CHAPTER V

FINDINGS & ROOT CAUSE IDENTIFICATION

This chapter outlines the actual problems faced by HSSP. As a result of the exploratory research, the employees' perception of HSSP's 11 organizational factors are ranked and the top 4 and bottom 4 factors are elaborated. The bottom 4 factors which were scrutinized during causal research are then discussed in depth to give an explanation on the reason for them being rated low by HSSP's employees.

5.1 EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION OF HSSP'S ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS.

(Results of exploratory research)

Detail findings of this survey is clearly shown in Appendixes 5-1 to 5-12. These appendixes show the percentage of employees who have agreed and disagreed for every question. A summary of these findings have been depicted in Table 5-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Factor</th>
<th>Percentage Agree (satisfied)</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working climate</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change In General</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation &amp; Change</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Development</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working condition</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Culture</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception Of Own Job</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Style</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Mission</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall there were several factors that were very positive and encouraging and some areas of concern that needed to be addressed. The factor that obtained the highest percentage of respondents agreeing to it is Working Climate, followed by Change in General, Role Clarity and Innovation & Change.

The weakest factor seems to be the Company Mission, with a score of only 60.6% followed by Management Style (62.4%), Communication (63.3%) and Perception Of Own Job (64.2%).

5.1.1 Top Four Factors

Working Climate

Working climate has been identified as the factor with the highest level of satisfaction towards company performance among the sampled population.

The statistics indicate that the employees do not perceive "change" as a threat to their work satisfaction. On the contrary, they are of the perception that change will bring new opportunities which would create challenging and interesting work. Therefore, they already can see the positive outcome of change which management has been communicating and promising to them.

This situation is to the advantage of HSSP. Management would not face much resistance when it comes to utilizing its employees' experience and expertise. The management however has to ensure that more opportunities are opened up to them, as a large percentage of sampled population expects this to happen.

Change in General

It is very encouraging and motivating to realize that HSSP has a workforce that is very receptive to the change process in general. This is clearly reflected by
the question, "I believe that change within the company benefits everybody" scored 72%.

However, only 67% of them strongly agreed that they have skills which would enable them to adapt to change. This explains the high percentage of employees (88%) who strongly agree that training is necessary to be given to all employees to assist them to learn and adapt to new skills and paradigm.

**Role clarity**
Role clarity was rated the third highest among the other factors. The satisfaction which employees have expressed over the present conditions of this factor was fairly high as 80.7% of the population expressed satisfaction over "clearly defined performance standards" for their jobs.

Around 78.9% of the employees are of the perception that during the "change" process, management will provide them with clear description of their roles in the process as reflected in "Change will allow me to obtain sufficient information to do my job well".

Management should therefore communicate clearly of each and every employee's role in the change process. In this way, management will avoid confusion and stressful experiences which "change" process can bring with itself, by providing people with information of what will be required of them in the future.

**Innovation & change**
The fourth highest in satisfaction towards company's performance was this factor. Innovation and change would ideally provide the initiative on part of the employees to change their behavior in respect to continuously changing customer's demand.
This survey results are encouraging in that respect, as 92.7% of employees expressed an opinion that they are, "ready to change the way they do work in order to improve quality of service to customer." Employees also express a high degree of agreement that they should take ownership in the ways that the things are done, as 76.1% of them agreed that they are the ones responsible for it.

This should encourage management that HSSP's employees will be independent and will take initiative if they are provided with necessary resources and freedom to do the things in a new and better way. Such freedom would include a certain degree of empowerment and delegation.

Management need to support good ideas that are provided by employees and utilize them in order to encourage the positive spirit of change.

It is this willingness and drive on part of the employees that have the greatest potential to carry HSSP towards being the best in customer service and therefore to build its competitive advantage in this area.

5.1.2 BOTTOM FOUR FACTORS

Company mission and vision
The company mission and vision factor shows the lowest agreement to satisfactory company's performance with 61.34% of sample population agreeing that company is doing well. It is only logical the employees wanted to be involved in the company's future projects and definitely this is a positive sign as it indicates high involvement and morale of the HSSP's employees.

Management should have easy job satisfying the employees further by communicating to a greater extend about company's change process and strategic plans. (Of course to an extend to which it is possible). Providing
employees with an opportunity to give their input into the change process will “buy them in” even to a further extend.

At the same time employees will gain motivation through this process which will go way beyond any motivation which could be obtained through external rewards. Employees perceive change as a necessary step to achieve company’s target and mission statement, as 86.24% of them agreed that change is important to achieve company’s target.

The employees however have much lower confidence that they know clearly what the mission and vision statements of HSSP are (only 64.22%). This in a way explains their low agreement that management practices what is preached in mission and vision statements (46.79% only).

This leads us to conclude that management and employees together may not be sure of what company’s mission and vision are and how they should reflect it in day-to-day’s operation and behaviors.

It is very important that employees and management be involved into creation and formulation of company’s new mission statement. Only in this way, management will be able to walk the talk and adopt their management strategies to the overall corporate strategy expressed in company’s mission. On the other side, employees will be able to see clearly the connection between management’s actions and overall company’s goals.

**Management styles**

Management style is the factor that should draw the largest attention of the managers as it is the factor with second low performance (62.4%). However, the high degree of population which agree that management style is satisfactory, does, not allow us to say that there is something critically wrong with this
organization. Comparative to other factors, employees have lower satisfaction in this area and management should utilize this room for improvement in order to communicate strongly about their determination towards adjusting their behavior in accordance to their employees' perception.

The perception of employees is that change will make management even more approachable and concern for employees' welfare. In fact questions designed to measure this factor indicates that presently there is very low agreement that management is taking care of employees and their welfare, as only 4.83% of population think that their management is concerned with getting their job done and not about their employees.

It is also important to mention that the confidence among employees on their management’s competence and ability is very, very low as only as 6.37% of employees agreed that upper management consists of capable people and only 6.37% of them express the view of their immediate superior being competent and professional.

From the results we can also conclude that employees would like to feel more of top management’s involvement with their problems as there is equally low agreement (5.27%) that top management understands the problems faced by employees at their level. It is only expected that top management cannot be able to communicate to each and every individual employee, however, in dealing with employee’s feeling, the goal would be achieved even if they are provided with the channel through which they can voice out their opinions. In this way, they will have an important feeling that their problems are heard and this itself will create impression that top management’s involvement with their problems is present.
Perception of Own Job

This factor scored 64.59%, slightly better than communication. When we look into the high score of 88.99% of population which have agreed that they like the job they do, it allows us to say that there is no reason for a major concern in respect to employee’s morale in HSSP. It is true that employees may have high expectations of their jobs and that they perceive that there could be less unnecessary stress in their jobs.

However, the stressful experience of individuals is more likely to be caused by lack of clear direction which is supported by our findings in the area of company mission and vision as well as by problems arising due to unclear communication channels to voice out the major problems to the appropriate level where necessary action can be taken.

It is positive that employees on the other hand do not think that change will cause unnecessary stress for them which would be one of the greatest dangers. On the contrary, HSSP employees have high confidence (54.12%) that change will not bring unnecessary stress to them. This may be explained by the fact that they expect the change process to incorporate communication as an important part of it.

Apart from that, it was observed that the employees were not satisfied with the compensation that they are currently getting. Their allowances which have been promised is yet to be received even after a year. They are quite unhappy with the salary system whereby the new ones are paid more than the old who are more experienced in the field.

Communication

In support to the observations which were made in other factors where we indicated that there may exist certain ambiguity as to what company’s mission
and vision is on part of both employees and management as well as employee's desires towards more extensive management involvement into problems faced at their own level, communication is detected to be on of the possible explanations as it is identified as one of the lowest factors being only slightly better than other two areas of concern identified earlier.

Questions designed to measure the equality of present communication channels have relatively lowest scores. 54.9% of employees agree that they are always informed about any new occurrence in the company with 61.16% of employees feeling that the communication channels in the company are good and 56.86% of them agreeing that company communicates openly and frequently to employees at all levels concerning any change within the company.

This is comparatively low if we see that 91.5% of employees feel better when the company provides further and relevant information to them. This indicates that company should draw their attention further to building stronger and more open communication channels which will work both ways. This will enable employees to feel more of involvement from top management as they will have a clear way to voice out their problems. At the same time, this will provide an opportunity to management to involve the employees into the company's strategic planning process providing them with the feeling of belonging and shared destiny with the company of which they are an important part.

The importance of being able to contribute their opinion and thoughts especially regarding the change is obvious as lowest ranking of company performance in respect to communication comes in this area as only 57.69% of employees that think that company makes sufficient effort to get opinions and thoughts of people, especially regarding change.
5.2 MANAGEMENT'S CAPABILITY AND CAUSE OF BOTTOM FOUR FACTORS (*Results of causal research*)

As described earlier, the causal research attempted to recognize the executives' and management's capability via 360 Degree Feedback and to analyze the bottom 4 factors via Fish Bone Chart. The findings are described below.

5.2.1 360 Degree Feedback

The overall performance of the various categories of supervisors is shown in Table 5-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION RATING</th>
<th>TOP MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>MANAGERS</th>
<th>EXECUTIVES</th>
<th>SUPERVISORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>36 %</td>
<td>35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAK</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-2:
*The Distribution of Performance Rating for Top Management, Managers, Executives and Supervisors*

The percentage was calculated based on the total number of people in the "Position" category. For example, 1 out of a total of 6 managers fall in the "Excellent" category which is equals to 17 %.
Table 5-3 below shows the strengths and weaknesses observed in the various “Position” category.

Table 5-3:
Frequency chart

Strengths and weaknesses of Top Management, Managers, Executives and Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top mgmt</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Executives</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Focus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Oneself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Organizing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Interpersonal relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation &amp; Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Judgement &amp; Direction Setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The strengths and weaknesses identified by the 360 Degree program depends on the average of the individual. Therefore, the total strengths and weaknesses identified will vary from person to person. Consequently, the grand total of frequency for every position may not be the same.

Top Management

The above statistics show that the top management is quite weak as only 33% of them (only 1) was found to be good. As for the other two persons, they are
average and weak. Table 5-3 shows that they maintain their focus on Customer however, they are generally weak in Teamwork, Communication and Interpersonal Relationship and Leadership which are essential tenets of the top management.

**Managers**

About 34% of the managers are found to be either excellent or good and 50% of them have been categorized as average and only 17% fall into the weak category. Though some of them are quite strong when it comes to Customer Focus, some others need to improve this area. This is very essential as they are measured by bottom line that is to keep their customers satisfied. The managers also seem to be weak in Planning & Organizing, Business Judgement & Direction Setting and Leadership skills.

**Executives**

Most of these people are from HQ and they do not have many people reporting to them. The nature of job that they do is more by themselves. It can be observed from table 5-2 that the bulk of them seem to be below average. Their Planning & Organizing, Analysis and Teamwork seems to be in very dangerous level however, this group shows a great urge to improve themselves (Table 5-3).

**Supervisors**

Supervisors are mostly from Zone A. They are the ones responsible for handling the operations directly under the various managers and executives. Most of these people are ex – government staffs. Table 5-2 shows that about 53% of these people are in the category of weak or poor and 29% are in the average category and only 18% are in the good or excellent category. Their weak area seems to be Customer Focus, Leadership, Planning & Organizing, Innovation & Change and Integrity.
5.2.2 Cause & Effect Analysis
Upon collection of data via Work Review for the causal research, the data was analysed using the Fish - Bone - Chart or also known as the cause and effect diagram. The data was analyzed according to any of the 5Ms namely Man, Management, Method, Material and Machine. The findings are as shown in subsequent pages.

5.2.2.1 Company Mission & Vision
Refer to Appendix 5-13 for summary of findings on Vague Company Vision.

Non objective Company Vision
The Company vision which HSSP has does not have Core purpose and Core Values which are its essential tenets. It also lacks the “BHAG” or Big Hairy and Audacious Goal and the Vivid Description which would actually make the Company Vision more meaningful and realistic to the employees as well as the customers.

Lack of Awareness
About 35.78% of the respondents say that they do not have a clear understanding of the company mission (question number 46). And the staffs agreed that there was no any effort so far to “sell” the company mission to them. This was strengthened further when one of the managers confessed that the company handbook which would also consist of the company mission is in the pipeline. Besides this, no posters or plaques on the company mission was seen anywhere.

Lack of Management’s commitment
Question number 49 states: “The management practices what they preach in respect to the company’s vision and mission, especially in regards to change.” – 53.21% of respondents disagreed to it.
Based on one-to-one interview findings, one of the reasons for this is that there is lack of consistency in the targets as it appears to change from time to time and from person to person. This is further reiterated by question number 50 which states: "My company is totally committed to its objective." And only 46.79% of respondents agreed with this statement.

A number of the interviewees commented that in order to be committed to the company's objective (Customer satisfaction) they have to be equipped with the necessary customer relation skills and "on the job training". This would include internal and external customer service training.

The respondents and the rest of the employees are the ones who deal with the company directly daily and they are of the impression that the top management is unaware of the hardship that they confront with the customers.

According to the respondents, numerous employees' dissatisfaction have been voiced out to the top management but to no avail. Consequently, the respondents perceive that there is no total commitment to the company's objective.

5.2.2.2 Management Style
Refer to Appendix 5-14 for summary of findings for Poor management style.

Incompetent management
Question number 64. states: "My immediate superior is competent and professional." 35.73% of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with this statement. This could be the result of number of changes concurrently taking place at HSSP. Thus the skill level of some individuals may not be up to par with the position as of yet. The respondents hope that management strikes a balance between high expectations as well as to be sensitive to the current problems
faced by the employees at work as well as their welfare. The 360 Degree Feedback conducted on all the executives and managers too clearly supports this point.

**Not empathetic**

Question number 70 states "The top management understands the problems faced by employees at my level."- 46.78% of respondents disagree with this statement. The input from interviews clarified that this dissatisfaction arises when the employees are "ordered" to do something beyond their capability. The management has to ensure that the required resources and channels are available.

**Inconsistent / No feedback**

Question number 6 states: "My immediate superior involves me with regular feedback on my job performance."- 36.7% of respondents disagree with this statement. This is a very essential area and we do not need to wait for year end to do this. It need not necessarily be done in a very formal manner but as and when any assignments are delegated.

**High bureaucracy**

Through Work Review and interviews conducted, it was revealed that the employees (referring here to the managerial level) have to go through red tapes in order to get approval. This delays a lot of processes and puts the organization in a bad position when it comes to dealings with customers.

**Non appreciative management**

Inspite of them being in HSSP for the past one year, they never had the opportunity to meet the top management. As for others, they did comment that the top management does not seem to be so approachable. This probably could also be the reason for the low ratings obtained (32.1% disagreement) for
question number 69 which states, "I believe the that the top management will care more about the welfare of the employees when change occurs."

**Highly centralized**

This point is referred to the top management in Headquarters. The executives and managers in zone A commented that they have been given very little authority. Even their monitory approval limit is lower than RM 5 000, which is not even sufficient to buy one simple equipment. Basically, this is another reason for all quotations to be sent over to HQ and the delay it causes.

**Politics**

Another information obtained was that politics prevailed especially among the top management. This causes conflicts of interest among the fragmented groups and delays the approvals and decision making process.

**5.2.2.3 Communication**

Refer to Appendix 5-15 for summary of findings for Communication Barriers.

**Employees' ideas not considered**

Question number 13 states: "The company makes sufficient effort to get opinions and thoughts of people here, especially regarding change" - 47.12% of respondents expressed their dissatisfaction with this statement. This clearly indicates here that the respondents are of the perception that HSSP's management has not approached them for any contribution or for their opinions.

We can also conclude here that if given an opportunity, they will be able to come up with some good suggestions to successfully undergo the "change" process or even to improve the work flow.
Lack of direct and immediate top down communication

Question number 11 states: "I am always informed about any new occurrences in the company." 52.96% of respondents disagreed to it.

Be it in HSSP or anywhere, employees would always want to hear any good or bad news pertaining to the organization in a formal manner. This not only keeps them abreast with the goings on in the organization but also makes them feel wanted and respected.

Emphasizing in this area is worth the effort because it would enable the employees to quickly turn around or take the necessary steps to accommodate the change. HSSP is no exception to this.

Improper channel

Question number 12 stated: "I feel that the communication channels in my company are good." 44.66% of respondents disagreed to this statement. This question indicates that 44.66% of the population sampled were of the unanimous opinion that the existing communication channels or system needs attention. The respondents commented during the one-to-one interview sessions that on several occasions the messages were delayed or received through grapevine sources which may be inaccurate or filtered.

As a result of the interview, we also gathered that the delays were due to the memos or letters being in someone else’s tray, possibly due to the lack of urgency on part of individuals or due to the workload.

Other reasons which may have contributed to the poor rating for "proper channel" could be the following:

a) memos getting lost
b) the same memos having to be faxed over and over again
c) not aware of the company’s goals

d) not aware of the problems faced by management

e) by passing the managers/ department head

f) management not aware of problems faced at branches.

Though it is not necessary to tell the employees everything that the top management faces, it is essential to breakdown the relevant information in a simpler manner and disseminate them properly.

**Wide Management Trust Gap**

The communication problem is one of getting the message meaningfully down the organization. Not only has it to reach every pocket of the organization but also be meaningful and inspiring. But as the message cascades down from the top, the top management loses sight of the message not to mention control of it (Kotter, 1990).

Problems that may arise at HSSP is when middle management resent or repackage the message. The likely hood of this happening is greater with middle managers, who are at their pinnacle of achievement and feeling trapped.

It is the responsibility of the managers and middle managers to cascade down the accurate information. This apparently is not happening based on the data. Here we need to ask, Why is this so? Some of the reasons could be the following:

1) Information is power, they may want to hog the information to be in a position power.

2) Stop the information from getting to their superiors to protect themselves.

3) Filter what they think is important and discard the rest.

4) Place no importance or urgency to the information at hand.
5) Unclear of the information themselves
6) The set-up of the organization communication channels may not be effective.

Absence of dual channel
The employees feel that the management on most occasions develop a “I say you do” style, which hinders them from sharing their ideas with the management. Any move to explain or rationalize a particular situation is often regarded as “insubordination”.

Need for corporate communication
This is one of the means of communicating between branches. The absence of this channel, would alienate the employees of each entity and they would also not be aware of the progress of the company. Consequently, this will hinder the sense of belonging and ownership with the company.

5.2.2.4 Perception of own job
Refer Appendix 5-16 for summary findings for Poor Perception Of Job.

Work Stress
Question number 19 states: “I believe that I don’t have unnecessary stress in my work.” (This question was reversed) – only 43.12% of respondents agree with this statement. 47.18% of those less than 1 year of service in MOH disagree with this statement, whereas about 51.16% of with longer service in MOH disagree to this. (Difference of 3.98%)
As for the management, 57.63% of them comment that they are stressed as far as work is concerned, whereas 46.95% of the non-management say the same. (Difference of 10.68%)

In short this statistics dictates that this factor prevails, regardless of the years of service, for the difference is insignificant. However, it also shows that the
management is going through a higher stress in comparison to the non-management.

This stressful experience for the management is parallel with the fact that the job stress increases as a person gets higher up the corporate ladder. However, this fact should not be taken for granted and action should be taken to ensure it does not exceed saturation point.

**Fear of Change**

Question number 18 states: "I feel that my workload is not too much, and change may not cause it to increase." (This question was reversed) – 48.63% of respondents disagreed with it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY I</th>
<th>CATEGORY II</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1yr - 34.5%</td>
<td>&gt;1yr - 51.6%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management - 35.59%</td>
<td>Non-management - 45.67%</td>
<td>10.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51.6% of those with more than one year of service in MOH are of the perception that change may cause workload to increase whereas only 34.5% of those with less than a year service in MOH think the same way. This difference in perception (17.1%) can clearly be tied back with their career background history.

In comparison to the non-management (45.67% disagree), the management perceives (35.5% disagree) the change in a more positive manner. This could be due to the maturity in thinking. One of the greatest fears of change to the HSSP's employees are "additional workload". This may be explained by the fact that they expect the customer's expectations to increase with the privatization of the service.
Another reason for the above perception could be the change from a public to a private environment, without much training and time to adapt to the new environment and paradigm.

*Fear of Multi-skilling*

Besides the above, input received during the one-to-one interview shows that the Malaysian wide dilemma, that is the lack of manpower has also taken its toll in HSSP. The employees feel that there will be additional workload due to multi-skilling which cannot be avoided. However, they are of the perception that the management will provide the necessary training to accommodate for it.

*Poor machine condition*

Through the one to one interviews conducted, some of the employees complained of frequent machine breakdowns and insufficient equipment or tools to get job done. They complained that when this was highlighted to the management, the response was to share the tools. This is not always possible as the area that needs to be covered is wide and the frequency of usage is very high. This hinders the job from being done effectively (rush to pass to others) and causes unnecessary delay in jobs, for which the employees are confronted by customers as inefficiency.

Apart from this, the employees also highlighted that some of the working area is not conducive. They are either too small and crammed and poorly ventilated to name a few.

*Unrealistic Customer Expectations*

The MOH had given HSSP a set of performance indicators to be followed as the standard requirements. However, the employees complain that the customers expectations are way beyond whatever that is stipulated in the guidelines. In addition to this, they also expect the HSSP staffs to meet their
demands which are not even mentioned in the requirements. However, when this issue is brought up to the management, they just advise the employees not to bother about it.

*Too much paperwork*

Those who commonly lamented about this are those in the supervisory level. They complain that besides supervising the day to day operations, they are also required to do data entry.