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 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 behaviours 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 organisation, 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 organisation.

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 behaviour pattern, Type-B personality is a form of behaviour associated with people who are free from 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 panickly 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.