



## 2. RELATIONSHIP AMONG TYPE A/ TYPE B PERSONALITY, ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT AND SELF EFFICACY WITH READINESS TO CHANGE

*Roslina Abdul Rahman*

*Santi Julita*

*Sayed Hafizh*

*Wan Rafaei Abdul Rahman*

### **Introduction**

The millennium sees that rapid changes occur in every aspect of our life, be it environmental changes, life styles, working conditions, consumers expectations, technology advancement, etc. Organisations also cannot escape from the influx of changes. Indeed, organisations are under tremendous pressure to pursue organisational change in order to survive in an environment of increasing change and turbulence (Weber & Weber, 2001).

Armenakis, Harris, and Mossholder (1993) indicated that beliefs, perceptions and attitudes are critical in successful change. Change can be received with excitement and happiness or anger and fear while employees' response to it may range from positive intensions to support the change to negative intensions to oppose it. Cummings and Worley (2005) called this concept as readiness for change and resistance to change on behalf of leading and managing change. Readiness to change is positive attitudes towards change. On the contrary, resistance to changes is neglecting to change.

Readiness for change models have been applied widely in the organisational and behavioural sciences. Prochaska and colleagues (as cited in Cunningham, Woodward, Shanon, MacIntosh, Lendrum, Rosenbloom, & Brown, 2002), for example, found that readiness for individual change proceeded through stages beginning at the precontemplative stage, where the need for change is acknowledged. At the contemplative stage, individuals consider but do not initiate change. As a preparatory stage is reached, planning for change occurs.

Readiness to change was found to be vital in achieving organisational goals and in succeeding in change programmes (Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005). Although change management literature has provided practice with frameworks and methodologies to understand and manage change, the results are quite disappointing. The brutal fact, as Beer and Nohria (2000) described, is that 70 per cent of all change initiatives fail. The number one reason why organisation change initiatives fail is resistance to change (Deloitte & Touche, 1996), which is closely linked with the development of negative attitudes to change.

Ghosal and Bartlett (as cited in Wright & Thompsen, 1997) stated two distinctive factors which lead to successful organisational changes. They based their finding on their studies of more than a dozen organisations. According to them, for measurable progress achieved by some in stark contrast to the struggle or failure in others are successful transformation efforts which were almost always deliberately phased in a sequence to



build organisational capability and the focus of attention to individual behaviour. Further, they state that the capacity for change or personal readiness among employees yields an overt unlocking of energy for productivity and innovation and thus, evident that the individual employee capacity for change must be assessed and taken into consideration as a basis for purposeful organisational motion.

According to Holt (2003), the readiness for change factors are related to personality variables. Furnham (2005) defines personality as all those fundamental traits or characteristics of the person. Allport, Ryckman and Furnham (as cited in Lau & Shaffer, 1999) gave a broader definition of personality as the dynamic and organized set of characteristics of a person that uniquely influence his or her cognitions, motivations, and behaviours. Responses of individuals to readiness interventions vary because of their own differing cognitive structures (Backer, 1995). Personality and attitudes represent important micro, cognitively oriented variables in the study of organisational behaviour (Luthans, 2005). Vakola, Tsaousis, and Nikolaou (2003) suggest that there are some individual difference variables, such as personality traits and EI that seem to differentiate individual response to change. These literatures provide a base of the personality variable and its effect on organisational change.

There is evidence in the change management literature identifying the role of organisational commitment in a changing environment. Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) conceive commitment as an attitude that reflects the nature and quality of the linkage between an employee and an organisation. It is a state in which an individual identifies with a particular organisation and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in order to facilitate these goals.

Many authors indicated that organisational commitment plays an important role in employee's acceptance of change (Darwish, 2000). Iverson (1996) suggested organisational commitment as the second most important determinant after union membership of attitudes toward organisational change. But other researchers indicated that a highly committed employee may resist to changes if he/she perceives it as a treat for his/her own benefit.

Research on interaction between self-efficacy and readiness to change suggests that workers with confidence in their ability to cope with change are more likely to contribute to organisational redesign (Axtel, Wall, Stride, Pepper, Cligg, Gardner, & Richard, 2002) and that self efficacious people interpret environmental demand as challenge than threats (Jerusalem & Mittag, 1995), select challenging settings, explore their environment, or create new environments (Schwarzer, 1998; Schwarzer & Scholz, 2000). In the light of technological change within organisation, self efficacy belief is likely to influence individuals attitude towards technology (McDonald & Siegall, 1996), and that gender differences is evident (Busch, 1995). In the environment where time pressures is high, collective efficacy or group efficacy will affect individuals activities as members of a group or organisation; individuals who perceive their group members to be highly competent may react less negatively when role conflict arises.

International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM) is an international university





comprising lecturers and students, from different parts of the world. With its mission to Islamize, internationalize, integrate, and to provide comprehensive excellence, IIUM is an established university in Malaysia that has produced a number of written works in the context of Islamisation and integration of education. The availability of abundant multicultural resources influences its operations to be dynamic and welcome changes to keep abreast with changing environment. Thus, the aim of the study is to see the correlation of type A/B personality, organisational commitment and self efficacy with readiness for organisational changes on the staff of IIUM.

## **Literature Review**

### ***Readiness to Change***

Readiness is the state or quality of being ready, preparation, aptitude, willingness (Aarons, 2007). Readiness to change has been defined as support for change and positive affect about the potential consequences of change (Miller & Chen, 1994).

Individual and organisational readiness to change is also defined as involving people's beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding the extent to which changes are needed and their perception of individual and organisational capacity to successfully make those changes (Armenakis et al., 1993).

According to Vakola and her colleagues (2003), positive attitudes toward change in general consists of a person's positive cognitions about change, positive affective reactions to change, and positive behavioural tendency toward change. More specifically, Elizur and Guttman (1976) classified individuals' or groups' response to the introduction of organisational change into three types:

1. Cognitive responses: the opinions' one has about advantages and disadvantages, usefulness, necessity, and knowledge require for handle the change.
2. Affective responses: the feelings of being linked to, satisfied with, or anxious about the changes
3. Instrumental responses: the actions already taken or which will be taken in the future for against the change

Based on all these explanations, researchers define readiness to change as positive attitudes towards change which include positive cognitions about change, positive affective reactions to change, and positive behavioural tendency toward change. Thus, the employees are in the state of being ready, prepared and willing to accommodate change.

This research will focus on the researchers' derived definition and the aspects provided by Prochaska (as cited in Cunningham et al., 2002) and Elizur and Guttman (1976).

### ***Type A Behaviour Pattern (TABP) and Type B Behaviour Pattern (TBBP)***

In past researches done on organisational change, many aspects of personality are being studied, most focus on attitude. For example, studies done by Carol (1998) shows that difference in individual attitudes towards change can also be accounted for how people will respond. Some people are adept at adjusting to changes, whereas others lose





perspective quite easily and fall apart. People who have high tolerance for ambiguity and who have a fairly high level of self confidence usually adjusted well. Walker, Armenakis and Bernerth (2007) argue that individual differences may influence reactions to change and commitment to change during organisational change efforts. For example, individuals highly tolerant of ambiguity should be better equipped to handle the uncertainty associated with organisational change.

A research on five factor model of personality where one of the aspects being studied is openness to change found the positive relationship with openness to experience to effective coping and adjustment. Openness to experience is also found to be a dimension that can be related to positive attitudes towards change (Vakola et al., 2003). McCrae and Costa (1986) indicated a positive relationship between openness to experience and utilization of effective coping mechanism in order to deal with stressful events in life.

In this study, the dimensions of personality that will be investigated are Type A Behaviour Pattern (TABP) and Type B Behaviour Pattern (TBBP). TABP is characterized by impatience, time urgency, and hostility (**Nabi, Consoli, Chastang, Chiron, Lafont, & Lagarde, 2005**). Lee (as cited in Frei, 1999) characterized TABP as extremely hard driving and competitive, impatient, achievement-oriented, and polyphasic in thought. Furnham (2005) further stipulated TABP features as often being deeply involved in and committed to their work, significantly linked to need for achievement, autonomy and power. On the other hand, TBBP is very laid back, patient and take a very relaxed, low key approach to life and their job and take a broader view of things (Luthans, 2005).

A study done by Kunnanatt (2003) on the managerial performance of Indian bank executives found TABP performs better than TBBP in the highly competitive, time-bound and target-driven work environment of banking. According to him, the result showed that type A individuals are more aggressive, competitive, impatient, and ambitious, have an extreme sense of time urgency than type Bs, where, given their high level of competitiveness, it seems reasonable to expect that the type As will work harder at various tasks than the type Bs and, as a result, will perform at higher levels. Kunnanatt used Lifestyle Questionnaire, a modified version of the Bortner Rating Scale to measure TABP and TBBP. His findings showed that TABP can perform better in competitive work environment. According to Parker and Wall (2002), competitive work environments constitute the continuous organisational change in fundamental ways in order to maintain or increase their competitiveness. Thus, based on Kunnanatt's findings, it can be assumed that TABP will have no problems with changes in organisations, or in other word, they are ready for changes.

Research on the impact of change among American managers indicate that they views change as a threat where they feel threatened with uncertainty and instability and what they perceived as threat to their comfort, success and influence. This change produces stress which is further influenced by number of moderators such as TABP (Gray, 1998). Furnham (2005) suggested that TABP are more prone to stress and fit unambiguous environments and find ambiguous environments stressful, where as the opposite is true for TBBP. This suggestion if apply in organisational changes might mean that TABP will





not correlate positively with readiness to change if the changes is perceived as ambiguous. On the other hand, TBBP may have positive correlation in readiness to change in any situations in regard to their relax attitude. However, if the TABP has clear information on changes and perceived the changing environment as unambiguous, the contrary may happened. Frei (1999) specified that TABP behaviour also links to a compulsive need for control. However, the attentiveness, high job involvement, and persistence associated with TABP have been related to positive organisational outcomes.

Williams and Powell (as cited in Gray, 1998) suggested that there are two contrasting sub-components of TABP behaviour which should be considered separately: the “achievement-striving pattern” and the “impatient-irritability pattern.” The former is positive and leads to successful performance outcomes, whereas the latter is negative and may lead to adverse health outcomes. Bluen, Barling, and Burns (1990) examined the relationship of Type A personality and sales performance, job satisfaction, and depression. In this study Bluen, Barling, and Burns investigated the relationship of the domains of Type A personality; Achievement Strivings (AS) and Impatience-Irritability (II), with outcome variables. Results of this study concluded that the operationalizing and conceptualizing of Type A personality as a global construct is problematic, as AS and II are conceptually distinct, and thus yield different relations toward outcome variables. Bluen, Barling and Burns cautioned that global Type A personality construct have not been successful to be a good predictor variable.

These literatures findings and reviews give conflicting signals on TABP and TBBP readiness to change. If we look from the perspectives of stress, it seems that TABP will have either negative or positive correlation towards readiness to change depending on the ambiguity of the changes. In terms of high job involvement, it is supposed to be highly positively correlated with readiness to change as a committed and achievement oriented person which tend to characterised TABP will tend to be more committed to, and perform better at, organisational goals (Furnham, 2005).

### ***Organisational Commitment***

Porter, Crampon and Smith (1976) defined organisational commitment as the relative strength of an individual’s identification and involvement in a particular organisation. Mowday et al. (1982) conceive commitment as an attitude that reflects the nature and quality of the linkage between an employee and an organisation. It is a state in which an individual identifies with a particular organisation and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in order to facilitate these goals.

Commitment can be characterized by at least three related factors; a strong acceptance of the organisation’s values and goals, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organisation and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organisation. As a result, commitment is determined by a range of organisational and individual factors such as personal characteristics, structural characteristics, work experience and role related features (Vakola & Nikalaou, 2005).

According to Bogler and Somech and Mowday (as cited in Diana Setiyawati, 2005),





the original concept of organisational commitment was based on three factors, namely:

1. Identification: the acceptance of the organisation's goals and values.
2. Involvement: the willingness to invest effort on behalf of the organisation.
3. Loyalty: the importance attached to maintaining membership in the organisation.

O'Reilly and Chatman (as cited in Fields, 2002) described three dimensions of organisational commitment:

1. Internalization: defined as an employee adopting the organisation's mission as the employee's own.
2. Identification: defined as the employee's belief that the organisation's values are very similar to the employee's.
3. Compliance: defined as continuing to remain an organisation member because the costs of changing are too high.

Many authors indicated that organisational commitment plays an important role in employee's acceptance of change (Darwish, 2000). Iverson (1996) suggested organisational commitment as the second most important determinant after union membership of attitudes toward organisational change. More specifically, Lau and Woodman (1995) argued that a highly committed employee is more willing to accept organisational change if it is perceived to be beneficial.

Other research also indicated that organisational commitment is a better predictor of behavioural intentions than job satisfaction within a change context (Iverson, 1996; Iverson and Roy, 1994). Employees with high organisational commitment are more willing to put more effort in a change project and, therefore, it is more likely to develop positive attitudes towards organisational change (Iverson, 1996; Guest, 1987). Likewise, Vakola and Nikolaou (2005) also found a positive relationship between organisational commitment and positive attitudes to change in their study. The more employees identify with their organisations the higher their commitment to their organisation and the greater their willingness to accept organisational change (Cordery, Sevastos, Mueller, & Parker, as cited in Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005).

Guest (1987) suggested that organisational commitment mediated the total causal effects of positive affectivity, job security, job satisfaction, job motivation and environmental opportunity on organisational change.

Based on these definitions, this future research will use Mowday et al. (1982) definition that organisational commitment is an attitude that reflects the nature and quality of the linkage between an employee and an organisation. It is a state in which an individual identifies with a particular organisation and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in order to facilitate these goals.

### ***Self Efficacy***

Bandura (1995) conceptualized self efficacy as an exercise control over events that affect life of individuals. It is by exerting influence in spheres over which they can command some control, thus individuals are better able to realize desired futures and to



forestall undesired ones. Bandura further explained that efficacy beliefs influence how people think, feel, motivate, and act. Benight and Bandura (2003) denoted that whatever other factors serve as guides and motivators, they are rooted in the core belief that one has the power to produce desired effects by one's actions, otherwise one has little incentive to act or to persevere in the face of difficulties. According to Bandura (1977) efficacy beliefs have influence on level of effort, persistence, and choice of activities; a study involving students as participants conclude that students with high sense of efficacy for accomplishing an educational task will participate more readily, work harder, and persist longer when they encounter difficulties than those who doubt their capability.

Scholz, Gutiérrez-Doña, Sud, and Schwarzer (2002) stated that self efficacy, or "can do"-cognition, mirrors a sense of control over one's environment. It reflects the belief of being able to control challenging environmental demands by means of taking adaptive action. Gist (1992) stated that self-efficacy is a judgment of task capability.

Bandura (1995) explained that efficacy beliefs influence how people think, feel, motivate, and act. According to Bandura, sources of efficacy beliefs come from four main influences: (1) *Mastery Experiences*, i.e. experience of success builds robust belief in one's efficacy, and failures undermine it. (2) *Vicarious Experiences* obtained through social models, i.e. seeing people similar to themselves succeed by perseverant effort raises observer's belief in own capabilities to master an activity. (3) *Social persuasion* is a third way of strengthening people's beliefs that they have what it takes to succeed. As one is persuaded, it strengthens one's efficacy belief, which leads to self-affirming beliefs promoting development of skills and a sense of personal efficacy. (4) *Physiological and emotional state* also influences in judging own capabilities. Positive mood enhances perceived self efficacy, while negative mood diminishes it.

Self-efficacious people are prepared to take responsibilities and face challenges, will persevere in the face of difficulties and possess sense of control over environment in which they function than the inefficacious people (Bandura, 1977; 1995). According to Bandura and Wood (1989), individuals who show strong sense of self-efficacy set increasingly challenging goals, possess cognitive that environment is controllable, and exhibited effective analytic thinking, which subsequently affect organisational attainments.

According to Schwarzer and Scholz (2000), people with high self-efficacy set themselves higher goals and stick to them. Actions are pre-shaped in thought, and people anticipate either optimistic or pessimistic scenarios in line with their level of self-efficacy. Once an action has been taken, high self-efficacious persons invest more effort and persist longer than those who are low in self-efficacy. When setbacks occur, they recover more quickly and maintain the commitment to their goals. Self-efficacy also allows people to select challenging settings, explore their environments, or create new environments.

Axtell, Wall, Stride, Clegg, Gardner and Richard (2002) explained that workers with confidence in their ability to cope with change are more likely to contribute to organisational redesign. In contrast, workers may resist changes that they believe exceed their coping capabilities. Armenakis et al. (1993) explained that a demonstrable need for change, a sense of one's ability to successfully accomplish change (self-efficacy) and an





opportunity to participate in the change process contribute to readiness for organisational change.

Jerusalem and Mittag (1995) in a study assessing young East German migrants and refugees during a stressful life transition of two years after their move to the West as a reaction to the collapse of the Eastern system, found that people with high sense of perceived self efficacy trust their own capabilities to master different types of environmental demands. They tend to interpret demands and problems more as challenges than as threats or subjectively uncontrollable events. High perceived efficacy enables individuals to face stressful demands with confidence, feel motivated by physiological arousal, and judge positive events as caused by effort and negative events as due primarily to external circumstances.

McDonald and Siegall (1996) in a study examining the relationship between perceived technological self-efficacy (TSE); the perceived ability to perform successfully a technologically new tasks, and people's reaction to change found that technicians with high levels of TSE were significantly more satisfied with their jobs and more committed to the organisation after the changeover compared with workers with low levels of TSE. According to McDonald and Siegall, self-efficacy is one of the characters that prevent negative reactions to new technological change.

Busch (1995) in a study investigating gender differences regarding computer attitudes and perceived self efficacy in the use of computers, concluded that no gender differences in self efficacy expectations in performing simple tasks, however gender differences are strongest in performing complex tasks; females are found to have less self-efficacy with regards to complex computing tasks than their male counterparts with the most important predictor of computer attitude is previous computer experience and encouragement. Thus, it is assumed that in the environment where changes in technology as part of organisational change agenda (i.e. installation of new computer technology or system) take place, self efficacy will likely to influence individual attitude in the use of new technology, and that gender differences is evident.

Therefore, it is expected that self efficacy will likely to influence organisational member's readiness towards the likelihood of organisational change.

### ***Objective of Study***

It is the purpose of this study to examine the relationship between organisational commitment and readiness to change, TABP and readiness to change, and Self-Efficacy and readiness to change, as well as the differences of these variables in terms of gender, nationality, age and education level.

This research will address the following questions:

1. Whether organisational commitment correlate with readiness to change.
2. Whether self-efficacy correlate with readiness to change.
3. Whether type A behaviour pattern correlate with readiness to change.





Based on the literature review, it is hypothesized that:

H1: TABP will correlate negatively with readiness to change.

H2: Organisational commitment will correlate positively with readiness to change.

H3: Self efficacy will correlate positively with readiness to change.

In addition, this research also aims to explore the impact of age, education level, gender and nationality towards readiness to change, organisational commitment, type A/B behaviour pattern, and self-efficacy.

## Method

### *Participants*

Convenient sampling method was used in this study. 300 survey questionnaires were sent to staffs of the International Islamic University Malaysia. Staffs were from offices of the university, which includes, Library Administrative Office, Finance Division, Public Relation, Centre for Postgraduate Studies, IIUM Properties office, and Student Affairs Division, to distribute the survey questionnaires to staffs. 80 responses were obtained and analysed. Participants are grouped based on, gender, nationality, age groups, and education level. Table 1 summarizes the demographic data of participants.

**Table 1:** Demographic profile of participants

Demographic	n
Gender	
Male	35
Female	47
Not indicated	1
Nationality	
Malaysian	78
International	2
Not indicated	3
Age	
20-29	33
30-39	29
40-above	19
Not indicated	2
Education Level	
SPM/Certificate	35
STPM/Diploma	14
Undergraduate	7
Graduate	18
Not indicated	9
N	83

### *Instruments*

The questionnaire used to assess the variables in this research composed of four measurements. The following measures are:

1. Measurement of Readiness to change
2. Measurement of Personality
3. Measurement of Organisational Commitment

#### 4. Measurement of Self Efficacy

##### ***Readiness to change***

The operational definition of readiness to change in the context of this study was based on aspects given by Prochaska (as cited in Cunningham et al., 2002) and, Elizur and Guttman (1976). The questionnaire of readiness to change was developed by researchers in which consists of 10 items by using Likert scale 1 to 5. The highest score (5) means high readiness to change, and the lowest score (1) means low readiness to change. Favourable items are items number 1, 2, 4, 9, and 10, and unfavourable items are items number 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

##### ***Type A/B behaviour pattern***

The operational definition of personality in the context of this study was based on A Short Rating Scale as a Potential Measure of Pattern A Behaviour developed by Bortner (1966). This scale consists of 14 verbal descriptions of behaviour items which are seated at each end of the seven continuums, and each continuum starts with lowest scale of 1 and ends with highest scale of 8. Each endpoints represent different dimension of behaviour. High score in this measurement constitute a Type A personality, whereas low score means Type B personality.

##### ***Organisational commitment***

The operational definition of organisational commitment in the context of this study will be based on Mowday et al. (1982). A nine-item shortened version of the 15-item Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) by Mowday and his colleagues will be used in this research. It measures attitudinal or affective commitment.

The shortened OCQ has been shown to have a large positive correlation with the 15-item OCQ (Huselid & Day, as cited in Fields 2002). It has been used in numerous research projects, where it typically yielded internal consistencies between  $\alpha = 0.74$  and  $0.92$ . This questionnaire has been used successfully across culture. In Malaysian context, Diana Setiyawati (2005) found a good reliability of the scale (cronbach  $\alpha = 0.93$ ). Responses are obtained on a 7-point Likert type scale where the highest score (7) means high organisational commitment, and the lowest score (1) means low organisational commitment.

##### ***Self efficacy***

The English version of General Self-Efficacy scale was originally developed by Jerusalem and Schwarzer in 1993, which originally was derived from the German version developed by Jerusalem and Schwarzer in 1981. Initially, it consisted of 20 items, which later on was reduced to 10 items. It consists of items such as, "Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations", and "When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions". Response format consists of, *Not at all true*, *barely true*, *moderately true*, and *exactly true*, which are coded into 4 point scale.

The sum of the responses of the 10 items yields the final composite score. High score in General Self-Efficacy means high self-efficacy.

It has been used in numerous research projects, where it typically yielded internal consistencies between alpha = .75 and .90. The scale is not only economical and reliable, it has also proven valid in terms of convergent and discriminant validity. For example, it correlates positively with self-esteem and optimism, and negatively with anxiety, depression and physical symptoms (Schwarzer, 1998). The General Self-Efficacy scale has been currently been used and adapted into 22 cultures (Schwarzer & Scholz, 2000).

### ***Procedure***

Measurements of variables used in the study were made into a booklet to facilitate survey response and ease of responding for participants. Visits were made to university offices, including Library Administrative Office, Finance Division, Public Relation, Centre for Postgraduate Studies, IIUM Properties office, and Student Affairs Division, to distribute the survey questionnaires to staffs. Researchers met with person-in-charge of the offices to seek help in assisting distributions of questionnaires within each office. A period of one week was given before responses were collected. From the total number of survey questionnaire given, response rate was very poor.

### ***Data Analysis***

Data was analyzed using SPSS package. All researchers took part in the keying-in of data and data analysis. For all variables in this study (Readiness to Change, Organisational Commitment, Self-Efficacy, and Type A/B personality) item scores were added up into a total score of each variable before further analysis was done. Assumption test was done to test the normality and linearity of results. T-test and ANOVA was done for exploratory tests to analyze differences in means of age, gender, nationality, and education level with regards to readiness to change, type A personality, organisational commitment, and self-efficacy. Partial correlations were done to analyze the relationship among variables; organisational commitment and readiness to change, type A personality and readiness to change, and self-efficacy and readiness to change. Simple regression was done subsequently to analyze the predicting values of variables that were found to have significant relationship with the outcome variable. Cronbach alpha reliability test was done to measure the reliability of the four measurements. The reliability coefficients of Readiness to Change Questionnaire, Type A/B Behaviour Scale, Organisational Commitment Questionnaire, and Self Efficacy Scale showed Cronbach alpha of .82, .59, .95 and .92 respectively. The assumption tests were conducted to investigate the normality and linearity of the data. The normality tests found that data were normal for readiness to change, type A/B behaviour, organisational commitment, and self efficacy ( $p = .59, .41, .05, .07, p > .05$  and  $KS-Z = .77, .89, 1.35, 1.28$ ). The linearity tests found that data was linear for self efficacy and readiness to change ( $p = .000, p < .05$ ) and non linear for type A/B behaviour and readiness to change ( $p = .38, p > .05$ ), and organisational commitment ( $p = .58, p > .05$ ). Since some data were not linear, it means that these findings may not be generalized to another population.

## Result

The results are described in two parts. The first part described the three hypotheses tested in this study. The later part described the exploratory analysis.

### *Hypotheses Testing*

Three hypotheses were tested in this part. Table 2 summarizes the partial correlations among readiness to change, type A/B behaviour, organisational commitment and self efficacy. Partial correlations by controlling for age, nationality, gender, and educational level, indicated that there is no correlation between type A behaviour and readiness to change among university employees, and no correlation was found between organisational commitment and readiness to change among university employees. On the other hand, results indicated the significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and readiness to change among university staff. Based on results found, hypotheses 1 and 2 are not supported, whereas hypothesis 3 is supported. After singling out the controlling variables one by one to investigate which of the variables influences relationship between self-efficacy and readiness to change, it was found all variables influence the relationship. Moreover, based on regression analysis also found that self efficacy can be a strong predictor to readiness to change, and vice versa ( $p > .0001$ ,  $R = .47$ ).

**Table 2:** Partial Correlations among Self Efficacy, Life Satisfaction, and Type A/B Behaviour

	1	2	3	4
Readiness to Change	-	-	-	-
Type A/B Behaviour	.12	-	-	-
Organisational Commitment	.06	.14	-	-
Self Efficacy	.40*	.23	.25*	-

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

### *Exploratory analysis*

The objectives of these exploratory analyses were to find out if there were significant differences in the three variables among university employees in terms of demographic variables; age, nationality, gender, and education.

#### *Age and Readiness to Change*

Age is categorized into three groups: 20-29, 30-39, and 40-above. Table 3 summarizes the mean and standard deviation values of participant's group based on this category. It is indicated that the differences in the mean of readiness to change among participants based on their age are not significant ( $F = 1.72$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 3: Mean Readiness to Change Scores and Standard Deviation by Age**

Age	N	M	SD
20-29	33	37.04	5.71
30-39	29	39.14	5.10
40-above	19	36.64	4.74

**Table 4: Summary of One-way ANOVA for Readiness to Change**

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	95.79	2	47.90	1.72	.19
Within Groups	2175.50	78	27.89		
Total	2271.29	80			

**Age and Type A/B Behaviour**

Table 5 summarizes the mean and SD values of participant's group based on this category. It is indicated that the differences in the mean of type A/B behaviour among participants based on their age are not significant ( $F=.64, p>0.05$ ).

**Table 5: Mean Type A/B Behaviour Scores and Standard Deviation by Age**

Age	N	M	SD
20-29	33	37.03	6.78
30-39	29	36.63	4.91
40-above	19	38.72	7.94

**Table 6: Summary of One Way Anova for Type A/B Behaviour**

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	53.74	2	26.87	.64	.53
Within Groups	3282.49	78	42.08		
Total	3336.23	80			

**Age and Organisational Commitment**

Table 7 summarizes the mean and SD values of participant's group based on this category. It is indicated that the differences in the mean of organisational commitment among participants based on their age are not significant ( $F=.19, p>0.05$ ).



**Table 7: Mean Organisational Commitment Scores and Standard Deviation by Age**

Age	N	M	SD
20-29	33	46.94	12.09
30-39	29	47.55	11.87
40-above	19	49.16	13.96

**Table 8: Summary of One Way Anova for Organisational Commitment**

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	60.08	2	30.04	.19	.83
Within Groups	12131.58	78	155.53		
Total	12191.65	80			

### **Age and Self Efficacy**

Table 9 shows the mean and SD values of participant's group based on this category. It is indicated that the differences in the mean of self efficacy among participants based on their age are significant ( $F=3.12, p \leq 0.05$ ).

**Table 9: Mean Self Efficacy Scores and Standard Deviation by Age**

Age	N	M	SD
20-29	33	28.24	6.40
30-39	29	30.42	5.75
40-above	19	32.47	5.55

**Table 10: Summary of One-way ANOVA for Self Efficacy**

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	223.35	2	111.67	3.12	.05
Within Groups	2792.05	78	35.80		
Total	3015.39	80			

### **Nationality and Readiness to Change**

Table 11 summarizes the mean and SD values of Malaysian and International group of participant on readiness to change. It indicates that the differences in the mean of readiness to change between Malaysian and International employees are not significant ( $t=1.38, p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 11: Mean Readiness to Change and Standard Deviation by Nationality**

<i>Nationality</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Malaysian	78	37.84	5.23	1.38	.17
International	2	43.00	2.83		

***Nationality and Type A/B Behaviour***

Table 12 summarizes the mean and SD values of Malaysian and International group of participant on type A/B behaviour. It indicates that the differences in the mean of type A/B behaviour between Malaysian and International employees are not significant ( $t=1.20$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 12: Mean Type A/B Behaviour and Standard Deviation by Nationality**

<i>Nationality</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Malaysian	78	37.60	6.57	1.20	.23
International	2	32.00	0.00		

***Nationality and Organisational Commitment***

Table 13 summarizes the mean and SD values of Malaysian and International group of participant on organisational commitment. It indicates that the differences in the mean of organisational commitment between Malaysian and International employees are not significant ( $t=1.01$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 13: Mean Organisational Commitment and Standard Deviation by Nationality**

<i>Nationality</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Malaysian	78	47.87	12.36	1.01	.32
International	2	39.00	5.66		

***Nationality and Self Efficacy***

Table 14 shows the mean and SD values of Malaysian and International group of participant on self efficacy. It indicates that the differences in the mean of self efficacy between Malaysian and International employees are not significant ( $t=.47$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 14: Mean Self Efficacy and Standard Deviation by Nationality**

<i>Nationality</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Malaysian	78	29.91	6.24	0.47	.64
International	2	32.00	0.00		

***Gender and Readiness to Change***

Table 15 shows the mean and SD values of male and female group of participant on readiness to change. It indicates that the differences in the mean of readiness to change between male and female employees are significant. Females have higher score on readiness to change compared to males ( $t=2.22$ ,  $p<0.05$ ).

**Table 15: Mean Readiness to Change and Standard Deviation by Gender**

<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	35	36.29	4.92	2.22	.03
Female	47	38.88	5.42		

***Gender and Type A/B Behaviour***

Table 16 shows the mean and SD values of male and female group of participant on type A/B behaviour. It indicates that the differences in the mean of Type A/B Behaviour between male and female employees are not significant ( $t=.57$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 16: Mean Type A/B Behaviour and Standard Deviation by Gender**

<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	35	36.91	5.64	0.57	.57
Female	47	37.75	7.09		

***Gender and Organisational Commitment***

Table 17 summarizes the mean and SD values of male and female group of participant on organisational commitment. It indicates that the differences in the mean of organisational commitment between male and female employees are not significant ( $t=1.22$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 17: Mean Organisational Commitment and Standard Deviation by Gender**

<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	35	45.71	13.26	1.22	.23
Female	47	49.04	11.43		

### ***Gender and Self Efficacy***

Table 18 shows the mean and SD values of male and female group of participant on self efficacy. It indicates that the differences in the mean of self efficacy between male and female employees are not significant ( $t=0.06$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 18:** Mean Self-efficacy and Standard Deviation by Gender

<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	35	29.97	5.08	0.06	.96
Female	47	30.04	6.82		

### ***Education Level and Readiness to Change***

Education level is categorized into four groups: SPM, STPM, undergraduate, graduate. Table 19 summarizes the mean and SD values of participants based on this category. It is indicated that the differences in the mean of readiness to change among participants based on their education are significant ( $F=13.49$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). Graduate shows higher score on readiness to change compare with undergraduate followed by STPM and SPM. The Tukey HSD method, found that SPM has differences with undergraduate and graduate (-5.65 and -7.42), STPM has difference with graduate (-5.39), undergraduate has differences with SPM (5.65), and graduate has differences with SPM and STPM (7.42 and 5.39).

**Table 19:** Mean Readiness to Change Scores and Standard Deviation by Education

<i>Education</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
SPM	35	34.97	4.33
STPM	14	37	4.28
Undergraduate	7	40.62	3.53
Graduate	18	42.39	4.20

**Table 20:** Summary of One-way ANOVA for Readiness to Change

<i>Source</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	722.65	3	240.88	13.49	0.00
Within Groups	1249.96	70	17.86		
Total	1972.60	73			

### ***Education and Type A/B Behaviour***

Education is categorized into four groups: SPM, STPM, undergraduate, graduate. Table 21 shows the mean and SD values of participant's group based on this category. It is indicated that the differences in the mean of type A/B behaviour among participants based on their education are not significant ( $F=.35$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 21:** Mean Type A/B Behaviour Scores and Standard Deviation by Education

<i>Education</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
SPM	35	37.30	6.81
STPM	14	37	4.54
Undergraduate	7	38.63	7.01
Graduate	18	38.80	5.68

**Table 22:** Summary of One-way ANOVA for Type A/B Behaviour

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	40.07	3	13.36	.35	.79
Within Groups	2687.64	70	38.40		
Total	2727.71	73			

***Education and Organisational Commitment***

Education is categorized into four groups: SPM, STPM, undergraduate, graduate. Table 23 shows the mean and SD values of participant's group based on this category. It is indicated that the differences in the mean of organisational commitment among participants based on their education are not significant ( $F=1.35$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 23:** Mean Organisational Commitment Scores and Standard Deviation by Education

<i>Education</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
SPM	35	45.66	14.34
STPM	14	47.21	11.31
Undergraduate	7	50.57	6.95
Graduate	18	52.33	8.39

**Table 24:** Summary of One-way ANOVA for Organisational Commitment

<i>Source</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	584.92	3	194.97	1.35	0.27
Within Groups	10145.96	70	144.94		
Total	10730.88	73			

***Education and Self Efficacy***

Education is categorized into four groups: SPM, STPM, undergraduate, graduate. Table 25 shows the mean and SD values of participant's group based on this category. It is indicated that the differences in the mean of self efficacy among participants based on



their education are not significant ( $F=2.1, p>0.05$ ).

**Table 25:** Mean Self Efficacy Scores and Standard Deviation by Education

<i>Education</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
SPM	35	29.71	5.47
STPM	14	28.21	7.67
Undergraduate	7	32	2.71
Graduate	18	32.61	4.03

**Table 26:** Summary of one-way ANOVA for Self-efficacy

<i>Source</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	189.14	3	63.05	2.1	.11
Within Groups	2101.92	70	30.03		
Total	2291.06	73			

## Discussion

Self-efficacy was found to correlate positively with readiness to change and self-efficacy was also found to predict readiness to change. This means that high self-efficacious individuals are more likely to be ready to embrace change when it happens. Results supported previous studies denoting that efficacious individuals will be more likely to participate in organisational redesign (Axtel et al., 2002). Research has found that generally efficacious individuals are more ready to participate in activities, as efficacy belief influences the amount of effort put in, and perseverance in the face of challenges (Bandura, 1977). This is so because high efficacious individuals believe that they possess control over their environment that this belief influences the power to produce desired effects by one's actions (Bandura, 1995; Benight & Bandura, 2003). This ability belief or cognition that one has the ability to accomplish goals, and the opportunity to participate will contribute to the readiness to organisational change (Armenakis et al., 1993). Smith (2005) defined change as moving to a new and different state of things. The process of organisational change is often characterized by environment that is ambiguous, especially when information flow is controlled. During this stressful transition, high efficacious individuals are the ones that will persevere longer, as efficacious people are found to be adaptive and possess a belief of the ability to control over their own environment (Schwarzer, 1998).

On the other hand, results indicated that females are found to be more ready to embrace change than male. Education was also found to have a positive impact on participants' readiness to change. The higher the participant's educational background is, the more readily they embrace change. This finding supported Iverson (1996) notion that employees with higher education are better equipped to meet new challenges at work.

The results on the impact of gender and education level on readiness to change replicated earlier finding by Vakola and Nikalou (2005).

With regards to age, self efficacy was found to be higher among older participants. Results indicated that the older the participant, the higher the self-efficacy. This finding indicates that self-efficacy belief grows with age. This finding supports Bandura's (1995) idea that experience of success will boost one's confidence in his/her ability, also referred as *mastery experience*, which is one of the sources of self-efficacy development, among others including *vicarious experiences* obtained through social models, *social persuasion*, and *physiological and emotional state* that will influence in judging own abilities.

### **Limitations**

The current study has a set of limitations. Firstly, the sample size used in the current study was too small for the study to be able to provide a sound inference. From the number of survey questionnaires sent to offices, only a portion was returned. From the returned responses, grouping of participants based on demographic variables did not achieve a balanced portion, thus comparison was not possible. Time was a constraint hindering further inquiry for further possible data accumulation to achieve an ideal number of sample. Lastly, results obtained in this study was not linear, thus cannot be used for generalization.

### **References**

1. Aarons, G. A. (2007). *Measuring organisational readiness*. Retrieved December 19, 2007 from [http://casrc.org/People/Internal\\_Investigators/aarons.htm](http://casrc.org/People/Internal_Investigators/aarons.htm)
2. Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. V. (1993). Creating readiness for organisational change. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 681-704.
3. Axtell, C., Wall, T., Stride, C., Pepper, K., Clegg, C., Gardner, P., & Richard, B. (2002). Familiarity breeds content: The impact of exposure to change on employee openness and well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 75(2), 217- 231.
4. Bandura, A. (1995). Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp.1-45). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behaviour change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
6. Beer, M. & Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(2), 133-41.
7. Benight, C. C. & Bandura, A. (2004). Social cognitive theory of posttraumatic recovery: the role of self-efficacy. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 42, 1129-1148.
8. Bluen, S. D., Barling, J. & Burns, W. (1990). Predicting sales performance, job satisfaction, and depression by using the achievement strivings and impatience-

irritability dimensions of Type A behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(2), 212-216.

9. Book, H. E. (2002). How leadership and organisational structure can create a winning corporate culture. *A mental health and productivity in the work place: a handbook for organisations and clinicians (1<sup>st</sup> ed.)*. U.S; John Willey and Sons.
10. Busch, T. (1995). Gender differences in self efficacy and attitude towards computers. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 12, 147-158.
11. Cunningham, C. E., Woodward, C. A., Shanon, H. S., MacIntosh, J., Lendrum, B., Rosenbloom, D., & Brown, J. (2002). Readiness for organisational change: A longitudinal study of workplace, psychological and behavioural correlates. *Journal of Occupational & Organisational Psychology*, 75 (4).
12. Darwish, Y. (2000). Organisational commitment and job satisfaction as predictors of attitudes toward organisation change in a non-western setting. *Personnel Review*, 29(5), 6-25.
13. Deloitte & Touche (1996). Executive survey of manufacturers. Retrieved December 19, 2007 from [www.dtcg.co/research](http://www.dtcg.co/research)
14. Setiyawati, D. (2005). Spirituality and personality correlates of organisational citizenship behaviour. *Unpublished Master Thesis*. International Islamic University Malaysia.
15. Dordevic, B. (2004). Employee commitment in times of radical changes. *Economics and Organisation*, 2(2), 111-117.
16. Elizur, D. & Guttman, L. (1976). The structure of attitudes toward work and technological change within an organisation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 611-23.
17. Fields, D. L. (2002). *Taking the measure of work*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication, Inc.
18. Frei, R. L. (1999). The impact of monochromic and type a behaviour patterns on research productivity and stress. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14, 374 – 387.
19. Furnham, A. (2005). *The psychology of behaviour at work: the individual and organisation*. East Sussex, Britain: Psychology Press.
20. Gray, R. (1998). Workplace stress: a review of the literature. Retrieved January 5, 2008 from <http://www.btinternet.com/~kumpania/stress.htm>
21. Guest, D. (1987). Human resource management and industrial relations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24(5), 503-21.
22. Iverson, R. D. (1996). Employee acceptance of organisational change: The role of organisational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 7 (1), 122-49.
23. Jerusalem, M., & Mittag, W. (1995). Self efficacy in stressful life transitions. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp.177-201). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
24. Kinnanatt, J. T., (2003). Type A behaviour pattern and managerial performance: A

study among bank executives in India. *International Journal of Manpower*, 24(6), 720-724.

25. Lau, C. & Woodman, R.C. (1995), Understanding organisational change: A schematic perspective, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 537-54.
26. Luthans, F. (2005). *Organisational Behaviour* (10<sup>th</sup> ed.) New York, McGraw-Hill
27. McCrae, R. & Costa, P. (1986). Personality, coping, and coping effectiveness in an adult sample. *Journal of Personality*, 54, 385-405.
28. McDonald, T. & Siegall, M. (1996). Enhancing worker self-efficacy: an approach for reducing negative reactions to technological change. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 11(2), 41-44.
29. Miller, D., & Chen, M. J. (1994). Sources and consequences of competitive inertia: A study of the US airline industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(1), 1-23.
30. Mitchell, T. R., & Daniels, D. (2003). Motivation. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology*, 12, 225-254. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
31. **Nabi, H., Consoli, S.M., Chastang, J., Chiron, M., Lafont, S. & Lagarde, E. (2005). Type A behaviour pattern, risky driving behaviours, and serious road traffic accidents: A prospective study of the gazel cohort. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 161, 864 – 870.**
32. Parker, S. K. & Wall, T. D. (2002). Work design: Learning from the past and mapping a new terrain. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organisational psychology*, 1, 90–109. London: Sage Publications.
33. Schwarzer, R. & Scholz, U. (2000). Cross-cultural assessment of coping resources: The general perceived self-efficacy scale. *Paper presented at the First Asian Congress of Health Psychology: Health Psychology and Culture*, Tokyo, Japan. Internet preprint.
34. Scholz, U., Gutiérrez-Doña, B., Sud, S., & Schwarzer, R. (2002). Is general self-efficacy a universal construct?: Psychometric findings from 25 countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 18 (3), 242-251.
35. Smith, I. (2005). Achieving readiness for organisational change. *Library Management*, 26(6), 408-412.
36. Vakola, M. & Nikolaou, I. (2005). Attitudes towards organisational Change: What is the role of employees' stress and commitment?. *Employee Relations*, 27(2), 160-174.
37. Vakola, M., Tsaousis, I. & Nikolaou, I. (2003). The role of emotional intelligence and personality variables on attitudes toward organisational change. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(1), 88-110.
38. Walker, H. J., Armenakis, A. A., & Bernerth, J. B. (2007). Factors influencing organisational change efforts: an integrative investigation of change content, context, process and individual differences. *Journal of Organisational Change*



- Management*, 20(6), 761-773
40. Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp.202-231). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

