

PERPUSTAKAAN UNIVERSITI MALAYA

ACF-8211
INVC. DWS 10/11/98

**MEASURING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF
INFORMATION SYSTEMS IN
ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONICS MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES**

Ang Sew Hong

**Bachelor of Electrical Engineering (Hons)
University of Technology Malaysia
Malaysia
1992**

**Submitted to the Faculty of Business and Accountancy,
University of Malaya, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for The Degree of
Master of Business Administration**

1997/98

Perpustakaan Universiti Malaya



A508303820

Disprofiikan oleh

No. Maklumi

Jumlah

07.01.1999
13918

HAMSIH B. MOHAMAD ZAHARI
UNIT REPROGRAFI
PERPUSTAKAAN UTAMA
UNIVERSITI MALAYA

UPR

Acknowledgment

I would like to sincerely thank my supervisor, Dr. Ainin Sulaiman. Without her valuable guidance and support, this research project would not be completed.

I would also like to thank the companies which participated in this project for their support and cooperation.

My appreciation goes to my MBA friends who gave me moral support during the MBA course.

Last but not least, my deepest regards to my family who understand my difficulties throughout the duration of the MBA course.

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to develop a tool to evaluate an information system's effectiveness. In this case, the information effectiveness is measured in terms of the users' perception towards a particular information system.

This study concentrated on the Electrical and Electronics Manufacturing Industries. A total of 151 respondents from eight companies participated in this study. This study enables an organization to know the user's perceived performance, identify the weakness of the system and take appropriate actions to rectify the system and for future information system strategy planning.

The research findings showed that there were three main factors affecting the effectiveness of an information system. These three factors are: Information product quality, knowledge and involvement, and output quality.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgment	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Background	1
1.2 Definition	3
1.3 Purpose of the Research	4
1.4 Scope and Organization of the Research	4
1.5 Limitation of the Study	5

Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 The Growth of User Satisfaction Approaches	7
--	---

Chapter 3 Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design	12
3.2 Data Collection	13
3.3 Data Editing	13
3.4 Data analysis	14

Chapter 4 Research result

4.1 Respondents Profile	18
4.2 Validity of the Result	24
4.3 Reliability of the Result	29
4.4 Effectiveness Measures	31

Chapter 5 Conclusion

5.1 Summary of Result	35
5.2 Implication	36
5.3 Future Study	37
5.4 Conclusion	38

Reference	40
-----------	----

Appendix I: Average and Standard Deviation for the Attributes (by Company)	42
--	----

Appendix II: Respondents' Data	43
--------------------------------	----

Appendix III: Factor Analysis : Rotated Component matrix	47
--	----

Appendix IV: Total Variance Explained	49
---------------------------------------	----

Appendix V: Sample Questionnaire	50
----------------------------------	----

List of Tables

Table 4.1a : Distribution of Respondents	18
Table 4.1b(i) : Demographic Profile of the Respondents (by Age)	19
Table 4.1b(ii) : Demographic Profile of the Respondents (by Education)	19
Table 4.1b(iii) : Demographic Profile of the Respondents (by Position/ Designation)	20
Table 4.1c : User Satisfaction (Q25) Responses Summary	21
Table 4.1c(i) : Satisfaction of the System(Q25): By Age	21
Table 4.1c(ii) : Satisfaction of the System(Q25): By Education Level	22
Table 4.1c(iii) : Satisfaction of the System(Q25): By Position/Designation	23
Table 4.2a : Results of Factor Analysis	26
Table 4.2b : Mean Score & Standard Deviation on user Satisfaction Measure	29
Table 4.3a : Reliability Test Result	30
Table 4.4a : Effectiveness Measures	31
Table 4.4b : Correlation of the Attributes	33

List of Figures

Figure 2.1a : Delone & McLean's IS Success Model	9
Figure 4.2a : Eigenvalue of the Factor Constructed	24
Figure 4.4a : Comparison Correlation Between single- and Composite Scale	34
Figure 4.4b : Comparison Significant Level Between single- and Composite Scale	34