this endeavour points towards varying calibres of individuals and that the differences in Personality are discernible and measurable in terms of psychological analysis. Modern social and behavioural sciences in general and psychology in particular aim at utilizing and controlling human Personality to the full development and progress of the individual and society. Thus this emergence of the behavioural sciences as well as of psychology has emphasized on the need to study executive Personality.


Executive Personality has been variously defined by different authors, in terms of their leadership role, executive position and administrative capacity. Goode (1951) defined executive as a leader of men, with high...
intelligence, well-rounded Personality (Row,1965), powerful inner drive, understanding, cooperative efforts and depending on administrative skills.

Katz (1955) defined administrators in terms of technical, human and conceptual skills. He emphasized that executives are not born but developed.

Schell (1957) stated that traits essential for Executive Effectiveness are innate interest and affection for people, strength or power of Personality, scientific bent of mind.

Eysenck (1961) found Extraverts to have more tough-minded attitudes than introverts.

Jennings (1962) referred to the executive duality regarding temporary human existence and striving for performance. The anxiety, alienation and stress of an executive are outcomes of clashing interests of firm, labour and society. His maturity demands dynamism, realism and futurism.

Lynn (1964), Eysenck (1965) reported that behaviour patterns become more introverted with increasing age.

Hauser (1965) suggested that the executives are less neurotic than the general population, and in general have better health, even in those areas said to be chronic to executive life, i.e., ulcers and heart attacks.

Nash (1965) opined that effective executives possess highly persuasive verbal skills.
Skolnick (1966) maintained that the police may in fact be psychotic or neurotic (Westley, 1951).

Eysenck (1967) on the basis of the study of Personality patterns in various groups of businessmen opined that the youngest group of executives (20-29 years of age) tend to be more extraverted than all other groups (age ranging from 30-50 years).

Baehr, Furcon and Froemel (1968) found police officials to be uncomplicated and conscientious.

Muthayya (1969, 1970) studied executive Personality in administrative set up and found the officers to be introverted.

Kumar (1970) found successful and effective executives to be challenging, stimulating and task-oriented.

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) included competitive, dedicated, energetic in their list of personal qualities said to be necessary for Executive Effectiveness.

Dwivedi (1970) revealed that Indian executives assign top priority to traits like cooperation, being energetic and low priority to aggressiveness and dominance.

Ghiselli (1971) studied eight Personality and five motivational traits for their possible significance for Executive Effectiveness and success.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Traits</th>
<th>Motivational Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Need for occupational achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Need for self-actualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory ability</td>
<td>Need for power over others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assurance</td>
<td>Need for high financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity for the working class</td>
<td>Need for job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity-feminity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity (conformity to age norms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of his study suggests the following conclusions:

(1) Cognitive characteristics are important for Executive Effectiveness in addition to motivation.

(2) There is little support here for the hierarchical, "power over others" oriented leader as being more successful.

(3) The security-oriented person content to rest on the directives of others, is not the individual who becomes a successful executive.

Studies in Western countries have indicated that the individual who opts for or already holds an executive position is less Extraverted (Eysenck, 1971; Uberai and Chakravorty, 1974). Further Eysenck (1971); Eysenck (1964) maintained that such
individuals obtain normal scores on Neuroticism and Lie-scale.

Argyle (1972) reported that American studies have found successful and effective executives to be well-adjusted, friendly, dominant and socially skilled.

Fenster and Locke (1973) using the EPI (Form A) found that Neuroticism was not a major characteristic of the average police official. However earlier Westley (1951), Skolnick (1966), Zion (1966) indicated that police officers may in fact be neurotic or even psychotic. It has even been suggested that occupational choice of joining police service may be dictated by certain aggressive or authoritarian needs.

Uberai and Chakravorty (1974) reported that individuals who opt for or already hold an executive position have higher scores on Neuroticism.

De (1974) maintained that Indian executives like to be kept in touch and consulted more often than their Western counterparts. This was thought to arise from a diffused pattern of authority in the joint family.

Mohan (1977), in a comparative study of executives, found them to be introverted, with high drive and courage, and qualities of effective decision-making, a sense of responsibility, kind heartedness, capacity to lead individuals and even God-fearing.

Mohan and Thakre (1977), in a pilot study found army executives more Extraverted than the I.A.S. officers,
but very near to the administrative and police officers.

Mohan and Kapoor (1977) viewing MBA's as potential managers made the following observations: they found them to be higher on Extraversion and Neuroticism, than the other Panjab University students (Madan, 1967; Mohan and Jaspal, 1975; Mohan, Oberoi, and Chakraborty, 1975) and highly motivated.

Dubey (1977) reported that MBA scores of E, N, L were not different from those obtained from the mixed general population. But these students tend to fall towards Extraversive pole of I/E dimension on the EPI.

Tuli (1977) held the view that an executive who is able to guide and motivate subordinates, and motivate their behaviour to fit the plans and jobs that have been established, is an effective executive.

Hanewicz (1978) found police officials to be of the thinking and judging types on the Myers Brigg Type Indicator (MBI).

Patil and Manerikar (1978) found that Indian executives are active, relaxed in social relations, rational, self-confident, somewhat depressed and anxious.

Sen (1978) revealed the presence of six important Personality traits in the executive arranged in a hierarchical order, viz., Dominance, Order, Achievement, Deference, Intraception, Abasement.
Ghosh and Manerikar (1978) compared the Indian bank executives to their American counterparts and found the Indian executive to be neither distinctly aloof, nor clearly sociable, somewhat emotional, enthusiastic, neither casual nor very persistent, shy, tough, realistic, adaptable, practical, accepting, group dependent, not exacting and having some tension. The American executive on the other hand appeared to be warm and sociable, calm and mature, very enthusiastic, conscientious, adventurous, sensitive, suspicious, rather unconcerned, sophisticated, anxious, experimenting, self-sufficient, controlled and composed.

Sayeed (1978), Prasad (1979) found the Personality of the executive to effect his effectiveness.

Dalton, Kenate, Feldman and Mitchell (1979) maintained that a Personality embodying the qualities of unemotional and calm behaviour is evaluated as an effective one.

Williams, Sjoberg and Sjoberg (1980) gave the concept of the "bureaucratic face" - which they say clearly reveals the personality traits of successful bureaucrats. This is a mask of formal cordiality that gives a "flat effect," indicates adherence to rules. Williams et al. (1980) viewed the consequences of bureaucracy for Personality patterns in the society as unfavourable.

Charate (1980) in a study on army executives found Lieutenant Colonels to score the highest on Neuroticism followed by Captains and Majors. Further Captains were found to score highest on Extraversion followed by Majors and Lieutenant
Sen and Opal (1980) found executives with personality traits like dominance, intraception, endurance, achievement to be preferring off job activities like reading, driving, camping, music, sight-seeing, and preferred to indulge in constructive work.

Mills and Bohannon (1980) found the Personality characteristics of effective police officers to be bright, assertive, autonomous, self-assured, responsible, dependable, straight forward level headed. These findings are in accordance with those of Matarazzo, Allen, Saslow and Wiens (1964); Baehr, Furcon and Froemel (1968); Hogan and Kurtines (1975).

Ferreira (1980) established a relationship between the characteristics of Personality as given by Holland and Guilford. Holland identified six basic Personality types through which individuals can be characterized as - the realist, intellectual, social, conventional, adventurous and artistic. Guilford identified specific factors that help to identify the individuals in professional categories, mechanical and scientific interest, social welfare, cultural conformity, self-confidence, aesthetic expression.

Mashiuddin (1980) reported that successful and effective entrepreneurs were found to be sociable outgoing and assertive.
Dubey and Verma (1980) used Rorschach (a projective test of Personality) on male executives and found them to be imaginative, productive, having healthy relations with others, sharing common ways of perception, quick to respond and free from pathological signs.

Brown, Grant and Patten (1981) opined that executives were found to have capacity for status, were pragmatic, confident, persuasive and preferred leadership roles.

Mohan and Charate (1982) administered the EPI to army executives and found that the E scores as measured by EPI tended to go down with age, whereas Neuroticism grew with an increase in age and amount of responsibility.

Singh and Gupta (1983) found administrators to be active, with strong superego, shrewd and tense.

Maitra (1983) found effective executives to be original in thought having broad interests and emotional stability.

Jahangiri (1983) found managers in the private sectors to score lower on Neuroticism as compared to managers of the government sectors, whereas the latter scored higher on Extraversion as compared to private sector managers.

Burbeck and Furnham (1984) found the police officials to be low on Psychoticism, venturesome and impulsive.

Mahanta and Kathpalia (1984) administered the EPQ to police officers and found that they presented themselves in
a socially less desirable way (Burbeck and Furnham, 1984).

Chakrabarty and Kundu (1984) opined that the effective management personnel are warm-hearted, attentive people, trustful and easygoing. They are insightful and learn fast and are persevering. They possess higher general mental ability and better judgement. They are assertive, competitive, independent minded, playful, thick skinned, active and participate in social situations, ar expedient cheerful, careless of people's approval or disapproval, controlled, exacting, socially precise and are likely to be chosen as leaders. They are relaxed, unfrustrated with an average level of anxiety, neither too introverted or extraverted.

The Personalities of pilots have been subjects of several investigations. (Bauer, 1943; Clinton and Thorn, 1943; Ford, 1945; Voas, Bair and Ambler, 1954; Peterson, Lane and Kennedy, 1965; Fleischman, Ambler, Peterson and Lane, 1966; Fine and Hartman, 1968; Fry and Reinhardt, 1969; Reinhardt, 1970; Bucky and Ridley, 1972).

Fry and Reinhardt (1969), Reinhardt (1970), Bucky and Ridley (1972) found trainee pilots to be assertive, enthusiastic, conscientious, uninhibited and controlled, dependable, tactful.

De (1986) in an article found 30 per cent of the I.A.S. officers who attend the compulsory training, to be knowledgeable
constructive in their thoughts and actions, alive to societal problems, humble. Some were reported as being too bright and too brilliant. The other 70% operate like a pendulum between scepticism and cynicism. In these officers sensitivity to the context of a problem or a situation is either absent or poor.

In general, majority of the I.A.S. officers who appear to be the backbone of the Indian administrative culture suffer from a poor orientation towards generating a continuing learning culture for themselves and their colleagues in the government system.

Review of literature on the relationship of Executive Effectiveness to Personality has given certain additional findings on which various psychologists are in accordance with each other, for instance effective executives were found to be emotionally stable by Hauser (1965), Muthayya (1969, 1970), Mashiuddin (1980), Dubey and Verma (1980), Chakrabarty and Kundu (1984).

They were found to be extraverted individuals by Kumar (1970), Dubey (1977), Hanewicz (1978), Burbeck and Furnham (1984).

Patil and Manerikar (1978), Dubey and Verma (1980) reported effective executives to be ambitious.
Goode (1951), Mataraazzo et al. (1964); Dwivedi (1970), Argyle (1972), Dubey and Verma (1980), Chakrabarty and Kundu (1984) reported that an executive so as to be effective must be intelligent.

The effective executive ought to be creative, imaginative and an innovator (Kumar, 1970; Campbell et al., 1970; Dubey and Verma, 1980).

Thus it can be seen that a good image of the Personality of an effective executive tends to include some major characteristics and traits. The foremost among these being emotional stability, sense of responsibility and impartiality in official dealings, compounded with his sincerity to work and lead people, dynamism and inspiring initiative and integrity in approach. Above all, a human approach, a wholistic angle and commitment to the organization lend colour and drive to the Personality of an executive (Mohan, 1977).

Thus the Personality of an effective executive may be viewed as a blend of specific abilities, human skills and leadership potential, which develop due to the interaction of inherent characteristics and professional climate and a work ensuring effectiveness.
Self-Perception is one of the most important approaches and methods to understand the individual. It is a person's image about his own self, his beliefs, feelings, attitudes, fears and hopes. It is a reflection of the individual's conscious and or unconscious efforts to behave in those real or imagined ways demanded by his immediate and or most important social group. Thus the perception the person has of himself as "an actor on the world's stage," tends to be influenced substantially by such social environment as the world of work, if he is a career person, or the gay society, if he is a play boy. (Merenda and Clarke, 1967).

James (1890, 1902) defined self as an object of knowledge. James (1902) gave the definition of self-perception - as the sum total of all that a person can call his own.

Cooley (1902) suggested that one perceives oneself just as one might perceive one's image in a mirror.

Adler (1929) suggested that the self-concept is the principal determinant of behaviour. Adler (1931) showed how feelings of inferiority (components of self concept) affect an individual's behaviour and his attitudes towards the society as well as towards the family situation and the work situation.

Mead (1934) a renowned anthropologist and a social psychologist, and Sutherland (1956) regarded self as extremely
powerful ingredient of all types of social interaction.

Raimy (1943), Bertocci (1945) Sherif and Cantril (1947) opined that self concept revolves around the same perception of self.

Murphy (1947) defined the self as an individual's perception and conception of his whole being, i.e., the individual is known to the individual.

Snygg and Combs (1949) reported that behaviour is totally determined by perceptual field (perceptual field means the entire universe including the person himself). In the motivation of all behaviour, self is that part of the perceptual field which is perceived by a person to be most characteristic of himself, i.e., his Self-Perception. Many facets of Personality are balanced in the conception of self, i.e., collection of attitudes, opinions and beliefs the person holds about himself.

According to Block (1950) Self-perception is very important for satisfaction and adjustment.

Willin (1950), Sarabin (1952), Taylor and Combs (1952), Hanlon, Hofstaetter and O'Connor (1954), Crandall and Bellugi (1954), Sarabin and Rosenberg (1955), Zuckerman, Baer and Monashkin (1956) gave supporting evidence that people are more satisfied, when they are honest, accurate, confident, realistic, and less anxious.
Rogers (1951) opined that "an individual always consciously or unconsciously wants to satisfy itself and it always functions with a view to maintain, enhance and actualize itself." Thereby self-concepts are translated into actions.

Symonds (1951) maintained that the self is the way in which the individual reacts to himself. The self consists of four aspects:

(a) How a person perceives himself.
(b) What he thinks of himself.
(c) How he evaluates himself.
(d) How he attempts through various actions to enhance or defend himself.

The person may not be aware of these perceptions, conceptions and evaluations, and defending or enhancing reactions. The conscious evaluation of the self does not necessarily agree with unconscious self evaluation.

Jung's (1953) 'Mid-point of Personality' revolves around the perception of self.

Bugental and Gunning (1955) found that Self-Perception and behaviour mutually influence each other.

Self as object and self as process are the two meanings of self as suggested by Hall and Lindzey (1957). Self as object is simply the aggregate of attitudes, feelings, judgements and values which an individual holds with respect to his behaviour, his ability, his worth, as a person in short how he perceives
and evaluates himself, self as process is defined in terms of activities, such as thinking and perceiving and coping with the environment.

Freud (1957) reported that Ego is the executive of Personality as it controls the gateway to action, selects features of environment to which it will respond and decides what instincts will be satisfied and in what manner.

Hilgard (1957) opined that self is "the subjective aspect of Personality, the manner in which the person perceives himself." He means that the self denotes one's image of oneself.

Smith (1959) maintained that Self-Perception influences the behaviour directly or indirectly.

Personality is related to Self-Perception - "in assessing personality through self-rating techniques the principal object is to derive a measure from which personality descriptions can be made." (Merenda and Clarke, 1965).

McDavid and Harari (1968) opined that "the term self-concept is used to refer to the organized cognitive structure derived from one's experience of his own self."

A study of perception of self according to Merenda and others provides an important key to understand the multitude of behavioural events displayed by the individual.

Activity Vector Analysis (AVA) developed by Clarke (1963) used in the present study is a measure of Self-Perception. It is intended to indicate how a person feels, and typically
acts, and the types of activities he likes.

Personality theory by Clarke and Marston (1928) further proves that all human behaviour can mainly be described in terms of five vectors: Aggressiveness, Sociability, Emotional Stability, Social Adaptability and Social Intelligence. These are measured through an adjective checklist consisting of 81 items, requiring the subject to check only those which they consider are applicable to them.

A description of the vectors is as follows:

Aggressiveness ($V_1$)

Individuals scoring high on this vector are self-starters, willing to "stick their necks out", exhibit enthusiasm over their actions and accomplishments. They are likely to be noisy, than quiet, excited than calm and untidy than fastidious. They are likely to be temperamental, bossy, impulsive and self-confident.

Sociability ($V_2$)

Individuals who are high on this vector are gregarious, socially outgling and make friends easily. They are "people oriented" and their behaviour is basically motivated by a need
to "seek out", and be with people.

**Emotional Stability (V₁)**

Individuals scoring high on this vector are basically quiet, relaxed, gracious and even-tempered. They are usually unobtrusive in ordinary contacts and enjoy the good things of life without much ceremony or fan fare. They are warm-hearted, people who enjoy being in the company of others, develop close intimate relationships rather than taking initiative in seeking them out and establishing initial contacts.

**Social Adaptability (V₂)**

The predominant trait of an individual scoring high on this vector is dependency. He is basically driven by compulsion to adhere strictly to rules, regulations and conventions. He is a person who follows rather than leads. He is deliberate in his actions, exacting in his intentions determined by his, objectives and fastidious to the point of imitation on the part of his associates.

**Social Intelligence (V₃)**

Clarke (1963) opined that individuals scoring high on this vector display good adjustment, foresight and planning ability.

A large number of psychologists are of the view that "self-perception of a person dictates his responses in any setting."
EXECUTIVE EFFECTIVENESS AND SELF PERCEPTION

Since the earlier work of Adler (1931), Kluckhohn, Murray and Schneider (1953), Rogers and Dymond (1955), McCandlers (1962), much has appeared in literature regarding Self-Perception.

The most popular technique for studying the intriguing and challenging concept of Self-Perception, is the Activity Vector Analysis (AVA) (Clarke, 1963). This technique has been used extensively by Merenda and associates, for research as well as for consultative purpose. The use of AVA has been indeed very extensive.

Clarke (1956) used the AVA to study profiles of self-made Company Presidents. Wallace, Clarke and Dry (1956) used it as a selector for Life Insurance Salesmen, Merenda and Clarke (1967) used the AVA for studying differences in results of inferential self-measurement, in self-concept analysis.

Clarke and Hasler (1967) used the AVA for differentiating criminals and non-criminals.

A series of research findings have studied the cross-cultural perceptions of mainly students as regards certain well known political leaders, e.g., Indira Gandhi, Abraham Lincoln, Johnson, Kosygin and so on. (Merenda and Mohan, 1968; Merenda, Mohan, Clarke, Schultz, Strehse and Winneke, 1968; Merenda, Clarke, Schultz, Strehse and Winneke, 1970; Merenda and Mohan, 1970; Merenda, Mohan and Clarke, 1971; Merenda, Clarke, Bassiri and Shapurian, 1971; Merenda, O'Brien and Mohan, 1973; Merenda, Shapurian and Clarke, 1974; Morrow, Clarke and

Kuhn and McFarland (1954) maintained that the individual's self-conception is heavily influenced by his social demarcation and group.

Clarke (1956) demonstrated that certain patterns or syndromes tend to occur which are positively related with success in a particular type of work situation.

Merenaa and Clarke (1956) showed that temperamental characteristics exist between employees of higher and lower ranks. Upper occupational class was seen to be more aggressive and socially confident, while lower class appeared to be more placid and submissive. Thus, the leadership qualities like outgoing and self-initiating behaviour are necessary requisites of successful performance in the upper class (supervisory position), while tendencies towards more relaxed and dependent behaviour are important at middle level to ensure production of best quality and quantity.

Merenaa and Clarke (1956) found self-made company presidents as

(a) More congruent in their social and ideal self-perception in comparison to a mixed occupational sample.

(b) Confirming a standard syndrome of temperamental characteristics.
(c) More active than mixed occupational level sample.

Brandt (1958) found accuracy of Self-Perception to be positively related to intelligence, to the social ability, to predict the social status of others, and acceptance by peers.

Gupta (1961) and Malik (1965) studied self-perception of professional college students and high school teachers respectively and found some sex differences related to Self-Perception.

Kasor and Bourassa (1973) maintained that the extent to which the Self-Perception can be interpreted as an aspect of Personality, may imply a relationship between Personality and perceptual ability.

Merenda, Mohan and Shaw (1975) found the perception of Business Executives by Indian graduate students, to be clustering around the pattern of aggressive - decisiveness on AVA. Qualities like inspiring, confident, good-natured, considerate and tactful were assessed as important for successful and effective executives.

In a study on I.A.S. officers, Police officers, Bank officers, MBA's and University students, Mohan (1977) reported very interesting and informative findings. This group was administered the AVA and it was seen that the I.A.S. Officers saw themselves as considerate, generous, balanced and considered the ideal executive to be bold, balanced and courteous. The Police officers viewed themselves as loyal,
God-fearing and considerate, they considered their ideal self to be bold, loyal and tactful. Bank officers saw themselves as mature, persistent and capable and thought their ideal self to be bright, capable and soft-hearted. MBA's saw themselves as bright, inspiring and decisive and considered their ideal self to be forceful, tactful and persuasive. The University students perceived themselves as appealing, cheerful and persuasive. They viewed their ideal self to be generous, bold and charming.

These observations indicate that these executives are emotionally balanced, human in approach, loyal to the organization, effective in decision making with a lot of persistence, intelligence and consideration. These qualities are more situation-oriented than the almost ethereal characteristics perceived by the University students. The emphasis here is on a deeper sense of responsibility, professional acumen and skills of human relations.

Brenner and Tomkiewicz (1980) in a study on the relationship of Aggressiveness with Executive Effectiveness of middle level executives in a firm, reported that the Aggressiveness of the executive was positively correlated with his effectiveness.

Charate (1980) found that junior army executives (Captains) were high in the area of Sociability ($V_2$) and low in the area of Social Adaptability ($V_4$). The Lieutenant Colonels were found closer to the general population in their Self-Perception and their concepts of what behavioural characteristics
are demanded by the organization and society. Further Charate (1980) reported that the most desirable traits perceived by the army executives were Considerate, Accommodating, Friendly, Humane, Obliging, Courteous. The executives as a group possessed traits like Loyal, Accommodating and Peaceful.

Markus (1983) suggested that Self-Perception or self-knowledge can reveal future behaviour. It indicates which domains of behaviour are regarded as the most self-relevant. It expresses desired and undesired states of the self.

Venkatapathy (1985) studied the perception of self among first and second generation entrepreneurs. Vankatapathy (1983b) classified entrepreneurs into first and second generations. The former refers to individuals, who initiate their own ventures for which there was no precedence and the latter to individuals, who adopt or take over ventures already established by a member of their family or relatives.

It was seen that first generation of entrepreneurs perceived themselves as less impulsive, shy, gloomy and also less sensitive, more problematic, artistic and moody than the second generation entrepreneurs.

Both the groups perceived themselves as cheerful, stable, informal, innocuous, self-centered, brave, poetic, excitable, subservient, nervous, motionless ocean, sober, social, complex, cruel, self-conscious and sportive.
VALUES - THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Myriads of human responses are evoked by the same stimuli. The reason of such an occurrence can be explained on the basis of the varied motives of the individuals, their respective personality make-up, as well as their innumerable value-orientations. Values are important because they sum up the past experience of the individual in terms of directive motivational, perceptual states, growing out of learning and further fashioning further learning (Saiyadain, 1976). The value-systems provide a vivid insight into the human psyche. They form the very basis of the individual's philosophy that provides a direction to his behaviour, in a variety of situations. They are the products of the individual's socialization process.

The concept of values has received attention in every discipline in the social sciences. Economics defines Values in terms of the market price of goods and services. Anthropology uses the notion of Values to describe dominant cultural patterns and cultural themes. Political Science states Values via desirable ingredients of political goals. History uses Values to analyse historical events and sequences. Philosophy discusses the role of Values in the underlying processes of human behaviour and existence. Sociology utilizes the concept of Values in explaining social action and explores the learning of Values and the effect of individual Values, on cognitive and
affective behaviour.

To some scholars Value is a conception of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action. Defined thus, Value is an abstraction whose focus is neither in the organism nor in the immediately observable world, but in the realm of all scientific abstractions. In this sense Value is not just a preference, but a preference justified morally, logically and aesthetically.

Everett (1918) opined that every Value must be viewed not merely as an agreeable feeling in consciousness but also as an activity through which the feeling is constituted.

Murphy, Murphy and New Comb (1937) opined that a Value is simply the maintenance of a "set towards the attainment of a goal."

Woodruff and DiVesta (1948) defined Value as "a generalized condition of living which the individual feels has an important effect on his well being."

According to Smith (1949) Values are considered as highly general attitudes that define a person's orientation towards life in terms of the things he deems most important.

Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey (1951) defined Values according to the type of orientation that the individual prefers to other orientations. Further, Allport (1961) maintained that ordinarily attitude should be employed
when the disposition is bound to an objective or value, i.e., when it is aroused by a well defined class of stimuli and when the individual feels towards these stimuli a definite attraction or repulsion.

Schaffer (1953), Locke (1969) indicated that in research concerning the area of job-satisfaction, Values are considered as needs.

Studies by Astin (1958), Atkinson and Litwin (1960), Burnstein (1963) and Pal (1967), have shown that the value system of one person differs from that of another person, due to differences in their personalities.

Thus each society has a dominant value orientation which relates to attaining solutions to problems that arise out of human situations. Values can then be considered as a concept explicit or implicit of the desirable which influences the selection from available means and ends of action. A given value may have a strength of any particular motive though it remains in some sense, a function of the total motivational system. Morris (1956) distinguished 3 different ways in which the term Value is commonly employed, viz.,

(a) *Operative Values* referring to the tendencies or dispositions of living beings to prefer one kind of object to another.

(b) *Conceived Values* referring to cases of preferential behaviour directed by an anticipation or foresight of the outcome.
(c) 'Object Values' referring to what is preferable or desirable.

Scott (1956) defined Values as a conception, explicit or implicit of the desirable which influences the process of selection from available modes and ends of action.

Jacobs (1957) considered Values as preferences or choices of personal or group action.

Rosenberg (1957), Goldson, Rosenberg, Williams and Suchman (1960), Sharma (1971) defined Values by operationalizing them in terms of choice.

Super (1957), Kilpatrick, Cummings and Jennenza (1964) considered that Values are the importance attached to jobs in general.

Pepper (1958) maintained that Values have been defined as interests, pleasures, likes, preferences, duties, moral obligations, desires, wants, needs, aversions and attractions and many other types of selective orientation.

Rettig and Pasamanick (1959) defined a concept of Values that is fairly compatible with the notion of what is desirable (rightness and wrongness, goodness and badness can be viewed as dimensions which determine desirability).

Samler (1960) upheld that "Values should be subject to explicit examination as criteria for choice, as determinants of behaviour."
Churchman (1961) conceived of Values in terms of preferences placed by the individuals on the possible outcomes of behavioural actions.

Crites (1961) opined that Values can be adequately defined in terms of one's vocational interests.

In his review of the different meanings assigned to Values, Tisdale (1961) suggested the following summary definition of Values:

Values are inferred motivational constructs associated with perceived differences in goal-directed behaviour, and indicated by the selection of action alternatives within social situations.

Ehrlich and Weiner (1961) considering various definitions of Values propounded 5 aspects that they saw as encompassing these definitions. These are:

(a) an effective dimension,
(b) desirability in terms of long-range preferences or preferable alternatives in a given situation.
(c) that Values can be implicit or explicit.
(d) a tendency to determine directionality of behaviour.
(e) relationship to means and goals of action.

Kluckhohn (1962) stated that members of various cultures developed Values, concerning solutions of certain problems.

Katzell (1964) maintained that Values can be defined by characteristics of the job, which indicate high sources of
satisfaction.

Faulding (1965) opined that a Value guides behaviour towards uniformity with the objective of providing the individual a feeling of self-sufficiency and satisfaction.

Williams (1968) opined that Values indicate a conception of the 'desirable'. They represent things in which people are interested, things they desire and enjoy. Values are considered as potent determinants of human behaviour. They make human behaviour patterned and help to make sense out of discrete processes of human behaviour which otherwise do not have any connection. Values provide grounds for accepting or rejecting particular norms.

Rokeach (1968, 1969, 1970), indicated that Values can be considered as ideals, positive or negative which are not tied to any specific object or situation and which represent a person's belief about modes of conduct and ideal terminal goals. They are thus global beliefs that transcendentally guide actions and judgements across specific objectives and for justifying one's own and others' actions and attitudes for morally defining self and others for comparing self with others.

Further Rokeach has poignantly brought out the importance of Values in understanding the dynamics of social processes. He argues that Values have to do with Modes of Conduct and end states of existence.
Baier (1969) defined a Value as essentially an attitude for or against an event or phenomenon based on belief that it benefits or penalizes some individual, group or institution. He further contends that Values imply some codes or normative standards which generate the criteria for ordering the intensities of human desire and preference.

In addition, Baier (1969) listed several of the popular definitions of Values to show the great variety of meanings:

- A thing has or is a Value if and when people behave towards it, so as to retain it or increase their possession of it (George Lundberg).

- Anything capable of being appreciated and wished for is a Value (Robert Part and E.W.Burgess).

- Values are the obverse of motives, the objects, quality or condition that satisfies the motivation. (La Pierre).

- Values are any objects of any need (Howard Becker).

- A desideratum or anything desired or chosen by someone, at sometime - operationally what the respondent says he wants (Stuart, C.Dodd).

- By a social value one understands any datum having an empirical content, accessible to the members of some society, group and a meaning with regard to which it is or may be an object of activity (Znaniecki).

- "Values" are "the desirable end states which act as 'a guide to human endeavour or the most general statements of legitimate ends which guide social action." (Neil, J. Smelser).
The noun 'Value' has usually been used to imply some code or standard which persists through time and provides a criterion by which people order the intensities of desiring various desiderata. To the extent that people are able to place objects, actions, ways of life, and so on, on a continuum of approval-disapproval with some reliability, it appears that their responses to a particular desideratum are functions of culturally acquired values (William, R. Catton Jr.).

Values are normative standards by which human beings are influenced in their choice among the alternative courses of action which they perceive (Philip E. Jacob and James J. Flink).

Blood (1969), Wollack, Goodale, Wijting and Smith (1971), Searies, Branch and Miskimini (1974), maintained that Values are derived from work, ethics and religion.

Bales (1970) represented a comprehensive factor analysis of what he termed as "Value Statements"—which go to explain the Values and give a vivid definition of Values.

A Value Statement is "a statement of an existing norm or a proposal for a new norm." The context of this norm is primarily viewed in a small group situation.

According to Hall and Lindzey (1970), "The amount of psychic energy invested in an element of the personality is called Value of that element, Value is a measure of intensity. When we speak of placing a high Value upon a particular idea or feeling we mean that the idea or
feeling exerts a considerable force investigating and directing behaviour."

Coleman (1971) indicated that Values determine the intensity and continuity of human behaviour. They are the key choices that shape the type of life the individual carves for himself and the kind of person he becomes. Values imply cherishing something, holding it in high esteem.

Lazlo (1973) defined Values as human expressions of how human beings relate to the world around them.

Upadhyay and Mukerjee (1977) regarded Values as an especially important class of beliefs acquired through experience. These Values are widely shared by the members of the culture and thereby effect the culture of a society.

Singh (1979) analysed the Indian concept of Values. He proposed that a Value is that which is a measure of right or wrong, good or bad. It represents what is desirable and not what is desired alone. The concept of Value is normative rather than positive in its content. It is an ethical concept which determines what man considers he should do.

He has further listed the major Indian Values as gleaned from the Vedas, Upanishads and Mythology as:

(i) Achievement of bliss or enlightenment as the highest motivation of life.
(ii) Right conduct, duty or selflessness as mainstrings of socially desirable works.

(iii) Sacrifice, detachment and objectivity as important Values.

(iv) Awareness of unity of total existence.

(v) 'Artha' and 'Kama' have been recognized as Values but lower in hierarchy as compared to 'Dharma' and 'Moksha'. The fulfilment of highest objectives is gained by working through them.

Neponmyaschaya et al. (1980) considered that Values characterize an area of behaviour that has the greatest significance for the individual and that defines the content of the self-concept. Two independent aspects of Values are distinguished; an objective one, affecting the specific value content; and a subjective one reflecting the self-concept. Values determine the nature of the components of personality.

Dutt (1983) defined Values as an endeavour which satisfies need system, psychological as well as physiological and adds in self-drive. Values impart significance to life and help the individual in self-evaluation.

Classification of Values

Different psychologists have propounded different classifications of Values.

Spranger (1928)

Spranger characterized individuals in accordance with their fundamental orienting values, utility, truth, love, God, power and beauty (Ferreira, 1960). Spranger
maintained the view that Values provide a clear insight into the personalities of men. He thus came up with 6 Values. These are described as follows:

(i) **Theoretical Values**: The major interest of the theoretical individual is the discovery of truth. His interests are critical, empirical, rational. He is an intellectual man, and is often a scientist or a philosopher. Such an individual seeks only to observe and to reason. He aims at systematizing and enhancing his knowledge.

(ii) **Economic Value**: This type is 'practical' and conforms well to the prevailing stereotype of the average American businessman. He is chiefly interested in what is useful. The interest in utilities develops to embrace the practical affairs of the business world - the production, marketing, accumulation of tangible wealth.

The Economic Value often comes into conflict with other Values. For instance the Economic man wants education to be purely practical and considers unapplied knowledge as a waste. Similarly he only appreciates art, when it serves commercial ends. He often confuses luxury with beauty. In his interpersonal relations, he is only interested in surpassing other people in wealth. At times he may make his religion the worship of Mammon. He considers God as the giver of good gifts of wealth, prosperity and other tangible blessings.
(iii) **Aesthetic Value**: The aesthetic man accords the highest value to beauty, grace, form, harmony, symmetry and fitness. He regards life as an embodiment of events, each of which must be enjoyed, his chief interest lies in the artistic episodes that life provides.

Unlike the theoretical man he is concerned with diversity. He regards the processes of advertising, manufacturing, production, as wreaking destruction on the values that are most important for him. In social affairs, he tends towards individualism and self-sufficiency. He is interested in people, but not necessarily in their welfare. He opposes political activity when it represses individuality. Such people are fond of pomp and power, they often confuse pure religious experiences with beauty.

(iv) **Social Value**: Such a man is likely to find the theoretical, economic and aesthetic attitudes as cold and inhuman. For the social man the highest Value is accorded to the altruistic or philanthropic aspect of love. Spranger pointed out that in its purest form the social interest is selfless and tends to approach very closely to the religious attitude. He regards other persons as ends and is therefore himself kind, sympathetic and unselfish.

(v) **Political Value**: Since competition and struggle play a large part in life, many philosophers regard power as the most fundamental and universal of motives. The political man accords the highest Value to the attainment of power. He wishes above all else for personal power, influence and reason.
(vi) Religious Value: Such an individual is mystical and seeks to comprehend the cosmos as a whole and to relate himself to this totality. His highest value thus may be called unity. Some men of this type are "immanent mystics" that is, they find their religious experience in the affirmation of life and in active participation therein. The "transcendental mystic" on the other hand, seeks to unite himself with a higher reality by withdrawing from life, he is the ascetic, finds the experience of unity through self-denial and meditation. In many individuals the negation and affirmation of life alternate to yield the greatest satisfaction. Spranger defined the religious man as one "whose mental structure is permanently directed to the creation of the highest and absolutely satisfying value experience."


Catton (1954) derived 6 abstract Values such as (1) Human life itself, (2) Man's creative achievement, (3) Wholesome cooperation with our fellowmen for a happier life for all, (4) Worship of God and acceptance of God's will, (5) Fullest development of the moral character of mankind, and (6) Fullest development of human intelligence, human abilities.
Margenan (1959) distinguished 2 types of Values - factual and normative. Value is factual, when it is the measure of satisfaction of a human want. In the normative sense, it refers to the "entities which values or to which value is said to adhere."


According to Coleman (1971) Values can be classified thus:

1. Economic Value - an object has economic value if it commands a money price.

2. Health, bodily and recreational Values - The value of this kind comes from the gratification of bodily needs e.g. hunger, thirst etc.

3. Social Values - The satisfaction one gets from friendship, love, family, and membership in groups.
Moral Values - which are the outcome of an individual's right choice.

Aesthetic Values - objects which are perceived as beautiful or ugly and arouse in the observer the kind of experience which one calls aesthetic.

Intellectual Values - Here one strives to get satisfaction from attaining truth in its any form.

Religious Values - If an object by virtue of its relation to the divine can be called holy or sacred, it is said to have a religious value.

Theoretical Value - Here the dominant interest is in the discovery of truth.

Paramesh (1972) classified values into 2 categories:

1. Theoretical Values which reflect a dominant interest in the discovery of truth and knowledge.

2. Aesthetic Values which are characterized by form and harmony.

Measurement of Values

Five basic methods have been utilized to assess an individual's Values.

(a) Rank ordering (Hunt 1935; Catton, 1954; Rokeach, 1969) or via Q-Sort e.g. (Gorlow and Barocas, 1964, 1965; Gorlow and Noll, 1967).
(b) Paired-comparison or forced choice (e.g., Allport and Vernon, 1931; Catton, 1954).

(c) Coding of open-ended questions (e.g., Smith, 1949; Scott, 1959).

(d) Attitude scaling (e.g., Lurie, 1937; Van Dusen, Wimberly and Mosier, 1939; Woodruff and DiVesta, 1948; Morris, 1956; Rettig and Pasamanick, 1959).

(e) Projective Scaling (Kilman, 1975).

The most well known and researched set of value lists is that by Allport and Vernon (1931) and later revised by Allport, Vernon and Lindzey (1951, 1960). Taking from the 6 types of men which Spranger theoretically defined by their different "evaluative attitudes". Allport and Vernon devised a forced-choice questionnaire to assess the 6 types of value orientations.

Scott (1959) stated that the Allport-Vernon scale appears more like a test of object preferences than a test of personal values in the present sense; most of the items do not require moral evaluation of courses of action, but simply selection among them. In other words, the "Study of Values" does not involve evaluative dimensions in any aspect of the assessment.

For the present investigation the 'Study of Values' developed by Allport, Vernon and Lindzey (1960) has been used.
EXECUTIVE EFFECTIVENESS AND VALUES

Since executives are a class of individuals who control and provide guidelines of behaviour for other people, a study of their Values is of immense importance. McMurry (1963) correctly emphasized the importance of studying Values and their behavioural relevance. Human behaviour is in fact purposive and goal-oriented. Hence the usefulness of the study of executive values lies in examining their relationship with managerial actions, decisions and the organizational culture. Organizational decision making processes and processes of Executive Effectiveness are influenced by the occupational values, beliefs and aims of those who are involved in the decision-making process (Bass, 1965; Wadia, 1968; Singh and Dass, 1977).

Executive action, planning, coordination, control, motivation, etc. therefore, are likely to be directly related to the Values of the executives. The research findings of Courghlan (1969), Hodgkinson (1971), Gies and Leonard (1971) indicate a strong relationship between Values, organizational climate, Executive Effectiveness and executive performance.

Studies regarding the executive values are indeed voluminous (Scott, 1959; McClosky, 1958; Kohn, 1959; Kumar, 1965; Panandikar, 1966; Stretcher, 1967; Jain, 1971; Hampden-Turner, 1971; Hampden-Turner and Whitten, 1971; Hendershot and Eckhardt, 1971; Sharma, 1971; Baggaley, 1973;
Chowdhary (1958) pointed out that behind the facade of confidence in executives, one can identify considerable anxiety, insecurity.

Kumar (1965) found leaders to be lower on Theoretical, Aesthetic and Religious Values and higher on Economic, Social and Political Values in comparison with the general population.

Tandon (1968) opined that managerial effectiveness depends on the Values that management has and also the Values of the society to which management belongs. In India, the Value system is at a complete variance with the Value system from where it is trying to import its technology.

There are 3 sets of Values behind management:
(a) Values belonging to society.
(b) Imported technology.
(c) Synthesis of the Values that management creates for itself.

Thus there is a need to understand our own Value system and see what modification it needs, and how it can be improved.
Kipnis and Consentino (1969) pointed out that military supervisors relied more heavily on extra instruction, direct punishments, and changes in the task environment of subordinates to change subordinate's behaviour. Industrial supervisors, on the other hand relied more on their persuasive powers.

Batten (1970) maintained that the management statesman relates his philosophy to the entire world around him. The emphasis here is on positive values. The tough-minded executive, 'the old smoothie', must have the guts to put himself to some emotional inconvenience for the sake of getting through artificial defenses, mechanisms and getting real growth started.

Chwast (1970), pointed out that "key determinants in the course the police pursue are the values underpinning these processes." A number of studies have been concerned with police attitudes and values and have pointed to the complexity of factors that shape the police values (Schnepf 1966; Stretcher, 1967; McNamara, 1967; Piliavan and Brian, 1968; Knudten, 1970; Eisenberg, Fosen, and Glickman, 1973; Kelley and Farber, 1974).

Kumar (1970) and Sharma (1971a) showed that there is a striking similarity between the needs and values of Indian and Western executives.

Hay (1970) opined that the business executive has the incentive to pursue means which could assist in the transformation
of the quality of life of those engaged in working in his sphere of influence. The executive must always be in the ceaseless pursuit of quality. Need for constant consciousness and self-discipline should be there, against status orientation, so that he creates values where achievement has its social rewards. A rational system of accountability at all levels of intellectualism and commitment should be there.

Rapoport (1970) opined that there are 3 main types of executives based on their respective value orientations. They are:

(a) Metamorphic - they are creative, ambitious, restless and full of conflict.

(b) Incremental - they are uncritical but are fulfilled having a happy personal life.

(c) Tangential - they are alienated, rebellious, not interested in the organization they work for.

Dhingra (1972) studied 265 public sector managers for participative predisposition, and found that the largest group of managers (41.5%) had a morality orientation, whereas 38.8% had a pragmatic orientation. Only 16.25% of the managers had clear participative predisposition.

Triandis (1972) studied Values and cognitive structures of students in Illinois, Athens, Bangalore and Tokyo, as many of these students would later on work in organizations
as executives, a study of their values and attitudes was relevant. Triandis used concepts like 'Freedom', 'Power', and 'Wealth' and found that 'Freedom' was valued in all the four countries, its consequences being conceptualized in socio-political terms by the Greek and Indian students. 'Power' had strong values in the 2 western countries than the 2 Eastern countries. 'Wealth' had a strong value in Japan and America, but not so in India and Greece.

Sharma (1973) gave certain perspectives on Indian Police. Police officials in India are fairly conservative and have strong professional biases to keep their structure closed and insulated from the rocking winds of change.

England and Lee (1974) maintained that value patterns of executives are predictive of executive success and effectiveness. More successful and effective executives have pragmatic, dynamic, achievement-oriented values, whereas the less successful executives have more static and passive values. The more successful executives prefer an active role in interaction with other individuals. England and Lee further suggested that change, aggressiveness, creativity, competition, and liberalism are behaviourally relevant whereas social welfare, obedience, trust, conformity, leisure, dignity, equality, conservatism and religion are less behaviourally relevant.
England, Dhingra and Agarwal (1971) have done exhaustive work in the area of Values. In a cross-cultural study on managers of India, Japan, U.S. and Australia they found that some managers had very small set of Values, whereas others had a large set, some had ethical and some had moral orientation.

Further they found that:

(a) Indian managers are more morally oriented.

(b) Indian managers value stable organizations with steady growth and emphasize both organizational competence notions and organizational compliance notions.

(c) There is a high degree of "personalism" in their value system.

(d) Groups of people do not play a significant part in their value system.

(e) A great deal of variation is present in the personal value system of the Indian managers.

In another study England et al. (1974) reported that managers with different personal and organizational experiences and responsibilities differ in value patterns to a significant degree. Managers with high levels of responsibility, high levels of education and from organizations in North India, are those who fuse or blend traditionalism, humanism and bureaucratic orientations to the greatest degree.
England et al. (1974) yet in another study found that public sector managers have more moralistic than pragmatic Value orientations.

England et al. (1974) studied the personal Value systems and found that union leaders had moralistic orientation, whereas managers had pragmatic orientation. Employee and social welfare are weak Values for the manager. They valued traditional goals of productivity, organizational growth, industrial leadership and efficiency, they were thought of thus as highly ambitious, possessing ability and skill.

Mankoff (1974) maintained that Values and Value systems play a central role in human motivation and communication and dissonance between corporate values and individual values and create problems of motivation, commitment and productivity.

Steels and Ward (1974) found MEAs well adjusted, well-paid and changing jobs quite often and in a good number.

Ganesh and Malhotra (1975) studied the Values of executives and found that they place high value on duty consciousness, willingness to accept responsibility, security and stability to employees and goal directedness. Private sector executives were significantly more manipulative and less socio-centric as compared to executives in the public sector and in government organizations. Executives at the top level were more existential than the executives at the middle level. Conformistic and socio-centric values were found
to decrease with age.

Singhi (1974) reported that "there is dissonance between the defined goals and rational norms of bureaucracy and the value-orientation of the bureaucrats." The bureaucrats reveal ambivalence and contradiction in Values which is the result of the twin processes of traditionalism and modernity.

Paul (1975) made some very significant observations of the MBAs in Indian industry. He found that the MBA in contrast to an ordinary graduate has a glamour value, centering around four-figure employment offers.

Badami (1976) indicated that an effective executive should develop a value system in such a way that the subordinates have trust and confidence in him. His philosophy should be based on 'do what you say' and he should live up to his legitimate and expected image.

Barnard (1976) gave a description of the Values of the efficient, and effective executive. He wrote about 2 aspects of leadership:

(a) Technical aspect: which consists of superior qualities of the individual, physical and technical imagination, etc.

(b) Quality of responsibility: which consists of the moral factor in organization - the quality which gives dependability and determination to human conduct, ideality to purpose. Further, the executive responsibility does not end with conformity to a complex set of codes, but an effective
executive must also have the capacity to create moral codes for others. Here organizational morale is a manifestation of the success of the executive in creating commonly held codes within the organization. Organizations endure in proportion to the breadth of the morality by which they are governed. Foresight, high ideals are the basis for the persistence of cooperation.

Behaviour of each executive depends on the dominant Values. On the positive side, skill in avoiding trouble, or expediting decision making may be valuable to one. For others power may be the chief reinforcer, which can be the most corrupting influence, inhibiting the development and communication of a moral commitment in others.

Hofstede (1976) studied Values of executives of 15 nationalities, grouped thus - Nordic, Germanic, Anglo, Latin and Asian. It was found that Asian executives rated high on the value of 'Orderliness' and 'Conformity' and low on independence, whereas the U.S. executives were seen to be low on conformity - independence.

Ronen and Kraut (1976) in their cross-cultural comparison of a large number of countries showed that India comes closer to Latin America and other developing countries of the world, in work values and attitudes.

Mohan and Kapoor (1977) reported that one finds many stereotyped reactions among MBAs on day-to-day executive
problems, almost lacking original insight and richness in personal Values. There is a certain lack of personal honesty and self-discipline and an obsessive concern with money. The executive does not lay much emphasis on professional executive ethics.

Sen (1977) maintained that managerial effectiveness lies in human Values, it relates directly to the human material in every organization, it lies in the dynamic, modern, ever changing managerial environment. A subtle and appropriate blending of management techniques and human Values is what is now needed to enhance effectiveness and pave the way for an economically progressive and viable society.

Ram (1978) opined that of the many elements that go into the making of an executive, the most crucial element is the formation and imparting of his Value systems. The first set of Value systems concerning the executives of the third world pertains to the fact that they are operating in poor societies where a vast number of unemployed and under-employed men are the dominant feature. Another fact of Value Systems bears on the quality of life that the executives are able to create for the men in their charge. The third set of Value Systems is concerned with the executive's basic attitude towards the earth's resources.

Dolke and Atira (1978) compared Indian textile executives with other Indian executives and with executives of 13 other countries and reported that Indian
textile executives believe in more traditional - autocratic managerial practices and value orientations as compared to other Indian executives and executives from other countries.

Howard, Cunningham and Rechnitzer (1978) found the prevalence of Type A behaviour (i.e. chronic and excessive struggles, competition, ambition and impatience) in executives.

Griffeth and Cafferty (1978) reported that the value configurations of the police personnel were fairly high, indicating general agreement on relative order of most values, when the comparison of individual values to the comparison of configurations of values between police and citizens was conducted.

Rao (1978) pointed out that there is a further need for concentrated efforts to discover the correlates of value determinants, value change and value influences for enhancing the concept and study of Values and their relevance in Executive Effectiveness.

Sayeed (1978) in a study on executives found their Value dimensions to be - acceptance of authority and equalitarianism.

Maccoby, Michael and Katherine (1979) discussed how the nature of a person's occupation influenced his or her character. In the United States independence as a personal value is stressed, among the executives. It is suggested that there should be reorganisation of working
systems with emphasis on individuation, structuring tasks to suit the individual's talents and interests and the development of democratic decision-making processes within the organization.

Singh (1979) maintained that Indian executives have a great preference for aspects like freedom from supervision, challenges and adventurous experiences. Their actions are significantly influenced by the reference group rather than by the rest of the Indian culture.

Dashora (1980) reported that George England has categorized managerial Values thus as: (i) Operating and (ii) Intended and Adopted.

(i) Operating Values include consideration of organizational efficiency, stability, belongingness, ability, ambition, skill, competition, etc.

(ii) Intended and Adopted Values consider employee welfare and social welfare, individuality, prestige, dignity, security, loyalty, trust, honour, obedience, etc.

Value considerations include ethics, work and professional ethics for managers is an important Value in itself. Managerial Values imbibe the individual values, organizational values and social values.

Teahan, Adams and Podany (1980) studied the Value structures of the U.S. and British police. They found that for the U.S. police officials Values like accomplishment,
ambition, courage are relatively very important. Values of happiness, pleasure, friendship, cheerfulness, good manners are more important to the British police officials.

Guerrier and MacMillan (1981) maintained that the young executives are more entrepreneurially oriented and oriented towards self-indulgence. They value attainment and success at work (Sofer, 1981; Hofstede, 1981). They desire the work to be challenging and need to control and have power. A conflict of values exists between social and business executives (Taylor, 1975). Personal Values are attributable to reason of age, experience and personality.

Schirks (1981) found that executives in an international organization had a different Value system, and a typical motivational structure for the personnel. Better educated and more critical executive force wants, in addition to economic security, a challenging job that allows psychological growth through job autonomy and co-operation with others.

Whitely and England (1980) studied the Values of managers of U.S.A., Japan, Korea, India and Australia and found that six Value dimensions emerged as significant factors. They were: personal loyalty, social equality, personal influence, personal assertiveness, control, personal competence and reference groups. Indian executives scored high on the personal influence dimension and low on assertiveness-controlling dimension, in comparison to the executives of U.S., Japan, Korea and Australia.
Kalra (1981) upheld that with increase in age, Indian executives seem to be working more for extrinsic job factors rather than intrinsic factors.

Palmer, Viega and Vora (1981) stated that results from 74 Indian and American executives show 2 dominant profiles viz., pragmatic and altruistic.

Soares, Valecha and Venkataraman (1981) indicated that the Personal Value System of the Indian executives shows that good work ethics have the highest priority. Interpersonal Values such as being helpful, supportive, empathic towards subordinates, are passively moralistic, rather than pragmatic and success oriented as the Japanese and American executives. 

Value orientation of executives underlies managerial behaviour.

Adhikari and Hasnain (1982) in a study of Values among professional trainees reported that nursing trainees were found to be higher than business training college students on Theoretical, Economic, Social, Political and Religious values.

Pratap and Srivastva (1982) used the Hindi version of the Allport Vernon Lindzey, Study of Values on technical and non-technical employees. Non-technical subjects were more interested in the discovery of truth, whereas technical employees were more practical, power and prestige oriented.

Warrier (1982) maintained that Values subscribed by successful and effective executives were honesty, hard work,
sincerity, dedication, courage of convictions, determination and initiative.

Banerjee (1983) opined that perception of Values is part of the civilized world and particularly in our Indian culture. Yet in management and administration, a considerable Value erosion is noticed. One is confronted with the task of Value inculcation across the sinews of administration. A tri-dimensional approach needs to be involved, whereby a cause-and-effect nexus is established as a means of Value transmission in the realized world of management in government.

Cressey and Moore (1983) in their study on managerial Values and corporate codes of ethics suggested that top executives have little or no concern for social responsibility or ethical considerations.

Cromie and Johns (1983) reported that high achievers had Economic and Theoretical values.

Howard, Shudo and Umeshima (1983) reported that American executives attached great importance to individuality and straight-forwardness, whereas the Japanese executives attached great importance to socially beneficial Values, they were also more achievement-oriented.

relationships and organizational performance are not separated in India. Loyalty often gets priority over efficiency (Dayal, 1976).

Venkataraman, Valecha and Soares (1983) opined that Indian executives advocate a style of management that revolves around rigid work norms and employee welfare, rather than dynamic personal attributes and values.

Warrier (1983) gave a value profile of Indian executives. Today's Indian executive is more concerned with:

(a) happiness, contentment, peace for himself and his near ones;
(b) achieving goals set for himself;
(c) "good" man image.
(d) self actualization.

He has acquired a value system tinged with concern for genuineness in human relationships, human attitude, devotion to task, concern for being diplomatic with a regard for other people's feelings.

Jahangiri (1983) found that the educational administrators had a greater preference for 'creativity' and 'originality', they use special ability talents, social status, and prestige, like opportunities to work with people, stable and secure future, to be free from supervision and subordination, to get
a chance to earn a good deal of money and exercise lordship-control over others. It was reported that the goal values of the private and government sectors were found to be more or less similar.

Brunson (1985) developed a Value typology of the top management personnel and found that 2 sets of Value orientations emerged viz., pragmatic and moralistic humanistic.


Indian executives discourage rather than encourage the development of dynamic and pragmatic personal attributes positively related to managerial success. The inefficiency and poor performance of Indian executives, in various areas of human endeavour is intimately linked to the Indian managerial Values, which represent a crisis in "the way" the Indian executives are made.

Valecha (1985) has outlined some psychological causes for efficiency and inefficiency. The Japanese are much more efficient because they have in their cultural ethos, a deep-rooted Value epitomized in the concept of 'Giri', i.e., obligation. In operational terms it means that every Japanese believes that an honourable and worthy person has an obligation to reciprocate by hard work for the benefits, rewards, favours or any positive action that he receives from his organization.
In Indian culture the concept of 'Dharma' and 'Karma' are present. However, the prevalent materialistic exploitative environment and Value System generally produces individuals who are more interested in the fruits of action, rather than in performing one's duty for the sake of doing one's duty.

Thus these can be viewed as the causes of the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of the Japanese as well as the Indian executives, the causes which lie deep-rooted in their cultural ethos and their value orientations. Further, Japanese executives' Values display a striking similarity with the Values of Indian executives, and a sharp contrast with Western Values of autonomy, rationality and equality.

THEORIES OF MOTIVATION

The importance of motivation for enhancing and improving the effectiveness of the executives has been realized, and the psychologists and behavioural scientists are increasingly becoming aware of the dynamic aspects of this concept. One of the most fruitful areas in motivation theory has been that of Achievement Motivation. However, in addition to Achievement Motivation, an expose of certain other theoretical formulations and models is deemed necessary, solely for the purpose of providing a deeper insight into the motivational dynamics of Executive Effectiveness.

Requisite Task Attribute Model

Turner and Lawrence (1965) identified six task attributes as the most salient characteristics, considered from motivational point of view. These are:

(i) Variety
(ii) Autonomy
(iii) Responsibility
(iv) Knowledge and skill
(v) Optional interaction
(vi) Required interaction

Herzberg's Two Factor Theory

This provides an excellent framework to look at the motivation aspect of the executives. Prof. Herzberg (1966) modified the Maslow approach to motivation and suggested that the real motivators are neither money, nor social needs, but
higher order needs of human beings such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, challenge of the work itself and growth opportunities. These are the job related factors, which according to Herzberg are intrinsic factors to the job and are the real motivators.

Salary, company policy, supervision, working conditions, job security etc. on the other hand are seen as maintenance or 'hygiene factors', which would only prevent dissatisfaction, but would not contribute to satisfaction. These were found to be job-content variables. Therefore, he argued that if an organization wants to make its executives happy and motivated, it should ensure that factors such as salary, working conditions, etc. which could cause dissatisfaction are taken care of, and should also ensure the meaningful scope of the real motivators to come into action. Herzberg considered recognition for good work, more challenging, and responsible work, achievement on the job and increased opportunities for advancement and growth as real motivators.

Motivation seekers, maintained Herzberg, are inner-directed, whose belief patterns are deliberately chosen and less influenced by environment. They have a tendency to work hard and to strive for quality. Hygiene seekers have been described as out-directed. They have a tendency to blow with the wind and are highly influenced by external environment, have little interest in work, are careless about the quality of work and express cynicism regarding positive virtues.
Valence-Instrumentality-Expectancy (V-I-E) Theory

This theory has been the most popular research to motivation among industrial researchers (Lawler, 1973). This theory provides a comprehensive motivational model to date. It is a form of calculative psychological hedonism, in which the ultimate motive of every human act is asserted to be the maximization of pleasure and minimization of pain. Sometimes Valence works best (Pritchard and Sanders, 1973), sometimes Instrumentality works best (Mitchell and Knudsen, 1973). More often Expectancy works best (Arvey, 1972; Gavin, 1973; Schwab and Dyer, 1973).

V-I-E formula, it is assumed, can predict performance and effectiveness better than any component by itself. An additive model works better than a multiplicative one (Schwab and Dyer, 1973).

Motivational Techniques

Two approaches are given here:

(a) Behaviour modification approach (Hamner, 1974; Hamner and Hamner, 1976).

(b) Goal Setting Approach (Locke, Shaw, Saari and Latham, 1981).

(a) Behaviour modification approach (Hamner, 1974; Hamner and Hamner, 1976): It is argued that motivation is a basically non-cognitive form of learning in which one's actions are shaped
by the scheduling of rewards and punishment. Thus it is seen that individuals seek to maximize valued outcomes with those outcomes being determined by the reward system of the organization as well as the individual's capability in achieving high performance.

(b) **Goal setting approach** (Locke, Shaw, Saari and Latham, 1981): Setting a specific goal leads to greater performance than general instructions. Goal setting appears to be a powerful motivating agent and thereby enhances effectiveness of the executive.

**Collective Motivation**

Lawler (1982) maintained that collectively oriented behaviour is motivated if it contributes to organizational performance, which in turn is linked to intrinsic as well as extrinsic rewards received by the individual, as follows:

\[
\text{Collective Motivation} = \text{Problem} (P_i \rightarrow P_o) \times \text{Problem} (P_o \rightarrow U_i)
\]

where,

- \(P_i\), is the performance of the individual.
- \(P_o\), is the performance of the organization.
- \(U_i\), is the outcomes for the individual.

Another view can be to view Collective Motivation in light of cooperative prosocial behaviour (Puffer, 1983; Staw, 1984). Many individuals are asked to perform or to take decision on behalf of the organization in ways which are sometimes damaging to their personal welfare - yet these prosocial behaviours are commonly performed. Therefore, this altruistic
model (Wispe, 1978; Rushton and Sorrent, 1981) of Collective Motivation can be expressed as follows:

\[ \text{Collective Motivation} = \text{ID} \times \text{Problem} (P_i \rightarrow O_o) \]

where,

- \( \text{ID} = \) Identification with the organization.
- \( P_i = \) Performance of the individual.
- \( O_o = \) Outcomes for the organization.

At present collectively oriented behaviour has been frequently lauded as vital to Executive Effectiveness, but no outstanding research has been done on this so far.

Bhatia (1985) in an empirical study has given an account of two models which provide additional information regarding the motivational aspects of Executive Effectiveness. These models are:

(a) Trist's Socio-Technical Systems Model

(b) Hackman, Oldham, Janson and Purdy's Job Characteristics Model.

**Socio-Technical Systems Model**

Trist offered a set of general socio-technical principles which are:

1. Reasonably demanding content of the job.
2. An opportunity to learn something.
3. Some autonomy or discretion in decision making.
4. Recognition.
A relationship between what is produced and executive's social life.

Feeling that the job leads to desirable future.

**Job Characteristics Model**

Hackman, Oldham, Janson and Purdy have identified "critical psychological states", associated with high level of internal motivation, satisfaction and quality of performance.

These psychological states are:

(i) Meaningfulness of the job.
(ii) Responsibility.
(iii) Knowledge of results.

When these psychological states are present, they lead to high levels of motivation.

High achievers are hard working, engaged in repetitive and less challenging work, they experience dissatisfaction. Hackman and Lawler (1971) opined that individuals having high growth need and strong desire to grow and develop themselves would react more positively to intrinsic aspects of jobs. Low achievers would not appreciate complex and challenging work as they are not ambitious, hardworking and have low aspirations.

**Achievement Motivation Theory**

According to Murray, McClelland, Atkinson, along with other needs, the individuals exhibit varying levels of need for achievement (n-Ach). The tendency which is called n-Ach is deeply rooted in human nature. The presence of n-Ach
in an individual reflects his wish to do well. This represents a desire to succeed in competition with a standard of excellence (McClelland, Atkinson, Clarke, and Lowell, 1953) set by others or by one's own, earlier standards. Executives with high n-Ach prefer situations in which they would get quick and concrete feedback on their performance (Atkinson, 1958), and enjoy taking calculated risks, searching the environment for challenging opportunities, personal responsibility, autonomy and situations in which they are likely to get a sense of mastery. Executives with low n-Ach prefer situations where risk levels are low and responsibility for task accomplishment is shared with others. For such low need-achievers motivational strategies other than job enrichment seem to be by way of use of group pressure, more effective leader behaviour, or stronger performance - reward contingencies. Such findings have emerged (Andrews 1967; Cummin, 1967; Steers, 1975b).

Further n-Ach has been defined as - to work at something important with persistence and energy, to strive to accomplish something credible; to get ahead in business to persuade or lead a group, to create something, to have an interest in attaining a high quality of performance regardless of the social status or remuneration associated with the endeavour (Eron, 1951; McClelland, Atkinson, Clarke and Lowell, 1953; Veroff, 1957; Arnold, 1962; Bellak, 1971; Honor and Vane, 1972).

For Atkinson (1964) it is the inner force, desire or need. Experimentally it is the conscious experience of desire,
emotion, feeling of determination and the inclination to act, whereas behaviourally it is the description of the direction (vigour) and persistence of observable behaviour in relation to observable environmental conditions. Thus Achievement Motivation is a desire to do well, not so much for the sake of social recognition or prestige, but for the sake of inner feelings of personal accomplishment. Any behaviour related to striving for success relates to occupation and achievement. Further, Atkinson (1968) stated that all motives are "learned". The achievement motive is learned from a wide range of experiences which are accompanied by strong positive effect. Once developed the disposition is found to be relatively stable, and is assumed to be aroused when the person expects that the situation offers the possibility of mastery and the accompanying positive effect. The evaluation with reference to the standard of excellence gives intrinsic satisfaction and is not a means to the reduction of other needs.

For Heckhausen (1967), it is "the striving to increase or keep as high as possible one's own capability in all activities in which a standard of excellence is thought to apply and where the execution of such activities can refer either success or failure."

Earlier in 1951, McClelland maintained that as motive increases in intensity, it first leads to an increase in the efficiency of the instrumental activity and then to a decrease. Then one can assume that given some value of ability greater than zero, level of performance is a constantly increasing function of amount of motivation. The more motivated the individual to perform, the more effective his performance. (Fig. 10).
FIG. 10. HYPOTHETICAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN AMOUNT OF MOTIVATION AND LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE.
It has been seen that under certain conditions effective performance may be its own reward. Individuals may derive satisfaction from a high level of performance on a task, even though no externally mediated reward is forthcoming and they may experience dissatisfaction from a low level of performance, even though no punishment is administered.

McClelland et al. (1953), Atkinson (1956b) developed a method for measuring the strength of the individual's n-Ach. The amount of satisfaction derived by a person from successful performance on a task is assumed to be directly related to the difficulty (probability of success) of the task and to the strength of his n-Ach.

Thus, it can be seen that in all the above mentioned models, emphasis is laid on factors viz., achievement, recognition, challenging work and so on. These have been found to be related to motivation and successful and effective performance of industrialists, entrepreneurs, executives.

**Historical Background of Achievement Motivation**

Although research on Achievement Motivation has comparatively a short history of development, but it is a subject matter of immense importance in Personality dynamics, its roots can be traced to James (1890), who talked of man's self regard as being determined by self imposed goals. The achievement of these goals leads to feelings of well-being, while failure results in feelings of frustration as
well as brings about social humiliation. Twenty years later in Germany Ach (1910) sought to explain the achievement related behaviour of his laboratory subjects. The construct of Achievement Motivation further finds a place in the works of Adler (1927). His concepts of 'inferiority complex', 'Masculine Protest', and striving for superiority all point to the gratification of achievement needs as an important goal of human behaviour. However, the formalization of the construct of achievement motive is primarily derived from the theory and work of Murray (1938), who stressed the importance of human needs in his system of Personality study. Murray and his colleagues (Fineman, 1968) conducted an in-depth 'multiform' study of 50 young male subjects; from this a taxonomy of personality needs emerged, which was defined as hypothetical constructs reflecting physiological 'forces' which direct behaviour. One of these needs was the need for achievement (abbreviated n-Ach). This motive was defined thus - 'The desire or tendency, to do things as rapidly and as well as possible.' It also includes the desire to accomplish something difficult, to master, manipulate and organize physical objects, human beings or ideas, to do this as rapidly and independently as possible, to overcome obstacles and attain a high standard, to excel one's self to rival and surpass others, and to increase self-regard by the successful exercise of talent (Murray, 1938). Lewin (1935) was one of the pioneers to study the 'upward striving' nature of human achievement aspirations and behaviour. He emphasized the importance of 'n-Ach' in
human experience. His contribution to the achievement oriented behaviour was his paradigm of level of aspiration.

McClelland (1951) was deeply influenced by Murray's findings regarding need systems. McClelland's formulations are rooted in the psychoanalytic school of motivation, an orientation which attests to the influence of Murray as well as of Freud. Earlier McClelland devoted himself to developing a general theory of Achievement Motivation (McClelland et al., 1953), in recent years however, the focus of his study has been on applying the theory to the problems of economic growth, as well as certain specific issues of entrepreneurial and managerial behaviour (McClelland, 1961; McClelland and Winter, 1969).

Atkinson (1957, 1964) talked of n-Ach in terms of the capacity for taking pride in accomplishment. His analysis of the antecedents of achievement behaviour focusses upon the motivation to achieve, as well as upon the motivation to avoid failure. Each of these motives, is seen as a function of two situational variables - the perceived expectancy of success and the incentive value of the task activity. Heckhausen (1967), developed a two motive theory of achievement behaviour. His motives are termed as 'hope of success' and 'fear of failure'. 'Hope of success' is defined as 'the striving to increase or keep as high as possible, one's own capability in all activities in which a standard of excellence is thought to apply and
where the execution of such activities can, therefore, either succeed or fail.'

The field of motivation research has undergone a few changes in the past few years. One of the most important changes in experimentation on motivation has been a shift from a primarily biological orientation (done mostly through extrapolation studies on animal motivation) to a greater attention to characteristics of human motivated behaviour. This further has lead to two major changes in assumptions in motivational theory, namely, that the important psychogenic motives are important, psychogenic motives are learned not instinctual and that they are somehow acquired by association with primary biological pleasure and pain (McClelland, 1951). A second major change has been a shift of emphasis from learning the 'how' of things to a process oriented approach to learning 'what' of things (a content-oriented approach). A third major change relates to the increasing emphasis which is now being placed on finding the clues of human behaviour in the family, the social, political, economic, and religious environment of the individual. Particularistic empirical approach in studies on motivation is now being preferred to a global approach.

**Measurement of Achievement Motive**

Many different measures have been devised for measuring this concept; These measures are mainly of the following three types:
(i) **Protective Measures**: The most common projective instruments are McClelland's Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) (McClelland et al., 1953), Graphic Expression Technique (Aronson, 1958), French Test of Insight (FTI) (French, 1958), Knapp Tartan Test (Knapp, 1958), and Heckhausen's Thematic Apperception Test (Heckhausen, 1967).

(ii) **Comprehensive Personality Inventories**: A few popular Personality inventories which incorporate achievement motive are: California Psychological Inventory (CPI) (Gough, 1957), Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) (Edwards, 1959), Adjective Check List (ACL) (Gough, 1960), Personality Research Form (PRF) (Jackson, 1967), Self Description Inventory (SDI) (Ghiselli, 1971).

(iii) **Specific Questionnaire Measures**: These are Robinson's Achievement Motivation Questionnaire (RAM*) (Argyle and Robinson, 1962), The Achievement Risk Preference Scales (ARPS) (O'Connor and Atkinson, 1962), Sherwood Achievement Scale (SAS) (Sherwood, 1966), Costello's Achievement Motivation Scale (CAMQ) (Costello, 1967), Mehrabian Achievement Scale (MAS) (Mehrabian, 1968), Lynn's Achievement Motivation Questionnaire (LAMQ) (Lynn, 1969), Herman's Achievement Motive Questionnaire (HAMQ) (Hermans, 1970).

It is reported that primary psychometric requirements of n-Ach measures are that its items or parts should be sufficiently homogeneous, i.e., have internal consistency,
stability across time and validity. In a study comparing projective and questionnaire measures of n-Ach, the internal consistency, test-retest reliability and validity of questionnaire measures were reported to be superior in comparison to those of projective measures. It could then be concluded that projective techniques failed when judged against certain traditional psychometric criteria. Thus, keeping this in view it was decided to study n-Ach, for the present investigation using Ray's Achievement Motivation Questionnaire which has a fairly high consistent reliability, internationally and also has superior validity (Ray, 1979).

For the present study Ray's Achievement Motivation Questionnaire has been used.
Research in the field of behaviour that is achievement-oriented has revealed certain findings of immense relevance to the area of Industrial Psychology, Managerial Psychology, Managerial Culture and Executive Effectiveness. Kurt Lewin was the pioneer of research in the area of achievement behaviour. Vroom (1965) stressed the importance of environmental and Personality factors in understanding work motivation. Since then much work has been done in this area (Vroom, 1967; Roy, 1971; Winter, 1973; Laxminarain, 1973; Dale, 1976; Wynn, 1980; Muthayya and Kumar, 1985; Misra, Kanungo, Rosenstiel and Stuhler, 1985; Bhatia, 1985).

Motivation acts as a set which predisposes the individual to adopt certain modes of behaviour. Achievement motive is a motive imparted to the individual by his socio-cultural milieu. It is the striving to increase or keep as high as possible one's own capability in all activities, in which a standard of excellence is thought to apply and where the execution of such activities can refer either success or failure.

Miles, Wilkins, Lester and Hutchins (1946), reported that scores on Achievement Motivation are related to effectiveness and better performance.

The achievement motive has been studied through observations, projective techniques and questionnaires.
McClelland and associates (1953) studied the effect of the n-Ach on TAT, to select administrative qualities and study capability of navy cadets.

French (1955), Wendt (1955), Atkinson and Raphaelson (1956), reported that individuals who are high on n-Ach are also effective on their task-performance.

McClelland and associates (1953) found that the strength of need to achieve is a basic dimension of personality. The high achievers were more resistant to social pressure and set for themselves moderately high but realistic targets and were optimistic about their attaining those targets.

French (1955) studied the Achievement Motivation of US Air Force Personnel and found that high achievers were not easily motivated by extrinsic rewards.

Bose (1958) argued that pleasant working conditions and satisfactory social relations contribute substantially to motivation.

Veroff, Atkinson, Feld and Gurin (1960) used TAT to assess motivation and found executives to be high on n-Ach. Achievement Motivation scores and social desirability scale (Crowne and Marlow, 1960) were related with need for approval.

The high achiever, it is seen, prefers moderate risks to high risks and low risk situations, is confident in predicting his performance and likes taking personal responsibilities for his actions. Moreover he has above average preference for
business occupations, at least this is so in the American culture. Thus Heckhausen (1967) suggested that the characteristics of the high need achievers are exactly those which economists associate with the entrepreneur.

However, McClelland (1961) revealed that top executives had lower achievement scores than the middle class executives, because their achievement aspirations were mostly satisfied.

Meyer, Walker and Litwin (1961) compared a group of executives to a group of specialists, and found the executives to be high on n-Ach.

Burnstein, Moulton and Liberty (1963) reported that those who have high Achievement Motivation also have a strong motivation to excel, given a choice between a job that demands excellence, or one in which prestige is the main attraction, such individuals will select the former. On the other hand those who have low achievement needs will probably select a position that has low standards of excellence, but entails substantial prestige.

Murray (1964) revealed that high achievers are those who are hard headed, ambitious and take risks.

Achievement motivation, it is realized, is extremely important for economic growth (Kock, 1965; Andrews 1966; Levin, 1966; Sheppard and Belitsky, 1966; McClelland and Winter, 1969). It not only facilitates but also enhances economic growth. Studies and research findings have revealed
that companies led by executives high on Achievement Motivation are very much successful, and their production is double the amount of production of companies that are led by executives having low Achievement Motivation.

At the micro organizational level Morgan (1964) demonstrated that the mean capital income of self-employed businessman was 75% greater for those with high Achievement Motivation, than for those with low Achievement Motivation.

Hundal (1964, 1971, 1977) revealed that the growth of the companies was higher where entrepreneurs had high nAch.

Klinger (1966), O'Gorman (1974), reported that high achievers were more productive and efficient, and showed better emotional adjustment. Thus performance measure was found to be related to high scores on Achievement Motivation.

Bray and Grant (1966), Bray, Grant and Katkovsky (1967), Hinrichs (1967), Wollowich and MacNamara (1969), found Executive Effectiveness, managerial success and Achievement Motivation to be positively correlated with each other.

In the same line Andrews (1967), Birney (1968), Argyle (1972), Anantharaman, Deivasenapathy (1979) opined that successful executives had high n-Ach, or Achievement Motivation.

Lynn (1969) developed a measure of Achievement Motivation on 3 groups of successful people, i.e., entrepreneurs, professors and managers.
Executives who are high on n-Ach are happier doing jobs that are high in variety, identity, significance, autonomy and feedback. (Lawler, 1969; Pierce and Dunham, 1976).

McClelland and Winter (1969) maintained that organizations with high n-Ach performed much better than those who had a high need for power.

Companies led by entrepreneurs with high Achievement Motivation were almost 25% higher (.73 versus .21), on effective performance, than those companies led by entrepreneurs with moderate achievement (Wainer and Rubin, 1969). These findings are supported by Kock (1965), Morris and Fargher (1974), Hundal and Singh (1975) and Singh and Jaiswal (1977).

Findings suggest that executives with strong needs for achievement will react to more interesting, challenging jobs by performing better and feeling more satisfied. (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick, 1970). Thus

\[ \text{Performance} = \text{Ability} \times \text{Motivation} \]

However the individual may regard his job as more challenging and interesting, but not be motivated, because his n-Ach remains basically unchanged. On the other hand he may be attached to the organization but lack the required abilities to perform effectively.

Rosenbaum (1971) and Kukla (1972) presented evidence that individuals with different levels of Achievement Motivation, have separate explanations for their success or failure. Highly motivated individuals ascribe success to their own ability and efforts, than do subjects who are low on motivation.

Kumar (1970) found successful and effective executives to be achievement oriented, challenging, stimulating, task-oriented and creative.

"Enriched jobs" are often associated with effectiveness, satisfaction and increased performance (Hackman and Lawler, 1971, 1976; Porter and Steers, 1973; Pritchard and Peters, 1974; Wanous, 1974; Brief and Aldag, 1975; Staw, 1976; Stone, 1976; Umstot, Bell and Mitchell, 1976).

Salas (1973) assessed achievement, self improvement and career consideration, regarding the defence personnel of Australia.

Sundaram (1973) maintained that traditional system of relationships and values, leadership charisma, bureaucratic set-up are the causes of lack of managerial motivation in the public sector in India.

Husaini (1974) in a cross-cultural study of Achievement Motivation and self-esteem studied Indian and American students, n-Ach it was seen was positively correlated with self-esteem, for American students but only marginally for Indian students.
McClelland and Burnham (1976) conducted a survey among a number of managers in a company and revealed that power motivation rather than Achievement Motivation is conducive to Executive Effectiveness. This power motivation should be tempered with maturity and self-control.

Armstrong (1977) opined that to motivate executives negative rewards and inhibitory factors must be eliminated, focus should be on rewards which executives value and which are based on human needs, as many rewards as is possible should be structured to a heavy dependence on effort, and reliance should be primarily on developing favourable attitudes and secondarily on developing the process.

Mohan and Kapoor (1977) on the basis of their study on MBA's found them to be superior in general ability and highly motivated.

Tuli (1977) maintained that the executive has to deal with three variables:

(i) human resources
(ii) the job factors
(iii) the organizational set-up

In the existing organization the human element will have to be taken as "given" and the other two to be adapted to Achievement Motivation. Reward systems influence motivation which depends on 4 things:
(a) Personality differences of employees
(b) Nature of the job
(c) The organizational climate;
(d) Executive's own value orientation style.

The executive should be deeply concerned with the motivational problems of the staff.

Singh and Jaswal (1977) on the basis of their findings opined that high scores on Achievement Motivation and moderate success on risk-taking were associated with business success, lower scores on Achievement Motivation and high scores on risk taking behaviour were associated with declining business.

Adams and Stone (1978) were of the opinion that the executives whose Achievement Motivation was not satisfied on the job were more likely to engage in high achievement-oriented leisure activities than those whose Achievement Motivation was satisfied on the job.

Dolke and Sutaria (1978) reported that high achievers were found to be motivation seekers and low achievers were found to be hygiene seekers. They further found that Personality dimensions of Extraversion/Introversion, and Neuroticism/Stability were not strongly related to motivation.

Agarwal and Tripathi (1978, 1980) maintained that achievement-oriented executives are also future-oriented.

Khetan (1979) pointed out the following points, that an executive must always keep in mind, so as to be effective,
viz.,

(a) Concentration on achievement.
(b) Concentration on motivation.

Singh (1979) maintained that the findings of McClelland and his associates supported the hypothesis that at macro and micro levels Achievement Motivation promoted entrepreneurship. Singh and Ray (1980), Hay and Singh (1980) found Achievement Motivation to be influential in increasing economic production among middle-class Indian farmers.

According to Prakasam (1979) potential motivational forces of the top management have a significant impact upon the organizational climate, which in turn influences the motivational tendencies of the employees. It was seen that the top management executives in industries with high production were high on need for achievement as compared to the top management of the industries with low production.

Franklin (1980) viewed motivation as an important factor in Executive Effectiveness. It is essential for the executive administrator to create a work place where positive performance and performance improvement are likely to occur. He should avoid dissipating energy on questionable and futile attempts to motivate the unmotivated, and by making promises that cannot be delivered. He should be motivated to give personal attention to all the work and should be himself a good model.

CHARATE (1980) in a study on army executives found Majors to be higher on Achievement Motivation than lieutenant Colonels and Captains. Thus the Majors were found to be ambitious.
and better in emotional adjustment.

Motivation, logic, creativity are the important requisites for Executive Effectiveness, according to Patwardhan (1981). Kalra (1981) listed the chief motivators that motivate Indian managers. These were job-security and intrinsic factors like opportunities and satisfaction.

Komarraju (1981) reported that middle managers in the private sector had a greater deal of intrinsic motivation than their counterparts in the public sector.

Ray (1981a) opined that better educated individuals should be higher on Achievement Motivation.

Pareek and Keshote (1981) in a comparison of two cross-cultural executives viz., Indian and Malaysian revealed that Indian executives showed a high preference for motivators like technically competent, considerate, sympathetic superior.

High performing motivated organizational executives according to Vaille (1982) have the following:

- clarity of purpose;
- member motivation;
- team work;
- leadership;
- technical competence and innovation;
- boundedness from the environment;
- relationship to the environment;
- the unique ways in which the system "jells!"
Warrier (1982) suggested that characteristics of successful executives are high n-Ach, work centrality, efficient perception of reality and acceptance of it, a healthy dependance on one's own efforts.

Machungwa and Schmitt (1983) held the view that nature of work, growth and advancement opportunities, material and physical provisions, all act as motivators.

Maitra (1983) found that effective executives were more intellectually motivated, had high drive and activity orientation.

Prasad (1983) emphasized the fact that the executives value achievement and self-actualization. Further he maintained that competent policy and administrative opportunities for growth are effective motivators.

Chusmir (1984) in a study on the motivational need patterns for police officers reported that effective police officers have high need for power and moderate need for achievement.

Gupta (1984) has given certain motivators and inhibitors known to affect executive performance and effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivators</th>
<th>Inhibitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial compensation</td>
<td>Lack of consistency in management policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and recognition</td>
<td>Lack of clarity of objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in decision making</td>
<td>Lack of clear definition of responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baumgartel, Reynolds and Pathan (1984) reported that executives high on n-Ach were more likely to apply new knowledge and skills on the job.

Orpen (1985) opined that only executives with strong needs for achievement and independence will react to more interesting and challenging jobs by performing better and feeling more satisfied.

It has been realised theoretically as well as practically that effectiveness is deeply couched in the motivational dynamics of the executives.