

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **ANALYSIS OF DATA**

The data collected was analyzed by using the "Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)". Data from the questionnaires were coded and entered into the computer. For the purpose of reporting and analyzing, the data has been presented in the form of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics.

Descriptive statistics was used to describe the characteristics of the data collected in the form of mean, percentage, frequency and standard deviation.

#### **Research Findings**

Analysis of data is reported in three parts. The first part provides a description of the background information of the respondents in relation to their gender, age and the Division they work in. The second part provides the perception of staff (subordinates) pertaining to the communication styles of which is presented in descriptive statistics. The third part explores the relationship between the communication styles of the Division Heads and the subordinates' organizational commitment by means of inferential statistics.

#### **Background Information of respondents**

The questionnaires were distributed to all the 125 staff at the Public Health Institute. However, only 93 questionnaires were returned to the researcher.

Table VI below shows the information pertaining to the profile of the respondents according to the Divisions they work in.

**Table VI**  
**Distribution of Respondents According to the Divisions**

Division	Sample	Number Responded
Training	54	44 (81.5%)
Health System Research	20	14 (70.0%)
Epid. & Disease Control	18	15 (83.3%)
Family Health & Nutrition	13	10 (76.9%)
Management Training	14	6 (42.9%)
Occupational Health	6	4 (66.7%)
Total:	125	93

The Table VII below shows the profile of the respondents according to their gender. From the total 93 who responded, 60 (64.5%) were male and 33(35.5%) were female respondents.

**Table VII**  
**Distribution of Respondents According to Gender**

Sex	Number Responded
Male	60 (64.5%)
Female	33 (35.5%)
Total:	93

Table VIII below shows the age group of the respondents. Among the respondents, the 46 years age group comprised the largest group, that is, 38 (40.9%). The 41- 45 years age group, totaling 29 (31.2%) was the next largest. A total of 21 (22.6%) were from the 35-40 age group, whereas, those below 35 years old constitute only 5 (5.4%) respondents. Overall, there was a high percentage of staff who can be considered as matured due to their age which normally we relate to experience and maturity.

**Table VIII**  
**Distribution of Respondents According to Age Groups**

Age	Number
< 35 years old	5 (5.4%)
35 –40 years	21 (22.6%)
41 –45 years	29 (31.2%)
> 46 years	38 (40.9%)
Total :	93

Table IX shows the number of years the respondents has worked in the PHI. A total 5 (5.3%) of the respondents have worked in PHI for less than 3 years, 12 (12.9%) have worked for 4 to 7 years, the majority (52.7%) of the respondents have worked in the PHI from the 8 to 11 years and 15 (16.2%) have worked 12 to 15 years. There are also 12 (12.9%) of the respondents who have worked for more than 16 years.

Overall, there was a high percentage of staff who has worked at the institute for relatively long period of time.

**Table IX**

**Distribution of Respondents According to Number of Years Worked in PHI**

Years worked in PHI	Number of Respondents
Less than 3 years	5 (5.3%)
4 –7 years	12 (12.9%)
8–11 years	49 (52.7%)
12-15 years	15 (16.2%)
more than 16 years	12 (12.9%)
Total :	93 (100%)

**Communication Styles of the Division Heads Perceived by Subordinates**

In order to establish the relative strength of each of the dimensions for communication styles, the overall score is grouped into categories as shown in Table X below. The table shows the distribution of score range for each of the dimensions for communication style. The lowest overall mean score would be “0” and the highest overall score would be “5” for each dimension. The mean scores are calculated and grouped into the appropriate categories as shown in Table X.



**Table X**

**Distribution of Range of Scores for Each Category of Communication Styles**

Category of Communication Styles	Quartile	Score range
None	1	0.00 – 1.25
Low	2	1.26 – 2.50
Moderate	3	2.51 – 3.75
High	4	3.76 – 5.00

**Communication Styles of Division Heads Perceived Being Friendly by the Subordinates**

Table XI shows the distribution of frequency of responses based on 4 items that imply friendly communication style. Based on the frequency distribution of item 1, there were 46 (49.5%) of the respondents who had perceived that the Division Heads as friendly because they always greet them, whereas 32 (34.4%) have responded that the Division Heads sometimes greet them. Item 4 implies that 35 (37.6%) of the respondents perceived that their Division Heads always create favorable environment and appreciate the subordinates' contribution. A total of 37(39.8%) of the respondents perceived the Division Heads only sometimes create favorable environment and appreciate the subordinates' contribution.

**Table XI**

**Communication Style of Division Heads Perceived Being Friendly**

Item Number	Never	Seldom	Once a while	Sometimes	Always	Mean	Std. dev
Item 1	3 (3.2)	5 (5.4)	7 (7.5)	32 (34.4)	46 (49.5)	4.22	1.02
Item 4	1 (1.1)	2 (2.2)	18 (19.4)	37 (39.8)	35 (37.6)	4.11	0.87
Item 28	0 (0.0)	6 (6.5)	22 (23.7)	38 (40.7)	27 (29.0)	3.92	0.89
Item 36	1 (1.1)	7 (7.5)	25 (26.9)	33 (35.5)	27 (29.0)	3.84	0.99

n = 93 ; Mean for Friendly style:4.02 ; std deviation: 0.68

Category : Very Friendly

The third item in the dimension that is, item 28 implies the Division Heads as friendly communicators. A total of 27 (29.0%) of the respondents have perceived the Division Heads as always friendly, 38 (40.7%) have perceived them as sometimes friendly. A total of 27 (29.0%) of the respondents have perceived the Division Heads as always encouraging the subordinates to work hard as implied by item 36. However, 33 (35.5%) have perceived that the Division Heads only sometimes encourage the subordinates to work harder.

The overall mean for friendly style was 4.02 which means that the communication style of the Division Heads was perceived as very friendly.

**Communication style of Division Heads Perceived to Leave an Impression on the Subordinates**

Table XII shows the frequency distribution of responses based on four items, which relate to communication styles of Division Heads that leaves impression on them. Based on the 4 items for this style, 18 (19.4%) of the

respondents perceived that their Division Heads’ communication styles always, and 36 (38.7%) sometimes leave an impression on them. Item 3 describes that the Division Heads conduct meetings in a cordial manner and leaves an impression on them. For this item, there are 16 (17.2%) respondents who perceived that their Division Heads always conduct meetings in a cordial manner and leaves lasting impression on them and 36 (38.7%) perceived as they do so sometimes. For item 10, there were 21 (22.6%) who responded that their Division Heads’ actions always leave a lasting impression on them, whereas 44(47.3%) perceived that only sometimes their actions leave lasting impression. Item 35 describes the effects of the style of delivering messages. For this item, 16 (17.2%) and 35 (37.6%) responded that their Heads always and sometimes leave a lasting impression respectively.

**Table XII**

**Communication Styles of Division Heads Perceive to Leaves an Impression on the Subordinates**

Item\No	Never	Seldom	Once a while	Sometimes	Always	Mean	std dev
Item 2	2 (2.2)	7 (7.5)	30 (32.3)	36 (38.7)	18 (19.4)	3.66	0.95
Item 3	1 (1.1)	13 (14.0)	27 (29.0)	36 (38.7)	16 (17.2)	3.57	0.97
Item 10	1 (1.1)	11 (11.8)	16(17.2)	44 (47.3)	21 (22.6)	3.78	0.97
Item 35	5 (5.4)	6 (6.5)	31 (33.3)	35 (37.6)	16 (17.2)	3.55	1.03

n = 93 ; Mean for leaves an impression : 3.64 ; std deviation: 0.81

Category : Moderately Leaves an Impression

The mean for the style of delivering messages that leaves a lasting impression on subordinates is 3.64. This score indicates the Division Heads are perceived to possess style of delivering messages that leaves a mild impression on the subordinates.

**Communication Style of Division Heads Perceived Being Relaxed**

Table XIII shows the frequency distribution of responses based on four items that is communication styles of Division Heads indicating that they are relaxed. For item 5, the number of respondents who responded that their Division Heads always do not show nervousness during conversation was 41 (44.1%), on the other hand, 26 (28.0%) indicated that only sometimes they do not show Nervousness. Item 6 shows that 39 (41.9%) of the respondents perceived that their Division Heads are always flexible in their relationship with the staff whereas 31 (33.3%) responded only sometimes they were so. The response to item 11 show that for 20 (21.5%) of the Division Heads nervousness always do not affect the flow of their speech and for 32 (34.4%) this nervousness sometimes do not affect their speech. Item 12 describes that the Division Heads are calm even under pressure. For this item, 30 (32.3%) noted that the Division Heads are always calm under pressure, 31 (32.3%) of the respondents stated that sometime they are calm under pressure.



**Table XIII****Communication Style of Division Heads Perceived as Relaxed**

Item\No	Never	Seldom	Once a while	Sometimes	Always	Mean	std dev
Item 5	2 (2.2)	9 (9.7)	15 (16.1)	26 (28.0)	41 (44.1)	4.02	1.09
Item 6	2 (2.2)	5 (5.4)	16 (17.2)	31 (33.3)	39 (41.9)	4.08	1.00
Item 11	3 (3.2)	14 (15.1)	24 (25.8)	32 (34.4)	20 (21.5)	3.56	1.09
Item 12	2 (2.2)	4 (4.3)	26 (28.0)	31 (33.3)	30 (32.3)	3.89	0.98

n = 93 ; Mean for relaxed style:3.89 ; std deviation: 0.76

Category : Very Relaxed

The mean for the style “always calm under pressure” is 3.89. This score indicates that the Division Heads are perceived to possess a communication style that is very relaxed.

**Division Heads' Communication Styles Perceived as Likes to Discuss**

Table XIV below shows the frequency distribution of responses based on four items that describes the Division Heads' style that shows that they like to discuss. For item 7, there are 27 (29.0%) who responded that the Division Heads always do not raise his voice when they do not agree with the staff while 31 (33.3%) responded as sometimes. For the next item, item 26, the response showed that 19 (20.4%) of the respondents perceived as always and 47(50.5%) perceived as sometimes that their Division Heads like to discuss with staff before making decisions. The responses for item 27 shows that 22 (23.7%) respondents

perceived always and 35 (37.6%) as sometimes that the Division Heads manages to keep calm in intense arguments with the staff.

**Table XIV**

**Communication Styles of Division Heads Perceived as Likes to Discuss**

Item\No	Never	Seldom	Once a while	Sometimes	Always	Mean	std dev
Item 7	2 (2.2)	14 (15.1)	19 (20.4)	31 (33.3)	27 (29.0)	3.72	1.11
Item 26	0 (0.0)	4.(4.3)	23 (24.7)	47 (50.5)	19 (20.4)	3.87	0.78
Item 27	1 (1.1)	9.(9.7)	26 (28.0)	35 (37.6)	22 (23.7)	3.73	0.97
Item 32	2 (2.2)	12 (22.9)	28 (30.1)	38 (40.9)	13 (14.0)	3.52	0.96

n= 93 ; Mean for Like to Discuss style:3.71 ; std deviation: 0.61

Category: Mildly likes to discuss

Finally, for item 32, the staff perceived their Division Heads always get irritated when discussions are not conclusive. A total of 38 (40.9%) of the respondents have perceived that the Division Heads sometimes get irritated when discussions are not conclusive.

Mean for likes to discuss is 3.71. The score indicates the perception by the subordinates that the Division Heads only moderately like to discuss with the staff.

**Communication Styles of Division Heads Perceived Gives Attention to Subordinates' Grievances**

Table XV shows the frequency distribution of the responses based on four items that describes the Division Heads' style with regard to attention given to subordinates' grievances. For item 8, there are 28 (30.1%) who responded that the

Division Heads always repeats his questions if someone fails to understand. However, 42 (45.2%) responded that the Division Heads only sometimes repeats his questions if someone fails to understand. The next item, that is, item 15 describes the Division Heads immediate reaction indicating that they have listened to what has been conveyed to them. A total of 32 (34.4%) perceived Division Heads always, and 38 (40.9%) perceived them as only sometimes react immediately indicating that they have understood what has been conveyed to them. The third item, item 29, had 22 (23.7%) responses as always and 41 (44.1%) as sometimes the Division Heads listen to the staff's grievances. The fourth and last item describes the Division Heads' style as an attentive listener. For this item the staff perceived they 20(21.5%) the Division Heads always and 41 (44.1%) sometimes listened attentively to the staff's grievances.

**Table XV**

**Communication Styles of Division Heads Perceived Gives Attention to Subordinates' Grievances**

Item\No	Never	Seldom	Once a while	Sometimes	Always	Mean	std dev
Item 8	0 (0.0)	4 (4.3)	19 (20.4)	42 (45.2)	28 (30.1)	4.01	0.83
Item 15	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	21 (22.6)	38 (40.9)	32 (34.4)	4.06	0.84
Item 29	2 (2.2)	8 (8.6)	20 (21.5)	41 (44.1)	22 (23.7)	3.78	0.98
Item 39	0 (0.0)	9 (9.7)	23 (24.7)	41 (44.1)	20 (21.5)	3.77	0.90

n= 93 ; Mean for give attention style:3.91 ; std deviation: 0.66

Category: Highly Give Attention



The mean score for this Division Heads' style is 3.91. The score indicates the subordinates have perceived that the Division Heads in the PHI are very attentive listeners of the staff's grievances.

### **Division Heads' Communication Styles Perceived Being Accurate**

Table XVI shows the frequency distribution of responses based on four items that describes the Division Heads' style related to their preference to be accurate in their discussions. Based on the frequency distribution for item 9, 18 (19.4%) of the respondents perceived that the Division Heads are always meticulous in stating their opinion, whereas 37 (39.8%) perceived them as only sometimes meticulous. Item 20 describes the Division Heads as preferring the staff to make themselves heard and understood well. For this item there are 30 (32.3%) respondents who perceived that always and 36 (38.7%) perceived as only sometimes the Division Heads prefer the staff to make them heard and understood well. The response recorded implies that 22 (23.7%) of the respondents perceived that the Division Heads always prefers precision, and 44 (47.3%) perceived that they only sometimes they prefer that. Finally for item 30, there are 22 (23.7%) respondents who responded that the Division Heads discuss in detail with the staff during discussions. For the same item, 45 (48.4%) responded that only sometimes the Division Heads discuss in detail with the staff during discussions.

**Table XVI****Communication Styles of Division Heads Perceived Being Accurate**

Item\No	Never	Seldom	Once a while	Sometimes	Always	Mean	std dev
Item 9	2 (2.2)	11 (11.8)	25 (26.9)	37 (39.8)	18 (19.4)	3.62	1.00
Item 20	0 (0.0)	6 (6.5)	21 (22.6)	36 (38.7)	30 (32.3)	3.97	0.90
Item 22	1 (1.1)	4 (4.3)	22 (23.7)	44 (47.3)	22 (23.7)	3.88	0.86
Item 30	2 (2.2)	5 (5.4)	19 (20.4)	45 (48.4)	22 (23.7)	3.86	0.92

n= 93 ; Mean for precise style:3.83 ; std deviation: 0.73

Category: Strongly prefer Accuracy

The mean for prefer to be precise is 3.83. This score indicates that the subordinates perceived that the Division Heads strongly prefer accuracy in their discussions with the staff.

**Communication Styles of Division Heads and Their Expressiveness**

Table XVII shows the frequency distribution of responses based on four items that describe the Division Heads' expressive style. For item 13, there are 23 (24.7%) respondents who responded that the Division Heads' eyes always express emotion during communication. A total of 35 (38.0%) reported that the Division Heads' eyes only sometimes express emotion during communication. Item 18 describes that the Division Heads use a lot of hand gestures while talking. For this item, there are 23 (24.7%) respondents who responded that always and 22(23.7%) responded that sometimes this behaviour is observed. Item 34 illustrates that the Division Heads express ill feelings through facial expressions and body gestures.

A total of 19 (20.4%) perceived that always and, 30 (32.3%) of then reported that sometimes Division Heads express ill feelings through facial expressions and body gestures.

**Table XVII**

**Perceived Communication Style of Division Heads Being Expressive**

Item\No	Never	Seldom	Once a while	Sometimes	Always	Mean	std dev
Item 13	2 (2.2)	6 (6.5)	27 (29.0)	35 (38.0)	23 (24.7)	3.76	0.97
Item 18	2 (2.2)	11 (11.8)	35 (37.6)	22 (23.7)	23 (24.7)	3.57	1.06
Item 34	3 (3.2)	11 (11.8)	30 (32.3)	30 (32.3)	19 (20.4)	3.55	1.05
Item 37	2 (2.2)	7 (7.5)	30 (32.3)	34 (36.6)	20 (21.5)	3.68	0.97

n= 93 ; Mean for Expressive style:3.64; std deviation: 0.72

Category: Moderately Expressive

Item 37 describes the Division Heads use facial expressions during conversation with the staff. For this item, 20 (21.5%) perceived it as always and 34 (36.6%) perceived it as only sometimes the Division heads exhibit this kind of behaviour.

The mean score for this style is 3.64, and therefore implies that the Division Heads in the PHI only moderately express their emotions through facial and body gestures.

**Communication Styles of Division Heads Perceived Being Dramatic**

Table XVIII shows the four item that describes the dramatic style of the Division Heads as perceived by the subordinates. Item 14 relates to the subordinates' perception that the Division Heads do not pretend during their

conversation with others. A total of 36 (38.7%) of the respondents have responded that the Division Heads always and 25 (26.9%) have perceived that they sometimes do not pretend during conversations with others. Item 17 describes that sense of humour of the Division Heads. A total of 23 (24.7%) of the respondents perceived that the Division Heads always and 34 (36.6%) sometimes exhibit good sense of humour. The next item the respondents responded was item 23 which describes the Division Heads ability to articulate clearly while speaking. The total number of 23 (24.7%) respondents perceived that the Division Heads always and 34 (36.6%) sometimes articulated well while speaking. The respondents were also asked to respond to item 38 which describes the habit of the Division Heads who like to 'beat around the bush' when giving an explanation. In relation to this item 13 (13.9%) of the respondents perceived that the Division Heads always and 25 (26.9%) of them perceived that their Division Heads sometimes drag on with their explanation.

### XVIII

#### Communication Styles of Division Heads Perceived Being Dramatic

Item\No	Never	Seldom	Once a while	Sometimes	Always	Mean	std dev
Item 14	1 (1.1)	6 (6.5)	25 (26.9)	25 (26.9)	36 (38.7)	3.96	1.01
Item 17	3 (3.2)	11 (11.8)	22 (23.7)	34 (36.6)	23 (24.7)	3.68	1.08
Item 23	2 (2.2)	9 (9.7)	25 (26.9)	34 (36.6)	23 (24.7)	3.72	1.01
Item 38	2 (2.2)	14 (15.1)	36 (38.7)	25 (26.9)	13 (13.9)	3.29	1.06

n= 93 ; Mean Dramatic style:3.66; std deviation: 0.68

Category: Moderately Dramatic

The mean score for dramatic style of the Division Heads is 3.66 and this score indicates that the Division Heads are moderately dramatic during their interaction with others.

### **Communication Styles of Division Heads That Show They Are Open**

Table XIX shows the frequency distribution of responses to four items, which describes the Division Head's open style. Item 16 describes the habit of a Division Head who informs their staff about his scheduled tasks. A total of 28 (30.1%) respondents perceived the Division Heads always and 32 (34.4%) perceived it sometimes they inform their staff about their scheduled work. For Item 19 that describes the style of the Division Heads who converse openly there were a total of 34 (39.6%) of the respondents who perceived that the Division Heads are always open and 39 (41.9%) perceived sometimes they are open in their conversation. The next item the respondents were asked to responses was item 24 which describes the Division Heads willingness to readily accept opinions from the staff. For this item, a total of 29 (31.2%) respondents perceived that always and 42 (45.2%) sometimes the accept opinions from the subordinates. Item 40 describes the Division Heads openly expressing their feelings and emotions. A total of 22(23.7%) responded that Division Heads always and 28 (30.1%) have perceived that only sometimes they openly express their feelings and emotions.

**Table XIX**

**Communication Styles of the Division Heads Perceived Being Open**

Item\No	Never	Seldom	Once a while	Sometimes	Always	Mean	std dev
Item 16	2 (2.2)	11 (11.8)	20 (21.5)	32 (34.4)	28 (30.1)	3.78	1.07
Item 19	1 (1.1)	3 (3.2)	16 (17.2)	39 (41.9)	34 (36.6)	4.10	0.87
Item 24	1 (1.1)	4 (4.3)	17 (18.3)	42 (45.2)	29 (31.2)	4.01	0.88
Item 40	2 (2.2)	12 (12.9)	29 (31.2)	28 (30.1)	22 (23.7)	3.60	1.05

n= 93 ; Mean for Open style:3.87; std deviation: 0.70

Category: Very Open

The mean score for open style of the Division Heads is 3.87. This score describes the Division Heads in the PHI as being very open in their expressions.

**Division Heads' Communication Styles Perceived Being Dominant**

Table XX shows the frequency distribution of responses to four items that describe the Division Heads' dominant style. Item 21 describes the habit of the Division Heads who like to talk in formal as well as informal functions. A total of 27 (29.0%) respondents perceived the Division Heads always and 36 (38.7%) sometimes like to talk in both informal and formal functions. Item 25 describes the Division Heads as being influential in social activities.

**Table XX****Communication Styles of Division Heads Perceived Dominant**

Item\No	Never	Seldom	Once a while	Sometimes	Always	Mean	std dev
Item 21	0 (0.0)	7 (7.5)	23 (24.7)	36 (38.7)	27 (29.0)	3.89	0.91
Item 25	4 (4.3)	8 (8.6)	25 (26.9)	33 (35.5)	23 (24.7)	3.68	1.08
Item 31	2 (2.2)	3 (3.2)	28 (30.1)	44 (47.3)	16 (17.2)	3.74	0.86
Item 33	9 (9.7)	18 (19.4)	35 (37.6)	20 (21.5)	11 (11.8)	3.06	1.13
n= 93 ; Mean for Dominant style:3.59; std deviation: 0.69							
Category: Moderately Dominant							

A total of 23 (24.7%) respondents perceived that the Division Heads are always and 33 (35.5%) responded sometimes they are influential in social activities. Item 31 describes the Division Heads who like to take control of the situation while they are with the staff. A total of 16 (17.2%) respondents have perceived that the Division Heads always 36 (38.7%) and 44 (47.3%) sometimes take control of the situation. Finally, item 33 received responses from a total 11 (11.8%) who perceived always and 20 (21.5%) sometimes the Division Heads are rigid in social functions in the PHI.

The mean score for dominant style is 3.59, and this score indicates that the Division Heads in the PHI as mildly dominant.

**The main Communication styles of the Division Heads**

The mean score for the 10 communication styles are tabulated in an ascending order as shown in Table XXI. The communication style that is most

prominent is the one described as friendly. This is followed by the style described as gives attention. The least or lowest mean score was for the dominant style.

**Table XXI**

**Main Communication Styles of Division Heads Perceived by Subordinates**

<b>Communication Styles</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Friendly	4.03	1
Gives attention	3.91	2
Relaxed	3.89	3
Open	3.87	4
Precise	3.83	5
Likes to discuss	3.71	6
Dramatic	3.66	7
Leaves lasting impression	3.64	8
Expressive	3.64	9
Dominant	3.59	10
Overall mean communication Style is 3.78		

Overall, the communication styles of the Division Heads in the Public Health Institute as perceived by the subordinates may be described as being friendly, one that give attention, and one that is relaxed and open. It is worth noting that being dominant in communication style has the lowest score.

**Level of Organizational Commitment of the Subordinates:**

To determine the level of subordinates' organizational commitment, the scores as shown in Table XXII is used as a reference. The scores measure the subordinates' organizational commitment for each of the dimension, namely,



feeling proud, involvement and loyalty. A high score of 5 and low score of 0 are given. The ranges of scores were divided into four levels; that is, very low, low, slightly high and high.

**Table XXII**

**The Continuum of the Subordinates' Level of Organizational Commitment**

Score	Commitment Level
0.00 – 1.25	Low
1.26 – 2.50	Somewhat Low
2.51 – 3.75	Somewhat High
3.76 – 5.00	High

**Subordinates Feeling Proud of the Organization**

Table XXIII shows the items that imply that the subordinates feel proud of their organization. Based on item 1, a total of 45 (48.4%) of the subordinates responded that they totally agree that they are proud of the PHI, and 28 (30.1%) have responded that they agree that they are proud of the organization. Item 5 indicates that 58 (62.4%) of the subordinates totally agree that they feel that they are part of the organization and a further 23 (24.7%) agree as such. Item 8 shows that 35 (37.7%) of the respondents totally agree and 46 (49.5%) agree that they will recommend to their friends to work in this organization.

**Table XXIII**

**Level of the Subordinates Feeling Proud of the Organization**

Item\ No	Totally disagree	Disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Totally Agree	Mean	std dev
Item 1	3 (3.2)	1 (1.1)	16 (17.2)	28 (30.1)	45 (48.4)	4.19	0.98
Item 5	0	2 (2.2)	10 (10.8)	23 (24.7)	58 (62.4)	4.47	0.77
Item 8	0	4 (4.3)	8 (8.6)	46 (49.5)	35 (37.4)	4.20	0.77
n= 93 ; Mean commitment (feeling proud):4.29 ; std deviation: 0.66							
Category : High Level of Commitment							

Overall, the mean score for the dimension of feeling proud of their organization was 4.29, which is on the high end. This clearly indicates that the subordinates are proud to work in the PHI.

**The Subordinates' Involvement in the Organization**

Table XXIV below shows the items that describe the level of willingness of the subordinates to get involved in the organization's activities. The level commitment through involvement is presented by the three items. Item 3 focuses on the willingness of the subordinates to take risks. For this item there are 20 (21.5%) respondents who totally agree to take risk, whereas 36 (38.7%) agree that they are willing to take risks for the sake of the institution. Item 6 shows that 64 (68.8%) totally agree and 24 (25.8%) agree respectively with the idea that their work is intended to benefit them as well as the institution. Lastly, item 9 recorded 67 (72.0%) responses from respondents who totally agree and 21 (22.6%) agree

that if their contributions to the institution are given due recognition, they are determined to do more.

**Table XXIV**

**Level of the Subordinates' Involvement in the Organization**

Item\ No	Totally disagree	Disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Totally Agree	Mean	std dev
Item 3	1 (1.1)	12 (12.9)	24 (25.8)	36 (38.7)	20 (21.5)	3.67	0.99
Item 6	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	4 (4.3)	24 (25.8)	64 (68.8)	4.62	0.62
Item 9	0(0.0)	1 (1.1)	4 (4.3)	21 (22.6)	67 (72.0)	4.66	0.62
n= 93 ; Mean commitment (involvement):4.32 ; std deviation: 0.57							
Category : High Level of Commitment							

Overall, the mean score for the dimension for involvement in the their organization is 4.32 and it is on the high end. This clearly indicates that the subordinates are willing to be involved in activities in the PHI.

**The Subordinates' Loyalty to the Organization**

Table XXV shows the 3 items that imply the level of the subordinates' loyalty to their organization. Based on item 2, the response shows that 46 (49.5%) totally agree and 29 (31.2%) agree, respectively, that they would work in the institution until they retire. Item 4 describes the subordinates' willingness to stay on in the institution even though the financial situation is not good. For this item, 45 (48.4%) totally agree and 33 (35.5%) agree respectively with this idea. The final item that describes organizational commitment of subordinates is item 7 which describes the determination of the subordinates to stay in the organization

even if there is a better salary offer from other institutions. For this item, 35 (37.6%) totally agree and 27 (29.0%) agree that they are determined to stay on with the institution.

**Table XXV**

**Level of Loyalty of the Subordinates to the Organization**

Item\No	Totally disagree	Disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Totally Agree	Mean	std dev
Item 2	3 (3.2)	3 (3.2)	12 (12.9)	29 (31.2)	46 (49.5)	4.20	1.01
Item 4	2 (2.2)	5 (5.4)	8 (8.6)	33 (35.5)	45 (48.4)	4.23	0.97
Item 7	5 (5.4)	2 (2.2)	24 (25.8)	27 (29.0)	35 (37.6)	3.91	1.10
n= 93 ; Mean commitment (loyalty):4.11 ; std deviation: 0.78							
Category : High Level of Commitment							

Overall, the mean score for the dimension of loyalty to their organization is 4.11, and is still at the high end. This indicates that the subordinates are loyal to the PHI.

**Associated Relationship between the Dimensions of Communication Styles of the Division Heads and the Organizational Commitment of the Subordinates**

In order to establish the strength of the relationship between the Division Heads' communication style and subordinates' commitment, Pearson Correlation  $r$  test was applied. Table XXVI shows the correlation coefficient values for establishing relationship between the Division Heads' communication style and the subordinates' commitment. The values of correlation coefficient is at -1 and +1.

Table XXVI below shows the relationship between the dimensions of each of the communication styles of the Division Heads with the subordinates' organizational commitment.

**Table XXVI**

**Interpretation of Correlation Coefficient Values**

Correlation Coefficient*	Strength of relationship
0.70 – 1.00	Strong positive relationship
0.30 – 0.69	Average positive relationship
0.00 – 0.29	Weak positive relationship ( correlation zero, no relationship)
0.00 – (-.29)	Weak negative relationship ( correlation zero, no relationship)
(-0.30) – (-0.69)	Average negative relationship
(-0.70) – (-1.00)	Strong negative relationship

\*Source: Taken from, Alias Baba, Statistics & Educational Research. UKM (Bangi).

Table XXVII shows the correlation between the dimensions of each communication style of the Division Heads and organizational commitment of subordinates. All ten communication styles have positive relationship with the subordinates' commitment. The communication styles, leaves an impression (0.364) and dominant (0.343), have average positive relationship with the subordinates' level of organizational commitment. The remaining communication styles, that is, dramatic (0.295), friendly (0.286), open(0.276) expressive (0.251), accurate (0.229), and likes to discuss (0.213), have weak positive relationship with the subordinates' organizational commitment.

**Table XXVII**

**Associated Relationship between the Dimensions of Communication Styles of the Division Heads with the Subordinates' Commitment**

Dimensions Division Heads' Communication Styles	Correlation Coefficient
Leaves an impression	0.364 **
Dominant	0.343**
Dramatic	0.295**
Friendly	0.286**
Open	0.276**
Expressive	0.251*
Accurate	0.229*
Likes to discuss	0.213*
Gives attention	0.164
Relaxed	0.099

\*\* significant at 0.01( 2-tailed)

\* significant at 0.05( 2-tailed)

On the whole, it can be seen that there is positive relationship between the communication styles of the Division Heads and subordinates' organizational commitment. However, based on the correlation coefficient value shown in Table XXVI, the strength of relationship between the two variables is average positive and weak positive.