

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH RESULTS

Chapter 4 mainly focuses on the results of the survey. The data are analyzed to test the hypothesis. Some of the analyses conducted are reliability analysis, factor analysis, bivariate correlation analysis, stepwise regression analysis, and one-way ANOVA with post-hoc analysis.

4.1 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Table 1 : Demographic Statistics

	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	114	55.9
Female	90	44.1
Age		
< 30	126	61.8
30 – 39	60	29.4
40 – 49	18	8.8
Race		
Malay	104	51.0
Chinese	82	40.2
Indian	18	8.8
Education Level		
High school and below	19	9.3
Diploma	27	13.2
Bachelor degree	134	65.7
Masters	24	11.8
Annual Income		
< \$25,000	79	38.7
\$25,001 - \$50,000	93	45.6
\$50,001 - \$100,000	30	14.7
\$100,001 - \$150,000	2	1.0
Job Status		
Managerial level and above	33	16.2
Supervisory level	33	16.2
Executive level and below	138	67.6

	Frequency	Percentage
Sector / Industry		
Services	104	51.0
Manufacturing	31	15.2
Other	69	33.8
Tenure		
Less than 1 year	44	21.6
1 – 5 years	106	52.0
6 – 10 years	30	14.7
More than 10 years	24	11.8
Types Of Training		
Informal training	45	22.1
Formal training	10	4.9
Both	148	72.5
Frequency Of Training		
Less than once a year	36	17.6
Once a year	37	18.1
Twice a year	37	18.1
Three times a year or more	94	46.1
Duration Of Training		
Less than 1 day	31	15.2
1 day – 1 week	161	78.9
Less than a month	6	2.9
More than a month	6	2.9

As survey has shown, the number of male respondents was more than female respondents. There were 114 males (55.9%) as compared to 90 females (44.1%) in this sample. Majority of the respondents were below 30 years old (61.8%). This young age group affected the sample to skew towards the executive level position instead of a higher position (Appendix 5).

Malays comprised the largest ethnic group (51%) followed by Chinese (40.2%) and Indians (8.8%). Furthermore, the profile revealed that there is a substantial proportion of Chinese males (26.5%) and Malay females (27%) as shown in Table 2.

Also in the sample, a large proportion of the respondents report that they have earned a bachelor degree (65.7%), while the remaining only completed high school (9.3%), earned diplomas (13.2%), and masters (11.8%).

Slightly more than 50% of the total respondents were employed in the service industry. The remaining was either in manufacturing or other sectors such as banking, IT, construction and so forth. In terms of annual income, the median range was between \$25,000 to \$50,000. The data also revealed that the average tenure was between 1 to 5 years which was in line with the young age of respondents.

With respect to training, most organizations (72.5%) conducted both, informal and formal, types of training. These organizations often performed training approximately more than three times a year and each training session would often last between one day to one week.

Table 2 : Cross-Tabulation of Gender and Race

			Race			Total
			malay	chinese	indian	
Gender	male	Count	49	54	11	114
		% of Total	24.0%	26.5%	5.4%	55.9%
	female	Count	55	28	7	90
		% of Total	27.0%	13.7%	3.4%	44.1%
Total	Count	104	82	18	204	
	% of Total	51.0%	40.2%	8.8%	100.0%	

4.2 RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

Reliability analysis was carried out after 30 responses were received from the participants. It acts as a pretest to see whether the individual-scaled items and the overall items are reliable, free from error, and yield consistent results.

Furthermore, Statement 19 was negatively worded and was recoded prior to the analysis. Table 3 shows the Cronbach's Alpha for 30 and 204 respondents.

According to Nunnally (1967), an alpha coefficient of 0.5 or higher is necessary for an exploratory research such as a survey to be considered reliable. Thus, it can be concluded that the reliability of the scaled-items and the overall items were found to be acceptable ($p > 0.5$) in the pilot test and in the final survey.

Table 3 : Cronbach's Alpha

Statement	Cronbach's Alpha Values	
	N = 30 (Pilot test)	N = 204
Statement 1 – Statement 7	0.7918	0.8809
Statement 8 – Statement 13	0.6860	0.7465
Statement 14 – Statement 19	0.7200	0.6905
Statement 20 – Statement 26	0.8215	0.8989
Statement 27 – Statement 30	0.7723	0.8167
Statement 31 – Statement 35	0.7918	0.8591
Statement 36 – Statement 41	0.9041	0.8920
Overall Statement (1 – 41)	0.8903	0.9345

4.3 FACTOR ANALYSIS

Commitment items (Statement 1 – 20) were not factorized due to the fact that the statements were quoted by several scholars in the past. Thus, the data are reliable and the integrity of the original instrument measuring commitment needs to be maintained. However, the 21 items comprising of statement on training that were developed for the purpose of this paper were factor analyzed using Varimax rotation. The purpose was to determine whether the scaled-item fall in the same construct. The results of this test are presented in Table 4.

The result shows a good indicator of well-segregated questions in the original questionnaires. All the statements with the exception of Statement 36 are factorized according to the group developed in the questionnaires which are :

- Factor 1 : Support for training (S20 - S26)
- Factor 2 : Motivation to learn (S27 – S30)
- Factor 3 : Training environment (S31 – S35)
- Factor 4 : Benefits of training (S37 – S41)

Table 4 : Factor Analysis Of Training's Statement

Statement	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
S21	0.701			
S22	0.655			
S23	0.799			
S24	0.760			
S25	0.616			
S26	0.604			
S27		0.612		
S28		0.529		
S29		0.794		
S30		0.756		
S31			0.616	
S32			0.707	
S33			0.682	
S34			0.659	
S35			0.651	
S36		0.529		
S37				0.668
S38				0.704
S39				0.757
S40				0.660
S41				0.768

Statement 36 (S36), 'Training allows me to acquire new knowledge and skills', was previously categorized under the scale 'Benefits of training'. Subsequent to factor analysis, S36 was loaded under Factor 2 with factor loading of 0.529. This signifies that S36 should be categorized under 'Motivation to learn' scale. Thus,

for the remaining of the analysis in this study, the scores for Statement 36 will be calculated under the scale 'Motivation to learn'.

The reliability of the two modified scales, 'Motivation to learn' and 'Benefits of training' were tested again to see the reliability of the data. Table 5 indicated that the data was reliable ($p > 0.05$).

Table 5 : Cronbach's Alpha After Factor Analysis

Statement	Cronbach's Alpha Values
	N = 204
Statement 27 – Statement 30 & 36	0.8507
Statement 37 – Statement 41	0.8785

4.4 CORRELATION ANALYSIS

In this study, Bivariate Pearson Product-moment correlation (one-tailed test) was used to test the causal relationship between the demographic variables and training variables with commitment. This test focused on determining the strength of the relationship of each variable with organizational commitment independent from other variables. The detailed results of correlation analysis can be found in Appendix 4.

4.4.1 Relationship Between Demographic Variables And Commitment

The results of the study show that only affective commitment has positive and significant relations with age ($r=0.213$, $p=0.001$) and tenure ($r=0.186$, $p=0.004$). This means that the greater the age of the employees and the longer the tenure, there will be a higher sense of emotional attachment towards their organization and employer. Researchers in the past revealed that factors such as age and organizational tenure are known to positively correlate with affective commitment (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1982; Mathieu and Zajac,

1990; Lok and Crawford, 2001; Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972; Steers, 1977; Williams and Hazer, 1986). It would seem that older employees who had worked many years do have a strong attachment to their organization.

On the other hand, the findings suggest that age and tenure were unimportant in predicting normative or continuance commitment. Thus, there was not much evidence for the belief that older people or longer time spent with an organization has greater impact on commitment to stay. According to the interview done with several employees, many feel that even though they are emotionally attached to their organization, it would not stop them from leaving the organization to gain higher income or benefits. Findings by several scholars (Tan and Akhtar, 1998; Irving, Coleman, and Cooper, 1997) also support the fact that age and tenure did not correlate significantly with normative commitment. Thus, the length of time spent within an organization is not highly predictive of a person's commitment to stay.

It is important to note the fact that the overall findings are not relatively consistent with the previous literature that suggested age has statistically significant positive effects on the overall commitment (Lok and Crawford, 2001; Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972; Steers, 1977; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Williams and Hazer, 1986). Researches done in the past also contradict the present findings on the relationship between tenure and the overall commitment. (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1982; Angle and Perry, 1981; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Steers, 1977).

The contradictory findings for age and tenure could be attributed to the relatively young executives involved in the survey. They may not be prepared to have a long-term engagement with the organizations in which they work. This is fairly consistent with the work culture in Malaysia that is rather volatile across time. This is due to various reasons such as uncertain business environment, pressure to cut costs, and restructuring.

The results indicated that gender and race have no correlation with commitment. This confirmed previous studies that specify gender has no direct effect on organizational commitment (Ngo and Tsang, 1998; Parasuraman and Greenhaus, 1993). In term of race, no empirical analysis has directly addressed the issue of race differences in commitment. This reflects a lack of race perspective on this subject area.

Although the results did not show a negative correlation between the level of education and the overall commitment which was found in the some previous studies (Decotiis and Summers, 1987), there is a significant negative correlation associated with continuance commitment ($r = -0.130$, $p = 0.032$). This signifies that less educated employees thought the cost of leaving their organization is very risky. On the other hand, more educated employees do not fear losing certain benefits if they leave their job, thus they are less committed.

Annual income was found to correlate positively with affective commitment ($r = 0.220$, $p = 0.001$) which imply higher income causes a stronger sense of attachment to the organization. Income was also significantly and positively correlated with the overall commitment ($r = 0.137$, $p = 0.026$). Previous findings by Becker, Sobowale and Cobbey (1979) supported this result.

Although this study has stemmed from a viewpoint shared with other researchers who posited that organizational position are known to correlated negatively with normative and affective commitment (Tan and Akhtar, 1998), the results from this study only indicated that there is a significant negative correlation with affective commitment ($r = -0.165$, $p = 0.009$) and the overall commitment ($r = -0.135$, $p = 0.027$). There was no correlation towards either normative or continuance commitment.

4.4.2 Relationship Between Availability Of Training And Commitment (Hypothesis A)

Table 6 : Correlation Analysis Between Availability Of Training And Commitment

	r	Significance
Affective Commitment	0.362	0.000 (p<0.01)
Normative Commitment	0.137	0.025 (p<0.05)
Continuance Commitment	Not significant	-
Organizational Commitment	0.252	0.000 (p<0.01)

The data revealed that availability of training are positively correlated with affective, normative, and the overall organizational commitment. The test of significance showed that independent variables were significant at $p<0.01$ and $p<0.05$ level. Therefore, the results partially supported Hypothesis A. There is a positive relationship between availability of training along with affective, normative and the overall organizational commitment as measured by the types of training, frequency, and duration of training. However, there was no correlation between availability of training and continuance commitment.

The results supported the findings by Bartlett (2001) which indicated availability of training has strong relationship with affective and normative commitment, but no association with continuance commitment. With the presence of training, employees are more likely to feel loyal and morally obligated to remain with their company.

According to the results, employees in Malaysia do not feel that the cost of leaving the organization have any association with the availability of training within their organization. Hence, although they could have access to training, employees would not take this factor under consideration when choosing to leave their company. In other words, they do not consider the availability of training as a high cost or benefit that they have to forgo when leaving their organization.

4.4.3 Relationship Between Support For Training And Commitment (Hypothesis B)

Table 7 : Correlation Analysis Between Support For Training And Commitment

	r	Significance
Affective Commitment	0.723	0.000 ($p < 0.01$)
Normative Commitment	0.572	0.000 ($p < 0.01$)
Continuance Commitment	Not significant	-
Organizational Commitment	0.660	0.000 ($p < 0.01$)

The results give an indication that support for training is highly correlated with affective commitment. It must also be noted that normative and the overall organizational commitment is affected too. The test of significance showed that independent variables were significant at $p < 0.01$ level. Thus, Hypothesis B is partially supported because support for training is positively correlated with the all levels of commitment with the exception of continuance commitment.

The results show a strong linear relationship between support for training and affective commitment, that is, the greater the support given to employees in training, the higher will be the affective commitment. This study confirmed the findings and suggestions of several scholars (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa, 1990; Guzzo, Noonan, and Elrod, 1994; Settoon, Bennett, and Liden, 1996; Shore and Wayne, 1993) who stressed that the support given by top management or supervisors plays an important role in increasing affective commitment of employees. Employees who felt valued and supported by their organizations were more emotionally attached to their organization and profession.

In the case of normative commitment, employees in Malaysia feel a greater sense of obligation to remain in their organizations when they view their organization as supportive, particularly in training. Employees are more likely to

be committed to stay within their organization if employers are willing to support their long-term career development and personal career aspirations through training. This also confirmed the study by Allen and Meyer (1990) for the fact that normative commitment correlates positively with organizational support.

Researches done by Allen and Meyer (1990) and Shore and Wayne (1993) reported weak negative correlations between continuance commitment and support for training, which slightly contrasted with the findings of this research. Nevertheless, the results concurred with Meyer and Smith (2000) who found there is no correlation between support and continuance commitment. Therefore, that support for training had no effects on employees' perceptions of the costs of leaving the organization. Individuals do not feel that there is lack of attractive alternative in other organizations or that their life would be disrupted if they leave the organization they are currently working at.

Clearly, the results indicated that there is a need in building partnerships among trainers, trainees, and managers to support training usage as believed by Brinkerhoff and Montesino (1995), Huczynski and Lewis (1980), and Michalak (1981). Employees are often more enthusiastic in performing good work when they feel valued by their organization and if they can depend upon the organization for support. Thus, organizations that take an active role in helping employees to prepare themselves for advancement in the organization by undergoing training will foster a stronger bond from the employees.

4.4.4 Relationship Between Motivation To Learn In Training And Commitment (Hypothesis C)

Table 8 : Correlation Analysis Between Motivation To Learn And Commitment

	r	Significance
Affective Commitment	0.433	0.000 ($p < 0.01$)
Normative Commitment	0.249	0.000 ($p < 0.01$)
Continuance Commitment	Not significant	-
Organizational Commitment	0.371	0.000 ($p < 0.01$)

Motivation to learn particularly in training were found to be significantly and positively correlated with affective, normative, and the overall organizational commitment. These independent variables were significant at the $p < 0.01$ level. On the other hand, continuance commitment shows no association with motivation to learn. Thus, Hypothesis C is partially supported because employees with higher levels of motivation to learn in training will result in higher levels of affective, normative, and overall organizational commitment, but not continuance commitment.

The present findings indicate that affective and normative commitment can be enhanced by the increase of motivation to learn in training. The result is consistent with the research by Bartlett (2001) which indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between motivation to learn in training with affective and normative forms of commitment. Thus, it can also be reasoned that motivated employees want to remain with their organization and feel a strong sense of belonging to their organization.

It is quite obvious that trainees with high commitment to their career are more likely to exert considerable effort towards learning the training content. A study by Mathieu, Tannenbaum and Salas (1992) supported this finding where employees would be more motivated to achieve greater performance results. Hence,

commitment is dependent highly on employees' individual effort and participation. Further, employees with high level of commitment may be motivated to sustain learning when they think that acquiring new knowledge and skills would help them remain with their chosen careers and organization.

Studies have found that higher "self-expectancies" lead to higher training performance (Eden and Ravid, 1982) and thus higher desire to commit to their profession as well as organization. There is a clear link between training improvement and commitment among the employees. Some of the interesting comments made during interview were,

"Basically, I put my best effort in training so I can improve my performance and earn respect from my manager."

"I really feel that the company's problems are also mine, so I put a lot of hours into work which cuts down my family time. I attend the training course that was offered because I wanted to be more independent at work. Plus the flexibility that I can gain after attending training really helps to cut down the extra hours of work."

However, the results of this research provided little evidence for the impact on continuance commitment by motivation to learn. Bartlett (2001) reported that there is a negative but non-significant relationship between motivation and continuance commitment. The outcome of this study relatively confirmed his study since no correlation exists. Thus, individual's motivation to learn and participate in training has no impact towards their assessment on the costs of leaving the organization.

4.4.5 Relationship Between Training Environment And Commitment (Hypothesis D)

Table 9 : Correlation Analysis Between Training Environment And Commitment

	r	Significance
Affective Commitment	0.569	0.000 ($p < 0.01$)
Normative Commitment	0.374	0.001 ($p < 0.01$)
Continuance Commitment	0.162	0.010 ($p < 0.005$)
Organizational Commitment	0.517	0.000 ($p < 0.01$)

According to the results above, there exist a positive correlation between training environment and the three levels of organizational commitment. The test of significance showed that continuance commitment were significant at $p < 0.05$ level while the affective, normative, and overall organizational commitment were significant at $p < 0.01$ level respectively. Hypothesis D stated that training environment is an important factor in enhancing organizational commitment. The hypothesis is supported.

The results illustrate that training environment correlate positively and significantly with affective commitment. They also correlate, albeit not as strongly, with normative commitment. Undoubtedly, comfortable and pleasant work surrounding influence development of employees' attachment towards their organization (Poole and McPhee, 1983). During an interview with a 40 year old manager from the service industry, the critical importance of training environment was made quite clear.

"I am very happy to remain with the organization I am working for. I have been working here for 15 years and I must say that the one major factor that kept me staying is the working environment, in terms of its people and the physical surrounding. When we undergo training, there are always clear guidelines being prepared by the HR department. The work space

for training is positioned in such a way that all of us are able to communicate with each other easily. Also, the advantage is that we are given the flexibility to learn on our own pace.”

The study reveals that training environment also has a slight impact on continuance commitment. This denotes that employees do take training environment into consideration as one of the cost of leaving an organization. Judging from the overall results, managers should establish a satisfying workplace particularly in training to ignite employee commitment.

4.4.6 Relationship Between Benefits Of Training And Commitment (Hypothesis E)

Table 10 : Correlation Analysis Between Benefits Of Training And Commitment

	r	Significance
Affective Commitment	0.434	0.000 (p<0.01)
Normative Commitment	0.382	0.000 (p<0.01)
Continuance Commitment	0.146	0.019 (p<0.005)
Organizational Commitment	0.441	0.000 (p<0.01)

Employees' assessment of the benefits they could gain from training was found to contribute to commitment. As predicted by Hypothesis E, there is a significant, positive relationship between the recognized benefits of training and all the variables in organizational commitment and the significant level of $p<0.01$ and $p<0.05$.

Based on evidence cited earlier by Nordhaug (1989), employees who reflect positively on training benefits are thought to exhibit stronger feelings of commitment to the organization. The results also suggested that although employees felt loyal to their organization due to the benefits gain in training, there

may also be cases where there is a positive emotional attachment towards their organization that arise independently of obligation or the costs of leaving.

It is rather clear that the more a person learns and acquires skills and knowledge in training, the more likely they would develop a strong bond towards their company. Employees develop a greater desire to remain with their employer due to the self-improvement that they gain from attending training courses.

Although there exist relationship between continuance commitment and benefits in training, the correlation is very weak. It can be assumed that although individual believed that training is advantageous to them, it does not necessarily mean that it will effect their perception on the cost of leaving. Employees do not think that benefits of training play a major role in affecting their decision to stay or leave their companies.

Most of the respondents interviewed agreed that training gave them more understanding, self-confidence, self-satisfaction, strengthen their skills and enhanced their knowledge. They are also more independent at work and have a wider outlook over various matters. While participating in training, they could also interact with colleagues from different department and exchange ideas to improve their performance. One respondent mentioned,

“Training basically gives me a chance to rest and get away from the job for a while. It helps me to meet other people from different departments and gives me the opportunity to exchange some ideas with them, which could of course enhance my knowledge about the company. It also helps to inculcate team spirit in problem-solving activities and improved our leadership qualities.”

Another respondent stated,

"There are a lot of benefits from training and I could go on and on. Perhaps the most important one is that it helps me to improve my supervisory skills and somehow I make better decision and able to manage my subordinates better after attending a training session. Training guides me to a smart working method instead of being semi-productive. It boosts my self-esteem and self-worth when I can benchmark my previous performance with the current one. Training is definitely a good exposure for all of us, not only to develop knowledge and improve our professional know-how, but also a good form of assistance in terms of career advancement. I have received promotion in the past due to the knowledge I gained in training. I would be quite content to work here until I retire actually."

Generally, through training, employees could develop personal satisfaction and improve performance on the job and thus enhance their chance for promotion. Employer could increase the level of commitment among their employees by providing training courses that could help improve employees' performance. In addition, by making it costly for employees to leave, that is when benefits would be lost or acquired skills would be less useful elsewhere, employer could retain commitment from their employees and reduce turnover within their organization.

4.5 STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

The hypothesis testing through Bivariate Correlation analysis reported that there exists significant association between the independent variables of training and the dependent variable, commitment. Unfortunately, the analysis only signifies the association of the variables when analyzed individually. It did not indicate the predictive power of the independent variables when all of the independent variables were taken into account simultaneously. Hence, it was necessary to

perform multivariate analysis by using stepwise multiple regression analysis to examine the important factors that influence each level of commitments. Appendix 6 shows a detailed SPSS result of stepwise regression analysis results.

It should also be noted that the Training Variable 1 includes 'types of training' which is a categorical data. Statistical scholars maintained that multiple regression analysis is suitable for interval and ratio data. However, such limitation is not absolute and should not pose a hindrance in this study. Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973) had suggested that social researchers could treat ordinal data or categorical as interval data, but be consistently alert when interpreting the results. Hence, the types of training can be considered as interval data. The interpretation is as follows:

1 - Informal training – Weak

2 – Formal training – Strong

3 – Both informal and formal training – Very Strong

In addition, prior to conducting the analysis, the variables were ensured to have a normal distribution. Only those variables that have an approximately normal distribution were selected to be included in this analysis. Appendix 5 shows the distribution for each of the variables.

4.5.1 Analysis On Training Variables

The initial part of the stepwise regression analysis is to identify the important factors of training (availability of training, support for training, motivation to learn,

training environment, and benefits of training) that influence each level of commitments.

Table 11 : Stepwise Regression Analysis For Affective Commitment

Step	Training Variables	R Square	Significant R
1	Support for training	0.523	0.000
2	Benefits of training	0.547	0.001
3	Availability of training	0.556	0.041

The data in table 11 shows that three variables entered the regression equation, with 'support for training' being the best criterion. Together, these variables accounted for 55.6 percent of the total variance in affective commitment. Support for training, benefits of training and availability of training were the most important determinants of affective commitment. The remaining independent variables have no significant contribution to the explained variance.

Table 12 : Stepwise Regression Analysis For Normative Commitment

Step	Training Variables	R Square	Significance R
1	Support for training	0.328	0.000
2	Benefits of training	0.349	0.012

Results indicated that there were two variables that have predictive strength on normative commitment. Jointly, these variables explained 34.9 percent of the variability or total variance in normative commitment. Other independent variables failed to meet the selection criteria. This suggests that those who feel they are being encouraged by the management or trainers are more likely to exhibit loyalty to the organization.

Table 13 : Stepwise Regression Analysis For Continuance Commitment

Step	Training Variables	R Square	Significance R
1	Training Environment	0.026	0.020

Only one variable, that is training environment, has been entered into the regression equation. This variable accounted for only 2.6 percent of the total variance in continuance commitment which is very minimal. Therefore, it is expected that conditions of the workplace or surrounding during training have a small impact on the perception of the cost of leaving the organization. The remaining independent variables have made no significant contribution to the explained variance.

Table 14 : Stepwise Regression Analysis For Overall Organizational Commitment

Step	Training Variables	R Square	Significance R
1	Support for training	0.435	0.000
2	Benefits of training	0.467	0.001

Interestingly, support for training was the first to enter into the regression equation. The variable explained 43.5 percent of the variability or total variance in the overall organizational commitment. This was followed by benefits of training. Cumulatively, both variables explained 46.7 percent of the variability in organizational commitment.

Clearly, it can be concluded that the likelihood of being committed to the organization increased when support from top management or subordinates are high. Thus, supervisor or trainer should give feedback or encouragement to trainees and work co-operatively to retain good employees within their organization. Additionally, giving valuable training to employees is an important aspect to consider by trainers or managers.

It is also important to note that when all the training variables were evaluated together, the importance of availability of training, motivation to learn, and training environment in creating organizational commitment is diminished. Hence, these three variables might not be a necessary factor in predicting organizational commitment.

4.5.2 Analysis On Training And Demographic Variables

The second part of the stepwise regression analysis was to identify the important factors that influence each level of commitments when all the factors (training and demographic) were taken into consideration. The findings are as follows :

Table 15 : Stepwise Regression Analysis For Affective Commitment

Step	Training Variables	R Square	Significant R
1	Support for training	0.523	0.000
2	Benefits of training	0.546	0.002
3	Age	0.561	0.010

Table 11 indicated that support for training has been retained as the best predictor for affective commitment. Nevertheless, when demographic variables are taken into consideration, the importance of availability of training is diminished. Instead, age became the third most important factor in determining the emotional attachment one has with their organization. Together, all these variables accounted for 56.1 percent of the total variance.

Table 16 : Stepwise Regression Analysis For Normative Commitment

Step	Training Variables	R Square	Significance R
1	Support for training	0.328	0.000
2	Benefits of training	0.355	0.004
3	Motivation to learn	0.368	0.038

Result shows a rank of four set of predictors to normative commitment. As in the initial analysis, support and benefit of training become the first and second

criterion. Both variables explained 35.5 percent of the total variance of normative commitment.

Motivation appears to be included as the third factor influencing normative commitment. The level of involvement and experiences in training could very well be the main reason these employees remain with their organization.

Table 17 : Stepwise Regression Analysis For Continuance Commitment

Step	Training Variables	R Square	Significance R
1	Training Environment	0.026	0.020
2	Education	0.050	0.025

Training environment was still the most important criteria in explaining continuance commitment. However, the levels of education that employees earned are also listed as an important reason for wanting to stay or leave their organization. Although both predictors are significant, their contribution to the total variance is still weak because only 5 percent was explained.

Table 18 : Stepwise Regression Analysis For Overall Organizational Commitment

Step	Training Variables	R Square	Significance R
1	Support for training	0.435	0.000
2	Benefits of training	0.471	0.000

The final result demonstrated that the most important training factors in determining organizational commitment are still support for training followed by the benefits of training. Jointly, they explained 47.1 percent of the total variance in organizational commitment. With the presence of demographic variables, the value of variance explained both variables seemed to increase.

In view of the fact that support and benefits of training play a key role in commitment, the marginal contribution of these variables, B and Beta scores

were also analyzed (as shown in Appendix 6). With all the variables controlled, support for training emerged as the most excellent predictor of organizational commitment with a B value of 1.277. This suggests that for each additional score on support for training, organizational commitment was increased by 1.277 scores. However, when scores were standardized on the basis of their respective standard deviation, one standard deviation increase in support for training was found to increase organizational commitment by 0.660.

It is important to recognize that the second factor play a major part in increasing commitment among employees too. As stated by several scholars (Donovan, Hannigan, and Crowe, 2001), employees become more confident, open to change and supportive of each other when they achieved the benefits of training. Many respondents made an important comment during interviews. One of them stated,

"Employees of today can no longer afford to be committed to an organization that does not offer them favorable benefits. We are living in a materialistic world where everyone is in competition with each other, we want to be better than others, earn more than our friends, drive better cars, etc. We must be ready to take the risk to find available alternatives to achieve what we want. And when we are content with what a company has to offer, then we would stay. Definitely."

4.6 ONE-WAY BETWEEN GROUPS ANOVA WITH POST-HOC ANALYSIS

The purpose of this analysis was to observe whether there is any significant difference between group means among the demographic variables. In addition, Tukey HSD post-hoc test will be used to determine where the significance lies. Prior to the analysis, several assumptions were verified to ensure the accuracy of the test interpretation. The first assumption is normality. As seen in Appendix 5, there was minimal violation to the assumption of normality. According to

Rodeghier (1996), the normality assumption is not too critical for large sample sizes, but the equality of variance assumption must always be tested. Hence, after analyzing the variables, it was found that the population variances for age, income, and tenure were approximately equal. Thus, the study can proceed with analysis of variance between groups. The results of the analysis are as stated below and the detailed results of SPSS can be found in Appendix 7.

4.6.1 Analysis On Age

Table 19 : ANOVA - Age

Types of commitment	Significance
Affective commitment	0.006
Normative commitment	0.842
Continuance commitment	0.908
Overall Organizational commitment	0.396

From the table above, it can concluded that only affective commitment was significant ($p < 0.05$). Thus, the finding confirmed that affective commitment differs significantly across age group.

Table 20 : Post-Hoc Tests For Age In Affective Commitment

Age (I)	Age (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Significance
<30	40 - 49	- 3.8254*	0.005

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

Results of the post-hoc test indicates that employees who are less than 30 years old have significantly different mean commitment than employees who are between 40 to 49 years old. Mean difference indicates that 40 to 49 years old employees have a higher mean by 3.8254. Thus, older employees have a stronger attachment towards the organization they worked for, as stated by Gallie and White (1993). Therefore, younger and older workers may differ in their orientations toward self, others, and work. The proposition that younger and older workers may view work and self in fundamentally different ways is

supported by several scholars such as Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee (1978).

4.6.2 Analysis On Annual Income

Table 21 : ANOVA – Annual Income

Types of commitment	Significance
Affective commitment	0.017
Normative commitment	0.165
Continuance commitment	0.421
Overall Organizational commitment	0.210

Affective commitment was significant ($p < 0.05$). Thus, affective commitment differs significantly across the income group.

Table 22 : Post-Hoc Tests For Annual Income In Affective Commitment

Income (I)	Income (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Significance
<\$25,000	\$50,001-\$100,000	- 3.1684*	0.003

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

The findings indicated that employees who are earned less than \$25,000 have significantly different mean commitment than employees who earned approximately between the ranges of \$50,000 to \$100,000. Mean difference indicates that employees who earns more than \$50,000 have a higher mean by 3.1684.

This indicates that high income people would invest more effort in a company than lower income people since they are more committed. People who earn 'big money' feel a higher sense of attachment towards their organization in comparison with lower income group. The result can also be seen in a different view where people who are committed, earn more money. Employees would strive their hardest to earn large income. Hence, people are committed because

they want to earn more money to be able to obtain their wants and needs. We must not fail to notice that these employees treat the company problems as their own. Ultimately, it gives them a chance for promotion and to earn higher income.

4.6.3 Analysis On Tenure

Table 23 : ANOVA - Tenure

Types of commitment	Significance
Affective commitment	0.048
Normative commitment	0.772
Continuance commitment	0.002
Overall Organizational commitment	0.202

After proceeding with ANOVA, the results showed that affective and continuance commitment was significant ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, both differ significantly across group.

Table 24 : Post-Hoc Tests For Tenure In Affective Commitment

Tenure (I)	Tenure (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Significance
Less than 1 year	More than 10 years	- 3.4015*	0.033

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

The result of the data implies that the bases for choosing to engage in the behavior were different for the two groups. Employees who work more than 10 years have a significantly higher mean than employees who only work for a year or less. Mean difference indicates that employees with longer tenure have a higher mean by 3.4015. This finding is in line with the result from Table 20 where older people seemed to be more committed employees. It is only likely that people who are older have a longer tenure and this can affect how they feel towards that certain organization. For some people, the organization has become like a family to them.

Table 25 : Post-Hoc Tests For Tenure In Continuance Commitment

Tenure (I)	Tenure (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Significance
Less than 1 year	1-5 years	-1.7226*	0.014
1-5 years	More than 10 years	-2.2036*	0.012

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

In terms of continuance commitment, two groups of means were obtained. One major finding was that employees who work for 1 to 5 years have significantly higher mean than those who work for less than a year. However, the same group of employees (1 to 5 years) has significantly lower means than those employees who work for more than 10 years.