CHAPTER – V
DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In the present chapter analysis of data, interpretation and discussion of results has been reported. The data obtained after the administration of research tools concerning the independent variables viz; Leadership preference, organizational climate and type of school and dependent variables viz; scores on total organizational commitment, affective component of organizational commitment, continuance component of organizational commitment and normative component of organizational commitment was subjected to 2x2x2 factorial analysis of variance with equal cells. After analysis of data, the testing of hypotheses constructed in Chapter-III has been done and discussion of results has been reported in this chapter.

The data for the present study was collected from five districts of Punjab state. A 2x2x2 factorial design has been used for the analysis of the data which involved four dependent variables; scores on total organizational commitment, affective component of organizational commitment, continuance component of organizational commitment and normative component of organizational commitment. The independent variables in each of the four 2x2x2 ANOVA designs were: Leadership preference – autocratic and democratic, organizational climate – favourable and unfavourable and school type – Govt. and Private secondary schools. As per the objectives of the study, the data was divided into eight groups. The following was the design used:

Leadership Preference (A): Autocratic (A₁) and Democratic (A₂)
Organizational Climate (B): Favourable (B₁) and Unfavourable (B₂)
Type of School (C): Government (C₁) and Private (C₂)

Table 5.1 Shows the eight fold structure
Table 5.1
Table Showing Eight Cell Combinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁B₁C₁</td>
<td>Autocratic leadership preference, Favourable organizational climate, government school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁B₁C₂</td>
<td>Autocratic leadership preference, Favourable organizational climate, private school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁B₂C₁</td>
<td>Autocratic leadership preference, Unfavourable organizational climate, government school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁B₂C₂</td>
<td>Autocratic leadership preference, Unfavourable organizational climate, private school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂B₁C₁</td>
<td>Democratic leadership preference, Favourable organizational climate, government school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂B₁C₂</td>
<td>Democratic leadership preference, Favourable organizational climate, private school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂B₂C₁</td>
<td>Democratic leadership preference, Unfavourable organizational climate, government school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂B₂C₂</td>
<td>Democratic leadership preference, Unfavourable organizational climate, private school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Analysis of Main and Interaction effects of Leadership Preference (A), Organizational Climate (B) and Type of School (C) on Organizational Commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative).

5.1.1 Main Effects

The effect of a factor is defined to be the change in response produced by a change in the level of the factor. This is frequently called a main effect because it refers to the primary factor of interest in the experiment (Montogomery, 1991). According to Rosenthal and Jacobson (1966) “the weighted average of the simple effects for all level of the criterion variable is known as the “main effects of the treatments”. ‘Simple’ effects may be interpreted as the treatment effect for a given level of independent variable. In brief, the main effects pertaining to the factors are the mean squares for the levels of factors. The comparison between two levels of each of three main effects; leadership preference, organizational climate and type of school have been done with reference to their effects on the four dependent variables.
5.1.1.1 Leadership Preference (A)

The variable is analysed for the difference between autocratic and democratic leadership preference of secondary school teachers on organizational commitment and its sub-components (vide Tables 5.4 - 5.7).

5.1.1.2 Organizational Climate (B)

The variable is analysed for the difference between favourable and unfavourable organizational climate of secondary school teachers on organizational commitment and its sub-components (vide Table 5.4 - 5.7).

5.1.1.3 Type of School (C)

The variable is analysed for the difference between govt. and private secondary schools on organizational commitment and its sub-components (vide Tables 5.4 - 5.7).

5.1.2 Interaction Effects

An interaction effect is an effect attributed to the combination of variables above and beyond that which can be predicted from the variables considered singly (Winer, 1971). Interaction can be evaluated in all experiments having two or more independent variables (Broota, 1989). The interaction effects among three independent variables in double and triple combinations are presented in tables 5.4 - 5.7.

5.1.2.1 Double Interaction

The two factor interaction effect of variables viz. leadership preference, organizational climate and type of school are grouped in the following manner:

Leadership preference x organizational climate
Organizational climate x type of school
Leadership preference x type of school
5.1.2.2 Triple Interaction

The three factor interaction effect of leadership preference, organizational climate and type of school on the total organizational commitment and sub-components of organizational commitment is presented in Tables 5.10-5.13.

For application of ANOVA, we divide the “among means” variance by the “within groups” variance and compare the resulting variance ratio, called ‘F’, with the ‘F’ values as shown in Tables 5.10-5.13. ‘F’ furnishes a comprehensive or over-all test of the significance of the difference among means. A significant ‘F’ does not tell us which means differ significantly but that at least one is reliably different from some others. If ‘F’ is not significant there is no reason for further testing, as none of the mean difference will be significant. But if ‘F’ is significant we may proceed to test the separate difference by the t-test. Two confidence intervals are in general used and are now accepted as standard by most statisticians. We know that 95% of the cases in a normal distribution falls within the limits $M \pm 1.96 \sigma M$ and that 99% falls within the limits $M \pm 2.58 \sigma M$. If we take the limits specified by $M \pm 1.96 \sigma M$, we define an interval for which the level of confidence is 0.95. Basing our judgement as to the size of $M_{POP}$ on these limits we stand to be right 95% of the time and wrong 5%. For greater assurance we may take the interval defined by the limits $M\pm2.58 \sigma M$. The level of confidence for this interval is expressed as a $P=0.99$. In a nut shell the primary objective of statistical inference is to enable us to generalize from the sample to some large population.

Assumptions of Factorial Analysis of Variance

The data of 240 secondary school teachers was subjected to 2x2x2 factorial analysis of variance. The assumptions of ANOVA were first tested by using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to test the normality of the data and Bartlett’s test to test the homogeneity of variances. Table 5.2 shows the results of K-S test.
Table 5.2

Table Showing Results of Kolmogorov – Smirnov Test for Total Organizational Commitment and its sub-components

| Sr. No. | Variable                                      | $|C_{p_0} - C_{p_e}|_{max}$ |
|---------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1       | Total organizational commitment               | 0.0094                      |
| 2       | Affective organizational commitment            | 0.0429                      |
| 3       | Continuance organizational commitment          | 0.0634                      |
| 4       | Normative organizational commitment            | 0.0613                      |

Critical values from App. 16, ostel, B.(1966)

(P=.05) $1.36 / \sqrt{N} \leq 1.36 / \sqrt{240} \leq .0877$

(P=.01) $1.63 / \sqrt{N} \leq 1.63 / \sqrt{240} \leq .1052$

* $C_{p_0} =$ Observed cumulative fraction

* $C_{p_e} =$ Expected cumulative fraction

The table 5.2 clearly reveals that all the values of $|C_{p_0} - C_{p_e}|_{max}$ for total organizational commitment and its sub-components (affective, continuance and normative) are less than $1.36 / \sqrt{N}$ and $1.63 / \sqrt{N}$ which reflects that the data on all the sub-components of organizational commitment and total organizational commitment is normally distributed. Thus the assumption of normality is fulfilled.

Table 5.3 shows the results of the Bartlett’s Test of Homogeneity of Variances.

Table 5.3

Table Showing Results of Bartlett’s Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Total Organizational Commitment and its sub-components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ [B]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total organizational commitment</td>
<td>4.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Affective organizational commitment</td>
<td>3.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continuance organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Normative organizational commitment</td>
<td>2.551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table E (Garrett, H. E, 1981)

$\chi^2_{0.05, df=7} = 14.067$

$\chi^2_{0.01, df=7} = 18.475$
An inspection of tables 5.3 shows that all the values of $\chi^2$ for total organizational commitment and its sub-components are less than the critical values i.e. from Table E (Garrett, H.E. = 1981)

$$\chi^2_{.05} = 14.067$$
$$\chi^2_{.01} = 18.475$$

So, the data display homogeneity of variances for 2x2x2 (equal cell structure) ANOVA.

Therefore, both the important assumptions for ANOVA were fulfilled before using ANOVA to test the following hypotheses for the present study:

1. Secondary school teachers having autocratic leadership preference do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having democratic leadership preference with regard to total organizational commitment.

2. Secondary school teachers having favourable organizational climate do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having unfavourable organizational climate with regard to total organizational commitment.

3. Government Secondary School teachers do not differ significantly from their Private school counterparts with regard to total organizational commitment.

4. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to total organizational commitment.

5. The interaction organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to total organizational commitment.

6. The interaction leadership preference and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to total organizational commitment.

7. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to total organizational commitment.
8. Secondary school teachers having autocratic leadership preference do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having democratic leadership preference with regard to affective organizational commitment.

9. Secondary school teachers having favourable organizational climate do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having unfavourable organizational climate with regard to affective organizational commitment.

10. Government Secondary School teachers do not differ significantly from their Private school counterparts with regard to affective organizational commitment.

11. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to affective organizational commitment.

12. The interaction organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to affective organizational commitment.

13. The interaction leadership preference and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to affective organizational commitment.

14. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to affective organizational commitment.

15. Secondary school teachers having autocratic leadership preference do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having democratic leadership preference with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

16. Secondary school teachers having favourable organizational climate do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having unfavourable organizational climate with regard to continuance organizational commitment.
17. Government Secondary School teachers do not differ significantly from their Private school counterparts with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

18. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

19. The interaction organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

20. The interaction leadership preference and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

21. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

22. Secondary school teachers having autocratic leadership preference do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having democratic leadership preference with regard to normative organizational commitment.

23. Secondary school teachers having favourable organizational climate do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having unfavourable organizational climate with regard to normative organizational commitment.

24. Government Secondary School teachers do not differ significantly from their Private school counterparts with regard to normative organizational commitment.

25. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to normative organizational commitment.

26. The interaction organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to normative organizational commitment.
27. The interaction leadership preference and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to normative organizational commitment.

28. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to normative organizational commitment.

5.2 TESTING OF HYPOTHESES AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Testing of Hypotheses and discussion of results have been reported in three parts:

- Part 1: Testing of Hypotheses and discussion of results of main effects
- Part 2: Testing of Hypotheses and discussion of results of double interaction effects
- Part 3: Testing of Hypotheses and discussion of results of triple interaction effects

Testing of hypotheses, critical analysis and discussion of the results of the present investigation is important from the point of view of presenting the findings into a well organized form. The results about testing assumptions of 2x2x2 factorial analysis of variance are very satisfying as all the four measures, organizational commitment and its three sub-components (affective, continuance and normative) display normality, found on the basis of the most powerful K-S test of goodness of fit. Bartlett's test of homogeneity of variances reveals that homogeneity exists on all the four measures; organizational commitment and its three sub-components (affective, continuance and normative). It was therefore appropriate to use the 2x2x2 factorial analysis of variance with equal cell structure to which ANOVA is not insensitive to heterogeneity. The results obtained from the analysis of data are discussed in the context of hypotheses formulated earlier. The results already arrived at by various related studies have been compared with the
results of present study. This has been done to make the study more meaningful.

For testing of hypotheses, data of 240 secondary school teachers was subjected to 2x2x2 factorial analysis of variance. Tables 5.4 – 5.7 shows the summaries of 2x2x2 factorial analysis of variance for secondary school teachers on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (affective, continuance and normative).

Table 5.4
Summary Table of Analysis of Variance for 2x2x2 design on Leadership Preference, Organizational Climate and Type of School on Total Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square Variance SS/df</th>
<th>F-Ratio MSV/MSV with in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Preference (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.335</td>
<td>5.335</td>
<td>1.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.934</td>
<td>1.934</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXBXC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Conditions</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>832.404</td>
<td>3.587</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.5
Summary Table of Analysis of Variance for 2x2x2 design on Leadership Preference, Organizational Climate and Type of School on Affective Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square Variance SS/df</th>
<th>F-Ratio MSV/MSV with in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Preference (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.605</td>
<td>2.605</td>
<td>3.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxBxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Conditions</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>172.571</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6
Summary Table of Analysis of Variance for 2x2x2 design on Leadership Preference, Organizational Climate and Type of School on Continuance Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square Variance SS/df</th>
<th>F-Ratio MSV/MSV with in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Preference (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.921</td>
<td>2.921</td>
<td>2.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxBxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.7
Summary Table of Analysis of Variance for 2x2x2 design on Leadership Preference, Organizational Climate and Type of School on Normative Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square Variance SS/df</th>
<th>F-Ratio MSV/MSV with in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Preference (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxBxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Conditions</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>301.206</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An inspection of the tables 5.4-5.7 showing summaries of ANOVA shows that all the values of F-ratios for organizational commitment and its sub-components are less than table values i.e. from Table of F ratios:

For $df_1=1$, $df_2 = 232$
\[ F = 3.88 \text{ at } 0.05 \text{ level} \]
\[ F = 6.74 \text{ at } 0.01 \text{ level} \]

It is clear from tables 5.4-5.7 that none of the values of $F$ are significant on the measures of total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative). An analysis of the results concerning the four dependent measures of organizational commitment and the independent variables leadership preference (autocratic/ democratic), organizational climate (favourable/ unfavourable) and type of school (government/ private) for secondary school teachers shows that on all the four
measures there are no significant differences with reference to the independent variables and their interactions. It reflects that government secondary school teachers having autocratic leadership preference and favourable organizational climate are in no way different from the private secondary school teachers having democratic leadership preference and unfavourable organizational climate on total organizational commitment as well as on sub-components of organizational commitment.

PART-1 TESTING OF HYPOTHESES AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS OF MAIN EFFECTS

5.2.1 Main effect of leadership preference on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative)

To study the main effect of leadership preference on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative), hypothesis no.1, 8, 15 and 22 were tested.

The F-ratios for leadership preference in respect to total organizational commitment, affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment and normative organizational commitment came out to be 1.487, 0.611, 2.172 and 0.004 respectively which are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of significance (vide Table 5.4-5.7). It indicates that the preference for autocratic leadership style and the preference for democratic leadership style among secondary school teachers do not differ on each sub-component of organizational commitment as well as on the total organizational commitment.

Thus 1st, 8th, 15th and 22nd hypotheses of the study which state that

1. Secondary school teachers having autocratic leadership preference do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having democratic leadership preference with regard to total organizational commitment.

8. Secondary school teachers having autocratic leadership preference do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having
democratic leadership preference with regard to affective organizational commitment.

15. Secondary school teachers having autocratic leadership preference do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having democratic leadership preference with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

22. Secondary school teachers having autocratic leadership preference do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having democratic leadership preference with regard to normative organizational commitment.

are accepted as the F-ratios are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of confidence shown in Tables 5.4-5.7.

The probable reason for these results may be that secondary school teachers are highly committed with their organization. The commitment is like kinetic energy which is not effected by leadership skills. Teacher inevitably exhibit organizational commitment and they work within the confines of certain leadership styles, whatever it may be.

Results of the present study are in line with the study conducted by Awan and Mahmood (2009) who found no relationship among leadership style and employee commitment of university libraries in Pakistan’s province at their work place.

Results of present study are not in line with the study conducted by Cokluk and Yilmaz (2010) who found significant difference between sub dimensions of organizational commitment and directive leadership behaviour of school administrators.

5.2.2 Main effect of organizational climate on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative)

To study the main effect of organizational climate on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative), hypothesis no.2,9,16 and 23 were tested.
The F-ratios for organizational climate in respect to total organizational commitment, affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment and normative organizational commitment came out to be 0.068, 0.003, 0.017 and 0.335 respectively which are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of significance (vide Table 5.4-5.7). It indicates that secondary school teachers having favourable organizational climate and unfavourable organizational climate do not differ on each sub-component of organizational commitment as well as on the total organizational commitment.

Thus 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 9\textsuperscript{th}, 16\textsuperscript{th} and 23\textsuperscript{rd} hypotheses of the study which state that

2. Secondary school teachers having favourable organizational climate do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having unfavourable organizational climate with regard to total organizational commitment.

9. Secondary school teachers having favourable organizational climate do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having unfavourable organizational climate with regard to affective organizational commitment.

16. Secondary school teachers having favourable organizational climate do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having unfavourable organizational climate with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

23. Secondary school teachers having favourable organizational climate do not differ significantly from secondary school teachers having unfavourable organizational climate with regard to normative organizational commitment.

are accepted as the F-ratios are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of confidence as shown in Tables 5.4-5.7.

The probable reason for these results may be explained by factors like good planning, clear rules and regulations, cooperative heads of school, participation in decision making, job profile of teachers and their own satisfaction towards their own organizational life that teachers make much
more efforts and feel committed to their organizational without depending upon climate of the organization.

Results of the present study are in line with the study conducted by Srivastava and Singh (2006) who found no significant difference between organizational commitment of closed-open, paternal-open and controlled-autonomous school climate.

Results of the present study are not in line with the study conducted by Mina (2006) who found strong relationship between each aspect of organizational climate (Supportive, directive, collegial, committed and disengaged) and teacher’s organizational commitment.

5.2.3 Main effect of type of school on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative)

To study the main effect of type of school on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative), hypothesis no.3,10,17 and 24 were tested.

The F-ratios for type of school variable in respect to total organizational commitment, affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment and normative organizational commitment came out to be 0.022, 0.946, 0.001 and 0.208 respectively which are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of significance (vide Table 5.4-5.7). It indicates that government and private secondary school teachers do not differ on each sub-component of organizational commitment as well as on the total organizational commitment.

Thus 3rd, 10th, 17th and 24th hypotheses of the study which state that

3. Government Secondary School teachers do not differ significantly from their Private school counterparts with regard to total organizational commitment.

10. Government Secondary School teachers do not differ significantly from their Private school counterparts with regard to affective organizational commitment.
17. Government Secondary School teachers do not differ significantly from their Private school counterparts with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

24. Government Secondary School teachers do not differ significantly from their Private school counterparts with regard to normative organizational commitment.

are accepted as the F-ratios are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of confidence shown in Tables 5.4-5.7.

The probable reason for these results may be explained by the factors like teacher's degree of understanding of organization's goals and policies, requirements of their jobs, feeling of personal responsibility for their work, feeling that they are recognized and rewarded for doing good work and receiving of accurate performance feedback and the feeling of belongingness to their organizations characterized by the cohesion, mutual support, trust and pride.

The results of the present study are in line with the study conducted by Joolideh and Yeshodhara (2008) who found no significant difference in affective and continuance organizational commitment between government and private high school teachers.

The results of the present study are not in line with the study conducted by Migena (2005) who found significant difference between the teachers working in public and private schools with respect to job involvement and organizational commitment variable.

PART-2 TESTING OF HYPOTHESES AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS OF DOUBLE INTERACTION EFFECTS

5.2.4 Double interaction effect of leadership preference x organizational climate on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative)

To study the double interaction effect of leadership preference x organizational climate on total organizational commitment and its sub-
components (Affective, continuance and normative), hypothesis no. 4, 11, 18 and 25 were tested.

The F-ratios for double interaction effect of leadership preference x organizational climate in respect to total organizational commitment, affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment and normative organizational commitment (0.236, 0.742, 0.126 & 0.268 respectively) are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of significance (vide Table 5.4-5.7). It means that the teachers who prefer autocratic leadership style with favourable organizational climate and unfavourable organizational climate and the teachers who prefer democratic leadership style with favourable and unfavourable organizational climate do not show any difference on all sub-components of organizational commitment and on total organizational commitment among secondary school teachers.

Thus 4th, 11th, 18th and 25th hypotheses which state that

4. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to total organizational commitment.

11. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to affective organizational commitment.

18. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

25. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to normative organizational commitment.

are accepted as the F-ratios are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of confidence shown in Tables 5.4-5.7.

The probable reason for these results may be teacher’s loyalty to their organization, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, degree of goal and value congruency with the organization and desire to maintain membership in the organization.
5.2.5 Double interaction effect of organizational climate x type of school on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative)

To study the double interaction effect of organizational climate x type of school on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative), hypothesis no.5,12,19 and 26 were tested.

The F-ratios for double interaction effect of organizational climate x type of school in respect to total organizational commitment, affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment and normative organizational commitment (0.539, 3.516, 0.158 & 0.043 respectively) are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of significance (vide Table 5.4-5.7). It means that the secondary school teachers who are preferring autocratic leadership style of their heads in government schools and in private schools and who are preferring democratic leadership style of their heads in government schools and in private schools do not show any difference on all sub-components of organizational commitment and total organizational commitment.

Thus 5th, 12th, 19th and 26th hypotheses of the study which state that

5. The interaction organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to total organizational commitment.

12. The interaction organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to affective organizational commitment.

19. The interaction organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

26. The interaction organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to normative organizational commitment.
are accepted as the F-ratios are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of confidence shown in Tables 5.4-5.7.

The probable reason for these results may be similar ideology of both the groups as both the groups are bound by their actions and through their actions to beliefs that sustain the activities of their own involvement which creates a friendly working atmosphere and provides an environment where they are well taken care of. Teachers have clarity of organizational goals which encourage them to adopt a commitment to the goals. They have set high standards and help each other to meet them. All teachers take responsibility for their work and due to the teamwork at every level, organizational climate may be favourable/ unfavourable always increases teacher’s motivation to maintain effective performance.

5.2.6 Double interaction effect of leadership preference x type of school on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative)

To study the double interaction effect of organizational climate x type of school on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative), hypothesis no.6,13,20 and 27 were tested.

The F-ratios for double interaction effect of leadership preference x type of school in respect to total organizational commitment, affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment and normative organizational commitment (0.248,0.942,0.008 & 0.034 respectively) are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of significance (vide Table 5.4-5.7). It means that the secondary school teachers who are having favourable organizational climate in government schools and in private schools and who are having unfavourable organizational climate in government schools and in private schools do not show any difference on all sub-components of organizational commitment and also on total organizational commitment.
Thus 6th, 13th, 20th and 27th hypotheses of the study which state that

6. The interaction leadership preference and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to total organizational commitment.

13. The interaction leadership preference and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to affective organizational commitment.

20. The interaction leadership preference and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

27. The interaction leadership preference and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to normative organizational commitment.

are accepted as the F-ratios are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of confidence shown in Tables 5.4-5.7.

The probable reason for these results may be attributed to factors such as exerting efforts on behalf of the school, having a proper pride to belong to such a school, the motivation of the school for better working situations, to be interested in the future of the school, to perceive the school as the best one among the other schools and to be satisfied with the interaction of people in the school, to struggle more for their students.

PART-3 TESTING OF HYPOTHESES AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS OF TRIPLE INTERACTION EFFECTS

5.2.7 Triple interaction effect of leadership preference x organizational commitment x type of school on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative)

To study the triple interaction effect of leadership preference x organizational climate x type of school on total organizational commitment and its sub-components (Affective, continuance and normative), hypothesis no. 7,14,21 and 28 were tested.
The F-ratios for triple interaction effect of leadership preference x organizational climate x type of school (0.034, 0.081, 0.001 and 0.003 respectively) are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of significance (vide Table 5.10-5.13). It implies that three factor interaction effect of A, B and C when applied together does not influence the total organizational commitment, and its sub-components among secondary school teachers. It means that secondary school teachers who are preferring autocratic leadership preference with favourable and unfavourable organizational climate in government and private schools and who are preferring democratic leadership preference with favourable and unfavourable organizational climate in government and private schools do not show any difference on all sub-component of organizational commitment and also on total organizational commitment.

Thus 7th, 14th, 21st and 28th hypotheses of the study which state that 7. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to total organizational commitment.

14. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to affective organizational commitment.

21. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to continuance organizational commitment.

28. The interaction leadership preference and organizational climate and type of school does not contribute to any significant difference with regard to normative organizational commitment.

are accepted as the F-ratios are not statistically significant even at 0.05 level of confidence shown in Tables 5.10-5.13.

The probable reason for these results may be hierarchical decision making, autocratic working environment, lack of employee empowerment and govt or private type of school does not induce negative employee commitment in workplace.