SUMMARY
The primary aim of the present investigation was to study the effects of organizational ownership pattern, viz. public versus private and levels of management on Managerial Effectiveness, Eysenckian dimensions of Personality, motives, organizational commitment and Quality of Working Life. Thus a two way factorial design (2 x 3) was envisaged with two levels of organizational ownership (public and private sectors) and three levels of management (top, middle and lower), yielding six conditions. The number of replications in each condition was forty, so the total number of subjects were 240. Keeping the conditions of organizational ownership pattern and levels of management in view, the division of the sample of 240 managers was as follows:
(a) 120 public sector managers and 120 private sector managers;
(b) 80 top level managers, 80 middle level managers and 80 lower level managers.

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.

To measure managerial effectiveness, Managerial Position Analysis Test, constructed by Reddin (1985) was used. Revised version of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire developed by Eysenck et al (1985) was used to measure the Personality dimensions of Extraversion, Neuroticism, Psychoticism and the (Social Desirability) Scale. Questionnaire measures constructed by Misra and Tripathi
(1980) were employed to measure the four motives, viz. need for Achievement, need for Affiliation, need for Power and need for Approval. Organizational Commitment Scale of Cook and Wall (1980) was used to measure organizational commitment. Different dimension of Quality of Working Life were measured by the Quality of Working Life Inventory developed by Sinha and Sayeed (1980).

Analysis of Variance, Pearson's Product Moment Correlations and Factor Analysis were the statistical analysis used to analyse the raw data.

The main findings based on Analysis of Variance, Correlational Analysis and Factor Analysis can be summed up as follows:

ORGANIZATIONAL OWNERSHIP PATTERN

1. Ownership pattern emerged as a significant determiner of one management style, viz. Bureaucrat. It was found to be a significant determiner of need for Achievement. Ownership pattern was also a significant determiner of Quality of Working Life dimension of Career Orientation, Self Respect, Control, Influence and Participation and organizational commitment.

2. Ownership pattern was not a significant determiner of Developer style, Benevolent-Autocrat style, Executive style, Deserter style, Missionary style, Autocrat style and Compromiser style. Ownership pattern was not a significant determiner of the Eysenckian dimensions of Personality, viz. Extraversion, Neuroticism, Psychoticism and Lie (Social Desirability) Scale. Ownership pattern was found to be an insignificant determiner of the following motives, viz. need for Affiliation, need for Power...
and need for Approval. It was also found to be an insignificant
determiner of organizational commitment and the following dimensions
of Quality of Working Life viz. Economic Benefits, Physical Working
Conditions, Mental State, Advancement on Merit, Effect on Personal
Life, Union Management Relations, Supervisory Relationship,
Intragroup Relations, Sense of Achievement versus Apathy,
Confidence in Management, Meaningful Development, Employee
Commitment and General Life Satisfaction.

LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Levels of management emerged, as a significant determiner
doing managerial style and compromiser managerial style. Levels of management was found to be a significant determiner of
a single dimension of Personality viz. Extraversion. It emerged
as a significant determiner of a motive, viz. need for Approval.
Levels of management was also a significant determiner of the
following dimensions of Quality of Working Life, viz. Career
Orientation, Confidence in Management and Control, Influence
and Participation.

Levels of Management was not found to be a significant
determiner of the following managerial styles, viz. Bureaucrat,
Developer, Benevolent-Autocrat, Executive, Deserter and Missionary.
It also emerged as an insignificant determiner of the other three
dimensions of Personality viz. Neuroticism, Psychoticism and Lie
(Social Desirability) Scale. Levels of management was not a
significant determiner of the following motives, viz. need for Achievement, need for Affiliation and need for Power. It was also found to be an insignificant determiner of organizational commitment. Levels of management was found to be an insignificant determiner of the following dimensions of Quality of Working Life, viz. Economic Benefits, Physical Working Conditions, Mental State, Advancement on Merit, Effect on Personal Life, Union Management Relations, Self Respect, Supervisory Relationship, Intragroup Relations, Sense of Achievement versus Apathy, Meaningful Development, Employee Commitment, General Life Satisfaction and Organizational Climate.

INTERACTIONS

The two factor interactions of type of organization and levels of management were found significant for Benevolent-Autocrat managerial style and Quality of Working Life dimension of Self Respect.

CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS

1. It was found that Bureaucrat managerial style was negatively and significantly related to Neuroticism in the total sample of managers, the private sector managers, and the top level managers. It was negatively related to Lie (Social Desirability) Scale in the lower level managers. Results revealed that Bureaucrat managerial style was negatively related to the need for Affiliation in the total
sample, the private sector managers and the middle level managers. This style was not related to organizational commitment. In case of Quality of Working Life dimensions, Bureaucrat managerial style was indicated to be positively associated with Career Orientation, Supervisory Relationship in the private sector managers. It was positively correlated to Physical Working Condition in the middle level managers; and was found to be positively related to Mental State in the lower level managers but negatively so in the middle level managers. It was indicated to be negatively related to Union Management Relations in the public sector managers.

2. Developer managerial style was positively and significantly associated with Neuroticism in the private sector managers and the lower level managers. In case of Personality dimension of Lie (Social Desirability) Scale, this style was positively and significantly related to it in the top level managers and negatively and significantly related to it in the lower level managers. Developer managerial style was negatively related to need for Power in the top level managers. This style was found to be positively and significantly related to organizational commitment in the public sector managers and the middle level managers. Developer managerial style was positively associated with Quality of Working Life dimensions of Union Management Relations and Organizational Climate in the total sample. It was revealed to be positively related to Economic Benefits and Union Management Relations in the
middle level managers. In case of the lower level managers, this style was found to be negatively related to Economic Benefits.

3. Benevolent-Autocrat managerial style was not found to be associated to any personality dimension in any group except negatively to Lie (Social Desirability) Scale in the public sector managers. This style was found to be positively associated to need for Affiliation in the public sector managers and need for Achievement in the private sector managers. Benevolent-Autocrat managerial style showed no correlation with organizational commitment. Benevolent-Autocrat managerial style was negatively associated with Quality of Working Life dimension of Physical Working Conditions and Meaningful Development in the total sample. It was negatively related with Physical Working Conditions in the public sector managers. In case of the private sector managers, Benevolent—Autocrat style was negatively correlated with Career Orientation and Meaningful Development. This style was negatively associated with Organizational Climate in the top level managers.

4. Executive managerial style was positively related to Neuroticism in the total sample, the public and the private sector managers and the top level managers. This style was positively correlated to need for Affiliation in the total sample, the private sector managers and the middle level managers, and was negatively related to the need for Power in the public sector managers. It was found to be negatively correlated to need for Affiliation in lower level managers. This style too was not related to organizational
commitment. Executive managerial style was negatively related to Quality of Working Life dimension of Mental State in the total sample and the lower level managers and was negatively related to Union Management Relations in the private sector managers.

5. Deserter managerial style was observed to be positively associated with Extraversion in the total sample as well as in the top level managers and was negatively related to Psychoticism in the lower level managers. This style was negatively related to need for Affiliation in the total sample, the public sector managers and the middle level managers and was negatively associated to need for Approval in the total sample. Deserter managerial style was not correlated to organizational commitment. This managerial style was negatively related to Quality of Working Life dimension of Physical Working Conditions, Effect on Personal Life, Self Respect, Intragroup Relations, Meaningful Development, Sense of Achievement versus Apathy, Control, Influence and Participation and Employee Commitment in the total sample. Deserter managerial style was negatively related to Quality of Working Life dimensions of Advancement on Merit, Self Respect, Intragroup Relations, Control, Influence and Participation and Employee Commitment in the public sector managers and was negatively related to Effect on Personal Life and Employee Commitment in the private sector managers. It was positively correlated to Mental State in the private sector managers. In case of the lower level managers, this managerial style was negatively associated with Quality of
Working Life dimensions of Effect on Personal Life, Self Respect, Intragroup Relations, Sense of Achievement versus Apathy, Employee Commitment and General Life Satisfaction.

6. Missionary managerial style was found to be positively correlated to Lie (Social Desirability) Scale in the total sample, the public and the private sector managers, as well as in the top level managers. It was positively associated with Neuroticism in the middle level managers and to Psychoticism in the lower level managers, while it was negatively related to Extraversion in the total sample. This managerial style was positively correlated to need for Approval in the middle level managers. Missionary managerial style was positively and significantly related to organizational commitment in the total sample. This managerial style was positively related to Quality of Working Life dimension of Employee Commitment and Sense of Achievement versus Apathy in the total sample and to Union Management Relations and Employee Commitment in the public sector managers, while for private sector managers, it was positively related to Effect on Personal Life. In case of middle level managers this style was positively associated to Quality of Working Life dimensions of Economic Benefits, Advancement on Merit, Self Respect, Intragroup Relations, Sense of Achievement versus Apathy, Confidence in Management, Control Influence and Participation, Employee Commitment and Organizational Climate and was positively related to Effect on Personal Life in the lower level managers. It was also indicated that the top level managers scoring high on this style would have a negative perception of Quality of Working Life dimension of Career Orientation.
7. Autocrat managerial style was negatively related to Psychoticism in the private sector managers. As regards motives, this style was negatively related to need for Achievement in the total sample, the private sector managers and the lower level managers and it was positively associated to need for Affiliation in the public sector managers and the top level managers. This style had no correlation with organizational commitment. In case of Quality of Working Life dimensions, Autocrat managerial style was positively related to Advancement on Merit, Effect on Personal Life, Self Respect, Intragroup Relations, Employee Commitment, General Life Satisfaction and Organizational Climate in the total sample, while in the public sector managers it showed a positive correlation with Advancement on Merit, Effect on Personal Life, Self Respect, Supervisory Relationship, Intragroup Relations, Meaningful Development, General Life Satisfaction and Organizational Climate. This style was positively related to Employee Commitment in the private sector managers and was positively related to Effect on Personal Life, Intragroup Relations, Employee Commitment and Organizational Climate in the middle level managers. In case of the lower level managers Autocrat managerial style was positively associated with Quality of Working Life dimensions of Physical Working conditions, Self Respect, Intragroup Relations, Confidence in Management, Employee Commitment and Organizational Climate.

8. Compromiser managerial style was positively related to Psychoticism in the total sample, the private sector managers
and the middle level managers. It was negatively associated to Lie (Social Desirability) Scale in the total sample, the public and the private sector managers, the top, the middle and the lower level managers. In case of motives, this style was negatively related to need for achievement in the total sample and the private sector managers. Compromiser style had no relationship with organizational commitment. As regards quality of working life dimensions, Compromiser managerial style was negatively related to effect on personal life, general life satisfaction and organizational climate in the total sample and was negatively related to advancement on merit, effect on personal life, supervisory relationship, sense of achievement versus apathy, confidence in management, employee commitment, general life satisfaction and organizational climate in the public sector managers. In case of the top level managers, Compromiser managerial style was positively related to intragroup relations and negatively to mental state. This managerial style was found to be negatively associated with quality of working life dimension of effect on personal life, self respect, supervisory relationship, intragroup relations, sense of achievement versus apathy, confidence in management, control, influence and participation, general life satisfaction and organizational climate in the middle level managers.

Factor Analysis

As a result of varimax rotation twelve factors emerged for the total sample, twelve for the public sector managers and
twelve for the private sector managers. Fourteen factors emerged for the top level managers, fourteen for the middle level managers and fourteen for the lower level managers.

Of these factors, only four factors for the total sample, five factors for the public sector managers, six factors for the private sector managers, five factors for the top level managers, six factors for the middle level managers and six factors for the lower level managers were retained for meaningful and detailed discussion keeping in view the objectives of the study.

Factor analysis revealed that there was almost a complete exclusion of Personality, motivational, organizational commitment and Quality of Working Life variables from factor structures in case of the total sample; of motivational, organizational commitment and Quality of Working Life variables in case of the top level managers and of Personality and motivational variables in the public sector managers. In case of the private sector managers and the middle level managers, managerial effectiveness was related with some Personality and motivational variables and some Quality of Working Life dimensions. In the lower level managers there was a complete exclusion of Personality dimensions except Lie (Social Desirability) Scale, motives, organizational commitment from factor structure and managerial effectiveness was only related to some Quality of Working Life dimensions.