

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH RESULTS

4.1. Summary Statistics of Respondents

All demographic data showed a normal distribution curve consistent with the normal distribution curve of populations in general such as age, race and job categories. Table 4.1. depicts the descriptive analysis of the respondents. We can see that there are 27 (38.6%) male employees and 43 (61.4%) female employees, giving a total of 70 respondents.

Of these 70 respondents, none were aged less than 20 years old, 13 (18.6%) were aged 20-29 years old, 28 (40.0%) were aged 30-39 years old, 26 (37.1%) were aged 40-49 years old and 3 (4.3%) were aged 50-59 years old. None were aged 60 years old and over.

From the data, we can also see that 35 (50.0%) of the respondents were Malays, 22 (31.4%) were Chinese, 11 (15.7%) were Indian and 2 (2.9%)

were Bumiputeras. Of these, 6 (8.6%) of the respondents were administrative staff, 2 (2.9%) were clerical staff, 44 (62.9%) were professionals, 15 (21.4%) were technical staff, 2 (2.9%) were contract workers and 1 (1.4%) had other job functions than categorized. As would be in the healthcare sector, the majority of staff would be professionals such as surgeons, doctors, nurses, physiotherapists and pharmacists to name a few whereas there would be lesser of non-professional employees such as clerical and administrative.

In terms of supervisory responsibility levels, the majority of employees, 48 (68.6%) were not of any supervisory scale whereas 7 (10.0%) were team leaders, 2 (2.9%) were first line supervisors, 10 (14.3%) were managers and 3 (4.3%) were executives. The majority of employees were frontliners such as nurses, nursing aids, wad aids, physicians, medical officers and general practitioners.

The data collected were from 2 major categories of healthcare centers consisting of organizations with sizes of 50-249 employees where 38 (54.3%) of the respondents worked at and 250-999 employees where the remaining 32 (45.7%) worked at. Too small (less than 50 employees) and

too large (more than 1000 employees) would be extreme ends of the healthcare centers.

From the 70 respondents, years with the organization and years with the present job within the organization were also noted. None of the respondents had less than 1 year with the organization, 17 (24.3%) worked for the organization for 1-5 years, 27 (38.6%) worked for 6-10 years, 17 (24.3%) worked 11-15 years, 8 (11.4%) worked for 16-20 years, 1 (1.4%) worked for 21-25 years and none worked for more than 25 years. However, one (1.4%) had less than 1 year with the present job within the organization, 30 (42.9%) had 1-5 years, 25 (35.7%) had 6-10 years, 11 (15.7%) had 11-15 years, 3 (4.3%) had 16-20 years while none worked for more than 20 years in the present job.

Table 4.2. gives a general picture of the normal distribution of the respondents and their means.

**Table 4.1.
Descriptive Study of Demographics of Respondents**

Category	Item	Number	Percentage	Total
Gender	Male	27	38.6	100.0
	Female	43	61.4	
Age	Less than 20	0	0.0	100.0
	20-29 years	13	18.6	
	30-39 years	28	40.0	
	40-49 years	26	37.1	
	50-59 years	3	4.3	
	60/ over	0	0.0	
Race	Malay	35	50.0	100.0
	Chinese	22	31.4	
	Indian	11	15.7	
	Bumiputera	2	2.9	
	Others	0	0.0	
Job category	Administrative	6	8.6	100.0
	Clerical	2	2.9	
	Professional	44	62.9	
	Technician	15	21.4	
	Contract worker	2	2.9	
	Others	1	1.4	
Supervisory level	None	48	68.6	100.0
	Team leader	7	10.0	
	First line supervisor	2	2.9	
	Manager	10	14.3	
	Executive	3	4.3	
Organization size	Fewer than 50 employees	0	0.0	100.0
	50-249 employees	38	54.3	
	250-999 employees	32	45.7	
	1000 or more employees	0	0.0	
Years with organization	Less than 6 months	0	0.0	100.0
	Less than 1 year	0	0.0	
	1-5 years	17	24.3	
	6-10 years	27	38.6	
	11-15 years	17	24.3	
	16-20 years	8	11.4	
	21-25 years	1	1.4	
	Over 25 years	0	0.0	
Years with present job in organization	Less than 6 months	1	1.4	100.0
	Less than 1 year	0	0.0	
	1-5 years	30	42.9	
	6-10 years	25	35.7	
	11-15 years	11	15.7	
	16-20 years	3	4.3	
	21-25 years	0	0.0	
	Over 25 years	0	0.0	

**Table 4.2.
Mean of Demographic Data**

Category	Mean	Item	Category	Mean	Item
Gender	1.61	Female	Supervisory	1.76	Team Leader
Age	3.27	30-39 years	Organization Size	2.45	50-249 employees
Race	1.71	Chinese	Years With Organization	4.27	6-10 years
Job	3.11	Professional	Years With Job	3.79	1-5 years

4.2. Analysis of Measures

All data was found to be normally distributed and equal variances are assumed. Each question was categorized into 11 categories which were tested for correlation and its effect on employee satisfaction. The eleven categories are as follow:

- Rewards/ Recognition
- Development/ Guidance
- Innovation/ Improvement
- Customer Orientation
- Management
- Respect/ Fairness
- Information/ Communication
- Involvement
- Conditions/ Resources

- Work Environment
- Work-Family
- Stress
- Cooperation/ Teamwork
- Planning/ Measurement
- Supervision
- Overall

Table 4.3. shows the relationship between the eleven constructs and employee satisfaction. With the exception of respect and planning, all nine constructs are related linearly with employee satisfaction. Hence I can deduce that these categories (except respect and planning) affect employee satisfaction one way or the other. A test of bivariate correlation shows us the actual relationship between the categories and employee satisfaction whether they are significantly correlated with each other and how they are affect employee satisfaction.

Table 4.3.
Correlation between Categories and Employee Satisfaction

		F	Sig.
Rewards * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	1.822	.152
	Linearity	4.883	.031
Development * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	16.764	.000
	Linearity	39.923	.000
Innovation * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	49.088	.000
	Linearity	145.824	.000
Customer * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	18.850	.000
	Linearity	55.845	.000
Management * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	6.602	.001
	Linearity	19.029	.000
Respect * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	.826	.484
	Linearity	.267	.607
Information * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	13.223	.000
	Linearity	36.444	.000
Involvement * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	26.983	.000
	Linearity	78.211	.000
Conditions * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	9.207	.000
	Linearity	25.553	.000
Environment * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	64.204	.000
	Linearity	191.803	.000
Family * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	148.278	.000
	Linearity	444.695	.000
Stress * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	3.994	.011
	Linearity	10.927	.002
Teamwork * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	36.194	.000
	Linearity	105.751	.000
Planning * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	.907	.443
	Linearity	1.692	.198
Supervision * SATISFACTION	Between Groups (Combined)	2.407	.075
	Linearity	5.945	.017

Using other data assembled from the 10 healthcare centers, it was also found that employee satisfaction is associated with reduced intentions to quit. Since the Pearson correlation here is lesser than 1, this indicates that intentions to quit and employee satisfaction are negatively correlated and the small significance level makes this correlation significantly negatively correlated. Table 4.4. displays this association between quitting and satisfaction.

Table 4.4.
Intentions to Quit and Employee Satisfaction

Pearson Correlations

		SATISFACTION	P74
SATISFACTION	Pearson Correlation	1	-.282(*)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.018
	N	70	70
P74	Pearson Correlation	-.282(*)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.018	.
	N	70	70

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

AS119044639

4.3. Testing of Hypotheses

In order to test the null hypothesis i.e. HIWS would not lead to employee satisfaction at 10 healthcare centers in Malaysia, a correlation analysis was performed on the 10-item construct of HIWS and employee satisfaction. The results of the analysis can be found in Table 4.5. As can be seen, the results provide support to the expectation that HIWS is associated with employee satisfaction. The Pearson correlation coefficient measures the linear relationship between HIWS and employee satisfaction. Since the Pearson correlation here is closer to 1, this indicates that HIWS and employee satisfaction are positively correlated and the small significance level makes this correlation significantly positively correlated.

Kendall's tau-b measures the strength of association between variables measured at the interval level. Since the Kendall's tau-b correlation here is closer to 1, this indicates that HIWS and employee satisfaction are strongly correlated and the small significance level makes this correlation significantly strongly correlated.

Table 4.5.
Correlation of HIWS and Employee Satisfaction

Pearson Correlations

		HIWS	SATISFACTION
HIWS	Pearson Correlation	1	.719(**)
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.000
	N	70	70
SATISFACTION	Pearson Correlation	.719(**)	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.
	N	70	70

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Kendall's tau-b Correlations

			HIWS	SATISFACTION
Kendall's tau_b	HIWS	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.714(**)
		Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.000
		N	70	70
	SATISFACTION	Correlation Coefficient	.714(**)	1.000
		Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.
		N	70	70

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

4.4. Summary of Research Results

The results in this study tallies with the results presented by Harmon et al, 2003. HIWS leads to employee satisfaction which is mediated by several factors such as development, innovation, information, involvement, working conditions, work environment and teamwork. With HIWS leading

to employee satisfaction it also affect outcomes such as intentions to quit and employee turnover.