TYPE A BEHAVIOUR AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF FOUR HUNDRED LEVEL STUDENTS IN AKWA IBOM STATE UNIVERSITY

Augustine Idorenyin Paul, Baridam Don, and Brownson Christabel Divine

Department of Business Administration, Akwa Ibom State University.

ABSTRACT: *The study was conducted to examine the influence of Type A behavior on the academic performance of four hundred level students in Akwa Ibom State University. Survey research design was adopted for the study. This type of design enabled the researcher to obtain data directly from the respondents. The population for the study was 1700. Three hundred and twenty-four (324) was the sample size and it was derived using Taro Yamene's formula for sample size determination. Primary data was employed for the study. The instrument for data collection was a structured questionnaire. Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed in analyzing the collected data. Ordinal Logistic Regression was the inferential statistics. Findings revealed that competitiveness showed a standardized value of 3.246 while organizational support showed a value of 7.298. Based on this finding, it was concluded that type A personality has a positive and significant relationship with the academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University. As a recommendation, the university management should encourage the competitive behaviour of the students by giving rewards to the best academic performing students. Also, the university management should ensure that both the teachers and all staff adhere to the university policies.*

KEYWORDS: Type A, Competitiveness, Organizational Support, Academic Performance, Akwa Ibom State University.

INTRODUCTION

The academic performance of students is a cornerstone of success for tertiary institutions, whether public or private. Understanding the factors that influence this performance is critical for both educators and administrators. Among these factors, personality traits play a significant role, with Type A behavior being one of the most prominent characteristics associated with academic achievement (Mommadov, 2022). Type A individuals are known for their driven, meticulously organized, sensitive, and time-conscious nature. They often push themselves to meet stringent deadlines, work long hours, and find discomfort in delays (Uwa, 2022). In the realm of psychology, Type A behavior is characterized by competitiveness, a sense of urgency, and a strong drive for achievement, all of which can significantly impact academic outcomes (Johnson & Lee, 2021).

However, the success of Type A individuals in academia is a complex phenomenon influenced by both their positive attributes and the challenges they face. While competitiveness, hard work, and a high degree of motivation may lead to academic success, it is crucial to acknowledge the potential downsides. Research suggests that Type A students are more likely to experience stress-related issues such as anxiety, depression, and strained relationships, which can, in turn, affect their performance (Strong, 2022). This raises an important question: Are Type A individuals truly more suited to academic environments, or do they simply thrive in them due to the competitive nature of these settings? Their success may not necessarily be a result of intellectual superiority, but rather the environment's alignment with their personality traits.

Dominance is a core feature of Type A personalities, characterized by an intense focus on personal success, sometimes at the expense of collaboration. In academic settings, students with Type A traits are often seen as aggressive, quick to anger, and determined to achieve their goals. These individuals tend to exhibit high levels of energy, persistence, and competitiveness, not just in their academic pursuits but also in extracurricular activities such as sports (Oldham & White, 2020). Their impatience, a hallmark of Type A behavior, often manifests in frustration when things do not go according to plan, as they perceive time as an extremely valuable resource (Fretwell, Lewis & Hannay, 2019). This urgency to act and perform quickly can have both positive and negative effects on their academic performance.

Academic performance, particularly during the final year of higher education, is a critical measure of a student's success. At this stage, students are often engaged in more specialized coursework, facing greater academic pressures, making it an important period to assess how Type A traits influence their ability to succeed (Tinto, 2023). Academic performance is a multi-dimensional concept that encompasses not only the knowledge and skills acquired but also the behaviors, attitudes, and contributions made by students towards their academic success (Hijazi & Naqvi, 2019). Narad and Abdullah (2020) described academic performance as the knowledge gained and assessed through various means, including exams, coursework, and teacher evaluations, ultimately reflecting the goals set by both students and educators.

Within the context of higher education, students come from diverse backgrounds, each bringing their own set of values, beliefs, and attitudes to the academic environment. Type A students often stand out for their creativity and commitment to their work. They tend to embrace challenges, take on additional responsibilities, and work long hours, demonstrating a high level of dedication (Smith & Walker, 2021). However, these students are also prone to frustration,

hostility, and impatience when faced with obstacles, which can negatively impact their academic journey. While the positive traits associated with Type A behavior, such as persistence and ambition, may enhance academic performance, the negative aspects, such as stress and aggression, can serve as significant barriers.

Statement of the problem

The problem of underperformance/underachievement has assumed a worrisome dimension in the Nigerian education system. Desperate to make it anyhow, some students have devised various illegal means to succeed in their examinations and other academic activities even when they are not academically competent. Unfortunately, the system has buckled under the pressure. It is increasingly becoming difficult to equate competence of people with supposed academic performance as represented in their certificates. Many candidates are unable to defend the result they supposedly acquired honourably and, of course, this has consistently led to the inability to compete effectively in the job market which has become a serious issue. Several factors have been researched to find out the cause of this social malaise in the past but there seems to be indications that some hidden factors may be responsible that need to be revealed. Evidence has shown that personality traits of students as indicated in Type A behavior could directly affect their academic performance either positively or negatively. Inability of lecturers and university management to handle these personality traits like competitiveness, aggressiveness, impatience and value may likely result in poor academic performance. For this reason, the management may label such students as being unfit for the university and in extreme cases give them outright expulsion. However, such students upon graduation may be unable to compete favourably in the labour market.

These unhealthy scenarios have not been given adequate attention in management research carried out in Akwa Ibom State University. Thus, this study is an attempt to assess Type A behavior and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to assess the relationship between Type A behaviour and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University. Specifically, the objectives of the study are:

1. To assess the relationship between competitiveness and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University.

2. To assess the relationship between organizational support, Type A behaviour and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University.

Research Questions

The following research questions were raised for this study:

i. What is the relationship between competitiveness and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University?

ii. What is the relationship between organizational support, Type A behaviour and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University?

Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were developed for this study:

H$_{01}$: There is no significant relationship between competitiveness and academic performance of 400 level students of Akwa Ibom State University.

H$_{02}$: There is no significant relationship between organizational support, Type A behaviour and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Concept of Type A Behavior

Though the exact definition of Type A behavior is still evolving, personality traits such as competitiveness, impatience, hostility, job involvement, and time urgency are often considered characteristic of this behavior (Kumar & Ali, 2020). Initially, Friedman and Rosenman (2021) identified Type A individuals as those obsessed with work, deadlines, and competition. These individuals also showed a quick propensity for anger, often triggered by others' tardiness or perceived incompetence. Moreover, Type A personalities often find little satisfaction in their achievements, constantly striving for ever-higher, frequently ill-defined objectives.

Similarly, students classified as Type A behave consistently with their hard-working nature. They tend to work longer hours, commit more discretionary time to tasks, and are generally more driven (Brown & Davis, 2019). Type A individuals are often described as hurried, impatient, impulsive, and hyper-vigilant, which can sometimes lead to hostility or frustration. Studies show that they handle reality with a unique problem-solving approach: they talk quickly, take decisive actions, and view both obstacles and goals in every situation (McCaffrey, Taylor & Johnson, 2023). Living in a state of constant time pressure, they impose their own deadlines and become easily agitated when delayed by even minor inconveniences (Clark, 2021). Their perfectionist tendencies mean that they are rarely satisfied with "good enough" and demand excellence in their endeavors.

In management and psychological literature, it is often challenging to differentiate between Type A and Type B behaviors. Type B individuals are generally associated with lower stress levels, steadier work habits, and an ability to enjoy accomplishments without the intense pressures experienced by their Type A counterparts (Mahajan & Singh, 2022). While Type A students may feel the pressure to succeed at any cost, Type B individuals tend to take a more relaxed approach. They are less concerned with winning or losing, focusing instead on enjoying the process (White & Miller, 2020). Type B students often thrive in creative careers, such as acting, writing, or counseling, and are known for their tolerance and ability to foster teamwork (Jones & Lee, 2023).

However, it is important to note that a Type A personality's achievement-oriented mindset does not always guarantee better performance compared to Type B individuals. Type A personalities often struggle with tasks requiring careful thought and a slower pace; they tend to be poor delegators and are prone to overwork, leading to burnout (Santos & Ramos, 2021). Their urgency to meet deadlines can cause them to make hasty decisions, overlooking alternative solutions (Williams, Anderson & Carter, 2019). Moreover, their need for control, especially in

social settings, can make them appear aggressive and competitive, further driving their behavior. This "joyless striving," as described by Friedman and Rosenman (2021), often leaves Type A individuals only partially satisfied with their accomplishments.

Type A Behavior Factors Affecting Students' Academic Performance

As previously noted, several constructs of Type A behavioral patterns exist. In this section, four key Type A behavior constructs (competitiveness, aggressiveness, impatience, and value) are explained:

Competitiveness

In psychology, competition is often viewed as synonymous with rivalry in interpersonal relationships. It represents a hidden struggle for resources such as money, status, recognition, power, love, and self-fulfillment (Hassan & Ali, 2021). In social sciences, the concept of competition suggests that rivalry offers individuals the opportunity to secure advantages that enhance their survival in a competitive social environment. While healthy competition can drive individuals to perform better, it can also manifest in neurotic rivalry, where the desire for success, recognition, and prestige outweighs the significance of the task at hand (Miller, 2022).

Healthy competition fosters growth and productivity which may bring about commitment in the institution (Imagha *et al.*, 2023). According to cognitive evaluation theory, competition can increase competence by providing valuable feedback about one's abilities compared to others (Jones & Clark, 2019). In an academic context, students facing challenges and competition are encouraged to push themselves further, ultimately helping them to achieve their academic goals. Constructive criticism and difficult tasks can boost self-confidence and inspire students to excel (Smith & Evans, 2020).

However, competition can also lead to feelings of inadequacy, especially when students perceive themselves as underperforming relative to their peers. Even high-performing students may feel inferior when measured against others (Stevenson, 2021). This sense of uncertainty and incompetence can lead to stress and anxiety, negatively affecting academic performance. When students do not receive explicit feedback or when uncertainty exists, their sense of competence is diminished (Turner, 2020). Additionally, competitive environments can reduce students' sense of autonomy, as competition may be perceived as controlling and pressuring behavior, further adding to their stress (Lopez & Brown, 2023).

Organizational Support (OS)

Students are vital to any learning environment, and how they are treated reflects their importance. Organizational support refers to the degree to which students believe their institution cares for and values them (Turner & Green, 2022). It involves the extent to which school management respects students' welfare and provides help and support when needed (Chowdhury & Rahman, 2022).

Organizational support influences students' behavior and personality development within an academic environment. Social exchange theory suggests that students feel obliged to reciprocate when they receive care and support from their teachers and school management (Yang, Kim & Park, 2021). According to Efi and Imagha (2016), organizational support is of

great importance to various facets of the institution. Organizational support can also enhance students' emotional commitment to their institution (Eisenberger & Thompson, 2021).

When students feel valued, they are more likely to develop positive relationships with their peers and assist in academic tasks (Foster & Lee, 2020). Support from the institution enhances students' socioemotional needs, including respect and attachment, which fosters emotional commitment to their school (Garcia, Smith, Porter & Lee, 2021).

Students' Academic Performance

The concept of academic performance is believed to possess an amorphous nature since it broadly incorporates various factors ranging from attaining a professional degree to the development of students in the moral sense (Higgins, 2019). Hence, the best form of assessing students' academic performance is by looking at the features (Imagha *et al*., 2023). However, some practical definitions have been proffered. Chen, Sun and Liu (2020) defined students' academic performance as the quantifiable and apparent behavior of students within a definite period and is an aggregate of scores fetched by students in various evaluations such as class tests, mid and end semester examinations, among others. Kim (2021) further observed it as the extent to which a student accomplishes his/her studies and related tasks. Moreover, Tran (2021) opined that students' academic performance entails the product outcome portrayed by the students as a result of exposure to learning and training, and has been usually articulated through grades. In this study, it is conceived as students' persistence, which can be understood as the progression of the students on academic grounds, to attain completion of a degree, regardless of institution-related contexts and issues.

In broad-level students' academic performance analysis, there are a plethora of factors that could contribute to enhancing students' performance. As stated by Gikandi and Morrow (2020), high academic performance of students can be ensured through bringing congruence between the instructor's teaching style as well as the learning preference of students, which can be understood as the natural and preferred way of assimilating information. The propensity of the students to attend sessions, take notes, interact with instructors, adapt time management strategies, and stick to the schedule have a high level of correlation with the performance students portray academically. Research has equally proven a consequential relationship between good study habits, greater academic interactions, and ultimately greater academic performance (Alshahrani, 2021). Students having a greater sense of self-efficacy tend to set higher academic goals and end up performing better (Dumont, 2020). The interest of students in specific disciplines results in a specifically defined attitude towards the subject area, which in turn is reflected in their academic performance (Lu et al., 2021). Buttressing this assertion, Rosa and Fuchs (2019) posited that the interest of students allows them to focus attentively and deeply on the subject matter, which leads to enhanced academic performance.

The Theory of Reasoned Action: Ajzen and Fishbein (1980)

Due to the inability of traditional theories of job performance in eliciting reasons for students' performance, several other theories emerged. Within that continuum, the theory of reasoned action was developed. The theory was developed by Ajzen and Fishbein in 1980. The theory states that an individuals' behaviour to an assigned task is the result of three corresponding components: intentions, attitudes and subjective norms (perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform a given behaviour). According to the theorists, actions are determined by intentions which in turn are influenced by attitudes and subjective norms. This implies that, if

an individual intends to perform a specific action (an assigned task), then it is likely that he/she will do so as long as the attitudes and the subjective norms are in tandem with the intention.

Accordingly, this theory supports this study. This is because, in behavioural literature, it has been emphasized that Type A behaviours are not completely negative, that is, they are not always counterproductive. Rather, what elicits the positive or the negative aspect of Type A behaviour actions, according to this theory, is a function of students' attitude, either of themselves or co-students or school-related pressures. Therefore, to better understand reasons for students' academic performance, factors that influenced such outcome (the attitudes prior to the outcome and the associated subjective norms) should be analyzed.

Empirical Review

Prior studies have been carried out in this direction. Few of such studies are considered in this section of the study as shown hereunder:

Olatunji and Salawu's (2024) work on the impact of Type A Behavior on Academic Performance of Final Year Students in Nigerian Universities explored the influence of Type A behavior on the academic performance of final-year students at three public universities in Nigeria. A total of 400 participants were selected using stratified random sampling. The researchers employed a cross-sectional survey design and used the Jenkins Activity Survey (JAS) to measure Type A behavior. Academic performance was assessed using cumulative GPAs. Results indicated that students exhibiting higher levels of Type A behavior, characterized by time urgency and competitiveness, tended to have better academic outcomes ($r = 0.49$, $p < 0.01$). However, increased stress levels among these students also led to higher incidences of burnout, negatively affecting performance during high-pressure periods. The study recommended time management workshops and stress reduction interventions to help students balance their driven nature with well-being.

Johnson and Smith's (2023) study on the Role of Type A Behavior in Predicting Academic Success in the U.S. Senior College Students examined the impact of Type A personality traits on the academic outcomes of final-year students in the United States. The sample included 380 students from three large universities, and the researchers used a combination of the Jenkins Activity Survey (JAS) and GPA records to analyze the relationship. Results showed that students with pronounced Type A traits (e.g., competitiveness, time urgency) had higher academic performance ($r = 0.55$, $p < 0.01$). However, the study also uncovered that Type A students reported higher anxiety and stress levels during final exams, which led to lower performance under high-stress conditions. The authors suggested that universities develop targeted interventions to help Type A students manage stress more effectively while maintaining academic performance.

METHODOLOGY

Survey research design was used in this study. The population of the study was 1,700 students. This number of students in the studied university comprised 400 level students, which were drawn from six faculties in the university.

Table 1: Individual Faculties

FACULTIES	POP. OF STUDENTS
Arts	310
Biological Sciences	277
Education	235
Management Sciences	284
Physical Sciences	267
Social Sciences	372
Total	**1,700**

Source: *Academic Affairs, Akwa Ibom State University 2023/2024 Session*

The sample size of this study was 324 respondents determined using Taro Yamane (1967) sample size determination technique as shown hereunder:

$$n = N/1 + N (e)^2$$

where:

n = Sample Size

N = Population Size (1700)

e = Margin of Error (5%)

1 = Theoretical Constant

n = 323.8095

Therefore, 323 students were used as the sample size for the study. Simple random sampling technique was employed since the students which were selected for this study are from the total population. The researcher applied this sampling technique by administering the questionnaire on the potential respondents.

The Bowley's (1964) population allocation formula Nzelibe and Ilogu (1999: 201) was utilized in calculating the individual faculties sample size. This formula is shown below:

$$nh = \frac{nNh}{N}$$

where nh = the number of units allocated to each faculty

n = the total sample size

Nh = the number of students in each faculty

N   =   the population size

Table 2: Applying the above formula, we have:

FACULTIES	POP. OF STUDENTS	SAMPLE SIZE
Arts	310	59
Biological Sciences	277	52
Education	235	45
Management Sciences	284	54
Physical Sciences	267	51
Social Sciences	372	62
Total	**1,700**	**323**

Source: *Academic Affairs, Akwa Ibom State University*

Primary data was used in this study. The data was collected using an adapted questionnaire, which was sourced from different sources based on the constructs used in the study. Descriptive and inferential analytical tools were used while analyzing the generated data. Tables, frequencies, and percentage analysis comprised the descriptive tools that were used in analyzing data relating to demographic information of the respondents. Accordingly, the null hypothesis that was formulated for this study was analyzed using Ordinal Logistic Regression.

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Three hundred and twenty-three (323) copies of the questionnaire were administered to year 4 students in all departments in Akwa Ibom State University. However, out of the 323 copies that were administered, 208 copies were returned in a usable form. This process is shown below:

Table 3: Total Number of Questionnaire Administered and Returned

Questionnaire Administration	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Questionnaire Returned	208	64%
Questionnaire not Returned	115	36.%
Total Questionnaire administered	323	100%

Source: *Field Survey (2024)*

Table 3 represents the copies of the questionnaire administered and returned. As shown in the table, out of 323 copies of questionnaire that were administered, 208 copies (representing 64%) were returned in a usable form while 115 were not returned (representing 36%).

Analysis

What influence does competitiveness have on the academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University?

Tables 4: Responses on Competitiveness

Competitiveness	Strongly Agree Freq and (%)	Agree Freq and (%)	Undecided (%)	Disagree Freq and (%)	Strongly disagree (%)	Total (n) (%)
I set high goals for myself and become angry if I fail to attain them.	64 (30.8)	74 (35.6)	12 (5.7)	28 (13.5)	30 (14.4)	208 (100)
Even when I am sitting down watching T.V, I am usually moving around, checking my mails, tapping my foot or carrying out some similar physical activity.	75 (36.1)	66 (31.7)	14 (6.7)	35 (16.8)	18 (8.7)	208 (100)
I write down how I intend to spend my day and I rigidly stick to this schedule.	93 (44.7)	50 (24)	18 (8.7)	32 (15.4)	15 (7.1)	208 (100)

Source: *Field Survey (2024)*

For the question on "I set high goals for myself and become angry if I fail to attain them," it is shown that 64 respondents (representing 30.8%) agreed. While 12 of respondents were undecided, 28 respondents (representing 13.5%) disagreed. For the question on even when I am sitting down watching T.V., I am usually moving around, checking my mails, tapping my foot or carrying out some similar physical activity, 75 respondents (representing 36.1%) agreed. While 14 were undecided, 35 respondents (representing 16.8%) disagreed. When the respondents were asked if they write down how they intend to spend their day and rigidly stick to this schedule, 93 respondents (representing 44.7%) agreed that this applied to them. While 8.7% were undecided, 32 respondents (representing 15.4%) disagreed.

Table 5: Responses on Organizational Support

Organizational Support	SA and (%)	A (%)	UD (%)	D and (%)	SD (%)	Total (n) (%)
My school tries to make the learning environment as interesting as possible.	82 (39.4)	53 (25.5)	18 (8.7)	14 (6.7)	41 (19.7)	208 (100)
My school cares about the students' well-being.	75 (36.1)	66 (31.7)	14 (6.7)	32 (16.8)	18 (8.7)	208 (100)
My school is willing to help when we need special favour.	93 (44.7)	50 (24.7)	18 (8.7)	32 (15.4)	15 (7.1)	208 (100)
Help is always available from my school when students have challenges.	64 (30.8)	74 (35.6)	12 (5.8)	18 (8.6)	40 (19.2)	208 (100)

Source: *Field Survey, (2024)*

Table 5 shows that out of 208 respondents, 82 (39.4%) strongly agreed that their school tries to make the learning environment as interesting as possible, 53 (25.5%) agreed, 18 (8.7%) were undecided, 14 (6.7%) disagreed and 41 (19.7%) strongly disagreed. Also, on if their school cares about the students' well-being, out of 208 respondents, 75 (36.1%) strongly agreed to

questions, 66 (31.7%) agreed, 14(6.7%) were undecided, 32(15.4%) disagreed and 18 (8.7%) strongly disagreed. On if there is willing to help when we need special favour. Out of 208 respondents, 93 (44.7%) strongly agreed, 50 (24.7%) agreed, 18 (8.7%) were undecided, 32 (15.4%) disagreed and 15 (7.1%) strongly disagreed. On the question, if help is always available from their school when students have challenges. Out of 208 respondents, 64 (30.8%) strongly agreed, 74 (35.6%) agreed, 12 (5.8%) were undecided, 18 (8.6%) disagreed and 40 (19.2%) strongly disagreed.

Table 6:   Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
Intercept Only	874.683			
Final	675.484	199.198	3	.000

Link function: Logit.

Model fitting information shows that there is a significant improvement in fit as compared to the null model; hence, the model is showing a good fit. Here, the model is significant with p = 0.000. The differences between the intercept's only model and the final model should be significant.

Table 7:   Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	2584.548	1943	.510
Deviance	644.795	1943	1.410

Link function: Logit.

Goodness of fit statistic indicates a poor fit if the significant value is less than 0.05. Here, the model adequately fits the data (P>0.05). An insignificant value would mean that there are no significant differences in the observed data and fitted (assumed) model.

Table 8:   Parameter Estimates

							95% Confidence Interval	
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	Df	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[OS = 1.00]	20.100	17.664	1.295	1	.001	-14.522	54.721
	[OS = 2.00]	53.935	23.217	5.397	1	.002	8.431	99.440
Location	Competitiveness	3.246	3.069	1.119	1	.002	-2.769	9.260
	organizational support, Type A Behabiour and academic performance	7.298	1.569	1.235	1	.000	-2.520	9.116
	[LS=1.00]	4.323	2.439	3.142	1	.000	-.457	9.102
	[LS=2.00]	-4.659	5.899	.624	1	.-603	-16.220	6.903

[LS=3.00]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link parameter function: Logit.

a. This is set to zero because it is redundant.

Table 9:   **Test of Parallel Lines**

-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
332.212 312.203ᵇ	20.009	2	.352

Interpretations of Results

According to the null hypothesis, the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across the response categories. Table 8 shows the parameter estimations and further summarizes the impact of each predictor. The sign of the covariate coefficients and the relative values of the component level coefficients might provide valuable insights into the influence of the predictors in the model. Positive (negative) coefficients for variables suggest positive (inverse) connections between predictors and criterion variables.

Table 8 also shows the values of the ordinal logistic regression coefficients and intercepts, together with the corresponding standard errors, t-values and their p-values. The location becomes: competitiveness (3.246), organizational support (7.298), academic performance (4.323) and PV = 0.000. This shows that there is an anticipated rise in the log probabilities of failing at a higher level of the dependent variables for every unit increase on the independent variable.

Any rising value of a covariate with a positive coefficient translates to a greater likelihood of falling into one of the "higher" cumulative outcome categories. A factor level with a higher coefficient suggests a higher likelihood of being in one of the "upper" cumulative result categories. The sign of a coefficient for a factor level is determined by the influence of that factor level on the reference categories. In Table 8, the variable with the largest coefficient with p-value less than the chosen significant level of 0.05 is considered the most significant influential factor. Therefore, the p-value for all the independent variables are each less than 0.05. This shows that all the independent variables are statistically significant at the 5% level of significance.

Interpretations of Tested Hypotheses

The null hypotheses were tested using ordinal logistic regression analysis. The following results were obtained as indicated in Table 8.

Result of Hypothesis 1: Estimated location for competitiveness is 3.246, PV = 0.002, where C = competitiveness, PV = probability value, and AP = academic performance (threshold). The result in Table 8 shows a significant relationship between competitiveness and academic performance of 400 level students of Akwa Ibom State University. This is because the

estimated location for competitiveness is 3.246 when PV = 0.000. The probability value was less than 0.05.

Result of Hypothesis 2: Estimated location for organizational support, Type A Behaviour, is 7.298, PV = 0.003, where OS, TAB = organizational support, Type A Behaviour, PV = probability value, and AP = academic performance (threshold). The result reveals a significant relationship between organizational support, Type A Behaviour and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University. This is because the estimated location for organizational support, Type A Behaviour is 3.024 when PV = 0.003. The probability value was less than 0.05.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This study examines the relationship between Type A Behaviour and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University. An ordinal logistic regression analysis was carried out to ascertain how Type A Behaviour associates with academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University. The ordinal logistic regression model was significant at $p < .05$ (with df = 3).

The pseudo R^2 values (e.g., Nagelkerke = 0.674 = 67%) presented indicates that the ordinal logistic regression model with its independent variables explained a relatively large proportion of the variation in academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University. This further indicates that a model containing competitiveness and organizational support is very likely to be a very good predictor of academic performance. Furthermore, the result of the ordinal logistic regression analysis showed that competitiveness and organizational support were responsible for changes in academic performance among 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University. This was seen in the *P*-values all less than 0.05 level of significance. This implies that for any one unit increase in the level Type A Behaviour increases the chances for academic performance given that all of the other variables in the model are held constant.

To assess the relationship between competitiveness and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University.

The result for hypothesis (Ho$_1$) of the ordinal logistic regression analysis shows that competitiveness associates with academic performance of 400 level students of Akwa Ibom State University. This implies that any one-unit positive increase in the level of competitiveness will contribute to a change in academic performance given that all of the other variables in the model are held constant. Therefore, this suggests that a significant relationship exists between competitiveness and academic performance. Hence, the null hypotheses were rejected. This study was in line with Galih (2020) who studied the relationship among student stress, Type A personality and academic performance in a business school in Indonesia and found that students' stress negatively affects academic performance.

To assess the relationship between organizational support, Type A Behaviour and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University.

From the table above, the result from the test of null hypothesis (Ho$_2$) shows the relationship between organizational support, Type A Behaviour and academic performance as P-value is

less than level of significance (0.05). Therefore, this finding suggests a significant and positive relationship exists between organizational support, Type A Behaviour and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. This finding is in line with the previous findings by Fakhri, Haghdos and Maraashi (2014) who studied the relationship between A and B personality types with educational performance in medical students of Ahvaz Jundishapur Medical Sciences University: Educational Development of Jundishapur. The objective of the study was to investigate the relationship between two types of A and B personality with academic achievement of medical students in Jundishapur University. Survey research design was used in the study. Sixty-eight (68) medical students at internship level from Ahwaz University of Medical Sciences were used as both the population and sample for the study. Data analysis was done using correlation analysis. The finding indicated that there were significant differences in academic achievement in two personality types A and B.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Major findings from the study revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between competitiveness and academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University. Based on this finding, it was concluded that Type A personality has a positive and significant relationship with academic performance of 400 level students in Akwa Ibom State University with the moderating role of organizational support. Based on the findings in this study, the following recommendations have been made. The university management should encourage the competitive behaviour of the students by giving rewards to the best academic performing students. Also, the university management should ensure that both the teachers and all staff adhere to the university policies. This would enable them to carry out their tasks in a timely manner, leading to a decline in hostile behaviour among the students

REFERENCES

Alshahrani, T. (2021). The impact of study habits on academic performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Educational Research,* 58(3), 245-260.

Brown, P., & Davis, L. (2019). Understanding the impact of Type A personality on student performance: A behavioral perspective. *Journal of Behavioral Psychology,* 41(3), 200-215.

Chen, L., Sun, Y., & Liu, F. (2020). Defining academic performance: A behavioral approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 75(4), 342-357

Chowdhury, S., & Rahman, J. (2022). Organizational support and student behavior: A theoretical exploration. *Educational Psychology Journal,* 53(3), 245-262

Clark, T. (2021). The effects of time pressure and perfectionism on Type A individuals in academic settings. Psychology and Education Review, 29(2), 112-130.

Dumont, M. (2020). Self-efficacy and academic goal setting in high-performing students. *Journal of Learning and Development,* 46(5), 112-125

Efi, A. E. and Imagha, O. A. (2016). Perceived Organizational Support and Turnover Intentions of Employees in University of Uyo. *International Journal of Management Science.* 1(2).

Eisenberger, R., & Thompson, J. (2021). How organizational support affects student emotional commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 40(7), 533-549

Foster, J., & Lee, P. (2020). Enhancing socioemotional support through school policies: The student perspective. *Journal of Educational Development,* 55(6), 188-203.

Fretwell, D., Lewis, R., & Hannay, M. (2019). The influence of personality traits on academic performance: A closer look at Type A and Type B behaviors. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 58(4), 467-482

Friedman, M., & Rosenman, R. (2021). The characteristics of Type A behavior in students: An evolving definition. Personality and Behavior, 54(6), 378-400.

Galih. (2020). Relationship among student stress, Type A personality, and academic performance in a business school in Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Educational Psychology,* 13(2), 199-213

Garcia, L., Smith, A., Porter, J., & Lee, R. (2021). The role of socioemotional needs in students' academic commitment. *Journal of Social and Emotional Learning,* 30(4), 144-160

Gikandi, J., & Morrow, J. (2020). Matching teaching styles with student learning preferences to enhance academic performance. *Journal of Pedagogical Studies,* 29(1), 87-102.

Hassan, S., & Ali, M. (2021). Competitiveness and academic performance: Insights from Type A and Type B behaviors. *International Journal of Educational Research,* 72(4), 310-328

Higgins, S. (2019). The amorphous nature of academic performance: Defining the concept. *Journal of Educational Studies,* 51(2), 207-220

Hijazi, S. T., & Naqvi, R. (2019). Factors affecting students' academic performance: A case of private colleges. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 29(2), 146-153.

Imagha O.A., Okon M.G., Akpaetor U.A., Nkanor W.N. and Umana E.S. (2023) Technological Skills and the Performance of Managers of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria, *International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research*, 11 (1),40-53

Imagha, O. A., Akpaetor, U. A., Akpan, S. V. and Atakpo, U. E. (2023) Exploring the influence of Work Environment on Employees' Commitment in Selected Oil servicing firms in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 9(10)

Johnson, K., & Lee, Y. (2021). Personality and academic performance: The impact of Type A behavior on student outcomes. Psychology of Learning and Motivation, 59(4), 389-407.

Johnson, M., & Smith, T. (2023). The role of Type A behavior in predicting academic success in U.S. senior college students. *American Journal of Educational Psychology,* 21(3), 123-137.

Jones, M., & Clark, R. (2019). The role of competition in academic success: A comparative study of personality traits. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 56(7), 456-472.

Jones, S., & Lee, A. (2023). Personality traits in education: Comparing Type A and Type B students. *Journal of Educational Development,* 60(2), 88-102.

Kumar, R., & Ali, Z. (2020). Defining Type A behavior in academic performance: A review of competitiveness and job involvement. Psychological Studies, 58(4), 140-155.

Kim, Y. (2021). Measuring student accomplishment: A task-based approach to academic performance. *Educational Measurement Journal,* 43(5), 298-315

Kingsley L. Uwa (2022). Organizational fairness and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Study of selected food industries in Uyo Metropolis, AkwaIbom State, Nigeria. Internal Journal of Business and Management Review. Vol. 10, Issue 2, Page 33-43

Lopez, E. (2021). Impatience and stress in academic settings: A comparative study of personality traits. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32(3), 178-194

Lu, X., Chen, S., & Wang, Y. (2021). The role of student interest in academic performance: A psychological perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72(4), 589-603.

Mahajan, P., & Singh, K. (2022). Understanding the balance: Type A versus Type B behaviors in higher education. *Journal of Personality Studies*, 36(5), 312-329.

McCaffrey, P., Taylor, S., & Johnson, C. (2023). Social processing theory and aggression in students. *Journal of Psychology and Learning*, 45(4), 230-245.

Mommadov, J. (2022). Personality types and academic success: A comparative study of Type A and Type B students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(4), 441-455.

Miller, D. (2022). Neurotic rivalry: The dark side of competition in Type A individuals. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 117(8), 560-578.

Narad, A., & Abdullah, B. (2020). Exploring the dimensions of academic performance and student achievement in higher education. *Higher Education Journal*, 32(1), 22-29.

Oldham, C., & White, P. (2020). Personality, dominance, and academic achievement: How Type A students navigate success and failure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 112(2), 192-201

Olatunji, A., & Salawu, O. (2024). Impact of Type A behavior on academic performance of final year students in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Nigerian Educational Studies*, 32(1), 100-115.

Rosa, M., & Fuchs, K. (2019). The impact of student interest on focus and academic success. *Journal of Learning and Development*, 45(3), 189-204.

Santos, G., & Ramos, P. (2021). Type A personality and burnout in academia: Risks and implications for student success. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 55(4), 399-413

Smith, R., & Walker, H. (2021). Type A traits and their influence on creativity and academic engagement among university students. *Journal of Educational Psychology Research*, 88(3), 54-69

Strong, P. (2022). Personality, stress, and academic performance: The cost of Type A behavior in educational settings. *Journal of Higher Education Studies*, 61(5), 305-318

Smith, A., & Evans, D. (2020). The impact of constructive criticism and competition on academic self-confidence. *Higher Education Research Journal*, 39(5), 180-194.

Stevenson, C. (2021). Academic anxiety and performance pressure: The challenges of Type A students. *Journal of Academic Psychology*, 33(3), 290-307.

Tran, T. (2021). Academic performance: A measure of student progress and persistence. *Journal of Higher Education*, 69(2), 255-270.

Tinto, V. (2023). The role of final-year academic performance in shaping career outcomes: An examination of Type A students. *Higher Education Journal*, 67(3), 215-230

Turner, J., & Green, K. (2022). The significance of organizational support in higher education: A student-centric approach. *Journal of Academic Management*, 54(2), 114-130

White, H., & Miller, L. (2020). Type B personalities in academia: A relaxed approach to higher education. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 33(4), 299-317.

Williams, L., Zhang, J., & Mitchell, K. (2020). Self-regulatory efficacy and aggression in academic contexts. *Journal of Behavioral Psychology*, 61(2), 189-205

Yang, H., Kim, S., & Park, T. (2021). Organizational support and social exchange theory: Impacts on student engagement. *Journal of Organizational Development*, 62(1), 48-60.