

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results and discussion according to the constructed hypotheses. The mean and standard deviation of intrinsic values, extrinsic values, ethical work behavior, attitudes towards religious issues at work and overall job satisfaction are presented in Table 4. Mean values of these variables differed significantly between gender except attitudes toward religious issues at work. The Pearson correlation matrix of variables used in the analysis is shown in Table 6.

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Hypotheses were tested using univariate, bivariate and multivariate statistical analysis where ever appropriate.

Hypothesis 1

H₀: There will be no gender differences in intrinsic work values among Malay employees.

H_A: Females' work values are more strongly influenced by non-work factors (intrinsic values) than male work values, which is consistent with the traditional gender role socialization model.

Total scores on intrinsic and extrinsic values did not differ between male and female shown by independent samples t-test in Table 8. The t-tests did not support

any significant differences in mean values of intrinsic values and extrinsic values. Interaction effects were further tested on intrinsic and extrinsic values. Table 9 shows two-way analysis of variance, whereby, the interaction terms were gender*rank, gender*income, gender*children, gender*age. These interactions did not reveal any significant effect in intrinsic values but surprisingly gender*rank appeared to be significant ($F = 9.905$, $p\text{-value} < .01$) in extrinsic values. This finding supports the claim by the social structural model that observed differences in work values reflect men's and women's differential positions in the workplace hierarchy and thus their differential access to the system of the workplace rewards.

Previously, male and female samples differed in several demographic characteristics. To control for the effect of sampling variability on results, analyses of covariance were conducted. Age, children, job tenure and income were treated as covariates. In other words, as gender was addressed as fixed factor, age, children, job tenure and income were entered as covariates in order to determine whether gender makes a difference in the mean values of intrinsic and extrinsic values of the same age, children, job tenure and income. The interaction terms of the main effects were used to analyze assumption of equality (homogeneity) of regression slopes. The interaction terms provide the test of the null hypothesis of the equal slopes. Results shown in Table 11 supported the null hypothesis for the total intrinsic and extrinsic values. Similarly, assumption of equality of regression slopes hold for the 14 statements in intrinsic and extrinsic values.

A summary of means, standard deviations, estimated marginal means and eta square were reported in Table 10. From the analysis of covariance, the index of effect size (eta square) evaluates the proportional amount of the total population variance that is attributed to the variation between gender or simply 'explained variance'. According to Cohen (1977), a 'small' effect size is 0.01, a 'medium' effect size is 0.06 and a large effect size is 0.15 or greater. Total scores on intrinsic and extrinsic values showed no effect sizes but individually, a very small effect is detected in N3 ($\eta^2 = 0.012$) and K7 ($\eta^2 = 0.011$).

From the F-values, results revealed no significant difference between gender on total scores of intrinsic and extrinsic values. However, Table 10 detected 4 out of 14 statements had significant main effect in gender. Of these, one was from intrinsic statements and 3 were on extrinsic statements. After considering the negatively phrased statements, higher score suggested higher intrinsic and extrinsic work values. One intrinsic statement N3 yielded significant differences ($F = 7.027, p < 0.01$). With respect to statement N3 (*one should concentrate on his/her work and ignore other activities at his/her workplace*), female respondents obtained higher scores than male respondents. Significance of N3 provides an indication that female tended to place greater emphasis on working with people and concerned with affective values, consistent with Elizur (1994).

Three extrinsic statements (K1, K2 and K7) showed significant differences between gender. Statement K1 (*even though one has a good job, he/she should find a better job*) and statement K2 (*one should do part time job to increase his/her income*)

will tend to have a greater inclination toward intrinsic work values;
whereas non-religious employees will not exhibit a propensity towards
intrinsic work value

Pearson correlation of the quantitative dependent variables was given in Table 7. Significant correlations were highlighted. Results showed intrinsic values correlated positively with political/societal involvement ($r = 0.073$, $p\text{-value} < .10$), ethical work behavior ($r = 0.276$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), attitudes toward religious issues at work ($r = 0.152$, $p\text{-value} < .10$) and job satisfaction ($r = 0.173$, $p\text{-value} < .01$). Extrinsic values correlated negatively with education ($r = -0.189$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), income ($r = -0.090$, $p\text{-value} < .05$), formal religious education ($r = -0.075$, $p\text{-value} < .10$), informal religious education ($r = -0.113$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), understanding in *amalan* ($r = -0.138$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), political/societal involvement ($r = -0.093$, $p\text{-value} < .05$), intrinsic values ($r = -0.099$, $p\text{-value} < .05$), ethical work behavior ($r = -0.137$, $p\text{-value} < .01$) and attitudes toward religious issues at work ($r = -0.291$, $p\text{-value} < .01$). Most of the significant correlation variables were religious in nature.

Gender-specific multiple linear regression models were estimated to detect any striking similarity or differences in predicting intrinsic and extrinsic values. These models presented in Table 12 and Table 13, used 15 predictors, namely, age, number of children, marital status, education, place of stay, job rank, job tenure, part time job, income, religious education, informal religious education, understanding in '*ibadah*', understanding in '*amalan*', political/societal involvement and Islamic

courses. Gender was added as a dummy variable to the multiple linear regression model, which was further called as the full model.

From the gender-specific models, regressing intrinsic values on the predictors showed only one significant variable, place of stay ($\beta = 0.106$, $p\text{-value} < 0.05$). However, three similar significant variables in Pearson correlation test were found while regressing on extrinsic values, i.e., job rank ($\beta = -0.152$, $p\text{-value} < 0.01$), understanding in '*amalan*' ($\beta = -0.110$, $p\text{-value} < 0.05$) and political/societal involvement ($\beta = -0.110$, $p\text{-value} < 0.05$). Gender remains insignificant in the full model of intrinsic and extrinsic work values.

Significance of place of stay suggests those who stayed in urban area shows higher intrinsic values. Comparing the mean values of demographic variables between urban and rural, Table 20 showed significant differences in children, education, income and understanding in *ibadah/amalan*. On average, family size of urban-dwellers ($M = 2.34$ children) was significantly smaller ($p\text{-value} < .05$) than rural-dwellers ($M = 2.79$ children). Average income of urban-dwellers ($M = \text{RM}1527.56$) was significantly ($p\text{-value} < .001$) higher than rural-dwellers ($M = \text{RM}1019.54$). On average, urban-dwellers ($M = 10.86$) showed significantly ($p\text{-value} < .001$) higher in level of understanding in *ibadah* compared to rural-dwellers ($M = 10.36$). Similarly, urban-dwellers ($M = 13.93$) showed significantly ($p\text{-value} < .10$) higher in level of understanding in *amalan* compared to rural-dwellers ($M = 13.67$). Better facilities and easier accesses to improve religious education in urban area might contribute to the higher level of understanding in *ibadah* and *amalan*. These two significant

religious variables would support the alternative hypothesis. Those who stayed in urban area had higher religious background, thus showed higher intrinsic values.

Results again revealed religious variables as significant predictors in extrinsic values. The negative sign of beta indicates the higher understanding in *amalan*, the lower the extrinsic values. Consistent with study by Harpaz (1998), workers with strong religious workers would positively related the meaning of work to variables of intrinsic orientation and the same workers would negatively related the meaning of work to economic orientation and entitlement norms. Significance of job rank indicates non-officer shows higher extrinsic values than officer. Further analyzing this variable, Table 21 showed significant differences between officer and non-officer in mean values of five demographic variables. On average, non-officer ($M = 3.11$) obtained significantly ($p\text{-value} < .001$) lower level of education compared to officers ($M = 4.87$). Average income of non-officers ($M = \text{RM}1024.76$) was significantly ($p\text{-value} < .001$) lower than officers ($M = \text{RM}1902.15$). Regarding average level of formal religious education, non-officers ($M = 0.70$) significantly ($p\text{-value} < .05$) lower than officers ($M = 0.9720$). Average level of informal religious education of non-officers ($M = 5.48$) was also significantly ($p\text{-value} < .01$) lower than officers ($M = 6.12$). Finally, the average level of understanding in *ibadah* was significantly ($p\text{-value} < 0.01$) lower for non-officers ($M = 10.49$) compared with officers ($M = 10.99$). In other words, higher extrinsic values by non-officer might be due to their low level of religious education and understanding. Again, this argument supports the researcher to reject the null hypothesis.

Gender specific models are shown in Table 13. For male sample, place of stay ($\beta = 0.134$, $p\text{-value} < .05$) and Islamic courses ($\beta = -0.112$, $p\text{-value} < .10$) were found significant towards intrinsic values. Again, place of stay ($\beta = 0.142$, $p\text{-value} < .05$), understanding in *amalan* ($\beta = -0.112$, $p\text{-value} < .10$) and political/societal involvement ($\beta = -0.135$, $p\text{-value} < .05$) appeared as best predictors for extrinsic values.

As for female sample, religious education ($\beta = 0.204$, $p\text{-value} < .05$) showed as best predictors for intrinsic values and rank ($\beta = -0.270$, $p\text{-value} < .05$) for extrinsic values.

No striking differences occurred regarding the significant variables between the gender specific model and full model except for place of stay on extrinsic values (male sample only). The sign of β was positive suggesting male respondents who stayed in urban area would show higher extrinsic values. The mean value of age in urban area was 34.9 years compared to 35.7 years in rural area (Table 20). Furthermore, 63.4% of those who stayed in urban areas were males. This confirmed with Velasco (1998) that young men valued money and other extrinsic rewards in slightly higher proportions than did young women.

For the full model, the predictors explained 3.5% of the variation in intrinsic values and 8.0% of the variation in extrinsic values. Between gender, female sample showed a higher value of R^2 . The predictors explained 10.2% of the variation in intrinsic values compared to 6.4% of the male sample and 14.8% of the variation in extrinsic

values compared to 9.8% of the male sample. In testing whether there was a linear relationship between the dependent variable and the entire set of independent variables, only extrinsic values in the full model and male sample were significant. The full model on extrinsic values showed an F value of 2.162 ($p\text{-value} < 0.01$) and gender specific model on extrinsic values for male sample showed an F value of 1.856 ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$). Measurement for intrinsic values can be arguable to provide reasons behind these low values in goodness of fit for intrinsic models.

Hypothesis 3

H_0 : There is no relationship between religious background and ethical work behavior

H_A : Regardless of gender, employees with strong religious background will demonstrate higher ethical work behavior.

Results in Pearson correlation matrix shown in Table 7 significantly revealed ethical work behavior positively correlated with formal religious education ($r = 0.098$, $p\text{-value} < .05$) and attitudes toward religious issues at work ($r = 0.382$, $p\text{-value} < .01$). Pearson correlation test provides an indication of significant positive relationship between religious background and ethical work behavior.

Multiple linear regression was estimated for ethical work behavior. As shown in Table 14, the predictors were gender, age, number of children, marital, education, place of stay, job rank, job tenure, part-time job, income, formal /informal religious education, understanding in *amalan/ibadah*, political/societal involvement and

courses. From these 16 predictors, job rank and job tenure came out as significant variables for ethical work behavior, with $\beta = 0.127$ ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$) and 0.183 ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$) respectively. F value of 1.641 ($p\text{-value} < 0.10$) indicated a relationship between ethical work behavior and predictors. The model explained only 6.4% of the variance in ethical work behavior. The significance of job rank and job tenure in ethical work behavior regression may suggest that employees of higher rank and have been longer in existing job are more sensitive in work ethics as supported by the significant differences in mean value for formal/informal religious education between ranks. Table 21 showed on average, officers ($M = 0.97$) were significantly ($p\text{-value} < .05$) higher in formal religious education compared with non-officers ($M = 0.70$). Similarly, on average, officers ($M = 6.12$) were significantly ($p\text{-value} < .01$) higher in informal religious education compared with non-officers ($M = 4.8$). Results suggest strong religious background as the reason for higher rank employees to possess positive attitudes toward religious issues at work. Thus, null hypothesis can be statistically substantiated.

hypothesis 4

There is no relationship between religious background and attitudes toward religious issues at work.

Regardless of gender, employees with strong religious background will demonstrate positive attitudes toward religious issues at work.

Attitudes toward religious issues at work showed positive significant correlation with income ($r = 0.101$, $p\text{-value} < .05$), formal religious education ($r =$

112, $p\text{-value} < .01$), informal religious education ($r = 0.085$, $p\text{-value} < .05$), understanding in *amalan* ($r = 0.117$, $p\text{-value} < .05$) and political/societal involvement ($r = 0.155$, $p\text{-value} < .01$). Four out of five variables describing religious background are found to have significant positive relationships with attitudes toward religious issues at work.

Regression attitudes toward religious issues at work with 16 predictors (Table 14), political/societal involvement appeared to be significant with $\beta = 0.137$ ($p\text{-value} < .05$). F-value was 1.999 ($p\text{-value} < .05$) with 8.1% of the variance in religious issue at work was explained by the model. In another analysis, Pearson correlation matrix (Table 6) revealed positive significant relationship between political/societal involvement and formal religious education ($r = 0.113$, $p\text{-value} < .05$). Informal religious education ($r = 0.131$, $p\text{-value} < .01$) showed significant positive relationship with political/societal involvement. Therefore, the null hypothesis is statistically substantiated.

Hypothesis 5

- H_0 : There is no relationship between religious background and job satisfaction.
- H_A : Regardless of gender, employees with strong religious background will demonstrate higher job satisfaction.

Shown in Table 7, overall job satisfaction seems to correlate positively on the intrinsic values ($r = 0.17$, $p\text{-value} < .01$). Here, higher scores revealed higher job

satisfaction, whereby, three points were given to respondents who answered agree, two points to not sure and one point to disagree.

Discriminant analysis techniques were used to classify respondents into satisfied and dissatisfied in job on the basis of a set of measurements. 369 cases (59.6%) were used in this analysis with 250 cases (40.4%) were considered as missing cases. Simply looking at the mean values, indicated that dissatisfied respondents in job were more apt to be male, older, less children, married, more educated, living in rural area, non-officer, lower job tenure, did not had part time job, lower income, lower formal/informal religious education, higher religious understanding, lesser political/societal involvement, lower intrinsic and extrinsic values, lower in ethical work behavior and religious issues at work compared to satisfied respondents. Note that gender, marital, place of stay, job rank and part time job were coded as dummy variables. Thus, the average of 0.7097 indicated that 71% of the dissatisfied group was male.

In Table 15, results revealed only one significant variable among the group means. The high percentage of missing values may explain why the results come out inconsistent. On average, satisfied respondents possessed higher intrinsic values than dissatisfied respondents. Satisfied respondents showed mean value of 17.10 (s.d.=1.1174) in intrinsic values compared to mean value of 16.5269 (s.d.=1.3236) for dissatisfied respondents. Other group means are almost similar suggesting that those insignificant variables may not discriminate well the two groups. Researcher chose 15 variables to classify job satisfaction into two groups. They were gender,

age, children, marital, job rank, part time job, job tenure, income, formal religious education, informal religious education, intrinsic values, ethics, religious issues at work, understanding in *ibadah* and understanding in *amalan*.

Wilks' Lambda shown in Table 16, is the proportion of the total variance in the discriminant scores not explained by differences among the groups. 93.1% of the variable is not explained by group difference. The chi-square of 25.761 (p-value < 0.05) indicated significant difference between the two group centroids. Table 17 provided the standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients since different unit in measurement showed little indication of the relative contribution of the variable to the overall discriminant. Intrinsic work values (0.823) showed the largest effect on the discriminant function followed by job tenure (0.408), informal religious education (0.401), age(-0.362). Job rank (-0.030) showed the smallest effect in the group.

The structure matrix (Table 18) of this sample showed within-groups correlations of each predictor variable with the canonical variable. It provided another way to study the usefulness of each variable in the discriminant function. Intrinsic values (0.764) had the largest correlation with the canonical variable scores followed by informal religious education (0.271), part time job (0.257), ethical work behavior (0.249), formal religious education (0.236) and understanding in *ibadah* (-0.227). Rest of the variables showed very small correlation with the canonical variable scores. The four main demographics characteristics, namely, income, marital status, job rank and age were among the lowest group of variables in the structure matrix. Overall, the

variables could correctly classify 62.9% of all cases between the two groups in job satisfaction. Classification results were given in Table 19. The result suggests that satisfied employees may have higher intrinsic values than dissatisfied employees supported by significant positive correlation between intrinsic values and job satisfaction. The null hypothesis can be statistically rejected suggesting respondents with higher intrinsic values or indirectly, stronger religious education and understanding, will show higher level of job satisfaction.