CHAPTER 4

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF THE CUSTOMERS' SATISFACTION AND PERCEPTION OF SERVICE QUALITY

4.1 Demographic Profile Analysis

Table 4.1.1 Demographic Profile

Ser	Demographic Profile	Frequency	%
1.	**Corps**		
	a. Combat	34	17
	b. Combat Support	62	31
	c. Service Support	104	52
	Total	200	100
2.	**Age**		
	a. Below 22 yrs	14	7
	b. 23 to 27 yrs	39	19.5
	c. 28 to 32 yrs	54	27
	d. 33 to 37 yrs	59	29.5
	e. Above 38 yrs	34	17
	Total	200	100
3.	**Rank**		
	a. Junior NCOs and below	92	46
	b. Senior NCOs	88	44
	c. Officers	20	10
	Total	200	100
4.	**Service**		
	a. Below 5 yrs	31	15.5
	b. 6 to 10 yrs	37	18.5
	c. 11 to 15 yrs	74	37
	d. Above 16 yrs	58	29
	Total	200	100.0

a. **Corps.** The total number of respondent representing Corps variable is 200 of which the combat group is represented by 17%, combat support is 31% and service support is represented by 52%. The service support is the biggest group representing the corps.

b. **Age**. The group represents the age below 22 years is 7%, the age group from 23 to 27 years is 19.5%, the group from 28 to 32 years is 27 %, the age group from 33 to 37 is 29.5% and the age group above 38 years is 17%. The highest group is 33 to 37 years old, which represent 39.5% of the respondents. The smallest group represents the age group below than 22, which is only 7%.

c. **Rank**. The Junior NCOs and below represent 46%, the Senior NCOs represent 44% of the respondents and officers represent 10% of the respondents. The Junior NCOs and Senior NCOs represent the highest percentage, which is 46% and 44% respectively.

d. **Service**. The group, which below than 5 years of service represent 15.5%, group of 6 to 10 years represent 18.5%, group of 11 to 15 years represented by 37% and group above than 16 years represent 29%. From this profile the highest number is the service group 11 to 15 years, which represent 37%, and the lowest group is below than 5 years.

4.1.1 Overall Analysis on Demographic Profile. From the overall result of the demographic profile, it shows that the Service Support Unit has the highest number of representative. The Service Support Unit generally will contribute in representing the customers who are frequently use the transportation service, which provided by the Royal Service Corps. The representative from Combat Support Unit and Combat Unit as well has the representative with the smaller number. The Age group basically has the almost equal number starting from group below than 22 years old up to above 38 years old. In rank group those represent Junior NCOs and Senior NCOs are almost equal and can be considered as almost ideal. The officers group with 10% can be considered as ideal as the other ranks group. Generally the service groups represent the intended group, which the distribution can be considered as equal.

4.2 Crosstabulate Analysis

4.2.1 Customer Satisfaction of Service with:

a. **Corps Group**.

b. **Years of Service Group**.

c. **Rank Group**.

Cross Tabulation is a technique of organizing data by group or categories to facilitate comparison a joint frequency distribution of observation on two or more sets of variables.

The calculation of the **Chi-Square** statistic allows us to determine if the difference between the observed frequency distribution and the expected frequency distribution can be attributed to sampling variation. The significance value (p-Value = 0.05) is the probability of getting this result when there is no relationship exists.

H_o = Null Hypothesis

H_1 = Alternative Hypothesis

If p > alpha (0.05)

You fail to reject H_o (there is no significance)

Thus cannot conclude that the variables are related.

$\mu_1 = \mu_2$

If p < alpha (0.05)

You reject H_o

Accept H_1 and conclude that the (there is a significance)

Variables are related.

$\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

Table 4.2.1 Customer Satisfaction of Service by Corps Group

Corp / Satisfaction	Combat	Combat Support	Service Support	Total	Sig
High Satisfaction	5.9%	29%	41.3%	31.5%	
Medium Satisfaction	17.6%	37.1%	33.7%	32%	0.000
Low Satisfaction	76.5%	33.9%	25%	36.5%	

$X^2 = 31.953$ df = 4

The table result indicates that **there is a significance** relationship between **Corps Group** and **Customer Satisfaction of Service** because **p-Value (.000)** is less than 0.05. The table also shows that the Service Support are most satisfied in service provided with 41.3% and the least satisfied group is the Combat Group with only 5.9%. The percentage shows that the overall members of the Corps Group still do not satisfied with the transport service provided by the Royal Service Corps. As the table shows, the total of medium and low satisfaction is 32% and 36.5% respectively and only 31.5% those who are satisfied with the service.

Table 4.2.2 Customer Satisfaction of Service by Years of Service Group

Years / Satisfaction	Below 5 yrs	6 to 10 yrs	11 to 15 yrs	Above 16 yrs	Total	Sig
High Satisfaction	51.6%	29.7%	24.3%	31%	31.5%	
Medium Satisfaction	25.8%	16.2%	43.2%	31%	32%	0.11
Low Satisfaction	22.6%	54.1%	32.4%	37.9%	36.5	

$X^2 = 16.561$ df = 6

The table above indicates that there **is no significance** relation between **Years of Service** and **Customer Satisfaction of Service** because **p-Value (0.11)** is bigger than 0.05 for all service.

Table 4.2.3 Customer Satisfaction of Service by Rank Group

Rank / Satisfaction	Junior NCO	Senior NCO	Officers	Total	Sig
High Satisfaction	31.5%	30.7%	35%	31.5%	
Medium Satisfaction	30.4%	34.1%	30%	32%	0.981
Low Satisfaction	38%	35.2%	35%	36.5%	

X^2 = .424 df = 4

The table above indicates that **there is no significance** relation between **Rank** and **Customer Satisfaction of Service** because **p-Value (0.981)** is more than **0.05.**

Table 4.2.4 Frequency of Service Usage by Corps Group

Corp / Frequency	Combat	Combat Support	Service Support	Total	Sig
Everyday	5.9%	4.8%	10.6%	8%	
More than once a week	17.6%	8.1%	29.8%	21%	0.000
Once a week	23.5%	8.1%	19.2%	16.5%	
Once a month	52.9%	79%	40.4%	54.5%	

X^2 = 25.618 df = 6

The result indicates that **there is a significance** relation between **Corps Group** and **Frequency of Service Usage** because **p-Value (0.000)** that is less than 0.05. The table also shows that the Service Support group is the most frequent user of the transport service provided by the Royal Service Corps (10.6%) compared to other groups. This situation occurs because there are Service Support Units have an attachment of RSC personnel in their unit's MT line. Overall statistics show that the usage is generally once a month, which is when the unit using the second line support of transportation during their exercises and other activities.

Table 4.2.5 Frequency of Service Usage by Years of Service Group

Yrs / Frequency	Below 5 years	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	Above 16 years	Total	Sig
Everyday	16.1%	8.1%	6.8%	5.2%	8%	
More than once a week	25.8%	21.6%	13.5%	27.6%	21%	0.407
Once a week	9.7%	13.5%	20.3%	17.2%	16.5%	
Once a month	48.4%	56.8%	59.5%	50%	54.5%	

X^2 =9.333 df = 9

The table above indicates that **there is no significance relation** between **Frequency of Usage** and **Years of Service** because **p-Value (0.407)** is bigger than **0.05.**

Table 4.2.6 Frequency of Service Usage by Rank Group

Rank / Frequency	Junior NCO	Senior NCO	Officers	Total	Sig
Everyday	7.6%	6.9%	15%	8%	0.570
More than once a week	19.6%	24.1%	15%	21.1%	
Once a week	19.6%	16.1%	5%	16.6%	
Once a month	53.3%	52.9%	65%	54.3%	

X^2 =4.8 df = 6

The table above indicates that **there is no significance relation** between **Frequency of Usage** and **Rank Group** because **p-Value (0.570)** is bigger than **0.05.**

Table 4.2.7 Period of Service Usage by Corps Group

Corp / Frequency	Combat	Combat Support	Service Support	Total	Sig
Less than 1 year	23.5%	14.5%	10.6%	14%	0.003
1 year	17.6%	12.9%	1%	7.5%	
2 years	8.8%	6.5%	7.7%	7.5%	
More than 3 years	50%	66.1%	80.8%	71%	

X^2 =19.989 df = 6

The result indicates that **there is significance** relation between **Period of Service Usage** and **Corps Group** because **p-Value (0.003)** is less than 0.05. The table also shows that 71% of the respondent has been using the transport service more than 3 years. On this aspect we think that the period of usage more than 3 years will contribute more reliable views on this study.

Table 4.2.8 Period of Service Usage by Year of Service

Year / Frequency	Below 5 years	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	Above 16 years	Total	Sig
Less than 1 year	22.6%	13.5%	14.9%	8.6%	14%	0.001
1 year	12.9%	8.1%	8.1%	3.4%	7.5%	
2 years	22.6%	2.7%	9.5%	0%	7.5%	
More than 3 years	41.9%	75.7%	67.6%	87.9%	71%	

X^2 =26.937 df =96

The result indicates that **there is a significance** relation between **Period of Service Usage** and **Year of Service Group** because **p-Value (0.001)** is less than 0.05. The table also shows that the majority of the respondent has the vast experience after serving more than 6 years in the army and has been using the transport service more than 3 years. On this aspect we think that will contribute more relevant views on this study.

Table 4.2.9 Period of Service Usage by Rank Group

Rank / Frequency	Junior NCO	Senior NCO	Officers	Total	Sig
Less than 1 year	18.5%	10.3%	10%	14.1%	

1 year	6.5%	9.2%	5%	7.5%	0.242
2 years	6.5%	5.7%	20%	7.5%	
More 3 years	68.5%	74.7%	65%	70.9%	

X^2 =7.948 df = 6

The table above indicates that, **there is no significance** relation between **Period of Service Usage** and **Rank Group** because **p-Value (0.242)** is bigger than 0.05.

Table 4.2.10 Customer View of Service Performance by Corps Group

Corp / Frequency	Combat	Combat Support	Service Support	Total	Sig
Excellence	5.9%	0%	4.8%	3.5%	
Good	0%	11.3%	12.5%	10%	
Satisfied	20.6%	35.5%	44.2%	37.5%	0.000
Acceptable	14.7%	40.3%	28.8%	30%	
Not Satisfied	58.8%	12.9%	9.6%	19%	

X^2 =50.612 df =8

The result indicates that **there is a significance** relation between **Customer View on Service Performance** and **Corps Group** because **p-Value (0.000)** is less than 0.05. The table also shows that 37.5% of the respondent rated satisfied, 30% rated acceptable and 19% rated not satisfied. The Service Support Group is the most satisfied group with the service whereby they represent 44.2%.

40.23% of the Combat Support Group rated acceptable on the performance. From the data it shows that the Combat Group is the most not satisfied with the service performance where they represent 58.8%.

Table 4.2.11 Customer View of Service Performance by Service Group

Serv / Frequency	Below 5 years	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	Above 16 years	Total	Sig
Excellence	6.5%	2.7%	2.7%	3.4%	3.5%	
Good	16.1%	13.5%	8.1%	6.9%	10%	
Satisfied	54.8%	27%	39.2%	32.8%	37.5%	0.262
Acceptable	12.9%	37.8%	27%	37.9%	30%	
Not Satisfied	9.7%	18.9%	23%	19%	19%	

X^2 =14.635 df = 12

The table above indicates that **there is no significance** relation between **Customer View of Service Performance** and **Service Group** because **p-Value (0.262)** is bigger than **0.05.**

Table 4.2.12 Customer View of Service Performance by Rank Group

Rank / Frequency	Junior NCO	Senior NCO	Officers	Total	Sig
Excellence	4.3%	3.4%	0%	3.5%	
Good	14.1%	5.7%	10%	10.1%	

Satisfied	34.8%	40.2%	40%	37.7%	0.793
Acceptable	29.3%	29.9%	30%	29.6%	
Not Satisfied	17.4%	20.7%	20%	19.1%	

X^2 =4.665 df =8

The table above indicates that there **is no significance** relation between **Customer View of Service Performance** and **Rank Group** because **p-Value (0.793)** is bigger than **0.05**.

4.3 Correlation Analysis

Table 4.3.1 Correlation Analysis

		TOTSAT	TOTPK	TOTRESP	TOTPERS	TOTKTR	CORPS	SERVICE	RANK
TOTSAT	Pearson Correlation	1	.400**	.519**	.453**	.475**	.359**	-.089	.022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.210	.757
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	199
TOTPK	Pearson Correlation	**.400****	1	.501**	.397**	.315**	.310**	-.056	-.079
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.434	.266
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	199
TOTRESP	Pearson Correlation	**.519****	**.501****	1	.550**	.405**	.312**	-.048	-.036
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000	.000	.000	.498	.613
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	199
TOTPERS	Pearson Correlation	**.453****	**.397****	**.550****	1	.304**	.113	-.071	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.	.000	.111	.316	.995
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	199
	Pearson Correlation	**.475****	**.315****	**.405****	**.304****	1	.243**	-.065	-.110

TOTKTR	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.	.001	.359	.123
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	199
CORPS	Pearson Correlation	**.359****	**.310****	**.312****	.113	**.243****	1	.138	.024
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.111	.001	.	.051	.741
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	199
SERVICE	Pearson Correlation	-.089	-.056	-.048	-.071	-.065	.138	1	.180**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.210	.434	.498	.316	.359	.051	.	.011
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	199
RANK	Pearson Correlation	.022	-.079	-.036	.000	-.110	.024	**.180****	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.757	.266	.613	.995	.123	.741	.011	.
	N	199	199	199	199	199	199	199	199

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlation is one of the most popular techniques that indicates the relationship of one variable to another and the correlation coefficient (**r**) ranges **from + 1.0 to –1.0.**

If **value r** is **1.0** - a perfect positive linear relationship.

If **value r** is **-1.0** - a perfect inverse or perfect negative linear relationship.

If **value r** is = **0** - No correlation

Table above indicates the correlation where there are 14 positive value (**) indicating positive correlation. The correlation is significance where the p-Value at the **0.01** level explains those variables that have very significant correlation (**). These correlations are as follows:

a. TOTSAT and TOTPK.
b. TOTSAT and TOTRESP.
c. TOTSAT and TOTPERS.
d. TOTSAT and TOTKTR.

e. TOTSAT and CORPS.

f. TOTPK and TOTRESP.

g. TOTPK and TOTPERS.

h. TOTPK and TOTKTR.

i. TOTPK AND CORPS.

j. TOTRESP and TOTPERS.

k. TOTRESP and TOTKTR.

l. TOTRESP and CORPS.

m. TOTPERS and TOTKTR.

n. TOTKTR and CORPS.

The analysis that can be made from the above correlations are as follows:

a. There is a positive correlation between TOTSAT and TOTPK, TOTRESP, TOTPERS, TOTKTR and CORPS.

b. There is a positive correlation between TOTPK and TOTRESP, TOTPERS, TOTKTR and CORPS.

c. *There is a positive correlation between TOTRESP and* TOTPERS, TOTKTR and CORPS.

d. There is a positive correlation between TOTPERS and TOTKTR, TOTKTR and CORPS.

4.4 ANOVA Test Analysis

Table 4.4.1 Customer Satisfaction by Corps Group (ANOVA test)

Ser	Customer Satisfaction	Mean Values			
		Combat	Combat Support	Service Support	Sig
1.	KP01. Perkhidmatan pengangkutan secara am.	1.9118	2.9194	3.1538	0.000
2.	KP02. Keadaan kenderaan.	1.8824	2.6452	2.8558	0.000

3.	KP03. Kapasiti tempat duduk dalam kenderaan.	1.8824	2.7419	2.9904	0.000
4.	KP04. Ciri keselamatan yang dibekalkan dalam kenderaan.	2.4706	2.6774	2.7212	0.467
5.	KP05. Pengurusan masa perkhidmatan pengangkutan	2.6471	2.9032	3.0481	0.123
6.	KP06. Penampilan dan personaliti pemandu kenderaan	3.1176	2.9194	3.0385	0.563
7.	KP07. Keramahan pemandu kenderaan.	2.6176	3.1129	3.2308	0.001
8.	KP08. Kebersihan dalam kenderaan	2.4118	2.9939	2.8654	0.020
9.	KP09. Keselesaan menggunakan perkhidmatan	2.7647	3.0645	3.0577	0.268
10.	KP10. Penyelenggaraan kemudahan dalam kenderaan	2.6176	2.5161	2.6154	0.822
11.	KP11. Kecekapan sistem pengangkutan	2.4412	2.8387	3.1635	0.000

12.	KP12. Pemandu kenderaan memberikan perkhidmatan yang tepat pada masa diperlukan.	2.7059	2.9839	3.0962	0.133
13.	KP13. Perkhidmatan kenderaan yang diberikan adalah cekap	2.3824	3.0000	3.1154	0.000
14.	KP14. Kebolehpercayaan perkhidmatan pengangkutan seperti yang diperlukan	2.1765	2.9677	3.2500	0.000
15.	KP15. Penampilan kenderaan	2.4118	2.8548	3.2404	0.177
16.	KP16. Keadaan keseluruhan kenderaan	2.3529	2.9355	2.9904	0.005

One-way **ANOVA** is used when we need to compare the means of two or more groups or populations. Table above shows the 16 constructs of Customer Satisfaction of Service provided by Royal Service Corps and 3 constructs of Corps.

Customer Satisfaction which has a **p-Value < 0.05** is as follows:

a. **KP 01**. The transportation service generally.
b. **KP 02**. The condition of the vehicle.
c. **KP 03**. Sitting capacity.
d. **KP 07**. Driver's politeness.
e. **KP 08**. Cleanliness in vehicle.
f. **KP 11**. The transport service system efficiency.

g. **KP 13.** Transport service's ability to perform promised service accurately.

h. **KP 14.** Transport service ability to perform promised service reliability.

i. **KP 16.** Overall condition of the vehicle.

Combat

Among the **Customer Satisfaction** constructs it is found that the **highest mean value** is for **KP 07** that is driver's politeness and the **lowest mean value** is for **KP 02** that is **the condition of the vehicle**.

Combat Support

Among the **Customer Satisfaction** construct it is found that the **highest mean value** is for **KP 07** that is driver's politeness and the **lowest mean value** is for **KP 02** that is **condition of the vehicle.**

Service Support

Among the **Customer Satisfaction** constructs it is found that the **highest mean value** is for **KP 14** which is **transport service ability to perform promised service reliability and lowest mean value** is for **KP 02** that is **the condition of the vehicle**.

4.5 Reliability Test

Reliability can be defined as the degree to which measures are free from error and therefore yield consistent result is achieved and this is necessary but not sufficient condition for validity and for this Cronbach' s Coefficient Alpha is used. For **alpha value > 0.6**, it shows that the reliability of variables is high.

Table 4.5.1 Reliability of Dependant Variables (customer satisfaction)

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
KP1	43.1900	86.1949	.5880	.8385
KP2	43.4350	85.6641	.6312	**.8366**
KP3	43.3350	86.9777	.5791	.8394
KP4	43.3950	86.3608	.5822	.8389
KP5	43.1250	87.4265	.5394	.8411
KP6	43.0450	90.5759	.4062	.8472
KP7	42.9700	91.2051	.4034	.8474
KP8	43.2350	88.9244	.4662	.8445
KP9	43.0500	87.1834	.5778	.8395
KP10	43.4750	87.7079	.5020	.8427
KP11	43.1200	89.0609	.4962	.8434
KP12	43.0650	88.5937	.4847	.8437
KP13	43.1050	87.5216	.5792	.8397
KP14	43.0800	88.6368	.5135	.8426
KP15	43.0800	81.6921	.2685	**.8837**
KP16	43.1950	85.7658	.6175	.8372

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 200.0 N of Items = 16

Alpha = **.8523**

Table above shows the reliability analysis of **Customer Satisfaction**, where the **alpha value is 0.8523. KP 02 (0.8366)** is the **most important variable** where it has the lowest alpha value if item deleted. The **highest alpha value if item deleted** is the **least important variable** that is **KP 15 (0.8837)**. The **larger** the **alpha value** at the bottom the **more reliable the variables are.**

Table 4.5.2 Reliability of Independent Variables (personality)

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
PERS12	13.0200	9.0247	.6104	.7504
PERS13	12.9500	9.1533	.6621	.7373
PERS14	12.9800	8.7433	.6982	**.7235**
PERS15	12.7800	9.5895	.4216	**.8130**
PERS16	12.9300	9.0202	.5456	.7717

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 200.0 N of Items = 5

Alpha = **.7983**

Table above shows the reliability analysis of **Driver's Personality**, where the **alpha value is 0.7983. PERS 14 (0.7235)** is the **most important variable** where it has the lowest alpha value if item deleted. The **highest alpha value if item deleted** is the **least important variable** that is **PERS 15 (0.8130)**. The **larger** the **alpha value** at the bottom the **more reliable the variables are.**

Table 4.5.3 Tangibles (ketara)

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
K1	8.2150	5.6370	.6269	**.6249**
K2	8.6300	6.1338	.6414	.6264
K3	8.2000	6.4422	.5158	.6915
K4	8.3300	6.5740	.3814	**.7728**

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 200.0 N of Items = 4

Alpha = **.7407**

Table above shows the reliability analysis of **Tangibles**, where the **alpha value is 0.7407. K 1 (0.6249)** is the **most important variable** where it has the lowest alpha value if item deleted. The **highest alpha value if item deleted** is the **least important variable** that is **K 4 (0.7728)**. The **larger** the **alpha value** at the bottom the **more reliable the variables are.**

4.6 Regression Analysis

$$Y = a + \beta 1\, X1 + \beta 2\, X2 + \beta 3\, X3 + \beta 4\, X4 + \epsilon$$

Where

Y = Customer Satisfaction

X1 = TOTRESP

X2 = TOTKTR

X3 = TOTPERS

X4 = CORPS

β1 = Regression coefficient of X1,=1,2,.....6

ε = Error term

Table 4.6.1 The Regression Analysis Model (stepwise)
Variables Entered/Removed

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	TOTRESP	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	TOTKTR	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	TOTPERS	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	CORPS	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a Dependent Variable: TOTSAT

The above Table indicates the **Stepwise** Regression Analysis where **4 independent variables** that are **TOTRESP, TOTKTR, TOTPERS** and **CORPS** meeting the selection criteria in relation to level of **Customer Satisfaction** compared with other variables.

Table 4.6.2 Model Summary Table Analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.521	.271	.268	.70796
2	.595	.354	.347	.66846
3	.619	.383	.374	.65475

4	.646	.418	.406	.63763

a Predictors: (Constant), TOTRESP
b Predictors: (Constant), TOTRESP, TOTKTR
c Predictors: (Constant), TOTRESP, TOTKTR, TOTPERS
d Predictors: (Constant), TOTRESP, TOTKTR, TOTPERS, KOR

The adjusted R square value from the above table can be read as follow:

Model 1 The Adjusted R Square is **0.268** and this indicate that **Independent variable** that is **TOTRESP** explain only 26.8**%** in relation to the **dependent variable** that is **Customer Satisfaction** (TOTSAT) where else 73.2**% cannot be explained** due to other unknown factors.

Model 2 The Adjusted R Square is **0.347** and this indicate that **Independent variable** that is TOTKTR and TOTRESP explain only 34.7**%** in relation to the **dependent variable** that is Customer Satisfaction (TOTSAT) where else 65.3**% cannot be explained** due to other factors unknown.

Model 3 The Adjusted R Square is **0.374** and this indicate that **Independent variable** that is **TOTRESP, TOTKTR and TOTPERS** explain only 37.4**%** in relation to the **dependent variable** that is **Customer Satisfaction** (TOTSAT) where else 62.6**% cannot be explained** due to other unknown factors.

Model 4 The Adjusted R Square is **0.406** and this indicate that **Independent Variable** that is **TOTRESP, TOTKTR, TOTPERS** and **CORPS** explain only 40.6% in relation to the dependent variable that is **Customer Satisfaction** where else 59.4% cannot be explained due to other unknown factors.

Table 4.6.3 Anova Table Analysis

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	36.760	1	36.760	73.344	.000
	Residual	98.737	197	.501		
	Total	135.497	198			
2	Regression	47.918	2	23.959	53.620	.000
	Residual	87.579	196	.447		
	Total	135.497	198			
3	Regression	51.901	3	17.300	40.356	.000
	Residual	83.596	195	.429		
	Total	135.497	198			
4	Regression	56.623	4	14.156	34.818	.000
	Residual	78.875	194	.407		
	Total	135.497	198			

a Predictors: (Constant), TOTRESP
b Predictors: (Constant), TOTRESP, TOTKTR
c Predictors: (Constant), TOTRESP, TOTKTR, TOTPERS
d Predictors: (Constant), TOTRESP, TOTKTR, TOTPERS, KOR
e Dependent Variable: TOTSAT

Using the **ANOVA analysis** it indicates that the entire 4 **models** that is **TOTRESP, TOTKTR TOTPERS** and **CORPS** has **a significant value of 0.00** and it shows that there is a significant difference between those variables and **TOTSAT**.

Table 4.6.4 Coefficient Table Analysis

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B		Beta		
1	(Constant)	.686	.156		4.399	.000
	TOTRESP	.861	.101	.521	8.564	.000
2	(Constant)	.177	.179		.991	.323
	TOTRESP	.648	.104	.392	6.219	.000
	TOTKTR	.524	.105	.315	4.997	.000
3	(Constant)	-6.029E-02	.192		-.314	.754
	TOTRESP	.476	.117	.288	4.081	.000
	TOTKTR	.488	.103	.293	4.723	.000
	TOTPERS	.345	.113	.206	3.048	.003
4	(Constant)	-.400	.212		-1.890	.060
	TOTRESP	.375	.117	.227	3.201	.002
	TOTKTR	.438	.102	.263	4.301	.000
	TOTPERS	.380	.111	.227	3.429	.001
	KOR	.218	.064	.199	3.408	.001

a Dependent Variable: TOTSAT

The B value of the 4 variables of the regression model and it can be explained as follows:

Y = -0.400 + 0.375 (TOTRESP) + 0.438 (TOTKTR) +0.380 (TOTPERS) + 0.218 (CORPS)

The **independent variable** that is **TOTRESP, TOTKTR, TOTPERS** and **Corps** has an impact on the **dependent variables** that is **Customer Satisfaction.** All of the variables have a **positive effect** on **Customer Satisfaction.** The most important independent variable and also has a **higher impact** on **Customer Satisfaction** is **TOTKTR**.

4.7 Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is to summarize the information contained in a large number of variables into a smaller number of factors.

Table 4.7.1 Total Variance Explained Table Analysis

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	**5.833**	**36.459**	36.459	5.833	36.459	36.459	3.429	21.430	21.430
2	**1.307**	**8.168**	44.627	1.307	8.168	44.627	2.165	13.533	34.963
3	**1.285**	**8.031**	52.658	1.285	8.031	52.658	2.163	13.516	48.479
4	**1.124**	**7.027**	**59.686**	1.124	7.027	59.686	1.793	11.206	59.686
5	.899	5.621	65.306						
6	.821	5.131	70.437						
7	.730	4.566	75.003						
8	.648	4.047	79.050						
9	.599	3.741	82.790						
10	.574	3.590	86.381						
11	.510	3.189	89.570						
12	.401	2.509	92.079						
13	.394	2.463	94.542						
14	.347	2.166	96.708						
15	.299	1.868	98.576						
16	.228	1.424	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table above indicates there are only 4 variables, which have an **eigenvalue** more than 1are as follows:

a. KP 1 - 5.833

b. KP2 - 1.307

c. KP3 - 1.285

d. KP4 - 1.124

KP 1, the independent variable that is **The Transportation Service In General** explains **36.459%** in relation to the dependent variable that is **Customer Satisfaction** while 63.541% unexplained which depends on other unknown variables.

KP 2, the independent variable that is **Condition of Vehicle** explains **8.168%** in relation to the dependent variable that is **Customer Satisfaction** while 91.832% unexplained which depends on other unknown variables.

KP 3, the independent variable that is **Sitting Capacity** explains **8.031%** in relation to the dependent variable that is **Customer Satisfaction** while 91.969% unexplained which depends on other unknown variables.

KP 4, the independent variable that is **Safety in the Vehicle** explains **7.027%** in relation to the dependent variable that is **Customer Satisfaction** while 92.973% unexplained which depends on other unknown variables.

The total percentage of the 4 variables above **KP 1, KP 2, KP 3** and **KP 4** explain **59.686%** in relation to the dependent variable that is **Customer Satisfaction** while 40.314% unexplained and this depends on other unknown variables.

Table 4.7.2 Rotated Component Matrix

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
KP1	**.802**	4.842E-02	.283	-2.508E-02
KP2	**.608**	-1.683E-03	**.516**	.142
KP3	.459	9.387E-02	**.534**	.152
KP4	**.506**	4.032E-02	.210	**.609**
KP5	**.569**	.318	.123	.138
KP6	3.032E-02	.497	3.807E-02	**.626**
KP7	.226	**.757**	7.984E-02	-.142
KP8	5.278E-02	**.650**	.303	.249
KP9	.365	.216	.471	.231
KP10	.234	1.760E-02	.397	**.654**
KP11	**.589**	.257	-4.333E-03	.195
KP12	.314	**.571**	1.094E-02	.298
KP13	**.729**	.242	-6.614E-02	.316
KP14	**.551**	.424	.333	-.382
KP15	-9.097E-02	5.897E-02	**.752**	3.881E-02
KP16	.308	.355	**.558**	.170

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a Rotation converged in 9 iterations.

In naming the group the variables which has the **highest loading factor** (above 0.5) has the strongest significant than the other variables and this can be seen below:

a. **Factor 1: Efficiency**

(1) KP1
(2) KP2
(3) KP4
(4) KP5
(5) KP11
(6) KP13
(7) KP14

b. **Factor 2: Driver's Personality**

(8) KP7
(9) KP8
(10) KP12

c. **Factor 3: Vehicle Condition**

(1) KP2

(2) KP3

(3) KP15

(4) KP16

d. **Factor 4: Comfort**

a. KP4

b. KP6

c. KP10

By using the factor analysis method we are able to group up the variables according to the Customer Satisfaction into 4 factor groups that is Efficiency, Driver's Personality, Vehicle Condition and Comfort.

4.8 Conclusion

From the results of data analysis it indicates that there is relationship between perception of service quality and customers' satisfaction towards the RSC transportation services. Those findings are useful by providing the secondary data, which provides information especially to the RSC Directorate and Army Log HQ. Results can also be used as an evaluation on the customers needs and wants in providing the quality services for customers' satisfaction.

Overall study shows that in providing quality service, the focus group should be on Combat unit because they are the most not satisfied group compare to Combat Support and Service Support unit.