INFLUENCE OF TYPE A AND TYPE B BEHAVIOURAL PATTERNS ON JOB SATISFACTION AND WORK COMMITMENT

DISSertation
SUBMITTED FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF
Master of Philosophy
IN
PSYCHOLOGY
BY
Masood ul Hassan
UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF
PROF. SHAMIM A. ANSARI

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY
ALIGARH (INDIA)
2010
Dedicated
to
My Parents

Under whose feet lies the paradise and
Who give up their today for my better tomorrow
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

This is to certify that the M.Phil. dissertation of Mr. Masood-ul Hassan on “Influence of Type A and Type B Behavioural Patterns on Job Satisfaction and Work Commitment” is his original work and has been carried out under my supervision. The dissertation is fit for submission for the award of M. Phil. degree in psychology.

(PROF. SHAMIM A. ANSARI)
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"Praise be to ALLAH who teacheth by pen,
Teacheth man that which he knew not"

I thank Almighty without whose blessings this work would have remained an unaccomplished task.

I shall ever be indebted to my learned supervisor Prof. Shamim A. Ansari, for his able guidance, constant help and cooperation throughout the course of preparation of dissertation. His tireless efforts, scholarly advice and guidance has been the pillar of my strength which not only helped me to complete my task but excel in every academic pursuit.

I owe my sincere thanks to my chairperson Prof. Hamida Ahmad for her able guidance, constant help and cooperation throughout the course of preparation of my work.

I extend my deep gratitude to Ali Iman, Faria Apa, Fancy, Fatima Apa, Hyder, Heena, Ishfaq, Mumtaz, Malik Yasir, Yasir, Tasdique and to all my friends for their support and encouragement during the entire work period.

I shall be failing in my duty if I do not express my deep gratitude to my parents whose unfailing support, affection, cooperation and encouragement to my work. I have no words to express my feelings to my sister who has been always a source of inspiration for me.

I shall always be acknowledging moral support and well-wishes extended by my grand parents. Indeed, it is because of their unstinted support and encouragement that I have been able to combat the hurdles of my life.

(Masoodul Hassan)
## CONTENTS

**Acknowledgements**  
1 - 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>15 - 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>44 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Result and Discussion</td>
<td>51 - 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Conclusion and Suggestion</td>
<td>78 - 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 - 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td></td>
<td>98 - 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>General Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Job-Satisfaction Scale (JSS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Work Commitment (WCS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Measure of Behavioural Pattern viz., Type A and Type B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Biographical Informational Blank (BIB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter - 1

INTRODUCTION

Industrial and organizational psychologists have done a tremendous work in quest for improving human efficiency in general and industrial organizational efficiency in particular. The advent of industrial revolution had revolutionized the whole work system that gradually introduced mechanization at work. Congruence of developing and maintaining man-machine interface had a chequered history starting from the pioneering work of Taylor (1901) in the form of scientific management principles and their greater implication in the world of work. However, Taylor's task-centered approach could not remain free from criticism inspite of its utility for productive efficiency. Beginning of 1920s witnesses a turning point for a major change from Taylor's management centered approach to employee-centered approach. With regard to the later approach, Mayo is considered to be a pioneer after conducting his investigation in the Western Electric Company in the United States of America in 1924 and thereafter, concerted efforts of Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson started employee-oriented approach as a movement popularly known as 'human relation movement'. This approach spread over the world of work and was witnessed to be at peak during 1930's to 1950's. It will be true to say that human relation movement changed the managers and supervisors style of functioning from anti-bureaucratic approach to successively increasing democratic and humanized approach leading to congenial work culture for the utmost fulfillment of employee's need at work.
It is a matter of fact that human relation movement changed the entire scenario of the world of work and it paved the way for understanding human motivations in work organization. As a result, motivational theories started pouring in after 1930s hence, the first motivational theory appeared in 1943 which is known as Maslowian need - hierarchy theory of motivation and thereon one after the other, job motivation theories appeared in different years. It is important to mention that all motivational theories have been used for job-satisfaction as job-motivation and job satisfaction are highly interrelated to each-other and for such reasons managers, supervisors and academicians too have using these two phenomena very interchangeable, although there is functional difference between the two phenomena. Motivation is a process where feeling of satisfaction and dissatisfaction is an outcome of goal attainment after the motivational process comes to an end and thereafter, feeling of satisfaction/dissatisfaction provides a feedback whether same state of affair be adopted or course of action be changed. In a nutshell, it is imperative to mention that motivation involves a process and satisfaction is an outcome of complete motivational process. Therefore, same models and theories explain to both phenomena of job satisfaction and job motivation.

21st century is witnessing a trend of increasing liberalization, globalization, and transitional invasion which has raised and set competitive standards among all countries but developed nations are of much more advantage compared to developing and under-developed nations because of later's dependency on successively developing and developed nations. In wake of modern age of global economy, Indian organizations are facing unprecedented competitive challenges. Liberalization of trade across
geographical boundaries has been instrumental for wide range economic reforms combined with revolution in communication and information technology which are considered to be the landmarks for paradigm shift in strategic business. Therefore, success is most likely to come to those who are capable in managing to adopt the virtues of conflicting paradigms rather than to simply rely on traditional approaches and principles. Such managerial approach is highly challenging but is most likely to become a tool or strategy for effective and efficient organizational functioning in the best possible manner. Hence, HRD — a most significant approach and/or organizational philosophy has come up as an strategy for the most efficient means to enhance individual and organizational effectiveness. Basically, HRD focuses on maximum utilization of all resources such as human, financial, technical and information resources, although, human resource occupy central importance in HRD and all other resources are controlled and utilized by human resource.

However, human resource play a key role in turning the wheels of an organization. It is therefore necessary that organization should take care of employees’ cravings for motives and subsequently their satisfaction commitment, involvement and other work related behaviour for their greater attachment and concern with the work or task they are performing in the most effective fashion.

Apart from the concern of individual employee’s work related behaviour, their personality pattern or attributes are also very important for creating the level of congenial environment at work especially were their team work. Generally in all sort of organizational functioning team work is inherent
aspect giving rise to maximum use of all inputs and resources for affective organizational functioning. Earlier two types of behaviourals patterns viz. Type A and Type B were identified but now this extent to type C and type D personalities. But Type A and Type B personality still have their greater implications in team work relationship.

In our study personality patterns viz., Type A and Type B have been taken as independent variable were as job satisfaction and work commitment as dependent variables. The details of the various phenomena occupying place important place in the present investigation are being presented in comprehensive detail.

**Job Satisfaction**

Phenomenon of job satisfaction is as old as human existence on earth. The history of man’s quest starts from need-fulfillment struggle specially for survival. Hence the phenomenon of satisfaction has always been important for human being but in work context the very concept of job-satisfaction was for the first time coined in 1935 and the credit for bringing it in currency goes to Hoppock. According to Hoppock job-satisfaction is “a combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, ‘I am satisfied with my job’. He highlights six major factors of job-satisfaction which he extracted from his study are (i) the way the individuals reacts to unpleasant situations, (ii) the facility with which the employee adjusts himself with other person, (iii) has relative status in social and economic group with which he identifies himself, (iv) the nature of work in relation to his abilities, interest and preparation, (v) security, and (vi) loyalty.
It has already been mentioned earlier that human relation movement was a landmark that very forcefully emphasized over employees centred approach. Hence, thereafter theories of motivation and satisfaction starting pouring in the just theory of motivation was profounded by Maslow (1943) and the same model was applied to explain job-satisfaction and job-motivation since the year 1954. Herzberg et al., 1959 contrary to Maslowian need hierarchy theory proposed two factory theory of motivation and job-satisfaction and their after gradually number of models appeared to explain the phenomena of job-satisfaction and job-motivation e.g. Adams (1963) equity theory, Vroom (1964) expectancy model, Alderfer (1972) ERG theory, etc.

A comprehensive description of job-satisfaction clearly emphasises that experiencing that job satisfaction is not very simple, rather a complex phenomenon which is a combination of personal characteristics, psychological and environmental circumstances that provide the experience of satisfaction – dissatisfaction.

Imtiaz (2000) rightly points out that “employees’ mental health, their well being, and organizational conditions require proper care for inducing and enhancing employee’s feeling of satisfaction”.

Work Commitment:

Work commitment is now a universally acceptable important phenomenon which is an outcome of employee’s psychological make-up, physical working conditions, organizational culture and climate helping to accelerate employees’ productive behaviour in terms of output in a working condition. Commitment refers to individual attraction and attachment with the
work in an organization. Attachment of employee with his/her work and the organization has received a considerable attention in management and organizational behaviour approaches and as a result the phenomena like attachment, identification, loyalty to the organization etc. has clearly emerged as the most recognized research construct. Whyte in 1950 highlighted the concept of ‘The organization Man’ that refers to one’s over-commitment to the organization. In Whyte’s opinion organization man is a person who works for the organization, as well as, possesses a feeling of psycho belongingness. In almost the same line Lawrence (1958) asserted “Ideally we would want one sentiment to be dominant in all employees from top to bottom, namely a complete loyalty to the organization purpose”. Kelman’s (1958) enumeration of taxonomy describes that individuals can influence in their conceptually distinct way: (a) Compliance or exchange, (b) Identification or affiliation and (c) Internalization or value congruence. These three require the process of internalization which is significantly important as it occurs when influence are accepted and consequently inculcate attitude and modifies behaviours congruent with one’s own values. Hence, the basis for one’s psychological attachment to an organization is likely to be in function of (a) compliance or instrumental involvement for specific, extrinsic rewards, (b) identification or involvement based on desire for affiliation and (c) internalization or involvement predicted on congruence between individuals and organizational values or in conjunction thereof.

Brown (1969) highlights three importance facets commitment that includes (a) the notion of membership, (b) current position of the individual, and (c) predictive potential concerning certain aspects of performance,
motivation to work, spontaneous contribution and other related outcomes. Brown asserts on the differential relevance of motivational factors. Hall et al. (1970) considered that commitment is the process by which the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent. This contention seems to be highly logical, as it is important in enhancing human working efficiency.

In view of Sheldon (1971) an attitude or an orientation towards the organization which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organization is called commitment.

According to Porter et al. (1976), commitment is the strength of one's identification with the job and the involvement in a particular organization, hence, characterized by one's willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and a desire to maintain membership in it.

Steers (1977) developed a model that describes the antecedents and outcomes of commitment. According to this model there are three main categories of variables that influence commitment are personal characteristics/attachments (it include the variables such as, need for achievement, work experience, age, and education). Work experience the second category of influence describes socializing forces as to have an impact on attachments formed with the organization.

Mowday et al. (1979) defined organizational commitment in terms of three-factors that includes (a) a strong belief in an acceptance of the goals and values of the organization, (b) readiness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and (c) a strong desire to remain a member of an
organization. These factors refer to behavioural dimension to evaluate employee's strength of attachment (Welsh & LaVan, 1981; Morrow, 1983). Further, Morris and Sherman (1981) investigated a multivariate predictive model of organizational commitment and focused on the role of job-level and organizational differences. The antecedents in this model include variables from each of Steer's (1977) categories.

Rechiers (1985) opened organizational commitment as a process of identification with the goals of organisations' multiple constituencies and these constituencies include from top management to the public at large.

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) contends to the fact that an employee's psychological attachment to an organization can reflect varying combinations of the three psychological foundations like compliance that occurs when attitudes and behaviours are adopted not because of shared beliefs but simply to gain specific rewards whereas, identification occurs when an individual accepts influence to establish or maintain a satisfying relationship, that is, an individual may feel proud to be a part of a group respecting its values and accomplishments without adopting them as his/her own. And thirdly, internalization occurs when influence is accepted because of the induced attitudes and behaviour that are congruent with one's own values, that is the values of the group or organization are same. The impact of O'Reilly's classification system has been found weakened as they failed in distinguishing between identification and internalization (e.g., Caldwell et al. (1990), O'Reilly et al. (1991), and Vandenberg et al. (1994) in most recent research combined the identification and internalization items to form a measure of what they called normative commitment.
Sharma and Singh (1991) describes that organizational commitment is the product of two independent sets of factors viz., personal and organizational which simultaneously operate in every organization.

Meyer and Allen (1991) noticed that generally the definitions related to commitment reflect three broad aspects viz., affective orientation, cost-based and obligation or moral responsibility. To acknowledge that each of these three sets of definitions represent a legitimate but clearly different conceptualization of the commitment construct. Meyer and Allen proposed a three-component model of organizational commitment and applied different labels to which they described as three components of commitment: affective, continuance and normative. Affective commitment refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment in an organization because they are internally compelled to do so. Continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organisation. It clearly carries the meaning that if an employee perceives that he/she has to pay more cost then it is most likely that they will remain attached to the organisation but on the other hand if they believe that leaving the organization and joining the other will be beneficial then such condition become instrumental in discontinuing their affiliation to one organisation or company. Finally normative commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to continue. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization.
Type A and B Behavioural Pattern:

The above descriptions were related to dependent variables namely job-satisfaction and work commitment and it was presumed that these work related attitude and behaviour are the function of behavioural patterns. Here in the present case type A and type B behavioural were taken as predictor variables. It looks pertinent to mention here that personality type is very important so far as human perception, attitude, experience and behaviour are concerned. The development of the concept of personality types came into being after the death of eminent surgeon, John Hunter was Scottish Surgeon (1728-1793) who suffered from angina pectoris and also from a short fuse. One day Hunter stormed out of the room immediately after an intensely heated board meeting, collapsed, and died in the arms of a colleague (Acierno, 1994). This incidence brought to light the powerful influence of emotions on heart. An analysis of Hunter's personality suggests that very likely he had what modern physicians would call Type-A personality which is characterized by intense ambition, strong competitiveness, and a constant preoccupation with deadlines. Contrary to these, persons lacking to these traits are said to have a Type-B personality. From the cardiac standpoint, the different two personality types may be important or may not be but there may be very significant aspects in team-work relation for all employees across organizational hierarchical levels. Type-A behaviour pattern (TABP) is defined as an action emotion complex generated by certain environmental events. Lachar and Barbara (1993) opine it is most likely to be influenced by western cultural materialistic values that reward those who can produce a function in any capacity with great amounts of (dynamism full of) speed, efficiency and aggressiveness. The TABP is
characterized by traits such as impatience, aggressiveness, a sense of time urgency, and the desire to achieve recognition and advancement by any means. People possessing Type-A behaviour are over-cautious, hence they perform generally most (of the) activities very rapidly and perfunctorily. Extensive investigation based on interviews of subjects possessing type A personality behavioural pattern also suggest that people with such personality pattern tend to have physical manifestation such as facial tension, rapid speech, prolepsis (interrupting of other's speech), tongue and teeth clicking, and the audible forced inspiration of air (Denollet, 1993).

Robbins and Sanghi (2006) have identified five characteristics of Type A personality behavioural pattern. These are:

1. always moving, walking and eating rapidly.
2. feel important with the rate which most events take place;
3. strive to think or do two or more things at once;
4. cannot cope with leisure time; and
5. are obsessed with numbers, measuring their success interims of how many or how much of every thing they acquire.

Contrary to Type-A behvioural pattern, Type-B personality is a form of behaviour associated with people who are free form hostility and aggression and lack discipline and compulsion to meet deadlines, they are not highly competitive in any spheres of life and subsequently have a low risk of heart attack. Type-B personality people are relaxed, uncompetitive, and inclined to self-analysis (Science Dictionary, 2002). Medical Dictionary (2002)
enumerates that people with Type B behaviour pattern are usually relaxed have patience, and are friendly that possibly decrease one’s risk of heart disease. Type-B’s are said to be more comfortable, more easygoing, less competitive and less aggressive. According to Lazarus (1994), Type-B’s also experience life stresses, however, they are less susceptible to be paniclly when they are faced with challenges and threats. Moreover as per observation of Howard et al. (1986) Type-B differ from Type-A’s in terms of their blood pressure and other biochemical reactions.

According to Robbins and Sanghi (2006) persons with Type-B personality pattern are possessing the characteristics that include (1) never suffer from a sense of time urgency with its accompanying importance, (2) Fell no need display or discuss either achievements or accomplishments unless such exposure is demanded by situation. (3) Play for fun and relation, rather than to exhibit their superiority at any cost; and (4) Can relax without guilt. On the other hand, Type-A persons are more persistent, more work addict and always in the over produce and more work in short span of time. Such tendency seems to give some sort of job satisfaction than the Type-B persons because Type A people enjoy work more than B-Type persons.

In addition to type A and type B behavioural patterns Cooper (1990) proposed the concept of type D personality. According to Cooper type D personality is a sub-set of type A and is “typified by chronically angry, suspicious, mistrustful behaviours and more prone to cardiovascular conditions”. Moreover, he also observed that people having type D personality are as “humanles hurried and aggressive”. Similarly the phenomenon of type E
personality also came into being that describes the professional women who neither fit type A nor type B personality categories but how have a marked sense of insecurity (Dental dictionary, 2004). Apart from the above descriptions different personality types and or behavioural patterns Farely (1986) had given the concept of type T personality. Individuals with type-T personality are motivated and thrill seeking (Big-T). On the other hand there are individuals who are risk and thrill avoiders labeled as ‘Little-T’. Big-T individuals are most likely to prefer high level of stimulation, complexity, and are distinguished by flexibility in thinking styles. Whereas, Little-T individuals appear overwhelmed by high level of stimulation, desiring routine, simplicity, certainty and predictability (Farley, 1986).

A comprehensive description about type-A and type B behavioural patterns in particular and type D, E and T in general have revealed to fact that different personality type and/or behavioural patterns have almost been studied in relation to different psychological diseases and especially, in relation to coronary diseases but behavioural patterns have not been studied in relation to work related behaviour, especially, viz., job satisfaction and work commitment. Such an observation will be quite witnessed from the forthcoming Chapter II meant for review and relevant and related literature.

In view of the above writings, it has become quite clear in the light of the absence of such investigation that the aim of the present investigation was quite pertinent in a sense that it was aimed to investigate the ‘Influence Of Type-A And Type B Behavioural Patterns On Job Satisfaction And Work Commitment’ which was a novel problem and subsequently, findings of the
study have filled the void of knowledge and have paved the way for future researches in understanding the relationships between behavioural patterns and individual's work-related behaviours at work for individual as well as for organizational effectiveness.
Chapter - II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of the present chapter is to review the available research studies similar to the theme of the present piece of research work. Since, the very purpose of the present work was to study job satisfaction and work commitment as a function of Type A and Type B behaviour patterns, the variables involved are required to be reviewed that therefore would have helped in identifying the novelty of the present study and moreover, in giving rational justification in findings of present study. The survey of literature, therefore is the only means to highlight the importance and relevance of the study in question, hence it is imperative to review first the available literature relevant to job satisfaction, work commitment and then with regard to Type A and B behavioural patterns that follow:

Job-Satisfaction and its related Studies:

The phenomenon of job satisfaction is as old as human existence but studies on job satisfaction started only after Hoppock’s study on skilled workers in 1935. In the same year (1935b) he conducted a survey on teachers using job-satisfaction blank. Hoppock is a pioneer who not only coined the term job-satisfaction but also had initiated the study by developing job-satisfaction blank. Subsequently, job-satisfaction studies caught managers, supervisors and psychologists’ attention. Job satisfaction phenomenon is so important that even today it occupies the relevance for both employees and employer as it is a hall-mark of almost all work related outcomes.
After Hoppock’s study there was a gradual increase of studies but since mid-1950’s job satisfaction studies were at increase. Morse and Weiss (1955) & Veroff et al. (1960) studied satisfaction across various hierarchical levels. Rosen (1961a, 1962b) reported on the basis of his study that managers and middle-level managers do not significantly differ in their satisfaction at work. Porter (1961) reported that management personnel differ in their need-satisfaction. Again, Porter (1962) reported based on his study that need-satisfaction increased with each hierarchical level of management for higher order needs (esteem need, autonomy need and self-actualisation need), while the lower order needs (security and social needs) were almost equal across all managerial levels. Lawler and Porter (1967) found significant correlation between satisfaction and performance. Following Maslowian and Porter’s models scores of studies were conducted and findings reported but the findings of Herzberg et al. (1959) broke new ground in studying job motivation and satisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1959) in their study found that the factors which were associated with high satisfaction (satisfiers) were somewhat different from the factors associated with no satisfaction (dissatisfiers). Following Herzberg’s model, scores of studies were carried on and certain criticisms were also raised. Vroom (1964) criticized Herzberg on the ground of respondent’s ego-defensive reaction to the question. King (1970) showing agreement with Herzberg approach had also criticized on three grounds: (i) That the study is technique-bound and its results can be confirmed only if identical method of investigation i.e., CIT is used, (ii) that the result reflect a defensive reaction of the subjects to the questions, and (iii) it is a sample-biased.
Job-satisfaction phenomenon is so popular and important that it can never lose its importance. Abundance of research studies on job-satisfaction are available, so, we will only restrict in the fore-going writings which appeared only from 1990’s till date. These are being cited below:

**Lang and Johnson (1994)** conducted a random telephone survey on N=211 adults to examine the effect of firm size on job-satisfaction. A single-item measure of initial fit was obtained for respondent’s reason in choosing the job at the time of employment.

**Abramis (1994)** conducted a meta-analysis of studies of two primary correlates of work role ambiguity, Job-satisfaction and job performance. To determine the role ambiguity to satisfaction and performance, 88 studies were examined which were taken from Psychological Abstract of the years between 1967-1990, 39 of which were included in the meta-analysis. Results suggest that the role ambiguity is significantly and negatively related to satisfaction and performance but very weak relation was obtained with to the latter. True variance in correlation exists across studies, suggesting that the effects of role ambiguity vary depending on other variables. Results suggest that role ambiguity is a valid construct in organizational research and that it is usually associated with lower job-satisfaction. **Knoop (1994)** analyses the relationship between importance and achievement of work values with job-satisfaction and found that both importance and achieved values individually and combined significantly related to satisfaction. Total variance explained by the work values included 63% for satisfaction with the work itself, 9% for satisfaction with pay, 43% for satisfaction with promotions, 16% for satisfaction with
supervision, 29% for satisfaction with co-workers and 35% for overall job-satisfaction.

**Witt (1994)** studied main and interactive effects on the job-satisfaction of variables assessing the person (disposition) and situation (organizational climate) across organisations. Disposition refers to the positive affects (PAF) and negative affects (NAF) scales. Results showed that perception of organizational support were more strongly related to job-satisfaction than was disposition (PAF or NAF). NAF had larger moderating effect than PAF on the perceived support-job-satisfaction relationship. **Korunka et al. (1995)** used a partly longitudinal design to examine the effects of work with new technologies (NTs) on psychosomatic complaints and job-satisfaction. Attention was focused on the influence of the work situation (Job contents, employee participation), attitudes and individual differences and it was found that NTs increased psychosomatic complaints and changed job-satisfaction, with the degree of change depending on job-contents, level of employee participation and gender. Job-satisfaction increased if the work with NTs diversified and called for high qualifications but tended to decrease for persons with low qualifications doing mental, monotonous work at visual display units. Effects of work with NTs were also interrelated with attitudes and individual differences.

**Organ and Lingl (1995)** hypothesized that the personality dimensions - agreeableness and conscientious account for commonly shared variance between job-satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Findings indicate that these two dimensions do, indeed, account for substantial
variance in satisfaction and that conscientiousness also accounts for unique variance in one dimension of OCB. Satisfaction accounts for unique variance for OCB was not explained by either of these personality dimensions. No evidence was found for differences in main or moderated effects in the UK and US samples.

*Schnake et al. (1995)* investigated the relationship among the variables — satisfaction, leadership behaviour, perceived equity, and organizational citizenship. 10 supervisors completed an organisational citizenship scale developed to rate the frequency in which their employees engaged in the various citizenship behaviours. Job-satisfaction and leadership behaviour was also measured. Leader behaviour contributed to the organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Leader behaviour also contributed to predict power of leadership variables on all OCB dimensions. Only intrinsic job-satisfaction contributed to OCB. Perceived equity did not exhibit an incremental effect beyond the effects of job-satisfaction and leadership on four dimensions of OCB. *Singh and Pestonjee (1995)* in their study examined the effects of job-involvement and participation on on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction among different groups. Data were collected from 145 officers and 135 clerical personnel of a large banking organization. Significant interactions between job involvement and participation and between job-level and participation were obtained. Subject participation was found moderately correlated with on-the-job factors.

*Gunter and Furnham (1996)* examined six biographical and 14 climate perception correlates of 1,041 employees to job-satisfaction and pride in the
organization in four public sector organisations. The alpha reliability scores for climate dimensions were satisfactory. Correlation analysis yielded correlation ranging from .12 to .51 between climate factors and job-satisfaction correlation, between climate and pride in the organization were nearly all positive but generally lower, which were ranging from $r = .80$ to $r = .53$. A stepwise regression analysis was performed separately for each organization on each of the dependent variables. In a nutshell, climate factors emerged as more significant than biographical factors as predictors of job-satisfaction and pride. Noticeable difference among the organization in the overall significance of climate and in the type of climate variables that were also noticed. In the same year Jones, Oswald (1966) identifies the factors which determine human resources reputation of firms involved in research development (R & D). Data were obtained by means of an extensive questionnaire dealing with factors likely to influence employer perceptions. Regression was used to examine the relationship between reputation and other variables. The analysis confirms that a human resource reputation exists as a distinct concept. Innovatory climate and job-satisfaction were identified as the main determinants of reputation among R & D scientists.

Burke again in 1996 examined the sources and levels of job-satisfaction among employees of professional services firm and found that subjects were only moderately satisfied. The men, who were at significantly higher organizational levels than the women, reported significantly greater job satisfaction. When hierarchical level was controlled, these differences disappeared. Women and men at higher organizational levels were more satisfied than those at the lower level.
Ting (1997) findings threw light on that job-characteristics such as pay satisfaction, promotional opportunities, task clarity and significance of skill utilization as well as organizational characteristics such as organizational commitment and relationship with supervisors and co-workers have consistent significant effects on the job-satisfaction of federal government employees. Butler and Cantrell (1997) examined the effect of perceived leadership behaviour on job-satisfaction and productivity. Analysis indicated strong effects of leaders initiating structure and considerations on both job-satisfaction and productivity of group member.

After reviewing literature concerning job-satisfaction its' clear that job-satisfaction is significantly dependent upon new-technology, organizational citizenship, leadership-participation and support, organizational climate, environmental congruence, quality of management and management practices, role and task-clarity, etc. However, no studies are found which studied personality variables, especially Type A and B behavioural patterns in relation to job satisfaction. Now, having reviewing the literature concerning job-satisfaction, it is necessary to move towards the next dependent variable i.e., work commitment. Hence, in the proceeding part of the chapter researcher will review the literature concerning work commitment.

Work-Commitment and its related Studies:

The phenomenon of work commitment has always been very important, especially, since mid-1960s with the work of Lodahl and Kejner but in the present scenario of hi-tech world, it has become of much more concern for management and employers. The last decade of 1990s has witnessed increasing
trend over the similar work related behaviour viz., work commitment hence, a
large number of studies are being witnessed since then. Work commitment is
one of the work related behavioural phenomena, which has its positive impact
on organisational productivity and effectiveness at large. The available studies
since 1990s follows:

**Luthans et al. in 1992**, examined the importance of social support for
employee's commitment and they found strong positive correlation between
strong supportive climate and bank tellers' organizational commitment. **Cannings (1992)** reported that corporate employees are merely attached to
their firm rather than committed. A model of managerial loyalty was developed
where loyalty was described as a function of percentage pay increase that an
employee would require to leave the current firm for alternative employment.
This model got strong support during a stable environment and not found
strong support in case of turbulent environment (i.e. during privatization and
deregulation). **Cohen (1992)** examined the relationships between
organisational commitment and its antecedents across occupational groups. The
member model focused on personal variables, while the organizational model
focused on role related structural and work experience variables. The study was
based on the sample group of N=98. The total sample was divided into two
main occupational groups: white collar employees who were again subdivided
into professionals and non-professionals, and blue-collar employees. In
general, the relationship between non-professional commitment and personal
antecedents, representing the member model was stronger for blue collar and
non-professional white-collar employees than for professional employees. For
the organisational model, differences among the occupational groups were less consistent.

Allen and Meyer (1993) examined affective, continuance and normative commitment as a function of age, service tenure, and positional tenure. Also they examined were the contributions cross stages of various work experiences to the prediction of affective commitment. Study was conducted on library employees and hospital employees and they were more closely related to increase in organizational commitment and positional tenure. Further relationships between work experiences and affective commitment was witnessed to be differed only slightly across tenure levels and not at all across employees' age groups.

Angle and Lawson (1994) examined the relationship between employee's commitment and performance in a manufacturing firm. Results suggest that the link between organisational commitment and performance may depend on the extent to which motivation rather than ability underlies performance. Findings also support the distinction between affective and continuance commitment suggested by Meyer and Allen (1991).

Akhtar and Tan (1994) assessed and conceptualized the multidimensional nature of organisational commitment by administering the organisational commitment questionnaire on 259 retail bank employees. Factor analysis yielded three dimensions proposed by Porter et al. One dimension i.e., desires to maintain organizational membership overlaps the withdrawal construct. Consistent with the 3-dimensional attitude theory, organisational commitment was reconceptualized in terms of cognitive, emotive, and conative
meanings. Proposed dimensions include normative commitment (amount of cognitive consonance with organisational norms), affective commitment (intensity of emotional attachment to the organization), and volitive commitment (extent of conative orientation towards organizational goals).

Zeffane (1994) examined organizational commitment and perceived management style using survey responses from 474 public and 944 private sector employees in Australia. Attachment to organization, flexibility and adoption, work discontinuity/change, tenure, and number of employees were also assessed. Private sector employees had higher organisational commitment and scored higher on flexibility and adoption than public sector subjects. Tenure and supervision also had some effect on organizational commitment but more so in terms of feelings of attachment to the organisation (for tenure) and in terms of feelings of loyalty/citizenship (for supervision). Variations in MS were found to have a significant effect on employee commitment but more so in terms of the degree of emphasis on flexibility and adoption that perceived. Organisation size had a moderate negative effect on organizational commitment, especially, in the private sector.

The study conducted by Wilson (1995) to examine the effects of power and politics on organizational commitment. Two theoretical explorations for organizational commitment were developed which incorporates 5 independent variables (1) a power-based theory of commitment (including sub-unit power, leadership power and leadership behaviour variables) and (2) theory of politics (including “arbitrary personnel practices” and the “political control” variables). The theories were tested on a group of 492 senior executive service managers
in the federal government who completed a commitment scale which measured strength of loyalty, involvement, and identification with their sub-units. Results provide empirical support for the effects of the team power, good leader-member relations, and political control on the commitment levels of top executives in the federal government.

McCaul, Hinz and McCaul (1995) studied the proposition that organizational commitment could be measured as a global attitude towards an organization. 174 employees from three organisations completed the organizational commitment questionnaire (OCQ) and measures of (1) global attitude towards the organization, (2) willingness to work hard for the organisation, (3) intention to leave the organisation, and (4) degree of the goals and values of the company management, co-workers, and supervisors. Subjects completed the questionnaire twice over a period of six months. The attitudinal measure correlated strongly with the OCQ. Measures of efforts, value acceptance, and intentions to stay with the organisation predicted little additional variance in the OCQ. Results support the proposition.

In a study Sharma and Panday (1995) tested the hypothesis that the quality of work life (QWL) perception will show significant relationship with the organizational commitment of managers in India. Two hundred young managers (age between 25-27 years) were selected from five levels of the managerial hierarchy. Results reveal that perceptions of QWL were significantly and positively related to organizational commitment. Moreover, QWL, work involvement, organizational effectiveness, and pursuit of individual and organizational goals were found to be significant predictors of
organizational commitment of managers. Mishra, Mishra and Patnayak (1996) have studied 80 employees of a public sector industrial organization. Results indicated that experience of commitment was satisfactory and often high among employees. No difference existed between the technical and non-technical subjects and moreover, technical education had not influenced commitment or a resistance towards accepting the work environment.

Shore et al. (1995) advocated that organisational citizenship behaviour positively predicted manager-rated affective commitment, whereas, continuance commitment was found negatively related to a variety of outcomes including managerial potential and promotability.

Sommer, Bae and Luthans (1996) analysed whether demographic and situational factors identified in US-based literature had the same influence on the commitment of 1192 employees of 27 large Korean firms. Consistent with US studies, the Korean employees’ position in the hierarchy, tenure in their current position and age were all significantly related to organisational commitment. Total tenure and education were not found related to commitment. All the situational antecedents, except management style were significantly related. It is interestingly observed from the study that ‘with the increase of organisational size, commitment decreased whereas, the structure became more employees-oriented, the commitment witnessed to be increased; and the more positive perception towards organisational climate, the more the commitment. This study provides beginning evidence and suggested that the theoretical constructs predicting the organisational commitment of employees may have cross-cultural validity.
Brown (1996) examined popular concepts and types of organisational commitment in the light of the definition of commitment and common factors that pertain to all type commitments. Commitment is best conceptualised as a single, fundamental construct that may vary according to differences in focus, terms, and time-specific evaluation. The commitment development process not only affects focus and terms of commitment, but also has strong implications for the evaluation process. Analysis of affective commitment measures indicates that certain measures contain more than one constraints to the basic meaning of commitment. Recommendations for evaluation of organisational commitment include the argument that commitment measures should address one set of terms and avoid evaluative phraseology.

Randell and O'Driscoll (1997) found high level calculative commitment associated with lower perceived organisational support, lower agreement with organisational policies, fewer perceived organisational values, and fewer bonds to various facets of the organisation. This pattern of findings was reversed for affective commitment.

Meyer, Irving and Allen in 1998 tested the hypothesis that the influence of early work experiences on organisation commitment would be moderated by the value employees' place on these experiences. Work values were measured in 2 samples of recent university graduates prior to organisational entry, and measures of commensurate work experiences and three forms of commitment (affective, continuance and nonnative) on different occasions following entry. Regression analysis revealed that values and experiences did interact in the prediction of affective commitment and
normative commitment but that the nature of interaction was different from different work values/experience combinations. The findings provide some challenge to the common-sense assumption that positive work experience will have the strongest effect on commitment among those who value most such experiences.

Dorman, and Zapf (1999) investigated the moderating effects of social support by supervisors and colleagues relative to social stressors at work and depressive symptoms using a structural equations approaching in a three wave longitudinal study over one year LISREL analysis with latent moderating effects revealing a moderating effect for supervisor support. This applied only if the time was 8 months, but not for longer or shorter lags under low-support conditions depressive symptoms were increased by social stressors, whereas social stressors reduced subsequent depression under high support conditions. No moderating effect for colleague support was found.

Phillips, Dianne and Morrison (2000) examined the effect of sex differences of married employees on job satisfaction and work related stress. Areas of greatest work dissatisfaction for both genders (male and female) were income and time required at work.

Hence, it is clear now that work commitment is contingent upon different factor such as environment, social and organisational support, power, and politics, and certain demographic variables. While reviewing literature researcher noticed that certain studies have covered both the variables i.e. work commitment and job satisfaction which are given below:
Studies investigating Job-satisfaction and Work commitment relationship:

Thompson et al (1992) hypothesised that self-employed individuals because of greater physical, emotional and financial investment in their jobs would report higher levels of organisational commitment and job-involvement and work silence than would individuals employed by organisations. It was also hypothesised that there would be a stronger relationship between job, life, family and self-satisfaction for self employed individuals. On the basis of the findings, first hypothesis received partial support and the second one was fully supported.

Knoop (1995) made a survey to examine the relationships among participative decision making, overall job-satisfaction, and facets of job-satisfaction; and organisational commitment. Participative decision making was found to be positively correlated with organisational commitment, overall job-satisfaction, and five dimensions of job-satisfaction: work, pay, promotion, supervision, and coworkers. Correlation between commitment and job satisfaction variables was also significant. Results indicate that making decisions jointly with employees can be expected to be increasingly related to positive job outcomes.

In 1996 Crames examined the temporal relationship between job-satisfaction and organisational continuance commitment over 13 months period on 295 professional employees (mean age 25 years) of a British engineering company using LISREL with latent variables analysis. Results indicate the cross-lagged path coefficients in the LISREL models were not significantly positive, relationship between these two variables was spurious and due to error
variance. Test-retest coefficients for both variables were moderately positive: showing that the relative ranking of individuals on these variables were fairly stable over time.

In 1996 Orpen examined the effect of perceived downward and upward communication quality on employee job-satisfaction and turnover intentions among a sample of 101 middle-level managers. Hierarchical regression and sub-grouping analyses showed that organisational commitment moderated both these effects but that the latter were unaffected by the direction of communication whether it was downward or upward. Results confirmed the importance of communication quality in organisation but make clear that its effect on valued outcomes like job-satisfaction and intentions to remain in the organisation vary, being much stronger among employees attached to the particular organisation. Implications of the findings for improving communication are developed.

Sharma (1997) explored the situational and personal determinants of organizational commitment among skilled workers of a private sector manufacturing organization. The measures of organizational characteristics adequacy of resources and humane and fair management style-were significantly and positively related to organizational commitment of the numerous task characteristics, only task difficulty and task ambiguity were significantly correlated to commitment. None of the personal characteristics were significantly related to commitment. Situational variables were found to be more important determinants of organizational commitment than personal variables.
Biswa (1998) examines the effect of life style stressors on organizational commitment. Results indicated that performance threat and frustration stressors were significant predictors of organizational job involvement. Organizational effectiveness was positively correlated with organizational commitment and job involvement. In comparison to supervisors and workers managers scored higher on organizational commitment and job involvement.

Ahmad and Ansari (1999) studied organizational commitment. Results indicated that workers (blue collar) expressed comparatively higher degree of organizational commitment than the owners of the company. Although the owners expressed a moderate level of commitment, they were affected by factors like lack of organizational resources, proper guidance and cooperation from the local authorities and state governments. Patel (1999) reported low job involvement and low organizational commitment in the younger group of employees in both nationalized and private banks and nationalized bank employees expressed higher commitment than their counterparts.

Pattanayak (2002) studied the influence of shift work and hierarchical position in the organization on job satisfaction and perceived organizational commitment of 360 employees of the Rourkela Steel Plant. The nature of duty as well as the hierarchical position of employees influenced organizational commitment. Both executives and supervisors in shift and non shift areas experienced an almost similar level of job stress in a number of dimensions with regard to the HRD climate, there was a significant difference between shift and non shift employees irrespective of their job category.
Heffner and Rentsch (2001) presented a model of organizational commitment proposing the hypothesis that work group social interaction would influence work group affective commitment, social interaction and work group affective commitment would independently influence organizational effective commitment. The results supported the hypothesized relationships between social interaction and affective commitment.

Finegan (2000) investigated the relationship between personal values, organizational values, and organizational commitment. 121 employees from a large petrochemical company rated 24 values with respect to how important the value was to the organization. It was found on the basis of hierarchical multiple regression analysis that commitment was predicted by the employees’ perception of organizational values. Furthermore, affective, normative, and continuance commitment were predicted by different clusters of values. This study also highlights the importance of recognizing that values are multidimensional and that each value cluster may affect behaviour differently.

Sturges, Guest, Conway and Davey (2002) investigated the relationships between organizational and individual career management activities and organizational commitment in the early years of graduate careers. Data were obtained from 212 graduates (mean age 26-31 yrs). The findings suggested that high organizational commitment predicts the practice of career management activities by graduates to further their career within the organization while low commitment is closely associated with behaviour aimed at furthering the career outside the organization.
Casper, Martin, Buffardi and Edwins (2002) investigated the impact of work interfering with family (WIF) and family interfering with work (FIW) on women's organizational commitment and examined both the direct and moderating effects of their perceived and organizational support. The study found that WIF was positively related to continuance commitment but unrelated to affective commitment. FIW was not related to either form of organizational commitment.

Yousef (2002) conducted a study to explore the mediating role of job satisfaction between role stresses, i.e. role conflict and role ambiguity as sources of stress, on the one hand and on the other hand various facets of organizational commitment, i.e. affective, continuance, and normative, on a sample of 361 employees in a number of organizations in the United Arab Emirates. Path analysis revealed that role ambiguity directly and negatively influences both affective and normative commitments. Results also reveal that job satisfaction directly and positively influenced affective and normative commitments and negatively influenced continuance commitment. The findings also suggest that both role conflict and role ambiguity directly and negatively influence job satisfaction. It also revealed that job satisfaction mediated the influences of role conflict and role ambiguity on various facts of organizational commitment, except continuance commitment.

Vanderberghe, Bentein and Stinglhamber (2004) investigated three longitudinal studies to examine the differential influence of affective commitment to the organization, the supervisor, and the work group. Study one on 199 employees from various organizations describes that affective
commitment to these entities were factorially distinct and related differentially distinct and related differentially to their theorized antecedents. Study second on a diverse sample group of 316 employees showed that organizational commitment (a) had an indirect effect on turnover through intent to quit, (b) partially mediated the effect of commitment to the effect of commitment to the supervisor on intent to quit, and (c) completely mediated the affect of commitment to the work group on intent to quit. Study third with matched data collected from 194 nurses and their immediate supervisors, determined that (a) commitment to the supervisor had a direct effect on job performance, and (b) organizational commitment had an indirect effect on job performance through commitment to the supervisor. However, study three failed to show any effect of commitment to the work group on performance while the remaining two studies showed the significant influence of affective communication.

**Studies related to Type A and type B behaviour patterns**

It has been mentioned earlier that in our research endeavour Type A and Type B behavioural patterns were taken as independent variable. Moreover, it has also been mentioned in the earlier writings that behavioural pattern and/or personality types have been very generally studied in relation to coronary and other diseases but have not been studied in relation to work-related behaviours especially job satisfaction and work commitment which have been dependent variables in this study. To substantiate our observation and contentions, there is a need to have a look on relevant survey of literature that follow:

Survey of literature have witnessed that good number of researches have attempted to explain the link between Type A behaviour and coronary heart
disease (CHD) compared to healthy Type B behaviour (Contrada & Krantz, 1988; Friedman & Rosenman, 1974; Houston, 1983). Individuals characterized with Type A behaviour are considered to be time-driven, hostile, aggressive, cynical, competitive, achievement striving, and impatient (Byrne, 1987; Glass, 1977; Price, 1982; Smith & Williams, 1992; Williams, 1989). Further, compared to Type Bs (individuals who are able to express their emotions appropriately, are capable of meeting their own needs and responding to others, and who are relaxed and self-assured (Temoshok & Dreher, 1992), Type As demonstrate elevated physiological reactions to acute laboratory stress tasks, although studies suggest that this reactivity may be specific to socially challenging tasks (Gallacher, Bennett & Sharpe, 1992).

The above findings of the studies suggest that Type As are physiological hyperreactive which are likely to be largely derived in competition with others. Physiological problems have been identified in Type A individuals, such as higher cholesterol levels, faster blood clotting times, and high triglyceride (fatty-acid) and noradrenaline hormone levels, compared to the persons possessing Type B personality dispositions. These findings are consistent with the expected effects of physiological hyperactivity as obtained by Friedman and Rosenman (1974) who have highlighted that there is an increased damage to the lining of arterial walls, subsequent atherosclerotic plaque development, increased blood platelet aggregation, and further cardiac malformations leading to coronary artery disease (CAD) and manifestations of coronary heart disease e.g. angina, myocardial infarction, and sudden death. Smith & Anderson (1986) have reported similar findings too. Further, the prevalence of other health conditions such as increased incidence of colds and influenza (Suls & Sanders,
migraines and headaches (Woods, Morgan, Day, Jefferson & Harris, 1984), chest pain (Eaker et al., 1992) and general health complaints (Shoham-Yakubovich, Ragland, Brand, & Syme, 1988) have been found to be more prevalent in Type A individuals.

Supportive evidence is provided by findings that Type A individuals place themselves in risky circumstances. For example, it has been reported that Type As often seek challenging and competitive situations (Feather & Volkmer, 1988; Smith & Frohm, 1985), tend to smoke more (Shekelle, Schoenberger & Stamler, 1976) and consume more alcohol (Folsom et al., 1985) than Type B individuals, and have a tendency to underreport the severity of their physical symptoms (Weidner & Matthews, 1978), which may place them at risk for disease development. Other studies have also found associations of high hostility scores (a feature of the Type A personality) with low physical exercise (Koskenvuo et al., 1988; Leiker & Hailey, 1988), high alcohol consumption (Houston & Vavak, 1991; Koskenvuo et al., 1988; Leiker & Hailey, 1988; Shekelle et al., 1983), heavier smoking (Dembroski, MacDougall, Costa & Grandits, 1989; Koskenvuo et al., 1988; Shekelle et al., 1983), more drunk driving (Houston & Vavak, 1991; Leiker & Hailey, 1988), larger body mass indices (Houston & Vavak, 1991), and less self-care (Leiker & Hailey, 1988). Moreover, some personality styles have positive effects. For example, positive associations have been found between conscientiousness and general health behaviours (Booth-Kewley & Vickers, 1994), and between conscientiousness and dietary adherence in renal dialysis patients (Christensen & Smith, 1995).
Contrary to the above direction of findings, there are good number of researches which are less supportive of the Type A personality and CHD relationship (Booth-Kewley & Friedman, 1987) with some reporting the effect of Type A in predicting CHD to be rather small to be of any relevance (Myrtek, 1995). Amelang (1997) has contended that while small in absolute terms, the risk of heart disease from personality type seems to be of meaningful. It is imperative to stress upon the contention of Eysenck (1991a) that personality has causal effect on disease, especially, cancer and heart disease.

With regard to coping styles with stress, there have been number of studies which focus on coping styles of individuals with Type A and Type B behavioural patterns. It is found that Type A behaviour pattern is positively associated with emotion-focused coping (Endler & Parker, 1990; Greenglass, 1988; Pittner et al., 1983; Weidner & Matthews, 1978), which is consistent with the aggressive and hostile tendencies of people possessing type A behaviour pattern. In a study it was identified that Type A are also more likely to use avoidance-focused coping (Endler & Parker, 1990) and there are some other studies which highlighted that suppression of aversive physical and emotional states (Pittner & Houston, 1980; Pittner et al., 1983).

It is also interesting to note and mention that Type A individuals show greater physiological reactivity even when under anesthesia (Kahn, Kornfield, Frank, Heller, & Hoar, 1980; Krantz, Arabian, Davia, & Parker, 1982) which is indicative of constitutional hyperactivity that does not require conscious mediation. Khan and Verma (2007) state that in addition to Type A and Type B behaviour pattern, there is one more behavioural pattern, viz., Type D has been
identified which refers ‘distressed’ personality associated a variety of cardiac problems. In their study Khan and Verma on the basis of their finding indicated that there is an increasing evidence of cardiac related problems indicate towards an urgent need to adopt a personality approach. Findings of the study signify that, type D personality can be a risk factor and it should be focused for proper intervention and treatment.

A Comprehensive perusal of relevant literature pertaining to job-satisfaction, work-commitment and beahvioural patterns have revealed the fact that these variables have been very well studied but these have not been studied as a function of individual behaviour patterns especially, Type A and Type B behaviour patterns. There is only one study conducted by Organ and Lingl who studied personality dimensions namely, agreeableness (characteristics of Type B) and consciousness (characteristic of Type A) in relation to job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour. Which seems to be little bit relevant to present investigation. But overall scenario highlight that the present topic of research was highly relevant in a sense that such problem have never been studied, hence the present investigator had chosen this challenging task to identify the influence of behaviour patterns on job satisfaction and work commitment.

In the light of the above available literature, it is clear that there is a paucity and/or absence of literature on personality patterns that could have been studied in relation to work commitment and job satisfaction. Therefore, such investigations are needed to study the behavioural patterns and their subsequent influence on job satisfaction and work commitment and the later
two viz., job satisfaction and work commitment are most likely directly related to teachers performance and efficiency in a broader sense.

As stated above, it is clear that studies on personality pattern in relation to job satisfaction and work commitment are either absent or failed to provide any clear cut direction of relationship, hence, now, there is no option left except to formulate null hypotheses for empirical testing.

Hypotheses in any empirical investigations are very important. Hypothesis is a presumption which provides the basis for investigation and ensures the proper direction in which the study should proceed (Michael, 1985). According to Kothari (1987) ‘hypothesis is a preposition which can be put to test to determine its validity’. Thus, hypothesis are significantly important in every scientific investigation/inquiry because they are working as instrument of theory, have a prediction value and also they are powerful tools for the advancement of knowledge and making interpretation meaningful (Kerlinger, 1983). Hence, tentative contentions were formulated in the form of hypothesis for empirical testing are being given below:

Hypotheses:

The following null-hypothesis were formulated, considering the purpose of our investigation as none of the researches have provided any direction on the influence of Type A and Type B behaviour patterns on job satisfaction and work commitment.

Ho1 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘security need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among private teachers.
Ho2 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘social need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among private teachers.

Ho3 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘esteem need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among private teachers.

Ho4 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘need for autonomy’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among private teachers.

Ho5 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘self actualization need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among private teachers.

Ho6 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence job satisfaction among private teachers.

Ho7 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence commitment with ‘affective commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment among private teachers.

Ho8 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence commitment with ‘continuance commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment among private teachers.

Ho9 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence commitment with ‘normative commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment among private teachers.
Ho10 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence work commitment among private teachers.

Ho11 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘security need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among public teachers.

Ho12 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘social need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among public teachers.

Ho13 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘esteem need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among public teachers.

Ho14 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘need for autonomy’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among public teachers.

Ho15 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘self-actualization need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among public teachers.

Ho16 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will influence satisfaction among the public teachers.

Ho17 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence commitment with ‘affective commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment among public teachers.
Ho18 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence commitment with ‘continuance commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment among public teachers.

Ho19 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence commitment with ‘normative commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment among public teachers.

Ho20 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence the work commitment among public teachers.

Ho21 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘security need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among private and public teachers.

Ho22 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘social need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among private and public teachers.

Ho23 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘esteem need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among private and public teachers.

Ho24 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘need for autonomy’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among private and public teachers.

Ho25 Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence satisfaction with ‘self actualization need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction among private and public teachers.
Ho26  Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence job satisfaction among private and public teachers.

Ho27  Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence commitment with ‘affective commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment among private and public teachers.

Ho28  Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence commitment with ‘continuance commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment among private and public teachers.

Ho29  Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence commitment with ‘normative commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment among private and public teachers.

Ho30  Behaviour pattern Type A and Type B will not influence work commitment among public and private teachers.

The above formulated hypotheses were framed to obtain micro-level information of the pattern of the cause and effect relationship. Moreover, the hypotheses clearly highlighted the very objective of the present endeavour which were empirically tested to fill the void of knowledge in specific area. The findings of the investigation will help the organization to redesign the work environment in such a fashion that might be fit to elicit positive influence of behaviour on perceived work related attitude and behaviour especially, like job satisfaction and work commitment which subsequently may lead to efficient, effective and decent work performance.
Chapter - III

METHODOLOGY

The aim of the present investigation was to study job-satisfaction and work-commitment as a function of Type A and Type-B behavioural patterns on the sample of public and private teachers. Hence, in quest of carrying out the study most objectively and scientifically, certain concrete steps were undertaken. In chapter-I comprehensive description of the meaning and concepts of the variables studied were highlighted and, thereafter, in the proceeding Chapter-II review of relevant literature were presented. And thereafter, methodology opted for the investigation is being presented in the present Chapter-III.

In any scientific research, methodology plays a very significant and crucial role. Edwards (1971) believed that “in research we do not haphazardly make observation of any or all kinds, but rather our attention is directed towards those observation that we believe to be relevant to the question we have previously formulated. The objective of research, as recognized by all sciences, is to use observation as a basis for answering questions of interest”.

Research fill the void of knowledge, hence, consequently provides some new knowledge. In all researches, the objectivity of the investigation is contingent upon the accuracy of research methodology. The choice of methodology of research is determined by the nature of the problems because every specific research demands a particular process and operation to be undertaken for carrying out investigations.
In carrying out any research, it is necessary to carefully adopt appropriate research design, selecting standardized tools, choosing appropriate sample through appropriate sampling technique, undertaking sound procedures for collecting data, tabulating them, and analyzing the data by running suitable statistics. The details of the methodological steps follows:

Sample

In general sample is a small portion of a specific population or universe as representative of that particular population or universe. Mohsin (1984) stated that “a sample is a small part of total existing events, objects, or the information”. For selecting appropriate sample, stratified-random sampling technique was adopted in conducting present investigation. In this sampling technique every individual had the equal probability be being selected. It was an appropriate sampling technique that was warranted to be opted in the very context of present research problem.

The sample of the study has been very clearly indicated in the topic of research endeavour that highlights teachers as the sample of study. For present research investigation the sample was randomly drawn from a various public as well as primary schools. The sample was collected from the districts of J & K namely, Pulwama and Anantnag.

From each of these two districts of J & K, one hundred and fifty teachers were randomly selected from private and public schools and they were distributed questionnaires. All the N=150 teachers filled the questionnaires properly in accordance with the instructions.
Table 3.1 Sample Breakup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Sample</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private School Teachers</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Teachers</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Showing Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Sample</th>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>No. of Dependents</th>
<th>Work Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range Average</td>
<td>Range Average</td>
<td>Range Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private school teachers</td>
<td>22-65</td>
<td>35 0-7 3</td>
<td>1-25 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private school teachers</td>
<td>27-56</td>
<td>44 0-11 6</td>
<td>4-27 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tools Used:

In order to measure and thereby understanding human behaviour, psychological tests are developed and used. It is a matter of fact that there is not a single tool or psychological instrument which may tell about all aspects of behaviour because of complex and varying psycho-emotional attributes of personality and human behavioural dimensions. Hence, there have always been a need for developing psychological instrument for each specific purpose that should be continually validated and revalidated in accordance with the changing time and situations.

Questionnaires since long have been most favoured and convenient means and tool in psychological researches. In the present investigation, questionnaires were used. Comprehensively details of each questionnaire used follow:
Measure of Behavioural Pattern viz., Type A and Type B:

Matterson and Ivancevich (1982) scale was used to assess behaviour patterns. The scale contains 21 bipolar statements and each statement is to be rated on a 7-point rating scale ranging from 7 to 1. The scale measures the three components of behaviour pattern: Importance (S), Job Impatience (J) and Hard Driving and Competitive (H). The items number 1-7 measures Impatience, the item numbers 8-14 measures Job Involvement and the item numbers 15-21 measures Hard Driving and Competitiveness. Total scores on these items represent a global Type-A behaviour. The scale differentiates between Type-A and Type-B behaviour patterns on the basis of scores. The scores differentiating individuals on behaviour pattern are given below:

- A score of 122 and above represented hard-core type A
- Score range from 99 to 121 reflects moderate Type-A.
- 90 to 98 represents low type-A.
- 80 to 89 reflects type X, i.e. and individual neither coming in the category of Type-A nor Type-B.
- 70 to 79 indicates low type-B.
- 50 to 69 represents moderate type-B, and
- Scores of 40 and below represents hard-core type B.

The range of the scores varied from 21-147 as a whole and separately to each dimensions varies from 6-42, 8-56, and 7-49 for impatience, job involvement and hard driving/competitive respectively. Khan and Khan (2007) established the reliability of this scale by using test retest method. The reliability of the
dimension: impatience (0.64), job involvement (0.72) and hard driving and competitive (0.75). The reliability of total score representing global Type-A behaviour was 0.71.

**Job Satisfaction Scale**

To tap the information with regard to employee's job-satisfaction, Porter's (1961) Need Satisfaction scale was used. This scale contains fifteen items based on five dimensions viz. Security need, Social need, Esteem need, Need for Autonomy, and Self-Actualization need. The scale has a 5-point response category ranging from "strongly agree" (i.e., 5) to "strongly disagree" (i.e., 1). It is a widely accepted and commonly used scale which is reported to be highly standardized as its reliability and validity are quite high.

**Work-Commitment Scale**

To understand and measure level of employee's work commitment, a scale developed by Imtiaz and Ansari (2000) was used. This scale is based on three dimensions proposed by Meyer and Allen (1991) viz., (i) affective commitment which involves employee's emotional attachment to identification and involvement with organization, (ii) continuance commitment which refers to commitment based on cost that employees associate with leaving the organization, and (iii) normative commitment that refers to employee's feeling of obligation to stay with the organization. Based on the afore-mentioned three dimensions, they had framed items/statements and thereafter proper, editing of the items/statements were made. Finally, the scale contained 15-items on the pattern of a Likert type scale having 7-point response category ranging from '1' strongly disagree to '7' strongly agree response categories. Split-half reliability
r = .80 and validity coefficient r = .76 are quite high, hence, scale is said to highly reliable and valid.

**Biographical Information Blank:**

In addition to the above Biographical Information Blank (BIB) was also prepared to record various demographic information of the respondents such as age, religion, sex, qualification, rural/urban, state and city, work experience, number of promotions earned, designation, marital status, numbers of dependents, and health condition which are most of the time become very important in interpreting the findings.

**Statistical Analysis:**

Once the data were collected, researcher transformed and summarized the data so that results could be interpreted and communicated in a briefly comprehensive manner. So, statistical method are very important as Kerlinger (1983) states that “Statistics, via its power to reduce data to manageable forms and its power to study and analysis variance, enable scientists to attach probability estimates to the inferences they draw from data”. Statistics, using probability theory and mathematics, simply makes the process more exact. It is briefly to say that through statistics we always make inferences, attach probabilities to various outcomes or hypotheses, and make decisions on the basis of statistical values with reasons. Selection of appropriate statistics is a very important aspect of the study which help in fulfilling and testifying the objectives and drawing precise and accurate inferences.

In analyzing the data of the present investigation, researcher had used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) statistical technique which is a non-parametric
statistics. This test is used to study the influence of independent variables viz. Type A and Type B behavioural patterns on dependent variables namely, job satisfaction and work commitment. Ks-test is a very appropriate technique to analyse the data of the present research endeavour where behavioural pattern is the only independent variable. Hence, this technique seems to be highly befitting, thus applied in the present piece of research work. The formula of this technique is given below:

$$Ks = 4(D)^2 \frac{n_1 n_2}{n_1 + n_2}$$

Having analyzed the data and obtaining the results, description and discussion of the results follow in the next Chapter-IV meant for result and discussion.
Chapter - IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Methodology adopted in carrying out the present investigation have been comprehensively described in the preceding Chapter-III and the present Chapter-IV has been meant to describe and discuss results. The present study being an empirical one was aimed in studying the differential of Type-A and Type-B behavioural patterns on job satisfaction and work commitment of public and private school teachers. Therefore, in quest of testing the objective of the study, number of null hypotheses were formulated and as stated earlier Kolmogrov-Smirnov statistical technique was used to analyze the data and obtaining the results.

Before describing and interpreting the results, it is imperative to point out that the analyses of the data were undertaken in three phases. In first phase, the sample group of private school teachers (n=75) were taken into consideration, whereas, in the second phase, sample group of public school teachers (n=75) were analyzed. In the third phase of the analyses, total sample combining both the sub-sample groups were analyzed to investigate the general pattern of the findings. Following the above scheme, results and their discussion will appear in the proceeding writings.

Group of Private School Teachers:

In the present endeavour the results pertaining to the sample group of private teachers will be described. It is imperative to point out that private school teachers work under private management. The description and discussion of the findings related to the group of private school teachers are given below.
Table – 4.1

Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘security need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>5 .(125)</td>
<td>22 (.675)</td>
<td>13(1)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>27 (.8)</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .125
Ks = 1.66 (<.05) insignificant

Table 4.1 highlights that the security-need – a dimension of job satisfaction is found to be insignificantly influenced by behavioural patterns i.e., either by Type-A and Type-B as obtained value Ks = 1.66 is found insignificant even at .05 level of confidence. Hence, in view of the finding related null-hypothesis Ho, rendered accepted.

The finding suggests that behavioural patterns are not relevant and important so far as job security of private school teacher is concerned. It is, in fact, true in Indian scenario that private schools do not provide job security to their employees. Teachers in private schools only continue till they are performing well but good and proficient teachers are always in high demand and for them, it can be said that ‘sky is not the limit’ so far as ‘salary progressions’ is concerned providing long-term security of life where job security seems to be implicit.
Table – 4.2

Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘social need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural patterns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>19 (.475)</td>
<td>21 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>1 (.0285)</td>
<td>27 (.8)</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.0285</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(D = .325\)

\(Ks = 7.8 > .05\) significant

Table 4.2 clearly highlights that behavioural patterns of private school teachers have their differential significant influence on satisfaction with ‘social need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction as its statistical value \(Ks = 7.88\) is found significant at 0.5 level of confidence, therefore null hypotheses \(H_02\) is found rejected.

It is a matter of fact that people with Type-A personality being extravert, sociable and dynamic are most likely to experience satisfaction by satisfying social needs at the work place as compared to those possessing Type B personality and this the reason why, such results have been obtained here. The patterns of findings are very clearly exhibited in Table-4.2 where frequencies of social need – a dimension of job-satisfaction are increasingly higher in case of Type A compared to Type B personality teachers, hence, it clearly indicates that Type A teachers possess greater satisfaction with social need at work place.
Table – 4.3

Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘esteem need’ — a dimension of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>5 (0.125)</td>
<td>19 (0.6)</td>
<td>16 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>2 (0.0571)</td>
<td>24 (0.743)</td>
<td>9 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.0679</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .143
Ks = 1.27 (<.05) insignificant

Table 4.3 highlights differential influence of Type A and Type B personalities on satisfaction with ‘esteem need’ — a dimension of job satisfaction where Ks = 1.27 is found to be insignificant even at .05 level of significance. A look over the frequencies of Table-4.3 indicates that both type of teachers either possessing Type A or Type B personalities have similar pattern of frequencies advocating adequate fulfillment of esteem need — a dimension of job satisfaction. This being one of the most important reasons that personality pattern failed to differentially influence satisfaction with esteem need as both the groups (Type A and Type B) have almost similar fulfillment pattern, hence hypothesis H03 stands accepted.

The profession of teachers is considered to be most sacred profession where teachers respect seems to play significant role hence, teachers possessing either Type A or Type B personality do not differ on this dimension of job
satisfaction. In other words, it will not be wrong to say that the right from 20th century onward people in general have increasingly become more cautious with regard to their fulfillment of esteem needs, therefore seeking or expecting respect from others has become universal phenomena almost for all irrespective of their social affiliation of caste, creed, religion, strata, etc. Even at the work place people always want respect from others and do not want to be humiliated at any cost. Therefore, it is witnessed that there have always been greatest reactions of people when are being suppressed, insulted, humiliated, victimized in any form for maintaining their honour and dignity.

Table – 4.4

Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘need for Autonomy’ – a dimension of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>13 (0.325)</td>
<td>20 (0.825)</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>12 (0.343)</td>
<td>19 (0.885)</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ D = 0.06 \]

\[ Ks = 0.268 < 0.05, \text{insignificant} \]

In Table 4.4, differential influence of Type A and Type B personality on satisfaction with ‘autonomy need’ – a dimension of job-satisfaction has been highlighted and obtained value of \( Ks = 0.2686 \) is found insignificant, therefore, hypothesis \( H_04 \) is accepted.
The pattern of finding in the light of the distribution of frequencies shown in the table, itself indicate that behavioural patterns failed to influence the difference in the satisfaction for autonomy need because in this modern age of democracy, autonomy seems to be slightly differentially but equally important for all groups of people especially here, in case of private school teachers. It is important to mention here that the values related to autonomy are being given prime importance by people at both vertical and horizontal levels in the society and/or in the work place.

Table - 4.5

Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘self actualization need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>3 (.075)</td>
<td>29 (.8)</td>
<td>8 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>11 (.314)</td>
<td>19 (.857)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = 0.239  
Ks = 4.265 (<.05, insignificant)

One another dimension of job satisfaction viz., ‘self actualizing need’ also failed to differentially influenced by behavioural patterns namely, Type A and Type B as statistical value Ks = 4.265 is found insignificant, therefore, our null hypothesis H05 is accepted. Such finding seems to be logical in the sense that self actualizing need is generally thought of attaining or fulfilling by
people occupying usually highest position in the society, group or organization
and hence, for private school teachers either possessing Type A or Type B
personality pattern have no sense of fulfilling self actualizing need. The finding
is almost in accordance with Maslovian need hierarchy theory (1943, 1959)
where self actualization is the highest level of need which is only thought of
satisfying by a very few people in a society, group or organizations.

Table – 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural patterns</td>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>13 (.325)</td>
<td>21 (.85)</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>16 (.457)</td>
<td>18 (.971)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = 0.132
Ks = 1.3 (<.05, insignificant)

Table 4.6 highlights the result pertaining to have differential influence of
personality behavioural patterns on job satisfaction as a whole. Calculated
statistical value Ks = 1.3 is found statistically insignificant, hence, null
hypothesis Ho is found accepted.

It is evident from the Tables-4.1 to Table-4.6 that none of the
dimensions except ‘social need’ dimension, all remaining have been found to
be insignificantly differentially influenced by personality behavioural patterns
of private school teachers including overall job satisfaction. Such findings look to be rationally true because private school teachers are forced to work these because they do not have any other employment opportunities especially in government run schools. When teachers join private school, they very well know that they can not enjoy job security, autonomy, self actualizing need and also to some extent they do not have the craving for the fulfillment of esteem need but teachers possessing Type A personality have greater sense of satisfaction with social need compared to teachers possessing Type B personality. Moreover, it is also imperative to mention that all teachers of different personality or behavioural patterns almost develop similar mental set and psychological bent of mind when they choose private school for their professional career, hence, the reason why, personality do not differentially influence satisfaction of different needs at work.

Having given explanations of the influence of Type A and Type B behavioural patterns on different dimensions of job-satisfaction and job-satisfaction as whole, the on-going description and discussions would be on the influence of behavioural patterns on work commitment and its various dimensions of the same sample group of private school teachers.

Table 4.7 indicates differential influence of behavioural patterns on ‘effective commitment’ – a dimension of the work commitment. It is witnessed from the Table that $Ks = 7.88$ is statistically found significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The pattern of frequencies given in the Table 4.7 clearly indicates that effective commitment is significantly higher among teachers possessing Type A personality than those possessing personality B qualities.
Table – 4.7
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘affective commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>Type A</th>
<th>Type B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>2 (.05)</td>
<td>5 (.142)</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>16 (.475)</td>
<td>19 (.8)</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>22 (1)</td>
<td>11 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = 0.325
Ks = 7.88 (>0.05, significant)

It is imperative to mention here that Type-A people are usually time driven, competitive and achievement oriented and aggressive, hence they have significantly greater “effective commitment” at work.

Table – 4.8
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘continuance commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>Type A</th>
<th>Type B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>14 (.325)</td>
<td>15 (.5714)</td>
<td>.2464</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>20 (.8)</td>
<td>3 (.6)</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>17 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = 0.2464
Ks = 4.518 (<0.05, insignificant)
Table 4.8 provides clear picture of the differential influence of behavioural patterns on "continuance commitment" – a dimension of work commitment. Where statistical value $K_s = 4.518$ is found insignificant at 0.05 level of confidence. The obtained $K_s$ value being insignificant supports related null hypothesis $H_0$. So far as school teachers in private school are usually in search of better avenues of employment hence there continuance commitment uniformly found low among both types of teachers possessing either type A or Type B personality. In this regard we have already mentioned earlier that teaching private schools is usually the last option of the teachers because of poor work conditions.

Table 4.9

Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on 'normative commitment' – a dimension of work commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>7 (.175)</td>
<td>11 (.46)</td>
<td>22 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>6 (.171)</td>
<td>23 (.8)</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$D = .34$

$K_s = 8.63 (> .05, significant)$

So far as 'normative commitment' – a dimension of work commitment is concerned, Table 4.9 highlights that it is significantly influenced or predicted by behavioural patterns as $K_s = 8.63$ is significant at .05 level of confidence.
Hence null hypothesis $H_0$ stands rejected. Frequencies highlighted in Table 4.9 show that normative commitment is significantly higher among teachers possessing type-A personality because of their dynamic and aggressive personality traits.

**Table – 4.10**

**Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on work commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>3 (.075)</td>
<td>15 (.075)</td>
<td>22 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>8 (.228)</td>
<td>15 (.289)</td>
<td>12 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$D = .207$

$Ks = 3.199 (<.05, insignificant)$

It is witnessed from Table 4.10 that work commitment as whole has not been differentially significantly predicted either of the two (Type A and Type B) behavioural patterns as obtained value of $Ks = 3.99$ is found insignificant at 0.05 level of confidence for the sample group of teachers working in private schools. Therefore, null hypothesis $H_{10}$ is accepted.

There is no need here to give any explanation to such finding because working in private schools is usually a fixed choice where work commitment in general has less meaning for the group possessing either type A or type B personalities. However, it is important to mention here that continuing for as long period of time even unwillingly develops commitment among type A
personality teachers as such pattern is witnessed from the frequencies given in the table, though the difference yet obtained is insignificant.

**Group of Government School Teachers:**

In the preceding description and discussion of results, only sample of private school teachers were taken into consideration and now ongoing discussion will pertain to the sub-sample group of teachers working government run schools that follows:

**Table – 4.11**

**Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘security needs’ – a dimension of job satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural patterns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>14 (.35)</td>
<td>26 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>7 (.2)</td>
<td>28 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .15

Ks = 1.6 (<.05, insignificant)

Table 4.11 highlights differential influence of Type A and Type B behavioural patterns on ‘security need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction. It is witnessed from the statistical value Ks = 1.6 that predictor variables failed to significantly influence even at .05 level of confidence. Therefore null Ho11 is found accepted. Here again like previous finding in case of private school teachers, frequencies given in the table clearly indicate almost similar pattern in
both the cases of Type A and Type B school teacher. Therefore, what explanations were given earlier stands the same here too.

For the convenience of describing and discussing results for on-coming tables, it is imperative to mention that since all tables pertaining to group of teachers working in government run schools will be described separately but over all discussion will be given at the end after Table-20.

**Table – 4.12**

**Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘social need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (.025)</td>
<td>15 (.4)</td>
<td>24 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>10 (.285)</td>
<td>25 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[D = .115\]

\[K_s = 0.987 (<.05, insignificant)\]

Table 4.12 indicates that Type A and Type B behavioural patterns fail to differentially influence satisfaction with social needs at work as \(K_s = 0.987\) is found insignificant at .05 level. In view of our finding, null hypothesis \(H_{012}\) i.e., Type A and Type B government school teachers will not differ on satisfaction of social needs, stands accepted.
### Table – 4.13
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘esteem needs’ – a dimension of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>15 (.375)</td>
<td>25 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>1 (.0285)</td>
<td>6 (.2)</td>
<td>28 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.0285</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .175  
Ks = 2.286 (<.05, insignificant)

Satisfaction with ‘esteem need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction also found to be insignificantly influence by either Type A and Type B behavioural patterns. The statistical value Ks = 2.286 being insignificant states that the two behavioural patterns do not significantly differ on satisfaction of esteem need hence, null hypothesis Ho13 stands accepted.

### Table – 4.14
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘need for autonomy’ – a dimension of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>16 (.4)</td>
<td>24 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>1 (.0285)</td>
<td>16 (.485)</td>
<td>18 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.0285</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .085  
Ks = .539 (<.05, insignificant)
Table 4.14 highlights that the government school teachers possessing Type A and Type B behavioural patterns differ on satisfaction with autonomy need at work as obtained $K_s = 0.539$ rendered statistically insignificant even at .05 level of confidence and in view to this null hypothesis $H_{014}$ proved to be accepted.

Table – 4.15
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘self actualization’ – a dimension of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>17 (.425)</td>
<td>23 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>15 (.428)</td>
<td>20 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$D = .003$
$K_s = 0.007$

It is witnessed from Table 4.15 that on satisfaction ‘self actualizing need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction the group of teachers working in government run school possessing Type A and Type B personalities do not significantly differ, hence it supports null hypothesis $H_{015}$. It is very clear from the table that statistical value $K_s = .007$ is very low because of fact that frequency given in the table for both Type A and Type B are almost similar on self actualizing need, hence this is one of the reason that obliterated significance of difference.
Table 4.16

Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>Type A</th>
<th>Type B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (.028)</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>22 (.55)</td>
<td>15 (.45)</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>18 (1)</td>
<td>19 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .1
Ks = 0.74 (<.05, insignificant)

Table 4.16 provides information with regard to insignificant difference between Type A and Type B behavioural patterns on job-satisfaction as whole as it obtained value of Ks = 0.74 is insignificant even at .05 level of confidence such finding is rationally true here as all the preceding tables from Table 4.11 show very similar patterns among both type A and type B teachers working in government schools.

It looks from the finding contained in from Table 4.11 to Table 4.16 that job-satisfaction does not seems to be function of the difference in personality patterns. If teachers are dynamic, aggressive, achievement oriented, active, etc. (Type A personality) have greater enthusiasm in all areas of job satisfaction and because of their higher expectation and level of aspiration they are always in the state of such experience where they are neither satisfied or dissatisfied. On the other hand teachers how are passive, calm, promising, etc. (Type B
personality) generally do not exhibit their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

We are describing the results showing the differential influence of behavioural patterns on various dimensions of job satisfaction and as a job-satisfaction as whole for the group the teachers working in government schools. Now, on going discussion of the same sample will highlight the differential influence of Type A and Type B behavioural patterns on different dimensions of work commitment and work commitment as whole.

Table – 4.17
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘affective commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>2 (.05)</td>
<td>16 (.45)</td>
<td>22 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>11 (.31)</td>
<td>24 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .14
Ks = 1.463 (<.05, insignificant)

Table 4.17 highlights differential influence on behavioural pattern on effective commitment but there was no significance of difference obtained between Type A and Type B behavioural pattern on effective as Ks = 1.463 found statistically insignificant even at .05 level of confidence. Therefore, null hypothesis Ho₁₇ was found accepted.
Table – 4.18

Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘continuance commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (.025)</td>
<td>21 (.55)</td>
<td>18 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>3 (.085)</td>
<td>16 (.54)</td>
<td>16 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .06
Ks = .269 (<.05, insignificant)

Similarly Table 4.18 pertaining ‘continuance commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment as a function of Type A and Type B behavioural pattern fail to elicit differential significant influence as Ks = 0.269 found statistically insignificant even at .05 level of confidence. Hence, the null hypothesis Ho18 stands accepted.

Table – 4.19

Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘normative commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (.025)</td>
<td>11 (.3)</td>
<td>28 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>14 (.4)</td>
<td>21 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .1
Ks = 0.746 (<.05, insignificant)
With regard to third dimension of work commitment viz., 'normative commitment' couldn't witnessed any significant differential influence as a function of behavioural pattern as its obtained $K_s = 0.746$ statistically rendered insignificant at .05 level. Therefore our null hypothesis $H_0$ found accepted.

**Table – 4.20**

**Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on work commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural patterns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>18 (.45)</td>
<td>22 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>14 (.4)</td>
<td>21 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$D = .05$

$K_s = 0.186 (<.05, insignificant)$

Similar to the above findings pertaining various work commitment dimensions, overall work commitment as function of differential influence of behavioural patterns was also found to be statistically insignificant as its $K_s = 0.186$ found statistically insignificant at .05 level of confidence.

In the light of the findings highlighted in the tables from Table 4.11 to Table 4.20, it is very clearly witnessed that for the group of teachers especially working in government run schools. There personality pattern has nothing to do with the experience of satisfaction – dissatisfaction and their commitment at work. Teachers when get access to any school for teaching students, then their work behaviour is usually determined by work conditions as well as by
academic environment in the school. Moreover in the era of uncertainty of employment all teachers try to adjust themselves in all work conditions till they get brighter avenues of employment. These are some of the reasons for which teachers personality type or behavioural patterns do not differentially influence either the experience of satisfaction or commitment with work.

The above description and discussions were separately undertaken for teachers working in private and government run schools which fail to elicit any difference except in one dimension of job satisfaction (social need) and ‘effective and normative commitment’ dimensions of work commitment of private school teachers.

Now, the proceeding description and discussion of results will pertain to the sample group of teachers as a whole irrespective of their affiliation to either private or government run school teachers.

Table – 4.21
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘security need’ – a dimension of job-satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (.062)</td>
<td>36 (.512)</td>
<td>39 (1)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (.014)</td>
<td>34 (.5)</td>
<td>35 (1)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.0125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .0482
Ks = 0.344 (<.05, insignificant)
Table 4.21 showing the differential influence of behavioural patterns on ‘security need’ - dimension of job satisfaction obtained statistical value $K_s = 0.344$ is insignificant even at .05 level of confidence. As a consequence to it null hypothesis $H_{021}$ is found accepted.

Table – 4.22
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘social need’ – a dimension of job-satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>1 (.0125)</td>
<td>34 (.4375)</td>
<td>45 (1)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>1 (.0142)</td>
<td>37 (.543)</td>
<td>32 (1)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.0071</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$D = .105$

$K_s = 1.646$ (<.05, insignificant)

Similar to the above, $K_s = 1.646$ highlighted in Table 4.22 is also found insignificant at .05 level of confidence and as a result accepting the null hypothesis $H_{022}$. The finding reveals to the fact that there is no significant differential influence of behavioural patterns on ‘social need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction of teachers as whole.
Table – 4.23
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘esteem need’ – a dimension of job-satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (.0625)</td>
<td>34 (.4875)</td>
<td>41 (1)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (.0428)</td>
<td>30 (.4714)</td>
<td>37 (1)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .019
Ks = .054 (<.05, insignificant)

Table 4.13 provides information regarding insignificant differential influence on Type A and Type B patterns on ‘esteem need’ dimension of job satisfaction as obtained Ks = .054 being very low is rendered statistically insignificant for beyond .05 level of confidence. Hence, null hypothesis H₀₂₃ stands accepted.

Table – 4.24
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘need for autonomy’ – a dimension of job-satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (.163)</td>
<td>36 (.613)</td>
<td>31 (1)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (.183)</td>
<td>35 (.686)</td>
<td>22 (1)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .073
Ks = .796 (<.05, insignificant)
Table 4.24 shows significance of differential influence of behavioural patterns on ‘autonomy need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction and calculated statistical value $K_s = .796$ is found insignificant keeping the null hypothesis $H_{024}$ as true.

Table – 4.25
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘self actualization’ – a dimension of job-satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>1 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 10</th>
<th>11 – 15</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural patterns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>3 (.0375)</td>
<td>46 (.6125)</td>
<td>31 (1)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>11 (.1571)</td>
<td>34 (.6428)</td>
<td>25 (1)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$D = .119$

$K_s = 2.115 (<.05, insignificant)$

Table 4.25 provides a picture of significance of differential influence of Type A and Type B personalities on the satisfaction with ‘self actualization need’ – a dimension of job satisfaction which is again found insignificant even at .05 level as $K_s = 2.115$ is very low. Therefore, null hypothesis $H_{025}$ stands acceptable.
Table 4.26
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on job-satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>15 – 35</th>
<th>36-55</th>
<th>56-75</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>13 (.1625)</td>
<td>43 (.7)</td>
<td>24 (1)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>17 (.242)</td>
<td>33 (.714)</td>
<td>20 (1)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .08
Ks = .955 (<.05, insignificant)

Table 4.26 analyses job satisfaction as whole as a function of behavioural patterns but similar to the above, it is also found not to be the function of job satisfaction as Ks = .955 is found insignificant at .05 level of confidence. And because of the reason insignificant differential influence, null hypothesis H026 is found accepted.

Table 4.27
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘affective commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>5-15</th>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>4 (.05)</td>
<td>32 (.45)</td>
<td>44 (1)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>5 (.066)</td>
<td>30 (.5)</td>
<td>35 (1)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .05
Ks = .373 (<.05, insignificant)
After assessing the significance of differential influence on various dimensions of job satisfaction and job satisfaction as whole, now we have taken up another dependent variable viz., work commitment and its various dimensions. Table 4.27 highlights the significance of differential influence of behavioural patterns on ‘effective commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment obtained statistical value $K_s = .373$ being very low is found statistically insignificant even at .05 level of confidence, therefore null hypothesis $H_{027}$ stand accepted.

**Table – 4.28**

*Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘continuance commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>5-15</th>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>14 (.175)</td>
<td>40 (.675)</td>
<td>26 (1)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>23 (.328)</td>
<td>31 (.771)</td>
<td>16 (1)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$D = .153$

$K_s = 3.495 (<.05$, insignificant)

Table 4.28 takes up another dimension of work commitment viz., ‘continuance commitment’ which is also found not to be influenced by Type A and Type B personality or behavioral patterns. Its obtained $K_s = 3.495$ is also found insignificant hence, accepting null hypothesis $H_{028}$. 
Table – 4.29
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on ‘normative commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>5-15</th>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>2 (.025)</td>
<td>44 (.55)</td>
<td>34 (1)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>6 (.085)</td>
<td>38 (.54)</td>
<td>26 (1)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .06  
Ks = .268 (<.05, insignificant)

Table 4.29 gives information regarding differential influence of Type A and Type B behavioural patterns on ‘normative commitment’ – a dimension of work commitment it is also found statistically insignificant as Ks = .268 is found to low. Therefore, null hypothesis H029 stands accepted.

Table – 4.30
Showing differential significant influence of behavioural patterns – Type A and Type B on work commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural patterns</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>15-45</th>
<th>46-75</th>
<th>76-105</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>3 (.038)</td>
<td>40 (.537)</td>
<td>37 (1)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>8 (.114)</td>
<td>38 (.657)</td>
<td>24 (1)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = .12  
Ks = 2.150 (<.05, insignificant)
Having undertaken the various dimensions of work commitment separately now, Table 4.30 provides information with regard to the differential significant influence of behavioural patterns on work commitment as whole for the total sample irrespective of their affiliation to private and government run schools. It is again to note that the obtained $K_s = 2.150$ is found insignificant even at .05 level of confidence that shows insignificant differential influence of Type A and Type B behavioural pattern on work commitment. Therefore, like most of above related null hypothesis $H_{030}$ is also found accepted.

From the findings it is consistently observed that behavioural patterns either Type A or Type B seems to have little importance to elicit differential influence on job-satisfaction and work commitment for the group of school teachers. The entire write-up of this chapter given in the preceding pages have comprehensively highlighted the findings obtained and the logical discussion of the results as well, opting the pre-programmed plan. Therefore, findings pertaining to the group of private school teachers, government school teachers and thereafter, total sample inspections of the two groups were described as well as discussed. However, conclusions drawn are being given in the next chapter.
Chapter - V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In the last chapter IV, results were described and discussed for the two groups namely, sample group of private school teachers and sample group of government school teachers separately and thereafter, for the entire sample group of teachers in quest of seeing the influence of Type A and Type B behavioural patterns. The conclusions drawn from the findings of the study are being enumerated below in the same fashion as results were described and discussed. It is imperative and mentioned here that a chart depicting the results at a glance have been prepared which provides clear picture of the results, and also conveniently helped in drawing conclusions of the present study that follow.

Sample Group of Private School Teachers

A look at Table-5 showing results at a glance very clearly highlights differential significant influence of behavioural patterns (Type A and Type B) on job-satisfaction and work commitment and on their different dimensions. In case of private school teachers only satisfaction with ‘social need’ – a dimension of job-satisfaction; and two dimension of work commitment viz., ‘effective commitment and normative commitment’ were found significant as function of differential influence of Type A and Type B personalities.

It is witnessed from the pattern of results that teachers possessing Type A behavioural patterns are found to have better satisfaction and commitment in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DVs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ks. =</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (.05)</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
<td>Sig. (.05)</td>
<td>Insig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
these dimensions compared to the teachers possessing the Type B personality pattern. Other dependent variables found insignificant so far as differential influence of behavioural pattern were concerned.

**Sample Group of Government School Teachers:**

It is also evident from the Table-5 showing finding at glance that Type A and Type B behavioural patterns failed to differential influence job-satisfaction and work commitment and their numerous dimensions of government school teachers as obtained results concerning these were found insignificant.

**Sample group of teacher as a whole:**

The teachers in general irrespective of their affiliation to different types of schools could not also be found to be different as the function of the personality patterns viz., Type A personality and Type B personality on either job satisfaction and work commitment and their different dimensions. This clearly indicate that teachers personality patterns has nothing to do with job satisfaction and work commitment.

In the light of the overall findings of present investigation it, seems that satisfaction, work commitment and other work related behaviour of school teachers are not the function of personality patterns especially, Type A and Type B. It has already been pointed out earlier in chapter I and chapter II that no investigation have been conducted on any work related behavioural phenomena as function of personality patterns and whatever studies have been
conducted in this regard are on psycho-physiological diseases as are evident from literature review.

However, the present investigation was an effort to investigate the differential significance of the influence of behavioural patterns viz., Type A and Type B on job satisfaction and work commitment and results obtained. On the basis of the findings of the present investigation, it cannot be concluded and subsequently suggested with firm conviction that there is no use of such investigations, studying behavioural patterns in relation to work related attitude and behaviour like job satisfaction and work commitment but such studies may have some fruitful findings and/or guidelines if such investigations are conducted on larger and varied sample groups.

At length, it can be concluded that behavioural patterns are usually inborn which can be slightly modified during the process of socialization (acculturation) and through exposure to the environment but whatever, the personality types are there, it may be further modified when an individual joins a job and the need of social assimilation at the work place force them to get adjusted with the social situation for self adjustment in the social setup. It is imperative to mention here as the last word that personality of an individual is a highly complex phenomena that may get re-shaped in any form in accordance with the situation in quest of confirming the expectations of work group and the work organizations for their sustainability and experiencing both psycho-physical comfort at work.
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Dear Sir/Respondents,

It's a pleasure to meet you for the purpose of data collection in pursuit of research work. This work cannot be accomplished without your co-operation. The aim of the present endeavor is to study about the various aspects of the work you are performing. So it is necessary to know your views and opinions related to job. The questions/statements in the questionnaire are meant to know your PERSONAL VIEWS. To make the research endeavor successful, it is important for you to extend your whole-hearted co-operation by giving frank and honest responses to each question/statement. I assure you that the information given by you would be kept strictly confidential. Once again you are requested to extend your co-operation for the accomplishment of the task.

Your co-operation is solicited.

Before going through the questionnaire, please see the following GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Answer the questions serially, i.e. as they appear in the format.

2. If some statements or questions appear to be similar, even then you answer each of them separately.

3. It is expected that while answering, you do not consult anyone else. We want to know your opinions, views and feelings, not theirs.

4. Do not take too much time over any particular question. Whatever, answer comes first to Your mind, give that.

5. Please be as honest as possible and do not hesitate. Feel free to give your frank responses. Confidentiality of your responses is assured.

6. It is necessary that you answer all questions/statements. Please do not leave any question/Statement unanswered.

Please, do not leave any question/statement unanswered.
Appendix-II

Job-Satisfaction Scale

(JSS)

Twenty job items have been listed below and you have to evaluate each aspect on 5-point scale. Here, you are requested to indicate the extent to which each aspect IS PRESENT in your job. Assign “5” to the job aspect which is present in the maximum degree and “1” to the aspect which is present in minimum degree in your job. So please rate each item on 5-point scale from maximum “5” minimum “1”.

1. The opportunity for personal growth and development. (  )
2. The pay for my job. (  )
3. The prestige of my job in the department. (  )
4. The opportunity in my job for participating in setting of goals. (  )
5. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment in my job. (  )
6. The opportunity in my job for participating in determination of method and procedures. (  )
7. The feeling of self-fulfilment a person gets from being in my job. (  )
8. The prestige of my job outside the department. (  )
9. The feeling of security in my job. (  )
10. The opportunity in my job to help other people. (  )
11. The opportunity for independent thought and action in my job. (  )
12. The opportunity to develop close friendship in my job. (  )
13. The feeling of being-in-the know in my job. (  )
14. The authority connected with my job. (  )
15. The feeling of self-esteem a person gets from being in my job. (  )

Please recheck that you have answered the entire question
Appendix-III

Work Commitment Scale
(WCS)

Listed below are a series of statement that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. Please, indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement in the bracket ( ) provided against each statement. Response to each item is to be measured on a 7-point scale with point labelled as:

- Strongly Disagree 1
- Moderately Disagree 2
- Slightly Disagree 3
- Neither Disagree Nor Agree 4
- Slightly Agree 5
- Moderately Agree 6
- Strongly Agree 7

1. I feel proud of being attached to my organisation. (a)
2. I feel that I would be at loss when I would be leaving this organization. (b)
3. I have a firm conviction of not leaving job in this organization because this organization has helped me to stand on my feet. (c)
4. I can never think of leaving this organization even if my promotion is delayed. (b)
5. Real pleasure come to me only when I accomplish the task. (c)
6. I live, eat and breathe my job in this organization. (a)
7. I feel sorry and dissatisfied when I fail to utilize my utmost efforts for meeting the goals of this organization. (c)
8. I don’t leave the work place unless I complete my task/work. (a)
9. My organization is sufficiently fulfilling my needs which other Organization can not do. (b)
10. I love to work for my organization. (c)
11. What status I am enjoying here, I could not have found it in other organisation. (b) 

12. Personal benefit are more important to help promote organisation development. (a) 

13. I do not delay my work because I can not take any risk of being kicked out form my organisation. 

14. I believe one should not over-stay in the organization at the cost of Family affairs. (a) 

15. My organization has provided me opportunity to live with dignity on this earth. So I can never think to switch-over to other organisation/ company. (c) 

Please recheck that you have answered the entire question.
Appendix-IV

Measure of Behavioural Pattern viz., Type A and Type B

Dear respondent:

Please go through each statements carefully of this questionnaire which contain a pair of 21 statements, each statement describe certain kind of behaviour, thought pattern of personal characteristics so you have to think on each statement and circle the number which you feel best describes where you are between each pair, the best answer for each set of description is the response that most nearly describe the way you feel, behave or think.

1. I am always on time for appointments. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 I am never quite on time.

2. When someone is talking to me, chances are I will anticipate what they are going to say, by nodding, interrupting or finishing sentences for them. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 I listen quietly without showing any impatience.

3. I frequently try to do several things at once. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 I tend to take things one at a time.

4. When it comes to waiting in line (at banks, theatres, etc.), I really get impatient and frustrated. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 It simply does not bother me.

5. I always feel rushed. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 I never feel rushed.

6. When it comes to my temper, I find it hard to control at times. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 I just do not seem to have one.

7. I tend to do most things like eating, walking and talking rapidly. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Slowly

8. Quite honestly, the things I enjoy most are job-related activities. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Leisure-time activities.

9. At the end of a typical work day, I usually feel like I needed to get more done than I did. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 I accomplished everything I needed to.

10. Someone who knows me very well would say that I would rather work than play. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 I rather play than work.

11. When it comes to getting ahead at work noting is more important 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Many things are more important.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12. My primary source of satisfaction comes from my job.</th>
<th>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</th>
<th>I regularly find satisfaction in non-job pursuits, such as hobbies, friends, and family.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Most of my friends and social acquaintances are people I know from work.</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Not connected with my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. I do rather stay at work than take a vacation.</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Nothing at work is important enough to interfere with my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. People who know me well would describe me as hard driving and competitive.</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Relaxed and easy going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. In general, my behaviour is governed by a desire for recognition and achievement.</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>What I want to do not by trying to satisfy others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. In trying to complete a project or solve a problem I tend to wear myself out before I will give up on it.</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>I tend to take a break or quit if I am feeling fatigued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. When I play a game (tennis, cards, etc.) my enjoyment comes from winning.</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>The social interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. I like to associate with people who are dedicated to getting ahead.</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Easygoing and take life as it comes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. I am not happy unless I am always doing something.</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Frequently, “doing nothing” can be quite enjoyable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. What I enjoy doing most are competitive activities.</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Noncompetitive pursuits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix-V

Biographical Information Blank

Please furnish the following information:

1. Age ...........................................
2. Sex ...........................................
3. Religion .....................................
4. State/City ...................................
5. Qualification ................................
6. Rural / Urban ................................
7. Marital Status ................................
8. Present Position ............................
9. No. of Dependents ...........................
10. Total work Experience ....................
11. Number of promotions earned till now: ................................
12. Work experience in the present organization: ................................
13. General health ...................... (Very Good / Good / Neutral / Poor / Very Poor)