

## CHAPTER 6

### 6.1 RESEARCH FINDINGS

#### 6.1 RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

The reliability test using the Cronbach Coefficient Alpha was undertaken to assess the consistency and stability of the measurement scales. It is important to perform the reliability test because without good measurements, the results of the study become questionable.

The statements can be grouped into 3 categories:

1. Assessing the effectiveness of downward communication.
2. Assessing the effectiveness of upward communication.
3. Assessing the effectiveness of informal communication.

Reliability analysis was performed on the nineteen statements which assess the effectiveness of communication in the restructuring exercise. The result is tabulated according to the categories described above.

For this kind of research, the acceptable internal reliability coefficients or alpha is 0.8 and above based on Nunnally's (1978) standard. Looking at the results in Table 6.1.1, the Alpha values for all of them are greater than 0.8. The high Alpha values means that the questions are consistent and stable as far as the score on the scales are concerned. Thus, the scales used are appropriate in measuring the effectiveness of downward communication in the company.

**Table 6.1.1**

**Downward Communication**

No	Statements	ALPHA
1	I was well-informed way ahead of the restructuring exercise.	0.9111
2	I was always kept informed about new developments in the restructuring process.	0.9057
3	I was satisfied with the quantity and frequency of information given to me on the restructuring.	0.9019
4	The quality of the information provided was consistently reliable and adequate.	0.9136
5	Top Management made efforts to ensure that I understood clearly the objectives of restructuring.	0.9090
6	My comments and recommendations were given due consideration by top management.	0.9177
7	Timely and adequate feedback was frequently offered by top management.	0.9126
ALPHA		0.9222
STANDARDISED ITEM ALPHA		0.9226

The result of reliability analysis for statements 8 to 14 as shown in Table 6.1.2 also show Alpha values of greater than 0.8. The measurement scales are consistent in measuring the effectiveness of upward communication.

**Table 6.1.2**  
**Upward Communication**

No	Statements	ALPHA
8	I was able to meet and discuss with all others about the restructuring whenever necessary.	0.8926
9	I was given ample opportunity to offer input and suggestions to the restructuring exercise.	0.8836
10	Before any final decision was made, I was given a chance to voice my views.	0.8852
11	Whenever, I was in doubt about some detail about the restructuring, I was able to discuss it with my superiors.	0.8927
12	I was able to make recommendations or comments without fear of reprisal.	0.8917
13	It was clear, to me who I should approach for information on restructuring.	0.9009
14	Overall. I feel that I was able to participate meaningfully in the restructuring process.	0.8971
ALPHA		0.9060
STANDARDISED ITEM ALPHA		0.9065

The Alpha values for statements 15 to 19 as shown in Table 6.1.3 are still quite high which indicate that the scales used are quite consistent and stable but not as good as statements in the previous two categories..

**Table 6.1.3**  
**Informal Communication**

No	Statements	ALPHA
15	I got most of my information about the restructuring from informal office chit-chat.	0.5559
16	I believed information obtained from informal sources was more reliable than official communications.	0.5402
17	Informal conversations with co-workers on restructuring increased my anxiety.	0.4879
18	Informal discussions on restructuring were generally not done very openly.	0.5816
19	I avoided conversation about the restructuring if it was within earshot of my superiors.	0.6309
ALPHA		0.6169
STANDARDISED ITEM ALPHA		0.6149



## 6.2

## ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Analysis of variance was performed on all the statements in the survey to see if there are any significant differences between the means of the different groups of respondents. Significant F of 0.05 or 5% was used as a criteria to determine if the means are significantly different. The statements can be grouped into four categories: (i) Effectiveness of Formal Downward Communication: statements 1 to 7 (ii) Effectiveness of Formal Upward Communication: statements 8 to 14, (iii) Effectiveness of Informal Communication: statements 15 to 19, and (iv) attitudes of respondents toward the restructuring: statements 20 to 25. The following sections will discuss the analysis of variance for all the categories of communication.

### 6.2.1 EFFECTIVENESS OF FORMAL DOWNWARD COMMUNICATION

Analysis of variance was performed on statements 1 to 5 of the survey which measure the effectiveness of formal upward communication in the restructuring exercise. The analysis will assess if there are significant differences between the means of the 7 groups of respondents.

#### 6.2.1.1 Analysis of Variance by Gender

The result of the analysis is shown in Table 6.2.1.1. The significant F values of all the statements show no significant difference between the means of

both male and female respondents. The means are more or less the same for both gender and the means are less than 3 for all statements in this group indicating that both male and female respondents tend to disagree that they did not receive enough information about the restructuring.

**Table 6.2.1.1**  
**Analysis of Variance by Gender**

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Male	Female	Sig. F
1	I was well-informed way ahead of the restructuring exercise.	2.57	1.215	2.56	2.75	0.544
2	I was always kept informed about new developments in the restructuring process.	2.42	1.088	2.42	2.38	0.871
3	I was satisfied with the quantity and frequency of information given to me on the restructuring.	2.38	2.314	2.38	2.31	0.793
4	The quality of the information provided was consistently reliable and adequate.	2.49	1.009	2.48	2.56	0.758
5	Top Management made efforts to ensure that I understood clearly the objectives of restructuring.	2.37	1.042	2.35	2.63	0.313
6	My comments and recommendations were given due consideration by top management.	2.32	1.003	2.3	2.56	0.205
7	Timely and adequate feedback was frequently offered by top management.	2.27	1.038	2.26	2.38	0.671

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### **6.2.1.2 Analysis of Variance by Salary Grades**

The result is shown in Table 6.2.1.2. The significant F values for all the statements are less than 0.05. This indicates that there are significant differences among the means of the different groups of respondents for all these statements. Higher level managers, salary grades JG27 and above, have the highest means. Middle level managers in salary grades JG24 to JG26 have the second highest means. Lower level executives in salary grades JG23 and below have the lowest means. In fact, the highest level of

executives were the only salary group with means of greater than 3.0. for all 7 statements. The means of the other two salary groups are less than 3.0. It seems that the lower level executives perceived that they were less informed about the restructuring, while the higher ranking managers were more informed. This is not unexpected, higher ranking managers are better informed than those of the lower ranking because opportunities for interactions with the top management of the organisation are more abundant.

On top of that, only the higher level managers agreed (means greater than 3) with statements 5,6, and 7 which suggest that higher level managers were happy about the quality and timeliness of information offered by top management. Respondents in the other two salary groups did not share the same view.

**Table 6.2.1.2**  
**Analysis of Variance by Salary Grades**

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	JG23 and below	JG24 to JG26	JG27 and above	Sig. F
1	I was well-informed way ahead of the restructuring exercise.	2.58	1.215	2.31	2.97	3.26	0.000
2	I was always kept informed about new developments in the restructuring process.	2.44	1.088	2.25	2.66	3.05	0.001
3	I was satisfied with the quantity and frequency of information given to me on the restructuring.	2.38	2.314	2.16	2.6	3.2	0.000
4	The quality of the information provided was consistently reliable and adequate.	2.49	1.009	2.27	2.73	3.26	0.000
5	Top Management made efforts to ensure that I understood clearly the objectives of restructuring.		1.042	2.19	2.4	3.47	0.000
6	My comments and recommendations were given due consideration by top management.	2.34	1.003	2.17	2.53	2.89	0.003
7	Timely and adequate feedback was frequently offered by top management.	2.27	1.038	2.14	2.42	2.72	0.027

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral = 3, Strongly Agree = 5

### **6.2.1.3      Analysis of Variance by Educational Background**

The result is shown in Table 6.2.1.3. Only the means of statements 2 and 3 show significant differences between different groups of respondents. For these two statements, engineers recorded the highest means while the accountants recorded the lowest means (means less than 2.0) , which indicates that respondents with accounting background received less information about the restructuring than respondents with engineering background. The engineers tend to be more informed than others as they made up the majority of executives in the company and hold most of the tops posts in the company. The top managers were more informed about the restructuring than lower level executives as discussed previously in Table 6.2.1.2 above.

For the other statements in this group, the means among the different educational backgrounds are not found to be significantly different. For these statements, the means are more or less similar but still the engineers recorded the highest means among the group which suggests that engineers tend to agree more with these statements than others.

Table 6.2.1.3

## Analysis of Variance by Educational Background

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Engineer	Account	Architect	Others	Sig. F
1	I was well-informed way ahead of the restructuring exercise.	2.57	1.215	2.59	1.33	0	2.61	0.202
2	I was always kept informed about new developments in the restructuring process.	2.44	1.088	2.48	1	0	2.26	0.048
3	I was satisfied with the quantity and frequency of information given to me on the restructuring.	2.39	2.314	2.42	1.33	0	2.26	0.048
4	The quality of the information provided was consistently reliable and adequate.	2.49	1.009	2.52	1.67	0	2.35	0.274
5	Top Management made efforts to ensure that I understood clearly the objectives of restructuring.	2.38	1.042	2.42	1.33	0	2.22	0.153
6	My comments and recommendations were given due consideration by top management.	2.33	1.003	2.35	2.07	0	2.14	0.539
7	Timely and adequate feedback was frequently offered by top management.	2.27	1.038	2.31	2	0	2	0.364

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### 6.2.1.4 Analysis of Variance by Grades of Superior

The result is shown in Table 6.2.1.4. Only the means of statement 4 and 6 indicate that there are significant differences among the different grades of respondents' superiors. The means of statement 4 and 6, show that as the gap between the salary grades of the respondent and the superior widens the means decrease. This suggests that as the hierarchical levels between the respondents and their superior increase, the effectiveness of communication in terms of quantity of information provided tends to decrease.

The means of the other statements in this group also shows similar trends. Eventhough the significant F values do not indicate that the means among the different grades of respondents' superiors are significantly different.

Table 6.2.1.4

## Analysis of Variance by Grades of Superior

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	1 & 2 grades higher	3 grades higher	4 grades higher	5 grades higher	6 grades higher	7 grades higher	Sig F
1	I was well-informed way ahead of the restructuring exercise.	2.58	1.215	2.63	2.62	2.64	2.12	2.78	2.14	0.565
2	I was always kept informed about new developments in the restructuring process.	2.44	1.088	2.51	2.48	3.54	2.06	2.33	1.86	0.443
3	I was satisfied with the quantity and frequency of information given to me on the restructuring.	2.39	2.314	2.46	2.38	2.68	2	2.11	1.71	0.148
4	The quality of the information provided was consistently reliable and adequate.	2.51	1.009	2.45	2.56	2.93	2.53	2.22	1.57	0.033
5	Top Management made efforts to ensure that I understood clearly the objectives of restructuring.	2.37	1.042	2.49	2.38	2.5	2	1.67	2	0.122
6	My comments and recommendations were given due consideration by top management.	2.34	1.003	2.34	2.42	2.66	2.19	1.67	1.57	0.04
7	Timely and adequate feedback was frequently offered by top management.	2.29	1.038	2.38	2.36	2.38	1.88	1.67	2	0.174

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### 6.2.1.5 Analysis of Variance by Age

The result is shown in Table 6.2.1.5. The significant F values for statements 1,3,4 and 5 show that there are significant differences among the means of the different age groups of respondents. The trend is that as the age of the respondents increase, the means also increase. This suggests that respondents in the older age groups were more informed than respondents in the lower age groups. This is not surprising considering that older respondents tend to hold higher job grade, and thus were more informed than those at lower levels.

The means of the other statements in this group were not found to be significantly different among the different age groups of respondents. But respondents in the older age groups recorded the highest means which suggest that respondents in this group were more informed and often received timely and adequate information about the restructuring.

**Table 6.2.1.5**  
**Analysis of Variance by Age**

No	Statement	Mean	Std. dev	25 and below	26 to 34	35 to 44	45 and above	Sig. F
1	I was well-informed way ahead of the restructuring exercise.	2.58	1.215	2.44	2.34	2.68	3.06	0.027
2	I was always kept informed about new developments in the restructuring process.	2.44	1.088	2.28	2.28	2.52	2.77	0.131
3	I was satisfied with the quantity and frequency of information given to me on the restructuring.	2.39	2.314	2.28	2.17	2.39	3.03	0.002
4	The quality of the information provided was consistently reliable and adequate.	2.5	1.009	2.39	2.34	2.48	3.03	0.012
5	Top Management made efforts to ensure that I understood clearly the objectives of restructuring.	2.38	1.042	2.28	2.25	2.27	3.06	0.001
6	My comments and recommendations were given due consideration by top management.	2.33	1.003	2.33	2.21	2.35	2.61	0.307
7	Timely and adequate feedback was frequently offered by top management.	2.28	1.038	2.11	2.16	2.33	2.55	0.274

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### **6.2.1.6 Analysis of Variance by Division**

The result is shown in Table 6.2.1.6. The means of statements 2, 3, 4 and 7 are significantly different for different divisions of respondents. For these statements , the highest means are recorded by respondents in the transmission division. For statements 2 and 3, the second highest means are recorded by respondents in 'Others" which includes executives in corporate and finance departments followed by respondents in distribution division,

while for statements 4 and 7, the second highest means are recorded by respondents in distribution division followed by respondents in 'Others'. The next highest means for all four statements are recorded by respondents in generation division and they are followed lastly by respondents in 'Subsidiary companies'. The higher means for transmission, distribution divisions and 'Others' may suggest that more communication took place in these divisions and respondents perceived that they received adequate and timely information about the restructuring from top management than respondents in generation division and subsidiary companies.

The means for the other statements in this group were not found to be significantly different among the different divisions of the company. The means are more or less the same for all divisions in the company which indicate respondents show similar disagreement to these statements (means less than 3.0).



Table 6.2.1.6

## Analysis of Variance by Division

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Distribution	General	Transmission	Subsidiary	Others	Sig. F
1	I was well-informed way ahead of the restructuring exercise.	2.59	1.215	2.56	2.42	2.8	2.65	3.04	0.236
2	I was always kept informed about new developments in the restructuring process.	2.44	1.088	2.53	2.28	3.2	2.10	2.54	0.024
3	I was satisfied with the quantity and frequency of information given to me on the restructuring.	2.29	2.314	2.55	2.24	2.8	2.05	2.63	0.050
4	The quality of the information provided was consistently reliable and adequate.	2.49	1.009	2.78	2.26	2.73	2.20	2.63	0.017
5	Top Management made efforts to ensure that I understood clearly the objectives of restructuring.	2.38	1.042	2.56	2.23	2.73	2.10	2.58	0.347
6	My comments and recommendations were given due consideration by top management.	2.34	1.003	2.46	2.19	2.67	2.35	2.36	0.347
7	Timely and adequate feedback was frequently offered by top management.	2.29	1.038	2.46	2.13	2.87	2	2.32	0.016

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

### 6.2.1.7 Analysis of Variance by Place of Work

The result is shown in Table 6.2.1.7. All the significant F values indicate that there are significant differences among the means of the different places of work of respondents. Respondents in regional offices recorded the highest means. Respondents in headquarters recorded the second highest means and they are followed by respondents in district offices. Respondents in power stations recorded the second lowest means while respondents in 'Others' recorded the lowest means. It is interesting to note, that means for respondents in regional offices are higher than means for respondents in headquarters. It seems that there was better downward communication at the regional offices than headquarters. The group with the lowest means are 'Others', which includes places like Ikatan in Bangi, and subsidiary

companies. The low means suggest that respondents at these places perceived that they received less information about the restructuring than their counterparts in the other places.

**Table 6.2.1.7**  
**Analysis of Variance by Place of Work**

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	HQ	District Office	Regional Office	Power Station	Others	Sig. F
1	I was well-informed way ahead of the restructuring exercise.	2.59	1.215	3.06	2.68	2.73	2.30	2.35	0.007
2	I was always kept informed about new developments in the restructuring process.	2.44	1.088	2.71	2.53	2.87	2.22	2.12	0.006
3	I was satisfied with the quantity and frequency of information given to me on the restructuring.	2.39	2.314	2.63	2.42	2.83	2.22	2	0.005
4	The quality of the information provided was consistently reliable and adequate.	2.49	1.009	2.81	2.79	2.77	2.26	2.18	0.002
5	Top Management made efforts to ensure that I understood clearly the objectives of restructuring.	2.38	1.042	2.6	2.47	2.77	2.23	2	0.012
6	My comments and recommendations were given due consideration by top management.	2.34	1.003	2.66	2.44	2.5	2.17	2.06	0.026
7	Timely and adequate feedback was frequently offered by top management.	2.27	1.038	2.54	2.33	2.67	2.13	1.82	0.002

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral = 1, Strongly Agree = 5

### 6.2.1.8 Summary

In general, the means for all the statements in this group are low (less than 3.0) The respondents perceived that they were not well informed about the restructuring and were not satisfied with the amount and timeliness of information offered by top management. Only the means for higher management are greater than 3.0 which suggest that only this group of respondents perceived that they were well informed about the restructuring in terms of quantity and timeliness of information

## **6.2.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF UPWARD COMMUNICATION**

Analysis of variance was performed on statements 6 to 14 which belong to the effectiveness of bottom-up communication. The purpose is to see if there are significant differences among the means of the different groups of respondents.

### **6.2.2.1 Analysis of variance by gender**

The result is shown in Table 6.2.2.1. The significant F values suggest that there are significant differences among the means of male and respondents only for statement 11. The mean is higher for female respondents than the mean for male respondents which suggests that female respondents were able to discuss with their superiors about the restructuring whereas their males respondents could not.

There is no difference between the means of the male and female respondents for the rest of the statements in the group which suggests that they show similar opinions about these statements.

Table 6.2.2.1

## Analysis of variance by gender

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Male	Female	Sig. F
8	I was able to meet and discuss with all others about the restructuring whenever necessary.	2.32	1.058	2.29	2.63	0.223
9	I was given ample opportunity to offer input and suggestions to the restructuring exercise.	2.17	1.053	2.15	2.31	0.564
10	Before any final decision was made, I was given a chance to voice my views.	1.99	1.015	1.96	2.31	0.190
11	Whenever, I was in doubt about some detail about the restructuring, I was able to discuss it with my superiors.	2.54	1.066	2.49	3.06	0.041
12	I was able to make recommendations or comments without fear of reprisal.	2.58	1.042	2.57	2.69	0.666
13	It was clear, to me who I should approach for information on restructuring.	2.58	1.116	2.57	2.69	0.681
14	Overall, I feel that I was able to participate meaningfully in the restructuring process.	2.28	1.066	2.27	2.38	0.704

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

### 6.2.2.2 Analysis of variance by salary grade.

The result is shown in Table 6.2.2.2. The significant F values indicate that there are significant differences among the means for statements 9, 13 and 14. This suggests that there are significant differences among the means of the different salary groups of respondents. The higher management, respondents in salary grades JG27 and above, have the highest means. The middle managers in salary grades JG24 to JG26 recorded the second lowest means. Respondents in the lowest salary grades JG23 and below have the lowest means. The higher means for the higher management indicate that better upward communication took place among this group. They were more involved and their views and opinions are sought by top management in restructuring the organisation.

The means of the other statements show no significant differences among the means of the different salary grades of respondents but respondents in the highest salary grades (JG27 and above) recorded the highest means which further reinforce the argument put forward previously.

**Table 6.2.2.2**  
**Analysis of variance by salary grades.**

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	JG23 and below	JG24 to JG 26	JG 27 and above	Sig. F
8	I was able to meet and discuss with all others about the restructuring whenever necessary.	2.32	1.058	2.2	2.5	2.56	0.11
9	I was given ample opportunity to offer input and suggestions to the restructuring exercise.	2.15	1.053	1.99	2.37	2.56	0.014
10	Before any final decision was made, I was given a chance to voice my views.	1.98	1.015	1.87	2.08	2.39	0.083
11	Whenever, I was in doubt about some detail about the restructuring, I was able to discuss it with my superiors.	2.51	1.066	2.5	2.52	2.53	0.987
12	I was able to make recommendations or comments without fear of reprisal.	2.56	1.042	2.48	2.59	3	0.116
13	It was clear, to me who I should approach for information on restructuring.	2.57	1.116	2.43	2.71	3.05	0.033
14	Overall, I feel that I was able to participate meaningfully in the restructuring process.	2.25	1.066	2.11	2.4	2.79	0.013

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

### **6.2.2.3 Analysis of variance by educational background**

The result is shown in Table 6.2.2.3. The statistical analysis shows no significant difference among the means of the different educational backgrounds of respondents but the highest means are recorded by respondents with accounting background (greater than 3.0) which suggests that better upward communication took place among respondents in this group than respondents with other educational background. Respondents

with the exception of the accountants show similar opinion about these statements.

**Table 6.2.2.3**  
**Analysis of variance by educational background**

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Engineer ing	Accounti ng	Archite cture	Others	Sig. F
8	I was able to meet and discuss with all others about the restructuring whenever necessary.	2.32	1.058	2.33	3.73	0	2.14	0.186
9	I was given ample opportunity to offer input and suggestions to the restructuring exercise.	2.16	1.053	2.16	3.33	0	2	0.122
10	Before any final decision was made, I was given a chance to voice my views.	1.99	1.015	1.96	3	0	2.05	0.217
11	Whenever, I was in doubt about some detail about the restructuring, I was able to discuss it with my superiors.	2.52	1.066	2.53	3.67	0	2.23	0.079
12	I was able to make recommendations or comments without fear of reprisal.	2.57	1.042	2.57	3.33	0	2.45	0.393
13	It was clear, to me who I should approach for information on restructuring.	2.58	1.116	2.6	2.67	0	2.41	0.741
14	Overall, I feel that I was able to participate meaningfully in the restructuring process.	2.27	1.066	2.29	2.67	0	1.95	0.295

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### **6.2.2.4 Analysis of variance by grades of superior**

The result is shown in Table 6.2.2.4. Only statement 6 is found to be significantly different for different groups of respondents. For this statement, the group with the highest hierarchical levels between the respondents and their superiors recorded the lowest means of only 1.57. It seems that there tend to be very little upward communication as far as consultation and involvement of the respondents in the restructuring took place in this group. The highest means are recorded by respondents with superior of 4 grades higher which indicates that better involvement and consultation took place in this group.

For the rest of the statements in this group, there is no significant difference among the different groups of respondents.

Table 6.2..2.4  
Analysis of variance by grades of superior

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	1 & 2 grades higher	3 grades higher	4 grades higher	5 grades higher	6 grades higher	7 grades higher	Sig. F
8	I was able to meet and discuss with all others about the restructuring whenever necessary.	2.32	1.058	2.39	2.46	2.24	2.19	1.78	1.71	0.290
9	I was given ample opportunity to offer input and suggestions to the restructuring exercise.	2.16	1.053	2.26	2.3	2.07	1.81	1.56	1.71	0.167
10	Before any final decision was made, I was given a chance to voice my views.	1.98	1.015	2.03	2.12	1.86	1.81	1.33	1.86	0.352
11	Whenever, I was in doubt about some detail about the restructuring, I was able to discuss it with my superiors.	2.53	1.066	2.59	2.57	2.41	2.65	2.44	1.86	0.604
12	I was able to make recommendations or comments without fear of reprisal.	2.58	1.042	2.69	2.59	2.66	2.24	1.89	2.57	0.223
13	It was clear, to me who I should approach for information on restructuring.	2.59	1.116	2.74	2.49	2.62	2.24	2.22	2.57	0.426
14	Overall, I feel that I was able to participate meaningfully in the restructuring process.	2.26	1.066	2.43	2.2	2.24	2.12	1.56	1.86	0.173

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

### 6.2.2.5 Analysis of variance by age

The result is shown in Table 6.2.2.5. There are no significant differences among the means of the different age groups of respondents.

Table 6.2.2.5  
Analysis of variance by age

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	25 and below	26 to 34	35 to 44	45 and above	Sig. F
8	I was able to meet and discuss with all others about the restructuring whenever necessary.	2.32	1.058	2.5	2.23	2.41	2.23	0.603
9	I was given ample opportunity to offer input and suggestions to the restructuring exercise.	2.15	1.053	2.44	2.01	2.17	2.29	0.34
10	Before any final decision was made, I was given a chance to voice my views.	1.98	1.015	2.28	1.85	2	2.1	0.37
11	Whenever, I was in doubt about some detail about the restructuring, I was able to discuss it with my superiors.	2.52	1.066	2.78	2.59	2.49	2.3	0.434
12	I was able to make recommendations or comments without fear of reprisal.	2.57	1.042	2.56	2.56	2.51	2.76	0.727
13	It was clear, to me who I should approach for information on restructuring.	2.57	1.116	2.61	2.43	2.59	2.88	0.268
14	Overall, I feel that I was able to participate meaningfully in the restructuring process.	2.26	1.066	2.39	2.17	2.25	2.42	0.656

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

### 6.2.2.6 Analysis of variance by division

The result is shown in Table 6.2.2.6. There are significant differences among the means of the different divisions of respondents for statement 8 and 14. For these two statements, the highest means are recorded by respondents in transmission division. The second highest means are recorded by respondents in distribution division and followed by respondents in "Others". The mean for respondents in generation division comes in next, while the mean for respondents in subsidiary companies are the lowest among the



groups. This suggests that respondents in the transmission division were more involved and better consulted about the restructuring while those respondents in subsidiary companies were consulted the least about the restructuring. This may be attributed to the fact that the restructuring is at company level, and these subsidiaries will not be affected by it. Among the three major divisions, respondents in generation division recorded the lowest mean which suggests that respondents in the generation division perceived that they were not consulted and not involved as much in the restructuring compared to respondents in the transmission and distribution divisions.

The significant F values of the other statements in this group show no significant difference among the different divisions of respondents but in general, the means show similar trend to the means of statements 8 and 14.

Table 6.2.2.6

Analysis of variance by division

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Distribution	Generation	Transmission	Subsidiary	Others	Sig. F
8	I was able to meet and discuss with all others about the restructuring whenever necessary.	2.32	1.058	2.39	2.29	3.07	2.0	2.36	0.005
9	I was given ample opportunity to offer input and suggestions to the restructuring exercise.	2.15	1.053	2.21	2.06	2.73	2.0	2.16	0.201
10	Before any final decision was made, I was given a chance to voice my views.	1.98	1.015	2.03	1.9	2.6	1.69	2.08	0.076
11	Whenever, I was in doubt about some detail about the restructuring, I was able to discuss it with my superiors.	2.51	1.066	2.52	2.48	3.07	2.43	2.36	0.316
12	I was able to make recommendations or comments without fear of reprisal.	2.57	1.042	2.56	2.68	2.73	2.36	2.36	0.48
13	It was clear, to me who I should approach for information on restructuring.	2.58	1.116	2.62	2.62	3	2.25	2.44	0.261
14	Overall, I feel that I was able to participate meaningfully in the restructuring process.	2.26	1.066	2.56	2.13	2.67	2	2.08	0.028

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### **6.2.2.7 Analysis of variance by place of work**

The result is shown in Table 6.2.2.7. There are significant differences among the means for statements 8, and 14. For these statements, the highest mean is recorded by respondents in regional offices. The second highest mean is recorded by respondents in headquarters. The third highest mean is recorded by respondents in district offices. The fourth highest mean is recorded by respondents in power stations and the lowest mean is recorded by respondents in 'Others' which include respondents in offices of subsidiary companies and Institute Kejuruteraan Tenaga Nasional, IKATAN, in Bangi. The higher mean for respondents in regional offices suggests that respondents were involved and consulted more by top management in the restructuring than respondents in the other places of work.

The significant F values for the rest of the statements in this group do not show significant differences among the different place of work of respondents but the means show some similarity with the trends for statement 8 and 14.

Table 6.2.2.7

## Analysis of variance by place of work

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	HQ	District Office	Regional Office	Power Station	Others	Sig.
8	I was able to meet and discuss with all others about the restructuring whenever necessary.	2.32	1.058	2.52	2.33	2.6	2.27	1.88	0.04
9	I was given ample opportunity to offer input and suggestions to the restructuring exercise.	2.15	1.053	2.39	2.39	2.47	1.96	2	0.09
10	Before any final decision was made, I was given a chance to voice my views.	1.98	1.015	2.16	1.94	2.23	1.88	1.76	0.22
11	Whenever, I was in doubt about some detail about the restructuring, I was able to discuss it with my superiors.	2.51	1.066	2.53	2.82	2.48	2.5	2.4	0.76
12	I was able to make recommendations or comments without fear of reprisal.	2.57	1.042	2.61	2.53	2.71	2.62	2.29	0.48
13	It was clear, to me who I should approach for information on restructuring.	2.58	1.116	2.57	2.65	2.71	2.59	2.43	0.88
14	Overall, I feel that I was able to participate meaningfully in the restructuring process.	2.26	1.066	2.31	2.65	2.65	2.06	2.14	0.04

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### 6.2.2.8 Summary

In general, the means for all the statements that assess the effectiveness of upward communication are low, less than 3.0. This indicates that very little consultation and participation by respondents took place in the restructuring exercise. Respondents were not offered more details about the restructuring by their superiors. Even the respondents in the highest salary grades also share the same feelings as their means are also less than 3.0.

### **6.2.3 EFFECTIVENESS OF INFORMAL COMMUNICATION**

Analysis of variance was performed on statements 15 to 19 that attempt to assess the effectiveness of informal communication. The purpose is to assess if there are differences in the effectiveness of the informal communication or the grapevine in disseminating information about the restructuring among the different groups of respondents.

#### **6.2.3.1 Analysis of variance by gender**

The result is shown in Table 6.2.3.1. Only the means of statement 2 are significantly different between the male and female respondents. The means of statement 2 indicate that female respondents tend to believe that information through the informal communication was more reliable than official communication. Male respondents tend to believe the contrary

The means for the rest of the statements in this group show no significant difference between the male and female respondents.

Table 6.2.3.1

## Analysis of variance by gender

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Male	Female	Sig. F
15	I got most of my information about the restructuring from informal office chit-chat.	3.51	1.158	3.55	3.25	0.326
16	I believed information obtained from informal sources was more reliable than official communications.	2.84	0.993	3.11	3.76	0.008
17	Informal conversations with CO-workers on restructuring increased my anxiety.	3.19	1.029	3.09	3.08	0.263
18	Informal discussions on restructuring were generally not done very openly.	3.31	0.915	3.32	3.41	0.162
19	I avoided conversation about the restructuring if it was within earshot of my superiors.	2.78	2.26	2.81	2.47	0.162

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

### 6.2.3.2 Analysis of variance by salary grades.

The result is shown in Table 6.2.3.2. Only the means of statement 15 are significantly different. For this statement, the highest mean (3.42) is recorded by respondents in the highest salary group, JG27 and above. The lower ranking executives received more from this informal communication than higher ranking executives (mean less than 3.0). It seems to show that informal communications were more effective in disseminating information about the restructuring at the lower levels than at the top.

The significant F values for the rest of the statements do not show significant difference among the different salary grades of respondents but the lowest mean is recorded by respondents from the highest level of managers, JG27 and above. Executives at lower levels recorded more or less similar means of more than 3.0 which suggests that these executives believed that information received through this channel was more reliable. They also perceived that the

restructuring was not carried out in a transparent manner. This opinion is not shared by respondents in the highest salary grades, JG27 and above whose means are more than 3.0 for all these statements.

**Table 6.2.3.2**  
**Analysis of variance by salary grades.**

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	JG 23 and below	JG24 to JG 26	JG 27 and above	Sig. F
15	I got most of my information about the restructuring from informal office chit-chat.	3.51	1.158	3.7	3.4	2.58	0
16	I believed information obtained from informal sources was more reliable than official communications.	2.84	0.993	2.86	3.93	2.33	0.07
17	Informal conversations with CO-workers on restructuring increased my anxiety.	3.19	1.029	3.28	3.11	2.78	0.116
18	Informal discussions on restructuring were generally not done very openly.	3.31	0.915	3.37	3.23	3.17	0.486
19	I avoided conversation about the restructuring if it was within earshot of my superiors.	2.78	3.74	3.25	2.77	3	0.575

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

### **6.2.3.3 Analysis of variance by educational background**

The results are shown in Table 6.2.3.3. There are no significant differences among the means of the different disciplines of respondents.

Table 6.2.3.3

## Analysis of variance by educational background

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Engineer ing	Accounti ng	Architect ure	Others	Sig F
15	I got most of my information about the restructuring from informal office chit-chat.	3.51	1.158	3.5	2.77	0	3.64	0.4
16	I believed information obtained from informal sources was more reliable than official communications.	2.84	0.993	2.88	3	0	2.43	0.121
17	Informal conversations with CO-workers on restructuring increased my anxiety.	3.19	1.029	3.12	3	0	3.26	0.898
18	Informal discussions on restructuring were generally not done very openly.	3.31	0.915	3.27	4	0	3.61	0.102
19	I avoided conversation about the restructuring if it was within earshot of my superiors.	2.78	2.26	2.81	3	0	2.44	0.269

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### 6.2.3.4 Analysis of variance by grade of superior

The results are shown in Table 6.2.3.4. The means for statement 15 are significantly different. For this statement, the highest mean is recorded by respondents whose superiors are 6 grades or higher. The second lowest mean is recorded by respondents whose superiors are 5 grades and higher, followed by respondents whose superiors are 7 grades and higher. The lowest mean is recorded by respondents whose superiors are 1 or 2 grades higher while the second lowest mean is recorded by respondents whose superiors are 3 grades higher. The trend is as the gap between the respondents and the superiors widens, the means get smaller but still the means are more than 3.0. This suggests that the informal communications are more effective as the hierarchical levels between the respondents and their superior increase.

The significant F values for the rest of the statements show no significant difference among the means of the different groups of respondents. Generally the respondents tend to agree that informal sources were more reliable than official communication as shown by the high means of statement 16 (more than 3.0). The other statements show that the different groups of respondents have more or less similar means which show they have similar feelings toward the transparency of the restructuring exercise. They felt that the restructuring was not done in a transparent manner.

**Table 6.2.3.4**  
**Analysis of variance by grade of superior**

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	1 & 2 grade s higher	3 grades higher	4 grades higher	5 grades higher	6 grades higher	7 grades higher	Sig. F
15	I got most of my information about the restructuring from informal office chit-chat.	3.51	1.158	3.33	3.45	3.62	4.18	4.22	3.71	0.034
16	I believed information obtained from informal sources was more reliable than official communications.	2.84	0.993	2.79	2.73	3.07	2.71	3.28	2.71	0.414
17	Informal conversations with CO-workers on restructuring increased my anxiety.	3.19	1.029	3.09	3.02	3.34	3.71	3.63	3.14	0.126
18	Informal discussions on restructuring were generally not done very openly.	3.31	0.915	3.25	3.48	3.31	3.24	3.75	3	0.444
19	I avoided conversation about the restructuring if it was within earshot of my superiors.	2.78	3.74	2.73	2.79	3	2.88	3	2	0.218

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### **6.2.3.5 Analysis of variance by age**

The result is shown in Table 6.2.3.5. Only the means of statement 16 show significant differences among the means of the different age group of respondents. For this statement, the oldest age group, 45 and above has the



lowest means (less than 3.0) while the 26 to 34 years has the highest means. The means of respondents below 44 years old are high (more than 3.0) which suggest that these respondents agreed that they received more information about the restructuring through the informal communication whereas for respondents in the highest age group, 45 and above, the informal communication was less effective. Due to their closeness to the top management, respondents in the highest group can get information directly from top management.

The significant F values for the rest of the statements do not indicate significant differences among the means of the different age groups of respondents. But the means give some interesting point for discussions. The means of statement 16 (less than 3.0 for all age groups except for the youngest age group) suggest that in general respondents agreed to a certain extent that information through the official communication was more reliable than information from informal sources. The means of statements 18 and 19, show that respondents felt that the restructuring was not done in a transparent manner and there was secrecy surrounding it.

Table 6.2.3.5  
Analysis of variance by age

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	25 and below	26 to 34	35 to 44	45 and above	Sig. F
15	I got most of my information about the restructuring from informal office chit-chat.	3.51	1.158	3.56	3.72	3.59	2.79	0.001
16	I believed information obtained from informal sources was more reliable than official communications.	2.84	0.993	3.06	2.82	2.95	2.47	0.097
17	Informal conversations with co-workers on restructuring increased my anxiety.	3.19	1.029	3.22	3.19	3.31	2.88	0.247
18	Informal discussions on restructuring were generally not done very openly.	3.31	0.915	3.11	3.32	3.34	3.31	0.82
19	I avoided conversation about the restructuring if it was within earshot of my superiors.	2.78	2.26	2.78	2.7	2.86	2.75	0.77

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

### 6.2.3.6 Analysis of variance by division

The result is shown in Table 6.2.3.6. Only the means of statement 16 are significantly different. For this statement, respondents in subsidiary companies recorded the highest mean (3.89). Respondents in generation division recorded the second highest mean (3.59). Respondents in transmission has the third highest mean (3.73). Respondents in 'Others' recorded the fourth highest mean (3.76). Respondents in distribution division recorded the lowest mean (3.07). Informal communication was most effective in disseminating information about the restructuring in subsidiary companies than in other divisions and the least effective in the distribution division.

The significant F values for statements 17 and 18 indicate no significant differences among the different divisions of respondents. The means are more or less the same which suggest that respondents tend to share similar feelings of anxiousness toward the restructuring exercise

Table 6.2.3.6  
Analysis of variance by division

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Distribu tion	Generati on	Transmis sion	Subsidia ry	Others	Sig. F
15	I got most of my information about the re-structuring from informal office chit-chat.	3.51	1.158	3.07	3.59	3.73	3.89	3.76	0.007
16	I believed information obtained from informal sources was more reliable than official communications.	2.84	0.993	2.77	2.95	3.07	2.63	2.65	0.375
17	Informal conversations with CO-workers on restructuring increased my anxiety.	3.19	1.029	3.15	3.26	3.40	2.93	3.22	0.578
18	Informal discussions on restructuring were generally not done very openly.	3.31	0.915	3.30	3.35	3.53	3.07	3.35	0.576
19	I avoided conversation about the restructuring if it was within earshot of my superiors.	2.78	2.26	2.83	2.69	3.40	2.7	2.71	0.086

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

### 6.2.3.7 Analysis of variance by place of work

The results is shown in Table 6.2.3.7. There are no significant differences among the means of the different groups of respondents.

Table 6.2.3.7

#### Analysis of variance by place of work

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	HQ	District Office	Regional Office	Power Station	Others	Sig. F
15	I got most of my information about the restructuring from informal office chit-chat.	3.51	1.158	3.57	3.29	3.16	3.56	3.71	0.319
16	I believed information obtained from informal sources was more reliable than official communications.	2.84	0.993	2.84	2.83	2.83	2.99	2.47	0.165
17	Informal conversations with CO-workers on restructuring increased my anxiety.	3.19	1.029	3.24	3.17	3	3.30	3.07	0.58
18	Informal discussions on restructuring were generally not done very openly.	3.31	0.915	3.35	2.89	3.41	3.38	3.26	0.317
19	I avoided conversation about the restructuring if it was within earshot of my superiors.	2.78	2.26	2.96	2.71	3.03	2.64	2.71	0.175

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

### 6.2.3.8 Summary

The means for statements for assessing the effectiveness of informal communication are relatively high compared to statements in the previous two categories. The means for statements 15, 17 and 18 are greater than 3.0 suggesting that respondents tend to agree with these statements. In general, respondents tend to agree that informal communications were effective in disseminating information about the restructuring. But they believed informal communications was not a reliable source of information compared to official communications. Respondents also seem to agree that informal discussions on restructuring were not done openly and it lacked the transparency that respondents would have expected.

#### **6.2.4 Attitudes of Respondents Toward the Restructuring**

The analysis of variance was performed on all the statements in this group. The purpose is to see if there are significant differences among the means of the different groups of respondents.

##### **6.2.4.1 Analysis of variance by gender**

The result is shown in Table 6.2.4.1. Only the means of statement 23 are significantly different between the male and female respondents. The means are generally higher for male respondents than female respondents which suggest that male respondents were more sceptical towards the restructuring exercise and believed that the restructuring will benefit only a selected group of individuals especially those at the top.

The significant F values for the rest of the statements in this group show no significant difference between the means of the male and female respondents.

**Table 6.2.4.1**

**Analysis of variance by gender**

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Male	Female	Sig. F
20	I was fully supportive of the rationale for restructuring that top management offered.	3.2	0.979	3.17	3.47	0.228
21	I was fully supportive of the way top management implemented the restructuring.	2.78	1.043	2.76	3.06	0.253
22	I was very pleased with the overall communication process in the restructuring exercise	2.38	0.983	2.36	2.59	0.333
23	I believed the restructuring benefited only a select group of individuals especially those at the top.	3.42	1.191	3.48	2.82	0.026
24	I believed that I would benefit greatly from the restructuring.	2.65	0.946	2.62	2.94	0.182
25	I was very anxious about the outcome of the restructuring on my career advancement.	3.64	1.098	3.62	3.88	0.337

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### **6.2.4.2 Analysis of variance by salary grades**

The result is shown in Table 6.2.4.2. The means for statement 20, 21, 22 and 23 are significantly different among the different groups of respondents. The higher salary grades, JG27 and above have the highest means (more than 3.0) for statements 20, 21, and 22. The middle managers, JG24 to JG26 have the second highest means, and the lower ranking executives have the lowest means. Higher level managers were more receptive and supportive of the restructuring than lower level executives. They also agreed with the way the restructuring was implemented. Respondents in the lower salary grades hold contrary opinion but they agree with the rationale for restructuring.. This may be due to the fact that respondents in the highest salary grades are close to top management and were more involved in the restructuring and thus understand better the rationale for it.

Respondents in the highest management also recorded the lowest mean for statement 23 which suggests that they do not believe that the restructuring will benefit a selected group of individuals but this opinion is not shared by other executives as reflected by means of less than 3.0 for respondents in the other salary grades.

The last two statements in this group show no significant difference in their means and the means are more or less similar among all respondents.

**Table 6.2.4.2**  
**Analysis of variance by salary grades**

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	JG 23 and below	JG24 to JG 26	JG 27 and above	Sig. F
20	I was fully supportive of the rationale for restructuring that top management offered.	3.2	0.979	3.05	3.31	3.94	0.001
21	I was fully supportive of the way top management implemented the restructuring.	2.78	1.043	2.59	2.97	3.61	0.000
22	I was very pleased with the overall communication process in the restructuring exercise	2.38	0.983	2.2	2.57	3.22	0.000
23	I believed the restructuring benefited only a select group of individuals especially those at the top.	3.42	1.191	3.58	3.27	2.5	0.001
24	I believed that I would benefit greatly from the restructuring.	2.65	0.946	2.58	2.81	2.83	0.204
25	I was very anxious about the outcome of the restructuring on my career advancement.	3.64	1.098	3.61	3.65	3.44	0.781

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### 6.2.4.3 Analysis of variance by educational background

The result is shown in Table 6.2.4.3. The means are not significantly different among the different educational backgrounds of respondents. The means are similar for all respondents.

Table 6.2.4.3  
Analysis of variance by educational background

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Engineering	Accounting	Architecture	Others	Sig. F
20	I was fully supportive of the rationale for restructuring that top management offered.	3.2	0.979	3.22	3.67	0	3	0.421
21	I was fully supportive of the way top management implemented the restructuring.	2.78	1.043	2.82	3	0	2.57	0.505
22	I was very pleased with the overall communication process in the restructuring exercise	2.38	0.983	2.43	3	0	2.17	0.285
23	I believed the restructuring benefited only a select group of individuals especially those at the top.	3.42	1.191	3.60	3.67	0	3.52	0.284
24	I believed that I would benefit greatly from the restructuring.	2.65	0.946	2.68	3.33	0	2.48	0.305
25	I was very anxious about the outcome of the restructuring on my career advancement.	3.64	1.098	3.63	4.33	0	3.58	0.435

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### 6.2.4.4 Analysis of variance by grades of superior.

The result is shown in Table 6.2.4.4. There are no significant difference among the means of the different groups of respondents. But it is interesting to note that the means of statement 23 indicates that as the levels between the respondent and the superior increase the means also tend to increase. This suggest that as the levels between the respondent and the superior increase, the more the respondents believed that the restructuring will benefit only a selected group of individuals.

**Table 6.2.4.4**  
**Analysis of variance by grades of superior.**

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	1 & 2 grades higher	3 grades higher	4 grades higher	5 grades higher	6 grades higher	7 grades higher	Sig. F
20	I was fully supportive of the rationale for restructuring that top management offered.	3.2	0.979	3.22	3.23	3.41	3.12	2.88	2.86	0.668
21	I was fully supportive of the way top management implemented the restructuring.	2.78	1.043	2.87	2.78	3.03	2.47	2.56	2.14	0.229
22	I was very pleased with the overall communication process in the restructuring exercise	2.38	0.983	2.5	2.47	2.52	2.18	1.89	2	0.313
23	I believed the restructuring benefited only a select group of individuals especially those at the top.	3.42	1.191	3.23	3.37	3.41	3.76	3.78	4	0.291
24	I believed that I would benefit greatly from the restructuring.	2.65	0.946	2.6	2.82	2.59	2.76	2.67	2.71	0.834
25	I was very anxious about the outcome of the restructuring on my career advancement.	3.64	1.098	3.54	3.73	3.66	4.12	3.56	3.43	0.453

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### **6.2.4.5 Analysis of variance by age**

The results is shown in Table 6.2.4.5. There are significant differences among the means of the different age groups of respondents for statements 20, 22, 23 and 24. For these statements, the means get higher as the age groups increase which suggest that at higher age group, the support and satisfaction with the implementation of the restructuring increased. But there are exceptions to this, respondents in the youngest age group, 25 and below, have the highest mean for statements 21 and 24 and second highest for statements 20, and 22. Respondents in the youngest age group, 25 and below, tend to share the same opinions as respondents in the oldest age group , 45 and above, that they were more supportive of the rationale for



restructuring offered by top management and were more satisfied with the implementation of the restructuring.

The high mean for respondents in the youngest age group, 25-and-below, for statement 24, in fact they are the only group with mean more than 3.0, suggests that respondents in this group tends to believe that they will benefit greatly from the restructuring. This sentiment is not shared by respondents in all the other age groups including the oldest age group.

The means of statement 23 are highest for 26-to-34 and 35-to-44 age groups (means greater than 3.0) which suggest that these groups were the most sceptical and believed that the restructuring will benefit only a selected group of individuals especially those at the top. The other two age groups do not share this view as shown by means of less than 3.0.

The means for statement 25 show no significant difference and all respondents tend to agree that they were anxious about the outcome of the restructuring on their career advancement.

Table 6.2.4.5

## Analysis of variance by age

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	25 and below	26 to 34	35 to 44	45 and above	Sig. F
20	I was fully supportive of the rationale for restructuring that top management offered.	3.2	0.979	3.44	2.99	3.25	3.5	0.048
21	I was fully supportive of the way top management implemented the restructuring.	2.78	1.043	3.06	2.59	2.87	3.03	0.111
22	I was very pleased with the overall communication process in the restructuring exercise	2.38	0.983	2.61	2.2	2.37	2.91	0.005
23	I believed the restructuring benefited only a select group of individuals especially those at the top.	3.42	1.191	3.83	3.78	3.35	2.87	0
24	I believed that I would benefit greatly from the restructuring.	2.65	0.946	3.22	2.46	2.73	2.69	0.016
25	I was very anxious about the outcome of the restructuring on my career advancement.	3.64	1.098	3.78	3.56	3.69	3.47	0.676

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### 6.2.4.6 Analysis of variance by division

The result is shown in Table 6.2.4.6. There are significant differences among the means of the different groups of respondents for all the statements except for statement 25. Respondents in the distribution division recorded the highest means for all the statements. The means for respondents in the transmission division and 'Others' are either second or third in most of these statements (except statement 23). The means for respondents in the subsidiary companies are the second lowest while the means for respondents in the generation division are the lowest among all respondents. It seems from the means of statement 20, respondents in generation division were not fully agreeable to the rationale for restructuring offered by top management. They were also not pleased with the way the restructuring was implemented

and the communication process that have taken place as shown by means of statements 21 and 22 of less than 3.0.

Respondents in generation and transmission divisions, including respondents in subsidiary companies hold similar believe that the restructuring will only benefit a selected group of individuals as shown by the means of statement 23. Respondents in distribution division including respondents in 'Others' do not share the same view as shown by their means of less than 3.0 for this statement.

The means of statement 24 show that respondents in distribution and transmission divisions believed that they will benefit from the restructuring exercise whereas respondents in the other groups do not share this feeling. Respondents in subsidiary companies would not be affected by the restructuring and as such they do not agree with statement 24.

There are no significant differences among the means of the different divisions of respondents for statement 25. The means indicate that all the respondents were anxious about the outcome of the restructuring as shown by means of more than 3.0 for all divisions of respondents.

Table 6..2.4.6

## Analysis of variance by division

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	Distribution	Generation	Transmission	Subsidiary	Other	Sig. F
20	I was fully supportive of the rationale for restructuring that top management offered.	3.2	0.979	3.62	2.89	3.33	3	3.43	0
21	I was fully supportive of the way top management implemented the restructuring.	2.78	1.043	3.27	2.39	2.93	3	3.21	0
22	I was very pleased with the overall communication process in the restructuring exercise	2.38	0.983	2.8	2.18	2.73	2	2.5	0
23	I believed the restructuring benefited only a select group of individuals especially those at the top.	3.42	1.191	2.85	3.97	3.47	3.14	2.92	0
24	I believed that I would benefit greatly from the restructuring.	2.65	0.946	3.13	2.27	3.13	2	2.92	0
25	I was very anxious about the outcome of the restructuring on my career advancement.	3.64	1.098	3.78	3.63	3.67	3.21	3.58	0.266

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### 6.2.4.7 Analysis of variance by place of work

The result is shown in Table 6.2.4.7. There are significant differences among the means of respondents for all the statements except for statement 25. The respondents in headquarters recorded the highest means for statements 20, 21 and 22, while the respondents in regional offices recorded the next highest means. For these statements, the respondents in power stations recorded the lowest means, even lower than respondents in 'Others' and subsidiary companies. From the means of statements 20, 21, and 22, it seems that respondents in headquarters, regional offices and 'Others' were supportive of the rationale for restructuring but this opinion is not shared by respondents in power stations (means less than 3.0).

The means for statement 23 show that the respondents in power stations recorded the highest mean of 3.99. Respondents in regional offices recorded the second highest mean followed by respondents in headquarters and 'Others'. Respondents in district offices recorded the lowest mean of 2.89 and in fact the only mean below 3.0. The trend indicates that respondents in power stations are the most sceptical and believed that the restructuring will only benefit a selected group of individuals especially those at the top.

Respondents in district offices recorded the highest mean for statement 24 (3.33), while respondents in headquarters recorded the second lowest mean. Again, respondents in power stations recorded the lowest mean for this statements. Respondents in district offices believe that they will benefit from the restructuring but the others do not share this view (means are all less than 3.0).

The means of statement 25 show no significant differences among the various places of work of respondents but they are anxious about the outcome of the restructuring on their career advancement.

Table 6.2.4.7

## Analysis of variance by place of work

No	Statements	Mean	Std. dev	HQ	District Office	Regional Office	Power Station	Others	Sig. F
20	I was fully supportive of the rationale for restructuring that top management offered.	3.2	0.979	3.53	3.44	3.59	2.85	3.12	0.000
21	I was fully supportive of the way top management implemented the restructuring.	2.78	1.043	3.08	3.11	3.21	2.42	2.8	0.000
22	I was very pleased with the overall communication process in the restructuring exercise	2.38	0.983	2.5	2.78	2.9	2.16	2.29	0.002
23	I believed the restructuring benefited only a select group of individuals especially those at the top.	3.42	1.191	3.00	2.89	3.14	3.99	3.03	0.000
24	I believed that I would benefit greatly from the restructuring.	2.65	0.946	3.00	3.33	2.93	2.24	2.63	0.000
25	I was very anxious about the outcome of the restructuring on my career advancement.	3.64	1.098	3.74	3.56	3.76	3.57	3.46	0.722

Strongly Disagree = 1, Neutral =3, Strongly Agree = 5

#### 6.2.4.8 Summary

In general, respondents fully support the rationale for restructuring as reflected by means of statement 20 of more than 2.5. But the means for the other statements on the attitudes of respondents toward the restructuring exercise suggest that they were not pleased with the communication offered by top management, and are sceptical about it. They believed that the restructuring will only benefit a selected group of individuals especially those at the top and they themselves will not benefit greatly from the restructuring. Overall, respondents are anxious about the outcome of the restructuring on their career advancement.

### 6.2.5 FORMS OF COMMUNICATION

The most popular forms of communication are uncovered by statements 26 to 29 of the survey. The analysis is performed by taking the means of each form of communication. The result is shown in Table 6.2.5.

The highest means are recorded by 'Reports in newspaper and 'E-mails including power chats' which suggest that these forms of communication are seldom used. Verbal communication which includes meetings recorded the lowest mean which indicates that verbal communication was the most frequently used form of communication in disseminating information about the restructuring.

Table 6.2.5  
Forms of communication

No	Forms of communication	Mean	Std. dev
26	Verbal e.g. meeting, adhoc communication	2.46	1.065
27	Official reports and special messages	3.13	0.883
28	Reports in newspaper	3.32	1.139
29	E-mails including powerchat	3.31	1.236

Very Often = 1, Very Seldom = 5