



## The Relationship between Personality Factors and Organizational Commitment of Iranian Primary School Principals

Mohammad Javad Shabahang<sup>1</sup>, Malahat Amani<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Islamic Azad University, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Malahat Amani, University of Bojnord, Iran

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received 02.02.2016

Received in revised form

18.05.2016

Accepted 09.08.2016

Available online

01.09.2016

### ABSTRACT

This study was conducted with the aim of identifying to study the relationship between personality factors and organizational commitment among a group of Iranian primary school principals. The sample included all the 108 primary school principals of Ardabil, a northern city of Iran. The study drew on a descriptive correlational research design. The research instruments consisted of The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The data were analyzed through Pearson and Spearman correlations, Independent t-test and Mann-Whitney U-test. The results showed that there was a significant relationship between the personality factor of emotional stability and organizational commitment. In addition, there were negative significant relationships between the personality factors of self-assured, conservative, group-dependent and organizational commitment. However, no other personality factor was significantly correlated with organizational commitment. Moreover, no significant difference was found between male and female principals regarding their organizational commitment. As emotional stability was a significant predictor of organizational commitment and organizational commitment is associated with positive working outputs, it is highly suggested that organizations pay special attention to the personality features of the human resources for employment.

Keywords:

Organizational commitment, personality factors, primary schools principals

### 1. Introduction

Organizational commitment is an important occupational and organizational construct getting the attention of many researchers of organizational behavior and psychology, especially social psychology. It has been diversely conceptualized and classified. All of these diverse definitions are identical in that they focus on the link between the individuals and their organizations. However, they are different in the extent to which they emphasize on the link between the two (Mathieu, & Zajac, 1990).

<sup>1</sup> javad.shabahang@gmail.com, Islamic Azad University, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Corresponding author's address: University of Bojnord, 4th km Esfarayen Road Bojnord, North Khorasan 9453155111 Iran

Telephone: +985842410700

e-mail: m.amani@ub.ac.ir

<http://dx.doi.org/10.17220/ijpes.2016.03.006>

In Gemlik, Sisman, and Signri's(2010) terms, organizational commitment is a multi-dimensional construct referring to an individual's psychological association with an organization. Similarly, Douglas (2010) defined organizational commitment as an individual's feeling of unity with an organization. This commitment can be characterized by the individual's trust in an organization and its values and objectives, and the tendency towards improving and staying with the organization. Aghdasi, Kiamanesh, and Ibrahim (2011) believed that the individuals who feel strongly attached with and express a higher rate of solidarity with an organization are consequently psychologically happier. In other words, organizational commitment is an individual's feeling of commitment to remain in an organization. This feeling is the result of the employee's experience on normative pressure (Mahdi, Gulam Mohd, & Almsafir, 2013).

Meyer and Allen (1991) defined organizational commitment as a kind of mental state indicating inclination, requirement or obligation to continue working in an organization. They represented a three-dimensional model of organizational commitment consisting of affective, continuance, and normative components. Continuance commitment is the result of an individual's awareness of the consequences of leaving the organization. It means that the employee continues to remain in the organization because he/she needs to do so as a result of analyzing the benefits. On the contrary, affective commitment is the feeling of internal belonging to the organization. In this kind of commitment, an individual decides to remain in the organization because he/she has a positive feeling about and attitudes towards the organization and its objectives and values. The employee remains in the organization in order to fulfill those objectives and values. If the values and objectives of the organization change, the individual will immediately leave the organization. Finally, normative commitment means that an individual decides to stay in an organization only due to the pressure of norms and moralities. In this case, the individual does not know what the colleagues' judgments will be after he/she leaves the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Some researchers suggest that the importance of organizational commitment is for its relevance with professional issues such as absenteeism, job quitting, job satisfaction, job involvement, performance, and the relationship between supervisor and subordinates (Finegan, 2000). A range of studies have focused on the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Tett & Meyer, 1993). In one of the recent studies of the type, Yucel and Bektas (2012) found that organizational commitment was positively correlated with job satisfaction. They also found that age differences affected the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, but it was not a linear relationship.

Some survey and meta-analysis studies have reported that organizational commitment plays an important role in the prediction of job behavior (Riketta, 2002). The previous studies have also indicated that organizational commitment is significantly correlated with organizational citizenship behavior, displacement, job performance, motivation of employees. It also plays an important role in understanding and increasing efficiency (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006; Riketta & Van Dick, 2005). The results of a meta-analysis of 67 studies containing 27500 individuals showed that there was a negative relationship between organizational commitment and absenteeism (Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, 2000). These results suggest that managers should pay more attention to organizational commitment in order to increase job satisfaction, and job performance and to reduce absenteeism.

The teachers and principals like other people have their own unique abilities, motivations, interests, and inclinations because they have different attitudes, knowledge, and value systems. It is quite evident that these different personality features can affect their acts and behaviors. Psychologists have defined personality as a pattern of relatively stable qualities, tendencies, and characteristics that, to some extent, give durability to individuals' behaviors (Feist, & Feist, 2002).

Cattell(1973) defined personality attributes or factors as relatively permanent trends for action and reaction, which are rooted in basic units of personality. After 20 years of intensive research on personality factors, he determined 16 profound attributes as the basic factors of personality (Feist & Feist, 2002). According to this personality model, every person can have certain attributes and tendencies towards the duties and objectives of the organization. Thus, personality differences can lead to creativity, or can affect the decisions and organizational behaviors of the employees.

Some studies have indicated significant relationships between extraversion/introversion and organizational commitment (Kumar & Bakhshi, 2010; Chu, 2010; Chandel, Sharma & Bansal, 2011; Panaccio & Vandenberghe,

2012; Kappagoda, 2013). Another research strand have explored the relationship between conscientiousness and organizational commitment (Mohammad Taheri, 2011; Jin, Watkins & Yuen, 2009; Kumar & Bakhshi, 2010; Chandel, Sharma & Bansal, 2011; Kappagoda, 2013). In addition, another group of studies have reported negative relationships between neuroticism and organizational commitment (Jin, Watkins & Yuen, 2009; Chu, 2010; Kumar & Bakhshi, 2010; Chandel, Sharma & Bansal, 2011; Kappagoda, 2013). Some other studies indicated a significant relationship between openness to new experience and organizational commitment (Kumar & Bakhshi, 2010; Kappagoda, 2013), while the direction of the relationship was not the same for all of them. Finally, agreeableness and organizational commitment have been found to be significantly correlated (Kumar, & Bakhshi, 2010; Panaccio & Vandenberghe 2012; Kappagoda, 2013).

In general, the literature shows that personality traits or attributes can influence the decisions and organizational behaviors of employees. As personality factors have been found to generally influence the way people decide and behave, a range of studies have investigated the relationship between personality factors and organizational commitment of employees. Majority of these studies have drawn on the five-factor model of personality to investigate the relationship between personality factors and organizational commitment and no study has used 16 personality factors of Cattell. In addition, the previous studies have investigated diverse samples of employees while no study has explored primary school principals for the relationship between their personality factors and organizational commitment. No study has been conducted on the relationship between the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) and organizational commitment of primary school principals either. Thus, the present study aimed at investigating a group of Iranian primary school principals for the relationship between their personality factors and organizational commitment. The present study could yield revealing results for the schools to employ better principals, and to train and prepare them as effectively as possible for their job position. The study addressed this research question: "Is there any statistically significant relationship between the personality factors and organizational commitment of Iranian primary school principals?"

## **2. Method**

This study has a descriptive correlation research design. It studies the relationship between personality factors and organizational commitment of primary schools principals in Ardabil city, a northern city of Iran.

### **2.1. Statistical population and sample**

The participants of the study consisted of all the male and female principals (n=108) of primary schools of Ardabil. The sample size equaled the statistical population. As the size was not so large, the census method was used to select the sample size. Therefore, all the 108 principals were selected as the sample to fill in the questionnaires. 103 questionnaires were returned after being completed by the respondents. As a result, 103 individuals were selected as the statistical sample, among 30 were male (29.1%) and 73 were female (70.9 %). The participants were of different age groups. The four age groups of over 45, 41-45, 36-40, and 31-35 made 34, 32, 30.1, and 3.9 percent of the sample, respectively. As for their education level, 84.4 percent of the participants had B.A. degrees. The other 15.6 percent had associate and M.A. degrees, 7.8 percent for each. As for their job experience, the participants with 21-25, 26-30, 16-20, 11-15, and 5-10 years of working experience had the respective percentages of 39.34, 15.5, 8.7, and 1.9.

### **2.2. Organizational commitment questionnaire**

This questionnaire was developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). It has 24 5-point Likert type items measuring the three subscales of affective, continuance, and normative commitments. The points on the Likert scale ranged from *Never*, *Rarely*, *Sometimes*, *Often*, and *Almost Always*. The reported Cronbach's Alpha for the affective, continuance, and normative components were 0.87, 0.75, and 0.79, respectively (Meyer & Allen, 1991). In the present study, the Cronbach's Alpha was found to be 0.70 for the instrument.

### **2.3. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF)**

This questionnaire was developed by Raymond Cattell (1973) using factor analysis. It comprises of 180 items designed to measure 16 major personality features or factors. Each factor is measured on a dichotomy with

positive and negative poles, one for the high scores and the other for low scores. The personality factors investigated in the present study were Reserved/Outgoing (A), Emotional Stability/ Emotional instability(C), Submissiveness/Dominance (E), Serious/Happy-go-lucky (F), expedient/Conscientious (G),Tough-minded/Sensitive (I),Practical/Imaginative(M), Forthright/Shrewd(N), Self-Assured/Apprehensive (O), Conservative/Experimenting (Q1), and Group-dependent/Self-sufficient (Q2). The other five factors including Reasoning, Social Boldness, Vigilance, Perfectionism, and Tension were not included in the study because they have less pedagogical value in educational environments. The reported test-retest reliability coefficients for the questionnaire have ranged from 0.65 to 0.93. The internal consistency coefficients of the questionnaire were found to be between 0.86 to 0.96, with the mean of 0.75, while the retest reliability coefficients with two-week time interval ranged from 0.56 to 0.79 (Clark &Blackwell, 2007).The Cronbach' Alpha coefficients were found to be between 0.09 to 0.43 in Iran (Novinnam, Shokarkon, &Mehrabizadeh Honarmand, 1999).In the present study, Cronbach's Alpha was found to be 0.79 for the whole scale. For the subscales, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients ranged from 0.08 to 0.31.

### 3.Results

As shown in table 1, the results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov showed that there were no normal distributions for the two factors of Reserved/Outgoing, and Expedient/Conscientious because their Z scores were high and p values were lower than 0.05. However, lower Z scores and p values bigger than 0.05 were reported for the other personality factors and organizational commitment indicating that they were normally distributed. To investigate the relationships between the two personality factors of Reserved/Outgoing and Expedient/Conscientious and organizational commitment, Spearman correlation was run. As for the relationships between the other personality factors and organizational commitment which were normally distributed, Pearson Product Moment correlation was conducted.

**Table 1:** The results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov for the normality of distribution

Variables	M	SD	Z	P
Reserved/ Outgoing (A)	12.72	1.97	1.62	0.01
Emotional Stability/ Emotional instability(C)	13.56	3.64	0.78	0.57
Submissiveness/ Dominance (E)	11.11	2.85	1.15	0.14
Serious/ Happy-go- lucky (F)	11.75	2.99	0.95	0.32
expedient/Conscientious (G)	15.80	2.87	1.58	0.01
Tough- minded/ Sensitive (I)	11.25	2.58	1.05	0.22
Practical/Imaginative(M)	11.40	2.99	1.29	0.07
Forthright/Shrewd(N)	11.42	2.29	1.26	0.08
Self-Assured /Apprehensive (O)	10.69	3.41	0.98	0.30
Conservative/Experimenting (Q1)	6.78	2.46	1.60	0.13
Group-dependent/Self-sufficient (Q2)	8.64	2.89	1.34	0.06
Affective commitment	31.40	4.60	1.02	0.24
Continuance commitment	26.60	3.75	1.13	0.15
Normative commitment	29.67	4.64	0.88	0.43
total commitment	87.61	9.88	0.89	0.40

As shown in Table 2, the personality factors of Reserved/Outgoing, Submissiveness/Dominance, Serious/Happy-go-lucky, expedient/Conscientious, Tough-minded/Sensitive, Practical/Imaginative, and Forthright/Shrewd did not have any significant relationships with dimensions of organizational commitment coefficient ( $P > 0.05$ ). On the contrary, Emotional Stability/Emotional instability was significantly correlated with Affective( $r = 0.40$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), normative ( $r = 0.43$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and total organizational commitment ( $r = 0.39$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ).Self-Assured/ Apprehensive also was negatively correlated with affective ( $r = -0.28$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), normative ( $r = -0.27$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and total organizational commitment( $r = -0.27$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). The personality factor of Conservative/Experimenting was negatively correlated with Affective ( $r = -0.24$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and total

organizational commitment ( $r = -0.19, p < 0.05$ ). Finally, the personality factor of Group-dependent/Self-sufficient was also negatively correlated with affective ( $r = -0.27, p < 0.01$ ), normative ( $r = -0.19, p < 0.05$ ), and total organizational commitment ( $r = -0.19, p < 0.05$ ). Surprisingly, no personality factor was significantly correlated with continuance organizational commitment.

**Table 2:** the results of correlation between personality factors and organizational commitment

Factors		Affective	Continuance	Normative	Total
Reserved/ Outgoing (A)	$r_{ho}$	0.10	0.07	0.12	0.13
Emotional Stability/ Emotional instability(C)	$r$	0.40**	0.002	0.43**	0.39**
Submissiveness/Dominance (E)	$r$	-0.11	0.004	0.03	0.03
Serious/Happy-go- lucky (F)	$r$	-0.13	-0.08	-0.05	-0.12
Expedient/Conscientious (G)	$r_{ho}$	0.14	0.09	0.11	0.17
Tough- minded/Sensitive (I)	$r$	-0.06	0.01	-0.08	-0.06
Practical/Imaginative(M)	$r$	0.06	0.10	0.18	0.15
Forthright/Shrewd(N)	$r$	0.09	-0.07	-0.01	0.01
Self-Assured/Apprehensive (O)	$r$	-0.28**	-0.03	-0.27**	-0.27**
Conservative/Experimenting (Q1)	$r$	-0.24**	-0.05	-0.12	-0.19*
Group-dependent/Self-sufficient (Q2)	$r$	-0.27**	0.05	-0.19*	-0.19*

As shown in table 3, there were no significant differences between female and male principals regarding total organizational commitment ( $t = 0.36$  and  $p > 0.05$ ) and the subscales of affective ( $t = 0.46$  and  $p > 0.05$ ), normative ( $t = 0.08$  and  $p > 0.05$ ), and continuance ( $t = 0.28, p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 3:** The results of Independent t-test for the differences between males and females.

	Sex	M	SD	F	Sig	T	Sig
Affective commitment	Male	31.66	5.02	0.65	0.42	0.46	0.64
	Female	31.20	4.45				
Continuance commitment	Male	26.77	3.93	0.18	0.66	0.28	0.77
	Female	26.53	3.71				
Normative commitment	Male	29.73	3.94	2.57	0.11	0.08	0.93
	Female	29.64	4.93				
total commitment	Male	88.17	10.03	0.17	0.68	0.36	.072
	Female	87.38	9.87				

As shown in Table 4, the results of stepwise regression analysis showed that the personality factors could significantly predict organizational commitment ( $F = 18.07, df = 1, p < 0.05$ ). It was found that only the personality factor of Emotional Stability/Emotional Instability could significantly predict organizational commitment. This personality factor could predict 0.15 of the variance related to organizational commitment.

**Table 4:** the results of multiple regression test to predict organizational commitment

First step	A	B	$\beta$	T	si	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F <sub>(101,</sub> 1)	Sig
Emotional Stability/ Emotional instability(C)	.48	0.25	0.39	4.25	0.0001	.39	.15	18.07	0.001

#### 4. Discussion

This study was conducted to investigate the relationship between personality factors and organizational commitment among a group of Iranian primary school principals. The results showed that the personality factor of Reversed/Outgoing (A) was not significantly correlated with organizational commitment. The results also showed that the principals obtained the highest scores, a positive pole, for this personality factor. The positive pole of this factor is identified with the features of kindness, affability, interest in people, tendency to help others, flexibility, and warm-bloodedness. The individuals with a positive pole of this personality factor mainly prefer a job which requires dealing with others. They usually prefer social situations that need a high degree of extroversion (Larsen & Buss, 2008). Compared with other factors, Reversed/Outgoing had the highest score and the lowest variance; this indicates that even the changes in organizational commitment cannot affect it. This indicates that majority of the principals had a positive pole of this factor. This piece of finding is inconsistent with the findings by Kumar and Bakhshi (2010), Chu (2013), Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2012), and Kappagoda (2013). However, Jin et al. (2009) came up with similar findings.

The personality factor of Emotional Stability/Emotional Instability was found to be significantly correlated with organizational commitment. The results of stepwise regression also showed that the personality factors could predict organizational commitment; only Emotional Stability/Emotional Instability could significantly explain about 0.15 of the variance for organizational commitment. The individuals with high rates of emotional stability are more tolerant of stress and rarely become distracted or nervous in challenging situations. They are really concentrated to follow their own ideas and goals (Larsen & Buss, 2008). Such individuals really feel connected with the organization and hardly decide to leave for another one. Contrastively, the individuals with high levels of emotion instability experience more negative emotions because they are intolerant of failures, visionary, nervous boredom, and restlessness. Negative emotions in neurotic individuals cause them to have weak working relationships with their organization and co-workers (Jackson, Dimmock, Gucciardi, & Grove, 2010) and consequently reduce their commitment to their organization. This finding is consistent with the results from the studies by Jin et al. (2009), Komar and Bakhshi (2010), Chu (2010), Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2012), and Kappagoda (2013).

It was also found that the personality factor of Submissiveness/Dominance was not correlated with organizational commitment. Dominance is defined in terms of features like assertiveness, aggression, competition, fulfillment of one's ideas, and being independent. On the other hand, Submissiveness is identified with features such as obedience, dependence, and unsteadiness (Larsen & Buss, 2008). The lack of relationship between the personality factor of Submissiveness/Dominance and organizational commitment can be partially attributed to the working conditions of the primary schools.

The results also indicated that there was no significant relationship between the personality factor of Serious/Happy-go-lucky and organizational commitment of the primary school principals. The participants were found to be quite relaxed, interested in excitement and hackneyed joking, and attentive to cases requiring time and effort. Meanwhile, the participants with a higher rate of Happy-go-lucky showed lower organizational commitment because they are engaged in more social activities and communication with others; As a result, they could have access to more job opportunities, weakening their commitment to their organizations (George, Helson, & John, 2011). This finding is inconsistent with the results found by Chu (2010),

Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2012), Kumar and Bakhshi (2010), and Kappagoda (2013), but is consistent with the findings found by Jin et al. (2009).

In addition, there was no significant relationship between the personality factor of Expedient /Conscientious and organizational commitment. Conscientious was the second factor with the highest score for the participants. This factor is characterized by the features of resistance, respect for authorities, obedience, agreement with authorities, power maintenance, responsibility, and fixed life style (Larsen & Buss, 2008). An individual, with a high degree of conscientious, consider themselves as ethically trusted, is attentive to moralities, maintains power, and is skillful at prediction. This factor is highly identical with the concept of superego which has been introduced by Freudian psychoanalysts. It can be stated that conscientiousness leads to a common attachment, based on which, individuals become disciplined and do their duties very well. At the same time, they need to receive motivational rewards to become obedient and consistent in their performance; otherwise, they may lose their commitment to their organizations. These results are consistent with the findings by Chu (2010) who similarly reported no significant relationship between organizational commitment and conscientiousness. Rossier, de Stadelhofen, & Berthoud (2004) also found that Expedient/Conscientious was significantly predicted by responsibility in the five-factor model. Contrarily, the finding of this study was inconsistent with the findings by Jin et al. (2011), and Kappagoda (2013) who reported positive relationships between conscientiousness and organizational commitment. The personality factor Expedient, which is characterized by features such as inconsistent, shallow, indifferent, expecting, unconfident, and antisocial, was not significantly correlated with organizational commitment.

No significant relationship was found between the personality factor of Tough-minded/Sensitive and organizational commitment. This factor is characterized by features such as dependence, opposition to independence, aestheticness, opposition to lack of artistic feeling, and opposition to feeling relaxed (Larsen & Buss, 2008). It seems that the individuals with high levels of sensitivity may not highly value rewards. Also, their tendencies and artistic preferences are not related to their computational thoughts. In fact, the reward that may lead to an increase in the organizational commitment of others is not of great importance for such individuals. In the study by Rossier, et al. (2004), it was found that this personality factor was significantly predicted by openness-to-experience dimension of the five-factor model. The findings of the present study are in tune with the results from the studies by Jin et al. (2008), Chandel et al. (2011), Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2012) who didn't find any significant relationship between organizational commitment and openness-to-experience. The present finding is also inconsistent with the result by Chu (2010) who found a positive relationship between openness-to-experience and organizational commitment, and the findings by Kumar and Bakhshi (2010), Kappagoda (2013), and Khodabakhshi (2013) who reported a negative relationship between openness-to-experience and organizational commitment. The relationship between this personality factor and organizational commitment is in dire need of reinvestigation.

No significant relationship was found between the personality factor of Practical/Imaginative and organizational commitment. Imaginativeness is characterized with attributes such as being exceptional, dreamy, venture, indifferent towards daily issues, forgetting trivial cases, and indifference to practical activities and creativity. On the other hand, practicality is defined in terms of the attributes of being bureaucratic, reasonable, accurate and relaxed in emergencies and following social norms (Larsen & Buss, 2008). It seems that imaginative individuals have divergent thoughts and are not affected by the common rewards making employees commit to their organizations. They are not very interested to remain in or belong to an organization for long due to their venture and whimsicality. In the study by Rossier, et al. (2004), this trait was significantly predicted by openness-to-experience dimension of the five-factor model. The finding of this study is also in agreement with the findings by Jin et al. (2008), Chandel et al. (2011), Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2012) who found no significant relationship between organizational commitment and openness-to-experience. However, this finding is inconsistent with the findings by Chu (2010) who found a positive relationship between openness-to-experience and organizational commitment and Kumar and Bakhshi (2010), Kappagoda (2013), and Khodabashi (2013) who reported negative relationships between the two variables. Since contradictory results have been reported for the relationship between the two variables, further studies are suggested to investigate the relationship between the two variables, with control of the other intervening variables.

There was no significant relationship between the personality factor of Fortright/Shrewd and organizational commitment. The individuals with a high level of shrewdness are self-contained, polite, dignified, educated, and effective on others, while the forthright individuals are clumsy and interested in others (Larsen and Buss, 2008). Belonging to and staying with an organization is important for the individuals with high rates of shrewdness because they would have the chance for promotion and advancement. Rossier, et al. (2004) found that shrewdness could be predicted by the openness-to-experience dimension of the five-factor model. This finding is inconsistent with the results found by Kumar and Bakhshi (2010), Choi (2010), Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2012), Maranjani et al. (2013), and Kappagoda (2013), while it is in agreement with the findings by Jin et al. (2009).

It was also found that the personality factor of Apprehensive/Self-Assured had a significant negative relationship with organizational commitment. In fact, as the degree of organizational commitment increases, the amount of Apprehensive comes down. The Apprehensive trait is characterized with features such as feeling of sin, depression, anxiety, rejection, suspicion, sensitivity to criticism, self-blaming, and constant mental occupation, while self-assuredness is identified with the features of being relaxed and insensitive, trusting, and being non-suspicious (Larsen & Buss, 2008). The individuals with high levels of organizational commitment feel connected to and have positive attitudes towards their organization leading to the acceptance of its goals. So these individuals easily adjust themselves to job environments as a result of job security. They also tend to increase their social relationship, feel personally efficient, feel responsible in material and human environments, are purposeful and reach self-actualization. Rossier et al. (2004) reported this factor predicted by neuroticism. This finding is consistent with the finding by Jin, et al. (2009), Kumar and Bakhshi (2010), Choi (2010), Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2012), and Kappagoda (2013).

The personality factor of Conservative/Experimenting was found to be negatively correlated with organizational commitment. The individuals with higher levels of experimenting are more extravagant and liberal, abandon traditions and current ways of doing works, and incline to make effective decisions, but they cannot be successful leaders because of strong criticism and verbal aggression (Larsen & Buss, 2008). It can be proclaimed that conservative individuals seem to be at a higher level of agreeableness and consequently experience more positive excitements and social acceptance in interpersonal communications. They are able to have stronger intimate and humanistic social interactions with their co-workers and employers. Such people also tend to criticize the existing traditional customs and procedures which may decrease their sense of belonging to an organization. Rossier, et al. (2004) found that this trait could be predicted by the agreeableness dimension of the five-factor model. This finding is inconsistent with the finding by Chandel et al. (2011). However, it is in tune with the results from the studies by Jin et al. (2009), Kumar & Bakhshi (2010), Chu (2010), Panaccio & Vandenberghe (2012), and Kappagoda (2013).

The personality factor of Group-dependent/Self-sufficient was found to be negatively correlated with organizational commitment. This indicates that highly dependent individuals have lower commitment to their organization. In other words, the higher the degree of self-reliance and the ability for decision making, the lower the degree of organizational commitment. Self-sufficiency indicates that an individual is mainly self-directed, but does not dominate others in social interactions. A Group-dependent individual prefers to work and makes decisions during his/her associations with others and wishes to be valued and confirmed. Such individuals obey customs and traditions and follow fashions. It can be stated that the highly competent employers tend to increase their social, individual, and economic/strategic contributions which lead to high commitment to the organization's policies, tremendous effort, and staying in the occupation and organization.

Finally, it was found that there was no significant difference in the degree of organizational commitment between the male and female principals. This can be attributed to the fact that male and female in the current Iranian society fill the same job opportunities with no difference in the range of activities they have to follow.

The present study has its own limitations. The first and the most noticeable limitation is about the research sample. Since the sample only included primary school principals, the findings of the present study could only be cautiously generalized to other organizations. It is highly suggested that similar studies be conducted with junior high school and high school principals. The second limitation was about the impossibility of controlling a range of intervening variables such as economic and social status, religious belief, intra organizational

variables, job satisfaction and organizational atmosphere. Another limitation of the present study was the use of self-report inventories for data collection which let for bias in responding.

As there were significant differences between the personality factors and organizational commitment, it is suggested that various organizations, including educational, employ principals taking into consideration their personality features. As there was no difference between female and male principals' organizational commitment, it is highly recommended that educational organizations employ principals without taking into consideration their gender differences.

## References

- Aghdasi, S., Kiamanesh, A. R., & Ebrahim, A. N. (2011). Emotional Intelligence and organizational commitment: testing the mediatory role of occupational stress and job satisfaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1965-1976.
- Chandel, J. K., Sharma, S.K., & Bansal, S.P (2011). Linking the big five personality domains to organizational commitment. *International Journal of Research in Commerce, IT and Management*, 1(3). 19-24.
- Chughtai, A. A., & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among Pakistani university teachers. *Applied H.R.M. Research*, 11(1), 39-64.
- Clark W. L., & Blackwell T. L. (2007). 16PF (5th edition) Personal career development profile: Test review. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 50, 247-250.
- Cui, C. (2010). *The relationship among personality traits, job design characteristics and organizational commitment: An empirical study of organizations in China*. Master thesis: The University of Waikato.
- Douglas, S. M. (2010). *Organizational climate and teacher's commitment*: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Alabama.
- Feist, J., & Feist, G.J. (, 2002,). *Theories of Personality* (5th, ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Finegan, J. E. (2000). The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment. *Journal of occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(2), 149-169, doi:10.1348/096317900166958
- Gemlik, N., Sisman, F. A., & Sigri, U. (2010). The relationship between burnout and organizational commitment among health sector staff in Turkey. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 8, 137-149.
- Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of management*, 26(3), 463-488, doi:10.1177/014920630002600305
- Jin, L., Watkins, D., & Yuen, M. (2009). Personality, career decision self-efficacy and commitment to the career choices process among Chinese graduate students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(1), 47-52, doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2008.10.002
- Kappagoda, S. (2013). The impact of five-factor model of personality on organizational commitment of English teachers in Sri Lankan Government Schools. *International Journal of Physical and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 2249-5894.
- Khodabakhshi, M. (2013). Predicting occupational stress for women working in the bank with assessment of their organizational commitment and personality type. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 84, 1859-1863.
- Kumar, K., & Bakhshi, A. (2010). The five-factor model of personality and organizational commitment: Is there any relationship. *Humanity and Social Sciences Journal*, 5(1), 25-34.
- Larsen, R.J., & Buss, D.M. (2008). *Differential and personality psychology*. third edition, McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

- Mahdi, O. R., Mohd, E. S. B. G., & Almsafir, M. K. (2014). Empirical study on the impact of leadership behavior on organizational commitment in plantation companies in Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109, 1076-1087.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194, doi:10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.171
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Mohammadtaheri, N. (2011). The study of effective factors on the teachers' work commitment in high schools. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1524-1530.
- Novinnam, G., Shokrkon, H., & Mehrabizadeh, M. (1999). Study of relationship between traits personality and managers' leadership style. *Journal of Education Science and Psychology*, 8(3- 4), 87-106.
- Panaccio, A., & Vandenberghe, C. (2012). Five-factor model of personality and organizational commitment: The mediating role of positive and negative affective states. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(3), 647-658, doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2012.03.002
- Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 23(3), 257-266, doi:10.1002/job.141
- Riketta, M., & Van Dick, R. (2005). Foci of attachment in organizations: A meta-analytic comparison of the strength and correlates of workgroup versus organizational identification and commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(3), 490-510, doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2004.06.001
- Rossier, J., Meyer de Stadelhofen, F., & Berthoud, S. (2004). The Hierarchical Structures of the NEO PI-R and the 16PF5. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 20(1), 27-38, doi:10.1027/1015-5759.20.1.27
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel psychology*, 46(2), 259-293, doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00874.x
- Yücel, I., & Bektaş, C. (2012). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and demographic characteristics among teachers in Turkey: Younger is better? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 1598-1608.