

# CHAPTER 5

## **CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS OF THE DRIVERS SATISFACTION AND PERCEPTION OF QUALITY**

### **5.1 Demographic Profile Analysis**

**Table 5.1.1 Demographic Profile**

<b>Ser</b>	<b>Demographic Profile</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.	<b>Education</b> a. SRP b. SPM c. STPM Total	43 54 3 100	43 54 3 100
2.	<b>Age</b> a. Below 22 yrs b. 23 to 27 yrs c. 28 to 32 yrs d. 33 to 37 yrs e. Above 38 yrs Total	16 29 24 23 8 100	16 29 24 23 8 100
3.	<b>Rank</b> a. Private b. Junior NCOs c. Senior NCOs Total	39 39 22 100	39 39 22 100
4.	<b>Service</b> a. Below 5 yrs b. 6 to 10 yrs c. 11 to 15 yrs d. Above 16 yrs Total	26 15 33 26 100	26 15 33 26 100

a. **Education.** The total number of respondent representing Education group variable is 100 of which the SRP is represented by 43%, SPM is 54% and STPM is represented by 3%. The SPM group is the biggest group representing the Education.

b. **Age**. The group represents the age below 22 years is 16%, the age group from 23 to 27 years is 29%, the group from 28 to 32 years is 24 %, the age group from 33 to 37 is 23% and the age group above 38 years is 8%. The highest group is 23 to 27 years old, which represent 29% of the respondents. The smallest group represents the age group above 38 years, which is only 8%.

c. **Rank**. The Private group represent 39%, the Junior NCOs represent 39% and the Senior NCOs represent 22% of the respondents. The Private group and the Junior NCOs represent the highest percentage, which is 39% respectively.

d. **Service**. The group, which below than 5 years represent 26%, group of 6 to 10 years, represent 15%, group of 11 to 15 years represented by 33% and group above than 16 years represent 26%. From this profile the highest number is the service group 11 to 15 years, which represent 33%, and the lowest group is the group of 6 to 10 years of service.

**4.1.1 Overall Analysis on Demographic Profile.** From the overall result of the demographic profile it shows that, most of the respondents have the education level of SPM level and below. Beside that the majority of the respondents are from the group of Junior NCOs and Private. Most of them also have the experience of service more than 6 years where we find that with this experience they have enough exposure to give reliable views on the RSC units they had served.

## **5.2 Crosstabulate Analysis**

### **5.2.1 Crosstabulate Satisfaction of Service with:**

- a. **Age Group.**
- b. **Years of Service Group.**
- c. **Rank Group.**
- d. **Education Group.**

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 no relationship, in fact exists.

**Ho = Null Hypothesis**

**H<sub>1</sub> = Alternative Hypothesis**

**If     p > alpha (0.05)**

**You fail to reject Ho (there is no significance)**

**Thus cannot conclude that the variables are related.**

$$\mu_1 = \mu_2$$

**If     p < alpha (0.05)**

**You reject Ho**

**Accept H<sub>1</sub> and conclude that the (there is a significance)**

**Variables are related.**

$$\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$$

**Table 5.2.1   Driver's Satisfaction by Age Group**

<b>Years Satisfaction</b>	<b>Below 22 yrs</b>	<b>23 to 27 yrs</b>	<b>28 to 32 yrs</b>	<b>33 to 37 yrs</b>	<b>Above 38 yrs</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Sig</b>
High Satisfaction	50.0%	27.6%	12.5%	43.5%	12.5%	30.0%	0.027
Medium Satisfaction	25.0%	48.3%	29.2%	21.7%	62.5%	35.0%	

Low Satisfaction	25.0%	24.1%	58.3%	34.8%	25.0%	35.0%	
------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

$$X^2 = 17.281 \quad df = 8$$

The result indicates that **there is a significance** relation between **Age Group** and **Driver's Satisfaction** because **p-Value (0.027)** is less than 0.05. The table also shows that the group below 22 years is the most satisfied with 50% and the least satisfied group is 28 to 32 years of age with 58.3%. The total percentage shows that the overall personnel of the RSC still do not satisfied within their Corps. As the table shows the total of medium and low satisfaction is 35% respectively and only 30% are satisfied in the service.

**Table 5.2.2 Driver's Satisfaction by Education Group**

<b>Satisfaction \ Corp</b>	<b>SRP</b>	<b>SPM</b>	<b>STPM</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Sig</b>
High Satisfaction	32.6%	29.6%	0.0%	30.0%	0.211
Medium Satisfaction	32.6%	33.3%	100.0%	35.0%	
Low Satisfaction	34.9%	37.0%	0.0%	35.0%	

$$X^2 = 5.848 \quad df = 4$$

The table above indicates that **there is no significance** relation between **Education Group** and **Driver's Satisfaction** because **p-Value (0.211)** which is bigger than 0.05.

**Table 5.2.3 Satisfaction of Service by Years of Service Group**

<b>Satisfaction \ Years</b>	<b>Below 5 yrs</b>	<b>6 to 10 yrs</b>	<b>11 to 15 yrs</b>	<b>Above 16 yrs</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Sig</b>
High Satisfaction	46.2%	26.7%	15.2%	34.6%	30.0%	

Medium Satisfaction	26.9%	46.7%	30.3%	42.3%	35.0%	0.061
Low Satisfaction	26.9%	26.7%	54.5%	23.1%	35.0%	

$\chi^2 = 12.040$        $df = 6$

The table above indicates that **there is no significance** relation between **Years of Service** and **Driver's Satisfaction** because **p-Value (0.061)** which is bigger than 0.05.

**Table 5.2.4 Satisfaction of Service by Rank Group**

<b>Satisfaction \ Rank</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Junior NCO</b>	<b>Senior NCO</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Sig</b>
High Satisfaction	41.0%	20.5%	27.3%	30.0%	0.137
Medium Satisfaction	35.9%	30.8%	40.9%	35.0%	
Low Satisfaction	23.1%	48.7%	31.8%	35.0%	

$\chi^2 = 6.977$        $df = 4$

The table above indicates that, **there is no significance** relation between **Rank Group** and **Driver's Satisfaction** because **p-Value (0.137)** which is bigger than 0.05.

### 5.3 Correlation Analysis

**Table 5.3.1 Correlation Analysis**

		TOTSAT	TOT RAM	TOT SUI	TOT FACY	TOTLAT	TOT CAR	UMUR	PKT	SERV	EDU
TOTSAT	Pearson Correlation	1	.132	.456(**)	.507(**)	.483(**)	.410(**)	-.105	-.144	-.099	-.302
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.190	.000	.000	.000	.000	.299	.152	.325	.823
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
TOT RAM	Pearson Correlation	.132	1	.071	.198(*)	.278(**)	.122	.069	-.057	-.056	-.022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.190		.482	.049	.005	.227	.495	.571	.582	.828
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
TOT SUI	Pearson Correlation	.456(**)	.071	1	.479(**)	.237(*)	.279(**)	-.005	-.067	-.070	-.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.482		.000	.018	.005	.958	.510	.486	.884
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
TOT FACY	Pearson Correlation	.507(**)	.198(*)	.479(**)	1	.359(**)	.260(**)	-.108	-.180	-.147	-.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.049	.000		.000	.009	.286	.074	.144	.773
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
TOTLAT	Pearson Correlation	.483(**)	.278(**)	.237(*)	.359(**)	1	.512(**)	-.091	-.180	-.112	.007
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.005	.018	.000		.000	.368	.074	.268	.942
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
TOT CAR	Pearson Correlation	.410(**)	.122	.279(**)	.260(**)	.512(**)	1	-.128	-.111	-.308(**)	-.038
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.227	.005	.009	.000		.205	.270	.002	.705
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
UMUR	Pearson Correlation	-.105	.069	-.005	-.108	-.091	-.128	1	.716(**)	.760(**)	.140
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.299	.495	.958	.286	.368	.205		.000	.000	.164
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
PKT	Pearson Correlation	-.144	-.057	-.067	-.180	-.180	-.111	.716(**)	1	.696(**)	.077
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.152	.571	.510	.074	.074	.270	.000		.000	.449
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
SERV	Pearson Correlation	-.099	-.056	-.070	-.147	-.112	.308(**)	.760(**)	.696(**)	1	.074
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.325	.582	.486	.144	.268	.002	.000	.000		.463
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
EDU	Pearson Correlation	-.023	-.022	-.015	-.029	.007	-.038	.140	.077	.074	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.823	.828	.884	.773	.942	.705	.164	.449	.463	
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

\*\* 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 13 positive and one negative value (\*\*) indicating the correlation. The correlation is significance at the 0.01 level explain those variables have a very significant correlation (\*\*). These correlations are as follows:

- a. TOTSAT and TOSUIT.
- b. TOTSAT and TOTFACY.
- c. TOTSAT and TOTLAT.
- d. TOTSAT and TOTCAR.
- e. TOTRAM and TOTLAT.
- f. TOTSUIT and TOTFACY.
- g. TOTSUIT and TOTCAR.
- h. TOTFACY and TOTLAT.
- i. TOTFACY AND TOTCAR.
- j. TOTLAT and TOTCAR.
- k. TOTCAR and SERV.
- l. AGE and RANK.
- m. AGE and SERV.
- n. RANK and SERV.



The analysis that can be made from the above correlation is that:

- a. There is a positive correlation between TOTSAT with TOTSUIT, TOTFACY, TOTLAT and TOTCAR.
- b. There is a positive correlation between TOTRAM and TOTLAT.
- c. There is a positive correlation between TOTSUIT with TOTFACY and TOTCAR
- d. There is a positive correlation between TOTFACY with TOTLAT and TOTCAR.
- e. There is a positive correlation between TOTLAT and TOTCAR.
- f. There is a negative correlation between TOTCAR and SERVICE.
- g. There is a positive correlation between AGE with RANK and SERVICE.
- h. There is a positive correlation between RANK and SERVICE.

#### 5.4 Anova Test Analysis

**Table 5.4.1 Driver's Satisfaction by Rank Group**

Ser	<u>Drivers Satisfaction</u>	Mean Values			
		Private	Junior NCOs	Senior NCOs	Sig
1.	<u>PUAS1.</u> Pakaian kemas dan bersih.	3.8718	3.4615	3.5455	0.115

2.	<u>PUAS2.</u> Mudah membuat pertukaran pakaian	2.6410	2.2308	2.5000	0.261
3.	<u>PUAS3.</u> Pakaian kerja yang mencukupi	2.9231	2.7949	2.7273	0.785
4.	<u>PUAS4.</u> Kenderaan pasukan masih sesuai digunakan	3.4103	3.1026	3.3636	0.423
5.	<u>PUAS5.</u> Keadaan kenderaan adalah memuaskan	3.3333	2.7436	3.5000	0.013
6.	<u>PUAS6.</u> Alat kemudahan kenderaan mencukupi.	3.3590	2.9231	3.1364	0.230
7.	<u>PUAS7.</u> Kenderaan mudah dikendalikan	3.4615	3.5385	3.5455	0.911
8.	<u>PUAS8.</u> Fasilitas asas senggaraan kenderaan mencukupi	3.3846	2.9231	3.1364	0.108
9.	<u>PUAS9.</u> Kursus yang dihadiri amat berkesan	3.9487	3.5897	3.4091	0.023

10.	<u>PUAS10.</u> Pengetahuan kursus dapat dipraktikkan	3.8205	3.9231	3.6818	0.500
11.	<u>PUAS11.</u> Latihan berterusan dijalankan dipasukan	3.8718	3.5641	3.6818	0.208
12.	<u>PUAS12.</u> Perjalanan kerjaya memuaskan	3.8205	3.5897	3.6364	0.465
13.	<u>PUAS13.</u> Minat terhadap profesion adalah tinggi	3.7949	3.8974	3.8182	0.836
14.	<u>PUAS14.</u> Sistem kenaikan pangkat adalah memuaskan	3.5128	2.9231	3.6364	0.019
15.	<u>PUAS15.</u> Masa depan kerjaya adalah jelas	3.6923	3.1282	3.7727	0.021

One-way **ANOVA** is used when we need to compare the means of two or more groups or populations. Table above shows the 15 constructs of Drivers Satisfaction and 3 constructs of Rank.

**Drivers Satisfaction** which has a **p-Value < 0.05** are as follows:

- a. **PUAS 5.** The vehicles condition is satisfied.
- b. **PUAS 9.** Courses attended are effective.
- c. **PUAS 14.** Promotion system is satisfied.
- d. **PUAS 15.** The future of the career is clear.

### Private Group

Among the **Drivers Satisfaction** constructs, it is found that the **highest mean value** is for **PUAS 9** that is courses attended are effective and the **lowest mean value** is for **PUAS 5** that is satisfied with the vehicles condition.

### Junior NCOs

As for **Drivers Satisfaction** construct, it is found that the **highest mean value** is for **PUAS 9** that is courses attended are effective and the **lowest mean value** is for **PUAS 5** that is satisfied with the vehicles condition.

### Senior NCOs

Among the **Drivers Satisfaction** constructs, it is found that the **highest mean value** is for **PUAS 15** that is clear about future career and **lowest mean value** is for **PUAS 9** that is courses attended are effective

## 5.5 Reliability Test

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

**Table 5.5.1 Reliability of Dependant Variables (driver's 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
PUAS1	47.0600	62.2388	.3243	.8448
PUAS2	48.2500	58.1288	.4899	.8362
PUAS3	47.8700	57.6900	.5141	.8346
PUAS4	47.4200	57.7814	.5303	.8335
PUAS5	47.5600	58.4711	.4701	.8375
PUAS6	47.5600	56.6327	.5818	.8301
PUAS7	47.1900	59.1252	.5652	.8322

PUAS8	47.5500	57.9268	.5989	<u>.8297</u>
PUAS9	47.0100	60.9797	.4855	.8369
PUAS10	46.8700	61.6698	.4513	.8386
PUAS11	46.9900	61.5656	.4580	.8383
PUAS12	47.0100	60.4140	.4963	.8360
PUAS13	46.8600	62.7277	.3551	.8429
PUAS14	47.3900	58.9272	.4337	.8399
PUAS15	47.2100	59.8847	.4077	.8411

#### RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 100.0

N of Items = 15

Alpha = **.8461**

Table above shows the reliability analysis of **Drivers Satisfaction**, where the **alpha value is 0.8461**. **PUAS 8 (0.8297)** is the most important variable where it has the lowest alpha value if item deleted. The larger the alpha value at the bottom the more reliable the variables are.

**Table 5.5.2 Reliability of Independent Variables (career planning)**

#### RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
CAREER1	17.1000	12.2929	.2529	.7037
CAREER2	17.5200	10.4743	.4061	.6629
CAREER3	17.2700	10.4213	.6965	.5845
CAREER4	17.4700	9.2213	.6356	<u>.5757</u>
CAREER5	17.7900	13.2989	.0575	<u>.7633</u>
CAREER6	17.5500	9.5631	.6195	.5851

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 100.0

N of Items = 6

Alpha = **.6948**

Table above shows the reliability analysis of **Career Planning**, where the **alpha value is 0.6948**. **CAREER 4 (0.5757)** 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 CAREER 5 (0.7633). The larger the alpha value at the bottom the more reliable the variables are.

**Table 5.5.3 Driver's Appearance (keterampilan pemandu)**

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
TERAM1	14.2100	12.3898	.3258	.7248
TERAM2	14.2700	12.5223	.3019	<u>.7315</u>
TERAM3	14.7200	9.5774	.5876	.6278
TERAM4	15.0400	8.2812	.6334	<u>.6024</u>
TERAM5	14.8000	9.2121	.5619	.6378

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 100.0

N of Items = 5

Alpha = .7207

Table above shows the reliability analysis of Driver's Personal Appearance where the alpha value is 0.7207. TERAM 4 (0.6024) 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 TERAM 2 (0.7315). The larger the alpha value at the bottom the more reliable the variables are.

**Table 5.5.4 Vehicle Suitability (kesesuaian kenderaan)**

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
SUIT1	9.9700	6.9183	.5954	.8405
SUIT2	10.2500	6.2702	.7694	<u>.7657</u>
SUIT3	10.2100	6.4302	.6956	.7979
SUIT4	10.0400	6.6448	.6717	.8083

#### Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 100.0

N of Items = 4

Alpha = .8455

Table above shows the reliability analysis of **Vehicle Suitability** where the **alpha value is 0.8455**. **SUIT 2 (0.7657)** is the most important variable where it has the lowest alpha value if item deleted. The larger the alpha value at the bottom the more reliable the variables are.

**Table 5.5.5 Formal and Informal Training**

#### RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
LATIH1	18.8500	8.8561	.4806	.7180
LATIH2	18.8200	7.8663	.5975	<u>.6821</u>
LATIH3	18.5100	9.8282	.5019	.7162
LATIH4	18.7600	9.2752	.5987	.6922
LATIH5	18.5600	9.5418	.4432	.7269
LATIH6	18.7500	9.2803	.3774	.7491

#### Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 100.0

N of Items = 6

Alpha = .7506

Table above shows the reliability analysis of **Formal and Informal Training** where the **alpha value is 0.7506**. **LATIH 2 (0.6821)** is the most important variable where it has the lowest alpha value if item deleted. The larger the alpha value at the bottom the more reliable the variables are.

**Table 5.5.6 Unit Facilities**

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
FACY1	6.8000	3.4747	.5129	.5941
FACY2	6.6200	3.1471	.5293	<u>.5756</u>
FACY3	6.5600	3.8651	.4891	.6269
Reliability Coefficients				
N of Cases =     100.0			N of Items =   3	
Alpha =     .6929				

Table above shows the reliability analysis of **Unit Facilities** where the **alpha value is 0.6929**. **FACY 2 (0.5756)** are the most important variable where it has the lowest alpha value if item deleted. The **larger the alpha value** at the bottom the more reliable the variables are.

## 5.6 Regression Analysis

$$Y = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \epsilon$$

**Where**

**Y     =     Drivers Satisfaction**

**X<sub>1</sub>   =   Unit Facilities**

**X<sub>2</sub>   =   Formal and Informal Training**

**X<sub>3</sub>   =   Vehicle Suitability**

**β<sub>1</sub>   =   Regression coefficient of X<sub>1,=1,2,.....6</sub>**

**ε     =     Error term**



**Table 5.6.1 The Regression Analysis Model (stepwise)**

**Variables Entered/Removed(a)**

<b>Model</b>	<b>Variables Entered</b>	<b>Variables Removed</b>	<b>Method</b>
1	TOTFACY		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	TOTLAT		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	TOTSUIT		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a Dependent Variable: TOTSAT2

The above Table indicates the **3 Stepwise Regression Analyses** where **3 independent variables** that are **TOTFACY, TOTLAT AND TOTSUIT** have **significance different** in relation to the level of Drivers Satisfaction compared with other variables.

**Table 5.6.2 Model Summary Table Analysis**

<b>Model</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>R Square</b>	<b>Adjusted R Square</b>	<b>Std. Error of the Estimate</b>
1	.507(a)	.257	.250	.70041
2	.601(b)	.361	.348	.65306
3	.639(c)	.408	.390	.63174

a Predictors: (Constant), TOTFACY

b Predictors: (Constant), TOTFACY, TOTLAT

c Predictors: (Constant), TOTFACY, TOTLAT, TOTSUIT

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

**Model 1** The Adjusted R Square is **0.250** and this indicate that **Independent variable** that is **TOTFACY** explain only 25% in relation to the **dependent variable** that is **Drivers Satisfaction (TOTSAT)** where else 75% **cannot be explained** due to other unknown factors.

**Model 2** The Adjusted R Square is **0.348** and this indicate that **Independent variable** that is **TOTFACY** and **TOTLAT** explain only 34.8% in relation to the **dependent variable** that is **Drivers Satisfaction (TOTSAT)** where else 65.2% **cannot be explained** due to other factors unknown.

**Model 3** The Adjusted R Square is **0.390** and this indicate that **Independent variable** that is **TOTFACY**, **TOTLAT** and **TOTSUIT** explain only 39% in relation to the **dependent variable** that is **Drivers Satisfaction (TOTSAT)** where else 61% **cannot be explained** due to other unknown factors.

**Table 5.6.3 ANOVA Table Analysis**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16.673	1	16.673	33.986	.000
	Residual	48.077	98	.491		
	Total	64.750	99			
2	Regression	23.381	2	11.690	27.411	.000
	Residual	41.369	97	.426		
	Total	64.750	99			
3	Regression	26.437	3	8.812	22.081	.000
	Residual	38.313	96	.399		
	Total	64.750	99			

- a Predictors: (Constant), TOTFACY  
b Predictors: (Constant), TOTFACY, TOTLAT  
c Predictors: (Constant), TOTFACY, TOTLAT, TOTSUIT  
d Dependent Variable: TOTSAT

Using the **ANOVA analysis** it indicates that the entire 3 models that is **TOTFACY, TOTLAT and TOTSUIT** has a **significant value of 0.00** where it shows that there are a significant difference between those variables and **TOTSAT**.

#### 5.6.4 Coefficient Table Analysis

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.740	.219		3.381	.001
	TOTFACY	.817	.140	.507	5.830	.000
2	(Constant)	.213	.244		.876	.383
	TOTFACY	.618	.140	.384	4.412	.000
	TOTLAT	.555	.140	.345	3.966	.000
3	(Constant)	-.054	.255		-.213	.832
	TOTFACY	.437	.150	.271	2.906	.005
	TOTLAT	.526	.136	.326	3.867	.000
	TOTSUIT	.402	.145	.248	2.767	.007

a Dependent Variable: TOTSAT

The  $\beta$  value of the 3 variables of the regression model can be explained as follows:

$$Y = -0.054 + 0.437 (\text{TOTFACY}) + 0.526 (\text{TOTLAT}) + 0.402 (\text{TOTSUIT})$$

The independent variable that is TOTFACY, TOTLAT and TOTSUIT has an impact on the dependent variables that is Drivers Satisfaction where all of the variables have a positive effect. The most important independent variable and also has a higher impact on Drivers Satisfaction is TOTLAT.

## 5.7. Factor Analysis

### 5.7.1 Factor Analysis of the Drivers Satisfaction

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

**Table 5.7.1 Total Variance Explained Table Analysis**

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.881	32.540	32.540	4.881	32.540	32.540	3.509	23.392	23.392
2	2.449	16.325	48.865	2.449	16.325	48.865	2.875	19.168	42.560
3	1.414	9.427	58.292	1.414	9.427	58.292	2.324	15.493	58.053
4	1.094	7.291	<b>65.583</b>	1.094	7.291	65.583	1.130	7.531	65.583
5	.957	6.381	71.964						
6	.800	5.335	77.299						
7	.759	5.059	82.358						
8	.578	3.853	86.211						
9	.468	3.118	89.329						
10	.416	2.776	92.105						
11	.316	2.104	94.209						
12	.282	1.882	96.090						
13	.236	1.572	97.662						
14	.201	1.339	99.001						
15	.150	.999	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table above indicates there are only 4 variables which has a eigenvalue more than 1 as follows:

a.	PUAS 1	-	4.881
b.	PUAS 2	-	2.449
c.	PUAS 3	-	1.414
d.	PUAS 4	-	1.094

PUAS 1, the **independent variable** that is **Clean Uniform** explains **32.54%** in relation to the **dependent variable** that is **Drivers Satisfaction** while **67.46% unexplained** which depends on other unknown variables.

PUAS 2, the **independent variable** that is **Easy to Replace Uniform** explains **16.325%** in relation to the **dependent variable** that is **Drivers Satisfaction** while **83.675% unexplained** which depends on other unknown variables.

PUAS 3, the **independent variable** that is **Enough Uniform Issued** explains **9.427%** in relation to the **dependent variable** that is **Drivers Satisfaction** while **90.573% unexplained** which depends on other unknown variables.

PUAS 4, the **independent variable** that is **Unit's Vehicles Still Suitable to be Use** explains **7.291%** in relation to the **dependent variable** that is **Drivers Satisfaction** while **92.709% unexplained** which depends on other unknown variables.

The **total percentage** of the **4 variables** above that are **PUAS 1, PUAS 2, PUAS 3** and **PUAS 4** explains **65.583%** in relation to the **dependent variable** that is **Drivers Satisfaction** while **34.417% unexplained** and this depends on other unknown variables.

**Table 5.7.2 Rotated Component Matrix (a)**

	<b>Component</b>			
	1	2	3	4
PUAS1	.253	.248	.255	<b>-.738</b>
PUAS2	.295	8.789E-02	<b>.619</b>	.378
PUAS3	.388	.342	.267	<b>.557</b>
PUAS4	<b>.865</b>	9.613E-02	-.012	-.007
PUAS5	<b>.878</b>	-.177	.140	2.333E-02
PUAS6	<b>.877</b>	9.033E-02	7.598E-02	-.015
PUAS7	<b>.733</b>	.297	-.006	-.138
PUAS8	<b>.579</b>	.272	.292	.187
PUAS9	9.878E-02	<b>.804</b>	.151	-.050
PUAS10	-.011	<b>.721</b>	.303	.161
PUAS11	.115	<b>.740</b>	.137	-.047
PUAS12	7.371E-02	<b>.501</b>	<b>.509</b>	7.548E-02
PUAS13	.123	<b>.677</b>	-.031	-.084
PUAS14	3.055E-02	.225	<b>.755</b>	-.169
PUAS15	4.481E-02	7.548E-02	<b>.854</b>	-.070

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

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: Vehicle**

- (1) PUAS 4
- (2) PUAS 5
- (3) PUAS 6
- (4) PUAS 7
- (5) PUAS 8

b. **Factor 2: Training**

- (1) PUAS 9
- (2) PUAS 10
- (3) PUAS 11
- (4) PUAS 12
- (5) PUAS 13

c. **Factor 3: Career Planning**

- (1) PUAS 2
- (2) PUAS 12
- (3) PUAS 14
- (4) PUAS 15

d. **Factor 4: Personal Appearance**

- (1) PUAS 1
- (2) PUAS 3

By using the factor analysis method, we are able to group up the variables according to the Drivers Satisfaction into 4 factors that is Vehicle, Training, Career Planning and Personal Appearance.

## **5.8 Conclusion**

From the results of data analysis it indicates that there is relationship between perception of service quality and drivers' satisfaction towards the RSC facilities and career planning in the RSC unit. 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 drivers' requirements towards increasing their competency in providing the quality services for their customers.

Overall study shows that in providing quality service, the RSC should focus on the career planning and developing the facilities in their units. In such organization, the human resources are the most important assets and they are the immediate representative deals with the customers.