CHAPTER – VII

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In the earlier chapter researcher has described findings on the basis of the interpretation. In this chapter, researcher would like to discuss conclusion and suggestions.

**Chi-square value of Organizational Effectiveness:**

♦ There is no association between type of the organizations and consensus component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between age and consensus component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between educational background and consensus component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between experience and consensus component of organizational effectiveness.

♦ There is no association between income and consensus component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and legitimization component of organizational effectiveness.

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between age and legitimization component of organizational effectiveness.
♦ There is no association between educational background and legitimization component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between experience and legitimization component of organizational effectiveness.

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and legitimization component of organizational effectiveness.

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and need for independence component of organizational effectiveness.

♦ There is no association between age and need for the independence component of organizational effectiveness.(chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between educational background and need for independence component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between experience and need for independence component of organizational effectiveness.( chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and need for independence component of organizational effectiveness.

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and self control component of organizational effectiveness.

♦ There is no association between age and self control component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)
There is no association between educational background and self control component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between experience and self control component of organizational effectiveness.

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and self control component of organizational effectiveness.

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and job involvement component of organizational effectiveness.

There is no association between age of the respondents and job involvement component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and job involvement component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between experience and job involvement component of organizational effectiveness.

There is no association between income and job involvement component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between type of the organizations and innovation component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between age and innovation component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and innovation component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)
There is no association between experience and innovation component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and innovation component of organizational effectiveness.

There is no association between type of the organizations and organizational commitment component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between age of the respondents and organizational commitment component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and organizational commitment component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and organizational commitment component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between income and organizational commitment component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between type of the organizations and organizational attachment component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between age of the respondents and organizational attachment component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)
There is no association between educational background and organizational attachment component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and organizational attachment component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between income and organizational attachment component of organizational effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

Chi-square value of Job satisfaction:

There is no association between type of the organizations and creativity component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between age of the respondents and creativity component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant).

There is no association between educational background of the respondents and creativity component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience of the respondents and creativity component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between income of the respondents and creativity component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant, at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of organizations and opportunity for growth and development component of job satisfaction.

There is no association between age of the respondents and opportunity for growth and development component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and opportunity for growth and development component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant).
There is no association between experience of the respondents and opportunity for growth and development component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between income of the respondents and opportunity for growth and development component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and decision making power component of job satisfaction.

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between age of the respondents and decision making power component of job satisfaction.

There is no association between educational background of the respondents and decision making power component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between experience and decision making power component of job satisfaction.

There is no association between income of the respondents and decision making power component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and job security component of job satisfaction.

There is no association between age of the respondents and job security component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)
♦ There is no association between educational background and job security component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between experience and job security component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between income of the respondents and job security component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between type of the organizations and remuneration component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant).

♦ There is no association between age of the respondents and remuneration component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant).

♦ There is no association between educational background of the respondents and remuneration component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between experience of the respondents and remuneration component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant).

♦ There is no association between income of the respondents and remuneration component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and working conditions component of job satisfaction.

♦ There is no association between age of the respondents and working conditions component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between educational background of the respondents and working conditions component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)
♦ There is no association between experience of the respondents and working conditions component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income of the respondents and working conditions component of job satisfaction.

♦ There is no association between type of the organizations and interpersonal relations component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between age and the interpersonal relations component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between educational background of the respondents and interpersonal relations component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between experience and interpersonal relations component of job satisfaction.

♦ There is no association between income and interpersonal relations component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and recognition to work component of job satisfaction.

♦ There is no association between age of the respondents and recognition to work component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)
There is no association between educational background and recognition to work component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between experience and recognition to work component of job satisfaction.

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and recognition to work component of job satisfaction.

As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is strong association between type of the organizations and discrimination of power component of job satisfaction.

There is no association between age of the respondents and discrimination of power component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and discrimination of power component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and discrimination of power component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant).

There is no association between income and discrimination of power component of job satisfaction. (chi-square value is not significant).

Chi-square value of Managerial Effectiveness:

As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of organizations and confidence in subordinates component of managerial effectiveness.
There is no association between age of the respondents and confidence in subordinates component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and confidence in subordinates component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant).

There is no association between experience of the respondents and confidence in subordinates component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income of the respondents and confidence in subordinates component of managerial effectiveness.

There is no association between type of the organizations and communication & task assignment component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between age and communication & task assignment component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no assignment between educational background & communication & task assignment component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and communication & task assignment component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant).

There is no association between income and communication & task assignment component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)
There is no association between type of the organizations and networking, component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between age and networking component of managerial effectiveness (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and networking component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and networking component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is significant)

There is no association between income and networking component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at the .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and colleague management component of managerial effectiveness.

There is no association between age and colleague management component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and colleague management component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and colleague management component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between income and colleague management component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)
♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and discipline component of managerial effectiveness.

♦ There is no association between age of the respondents and discipline component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between educational background and discipline component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between experience of the respondents and discipline component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and discipline component of managerial effectiveness.

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and informal communication component of managerial effectiveness.

♦ There is no association between age of the respondents and informal communication component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between educational background and informal communication component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between experience and informal communication component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is not association between income and informal communication component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)
As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of organizations and management of market environment component of managerial effectiveness.

There is no association between age of the respondents and management of market environment component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background of the respondents and management of market environment component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and management of market environment component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant).

There is no association between income and management of market environment component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and conflict resolution component of managerial effectiveness.

There is no association between age of the respondents and conflict resolution component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and conflict resolution component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and conflict resolution component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)
♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and conflict resolution component of managerial effectiveness.

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of organizations and integrity & communication component of managerial effectiveness.

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between age of respondents and integrity & communication component of managerial effectiveness.

♦ There is no association between educational background and integrity & communication component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between experience and integrity & communication component of managerial effectiveness.

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and integrity & communication component of managerial effectiveness.

♦ There is no association between type of the organizations and client management & competence component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between age of the respondents and client management & competence component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)
◆ There is no association between educational background and client management & competence component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

◆ There is no association between experience and client management & competence, component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant).

◆ There is no association between income and client management & competence. (chi-square value is not significant)

◆ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations & motivating component of managerial effectiveness.

◆ There is no association between age of the respondents and motivating component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

◆ There is no association between educational background and motivating component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

◆ There is no association between experience and motivating component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

◆ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income of the respondents and motivating component of managerial effectiveness.

◆ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of organizations and delegation component of managerial effectiveness.
♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between age of the respondents and delegation component of managerial effectiveness.

♦ There is no association between educational background and delegation component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between experience and delegation component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant).

♦ There is no association between income of the respondents and delegation component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and image building component of managerial effectiveness.

♦ There is no association between age of the respondents and image building component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between educational background and image building component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between experience and image building component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ There is no association between income and image building component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of organizations and welfare management component of managerial effectiveness.
- There is no association between age of the respondents and welfare management component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

- There is no association between educational background and welfare management component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

- There is no association between experience and welfare management component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

- As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and welfare management component of managerial effectiveness.

- As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of organizations and consultative component of managerial effectiveness.

- There is no association between age of the respondents and consultative component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square is not significant).

- There is no association between educational background and consultative component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

- There is no association between experience of the respondents and consultative component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

- As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and consultative component of managerial effectiveness.
There is no association between type of the organizations and inspection & innovation component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between age of the respondents and inspection & innovation component of managerial effectiveness.

There is no association between educational background and inspection & innovation component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and inspection & innovation component of managerial effectiveness. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and inspection & innovation.

**Chi-square value of Personality Traits:**

As chi-square values is significant at 0.01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and co-operative trait of personality.

There is no association between age and co-operative trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and co-operative trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and co-operative trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)
There is no association between income and co-operative trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between type of the organizations and flexible trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between age of the respondents and flexible trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant).

There is no association between educational background and flexible trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and flexible trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and flexible trait of personality.

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is strong association between type of the organizations and energetic trait of personality.

There is no association between age and energetic trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and energetic trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience of the respondents and energetic trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and energetic trait of the personality.
There is no association between type of the organizations and persevering trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between age and personality trait of persevering. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and persevering trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and persevering trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant).

As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and persevering trait of the personality.

There is no association between type of the organizations and original trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between age of the respondents and original trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and original trait of personality (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between experience and original trait of the personality.

There is no association between income and original trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)
As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and self-controlled trait of personality.

There is no association between age of the respondents and self-controlled trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and self-controlled trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and self-controlled trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and self-controlled trait of the personality.

There is no association between type of the organizations and aggressive trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between age of the respondents and aggressive trait of the personality.

There is no association between educational background and aggressive trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between experience and aggressive trait of the personality.

There is no association between income and aggressive trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)
There is no association between type of the organization and poised trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between age and poised trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and poised trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and poised trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and poised trait of the personality.

There is no association between type of the Organizations and sociable trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between age and sociable trait of the personality.

There is no association between educational background and sociable trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and sociable trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is strong association between income and sociable trait of the personality.

As chi-square value is significant at .05 level of confidence, there is a strong association between type of the organizations and independence trait of personality.
There is no association between age of the respondents and independence trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between educational background and independence trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between experience and independence trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between income and independence trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

There is no association between type of the Organizations and conformity trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)

As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between income and conformity trait of personality.

There is no association between type of the Organizations and dominant trait of the personality. (chi-square value is not significant)
♦ As chi-square value is significant at 0.01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between age of the respondents and dominant trait of personality.

♦ There is no association between educational background and dominant personality trait. (chi-square value is not significant)

♦ As chi-square value is significant at .01 level of confidence, there is a strong association between experience and dominant trait of personality.

♦ There is no association between income and dominant trait of personality. (chi-square value is not significant)
### T-test results of Organizational Effectiveness:

Independent Samples t-test for Organizational Effectiveness by Type of Organizations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organizations</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>5.35E-02</td>
<td>-2.242</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>5.40E-02</td>
<td>-2.242</td>
<td>267.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>5.12E-02</td>
<td>-3.636</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>5.80E-02</td>
<td>-3.636</td>
<td>263.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for independence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>8.47E-02</td>
<td>4.722</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>6.49E-02</td>
<td>4.722</td>
<td>250.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>7.80E-02</td>
<td>3.112</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>7.68E-02</td>
<td>3.112</td>
<td>267.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>6.14E-02</td>
<td>-1.324</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>5.73E-02</td>
<td>-1.324</td>
<td>266.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>5.46E-02</td>
<td>-1.051</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>5.51E-02</td>
<td>-1.051</td>
<td>267.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>5.61E-02</td>
<td>-2.79</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>5.66E-02</td>
<td>-2.79</td>
<td>267.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>5.52E-02</td>
<td>-1.638</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attachment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>5.35E-02</td>
<td>-1.638</td>
<td>267.716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to consensus (component of Organizational Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

2. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to legitimization (component of Organizational Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

3. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to need for independence (component of Organizational Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

4. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to self control (component of Organizational Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

5. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to Job involvement (component of Organizational Effectiveness). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

6. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to innovation (component of Organizational Effectiveness). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

7. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to organizational commitment (component of Organizational Effectiveness). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

8. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to organizational attachment (component of Organizational Effectiveness). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.
## T-test for Job Satisfaction:
### Independent Samples t-test for Job Satisfaction by Type of Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organizations</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>5.84E-02</td>
<td>2.099</td>
<td>268 0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>5.11E-02</td>
<td>2.099</td>
<td>263.387 0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to growth &amp; development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>5.13E-02</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>268 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>5.81E-02</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>263.985 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>7.19E-02</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>268 0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>7.44E-02</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>267.698 0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>7.14E-02</td>
<td>3.408</td>
<td>268 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>6.03E-02</td>
<td>3.408</td>
<td>260.623 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>8.24E-02</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>268 0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>8.52E-02</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>267.708 0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>5.01E-02</td>
<td>3.679</td>
<td>268 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>5.51E-02</td>
<td>3.679</td>
<td>265.622 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>7.03E-02</td>
<td>2.091</td>
<td>268 0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>5.95E-02</td>
<td>2.091</td>
<td>260.945 0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition to work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>7.22E-02</td>
<td>3.368</td>
<td>268 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>7.40E-02</td>
<td>3.368</td>
<td>267.844 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination of power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>7.32E-02</td>
<td>4.491</td>
<td>268 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>5.63E-02</td>
<td>4.491</td>
<td>251.398 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>5.26E-02</td>
<td>2.132</td>
<td>267.617 0.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to creativity (component of Job Satisfaction). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

2. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to opportunity to growth and development (component of Job Satisfaction). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

3. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to decision making power (component of Job Satisfaction). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

4. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to job security (component of Job Satisfaction). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

5. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to remuneration (component of Job Satisfaction). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

6. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to working conditions (component of Job Satisfaction). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

7. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to interpersonal relations (component of Job Satisfaction). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

8. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to recognition to work (component of Job Satisfaction). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

9. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to discrimination of power (component of Job Satisfaction). T value is significant. Hence a hypothesis has been accepted.
### T-test for Managerial Effectiveness:

Independent Samples t-test for Managerial Effectiveness by Type of Organizations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in subordinates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>9.43E-02</td>
<td>-4.892</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6.85E-02</td>
<td>-4.892</td>
<td>244.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Task assignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>6.23E-02</td>
<td>1.777</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>6.74E-02</td>
<td>1.777</td>
<td>266.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>6.77E-02</td>
<td>-835</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>5.74E-02</td>
<td>-835</td>
<td>261.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>5.74E-02</td>
<td>-3.580</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>5.38E-02</td>
<td>-3.580</td>
<td>266.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>7.40E-02</td>
<td>-5.354</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>5.46E-02</td>
<td>-5.354</td>
<td>220.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>5.46E-02</td>
<td>-1.383</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>5.89E-02</td>
<td>-1.383</td>
<td>266.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of market ENV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>9.02E-02</td>
<td>-4.986</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.63E-02</td>
<td>-4.986</td>
<td>267.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>7.11E-02</td>
<td>-4.595</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>4.334</td>
<td>-4.595</td>
<td>234.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity &amp; communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>4.334</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4.334</td>
<td>263.355</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client management &amp; Competence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>5.80E-02</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>6.06E-02</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>267.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>6.65E-02</td>
<td>-6.653</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>6.65E-02</td>
<td>-6.653</td>
<td>225.944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to confidence in subordinates (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

2. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to communication and task assignment (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

3. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to networking (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

4. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to colleague management (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

5. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to discipline (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

6. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to informal communication (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.
7. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to management of market environment (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

8. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to conflict resolution (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

9. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to integrity and communication (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

10. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to client management and competence (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

11. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to motivating (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

12. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to delegation (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

13. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to image building (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

14. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to welfare management (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

15. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to consultative (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

16. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to inspection and innovation (component of Managerial Effectiveness). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.
### T-test for Personality traits:

**Independent Samples t-test for Personality Traits by Type of Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organizations</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>6.37E-02</td>
<td>1.908</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>7.83E-02</td>
<td>1.908</td>
<td>257.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>5.87E-02</td>
<td>-.492</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6.87E-02</td>
<td>-.492</td>
<td>261.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>6.61E-02</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6.88E-02</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>267.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persevering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>6.65E-02</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>6.41E-02</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>267.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>6.03E-02</td>
<td>-.409</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>6.76E-02</td>
<td>-.409</td>
<td>264.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-controlled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>7.94E-02</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>6.12E-02</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>251.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>6.84E-02</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>6.30E-02</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>266.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>6.54E-02</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>6.44E-02</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>267.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>6.35E-02</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>6.64E-02</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>267.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>7.21E-02</td>
<td>-.853</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>6.25E-02</td>
<td>-.853</td>
<td>262.721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to cooperative (component of Personality Traits). T value is significant. Hence, hypothesis has been accepted.

2. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to flexible (component of Personality Traits). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

3. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to energetic (component of Personality Traits). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

4. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to persevering (component of Personality Traits). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

5. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to original (component of Personality Traits). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

6. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to self-controlled (component of Personality Traits). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

7. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to aggressive (component of Personality Traits). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

8. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with poised (component of Personality Traits). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.
9. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to sociable (component of Personality Traits). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

10. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to independence (component of Personality Traits). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

11. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to conformity (component of Personality Traits). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.

12. Hypothesis: Chemical and engineering organizations will differ significantly from each other with reference to dominant (component of Personality Traits). T value is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis has been rejected.
### 1. CORRELATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type of the organizations</th>
<th>Age of the respondents</th>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>Income (per month)</th>
<th>Consensus</th>
<th>Legitimization</th>
<th>Need for independence</th>
<th>Self control</th>
<th>Job involvement</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Organizational commitment</th>
<th>Organizational attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of the organizations</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-148(*)</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>161(**)</td>
<td>206(**)</td>
<td>-155(*)</td>
<td>0.124(*)</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of the respondents</strong></td>
<td>-148(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.785(**)</td>
<td>0.314(**)</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-148(*)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Background</strong></td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.161(**)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience in years</strong></td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.785(**)</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.373(**)</td>
<td>0.185(**)</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>0.146(*)</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income (per month)</strong></td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.314(**)</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.375(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.180(**)</td>
<td>-0.153(*)</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consensus</strong></td>
<td>0.161(**)</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.186(**)</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.289(**)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.282(**)</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.365(**)</td>
<td>0.314(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimization</strong></td>
<td>0.206(**)</td>
<td>-148(*)</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.289(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>0.256(**)</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.223(**)</td>
<td>0.304(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need for independence</strong></td>
<td>-0.328(**)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.180(**)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>222(**)</td>
<td>-0.144(**)</td>
<td>-0.144(*)</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>-0.130(*)</td>
<td>-1.30(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self control</strong></td>
<td>-0.155(*)</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.153(*)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>222(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.128(*)</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.193(**)</td>
<td>-0.176(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job involvement</strong></td>
<td>0.124(*)</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>2.82(**)</td>
<td>0.256(**)</td>
<td>-0.144(**)</td>
<td>-0.128(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.219(**)</td>
<td>0.418(**)</td>
<td>0.421(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.220(**)</td>
<td>-0.193(**)</td>
<td>219(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.242(**)</td>
<td>0.265(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational commitment</strong></td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-1.46(*)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.365(**)</td>
<td>0.223(**)</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>0.418(**)</td>
<td>242(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.640(**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational attachment</strong></td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.314(**)</td>
<td>0.304(**)</td>
<td>-0.130(*)</td>
<td>-0.170(**)</td>
<td>421(**)</td>
<td>0.265(**)</td>
<td>0.640(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Age of the respondents has significant correlation with legitimization component of organizational effectiveness.

Education of the respondents has significant correlation with organizational commitment component of organizational effectiveness.

Experience of the respondents has significant correlation with consensus and organizational commitment components of organizational effectiveness.

Income of the respondents has significant correlation with need for independence, and self-control components of organizational effectiveness.

Consensus component has significant correlation with legitimization, job involvement, organizational commitment and organizational attachment components of organizational effectiveness.

Legitimization component has significant correlation with consensus, job involvement, organizational commitment and organizational attachment components of organizational effectiveness.

Need for independence has significant correlation with job involvement, self-control, innovation and organizational attachment components of organizational effectiveness.

Self-control component has significant correlation with need for independence, job involvement, innovation and organizational attachment components of organizational effectiveness.

Job involvement component has significant correlation with consensus, legitimization, need for independence, self-control, innovation, organizational commitment and organizational attachment.

Innovation component has significant correlation with need for independence, self control, job involvement organizational commitment and organizational attachment components of organizational effectiveness.

Organizational commitment has significant correlation with consensus, legitimization, job involvement, innovation and organizational attachment.

Organizational attachment component has significant correlation with consensus, legitimization, need for independence, self control, job involvement, innovation and organizational commitment component of organizational effectiveness.
2. CORRELATION OF JOB SATISFICATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type of the organizations</th>
<th>Age of the respondents</th>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>Income (per month)</th>
<th>Creativity</th>
<th>Opportunity to growth &amp; development</th>
<th>Decision making power</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Remuneration</th>
<th>Working conditions</th>
<th>Interpersonal relations</th>
<th>Recognition to work</th>
<th>Discrimination of power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of the organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.48(*)</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>127(*)</td>
<td>181(*)</td>
<td>164(*)</td>
<td>204(*)</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>219(*)</td>
<td>127(*)</td>
<td>209(*)</td>
<td>225(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the respondents</td>
<td>-1.48(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>7.85(*)</td>
<td>314(*)</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>168(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in years</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>7.85(*)</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (per month)</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>314(*)</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>373(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>127(*)</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>541(*)</td>
<td>399(*)</td>
<td>234(*)</td>
<td>236(*)</td>
<td>285(*)</td>
<td>283(*)</td>
<td>298(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to growth &amp; development</td>
<td>.161(*)</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>541(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>379(*)</td>
<td>385(*)</td>
<td>324(*)</td>
<td>443(*)</td>
<td>270(*)</td>
<td>471(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making power</td>
<td>.194(*)</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>396(*)</td>
<td>579(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>369(*)</td>
<td>294(*)</td>
<td>291(*)</td>
<td>228(*)</td>
<td>298(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>204(*)</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>252(*)</td>
<td>380(*)</td>
<td>300(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>359(*)</td>
<td>475(*)</td>
<td>262(*)</td>
<td>393(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>289(*)</td>
<td>324(*)</td>
<td>296(*)</td>
<td>358(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>267(*)</td>
<td>150(*)</td>
<td>257(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>.210(*)</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>364(*)</td>
<td>443(*)</td>
<td>251(*)</td>
<td>475(*)</td>
<td>287(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>301(*)</td>
<td>465(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>.127(*)</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>284(*)</td>
<td>270(*)</td>
<td>228(*)</td>
<td>262(*)</td>
<td>301(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160(*)</td>
<td>230(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition to work</td>
<td>.202(*)</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>165(*)</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>296(*)</td>
<td>471(*)</td>
<td>296(*)</td>
<td>383(*)</td>
<td>307(*)</td>
<td>405(*)</td>
<td>160(*)</td>
<td>567(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination of power</td>
<td>.265(*)</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>396(*)</td>
<td>484(*)</td>
<td>349(*)</td>
<td>384(*)</td>
<td>304(*)</td>
<td>434(*)</td>
<td>230(*)</td>
<td>567(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

- Type of the organizations has significant correlation with creativity, opportunity to growth and development, decision making power, job security, working conditions, interpersonal relations, recognition to work and discrimination of power components of job satisfaction.
- Education has significant correlation with recognition to work component of job satisfaction.
- Creativity has significant correlation with opportunity for growth and development, decision making, job security, remuneration, working conditions, interpersonal relations, recognition to work and discrimination of power components of job satisfaction.
• Opportunity for growth and development has significant correlation with creativity, decision making power, job security, remuneration, working conditions, interpersonal relations, recognition to work and discrimination of power components of job satisfaction.

• Decision making power has significant correlation with creativity, opportunity for growth and development, job security, remuneration, working conditions, interpersonal relations, recognition to work and discrimination of power components of job satisfaction.

• Job security has significant correlation with creativity, opportunity for growth and development, decision making power, remuneration, working conditions, interpersonal relations, recognition to work, discrimination of power components of job satisfaction.

• Remuneration component has significant correlation with creativity, opportunity for growth and development, decision making power, job security, working conditions, interpersonal relations, recognition to work, and discrimination of power components of job satisfaction.

• Working conditions has significant correlation with creativity, opportunity for growth and development, decision making power, job security, remuneration, interpersonal relations, recognition to work and discrimination of power components of job satisfaction.

• Interpersonal relations component has significant correlation with creativity, opportunity for growth and development, decision making power, job security, remuneration, working conditions, recognition to work, and discriminations of power components of job satisfaction.

• Recognition to work has significant correlation with creativity, opportunity for growth and development, decision making power, job security, remuneration, working conditions, interpersonal relations and discrimination of power components of job satisfaction.

• Discrimination of power has significant correlation with creativity, opportunity for growth and development, decision making power, job security, remuneration, working conditions, interpersonal relations and recognition to work components of job satisfaction.
### 3. Correlations for Managerial Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Age of the respondent</th>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>Income (per month)</th>
<th>Confidence in subordinates</th>
<th>Communication &amp; Task assignment</th>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Collegiate Management</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Internal communication</th>
<th>Management of market ENV</th>
<th>Conflict resolution</th>
<th>Integricity &amp; Communication</th>
<th>Client Management &amp; Competence</th>
<th>Motivating</th>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Image Building</th>
<th>Welfare Management</th>
<th>Consultative</th>
<th>Inspection &amp; Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign significance</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Age of the respondents has significant correlation with networking, and integrity and communication, image building components of managerial effectiveness.

• Experience of the respondents has significant correlation with integrity and communication component of managerial effectiveness.

• Income of the respondents has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, discipline, conflict resolution, integrity and communication and motivating, welfare management, consultative components of managerial effectiveness.

• Confidence in subordinates has significant correlation with communication and task assignment, networking, colleague management, discipline, management of market environment, conflict resolution, integrity and communication and motivating, delegation, image building, welfare management, consultative, inspection and innovation components of managerial effectiveness.

• Communication and task assignments has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, networking, colleague management, discipline, informal communication, conflict resolution, integrity and communication, client management and competence, motivating, delegation, image building, welfare management, consultative components of managerial effectiveness.

• Networking has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, communication and task assignments, colleague management, informal communication, management of market environment, conflict resolution, client management, motivating, delegation, welfare management, consultative and inspection and innovations components of managerial effectiveness.

• Colleague management has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, communication and task assignment, networking, discipline, informal communication, management of market environment, conflict resolution, client management, motivating, delegation, image building, welfare management, consultative, inspection and innovations components of managerial effectiveness.

• Discipline has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, communication and task assignment, colleague management, management of market environment, conflict resolution, integrity and communication and
Informal communication has significant correlation with communication and task assignments, networking, colleague management, management of market environment, conflict resolution, integrity and communication, client management competence, motivating, image building, consultative, inspection and innovations components of managerial effectiveness.

Management of market environment has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, networking, colleague management, discipline, informal communication, conflict resolution, integrity and communication motivating, delegation, welfare management, consultative, inspection and innovations components of managerial effectiveness.

Conflict resolution has significant correlation with conflict in subordinates, communication and task assignments, networking, colleague management, discipline, informal communication, management of market environment, integrity and communication, client management and competence, motivating, delegation, image building, welfare management, consultative, inspection and innovations components of managerial effectiveness.

Integrity and communication has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, communication and task assignment, discipline, informal communication, management of market environment, conflict resolution, client management and competence, motivating, delegation, image building, welfare management, consultative components of managerial effectiveness.

Client management and competence has significant correlation with communication and task assignment, networking, colleague management, informal communication, conflict resolution, integrity and communication, motivating, delegation, image building, consultative components of managerial effectiveness.

Motivating has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, communication and task assignments, networking, colleague management, discipline, informal communication, management of market environment, conflict resolution, integrity and communication, client management and competence,
delegation, image building, welfare management consultative inspection and innovation components of managerial effectiveness.

♦ Delegation has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, communication and task assignments, networking, colleague management, discipline, management of market environment, conflict resolution, integrity and communication, client management and motivating, image building, welfare management, consultative, inspection and innovations components of managerial effectiveness.

♦ Image building has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, colleague management, discipline, informal communication, conflict resolution, integrity and communication, client management and competence, motivating, delegation, welfare management, consultative components of managerial effectiveness.

♦ Welfare management has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, communication and task assignment, networking, colleague management, discipline, management of market environment, conflict resolution, integrity and communication, motivating delegation, image building, consultative and inspection and innovation components of managerial effectiveness.

♦ Consultative has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, communication and task assignment, networking, colleague management, discipline, informal communication, management of market of environment, conflict resolution, integrity and communication, client management and competence, motivating, delegation, image building, welfare management, inspection and innovation components of managerial effectiveness.

♦ Inspection and innovation has significant correlation with confidence in subordinates, networking, colleague management, discipline, informal communication, management of market environment, conflict resolution, motivating, delegation, welfare market, consultative components of managerial effectiveness.
4. Correlations for Personality Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Age of the respondent</th>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Experience In years</th>
<th>Income (per month)</th>
<th>Cooperative</th>
<th>Flexible</th>
<th>Energetic</th>
<th>Perserving</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Self-controlled</th>
<th>Aggressive</th>
<th>Poised</th>
<th>Sociable</th>
<th>Independence</th>
<th>Conformity</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.146(*)</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>.162(**)</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>.141(*)</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the respondent</td>
<td>-.148(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>.785(**)</td>
<td>.314(**)</td>
<td>.203(**)</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>-0.123(*)</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience In years</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>.785(**)</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.373(**)</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (per month)</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>.314(**)</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.373</td>
<td>.1225</td>
<td>.201(**)</td>
<td>.316(**)</td>
<td>.223(**)</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>.187(**)</td>
<td>.144(*)</td>
<td>.132(*)</td>
<td>.178(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>.162(**)</td>
<td>0.203(**)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>.225(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.497(**)</td>
<td>.398(**)</td>
<td>.439(**)</td>
<td>.324(**)</td>
<td>.253(**)</td>
<td>.184(**)</td>
<td>.340(*)</td>
<td>.278(*)</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>.163(*)</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>.201(**)</td>
<td>.497(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.584(**)</td>
<td>.545(**)</td>
<td>.386(**)</td>
<td>.421(**)</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>.471(*)</td>
<td>.411(*)</td>
<td>.288(**)</td>
<td>.442(**)</td>
<td>.245(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>.316(**)</td>
<td>.395(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.743(**)</td>
<td>.523(**)</td>
<td>.509(**)</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.523(**)</td>
<td>.549(*)</td>
<td>.300(*)</td>
<td>.442(**)</td>
<td>.312(**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persevering</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>.223(**)</td>
<td>.439(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.533(**)</td>
<td>.438(**)</td>
<td>.178(**)</td>
<td>.550(**)</td>
<td>.588(**)</td>
<td>.313(*)</td>
<td>.488(*)</td>
<td>.249(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>.324(**)</td>
<td>.386(**)</td>
<td>.523(**)</td>
<td>.533(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.522(**)</td>
<td>.244(**)</td>
<td>.543(**)</td>
<td>.441(*)</td>
<td>.364(**)</td>
<td>.347(**)</td>
<td>.304(**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-controlled</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>.201(**)</td>
<td>.253(**)</td>
<td>.421(**)</td>
<td>.500(**)</td>
<td>.438(**)</td>
<td>.523(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>.579(*)</td>
<td>.455(**)</td>
<td>.489(*)</td>
<td>.366(**)</td>
<td>.216(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>.184(**)</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>.178(**)</td>
<td>.244(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>1.132(*)</td>
<td>.188(*)</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>.245(**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poised</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>.231(**)</td>
<td>.340(**)</td>
<td>.471(**)</td>
<td>.523(**)</td>
<td>.550(**)</td>
<td>.543(**)</td>
<td>.579(**)</td>
<td>1.132(*)</td>
<td>1.584(*)</td>
<td>.477(**)</td>
<td>.513(*)</td>
<td>.334(**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>.187(**)</td>
<td>.279(**)</td>
<td>.411(**)</td>
<td>.549(**)</td>
<td>.588(**)</td>
<td>.441(**)</td>
<td>.455(**)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.584(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.294(****)</td>
<td>.438(**)</td>
<td>.177(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>-1.23(*)</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>1.144(*)</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>2.286(**)</td>
<td>.300(**)</td>
<td>.313(**)</td>
<td>3.64(**)</td>
<td>1.489(****)</td>
<td>1.186(**)</td>
<td>1.477(*)</td>
<td>1.294(*)</td>
<td>1.383(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>1.132(*)</td>
<td>-1.63(*)</td>
<td>1.442(**)</td>
<td>1.442(**)</td>
<td>.489(**)</td>
<td>1.347(**)</td>
<td>.368(****)</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.513(*)</td>
<td>1.438(*)</td>
<td>1.307****</td>
<td>1.215(**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>1.167(**)</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>2.245(**)</td>
<td>.312(**)</td>
<td>.249(**)</td>
<td>3.04(**)</td>
<td>2.18(****)</td>
<td>1.245(**)</td>
<td>.334(*)</td>
<td>.177(*)</td>
<td>.393(*)</td>
<td>2.15(**)</td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

†Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
- Age of the respondents has significant correlation with co-operative and independence traits of personality.
- Income of the respondents has significant correlation with co-operative, flexible, energetic, persevering, self-controlled poised, sociable, independence and conformity traits of personality.
- Co-operative trait has significant correlation with energetic, persevering, original, self-controlled, aggressive, poised, sociable and conformity traits of personality.
- Flexible trait has significant correlation with co-operative, energetic, persevering, original, self-controlled, poised, sociable, independence, conformity and dominant traits of personality.
- Energetic trait has significant correlation with co-operative, flexible, persevering, original, self-controlled, aggressive, poised, sociable, independence, conformity and dominant traits of personality.
- Persevering trait has significant correlation with co-operative, flexible, energetic, original, self-controlled, aggressive, poised, sociable, independence, conformity and dominant traits of personality.
- Original trait has significant correlation with co-operative, flexible, energetic, persevering, self-controlled aggressive, poised, sociable, independence, conformity and dominant traits of personality.
- Self-controlled trait has significant correlation with co-operative, flexible, energetic, persevering, original, poised, sociable, independence, conformity and dominant traits of personality.
- Aggressive trait has significant correlation with co-operative, persevering, original, poised, independence, and dominant traits of personality.
- Poised trait has significant correlation with co-operative, flexible, energetic, persevering, original, self-controlled, aggressive, sociable, independence conformity and dominant traits of personality.
- Sociable trait has significant correlation with co-operative, flexible, energetic, persevering, original self-controlled, poised, independence, conformity and dominant traits of personality.
Independence trait has significant correlation with flexible, energetic, persevering, original, self-controlled, aggressive, poised, sociable, conformity and dominant traits of personality.

Conformity has significant correlation with co-operative, flexible, energetic, persevering, original, self-controlled, poised, sociable, independence and dominant traits of personality.

Dominant trait has significant correlation with flexible, energetic, persevering, original, self-controlled, aggressive, poised, sociable, independence conformity trait of personality.
SUGGESTIONS

Researcher would like to give suggestions based on present study and observations which may help organizations to achieve effectiveness at various levels.

1. Organizations should provide better and conducive working conditions, so that managers can work effectively.
2. Organizations should provide information to all managers and they should have strong networking for proper communication, so that immediately managers can get information and work accordingly.
3. Organizations should encourage participative management, wherein each manager has opportunity to share his opinion, knowledge and views.
4. Organizations should encourage young managers to participate in policy formulation and decision making processes, so that they can understand total process, as well as own certain decisions and implement effectively.
5. There should be an effective co-ordination of inter departments activities, wherein each department head should be made aware of his role and responsibilities, moreover, managers should understand role and functioning of each departments so that smooth relationship between each department can be developed for effective functioning.
6. Each organization should become 'learning organization', it should provide an opportunity to all employees to get new ideas, knowledge and information which may help managers to function properly.
7. Managers should be made aware of their own career advancement in the organizations. Managers should know what they are going to get in future. Uncertainty regarding career paths should be avoided.
8. Organization should avoid complexity of procedures at various levels.
9. Training and development should be considered as the most important tools for managerial development. Organizations should organize regular training programme wherein latest concept, approach to work, work motivation, human values, effective functioning, interpersonal relations, conflict resolutions etc. are covered.
10. Managers should be helped, supported and motivated through training programme for effective handling of market situations, plant level problems internal as well as external challenges.

11. Sensitivity training should be imparted from time to time to the managers to face future challenges and carved out their roles to meet these challenges.

12. Managers should have updated knowledge and skills of Modern Business Market.

13. In the present situation the role of managers dramatically and drastically has been changed. Therefore there is a need to equip manages to prepare themselves for new model role to be played and also to make themselves aware about changing concepts in managing individuals and organizations.

14. The organization should focus on enhancing the productivity of the employees by using the technique of restructuring and re-engineering of the organization. Further the organizations should also conduct various training programmes, to develop and sharpen the skills and abilities of the managers which in turn contributes towards the growth and development of the organization.

15. Career progression is an attraction for many of the budding professionals. The organizations should take interest in formulating and implementing career progression path in such a way that individuals shall have opportunities for growth and development in the organizations. This would minimize the gap between individual goals and organizational goal to the great extent.

16. Organizations should introduce special task force for converting poor performer into high performer in the organization.

17. Organizations development intervention strategies should be designed in such a way that individuals in the organizations get job satisfaction, mould their personality traits positively and developed managerial effectiveness leading towards overall organizational effectiveness.

18. Quality of a life in general and quality of work life in particular should be introduced.
ACTION PLAN

OBJECTIVES:
Organizational effectiveness can be increased by giving proper inputs to employees effectiveness, job satisfaction, managerial effectiveness and personality traits.

CONTENT:
(a). Organizational effectiveness areas viz, consensus, legitimization, independence, self-control, job involvement, innovation, organizational commitment and organizational attachment, etc. will be covered.

(b). Managerial effectiveness areas viz, confidence in subordinates, communication, networking, colleagues management, discipline, management of market environment, conflict resolution, client management, motivating, image building, inspection and innovation etc. will be covered.

(c). Job satisfaction areas viz, creativity, opportunity for growth and development, decision making power, job security, remuneration, working conditions, interpersonal relations, recognition to work, discrimination of power etc. will be covered.

(d). Personality traits areas viz, co-operative, flexible, energetic personality, original, self controlled, poised, sociable, independence and conformity areas will be covered.

Job environment, organizational climate, organizational culture, organizational role stress and coping mechanism will be covered. Further organizational health areas will be covered to achieve organizational effectiveness. Organizational health areas are goal clarity, vision, corporate identity, employees development, employees retention, empowerment, interpersonal relations, leadership, market movement, company image, performance management, physical work environment, quality consciousness, proper staffing etc.
Methodology:
- Lectures
- Case studies
- Personal profile discussion
- Seminar
- Guided group discussion

Faculty:
- HR educators
- HR practitioners
- HR consultants

Participants:
Executives and managers of chemical and engineering industries
(25 participants in each training programme)

Duration:
3 days – residential training programme.

FEEDBACK AND EVALUATION:
At the end of training programme there will be a feedback and evaluation session of training programme in which following area will be covered.

Areas:
- Extent to which objectives of training are addressed carefully.
- Adequacy of time input in training
- Expertise of trainers
- Quality of participation
- Utilities of training