METHOD
DESIGN

The main aim of the present investigation was to study the effects of organizational ownership pattern, viz. public versus private sector and levels of management, viz. top, middle and lower on Managerial Effectiveness measured through Reddin's Managerial Styles Questionnaire, Eysenckian dimensions of personality, viz. Extraversion, Neuroticism, Psychoticism and Lie (Social Desirability) Scale, motives, viz. need for Achievement, need for Affiliation, need for Power and need for Approval, organizational commitment and Quality of Working Life (QWL), viz. Economic Benefits, Physical Working Conditions, Mental State, Career Orientation, Advancement on Merit, Effect on Personal Life, Union Management Relations, Self Respect, Supervisory Relationship, Intragroup Relations, Sense of Achievement vs. Apathy, Confidence in Management, Meaningful Development, Control, Influence and Participation, Employee Commitment, General Life Satisfaction and Organizational Climate. Thus, a two way factorial design was envisaged (2 x 3) with two levels of ownership (public and private sector) and three levels of management (top, middle and lower) yielding six conditions. The number of replications in each condition was 40, thus yielding a sample of 240 subjects.

The secondary aim of the present investigation was to study the relationship of Managerial Effectiveness with Eysenckian dimensions of personality, motives, organizational commitment and Quality of Working Life.
Managerial Effectiveness was measured with the help of Managerial Position Analysis Test (MPAT) constructed by Reddin (1985) which yields eight managerial styles. Out of these eight styles, four are labelled effective styles, viz. Bureaucrat, Developer, Benevolent-Autocrat and Executive and four are labelled ineffective styles, viz. Deserter, Missionary, Autocrat and Compromiser by Reddin (1985). To measure Eysenckian personality dimensions, viz. Extraversion, Neuroticism, Psychoticism and Lie (Social Desirability) Scale, the revised version of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ-R) developed by Eysenck, Eysenck and Barrett (1985) was used. The four motives, viz. need for Achievement, need for Affiliation, need for Power and need for Approval were measured by questionnaire measures constructed by Misra and Tripathi (1980). Organizational Commitment Scale of Cook and Wall (1980) was used to measure organizational commitment. The Quality of Working Life (QWL) Inventory developed by Sinha and Sayeed (1980) was used to measure the different dimensions of Quality of Working Life.

SAMPLE

The sample comprising of 240 managers was drawn randomly from among managers of electronic industries of public and private sectors. Care was taken to see that these organizations were comparable on structural variables like size, capital investment and technology. Of the total sample, half of the managers i.e. 120 were selected randomly from public sector units and an equal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Sample (240 Managers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sector Managers</strong> (120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector Managers</strong> (120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top level Managers (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level Managers (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower level Managers (40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A**

**Design (2x3)**
number were selected from private sector units. Respondents were selected in equal numbers from three hierarchical levels, viz. top management, middle management and lower management (Table A). The hierarchy was based on position, salary structure and designation.

The mean age of top level managers was 38.68 years; of middle level managers 33.63 years and of lower level managers 28.90 years.

The educational qualifications of managers ranged from B.A. and M.A. degrees in Arts, Commerce, Sciences, Engineering, and Management.

TESTS

The following tests were used:

2. Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised (EPQ-R) (Eysenck, Eysenck and Barrett, 1985).
3. Motive Scales (Misra and Tripathi, 1980).
4. Organizational Commitment Scale (Cook and Wall, 1980).
5. Quality of Working Life Inventory (Sinha and Sayeed, 1980).

Reddin's Managerial Position Analysis Test (MPAT)

The MPAT was developed by Reddin (1985) on the basis of the 3-dimensional Managerial Style theory put forth by him in 1970.
This scale measures eight managerial styles, viz. Bureaucrat style, Developer style, Benevolent-Autocrat style, Executive style, Deserter style, Missionary style, Autocrat style and Compromiser style. A central part of Reddin's 3-Dimensional theory of Managerial Effectiveness is that there are four basic styles of management behaviour, viz. the Integrated style, the Dedicated style, the Related style and the Separated style. The two basic dimensions are Task Orientation (TO) and Relationship Orientation (RO). The third dimension is Managerial Effectiveness (E). The theory maintains and research has clearly established that there is no one best or ideal style, but rather effectiveness results from using the style more appropriate for the situation. This means that each of the four basic styles is seen as more effective when used appropriately and less effective when used inappropriately.

This results in eight managerial styles in which four effective styles are:-

(1) Bureaucrat: is one who follows orders/rules and procedures, is reliable/dependable/maintains the system as a going concern/ watches details/is efficient/rational/logical/self controlled/fair/ just/and equitable.

(2) Developer: is one who maintains open communication channels/develops the talents of others/coaches/and understands others/supports/works well with others/co-operates/is trusted by others/he also trusts others/ and listens to them.
(3) Benevolent-Autocrat: is one who is decisive/shows initiative/is industrious/energetic/is a finisher/committed/evaluative of quantity, time and costs/and obtains results.

(4) Executive: is one who uses team work in decision making/uses participation appropriately/induces commitment to objectives/encourages higher performance/and co-ordinates others in work.

The four ineffective styles are:

(5) Deserter: is one who works to rules/minimum output/gives up/avoids involvement and responsibility/gives few useful opinions or suggestions/make things difficult/resists change/and is uncooperative.

(6) Missionary: is one who avoids conflicts/is pleasant/warm and kind/seeks acceptance of self/is dependent/makes things easier/avoids initiation/is passive/gives no direction and is unconcerned with outputs and standards.

(7) Autocrat: is one who is critical/threatening/demands obedience/suppresses conflict/has downward communication only/acts without consultation/sometimes feared/and disliked.

(8) Compromiser: is one who is yielding/sometimes weak/avoids decisions/produces grey acceptable decisions/is ambiguous/and is distrusted or not understood.

This scale has a total of three hundred and twenty items. Each style can be measured with a maximum of forty assigned items. The test has eight rows of four alternative phrases. The
respondents were asked to choose two of the given four phrases/statements in each row. The responses of the respondents are then transferred on to an analysis sheet to obtain their scores on each of the eight managerial styles. This test has been used in India by Pinder and Pinto (1974), Singh and Das (1977), Mohan and Jahangiri (1985), Mohan and Rattan (1987) and Sehgal and Rana (1990) who found it to be fairly satisfactory and with adequate psychometric properties.

**Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised (EPQ-R)**

EPQ-R has been developed by Eysenck et al. (1985). The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire was originally constructed by Eysenk and Eysenck (1975) to measure Extraversion (E), Neuroticism (N), and Psychoticism (P). It also consists of a Lie (Social Desirability) Scale.

Regarding the scores on Lie (Social Desirability) Scale a number of interpretations have been offered by different persons. It is variously described as "desire to conform to social norms" (Edwards, 1959 and Edwards and Heathers, 1962), "ideal self" (Michaelis and Eysenck, 1971), "nice personality" (Skinner et al., 1970), "motivational distortion" (Cattell, 1965), etc. It is also called "faking good" response set. The subject has a motivation to give a false picture of self, rather a better picture of self than he really is. This tendency has been viewed as more or less an error to be avoided or response bias to be overcome, counter balanced or suitably corrected. Lately there has been a tendency
amongst various investigators to consider it as a separate, independent and powerful personal factor, to be measured in its own right (Edwards, 1964; Michaelis and Eysenck, 1971 and Verma, 1977). The present study did not attempt to exclude cases on the basis of Lie (Social Desirability) Scale, instead Lie (Social Desirability) Scale has been used as an important dimension of personality, to be measured in its own right.

The scale was revised by Eysenck et al. (1985) to improve the psychometric weakness of the Psychoticism scale. The revised version of the scale, consists of hundred dichotomously responded items, twenty three items for the Extraversion scale, twenty four for the Neuroticism scale, thirty two for the Psychoticism scale and twenty one for the Lie (Social Desirability) Scale.

The alpha reliabilities for the revised scale have been found to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EPQ-R has been extensively used in India by Verma and Wig (1972), Hundal and Upmanyu (1981), Upmanyu, Gill and Singh (1982), Sehgal (1984), Upmanyu and Singh (1984), Gahalawt (1986), Mohan (1986), Bhandari and Khan (1987), Bhandari and
Sarup (1987), Mohan et al. (1987, 1989), Mohan and Virdi (1987), Tayal (1987), Arora (1990) and Gujral (1990), and was found to be suitable.

Motive Scales (Misra and Tripathi, 1980)

Four questionnaire measures developed by Misra and Tripathi (1980) were used to measure, need for Achievement, need for Affiliation, need for Power and need for Approval.

The measure for need for Achievement consisted of twelve items. The measure for need for Affiliation consisted of eleven items; the measure for need for Power consisted of nine items and the measure for need for Approval consisted of twelve items.

The responses of subjects with regard to items were given scores from 1 to 5, according to the intensity of concerned motive. The five response alternatives were:

- To a very great extent 5
- To a great extent 4
- To some extent 3
- To a small extent 2
- Almost no extent 1

The score of subject was total score obtained by him on all scale items. The items were constructed in such a way that in about fifty percent of the items positive responses indicated presence of high motive.
As reported by the authors, test-retest reliability co-efficients are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motive Scales</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Coefficient of reliability</th>
<th>Index of reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The odd-even split-half reliability of the scales of various motive scales as reported by the authors is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motive Scales</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Coefficient of reliability</th>
<th>Index of reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motive scales have been successfully used in India by Sehgal and Bhandari (1987), Sehgal and Tayal (1990) and Gujral (1990), and found to be suitable.

**Organizational Commitment**

A nine-item scale by Cook and Wall (1980) was used to tap the respondents' organizational commitment. The scale
comprises of three dimensions: Organizational identity, Organizational involvement, and Organizational loyalty. A principal component analysis using varimax rotation revealed that the three dimensions were clustered together in the rotated factor matrix; hence they were treated as one single factor i.e. organizational commitment (Cook and Wall, 1980).

Of the nine items, six were positively worded and three were negatively worded.

For each item, the respondents' task was to indicate on a seven point scale, the extent to which he agreed or disagreed with the given item. Maximum agreement was to be indicated by circling 'A' and maximum disagreement with 'G', with the provision of a range of 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E' and 'F' in between. The summation of the scores on all items is done to find out the total score for organizational commitment. Ansari (1990) used this test in India and found it reliable.

Quality of Working Life (QWL) Inventory

The Quality of Working Life (QWL) Inventory was constructed by Sinha and Sayeed in 1980. The QWL Inventory is a scale having seventeen dimensions to measure various aspects of work life. In all there are 85 items in the inventory, measuring seventeen dimensions of QWL. The seventeen dimensions of QWL and their operational definitions are as follows:

(1) Economic Benefits (EB): Receiving adequate monetary income and financial rewards.
(2) Physical Working Conditions (PWC): Conditions affecting physical comfort and convenience on and at the job.
(3) Mental State (MS): Feeling good vs feeling of depression or being upset at work.
(4) Career Orientation (CO): Progressing for career objectives and having opportunities for progress.
(5) Advancement on Merit (AM): The extent to which rewards and punishments are based on merit.
(6) Effect on Personal Life (EPL): Effect of job on personal life. The hangover effect on the individual which may be positive or negative.
(7) Union Management Relations (UMR): The relationship between Union and Management, consideration of each other's point of view.
(8) Self Respect (SR): The feeling of being treated as an adult with respect and due dignity.
(9) Supervisory Relationship (RS): The relationship with the supervisor and mutual understanding.
(10) Intragroup Relations (IGR): The way workers in a group interact.
(11) Sense of Achievement vs Apathy (A): The workers' concern and ambition for work.
(12) Confidence in Management (CM): Beliefs that the management is aware of and concerned about workers' problems and interests.
Meaningful Development (MD) : Opportunity to learn more and apply skills and abilities meaningfully and in a challenging way.

Control, Influence and Participation (CIP) : The extent to which workers are involved in decision making, their influence and control.

Employee Commitment (EC) : Loyalty to company and concern for its future.

General Life Satisfaction (GLS) : Fulfilment of 'life' needs apart from the work situation, i.e. in family, in society and so on.

Organizational Climate (OC) : The organization's outlook and approach in the interest of the workers for the betterment of the industry.

The subject's task was to assess on a seven point scale for each item the extent to which a particular feature/characteristic was present in his/her job situation. The summation of the scores on all the items for a particular dimension is done in order to find out the presence of that dimension of Quality of Working Life in the respondent's organization. A high score on each dimension of Quality of Working Life indicates a positive perception of QWL.

The alpha reliability of the inventory was found to be .97 (Sinha and Sayeed, 1980). The inventory has been successfully

PROCEDURE

The subjects were selected randomly and contacted individually. They were requested to volunteer for the testing schedules. Rapport was established with each subject and they were assured that any information given by them, would be kept strictly confidential. They were requested to give honest and truthful replies.

A set of five questionnaires was given to each of them. They started by filling the Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire, followed by Organizational Commitment Scale. Next they filled up Misra and Tripathi's Questionnaire measures of motives followed by the Quality of Working Life Inventory. Lastly, they filled up Reddin's Managerial Position Analysis Test. All the tests were administered individually. A short break was given before the administration of the MPAT.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Instructions for the Managerial Position Analysis Test (MPAT)

Instructions for MPAT were: "The Questionnaire consists of 80 sets of four statements each. You must select two statements in each set, which describe what you actually do in the job you now have. It is very important that you select two statements in each set. You may sometimes find that none of the statements
apply. If so, select the two statements which best describe what you would do, if you had to make a choice amongst the four statements given. The questionnaire begins at the left side of the booklet. Read the first set of four statements and select the two statements which apply most closely to what you actually do in the job you now have. When you have made your selections encircle the number which appears at the upper left of each statement. Move to the next set of four statements and continue to work your way through the Questionnaire. When you have completed the Questionnaire you will have encircled 160 numbers."

Instructions for the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire - Revised (EPQ-R)

Instructions for the EPQ-R were: "Please answer each question by putting a circle around the 'Yes' or the 'No' following the question. There are no right or wrong answers, and no trick questions. Work quickly and do not think too long about the exact meaning of the questions. Please check that you have answered all the questions."

Instructions for the Questionnaire measures of motives, viz. need for Achievement, need for Affiliation, need for Power and need for Approval

Instructions for the Questionnaire measures of need for Achievement, need for Affiliation, need for Power and need for Approval were:
"Answer the following questions choosing any one of the given five alternatives indicating your degree of agreement with the statements:

To a very great extent  5
To a great extent       4
To some extent          3
To a small extent       2
Almost no extent        1

There are no right or wrong answers. Please check that you have answered all the questions."

Instructions for the Organizational Commitment Scale

Instructions for the Organizational Commitment scale were:
"Will you please indicate on this scale how much you agree or disagree with each statement in turn?"

Yes, I strongly agree      A
Yes, I agree quite a lot   B
Yes, I agree just a little C
I am not sure              D
No, I disagree just a little E
No, I disagree quite a lot F
No, I strongly disagree    G

Instructions for the Quality of Working Life Inventory

Instructions for the Quality of Working Life Inventory were:
"Given ahead are some statements and questions about certain characteristics related to your work and working conditions. Please assign weightages to these in terms of how much of these are
present in your employment. On the right side of each item/question/statement/quotation you would find a scale which would describe your views and feelings in terms of numerical values. The scale is from 1 to 7. **All you have to do is to rate on seven point scale on a continuum from minimum (1) to maximum (7), the number (4) stands for average.**

Thus in case of all items in this section, your agreement or disagreement, satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and your feelings positive or negative have to be answered from a minimum (1) to maximum (7). So, give your judgements to each and every item as specified above. Remember again we want your views opinions and feelings, not others, so please do not consult anyone.

So go ahead, read carefully the items/quotations/questions/statements and give your frank answers."

**SCORING**

All the afore-mentioned tests, viz. the Management Position Analysis Test, the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire - Revised, the Questionnaire measures of motives, viz. need for achievement, need for affiliation, need for power and need for approval, Organizational Commitment Scale and the Quality of Working Life Inventory were scored according to the procedures given in the respective manuals. The raw scores obtained were statistically analyzed.