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ABSTRACT

The primary aim of this research is to examine the generational differences in the engagement model. The study set out to examine the mediating influence of employee engagement in the relations between motivators and consequences, and whether this relationship is moderated by generations. This study consists of two phases. Phase 1 was a one-to-one interview of 63 participants while phase 2 was a survey study of 539 respondents. The unit of analysis is individuals who represent Malaysian employees from different organisations in Peninsular Malaysia. This study is backed by well-established theory from social psychology, the social exchange theory. IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Statistics 20 was used to perform exploratory factor analysis (EFA), reliability tests and preliminary correlation analysis. In addition, IBM SPSS Analysis of Moment Structures (Amos) 18 was used to test the hypotheses of the study. Findings show that there are generational differences in the Malaysia context. There are significant local historical events, work values, expectations, perceptions, behaviours, goal, leadership style and motivators for each generation. Results also show that each generation reacts differently to the motivators of employee engagement. To engage Boomers, employers should focus on reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague, as well as autonomy. For the engagement of Generation X, leaders can consider implementing work-life balance programme, autonomy as well as reward and recognition from the Management. In order to engage Generation Y, what they want is just reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague, as well as work-life balance. It was found that engaged employees from Generation X and Y have lower intention to leave, increased in-role performance and innovative job performance. However, engaged Boomers only displayed increased in-role performance. All these
lead to finding new and more harmonious ways of establishing working relationships and engaging the employees for all generations.
kerja, meningkatkan prestasi dalam peranan kerja serta prestasi kerja inovatif bagi kedua-dua Generasi X dan Y. Walau bagaimanapun, Boomers hanya dapat meningkatkan prestasi dalam peranan kerja. Pendekatan ini telah berjaya mewujudkan hubungan kerja yang harmoni untuk semua generasi.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This research undertakes a study of employee engagement among the three generations within the Malaysian context. Chapter 1 gives an overview of the study layout and concludes with the organisation of chapters for this research report.

1.2 Background of the Study

The business arena is becoming increasingly competitive and organisations are developing strategies to help establish competitive advantage. In their quest to gain an edge over their competitors, organisations realise the need to shower attention upon the executors of the organisational strategies - the employees.

Evidence indicates that engaged employees have positive attitudinal outcomes such as reduced turnover intention and improved job performance. Employees who exhibit greater heights of engagement contribute to their organisations with higher individual task performance (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010) - which naturally contributes towards improved organisational performance. Fundamentally, engaged workers are said to be more innovative, productive and prepared to put in more effort than expected (Arnold & Evangelia, 2008).
Organisational engagement refers to corporate individual members’ attachment to their roles (Kahn, 1990). Two years later, Khan (1992) further describes organisational engagement as behavioural drive into a mental state to be present. According to May, Gilson, and Harter (2004), engaged employees are often completely engrossed in their job and may not realise the duration and effort they have put in. In a nutshell, work engagement refers to a satisfying working mind-set, distinguished by vigour, dedication, and absorption. Vigour not only refers to dynamism but also to mental resilience while at work. Dedication is about being committed in one’s task, with a zeal for working. Absorption in one’s work is characterised by determination and concentration at work, where one is unable to detach from work, is unaware of time passing by and their concentration reflect being married to their job (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-romá, & Bakker, 2002).

Briefly, engaged employees are active and passionate about their work. Therefore, it is important to identify the drivers of work engagement to enjoy the benefits of having an engaged workers. Although, many studies have explored variables that may influence the level of work engagement among employees (Arnold & Evangelia, 2008; Arnold B. Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007; Arnold B. Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008; Bhattacharya & Mukherjee, 2009), most previous studies on work engagement did not address the transforming workforce.

In reality, career dynamics have shifted dramatically over the years. In the past, employees used to remain steadfast to the first organisation they joined and believed in rising through the ranks. Looking at the present trend in organisations, one
cannot help but realise that gone are the days where employees joined and stayed in the same organisation until they retire. Employee’s expectations are changing and so are their work-related attitudes. This is especially evident among the younger generation with most people under the age of 30 changing jobs almost once every one and a half year as compared to the national average of once every three years (Florida, 2009).

In addition to the competitive business platform and shift in career dynamics, the world’s workforce is also facing increasing issues of skills shortages. Failure of attraction, engagement and retention of the right talent will result in non-execution of any organisation’s expansion strategy. Despite its significance, top executives are only able to answer queries on accounting and finance, operations, sales and marketing. When it comes to talent retention, there is uncertainty. Yet, it is the most complicated matter preventing their organisations from achieving maximum success (Boudreau, 2005). For example, if we were to ask top executives today, they are able to quickly point out that managing talent well is their main concern and it is as important as marketing strategies, if not, more critical. At present, decision makers are treating equipment, technology, capital and even unskilled labour as commodities. However, when it comes to talent, such as employee knowledge, experience and wisdom, they are not treated as commodities and therefore cannot be managed as one (Thomas, 2008).

Talent has been high on the agenda of Human Resources (HR) professional over the past few years (Valerie & Wendy, 2008) and the war for talent will continue to be the most important resource for the next 20 years (MacKay, 2005).
Organisations are now willing to pay compelling sign-on bonuses to get the right talent on board. At present, people always keep their options open when it comes to other opportunities (Michaels, Jones & Axelrod, 2001). Being in a business and being in radical structural change, one of the most thought questions is "What can be done to make the business survive and grow, to be precise, the organisation performance?"

In this ever changing world, business processes must accustom to environmental changes to ensure success thus making business thrive. Under radical structural change, one of the alternatives to consider is to have the company undergo an organisational change. A new management team who is able to accept new changes, via radical humanist paradigm needs to be called for. Thus, retaining talent has always been a concern.

Issues of ageing population, retiring baby boomers, migration and globalisation intensify the shortage of talent workers in both technical and professional atmosphere. With the retiring older generations, they bring with them the skills and experience that they have accumulated, leaving the generation with lesser experience behind to take on their roles. Talent has become increasingly pressing in view of the economic expansion coupled with employee shortages as Baby Boomers retire since their total numbers are greater than the cohort that precedes them. Talent, a comprehensive term that covers the whole workforce: from incumbents under fast track career progression or those being groomed for senior positions within the organisation, or currently holding senior positions (Peter, 2008). Talents evolve around the best people. Investing, developing, and building on their potential, full utilisation of their strengths and improving on their weak spots comprise the core of talent management (Valerie & Wendy, 2008). Thus, as far as talent is concerned, it is
important for organisations to retain talented employees crucial to each generation. Hence, to retain talent, employees must be engaged for better organisational performance.

With the transforming workforce, researchers need to address differences in attitudinal outcomes and performance among different categories of employees. After all, employees are the executors of the organisational strategies. Bearing this in mind, this research intends to test the relationship between engagement and outcomes such as turnover intentions, in-role performance, and innovative job performance by comparing it among the different generations.

It is common to read about the generational divide in our local print media (Kam, 2012, Soo, 2010, Foong & Wong, 2009). Generation Y (born from 1981 to 2001) is the largest group after the Boomers and the youngest of all. Statistics show that the number of Generation Y entering the workforce is three times the number of those who were born between 1965 and 1980 or better known as Generation X (Accountants Today, 2010; Bloomberg Business Week, 2005). This number continues to grow a lot faster than other generations (Dries, Pepermans, & De Kerpel, 2008).

Latest available statistics show similar trend in Malaysia where, a youthful workforce, viz Generation Y is becoming part of a workforce that consists of four generations of employees – the Silent Generation, Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y. In fact, Generation Y represents a big portion of the workforce pie and their number is growing steadily (Statistics Department of Malaysia, 2010). The entrance of Generation Y in the Malaysian workforce environment has not only added
to the diversity at the workplace but also contributed to the issue of generational divide.

With the noticeable generational divide, the issue of generational conflict is gaining prominence. Generational conflict among employees at the workplace is not new. Leaders in most organisations are aware of it, albeit few are willing to address such conflicts. With the increasing number of Generation Y employees, in the workforce, the gap in work attitudes and behaviour characteristics between the younger and older generation continues to widen. However, problems that arise from generational differences cannot be resolved overnight. If resentment between the older and younger generations, (as they differ in their work and life values), is not resolved amicably, there may be friction or chaos at the workplace.

These cohorts, each with their peculiar characteristics are now working side-by-side; requiring today’s business leaders to re-examine how to respond effectively to the specific needs of each generation so as to motivate them to be more engaged in their jobs, avoid conflicts between them, and improve understanding between the generations for better functioning and more profitable organisations.

Mathematically, generation relates to both year and age. As stated by Kupperschmidt (2000), generation refers to identifiable group based on birth year and thus shares major life events that happened during their formative years. A generation or cohort generally covers a period of twenty years (Sayers, 2007). In retrospect, a generation is a group of people with approximately the same age surroundings who have experienced the same historical life events or circumstances within that period.
After completing their secondary education, they leave school and enter the workforce, build their career and settle down, start their families or retire about the same time. They experienced similar major world events (the difficulties), which have shaped them into unique human beings or employees. Generation is not to be confused with age where the latter generally refers to a person’s “age” in a generation.

While it is important not to stereotype individuals because of age groupings, it is imperative to understand the characteristics, values and strengths that each generation has. Acknowledgement of these generational differences can improve the work environment and thus minimise disagreement at work. People may vary from era to era (Howe & Strauss, 2007). Millennial or Generation Y, born from 1981 to 2001, are generally optimistic, enjoy teamwork, the most educated of all, civic-minded and confident. Generation X (frequently referred to Baby Boomers’ children who were born from 1965 to 1980) comes mostly from dual income families with relationship differences and growing divorce rates. Thus, Generation X is independent and self-reliant as compared to Generation Y (Howe & Strauss, 2007). The Boomers, born from 1946 to 1964, are socially matured; keen and high on job involvement and demonstrate strong work ethics (Kupperschmidt, 2000). Finally, Silent Generation (born from 1925 to 1945) prefers job security to entrepreneurship. This generation consists of individuals who are generally cautious, unadventurous, and are inward-focused. They tend to serve as facilitators and trendsetters, but not as leaders (Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000).

Clashes happen as each generation brings with them a different set of beliefs, values, and attitudes to work. Disagreements arise, as each generation has different
work styles and communication preferences. Every cohort has his or her own views, expectations, and perceptions. This research more deeply into these differences, looks into the varied generational views based on the core values of job characteristics, reward and recognition; and work-life balance. In addition, this research looks into the recently introduced concept of work engagement of different generational cohorts at work. The purpose is to examine whether different generations express different needs in the workplace, and subsequently, looking into creating key engagement strategies based on these generational needs.

In line with the prime working age of Generation X (born 1965 – 1980) and world population statistics, this research expects to have most of its respondents streaming from Generation X, followed by Generation Y (1981 – 1995), and Boomers (born 1946 – 1964). The Silent Generation, who has passed their retirement age, will be omitted as although they were still being employed, they will fall under contract group.

When it comes to workforce statistics, the latest available statistics show that Malaysia has similar trend in demographics (Statistics Department of Malaysia, 2010), compared to the statistics from the International Labour Organisation (2009). Workforce demography may not be the exact science, but it serves as a core in workforce planning (Thomas, 2008). Both statistics in Figure 1.1, from Malaysia and Figure 1.2, from International Labour Organisation clearly show that the world workforce trend is getting younger, the average age of workers is steadily declining and more and more young people are taking up important skilled jobs in key areas.
Thus, it is crucial to revisit strategies to connect with the younger workforce for greater productivity, as they will be the future runners of any organisation.

Figure 1.1: Ten Years Comparison on Distribution of Malaysian Workforce by Generation

Source: Statistics Department of Malaysia (2010)

Note: There is no available statistics for the Silent Generation, as employment status will normally change from permanent to contractual upon retirement in most companies. The age span for both Generation Y and X is 15 years while the span for Boomers in the figure 1.1 is 20 years.
As can be seen from Figures 1.1 and 1.2, the trend of Malaysian’s demographic is similar to that of the world’s population. Generation Y seems higher in the world population as this figure includes those who are still pursuing their studies whereas the Malaysia’s graph shows only those who are economically active. The same thing goes for the Boomers where the world population includes those who are no longer in the workforce. The numbers are increasing, as there is improvement on the world’s life span in general. With reference to Figure 1.1, it is evident that Generation Y has not overtook Generation X yet as most of them are still studying and yet to join the workforce. However, the trend indicates that they are narrowing the gap and soon they will represent the largest segment in the workforce. This implies that the Malaysian workforce is becoming more diverse with employees from various generations. Therefore, in line with the transforming workforce, it is hoped that this
study can shed some light on how to engage and retain employees from different
generations especially when they have unique expectations and characteristics.

1.3 Rationale for the Study

Much focus has been on engagement in recent years and Malaysia is no exception. Many claim that engagement predicts employee outcomes (Alarcon & Edwards, 2011; Alarcon & Lyons, 2011; De Lange, De Witte, & Notelaers, 2008; Hermsen & Rosser, 2008; Ho, Sze-Sze, & Chay Hoon, 2011; Kamalanabhan, Sai, & Mayuri, 2009) and critical business outcomes (Harter, Schmidt, Killham, & Agrawal, 2009; Matthew, 2008; Trahant, 2009; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009). Significant research has been conducted concerning understanding of engagement at workforce, the goal of this research is to expand the current knowledge base by creating a link between generation cohort and employee engagement since studies (Arnold & Evangelia, 2008; Bhattacharya & Mukherjee, 2009) seldom take into consideration potential differences among employees of various age groups. Examining multiple generations within the workplace is crucial as age demographics within the workforce have somewhat changed in the past few decades (Pitt-Catsouphes & Smyer, 2007) and each generation brings different beliefs, values, and perspectives. As the saying goes, one size does not fit all. There is a study, which shows that at least a quarter of Generation Y employees are disengaged globally with the exception of India (BlessingWhite, 2008). The low engagement of Generation Y may be the result of their different values and attitudes towards work. Thus, leaders need to look into the factors that lead to engagement
from the perspectives of each generation. Otherwise, non-engagement or even disengagement may be almost inevitable.

The benefits of this research are twofold. Firstly, this research intends to establish engagement as the mediator between work motivators and work outcomes. Secondly, this research explores the different views in the multigenerational work environment to enable different generations to work cohesively. The findings of this research will help organisations address important factors needed to help improve the level of employee engagement from different generations and subsequently reduce loss of talent (turnover), and improve performance.

1.4 Social Exchange Theory

Employers want engaged employees because they deliver improved business performance. Engagement is not about driving employees to work harder, but it is about providing a work environment that makes them want to put in more effort and work more effectively. All these relate to human interaction and the best theory to explain these interactions is through social exchange theory, the model used in this research. This social exchange theory framework is often used for the understanding of human interaction (Homans, 1961). It is built on the premise that people interact with the expectation that each person will be provided with a resource that the other perceives as valuable. Essentially, people enter relationships with the expectation of receiving some kind of benefit or reward. This voluntary exchange of sources and benefit is social exchange. These resources can be material goods such as money, clothing, or jewellery, or they can be social goods such as trust, approval, support, and
love. If individuals do not feel that they are gaining or benefiting from the relationship, they are unlikely to respond with care and attention (Byrd, 2006). In this research, each generation works for an organisation in exchange for monetary and or non-monetary benefits. On the other hand, organisation expects some contribution from the employee. Social exchange theory looks at the process of establishing and sustaining reciprocity between parties, or the mutual fulfilment.

1.5 Problem Statement

Talent has been high on Human Resource (HR) professional’s agenda over the past few years (Valerie & Wendy, 2008) and will be the most important resource for the next 20 years (MacKay, 2005). The Prime Minister of Malaysia, Datuk Seri Najib Tun Razak announced the establishment of Talent Corporation Malaysia (Talent Corp) under 2011 budget in accordance to the National Transformation Policy 2011 – 2020. The aim is to boost the number of qualified and talented workers in the country in time for the nation to achieve a high-income economy by 2020. This clearly highlights the importance of talent to sustain in today’s global competitive market. Staying competitive does not limit to enhancing cost efficiency, but includes managing intellectual property of an organisation. Knowledge based environment forms the highest value of intangible assets (Bryan & Joyce, 2007). On average, across all industries, only twenty to thirty percent of a company’s worth comes from tangible assets (Cheese, Thormas & Craig, 2008). The greater part of a typical companies’ value comes from knowledge (intangible resources) which resides within the people in the organisation.
Talent retention in today’s global economy is crucial for all organisations. It is a key pillar for success: without talent, corporate performance is inhibited. The costs and damaging effect of attrition are major concerns for organisations. Employee turnover is a concern when the best and the brightest leave. Direct costs include recruitment, selection, and training of new employees. Indirect costs include stress faced by employees who stay on, reduced productivity, and low morale for organisations, can cost as much as two years’ pay and benefits (Ramlall, 2004). The morale of those who stayed behind will be low as they feel the need to leave the company, as their workload is often heavier. The newly appointed employee must be trained and time is required for the employee to adapt to the organisation. This also negatively affects the staff morale. The amount of money and time invested in each individual for training is huge. Sadly, this investment goes to waste when the individual leaves and takes his or her knowledge with them. Hence, with talented employees being mobile and willing to change jobs frequently to meet their expectations, organisations need to pay closer attention to retention of these talented employees (Spherion, 2010).

Coupled with retiring older cohorts, the world’s workforce is facing a number of growing issues such as skills shortages that have made talent a top priority (Thomas, 2008). A greater challenge in attracting the right talent and retaining them involves understanding what makes them tick. Several studies demonstrated that differences in attitudes towards work are explainable because of generational differences (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Smola & Sutton, 2002). This is especially true as individuals from each generation have distinct values, attitudes, behaviours, and expectations (Crampton & Hodge, 2007). Understanding these differences is
crucial in understanding how to manage and attract talent from different generational groups (Cheese, et al, 2008).

The need for organisations to attract, motivate, and retain the best talent suggests that they need to change the way they recruit and provide benefits that actively include employees from all generations (Jenkins, 2008). In other words, organisations need to keep in mind generational differences when dealing with its employees. As each generation has its own values and attitudes towards work (Jenkins, 2008), it is likely that talented employees will respond differently. According to Meriac, Woehr, and Banister (2010), the work profiles were not similar across cohorts, indicating that it may not operate in the same manner across groups.

Despite reviews of these differences, relatively few empirical studies have examined the equivalence of constructs across generational cohorts. As per Crumpacker and Crumpacker (2007), understanding of generational values and attitudes within the workplace can be strategically useful for organisations. Of late, there has been emerging interest from both researchers and practitioners on engagement. Researchers have been looking at what constitutes engagement, its consequences, or both its antecedents and consequences. On the other hand, practitioners have been using engagement as a tool to engage employees and linking the results to critical business outcomes. As postulated by Ulrich (1997), organisations need to engage the body, mind and soul of every employee to ensure attainment of employee’s contribution.
This research will take a holistic view of engagement since engaged employees contribute to the bottom line, organisation performance, and they tend to stay longer, which, in turn, leads to talent retention. By looking at these perspectives together, it will be able to shed more light on engagement processes. It is imperative that scholarly research be completed to examine the differences in generations in the Malaysian context, what engages them and what really matters to each generation. It seems that employee engagement makes a difference at the individual, team, and organisational levels, yet there is lack of studies in relation to engagement for each generational group. This paper seeks to contribute to the theoretical and practical body of knowledge by examining the characteristics of each generation and the strategic implications for the Management in the current dynamic workplace comprised of three generations. This research will examine the strength of the engagement model and whether it is different for each generational group.

1.6 Significance of Study

Managing a diverse workforce can be very challenging to most corporations. Understanding the peculiarities of work behaviours and attitudes of employees is necessary to ensure harmony and cooperation between employees as well as between the employees and management. Past literature highlights several differences and similarities between the expectations and perceptions of different generations of employees (Tay, 2011; J. M. Twenge, 2010). Howe and Strauss (1991) in particular suggests that historical events, socio-economic, and political factors could shape the characteristics of four generational cohorts such as the Silent Generation, Baby Boomers, Generation X (Gen X) and Generation Y (Gen Y). Most of these studies
were documented in developed economies (Debra, Kenneth, & Terry, 2008; Diane, 2000; Ridley, 2004). For example, although there are 11 million working individuals, and they represent at least three generational cohorts in Malaysia, not much is known about them. About 34% of the Malaysian workforce is from Generation Y (Statistics Department of Malaysia, 2010). Some older generation of employees have intuitively and sometimes unfairly described the younger generation as different and vice versa (Lesser & Rivera, 2006). A better understanding of values and beliefs held by different generations is needed through systematic research providing additional knowledge related to the values of Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y.

This research hopes to map a new world by extending an engagement model for each generation. This study expects to give a better insight into new ways towards organisation performance through engagement - a learning paradigm in both theory and practice.

1.7 Research Objectives

1.7.1 General Objectives

The purpose of this research was to examine the influence of generational differences on the engagement model. The study hopes to develop generation specific engagement models that can facilitate the closing of generational gaps helping organisations to retain talent capable of driving organisation performance.
1.7.2 Specific Objectives

1. To understand the work preferences and values of each generation in the Malaysian context.

2. To investigate the relationship between (a) motivators (job characteristics, reward and recognition, and work-life balance) and consequences (intention to leave, in-role performance, and innovative job performance), (b) motivators and employee engagement, and (c) employee engagement and consequences.

3. To identify differences of the engagement model for each generation cohort.

1.8 Research Assumption

It is assumed that all respondents are rationale and capable of feeling engaged at workplace. Rationality enables individuals to understand their respective organisation’s strategic goals and values so that they can fit in. Respondents are also assumed not to suffer from adult Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) as it severely diminishes the relationship between engagement and higher performance. They are less capable in focusing on their resources on practical outcomes and comprehension such job performance (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2010). Individual who suffers from ADHD shows inattention and easily gets distracted will less lightly to complete the interview session or the questionnaire.
1.9 Thesis Organisation

This report is organised into six chapters, references and appendices. Report outline is as follows:

- Chapter 1 - Introduction
  
  Chapter 1 provides a study prologue on generational issues, engagement and talents. This chapter includes discussions on problem statement, significance of the study followed by objectives of the research.

- Chapter 2 – Literature Review
  
  This chapter serves to provide comprehensive literature based on existing research on generations and engagement, which includes engagement tools for better understanding of the scope of research. This chapter touches on promising relationships of the antecedents, mediators, and consequences of the engagement model.

- Chapter 3 – Theoretical Framework
  
  This chapter delves further into the research constructs and their relationships in the engagement model.

- Chapter 4 - Methodology
  
  Chapter 4 outlines methodology and techniques used in this study. This description includes the research design, setting, sample, sampling method and data collection procedures. This chapter also describes and discusses the
research instruments used to measure the variables, pilot test, and analysis of data.

- **Chapter 5 – Findings and Data Analysis**
  
  Chapter 5 presents findings from data gathered from both face-to-face interviews and quantitative methods. Reliability of the instruments is presented using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha.

- **Chapter 6 – Discussion and Conclusion**
  
  Chapter 6 concludes the report by discussing the contributions of research findings and limitations. This chapter also highlights possible future research that could be undertaken to further advance the contribution to knowledge presented in this report.

**1.10 Chapter Summary**

This chapter concludes with an overview of issues and rationale for this study. The research objectives, scope, and significance of the study has been outlined clearly in this chapter. Chapter 2 will now commence the discussion of the research literature, which continues into Chapter 3.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will review the literature related to the variables of this study. Subsequently, the relationship between employee engagement and employee performance is discussed. Finally, the chapter concludes with the characteristics of each generation and the moderating influence of generational differences on the employee engagement - employee performance relationship.

2.2 Intention to Leave

Employee turnover is not only common phenomenon in the West but is also apparent in Asian countries such as Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan (Chang, 1996; Barnett, 1995; Syrett, 1994). HayGroup reported that 2012 has the highest attrition rate since 2009. Towers Watson in their survey in Talent Management and Rewards 2012 – 2013 found that employers globally are finding it difficult in attracting and retaining the high potential employees. Almost six in ten companies report difficulty in retaining critical-skill employees with similar proportions for high-potential employees and top performers. Ability to retain employees reveals a lot about the health of an organisation and is crucial to a company’s success. Talent retention is necessary to increase global competitiveness. Managers and researchers consider turnover a setback as it calls for solution and
involves costs – monetary and time (Noor & Maad, 2008; Contino, 2002; Bonn, 1997; Tai & Bame, 1996; Lucas, Atwood, & Hagaman, 1993). In other words, the loss is not only limited to costly candidate search (Villanueva & Djurkovic, 2009) but also causes a lost in training time, investment as well as knowledge. A steady, productive employee also reduces the need for temporary staff. In addition, retention is also important for another reason, as over the next few years where Baby Boomers begin to retire; the younger generations who may have lesser work experience will take on the roles previously held by the Boomers.

Intention to leave precedes actual employee turnover. During this stage, the thought of leaving the organisation takes place. Thus, to reduce cost, minimising employees’ intention to leave is desirable. Whilst actual quitting is the main concern to both employers and researchers, intention to leave is said to be the best indicator of future turnover (Noor & Maad, 2008; Futrell & Parasuraman, 1984; Mowday, Koberg, & McArthur, 1984). According to the theory of attitudes, the best predictor of an individual’s behaviour is the intention itself (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Intent may directly lead to leaving for certain individuals; while for others, it will act indirectly through the initiation of a job search and exploration of options. Therefore, turnover intentions must be taken into account when attempting to control attrition.

According to a meta-analysis, turnover correlates with external, work-related, and personal factors (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986). Work-related factors such as pay or remuneration are said to have high negative correlations with turnover intention in most studies (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986). On the other hand, personal factors such as age is acknowledged to be negatively correlated with turnover intentions (James & James,
Therefore, this study takes into consideration of both work-related and personal factors. Work-related factors considered in this study include job characteristics, reward and recognition, and work-life balance. In contrast, personal factors considered the unique attitudes that each generation brings with them.

As this is not a longitudinal study, age can be translated into generation. This helps to explain the current phenomena where it is common to observe the younger generations changing jobs more frequently than their predecessors do. This may also be explained by what they experienced. Rampant downsizing in the late 1980s and 1990s has affected the attitudes of both younger and older workers although the mechanisms may differ. Younger employees began their careers at a time when traditional notions of job security and linear upward promotion had been demolished by radical restructuring and downsizing (Fryer, 1998; Tulgan, 2000). Many saw their parents’ expectations for job security dissipate. As a result, they tend to view jobs as short-term rather than stable commitments.

2.3 Job Performance

All organisations aspire to attain high performance rating. With Malaysia placed at number 16 (a slip from the 10th position in 2010) in the recent World Competitiveness Report 2011 from the Geneva based Institute for Management Development (IMD), organisations are under great pressure to perform. This achievement represents the overall scoreboard of the many organisations in Malaysia where job performance has turn out to be one of the significant indicators in gauging organisational performance (Wall et al., 2004).
Job performance, a multidimensional construct, is about how well an individual performs his/her job. In this study, engagement is looked at as a predictor whilst job performance as a consequence. Campbell, McHenry, and Wise (1990) describe this variable as an individual level variable, as job performance relates to outcomes from what an individual employee does. In this research, two dimensions of job performance are considered - in-role performance (also known as core task performance), and innovative performance.

**In-role Performance and Innovative Performance**

Engaged employees are prone to devoting their time and resources in job performance, both in-role and extra role performance (Halbesleben, Harvey & Bolina, 2009; Macey & Schneider, 2008). Task performance can be defined as the proficiency in which formally recognised and prescribed activities for a job are performed. It is distinguished by quality of work done, quantity of work performed, and interpersonal effectiveness. In short, it is defined as the performance on those activities related to one's core job role (Ng & Feldman, 2008). For example, a recruitment executive’s core task performance is assessed by timely placement of the right staff to the right job. There are also studies on the relationship between age and performance. A meta-analysis on 115 studies found inverted U-shape relationship between age and job performance (Sturman, 2003).

Innovative performance plays a critical role in competitive advantage sustainability and competing through innovation takes time. Leaders need to identify, develop and hone the skills that represent the antecedent of innovation. Innovation is
defined as a newly perceived idea or object by an individual or an agency (Robertson & Yu, 2001; Rogers, 1995). It consists of certain technical knowledge on how things can be improved (Tyler, 2001). Innovativeness - an entrepreneurial behaviour is said to enhance prospects of breakthrough or identifying a new market segment (Slater & Narver, 2000; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996) as current global competitive surroundings have made it almost impossible for organisations to continue with the traditional ways to perform their activities (Herbig, 1995). As far as Global Competitiveness Index 2012 - 2013 is concerned, Malaysia is currently placed at a transition period of efficiency driven economies to innovation driven economies. Thus, to stay competitive, innovation has become an instrument that drives organisations away from complacency and beyond maintenance of status quo.

Organisations’ innovativeness consists of different dimensions; human resource management practices (Bear & Frese, 2002), processes (Victor et al, 2000), work organisation; and product innovativeness valued by the customers (Harmsen et al, 2000). The importance of innovation has well been accepted and can be seen in recent decades where there has been a surge in patenting (Hall, 2004). Organisations have been putting in efforts to work on innovation to increase its efficiency and establish secure competitive positions by leveraging the workforce. All this boils down to the individual innovativeness of employees.

2.3 **Employee Engagement**

Progressively more and more companies are searching for cost effective methods to improve organisational performance. Organisations have to realise that
engaged employees tend to remain with the organisation and are better performers. Employee engagement has recently become an extensively used term at workplace (Halbesleben, 2011; Robinson, Perryman & Hayday, 2004). Retaining the top performers has been increasingly viewed as imperative in today’s highly competitive environment. Engagement outcomes are of utmost importance since they are linked to countless positive results (Bakker, Albrecht & Leiter, 2011). Talent Management and Rewards Survey 2012 – 2013 carried out by Towers Watson Financially found that high-performing organisations as exemplars of engagement. Kahn (1990) first conceptualised work engagement as employees binding into their roles as opposed to job involvement, a similar concept, but defined as psychological identification with a job (Kanungo, 1982) and organisational commitment, a concept where there is a sense of belongingness to one’s organisation (Brown, 1996). According to Kahn (1990), an employee is considered engaged when he / she is physically, cognitively, and emotionally attached. In nonprofessional terms, it simply means that an employee works with passion. Despite Kahn’s work on engagement, the construct was not examined in depth.

Reintroduction of the concept only happened when research on burnout surfaced. An employee who does not experience burnout is an engaged employee. Albeit engagement is conceptualised as direct opposite of burnout, it is not to be assumed that it has the reverse profile of Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI scores) (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Nevertheless, employee engagement refers to the commitment in accomplishing the assigned work. Engaged employees are concerned about the success of the company. They make effort to attain the mission and vision of an organisation. Engagement is seen as keen interest in ownership where
employees want to put in their best effort to achieve overall organisation success as a whole.

The term, employee engagement is now in the business community radar as many claim that it forecasts individual performance, organisational performance, and fiscal performance (Bates, 2004; Baumruk, 2004; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Richman, 2006). This is also in line with the surveys carried out by consulting firms (Debunking the Myths of Employee Engagement, 2006; Employee Engagement Report 2006, 2006; Gebauer, 2006). This translates to observable business outcomes, for example, reduction in talent attrition; better relationship with customers and team, and better business unit as well as enterprise-level performance.

2.3.1 Measurement of Employee Engagement

Measurement of employee engagement is widespread whereby organisations may opt for off-the-shelf employee engagement instruments. Table 2.1 lists some of the popular instruments available in the market:

Table 2.1: Popular Employee Engagement Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Scale / Instrument Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTRECHT University, Netherlands</td>
<td>UTRECHT Work Engagement Scale (UWES) or better known as UWES-9</td>
<td>9-item scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gallup Organisation</td>
<td>Gallup Workplace Audit or better known as Q12</td>
<td>12-item questionnaire with an additional item measuring overall job satisfaction (Harter et al., 2002).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.1: Popular Employee Engagement Measurement (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Scale / Instrument Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**UTRECHT Work Engagement Scale (UWES)**

UWES or the abridged version UWES-9 is used in this research. This is a 9-items scale (Appendix 1) using a 7-point Likert type scale. The initial instrument consists of a 24-items scale, which was later reduced to 17-items scale, and then 15-items and recently, 9-items as the weak items were removed. This scale is available in numerous languages and used by various working groups (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). As expected, this scale measures vigour, dedication, and absorption; the work engagement dimensions of Schaufeli. In this abridged scale, there are three items per dimension (Seppälä et al., 2009).
The Gallup Organisation

Gallop defines employee engagement as desirable organisational results predictors (Luthans & Harvie, 2002). This measurement is currently used by SCOPE International Malaysia, the first Global Shared Services Centre of an international bank in Malaysia, a subsidiary of Standard Chartered Bank, United Kingdom. The Q12 is found in Appendix 2. The engagement index groups employees into one of three categories:

- Engaged employees are obsessed in work and have deep association with the organisation they work for. They exert effort to drive the organisation forward.
- Disengaged employees are detached employees. They are physically in the office but lack passion.
- Actively disengaged employees look gloomy at work and they act out their dissatisfaction. They disrespect and undermine their engaged co-workers accomplishment(s) on a daily basis.

Development Dimensions International (DDI)

DDI is a consulting firm specialising in talent management. Employee engagement is assessed with DDI’s (2005) E3 survey tool. E3 is a 17-items standardised survey used to assess employee engagement across large populations, small teams, or individuals. The survey (Appendix 3) is organised into five key engagement elements: (1) align efforts with strategy, (2) empowerment, (3) teamwork and collaboration, (4) development plans, and (5) support and recognition.
According to CLC Managing Director Jean Martin, highly engaged organisations are likely to reduce attrition by 87% and improve employee performance by 20%. Employee Engagement Survey and Analysis Tool (ESAT) report is designed to answer the following four questions:

1. How engaged or disengaged are your employees, and are they engaged in the ways that matter most for performance and retention?
2. How does engagement vary throughout your workforce? Are some employees more engaged than others?
3. Are your employees more (or less) engaged than employees in other organisations? What employee segments are at risk?
4. How can you improve the engagement of your current employees?

Mercer Employee Engagement Toolkit (MEET) consists of 125 questions categorised into 13 dimensions. The dimensions are work processes, quality and customer focus, benefits, communication, work / life balance, job security and career growth, teamwork and cooperation, ethics and integrity, immediate manager, performance management, compensation, leadership and direction, and, training and development.

Mercer research reveals that the following questions are the best forecaster of employee engagement: I feel a strong sense of commitment to this company, I am not
considering leaving this company in the next 12 months, I am proud to work for this company, I am willing to "go over and beyond" in my job to help this company be successful, and, I would recommend my organisation to others as a good place to work.

These tools were reviewed and UWES measurement has been chosen for this study. UWES is the most widely used and this is backed by having the same measurement that has been translated into 20 languages. More importantly is the established construct validity, which indicates high correlation to the theorised construct of engagement (Seppälä et al., 2009). The instrument also appears to be internally consistent and show good factorial validity across different occupational groups, countries, and cultures (Schaufeli, Martínez, Marques Pinto, Salanova & Bakker, 2002). Using an instrument that is consistent across occupational groups is an important feature in this research as respondents come from different industries. In addition, its good construct validity also means that work engagement can be empirically separated from burnout and workaholism (Schaufeli, Taris & van Rhenen, 2008). Besides, UWES structure covers all three dimensions of employee engagement. Firstly, the cognitive dimension, identified as absorption in the construct. Secondly, the emotional dimension manifested as dedication. Thirdly, the physical dimension denotes vigour (Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006). Lastly, UWES is commonly used within the academic literature (Langelaan, Bakker, van Doornen, & Schaufeli, 2006; Mauno, Kinnunen, & Ruokolainen, 2007; Rothmann & Jordaan, 2006; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Storm & Rothmann, 2003) as compared to other measurements.
A review of Q12, the next popular measurement is more of a management tool where it is normally used to create changes at workplace. A closer look at the items reviewed that it measures employee’s satisfaction, enthusiasm, and perceived level of resources in an employee’s job. This is in line with findings from Bhatnagar (2007) where the researcher found that items from Q12 are contaminated with concepts such as employee satisfaction, commitment, and involvement. Thus, further work is required to determine the validity of this measure. Analysis was also carried out by Harter et al. (2002), where the correlation between the measurement and overall job satisfaction is very high, .77. Moreover, satisfaction is assessed with a single item of “How satisfied are you with <name of company> as a place to work?”

2.4 Employee Engagement for Better Employee Performance

When an individual joins a company, he / she is normally enthusiastic about the job. As time goes by, the employee slowly disengages. Even when the comparison is made with those who have just joined, it is obvious that engaged employees seem to be more effective and prepared to go further. Globally, 65% of full-time employees are not highly engaged (Towers Watson, 2012). It is said that there are at least four rationales why engaged employees do better. Firstly, engaged employees possess positive emotions and this feeling continues to be with them even after working in the same organisation for some time; fewer health complaints; higher ability to perform their job by gathering resources; and capability to infect others with their commitment. Work engagement plays a part to organisation’s bottom line, better job performance (A. B. Bakker & Bal, 2010; Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010;
Xanthopoulou et al., 2009) as well as company performance and customer satisfaction (Arnold & Evangelia, 2008).

Positive Emotions

Employees who are connected to their organisation often portray positive vibes, with a sense of belonging and thus more productive. The positive presence makes them happier, more enthusiastic and effective plus have better physical health. Contented employees are more sociable and ready to lend a helping hand to colleagues and are more confident (Cropanzano & Wright, 2001). In an organisational context, when ratio of positive to negative feelings is comparatively elevated during discussions, they tend to raise more questions and give more support, ensuing improved performance (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005).

Good Health

Research states that engagement has positive relationship to health. Hence, engaged employees are capable of better performance. They also report fewer emotional complaints (Demerouti, Bakker, De Jonge, Janssen & Schaufeli, 2001; Shirom, 2003).
Ability to Mobilise Resources

Engaged employees are able to decide which specific resource(s) can be used to apply to which specific type of work. They also get the resources to work, as their minds are always alert at work with a positive attitude.

Crossover of Engagement

Having engaged employees at work is important. Their positive outlook can influence other team members and it is undeniable that organisation performance is the end-result of collective effort of individuals. If colleagues are able to influence each other through work engagement, they will have better team and hence better work performance.

2.5 Job Characteristics

Job characteristics construct was examined in this research as the theory of job characteristics was built upon the premise that specific core job characteristics must exist in work settings to produce job outcomes of high job performance and low turnover, which are the consequences measured in this research. In addition, there were attempts made to determine if characteristics of a job are related to employee behaviour (Boonzaier, Bernhard & Braam, 2001; De Jong, Mandy & Jansen, 2001). Latest study by Sultan (2012) found that the five core job characteristics are effective predictors of employees’ work motivation.
Hence, job characteristics model, designed by Hackman and Oldham is being looked at. This model emerged from the idea that work itself is the answer to employee driving force. In general, a dull work stifles motivation, whereas a challenging job boosts motivation. According to Hackman and Oldham (1980), work, which stir employees’ performance and satisfaction demonstrate five core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significant, autonomy and feedback) as shown in Figure 2.1. These core characteristics will then affect employees’ critical psychological states in reactions to their jobs. Each core characteristic affects a particular psychological state. The first group of job characteristics, that is skill variety, task identity, and task significance influence meaningfulness of work; autonomy shapes responsibility for work outcomes while feedback determines whether an employee acquires the knowledge of the results of his or her work. Once the employee experiences all three states simultaneously, four outcomes will result. Foremost, they will possess high internal work motivation, quality work performance, satisfaction with work, and lower absenteeism and turnover. Figure 2.1 summarises Hackman and Oldham (1980) Job Characteristics Model.

Figure 2.1: Hackman and Oldham (1980) Job Characteristics Model
Meaningfulness of work refers to work that has value to the individual, which forms part of intrinsic motivation. Meaningfulness comes from:

- **Skill variety:** Designing a work that needs various skills makes a job interesting. This method is especially relevant to Generation Y employees where boring jobs are a big no to them as they like multitasking (Kathryn, 2008).

- **Task identity:** It is important to make it known to the incumbent on how vital his / her job is when it is viewed holistically. Employees find it meaningful when they know that their efforts contribute to the success of a project or a task. Since Generation Y has little loyalty to organisation, utilising this perspective on task identity may be beneficial to organisation.

- **Task significance** refers to impact of one's work on others. Having significant contribution gives purpose and sense to the incumbent. Other researchers have also found that meaningfulness of work is linked to greater task significance (Johns, Xie, & Fang, 1992; Renn & Vandenberg, 1995). As Gen Y brings with them a strong questioning approach to workplace, answering their constant inquisitiveness of ‘why?’ may have an impact to their job performance.

Responsibilities for outcomes derive from autonomy (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Hence, employees who are not given autonomy feel that they do not have the discretion to use their initiative at work. In this information era, gone are the days where employees work like robots, that is, doing exactly what their supervisors told them to do. Responsibility is thus referred to the opportunity given to make changes at work.
Feedback is an essential component for individuals to gain knowledge. Knowledge of outcomes is central on two grounds. Firstly, it tells the incumbent that their work has been done well, which in turn gives room for them to learn from previous mistakes. Secondly, the incumbent finds their work adds value to customer, thus giving meaning to work. In this diverse workforce, leaders need to understand that feedback is crucial and must not only be revealed during the annual appraisal session. Once an employee receives feedback, employee will then use this information to look at things differently and perhaps improve on matters.

As discussed earlier, employees’ critical psychological states in reactions to their jobs are affected by the core characteristics of a job. These psychological states seems to influence the workforce engagement as the concept of engagement, as explained by Kahn (1990), was that engaged employees are physically, cognitively, and emotionally connected to their work and to others. Two years later, Khan expanded this work by stressing on the importance of psychological presence in engagement. Hence, job characteristics are used as one of the antecedents of the engagement model in this research. High motivation happens when the employee experiences three psychological states whilst working.

2.6 Reward and Recognition

Motivation has always been a crucial component of employee performance from the Management perspective (Steers, Mowday & Shapiro, 2004). Rewards and recognition are often used as an incentive to achieve greater effort when it comes to individual performance, to motivate employees to strive beyond job tasks. According
to Pitts (1995), reward is a benefit obtained for performing a task, rendering a service or discharging one’s responsibility. In general, the primary reward is pay. Besides pay, common reward package in Malaysia are bonus, pension scheme, insurance, company car, loans, subsidised meals and share options. Rewards can be categorised into intrinsic rewards and extrinsic rewards. Intrinsic rewards refer to satisfaction that an employee gets from the job itself. Extrinsic rewards are rewards that an employee gets from the employer such as praise, money or promotion (Pitts, 1995). It can then be further broken down into financial and non-financial (De Cenzo & Robbins, 1996). Reward is now on the CEO agenda. It is no longer under the jurisdiction of compensation and benefits experts as companies are focusing more on intangible rewards such as challenging work and career development to boost engagement (HayGroup, 2012). Reward is now looked at as total reward.

In social exchange theory, employees put in their efforts at work in exchange for reward, to be exact, salary. Herzberg (1987) motivation hygiene theory, also known as the two-factor theory said that recognition forms part of motivator factors. The need of being recognised is now greater than ever, as today’s workplace is so diverse and so much into productivity. Once an employee feels appreciated, they will have positive emotions, which will further motivate them (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1997).

Recognition is also a strong motivator, which employees long for. Dubrin et al. (2004) states that motivating others by giving them recognition is a direct form of positive reinforcement. Studies as far back as 50 years ago have indicated that employees welcome praise for a job well done as much as they welcome regular pay
cheque (Dubrin et al., 2004). However, a survey in Malaysia found that most employees prefer cash reward (Rafikul, 2004).

Recognition and rewards are believed to modify attitude and behaviour. In addition, based on cognitive evaluation theory by Deci (1975), recognition would lead to the prediction and enhanced feelings of competence. Individuals who do not feel recognised would result in increased perceptions of incompetence (Shanab, Peterson, Dargahi & Deroian, 1981). Even though recognition is important in organisations, it is not sufficient in and of itself. It must be accompanied by rewards. If rewards are provided without recognition, employees can become saturated with these physical items causing them to lose their significance. Thus, reward and recognition was looked at as a whole.

As far as generation is concerned, Loi and Shultz (2007) found that older employees have lesser preference for the financial factor as compared to other age groups. This study is in line with Joyner (2000) where Gen Xers have a preference for money and benefits.

2.7 Work-Life Balance

Work-life balance is a common term used at present workplace. Contrary to popular belief, work-life balance is not about having a balance of time spent on both work and life aspects as different individual at different life stage have different priorities. It is about proper prioritising between work and life. Work refers to matters pertaining to career and ambition. Life can be leisure, family or spiritual development.
Thus, work-life balance is defined as one’s capability to meet both career’s and family’s needs / demands, including non-work tasks (Parkes & Langford, 2008) or allotment of time spent between the two that brings personal satisfaction (Tulgan, 2002). In this research, this construct is chosen, as work flexibility is increasingly apparent in today’s workplace. It is one of the top ten reasons why an employee stays with an employer (Chao, 2005). Leaders are looking at ways to have a balance life as they feel that it links to organisation outcomes such as attracting, retaining, and leveraging the talent from within (De Janasz & Behson, 2007). As far as academic is concerned, relationship between work-life balance and organisational outcomes, have reported both a mixed and even negative effects (Bruck, Allen & Spector 2002; Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne 2007; Kossek & Ozeki 1998), which suggest that there may be mediator in between. Employees tend to be more engaged when organisation shows commitment to its employees. Companies that support work-life balance are more likely to have engaged employees as employees are less stressful and they get to work at the comfort of their homes. Thus, employee engagement is being looked into as a mediator.

When compared to Boomers and Silent Generation, the younger generations especially Generation Y rates work not lower than leisure (Smola & Sutton, 2002; Jean M. Twenge, 2010). In addition, with the increasing numbers of Generation Y entering the workforce and retiring older workers, there will be massive changes in organisations as reported by Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman and Lance (2010). Hence, by adding this construct in the theoretical framework, this research is hoped to able to shed some light.
In addition, the family structure has been changing where dual career (Kossek, 2005) and single parent households (Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2007) have been on the rise. This phenomenon is also apparent in Malaysia where there has been an increase divorce rates on a yearly basis (National Registration Department & Jabatan Kemajuan Islam Malaysia Statistics, 2010). Employees are therefore finding it hard to assume the responsibilities of both work and non-work roles (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky & Prottas, 2002). Ashforth, et al. (2000) found that most people have some form of roles integration in their lives. The stress they face can be difficult and some with the financial capability may opt to leave the organisation to meet home demands. If they leave, talent is lost; if they stay, their minds might be at home. This has caused employers to step in by introducing work-life balance practices to reduce the stress that employees deal with, which in turn expects the employees to contribute to the success of the organisations. Whether it is the responsibility of the employer or otherwise, employees have been turning to their employers for assistance (Friedman & Galinsky, 1992). Lockwood (2003) found that both employee and employer find difficulties in managing different roles in accordance to the change in family structure and the contributing factor is poor work-life balance. On December 28, 2008, America’s First Lady, Michelle Obama, spoke about the need for work-life balance on a television broadcast show “60 minutes.” Some organisations have programmes that provide work-life balance to employees. These include flexible work schedules / telecommuting, child day-care and elder care as well as flexible leave policies, the most prevalent friendly benefits to a working mother (Working Mother Media, 2011). Theoretically, these benefits enable employees to be more productive as employers recognised the stress that they face. On the other hand, in return for these additional benefits, employers expect to be compensated by increased employee productivity.
and job satisfaction. For instance, Raber (1994) found that employers who sponsor childcare are rewarded by increased job satisfaction and lower stress levels among employees. In summary, when work-life balance is not achieved, it erodes the mental and physical well-being of an individual.

Employees who are singles are not spared from the imbalance between work and leisure (Weiss, 2012; Derballa, 2012). Today’s technology has created a fast moving employees where they are expected to reply emails and answer phone calls after office hours, during weekends and even when they are away on holiday via their trusted blackberries or iPhones. At the end of the day, employees literally collapse on their beds, feeling exhausted and drained, yet they still need to set their alarm clocks for the following day’s repetition of rat race. This imbalance has become more pronounced and made worse by today’s technology.

2.8 Characteristics of Each Generation

This section provides an overview of possible moderating role of generational differences to the relationships among the constructs in the proposed model followed by the characteristics of each generation. Every generation is different. These differences include work and life values, as well as different preferences, which result in deviate in behavioural patterns (Smola & Sutton, 2002). The researchers concluded that differences on dimensions of the construct were attributable more to cohort effects than age across samples collected from 1974 and 1999. These preferences were looked into by examining the different effect of motivators / work environment has on each generation.
Today’s workplace is the most diverse in history and diversity brings on new challenges. Generational concerns have become part of us. As mentioned by Mannheim (1970), the problem merits serious consideration. Organisations need to deal with diversity otherwise, they face intergenerational conflict (Steane & Christie, 2001). Acknowledgement of these generational variations can enhance work atmosphere and thus lessen conflict at work. Business leaders need to connect and relate to employees and understanding of what matters to them is necessary to achieve organisation performance.

Silent Generation

The Silent Generation also regarded as Traditionalist (Eisner, 2005), Veterans (Coates, 2007; Eisner, 2005), Conservative Matures or the Greatest Generation were born from year 1925 to 1945. In every generation, at least a major world event played a significant role in building their value structure. The Veterans; for example, the Second World War and the Great Depression had major influences on their lives (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). This group experienced much agony and financial struggles associated with stock market crash and subsequent depression. As a result, it is understandable that they place great importance to guidelines, rules and regulations (Renzulli, 2009), which they have to adhere to. They are conformist, loyal and believe in working hard (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2004). Veterans are compliant and they expect the same from others (Zemke et al., 2000). Due to their exposure to some social and economics catastrophes, this generation believes that they can only offer their efforts through tears and sweat. The difficulties that they had strived have taught
them to live with limited resources. Hence, hard work is valued more than any other generation and often they choose the traditional method of managing people (Coates, 2007), that is through command-and-control. Due to their non-complaining and adaptive nature, they are known as the Silent Generation. This generation is willing to accept and do anything, including work that do not necessarily need to have particular meaning (Berl, 2006), so that they are not financially deprived. Having said all that and due to their hard work and staunch principals, they are the ones who shaped the groundwork of our institution today. The Veterans are committed, patient, accept delayed reward as they experienced financial crisis and adhere to rules (Zemke et al., 2000). As far as leadership style is concerned, they are viewed as “keepers of the grail”. That grail is the values of reliability, loyalty, and solid performance characterised by the Veterans (Zemke et al., 2000).

To sum up, this generation is regarded as having a family functionalist view where Functionalists believe that family is a positive institution. It highlights an ideal family, a nuclear family. A nuclear family is made up of a breadwinner husband plus dependant spouse and children. Though passed retirement age, 75 million Americans were born before 1945 and 10% are still in the workforce (Dries et al., 2008) and the numbers are steadily declining. However, there is no statistics available on Veterans who are still in Malaysia workforce category (Statistics Department of Malaysia, 2010). This information is probably not captured, as the retirement age in Malaysia is 55 for the private sector since 1950s and 58 under the civil service but the latter has been changed to 60 in year 2011 and recently in 2012 for the private sector. Moreover, even if they are under employment, their employment status will normally be changed from permanent to contractual basis in most corporations.
Baby Boomers

Baby Boomers, the second generation in the workforce, also known as Boomers or Me Generation, were born into the world that was just getting over the two world wars (Elsdon & Lyer, 1999). They were born from year 1946 to 1964 (Jenkins, 2008) and are the workaholics among all (Berl, 2006; Carlson, 2004; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). They feel that work is an anchor in their lives resulting in high degree of loyalty. Due to their numbers, they have to compete for jobs throughout their lives and this makes them a generation that is easy to please. In addition, this generation believes that hard work will help them to get ahead of competition. They are believers of lifetime employment (Ansoorian, Good, & Samuelson, 2003; Elsdon & Lyer, 1999).

It is with the end of the two world wars that marks postmodernist attitudes. Heroes of Baby Boomer generation no longer were the military leaders of Second World War but leaders such as Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi and Martin Luther King (Zemke et al., 2000). As a result of postmodernism, the Boomers grew up in relative wealth (Fillipczak, 1994; Hornblower, 1997), free from terrorism and the start of expansionism (Crampton & Hodge, 2007). Thus, they are optimistic by nature and their strong focus on diligence and achievement may mean that this group has difficulty in balancing work and family lives (Dilworth & Kingsbury, 2005; Smola & Sutton, 2002). Their preferred style of working is to reach consensus through seminars and meetings, to embrace team decision. For them, having face-to-face communication is important; they prefer to walk over to their colleague to get an answer to a question (Yu & Miller, 2005). Despite being in the digital world, face-to-
face interaction is still the most powerful human interaction (Begley, 2005). To them, a sense of membership and affiliation is important. This is the generation that has been exposed to a wide variety of training programmes as economy progresses through industrial economy, service economy and now knowledge economy where different skills were acquired. They have gone through Theory X, control and supervise from the industrial economy; followed by Theory Y, relationship during service economy; and now, collaborative leadership (Yu & Miller, 2005).

Boomers are not keen on stock options; they would rather see the bottom line of their payroll (Glass, 2007). This generation has seen how the stock crash affected their predecessors. As for this generation, having feedback once a year is good enough and they manage well with lots of documentation (Dries et al., 2008). 80 million Americans were born and they comprised of 45% of the workforce (Dries et al., 2008; Eisner, 2005), denotes a population spike in reaction to the two World Wars, thus, the name Baby Boomers. According to Statistics Department of Malaysia (2010), there are approximately 26% of Baby Boomers in the Malaysian workforce. There was no breakdown of age in recent statistics.

**Generation X**

Generation X, also known as X-ers or 13th Generation born from year 1965 to 1980, values flexibility and work-life balance. This generation would go for a lower paying job that provides work-life balance (Glass, 2007). They are loyal to themselves rather than their workplace; prefer to do work for themselves as they experienced their parents being layoff, where they learnt that sacrifice does not ensure stable
family life and permanent employment (Gursoy, Maier, & Chi, 2008). This is also the generation with increasing members of divorce rates (Erickson, 2009). Despite being in prime working age, their numbers are still insufficient to replace the aging and retiring workforce – the Boomers (Bridgers & Johnson, 2006). They are also referred to as Baby Busters (Filipczak, 2004) due to drop in births coupled with increasing number of female joining the workforce and decisions to have smaller families (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). Many of them were raised in single parent home or had both parents working. In addition, this is the first generation that grew up with personal computers at information age (Alverson, 1999). They are more self-reliant than their successors due to heavy influence by social change representing financial, family, and social insecurity (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). They have survivor mentality and value individualism; this is also the generation where societies put blame on them for social ills, which caused them to be more cynical and independent. Conditioned by these social ills, they trust their own judgment and thus self-reliance is their trait (Sayers, 2007). Consequently, this generation has no identifiable heroes (Corbo, 1997; Zemke et al., 2000) as they desire to be self-reliant. It is also a noted departure from both the Veterans and the Boomers where they are renowned of planning one or two jobs ahead of their current employment in order to win. Loyalty to organisation is no longer a priority to them. They seek challenging jobs and necessary training to acquire career security, to which they are loyal to rather than job security (Kupperschmidt, 2000). They are comfortable and adapt well to changes, including career transformation (Sayers, 2007). This generation is the first that breaks Maslow’s hierarchy. Among 46 million Americans born, 30% are in the workforce (Dries et al., 2008; Eisner, 2005). As far as Malaysia is concerned, the workforce consists of 40% Generation X (Statistics Department of Malaysia, 2010).
Generation Y

Generation Y, being the youngest cohort into the working world; also called Millennial, Internet Generation, Generation Next or Net Generation (Glass, 2007), dot.com generation (Yu & Miller, 2005) or the N-Geners by (Tapscott, 1998). The Millennial, a whopping 70 million strong in the US (Insights, 2005), three times the size of Generation X will influence workplace and impact on regional economies more dramatically than Generation X who came before them. They are also known as Echo Boomers as their size is comparable to their parents, Baby Boomers. This diverse generation is highly comfortable with technology (Erickson, 2009), which is their second nature. This generation thinks differently as compared to other generation, in which in the study of philosophy, it is known as Radical Structuralism where, because of their upbringing and well-being, what they perceive may be of conflict with other generations. This generation assumes radical change as part of their lives and seeks explanations on relationships within the social structures setting. With Generation Y, theorists see structural differences within the society that generates constant transformation.

Generation Y wants a work-life balance, or to reflect more accurately, it is Life Work Balance as this group sees life as foremost important. Sacrificing their personal lives by clocking in extra hours is not their style. Instead, they will make full use of their technology resources to complete their tasks (Tapscott, 1998). In addition, this generation values development, they want to acquire skills, as their principal reason is to rely on themselves for job security just like the Generation X. They value knowledge (Oblinger & Oblinger 2005) and are the most educated of all, which is
also partly due to having both parents working and having economic stability during their time (Foreman, 2006). This generation has sports icons such as Michael Jeffrey Jordan and Eldrick Tont “Tiger Woods”. These icons serve this generation as positive athletic models. Their leaders such as William Henry "Bill" Gates III and Christopher D'Olier Reeves and it is balanced with socially responsible individuals such as Diana, Princess of Wales “Diana Frances” and Agnesë Gonxhe Bojaxhiu “Mother Teresa” (Zemke et al., 2000). It is noted that Mother Teresa has the spill over effect across generations (Schewe & Evans, 2000). These socially responsible examples have helped develop civic mindedness as noted by Zemke et al. (2000); Crampton and Hodge (2007). 76 million Americans were born from year 1981 to 2001, constituting 15% of the workforce, and this figure seems to grow a lot faster than other generations (Dries et al., 2008) versus 34% of Generation Y in the Malaysian workforce (Statistics Department of Malaysia. 2010).

Like their Generation X siblings, Generation Y is independent, entrepreneurial and demands immediate feedback (Martin, 2005). They would rather send a quick email than to have a face-to-face communication, - like Baby Boomers, which may hinder personal relationship with their colleagues, supervisors, direct reports and clients (Glass, 2007). Having high expectations of themselves and their employers are their fundamental trait (Foreman, 2006). Having a meaningful work to them is important. Fast track leadership programmes, clear career path, recognition and rewards based on contributions are preferred (Glass, 2007). For this generation, they are used to computer games where they used to having a clear degree of expectations and the minute they achieve the required target or accomplishment of a mission, they will be immediately informed of their achievement and advance to the next level.
automatically where more challenges await them and there seems endless challenges ahead. Thus, they expect the same at workplace where immediate feedback is necessary for them and they look forward for more challenges the minute they achieve the earlier target or mission (Francis-Smith, 2004). For Generation Y, challenges are viewed differently from having more responsibilities. They want to be mentally challenged (Baruch, 2004) and not bogged down with workload. Loads of documentation will bore them. Unlike the Boomers, they find handling documentation masses difficult (Glass, 2007).

For them, who gets the work done is not important, so long as it is completed (Baldonado & Spangenburg, 2009). Major event or experience includes the September 11 attack (Dries et al., 2008), which caused them to be more community minded. Generation Y is the most confident cohort in history (Shepherdson, 2000; Twenge, 2006; Zoba, 1999). Despite the availability of birth control and abortions, their families still opt to have them. Being born to smaller families and with greater resources available, their parents were more devoted in raising them, where they grew up with a focus on family. This generation has gone through busy schedule since young. They have to attend music, art, and computer classes (Baldonado & Spangenburg, 2009) and tuition after school. Having said that, however, some of their parents may be too involved in the lives of Generation Y where Human Resources at times need to field calls from their parents, despite them being in the working world (Glass, 2007). Some even go the extra mile by checking on their children’s application status and securing jobs for their children (Azizan, 2012).
Generation Y can be categorised into three major characteristics. Firstly, they are the most diverse generation and the most educated to date (Zoba, 1999). Secondly, they are exceptionally independent thanks to the increasing divorce rate of their parents, which eventually raised in a single parent environment, having spent their early years in day care and the digital age that grew up with. Lastly, they feel empowered (Zoba, 1999) thanks to overindulgent parents. Their parents seem to have a helicopter view of them.

The Millennial is the last cohort born in the 20th century. They were born directly into postmodernism and information era. Humanism, a result from the September 11 attack, as opposed to trans-humanism is their core value. Many Gen Y-ers always query the direction that their predecessors follow, and thus the “Generation Why”.

Much of Generation Y research were on investigation of generation group differences in work values and job satisfaction where Generation Y values status and freedom of work more than the older generations (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008).

Some of the principals that said to be able to manage the Millennials include providing good leadership as they crave for immediate feedback. As mentioned earlier, technology is of second nature to them and they have been exposed to various computer games, which give them immediate feedback. Once you have reached your mission, you will be upgraded to the next level instantly and they expect the same at workplace. They enjoy to be challenged and want to work together with friends and
fun is the key. This generation looks for fun in organisation and value work flexibility (McCrindle, 2002).

*Generation Z*

Subsequent to Generation Y would be Generation Z or Me Generation, who are even more aware and reliant to technologies, in which they were born within the digital era. Their parents are mostly from Generation X. Try giving those Wii games and they will be able to create their own characters and start playing without much help. As this generation is still at a very young age and still being born, it is hard to elaborate on their characteristics.

The generation themes can be summarised as follows:

Table 2.2: Generation Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silent Generation</td>
<td>Want to stay relevant and leave behind a legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>Need to find meaning and balance in their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Need to be challenged and always keep learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>Want to be taken seriously as contributors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 sums up the four generations.

Table 2.3: The Four Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Birth Years</th>
<th>Defining Moments (Historical, Economic &amp; Social Influences)</th>
<th>Core Values</th>
<th>Work-related Values</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silent Generation</td>
<td>1925-1945</td>
<td>Great Depression, British administration, World War II / Pearl Harbour, Japanese occupation, Communist insurgency</td>
<td>Conformism</td>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>We must pay out dues and work hard (adaptive / work first)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>Obligation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thrift</td>
<td>Value job security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3: The Four Generations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Birth Years</th>
<th>Defining Moments (Historical, Economic &amp; Social Influences)</th>
<th>Core Values</th>
<th>Work-related Values</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>1946-1964</td>
<td>Indonesian confrontation</td>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td>Team work</td>
<td>If you have it, flash it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 13 incident</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td>(idealist / live to work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Economic Policy</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrialisation</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John F. Kennedy assassinations</td>
<td>Self-fulfilment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moon landing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam War</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.3: The Four Generations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Birth Years</th>
<th>Defining Moments (Historical, Economic &amp; Social Influences)</th>
<th>Core Values</th>
<th>Work-related Values</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>1965-1980</td>
<td>Fall of Soviet Union</td>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Work-Life Balance</td>
<td>Whatever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women Liberation</td>
<td>Idealistic</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>(reactive / work to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Birth of computer / Internet</td>
<td>Scepticism</td>
<td></td>
<td>live)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Look East Policy</td>
<td>Materialism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mergers and acquisitions</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3: The Four Generations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Birth Years</th>
<th>Defining Moments (Historical, Economic &amp; Social Influences)</th>
<th>Core Values</th>
<th>Work-related Values</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generation Y</strong></td>
<td>1981-2001</td>
<td>MTV, Internet, September 11, Princess Diana’s Death, Facebook founded by Mark Zuckerberg (social networking), Iraq War</td>
<td>Collectivism, Positivity, Moralism, Confidence</td>
<td>Feedback, Recognition, Advance technology</td>
<td>Let’s make this place a better place (civic) (live first, then work)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Adapted for Malaysia from Dries et al. (2008); Howe and Strauss (2007); Tay (2011)
Every generational cohort has its own mind-set with values shaped by generational defining moments. These cohort values are formed when group of people who are about the same age go through similar important life experiences when they were young. These common experiences form generation’s principles stays throughout their life and remain unchanged. For example, the Silent Generation is shaped by hard times due to wars. Whereas, the Post-War Cohort, the Boomers are shaped by optimism and affluence of after war era; Generation X group is shaped by sluggish epoch. Lastly, Gen Y is shaped by strong economic position and the Internet. The Nexters believe in employability and is financially smart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-related</th>
<th>Silent Generation</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>Personal growth</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>Youthfulness</td>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>Optimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sacrificing</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Results driven</td>
<td>Civic mindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honourable</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diligent</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Techno-savvy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Rewards for hard work</th>
<th>Opportunities for continuous learning</th>
<th>Continuous change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging work</td>
<td>Fast track career growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviours</th>
<th>Respectful of authority</th>
<th>Challenge authority</th>
<th>Unimpressed by authority</th>
<th>Respect for competency, not title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear work style</td>
<td>Loyal to team</td>
<td>Loyal to manager</td>
<td>Loyal to peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results-focused</td>
<td>Focus on change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Goal         | Build a legacy           | Have an effect        | Maintain independence     | Find work and create a life that has meaning |

Source: Kovary (2008).
Based on table 2.4, each generation brings different perspective and beliefs to workplace. Each has different interactional styles, preferences, and may misinterpret words and actions of employees from other generations. These differences can be translated into having different responses to the same motivator. In today’s diverse workplace, it is important to identify the specific factor that motivates each generation. Organisations must be ready to accept the possibility of observing different responses even though the same motivator is used for different people. Ability to identify the correct motivator will strengthen the employee engagement.

2.9 Summary

In this study, generational differences across three generations will be examined. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivators for engagement will be looked at and similarities and differences will be compared among generations as in general, work attitudes differ across generations.

As can be seen from the theoretical framework, intrinsic motivators include job characteristics and work-life balance. Job characteristic is chosen, as this is always the area, which Human Resources look at when something went wrong at workplace. Job characteristics, as depicted in the famous Hackman and Oldham (1980) Job Characteristics Model, leads to job performance and job satisfaction. Maslach et al. (2001) model also suggests the importance of job characteristics for engagement. In a local study, consistent with Western context, study showed that job that requires a variety of skills and having constant feedback, which are part of the job characteristics core dimensions impacts on job satisfaction, organisational commitment and turnover
intentions (Hossam, 2009). In this research, engagement will be the mediator. In this study, investigation will be carried out to explore the influence these motivators have on each generation.

Secondly, work-life balance is considered, as this has been the trend including Malaysia. One of the work-life balance initiatives that is gaining its popularity is to allow employees to work from home. Some of the companies are IBM Malaysia, where a large number of employees are under the mobility programme in which they can work from home. The same goes for Citibank Berhad. Both companies allow two-or-three-day week instead of five-day week (Goh, 2012). As for both intrinsic and extrinsic motivators, reward and recognition is being considered. This decision was made using the social exchange theory as a basis to support the notion that individuals will put in effort, in this case, work, in exchange for reward and recognition. Lack of recognition, for example, when one’s hard work goes unnoticed and unappreciated devalues both work and the employees. Lack of reward is very much related to inefficacy thoughts (Maslach et al., 2001), which indirectly lead to job performance.

As far as research on generations is concern, researchers have identified their traits, motivators, methods to attract them into the organisation, yet nothing seems to work plus increasing generation issues at workplace. Nexters, the youngest yet most diversify cohort in history brings in multiple challenges to employers. They crave for immediate feedback and having fun at work is paramount (Debra et al., 2008). Besides having fun, they are looking for seamless work and life situation, which translates into having work-life balance, is crucial. As their values and preferences are so diverse among the generations, there are constant challenges that organisations
face, especially when they seek to harness the skills and talent retention of the diverse workforce in this competitive economy and attempting to form a cohesive team (De Kort, 2004).

As all these involve interaction, social exchange theory is used in the engagement model. Hence, the engagement model theoretical framework combines the social exchange theory and human resources practices. Human resources practices such as work flexibility, which the employees are eagerly looking forward to, and compensation will be looked into and these areas have also being suggested by Alan (2006).

2.10 Chapter Summary

This chapter explores the research constructs and existing research on generations and engagement. It has also discussed the definitions and theories in relation to the research constructs. The next chapter undertakes a detailed review of the development of hypothesis and the research model. Chapter 4 specifically examines the methodologies used in this research.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH MODEL AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research model and development of research hypotheses. This research examines the extent to which engagement mediates the relationship between work motivators and work consequences. It also examines the moderation effect of generation cohort to these relationships.

3.2 Research Model and Hypotheses Development

3.2.1 Job Characteristics and Work Outcome

The revised version of job characteristics model of Hackman and Lawler was originally developed by Turner and Lawrence in 1965. Nevertheless, the final version was developed by Hackman and Oldham in 1980 (Boonzaier, 2001) and it is used in many theoretical reviews. In accordance to the Job Characteristics Model, a job has five distinct characteristics, namely skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback.

To reiterate, skill variety is the degree to which a job requires a variety of different activities in carrying out the work, involving the use of different skills and talents of an individual for successful completion. It can be enhanced via job rotation,
enrichment and enlargement. *Task identity* is the degree, to which a job requires completion of a whole and identifiable piece of work, which involves doing a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome. On the other hand, *task significance* is the degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives of other people, whether to their colleagues or to the world at large. *Autonomy* is the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying out the job. More autonomy leads to a greater feeling of personal responsibility for the work. Efforts to increase autonomy might lead to job enrichment. Giving more freedom and authority so the employee could perform the job and increasing an employee’s accountability for work by reducing external control are some of the means to increase autonomy. Finally, *feedback* is the degree to which carrying out the work activities required by the job provides the individual with direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his or her performance.

Hackman and Oldham state that these five core dimensions of job characteristics in turn influence the three critical psychological states:

1. Experienced meaningfulness of the work: the degree to which the individual experiences the job as one, which is generally valuable, and worthwhile. *Skill variety, task identity,* and *task significance* are said to contribute to the experienced meaningfulness of the work.

2. Experienced responsibility for work outcomes: the degree to which the individual feels personally accountable and responsible for the results of the work he / she does. *Autonomy* accounts for this outcome.
3. Knowledge of results: the degree to which the individual knows and understands, on a continuous basis, how effectively he/she is performing the job (Pounder, 1999; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Hogan & Martell, 1987).

*Feedback* establishes the knowledge of work results.

According to Hackman and Oldham, these three critical psychological states subsequently influence work outcomes. The Hackman and Oldham model was initially used to measure job satisfaction (Jansen et al., 1996), but it is now used to measure other outcomes such as internal work motivation, work effectiveness, and absenteeism as well.

### 3.2.1.1 Job Characteristics and Turnover Intention

Generally, Job Characteristics are defined as a set of environmental variables that are widely thought to be important causes of employees’ behaviour (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). According to Job Characteristics Theory, all jobs have a quantifiable potential for motivating employees that leads to lower turnover. Job characteristics tend to decrease if employees experience high-level turnover intentions in which the findings are parallel with a study conducted by Samad (2004). Besides motivation, adverse Job Characteristics are said to lead to health problems (de Jonge et al., 2001), which eventually leads to turnover. Thus, the following hypothesis is assumed:

H1: Job characteristics are negatively related to intention to leave.

Job characteristic factors are negatively and significantly related to turnover intention (Samad, 2006). According to Hackman & Oldham’s Job Characteristics
Model, as far as Job Characteristics are concerned, the more skills are involved, the more meaningful the job is, which eventually reduces intention to leave. A job that has task identity makes an employee feel responsible for the whole product will also have a sense of completion. Therefore, this study offers the following hypotheses:

H1a : Skill variety is negatively related to intention to leave.

H1b : Task Identity is negatively related to intention to leave.

Task significance is not only applicable to professionals or high-level roles such as medical doctors or managers just because it refers to the degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives of other people within the immediate organisation or in the external environment. Jobs such as assembly line workers for a local automobile company, Perusahaan Otomobil Kedua Sdn Bhd (PERODUA), affect the life and death of passengers if installation is not done properly. In brief, even modest contributions can lend support to the perception of task significance. The employees only need to understand the role of their jobs to the overall mission of the company. Task significance is perceived to be of more intrinsic value of their work and has been reported high on job and family satisfaction (Judge, Locke, Durham & Kluger, 1998). As task significance is significantly and positively related to job satisfaction (Hadi & Adil, 2010), it is posited that intention to leave will be reduced. Thus, the following hypothesis:

H1c : Task significance is negatively related to intention to leave.

It is fundamental in building a sense of responsibility in employees. For example, a sales executive is considered to be highly autonomous by scheduling his or her own workday and deciding on the most effective approach to use for each
customer without supervision. With increased freedom and discretion given to employees, the feeling of being micro-managed is eliminated thus lowering the intention to leave among employees. As found by Hackman and Lawler (1971), job that gives little personal control or autonomy often lead to employees searching for more meaningful employment. Hence, the following hypothesis is suggested:

H1d : Autonomy is negatively related to intention to leave.

Feedback refers to the degree an employee receives information about their performance. Zetlin (2001) stated that intrinsic motivation such as reward, recognition and feedback are among strategies used in retaining talent of IT professionals. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1e : Feedback is negatively related to intention to leave.

3.2.1.2 Job Characteristics and Job Performance

Job Characteristics Model portrays the relationship between job characteristics with personal and employment related outcome (motivation, performance, satisfaction and turnover). This approach is similar to Herzberg where a set of features that should be built into a job to satisfy and motivate employees. Fulfilment of these psychological states can result in attainment of individual and work outcome, such as self-motivation, high level of performance and low attrition. Job design can have great impact on employee outcome. Besides increasing turnover intention, ineffective job design influence individual’s task and contextual performance negatively (Johari & Yahaya, 2009; Liao, 1998). The higher the presence of the three psychological states (meaningfulness of task, responsibility for work outcome, and knowledge of results)
in the workplace, the greater will be employees’ motivation, performance, and the lower their turnover. A greater motivating potential is reached when a job is high on at least one of the three components of experienced meaningfulness and both of the core job dimensions of autonomy and feedback. Basically, fulfilment of the above-mentioned psychological states can result in attainment of individual and work outcome such as self-motivation and subsequently high level of performance. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2 : Job Characteristics are positively related to in-role performance.

Meaningful work is the result of the combination of the first three dimensions of skill variety, task identity, and task significance. The incumbent views the job as being important, valuable, and worthwhile. According to the model of Hackman and Oldham (1980), once employees experienced meaningfulness, they obtain intrinsic rewards from a motivational point of view. Thus, the following hypotheses are predicted:

H2a : Skill variety is positively related to in-role performance.
H2b : Task identity is positively related to in-role performance.
H2c : Task significance is positively related to in-role performance.

Job performance was found to be associated negatively with lack of autonomy, one of the distinct characteristics of a job (Lu, Chang & Lai, 2011; Morgeson, Delaney-Klinger, & Hemingway, 2005; Zellars & Perrewée, 2001). Jobs that provide a great deal of autonomy are said to contribute to a person’s responsibility for work outcomes. Employees’ sense of ownership and responsibility for work outcomes are enhanced through the job characteristic of autonomy (Hackman & Oldham, 1980).
When they have the freedom to decide what to do and how to do it, employees feel more responsible for the results. Since the results of job performance would depend on the employees’ own efforts and decisions, a sense of responsibility occurs. Therefore, I posit that:

H2d : Autonomy is positively related to in-role performance.

In addition to autonomy, feedback is intrinsically motivating because it helps employees to understand the effectiveness of their performance and the contribution to their overall knowledge about the work. This includes both positive and negative feedback. Feedback gives employees the opportunity to change behaviour and also to charge forward. Employees need to know how they are doing, what worked and what did not, for them to perform to their full potential. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2e : Feedback is positively related to in-role performance.

3.2.1.3 Job Characteristics and Innovative Performance

The job characteristics model has been the dominant theoretical framework for understanding an employee’s reaction to the core dimensions of the job (Fried & Ferris, 1987). Piccolo and Colquitt (2006) asserted that there is a significant positive relation of job characteristics with task, as well as contextual performance, which is in line with studies carried out by Hackman and Lawler back in 1971. The latter suggested that certain job characteristics, such as skill variety, task identity, autonomy, and feedback motivate employees in their job performance. Similar
findings can be expected when testing the relationship between job characteristics and innovative performance. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3 : Job Characteristics are positively related to innovative job performance.

Oldham and Cummings (1996) found that all the five core job characteristics predict individual innovation at work. On the intellectual side, positive emotions are said to facilitate behavioural flexibility (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005), which eventually affects innovativeness in the organisation setting. This climate for innovation is necessary if organisations want to achieve competitive advantage (Shalley, 1995). Jobs that have high variety generally require higher skills. Skilled employees are able to work independently and thus have the capability to innovate or find new ways in performing their tasks. Thus, the following hypothesis is assumed:

H3a : Skill variety is positively related to innovative job performance.

Employees who are involved throughout the work process have a greater capability for innovation. Significance of task gives employees the feeling of contribution to the company’s development. In short, increased identification with assigned task lead and task significance increase job involvement, a natural propensity to adopt innovation. Hence, the following hypotheses:

H3b : Task identity is positively related to innovative job performance.
H3c : Task significance is positively related to innovative job performance.

There are positive links between positive emotions, which can be attained from one’s job that leads to innovative behaviour (Fredrickson, 2003). Zhou (1998) reported that besides feedback style and valence, innovativeness, and task autonomy
are strongly connected. This notion is supported by the findings of Mumford (2000). Mumford (2000) brought forward strong theoretical arguments for enhancing creativity by allowing employee autonomy. According to Mumford, employees should have the leeway to pursue emerging opportunities and to act in a way that suits them personally. Moreover, they should be free to manage their time and to structure their activities according to their own preferences that best suits their talents and provides them with the necessary autonomy to take their own decisions regarding task accomplishment. Such freedom supports innovativeness and continuous innovation requires autonomy. It is found that autonomy is an important driver for innovation (Ciabuschi & Martin, 2011). Hence, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3d : Autonomy is positively related to innovative job performance.

Feedback provides employees knowledge of results and allows them to learn from mistakes. Such learning orientation facilitates intentional generation, promotion, and realisation of new ideas (Chen, Marsden, & Zhang, 2012; Chien Ching & Seng Chee, 2010) or in other words, innovative job performance. Knowledge of results is shaped by the degree to which carrying out job-specified work activities provide the jobholder with direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his or her performance. When someone receives information about his or her performance from the work itself (e.g., when a sales person seals a deal), that feedback contributes to his or her overall knowledge of results about work outcomes. Hence, we posit that:

H3e : Feedback is positively related to innovative job performance.
3.2.2 Reward & Recognition and Work Outcome

Reward, which includes all monetary incentives, benefits that supplement employee’s monthly salary and stock option scheme, is no longer viewed as the only tool to motivate employees. Experts are now focusing on recognition in addition to the rewards system that they have to retain performers, to keep the best talent within the organisation. Various studies have found that there is a positive relationship between reward and recognition, and employee performance (Ciscel; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Deeprose, 1994; Freedman, 1978; Jo En, Liliana, & Michael, 2009), which is based on the exchange process in social exchange theory. Effective implementation of reward and recognition programme within an organisation creates a favourable work environment and motivates the employees to increase their performance, which ultimately improves organisations’ performance. This is supported by Lawler (2003) where he argued that organisations’ wealth and survivability are determined by the way in which employees are treated. Rewards and recognition programmes can boost employees’ morale and motivate them further. Employees who feel appreciated have higher self-esteem as they feel positive about themselves and lower intention to leave (Peterson & Luthans, 2006). Reward and recognition are said to have a positive relationship with employees’ task performance (Stajkovic & Luthans 2001, 2003).

Von Bonsdorff (2011) found that both financial and non-financial rewards were greatly valued in the nurses’ sample. Positive employees are potentially the best employees. Having said that, he also argued that there are two factors that determines the attractiveness of a reward. Firstly, is the amount of reward given, and the
secondly, the value of the reward perceived by the employee. Jo En et al. (2009) found that certain reward programmes given to retail sales associates improves both in-role and extra-role performance simultaneously. Thus, the following hypotheses:

H4 : Rewards and recognition is negatively related to intention to leave.
H5 : Rewards and recognition is positively related to in-role performance.
H6 : Rewards and recognition is positively related to innovative job performance.

3.2.3 Work-Life Balance and Work Outcome

Reward and recognition alone may no longer be sufficient. Instead, work-life balance is now gaining more importance. Khairunneezam (2011) indicates that perceived work-life balance satisfaction was correlated negatively with intention to leave and at the same time, as indicated by Tulgan (2000) having work-life balance benefits tend to hold special attraction for new employees. Without balance, employees tend to have higher absenteeism, less commitment, become less satisfied with their job, and have a higher likelihood of leaving their job (Todd, 2004). Thus, the following hypothesis incorporates the above arguments:

H7 : Work-life balance is negatively related to intention to leave.

In social exchange theory, when an employee perceives to have work-life balance, he / she feels obliged to put in effort at work. This is in line with the research carried out by Barnett and Rivers (1996) as well as Flynn (1997) where work-life balance enables employees to consistently perform at their best. Other researchers such as Cytrynbaum and Crites (1989) found that in order to be successful, individual
need to know how to adjust their work and life balance; thus the following hypotheses:

H8 : Work-life balance is positively related to in-role performance.
H9 : Work-life balance is positively related to innovative job performance.

### 3.2.4 Work Motivators and Employee Engagement

In accordance to the social exchange theory, one may argue that employees who are empowered (autonomy) with enriched jobs (skill variety and task identity) and challenging jobs (task significance) will feel indebted to the organisation resulting in higher levels of engagement. Disengaged employees are often the ones who receive the least feedback. Giving employees opportunities to seek and receive feedback can be a powerful tool to bring out the best in them. As such, feedback is a form of affirmation, encouragement, praise and recognition. As far as theory is concerned, providing feedback has a statistically significant effect on one’s learning (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001). Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H10 : Job characteristics are positively related to employee engagement.
H10a : Skill variety is positively related to employee engagement.
H10b : Task identity is positively related to employee engagement.
H10c : Task significance is positively related to employee engagement.
H10d : Autonomy is positively related to employee engagement.
H10e : Feedback is positively related to employee engagement.

Based on expectancy theory, employees are expected to engage themselves at work when rewards and recognition are given to compensate for their role.
performances. This theory explains that people implicitly or explicitly involved in a cognitive process by asking themselves “What is in for me?” when deciding whether to engage in a certain behaviour. Total rewards are found to be positively related to employee engagement as per Bakker and Demerouti (2008). Mercer (2012) reported that the trend of using rewards and incentives in forms other than cash appears to be increasing. This is in line with the latest research where organisations should focus more on the nonmonetary rewards to increase employee work engagement as the role of material rewards may vary in different country (Hulkko-Nyman, Sarti, Hakonen, & Sweins, 2012). Thus, the next hypothesis:

H11  : Rewards and recognition; is positively related to employee engagement.

Work-life balance is not about having the exact amount of time spent on work and other matters but it is all about proper prioritising based on individual’s priorities and needs. Married individuals may want to spend more time with their family while singles prefer to hang out with their friends. With advances in technology, work boundaries have become blurred. Employees can still work beyond the physical boundaries of their office. They can respond to emails or have conference calls beyond working hours, including weekends. This “new workplace” makes the employees connected to jobs more. In brief, the blurrier the boundary, the higher the work life conflict (Boswell & Olson-Buchanan, 2007). Boundary theory puts forward that individuals differ on the intensity when it comes to integrating into their numerous roles (Ashforth et al., 2000). People would give preference to roles that would give personal positive reinforcement (Ashforth et al., 2000; Stryker, 1980). Thus, H12 is proposed as follows:

H12  : Work-life balance is positively related to employee engagement.
3.2.5 Consequences of Employee Engagement

Engaged employees are said to be more resourceful, productive, and willing to go above and beyond (Arnold & Evangelia, 2008) and these has immediate impact on business results, such as business performance (Towers Perrin, 2009; Halbesleben, Harvey & Bolina, 2009; Macey & Schneider, 2008). These positive outcomes are the result of individual level achievement. Besides, engaged employees tend to have fulfilling work experience, bond with the organisation, and thus exhibit greater attachment to the organisation and lower the intention to quit (Mueller, Boyer, Price & Iverson, 1994). As explained in the social exchange theory, engaged employees will have positive attitudes and intention towards the organisation. Based on the reciprocity norm, it is therefore predicted that:

H13: Employee engagement is negatively related to intention to leave.
H14: Employee engagement is positively related to in-role performance.
H15: Employee engagement is positively related to innovative job performance.

3.2.6 Mediating Role of Employee Engagement

Bakker et al. (2004) found that engagement mediates the relationships between job resources and contextual performance. This supports the expectations of the present study, which views job characteristics as a type of job resource. Macey and Schneider (2008) theorised that certain attributes of the job, including skill variety and autonomy, may influence state engagement, which increases the likelihood of extra-role behaviours. As high task significance is associated with strong internal work motivation (Hackman & Oldham, 1975, 1976), employees are also more likely
to be engaged. When it comes to task identity, a person will also feel motivated if he/she sees a bigger picture. The same thing goes for feedback, as everyone likes a job well done. Employees of today are not only looking at salaries and benefits. They are also looking for a job that blends well with their other life demands, in short having a work-life balance, or some researchers called it a work life fit. Once this is achieved, the next level would be engagement, where it acts in both ways. It attracts talent as well as retaining them (Lejeune, 2012).

Employee engagement serves as the focal mediator due to its important implications for worker cognitive and emotional states at work. Unlike work attitudes such as organisational commitment, which emphasise on levels of psychological attachment to organisations over time, employee engagement focuses on workers’ psychological presence at work during task performance (Kahn, 1992). Workers can have relatively permanent attachment to organisations, but their engagement in specific tasks may vary. Personnel’s willingness to challenge the status quo depends on their investment in specific tasks (Blau & Boal, 1987; Burris, Detert, & Chiaburu, 2008). Therefore, employee engagement could serve as a pivotal mediator in this study.

Given that the antecedents predict engagement and engagement predicts the outcome, there is a possibility that engagement mediates the correlation between the antecedents and the consequences. For example, May et al. (2004) found that empowered employees are generally engaged, which would in turn influence their staying power with the organisation. Moreover, Schaufeli et al. (2002) implied that the energy level of engaged employees has the ability to deal with job demands.
Based on the reasoning provided above and the previous section, employee engagement is expected to mediate the relationship between work motivators and work consequences. Thus, the following hypotheses are derived:

H16: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and intention to leave.

H16a: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between skill variety and intention to leave.

H16b: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between task identity and intention to leave.

H16c: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between task significance and intention to leave.

H16d: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between autonomy and intention to leave.

H16e: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between feedback and intention to leave.

H17: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and in-role performance.

H17a: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between skill variety and in-role performance.

H17b: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between task identity and in-role performance.

H17c: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between task significance and in-role performance.

H17d: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between autonomy and in-role performance.
H17e: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between feedback and in-role performance.

H18: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and innovative job performance.

H18a: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between skill variety and innovative job performance.

H18b: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between task identity and innovative job performance.

H18c: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between task significance and innovative job performance.

H18d: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between autonomy and innovative job performance.

H18d: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between feedback and innovative job performance.

H19: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between rewards and recognition; and intention to leave.

H20: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between rewards and recognition; and in-role performance.

H21: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between rewards and recognition; and innovative job performance.

H22: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between work-life balance and intention to leave.

H23: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between work-life balance and in-role performance.
H24: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between work-life balance and innovative job performance.

### 3.2.7 Moderating Role of Generation Cohort

In addition, there are also prevailing stereotypes and misconception in the society about decreasing performance among older adults (Maurer, 2007; Hedge, Borman, & Lammlein, 2006; Henkens, 2003; Greller & Simpson, 1999). Although past studies revealed that adults aged above 40 years show declines in physical abilities (Shephard, 1999) and cognitive abilities (Colonia-Willner, 1998), older employees are not necessarily poorer on-the-job performers. Meta-analysis and review studies shown that there is inconsistent results involving age and job performance (Ng & Feldman, 2008), and this suggest that there might be mediators for the mixed findings. For instance, Rhodes (1983) in her qualitative review of studies concerning age and job performance found that there were just about equal numbers of studies reporting the relationship between age and job performance as positive, negative, u-shaped, and non-significant. In this study, respondents were grouped into different age group to test if increasing age is associated with a gradual decline in a number of human abilities from the Malaysian sample.

Skill variety may work better for the young, restless, and multi-taskers of Generation Y, followed by Generation X and Boomers. Armed with the skills, it gives them more opportunities for career growth and advancement, which is their third most important job consideration (Robert Half International, 2008). The impact of task identity and task significance is perceived to be stronger for Gen Y, as they
desperately wants to feel that their work is meaningful and important. As far as autonomy is concern, Boomers may have more impact on them, not because of their characteristics but also the opportunity that they may have or experience based on their job levels. This is followed by Gen X and Y. Gen Y expects immediate feedback, followed by Gen X and Boomers. The younger generations want clear expectations, just like a computer game to keep them engaged and motivated.

H25: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between job characteristics and employee engagement.

H25a: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between skill variety and employee engagement.

H25b: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between task identity and employee engagement.

H25c: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between task significance and employee engagement.

H25d: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between autonomy and employee engagement.

H25e: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between feedback and employee engagement.

Employees typically have preferences of reward elements. It is also extensively accepted that some reward inspire employees more (Stajkovic & Luthans 2001). Despite the growing issues on generation, there is little focus targeted at age group related changes when it comes to employee motivation (Kanfer & Ackerman 2004) and reward preferences (Doering, Rhodes & Schuster 1983). Rewards and recognition are no longer the motivating factor for the younger generations who crave
for work-life balance. Generation X for example, having positive working relationships and work-life balance are deemed more important (Wallace, 2006). The influence of reward and recognition on work engagement and outcomes will be greater among Baby Boomers and Generation Y compared to Generation X as the latter would not mind a lower paying job in search of job flexibility. In this research, these differences are examined based on the cohorts. Hence, the following hypotheses are derived:

H26: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between reward and recognition and employee engagement.

H27: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between work-life balance and employee engagement.

The impact of both younger generations is expected to be greater as compared to Boomers when it comes to relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention. Reason being, these generations do not generally tend to stay long in an organisation. Based on the work styles and attitude of each generation, it is expected that the Boomers may have higher impact on the in-role performances while Gen Y will have more impact on the innovative performance. Hence, the following hypotheses are predicted:

H28: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention.

H29: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between employee engagement and in-role performance.

H30: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between employee engagement and innovative job performance.
In brief, figure 3.1 shows the theoretical framework for this study.

Figure 3.1: Theoretical Framework
3.3 Summary of Research Hypotheses

Research hypotheses can be summarised as follow:

H1: Job characteristics, (a) skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance, (d) autonomy, (e) feedback is negatively related to intention to leave.

H2: Job characteristics, (a) skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance, (d) autonomy and (e) feedback are positively related to in-role performance.

H3: Job characteristics, (a) skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance, (d) autonomy and (e) feedback are positively related to innovative job performance.

H4: Rewards and recognition is negatively related to intention to leave.

H5: Rewards and recognition is positively related to in-role performance.

H6: Rewards and recognition is positively related to innovative job performance.

H7: Work-life balance is negatively related to intention to leave.

H8: Work-life balance is positively related to in-role performance.

H9: Work-life balance is positively related to innovative job performance.

H10: Job characteristics, (a) skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance, (d) autonomy and (e) feedback are positively related to employee engagement.

H11: Rewards and recognition is positively related to employee engagement.

H12: Work-life balance is positively related to employee engagement.

H13: Employee engagement is negatively related to intention to leave.

H14: Employee engagement is positively related to in-role job performance.

H15: Employee engagement is positively related to innovative job performance.
H16: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics, (a) skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance, (d) autonomy, (e) feedback and intention to leave.

H17: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics, (a) skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance, (d) autonomy, (e) feedback and in-role performance.

H18: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics, (a) skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance, (d) autonomy, (e) feedback and innovative job performance.

H19: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between rewards and recognition, and intention to leave.

H20: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between rewards and recognition, and in-role performance.

H21: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between rewards and recognition, and innovative job performance.

H22: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between work-life balance and intention to leave.

H23: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between work-life balance and in-role performance.

H24: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between work-life balance and innovative job performance.

H25: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between job characteristics, (a) skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance, (d) autonomy, (e) feedback and employee engagement.
H26: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between reward and recognition, and employee engagement.
H27: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between work-life balance and employee engagement.
H28: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention.
H29: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between employee engagement and in-role performance.
H30: Generation cohort moderates the relationship between employee engagement and innovative job performance.

3.4 Chapter Summary

In summary, this study examines the mediating role of employee engagement as well as moderating role of generational differences between work motivators and work outcome. Chapter Four discusses the research methods.
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this research is to examine the generational differences in the engagement research model, that allows cohesive working environment, which translates into talent retention strategies at workplace which inevitably drives organisation performance (Bates, 2004; Baumruk, 2004; Harter et al., 2002; Richman, 2006). This chapter provides detailed information on research design, sample treatment, sampling method, data collection, research measures, pilot test, analysis of data, and ethical consideration.

4.2 Research Design

This research consists of two phases of data collection: face-to-face interviews to investigate generational issues from the Malaysian perspective, followed by quantitative research via completion of questionnaires. Face-to-face interviews were conducted to examine if generational issues exist in the Malaysian working environment. As information regarding this phenomenon in the Malaysian context is rather limited, the best method to examine this phenomenon is through qualitative research. Furthermore, both qualitative and quantitative methods were used in this research, as there are critics where some phenomena are simply not measureable
through numbers. In such cases, conducting quantitative methodology alone may limit the chances of discovering certain social phenomena (Silverman, 2006).

4.3 Sample Treatment

This is a cross-sectional research, as data was gathered at a single point in time (Baker, 1999). It was carried out in organisations situated in Peninsular Malaysia for both phases of data collection. This research focuses on Baby Boomers, Generation X and Y. The Silent Generation was omitted, as there are only a handful of them who are still at workforce albeit beyond retirement age. The youngest Malaysian respondent would be 16 years of age as this is the minimum legal age to enter workforce in Malaysia. Based on the statistics, the biggest portion of respondents would be expected from Generation X and Generation Y followed by Baby Boomers. However, as some of the Baby Boomers have already retired, the majority of the respondents from phase two were from Generation X, followed by Generation Y and Baby Boomers.

4.4 Sampling Method

4.4.1 Phase One: Face-to-face Interviews

Past literature reveals that each generation of employees are shaped by some defining moments that occur around their time prior to joining the workforce. This research highlights some of the historical moments that are meaningful to three generations of employees. The results from a preliminary study of 63 participants
enhance understanding of the likely source of the peculiar work behaviours of each cohort in Malaysia.

This phase highlights part of a larger quantitative study and in particular determines the extent to which historical events that have taken place in the country are important or meaningful to Malaysian Baby Boomers, Generation X and Y. This is to enable employers to better understand each generation to allow better alignment of their corporate strategies with the expectations and perceptions of each cohort.

Face-to-face interview provides well-grounded information within the local context (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Therefore, a face-to-face interview was employed in phase 1. Stratified convenient sampling was used to have equal representation from each generation cohort. Initial plan was to interview 10 respondents per generation, that is Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y but this has been increased to 20 per generation for better data generalisation. Actual respondents interviewed were 70. To obtain full range or nearly full range of possible vital insights, Griffin and Hauser (1993) suggest that a total of 30 respondents for a qualitative sample size are acceptable. These 30 respondents lower the likelihood of losing a perception with a maximum of 10% incidence to less than 5% assuming random sampling, and it is the upper end of the range. If there are insufficient funds, these numbers can be less than 30.

Out of the 70 interviews, 63 were usable, as the remainder 7 has withdrawn from participation. All respondents were informed of the expected duration to complete the interview and their rights to withdraw from participation at any point of
time at the beginning of the interview. Out of the 63, 21 were from the Boomers, 22 Generation X and 20 from Generation Y. Only Malaysians working locally with concentration from Klang Valley aged 16 and above were considered in this research as this is the minimum legal working age in Malaysia. The interviewees were asked to describe about their values, expectation, attitude towards work and their goals. They were also asked about their perception towards their immediate supervisors and team members in relation to work values, expectation, attitude and perceived goals. These attributes were then matched to check on reliability. They were also asked to choose their age range and their respective supervisor’s age range based on generation definition. Each in-depth interview took about an hour and the interviews were conducted from mid-January until mid-May 2011.

4.4.2 Phase Two: Questionnaires

Although Towers Perrin (2003) concluded that industry segregation is not necessary as there is no industry differences when it comes to employee engagement; companies from various industries were still approached to avoid contextual constrains associated with focusing on just one industry. Web search was carried out to have a general understanding of the organisations to ensure that the sample comes from a variety of companies from different industries. Data were collected from mid-December 2011 to mid-June 2012. A total of 578 set of questionnaires were collected. This number clearly exceeds the required sample size of 300 respondents for Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) and 30 respondents per construct based on central limit theorem in probability theory - giving this study an acceptable sample size.
4.4.3 Ethical Consideration

Sampling method for both phases were reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of University of Malaya prior to data collection (appendix 10 and 12). No participant was required to disclose any identifying information and they were conscious about the ethical consideration of this research through anonymity and confidentiality. The participants are protected, as they were not identified throughout the survey process. Participation was voluntary, and they were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time, as they are not obligated to participate in the survey. There was also a secure website for online submission of the questionnaire. All questionnaires together with any additional notes concerning this research were compiled and stored in a locked drawer accessible only to the researcher. Protecting respondent anonymity is also one of the methods recommended by Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003) to reduce method biasness as it reduces the likelihood of respondents editing their responses to be more socially desirable or consistent with how they think the researcher wants them to be.

4.5 Data Collection

As mentioned earlier, data collection involved two-phases. Phase one employed face to face interviews. Details of data collection for phase one has been addressed in the previous section. Therefore, the focus of this segment is on phase two of data collection.
4.5.1 Phase Two: Questionnaire

Names of the Heads of Human Resources or the person in charge were first obtained from the list of selected companies. They were contacted via telephone, in person and email. Some organisations did not participate, as they have previously participated in similar surveys, or it was not timely. Some said that they are not agreeable to the reward and recognition section in the questionnaire as it may give some ideas to the employees on how they should be treated for performing their job well.

For phase two of this study, random sampling was employed. From the list with only employee ID numbers furnished by the respective Human Resources, respondents were randomly selected. It follows positivist philosophy as it is commonly held in quantitative research where data is obtained and verified for empirical evidence. Questionnaires were then distributed to the employee and supervisor with the help from the respective person-in-charge. They were informed that only aggregated data would be analysed to protect their confidentiality.

4.6 Research Instruments, the Questionnaire

Two sets of questionnaires together with a cover page were developed to collect data from employees and supervisors (appendix 13 – 16). The cover page includes nature and purpose of research; expected duration to complete the questionnaire; assurance that all data collected will be kept confidential and presentation of data will be in aggregate; contact details of both the researcher and
research supervisor to facilitate in answering queries raised by the respondents, if any; and various methods to return completed questionnaire, which includes via drop box, email, fax, and online link. Respondents were assured that there are no right or wrong answers and that they should answer questions as honest as possible. This is one of the recommendations mentioned by Podsakoff et al. (2003) to reduce method biasness.

Respondents were also informed of the reason they were chosen and their rights to withdraw from participation whenever they like. Questionnaire was first developed in English and then translated to Bahasa Melayu (appendix 13 – 16) to capture more respondents. Back-to-back translation was used. These questionnaires were then transferred to a web-based platform (appendix 17 – 20) where all questions were made compulsory.

There were serial numbers for both hardcopy and web based questionnaire. For example, employee A, who reports to supervisor B, has the same serial number. As for the web based questionnaires, the employee is advised to use his / her employee number as the serial number and their immediate supervisor is required to use the same number to evaluate this particular employee.

Data were gathered from two sources - the employee and their immediate supervisor. This was done to reduce the risk of common method bias. The employee’s questionnaire has 9 parts: 15-items job characteristics, 10-items reward and recognition, 4-items work-life balance, 9-items work engagement, 3-items intention to leave, 5-items in-role performance, 9-items innovative job performance, additional
information and background information. Additional information includes number of companies served in the last 5 years to gauge turnover intention and job-hopping behaviour; last performance review rating and description of last performance review rating. While background information consists of gender, ethnicity, year of birth (age), marital status, monthly gross income, academic qualification, designation, industry classification, tenure in current organisation, total number of years worked, employment type and employment status.

As for the demographic questions in the employee’s survey, year of birth, is asked to serve as a check and balance for the generation in which the respondents fall under where he / she is required to choose a range based on generation definition, that is from 1981 to 1995, from 1965 to 1980 and from 1946 to 1964. While employment type, a choice of full time and part time is given. The same goes for employment status, choice of permanent or contract. Industry, which respondent is attached to where a list of industry classification was provided were also asked to ensure that the data is not skewed towards one industry even though Towers Perrin (2003) has concluded that there are no industry differentiation in employee engagement.

The employees were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the statements pertaining to all variables of the study (measures of job characteristics, reward and recognition, work-life balance, work engagement, intention to leave, in-role performance, and innovative job performance). They were also asked for the extent to which they have received various outcomes for performing their job well in the last eighteen months (1½ years) in their current organisations and how they feel at work in the last twelve (12) months for work
engagement. When it comes to performances, the employees were asked to state the extent to which the statements reflect their immediate supervisor’s perception about their level of performance.

On the other hand, the supervisor’s questionnaire has 5 parts: 5-items in-role performance, 9-items innovative job performance, 15-items job characteristics, 10-items reward and recognition, and 4-items work-life balance. Likert scales were used as it has many advantages. These include familiarity of scale to respondents, which makes it easier for both participants and researcher; reliable method to obtain data and reduce time needed to obtain data from respondents.

The immediate supervisor of the employee was asked to evaluate the employee’s performance and work-related matters by indicating the degree to which each of the statement in the questionnaire best describes the employee. As measures from the immediate supervisor were the same as those from the employee survey, comparison from the two perspectives will be carried out in future research.

Each participant was asked to return the questionnaires immediately to the researcher, except for a small number of participants who were busy. Link to the web based questionnaires was given to those who prefer to do it online. In order to increase the response rate, these questionnaires were collected personally within the same week. The employee and supervisor’s surveys took about 15 and 10 minutes respectively.
4.7 Web Based Survey Platform

Based on the numbers, it is expected to get most of the respondents from the younger generation and as technology is a way of life to these groups, secured access web based questionnaires were used in addition to distributing hardcopies of the survey. Using online survey will enable them to multitask easily, which fits well into their characteristics and a web-based survey via real time technology is always their preferred choice (Wagner, 2007). Web based has various advantages, which include real time results, confidentiality, attracting respondents who may not want to respond to hardcopies (Cooper & Schindler, 2006), reducing financial burden and simplifying data entry. A survey link was sent via email based on the list given by the Human Resources Department. If not permitted, email link was sent to the Human Resources for their onward submission.

Five top web based survey platform were compared – Wufoo (http://wufoo.com/), SurveyGizmo (http://www.surveygizmo.com/), Google Forms, SurveyMonkey (http://www.surveymonkey.com/), and Surveyz (http://www.qualtrics.com/). The pros and cons of these online tools were weighted and final decision was to use Google Forms. Wufoo can be easily customised but limits its free surveys to three and 100 responses a month. Having a limit on the responses is a barrier, as forms will be deactivated once it exceeds the maximum number of entries. While SurveyGizmo offers a trial period of 14 days. The same thing goes to Surveyz where it comes with a fee. SurveyMonkey is the most user-friendly among all and well known for its survey. However, the basic free plan does not allow data to be downloaded, which is a major hindrance in this research. The
initial plan was to sign up for SELECT plan with a minimal fee. However that plan was shelved when Google Forms was discovered. The underlying basis for choosing Google Forms is that it is free for unlimited duration, plus it provides unlimited amount of surveys and has a space for over 1,000 responses. Moreover, the themes are plentiful though it may not look as nice as those paid platforms.

4.8 Research Measures

Established measures with high reliability were used in this research. Nevertheless, these measures were then subjected to exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to assess the underlying structure of the measures in the sample from Malaysia. Seven constructs were examined in this study. Five variables (job characteristics, reward & recognition, work-life balance, in-role performance, and innovative job performance) were both self-report measures and measures provided by the respondents’ immediate supervisors. The remaining variables (work engagement and intention to leave) were self-report measures. To avoid spuriously high or low correlation, confused by common method variance as in self-rated construct, there were five variables taken from both employee and supervisor (Organ et al., 2006). As immediate supervisors are deemed to be the most appropriate source of information with regard to job performance (Bohlander & Snell, 2007; Moideenkutty, Blau, Kumar & Nalakath, 2006), the immediate supervisors were asked to evaluate their subordinates on in-role performance and innovative job performance in addition to the independent variables.
4.8.1 Job Characteristics

Job characteristics, a 15-item measure were taken from revised Hackman and Oldham (1975), and Idaszak and Drasgow (1987). This measurement is often used to evaluate job characteristics of most jobs. Besides, Hackman and Oldham measurement is the most comprehensive measure for job characteristics (Dunham, 1977). The revised version is chosen as it was found that the revised job characteristics items conformed more closely to than the original items especially through confirmatory factor analysis (Kulik, Oldham, & Langner, 1988), which was also used in this study. As illustrated in Job Characteristics Model, the five core dimensions of a job (skill variety, task identity, feedback, task significance, and autonomy) leads employees to experience three critical psychological states (meaningfulness of work, responsibility for the outcome of work, and knowledge of results of work activities). Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement based on a 5-point Likert scale anchored from (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree.

Skill variety is defined as an array of different activities that uses different skills of the employee. This dimension is assessed with a two-item scale (items 1 and 2) in appendix 4. Task identity speaks about the extent, to which an individual sees the work from start to finish, as opposed to a portion or a fraction of the end product. Four items were used to assess task identity (Items 3 - 6). Whilst feedback relates employee’s awareness of how effective he / she is performing and is assessed with four questionnaire items (items 7 - 10). Whereas task significance, a two-item scale refers to perceived importance of one’s job, that is impact to the world (items 11 and
Lastly, autonomy refers to the degree of freedom one has, in terms of deciding ways to carry out assigned tasks, is assessed with three questionnaire items (items 13 - 15). Items 2, 3, 7, and 8 were reversed scores. Reliabilities in the original research by Hackman & Oldham (1975) were between 0.6 and 0.5. Although a reliable construct of 0.7 is an excellent value, a score of 0.5 and above indicates acceptability (Gliem & Gliem, 2003).

### 4.8.2 Reward and Recognition

Reward and recognition were adopted from Saks (2006) using a five-point Likert type scale with anchors from (1) to a small extent, (2) to some extent, (3) neutral, (4) to a moderate extent, and (5) to a large extent. Respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they have received various outcomes for performing their job well in the last eighteen months (1½ years) in their current organisation for 10 items. Eighteen months (1½ years) were chosen as almost all companies in Malaysia give pay raise (item 1) and promotion (item 3) once a year, that is at the end of each financial year and the grace period of six months is to give allowance for the official announcement made by the organisation. The Cronbach Alpha in the original study was 0.8 (Saks, 2006)

### 4.8.3 Work-Life Balance

Measures on work-life balance (flexible work arrangements) were adapted from Parkes and Langford (2008) on four items (Appendix 6). It is based on five-point Likert type scale of (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neither disagree nor
agree, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree. Their study demonstrates good internal reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.86 and good divergent reliability (Parkes & Langford, 2008).

### 4.8.4 Work Engagement

Work engagement a self-report instrument on a 9-item short form of UTRECHT Work Engagement Survey (UWES) was used with rating scale-measuring frequency in terms of how a respondent feels about their job. Participants were instructed to respond to the statements with reference to their work using UWES. The three factors of engagement, that is vigour, dedication, and absorption were compared among the generation cohort to measure the level of engagement according to Schaufeli and Bakker (2003). The overall Cronbach’s alpha in their study varies from 0.89 to 0.97 (median 0.93) with factors vigour being 0.89, dedication 0.89, and absorption 0.79 (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003).

### 4.8.5 Intention to Leave

Intention to leave was gauged using items from Jenkins (1993) and Kransz, Kosloswsky, Shalom and Elyakim (1995) scale. Turnover intention is operationalised as the likelihood that an individual seeks employment elsewhere instead of staying in his / her present job. Items such as probability of looking for another organisation in the near future were asked.
4.8.6 **In-role Performance and Innovative Job Performance**

Job performance was operationalised as both self-rated and supervisory ratings of employee in-role performance and innovative job performance. An in-role performance measure was from Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1989) while innovative job performance measure was from Janssen and Van Yperen (2004).

In-role performance is based on a 7-point Likert scale consisting of (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) somewhat disagree, (4) undecided, (5) somewhat agree, (6) agree, and (7) strongly agree. On the contrary, innovative job performance scale ranged from (1) never to (7) always. Out of the nine items, three items refer to idea generation, three items to idea promotion, and the remaining three to idea realisation. As the same measures were also used in the employee’s survey, the original items were rephrased from “this employee” to “I” in the employee’s survey.

4.9 **Pilot Study**

Prior to the actual research, a pilot test on the questionnaire was conducted to ensure that all questions are comprehensible. A pilot test of 50 respondents was randomly chosen. Participants were given the opportunity to comment on clarity and relevancy of the various statements included in the survey. Feedback obtained from a pilot test allows researcher the final opportunity to make changes (Robson, 2002).

The results of the pilot study found that only minor improvements were necessary for the Bahasa Melayu version. The items were clearly understood by the
respondents and the items had high reliability. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of the constructs for the test of scale reliability surpassed the 0.70 acceptable threshold recommended by Nunnally (1978). Internal consistencies of all measures in the pilot study were between .711 and .963. The scales were also close to the original study. For example, Cronbach’s alpha for work-life balance was .860 in the original study and reliability results for work engagement is within the range of the overall Cronbach’s alpha in the original from 0.890 to 0.970. Very high reliabilities of .95 or higher is unnecessary as it indicates that there are redundant items (Streiner, 2003).

Table 4.1 shows the reliability results of the pilot test:

Table 4.1: Internal Consistencies of Research Measures from a Pilot Study (n = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee’s Questionnaire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Characteristics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward and Recognition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Leave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-role Performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Job Performance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor’s Questionnaire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-role Performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Job Performance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Characteristics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sadly, the outcome of the pilot test was not all positive. There was a clear indication that obtaining data from the immediate supervisor was not an easy quest. It was found that supervisors were not serious and unwilling to answer the questionnaires. In most cases, supervisor did not return the survey form despite numerous reminders. Therefore, surveys returned by their subordinates could not be matched to their response. In some cases, even though the supervisor completed the questionnaire, the responses were often mixed up with another subordinate who is under their care despite having serial numbers written on the questionnaire. Besides, some supervisors were based in different countries especially when the employees are already holding senior positions here in Malaysia. Hence, supervisor’s questionnaires were not distributed in the actual study.

4.10 Analysis of Data

The current research has adapted the content analysis, a widely used method for qualitative research in order to provide insight into human interaction and relevant variables. In addition, quasi-statistics were used to analyse data collected from phase one. Data were documented in Microsoft Excel 2010, cleaned, and thereafter transferred to IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Statistics 20 for further analysis. Data cleansing include examining, conceptualisation, coding, and categorising of the data into concepts. Thereafter, relationships on how the concepts are connected were examined. All items from the interviews were analysed using content analysis with the exception of historical events that influenced the characteristics of respondents where quasi-statistics were used. This method is supported by prominent qualitative researchers such as Howard Becker and Martyn
Hammersley as it requires counting the number of times the event is mentioned and taking into consideration of the rank of significance given by the interviewee. These simple counts of things in quasi-statistics are a legitimate and important sort of data for qualitative researchers and its value is more precise as claimed by Becker (1970). This is further supported by Maxwell (2010) as the use of numbers per se in qualitative data, does not make it a mixed-method research.

The data collected from phase two was analysed by using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). SEM is a statistical technique, which allows both confirmatory and exploratory modelling thus, suitable for both assessment and advancement of theory, which is the core of this research. The Engagement Model starts with hypotheses, which represent the model, operationalises the constructs, and tests the fitness of model.

Two statistical software programmes were used to process raw data and test the hypothesis: IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Statistics 20 and IBM SPSS Analysis of Moment Structures (Amos) 18. SPSS 20 was used to check and clean the data. Incomplete responses were eliminated from the analysis. Thereafter, first stage of data analysis was carried out. These include descriptive statistics, means, and standard deviation of all variables, internal consistency using reliability analysis, skewness, and kurtosis to access normality. As per Coakes and Ong (2011), normality test is crucial as non-normality affects the validity of the results. SPSS was also used to perform exploratory factor analysis (EFA).
AMOS 18 was used to test direct and indirect relationships, access model fit, make any modification and test research hypotheses. AMOS is chosen over hierarchical regression in SPSS, as the latter is unable to tell how well the model fits. Instead, it tells whether the paths are significant. Besides, AMOS seems to be a better tool as it displays the interrelationships clearly (Cunningham & Wang, 2005). AMOS uses graphical interface with advanced computing engine for SEM. Bootstrapping has been used to obtain confidence intervals.

4.11 Chapter Summary

This chapter explains the strategy adopted in this study. It describes the research design, data collection procedures, development of questionnaires, and research measurements. Results from pilot study shows good internal consistencies for all measures and the overall results of the study are reported in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

5.1 Introduction

The results in this chapter are divided into two parts, that is results from face-to-face interviews and responses obtained from questionnaires.

5.2 Phase One: Face-to-face Interviews

The result from this phase is based on interviews conducted between mid-January 2011 until mid-May 2011. There were 21 Boomers, 22 Generation X and 20 Generation Y. Microsoft Excel 2010 was used to document the data and data cleansing was also carried out in this platform before exporting it to IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Statistics 20 for further checking and faster descriptive statistics. Data was conceptualised, coded, and categorised into concepts. Both content analysis and quasi-statistics were used to analyse the data. Categorising into concepts or searching out patterns include immersing oneself in the data as recommended by Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) to identify possible phenomena, inconsistencies and divergent of views given by different generations.
5.2.1 Demographic Description

As the society is placing more emphasis on education as the years go by, individuals from all three generations appear to be willing to invest their time and energy in obtaining higher education qualification. Preliminary study shows that the highest qualification attained for Baby Boomers are quite evenly spread as compared to other generations where majority have attained secondary school and below, degree / professional qualification and postgraduate. This shows that even after or while working, they have chosen to continue their studies at tertiary level. On the contrary, the majority of Generation X has at least a degree or holds a professional qualification. Similarly, the majority of Gen Y has a pre-university qualification with the aim to pursue their education later, or currently a degree holder. Figure 5.1 summarises the highest qualification attained across generations.

Figure 5.1: Highest Qualification Attained across Generations
When it comes to current position held, majority of the Boomers are Assistant Managers and above; and Non-executive as those who are capable would have move up to at least Assistant Manager level. Gen X, being in their prime working age, comprised mainly of Assistant Manager and above, followed by Executive or Senior Executive and Non-executive. The trend is reversed for the Gen Y as they are still gaining work knowledge and some have yet to complete their education or wish to further their studies later.

Figure 5.2: Designation across Generations

When it comes to tenure in organisation across generations, it seems that the Boomers tend to stay longer within the organisation as compared to the rest. This trend is in line with the report by Florida (2009) where employees under the age of 30 changes jobs almost once every one and a half year as compared to the national average of once every three years. As far as literature is concerned, job security was
the most important factor for employee. Then, from 1966 to 1975, job security became second after the nature of work (Jurgensen, 1978).

Figure 5.3: Tenure in Organisation across Generations

![Tenure in Organisation](image)

Based on figure 5.3, one may argue that it is only natural for Generation Y to stay in an organisation for less than a year, as they are still young and some may not have decided on their career paths. However, a closer look would review that they tend to stay in organisations from a year to less than 3 years. There was a Gen Y graduate who reviewed that she has changed four jobs in a year.

5.2.2 Significant Local Historical Events

To add to the literature, interviewees were asked to identify events that were significant to them. These events were not restricted by geographical area. They were free to list the events. As expected, they mentioned events that happened locally. The interviewees were later given some assistance, by showing them a list of events that
happened. With the list of significant events on hand, they were then asked if they wish to revisit the earlier mentioned events and rank them according to their significance. These rankings were later used to compute the top significance events for each generation.

Figure 5.4 shows an overview of events that are significant to each generation. These events were sorted according to the chronology of their occurrences to ease understanding and they corresponded with the formative years of the different cohorts. Zemke et al. (2000) notes that people resemble their times more than their parents do and this seems to be true in Malaysia too.

Figure 5.4: Events that Impacted Across Generations

Based on the rankings given by the interviewees, the outcome of events were further analysed to obtain the most significant events to the different cohorts in Malaysia. These events were summarised in table 5.1. Baby Boomers suggested that
the New Economic Policy impacts their daily lives the most, as they feel that it should be merit based. This is followed by the Internet revolution, economic meltdown, and the Malaysian independence. Even though Baby Boomers are about to retire, they still feel that the emergence of the Internet has an impact on them as it has changed the way things are done. At times, they feel left out for not being familiar with the Internet per say.

Table 5.1: Most Significant Event based on Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Economic Policy¹</td>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>Social Network Site</td>
<td>Social Network Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Meltdown</td>
<td>Birth of Computer / Internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian Independence</td>
<td>September 11</td>
<td>New Economic Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study showed that the Generation X in Malaysia is significantly influenced by the Internet just like their Western counterparts. In addition, as reported in past researches (Dries et al., 2008; Modzelewski, 2001), September 11 is deemed significant to them compared to Generation Y. The impact extends beyond the geographical area of the United States. To them, this may be the first ever attack that they have seen. As far as Generation Y is concerned, they seemed to indicate that only the Internet and social network sites as important to them. They cannot live without

¹ New Economic Policy (NEP) or Dasar Ekonomi Baru (DEB) in Malay is a socio-economic restructuring programme launched by the Malaysian government in 1971 under the then Prime Minister Tun Abdul Razak with stated goal of poverty eradication and economic restructuring to remove identification of ethnicity with economic function.
these. Gen Y seemed to be very technical and rely heavily on the Internet and access to the social networking sites as utmost important. This concurs with a global survey that Malaysia ranks number 11 in the usage of Facebook worldwide (Royal Pingdom, 2011) as shown in figure 5.5.

Figure 5.5: Top Twenty Countries on Facebook

![Estimated Monthly Visitors to Facebook.com (Million)](source)

Source: Royal Pingdom (2011)

As illustrated in Table 5.1, there are some spills over effects of events where some events may have affected more than one generation. For example, the Internet has a spill over effect across all generations but with different levels of importance. Internet seems to be the most important aspect for the Gen X and Y as they hunger for everyday Internet access. According to the Economist Intelligence Unit, Internet penetration in Malaysia accounts for 62% in the year 2011 and is expected to reach
77% by 2015. Social network site is deemed as second most important to these younger generations and these can be tracked down to the various write-ups on Facebook addiction (Aruna, 2012; Wong, 2012). However, when it comes to the Boomers, it is not the social network site that has impact on them but rather the technology itself - the Internet. When asked about how significant Internet is to them, they said that it has changed the way things are being done and how things are being looked at. They are amazed on the real time information that can be obtained, for example, from the KLSE board; and ease of daily chores such as online banking and payment of bills. They feel left out if they do not learn; knowing how to make use of the technology is another matter.

As for the New Economic Policy, Boomers find it the most significant as this is a major restructuring programme, which was launched during their time. On the contrary, Gen X ranks it number five after technology and September 11 incident. It is still viewed as a significant event, even though the term was officially ended in 1990 as it remained in effect through other governmental policies.

5.2.3 Expectations and Perceptions from the Younger and Older Generations

Interviewees were asked about their own work expectations and their perception about their colleagues who are younger and older than them in terms of age. They were also asked about the work values, behaviours and goals in life of themselves and their supervisors. Age range of their immediate supervisor, which is in accordance to the generation cohort were asked during the interview. Table 5.2 depicts cross tabulation of respondents and supervisors’ age. As expected, majority of
the supervisor comes from the Boomers as they may have moved up the corporate ladder as years go by. Nevertheless, there are supervisors who are younger than their subordinates are.

Table 5.2: Respondent and Supervisor Age Cross Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Supervisor's Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boomers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boomers</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generation X</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generation Y</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of us have expectations. Based on the findings from the interviews, the Boomers expect the younger generations, that are Gen X and Y to work harder, put in more initiative when it comes to work, be more independent, respectful, and responsible. They should have the eagerness to learn and should be fast learners, as they have left school not that long ago. They are expected to take the initiative to lead and lastly, they are expected to bring in fresh ideas to the organisations.

When asked about the Boomers, Gen X and Y expect them to portray good values, provide guidance, flexible, be a good listener, respect them, be more adaptable and display willingness to contribute. If these expectations fall short, clashes may happen. Thus, it is important for the employees to know what are expected from them. Table 5.3 summarises the respondents’ perceptions of their supervisors based on generation cohort.
Table 5.3: Respondents’ Perceptions of their Baby Boomers and Generation X

Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Work Values** | Results driven  
Loyal  
Dedicated  
Diligent | Dedicated  
Ambitious  
Results Driven  
Team Player  
Confident  
Optimistic  
Innovative |
| **Work Expectation** | Security | Challenging Work  
Security  
Fair Rewards  
Work-Life Balance  
Fast Track |
| **Work Behaviour** | Results-focused  
Respect Authority | Respect Authority  
Results-focused  
Multitasking  
Loyal to Team |

5.2.4 Characteristics of Each Generation

The responses gathered from the interviews were grouped together, aligning it with the identified research question. Based from the responses, it was found that, career does not hold the same meaning or importance for the Generation X cohorts as it does for the Baby Boomer. Generational characteristics are defined by the unique events of history that occur during the formative years and set the platform for differing work styles and goals for each generation (McDonald, 2008). Among the three generations in Malaysia, Baby Boomers are the ones who have gone through the hardest moment in their lives. They strived through the hard times of economic meltdown, the May 13 incident and witnessed the hardship of the leaders of Malaysia to gain its independence. Due to these, the Boomers tend to focus on careers, as they believe that having a job itself is already a bonus. Boomers are the most workaholic compared to Gen X and Y. Just like their Western counterparts, the Boomers may
have difficulties in balancing their work and family lives. Baby Boomer parents spend lesser time with their families, therefore raised Generation X to value work-life balance more upon seeing their parents.

Similar characteristics can be seen across the West and Malaysia with some locally unique characteristics. Their characteristics are comparable as they are shaped not only by its demographic numbers but also by past events. For example, Baby Boomers were born subsequent to the two world wars. Due to their numbers, they have to compete throughout and this makes them easy to please (Elsdon & Lyer, 1999). As a result, they are loyal, dedicated and long for job security. Having retirement plan would attract the Boomers.

As for Generation X, they saw their hardworking parents being laid off and seeing that, they realise that sacrifice does not warrant stable family life and long-term employment. Thus, it is crucial to have company goals ingrained in them and make them understand as to how they can contribute or fit into the overall plan. They should be given space to be creative and to search for solutions. Leaders should ask them what they feel and how things can be improved. What Gen X expects from their supervisors is merely guidance and they do not like to be micro managed. Gone were the days where employees asked for reason they should leave an organisation. Now is the question of how to give them the reason to stay. This is also the generation where both partners work or experiencing increased divorce rates for failed marriages, causing more single parents, which makes them more self-reliant. Thus, it is undeniable that the Internet and booming social networking sites are utmost important to them. These are the places where they connect to others and search for information.
In addition, this is also the cohort where societies put blame on them for social ills, which caused them to be more cynical and independent. Despite being negatively labelled, there is a compassionate side to them. They find September 11 important to them. They feel saddened by the death of many innocent people. Besides, having fair rewards are paramount to them. Thus, transparency and competency or performance based reward at work, place great importance to them. Gone were the days where seniority takes precedence. What Generation X wants is empowerment.

Generation Y, being the youngest in the working world is highly comfortable with technology, which is their second nature. This is again reflected in the events that impacted them – the Internet and social network sites. This would have contributed to the 17.5 million Internet users in Malaysia as of April 2011 as revealed by the Minister of Communication Dato’ Seri Utama Dr. Rais (Malaysian Wireless, 2011). Having information readily available from the Internet, both parents working and enjoying economic stability during their time, they are the most educated of all and they value knowledge. Having high expectations of themselves and their employers are their trait. Engaging in meaningful work is important to them. Fast track leadership programmes, clear career path, recognition and rewards based on contributions are preferred (Glass, 2007). To bring out the best in them, leaders need more collaboration rather than micro managing them. Their expectations need to be managed and at the same time, leverage on Baby Boomers’ experience. Managing the generations effectively will ensure positive outcome.

It seems that some of the characteristics have a delayed effect in Malaysia. For example, loyalty, and job security for the Baby Boomers. These characteristics were
reported under the Silent Generation in the West. Meanwhile, Generation Y has a spill over attributes of opportunity to learn, preference for work-life balance and challenging work. To them, if they feel that their needs are not met, and with the strong social network readily available in the market, many will join Generation X in embracing home based entrepreneurship or self-employment where it provides them the challenges, opportunities, and flexibility that they crave. Leaders must now realise that they are no longer leading a workforce that clocked in adequate working hours but a learning workforce. Being a leader by way of seniority is almost obsolete in current work settings. For example, they need to start putting new entrants into areas of responsibilities faster than their maturity warrant. Gone were the days where if you put in your time, your time will come.

Dedication and respect for authority are the two attributes that are seen across all generations as all of them find that they are dedicated to their jobs and have respect to the authority. Although some may argue that these attributes should be declining but these are viewed differently by each generation where they feel that they are still dedicated and respectful to the authority. Perhaps, it is time to redefine these attributes according to the generation group. Leaders may ask each generation a direct question on what they think dedication and respect for authority mean to them to avoid misunderstanding. For example, dedication for Boomers may mean concentrating at the task alone. Dedication to Gen X and Y may mean, so long as they finish the work on time, they have the right to do other things in between the given tasks. On the other hand, respect for authority for the Boomers may mean having to address a person according to his / her position and Gen X may find it sufficient to address them as Mr / Ms. Gen Y may find it adequate to say “Hi”, to which others may be offended.
Having said all that, leaders must not be judgmental but respect the values of younger generation, share job knowledge, provide support, and guidance. Employers should leverage on the experience of Baby Boomers by allowing them to feel valued by giving them the opportunity to mentor the younger generations. This is one way for employers to recognise their seniority, which is their key driver and at the same time, a good method to build strong relationships that cut across age cohorts and capitalise on their strength differences.

Table 5.4 summarises the characteristics of each generation cohort. These characteristics were concluded upon considering and matching with what the interviewees reported and what they perceived of other cohorts.

Table 5.4: Work Values, Expectations, Behaviours and Goal of Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Values</td>
<td>#Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>##Loyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Expectation</td>
<td>##Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Behaviour</td>
<td>#Respect Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4: Work Values, Expectations, Behaviours and Goal of Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Lead a Simple Life</td>
<td>###Independence Meaningful Work</td>
<td>###Meaningful Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:

#  Same characteristics across generation

##  Delayed characteristics compared to the West / Crossover to the next generation

###  Similar to West

####  Spill over attributes

### 5.2.5 Leadership Style

Interviewees were asked to describe their supervisor’s leadership style and their leadership style if they hold supervisory role. Both responses were crossed checked based on the respective generation cohort of both the interviewees and supervisor’s age group. It is found that there are differences when it comes to leadership style across generations. In general, Boomer has firm leadership style while both Generation X and Y prefer teamwork. Nevertheless, teamwork between the two generations is different. Gen X’s teamwork refers to participation from team members whereas Gen Y teamwork is all about empowerment where team members are allowed to complete tasks in his or her own creative ways.
5.2.6 Motivators for Each Generation

Interviewees were asked about factors that drive them to perform as well as factors that they believe drives colleagues who are of different generation as them and their supervisors. Based on the study, it is found that Boomers are generally self-motivated. They feel that it is their responsibilities to complete the tasks given. This is in line with what is perceived as their driving force. As for Gen X, they find that money followed by good teamwork drive them to perform. However, other generations perceive that money is the only motivator for Gen X. In order to motivate Gen Y, ones need to know their passion as this youngest cohort at workplace is driven by passion. If they like the job, they will do it. Besides, gaining knowledge is also said to be important to them. As there are not many Gen Y supervisors, the perceived driving force for Gen Y supervisor is difficult to ascertain. Nevertheless, both Boomers and Gen X perceive that Gen Y in general is money and passion guided. Both Boomers and Gen X find that their knowledge is valuable to the organisations. These motivators and perceptions from other generations are summarised in table 5.5:

Table 5.5: Actual Motivators and Perceived Motivators by Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>What Drives You to Perform?</th>
<th>What is Perceived as Your Driving Forces?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>It is my responsibilities</td>
<td>Self-motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-motivated</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good teamwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Passion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.7 Employees of Today and Five Years Ago

All interviewees were probed if they see any difference between employees of today and five years ago taking into consideration the different cohorts. In general, it is found that there are differences in various aspects of Malaysian employees between now and five years ago. Based on the findings from the interviews, the employees in general used to have good work values previously. As of now, is a general perception that dedication, work passion, sense of urgency, sense of responsibility and work knowledge is lacking among the Generation X and Y. This is especially so for Generation Y. Despite their shortcomings, these younger employees come with a higher ego. Besides, employees these days are more demanding when it comes to monetary.

Gone were the days where hard work is seen everywhere. The Boomers have been the hardworking employees all these while and some of them have retired. They noted that work behaviours have changed. The younger generations especially the Gen Y Malaysians now prefer short cut and at times, fail to look into the consequences of taking the shorter route. The interviewees said that the current trend at work is characterised by behaviour and attitudes such as giving up easily, inability to stay long in an organisation or job, more aggressive, and lazy. Employees these days values money, authority, fast track career progression, freedom, and flexibility. One interviewee even mentioned that they feel that the world owes them a living. Having said all that, work style has a positive outlook. Leaders are moving towards creative and participative approach with higher expectation of contribution from their respective team.
Some claimed that there is not much difference if it is five years but there is a lot of difference if it is 10 years. Baby Boomer era looks down on the work habits and commitment levels of the Generation X. These variances in values and beliefs held by differing cohorts create the foundation of generational differences. The next part will discuss on the findings obtained from the questionnaires.

5.3 Phase Two: Questionnaire

This research adopts both hardcopy and online questionnaires which were made available in both English and Malay languages. 583 hardcopy of questionnaires were distributed whereas another 130 online links were sent to selected respondents. Of these, 482 hardcopies and 96 online responses were received yielding a response rate of 82.68% and 73.85% respectively. This gave an overall response rate of 81.07%. Online response rate was lower as compared to hardcopy as it is easy for the respondents to delete the email and close the browser half way through. Despite requesting the questionnaire link to be sent to them, some claimed that they do not have access to the Internet at work and have no time to complete the questionnaire at home. Unlike the web-based platform, the printed questionnaire is always on their tables, and thus served as a constant reminder to them. Therefore, the printed surveys yielded a higher response rate. Nevertheless, web-based questionnaire gives a higher percentage of usability as auto validation of data online was used. Thus, after deleting incomplete questionnaires from the hardcopy pile, there were 443 usable hardcopies. This gave a total of 539 usable responses. All 539 responses from various organisations were duly checked, cleaned, and treated where necessary. Initial data
cleansing stage includes consistency checks to identify out of range data (Malhotra, 2007) where actual questionnaires were rechecked where necessary.

5.3.1 Description of Research Samples

Out of the 539 respondents, 44% were males. In terms of ethnicity, they were mainly Chinese (47.7%) and Malay (41.6%) as most of the respondents were from the corporate sector, followed by Indians (8.3%), which is comparable to Malaysia’s Indians population of 7.3% (Statistics Department of Malaysia, 2010) and other ethnic group (2.4%).

As for the age cohort, majority were from prime working age, that is Generation X (40.3%); followed by Generation Y (34.9%) and the Boomers (24.9%) who are still in the workforce. The marital status of the sample of this study is similar to that of the Malaysia’s 2010 statistics as stated in brackets. Majority were married, 57.7% (59.6%), followed by single, 39.5% (35.1%), divorced / separated, 1.9% (4.5%), and widowed, 0.9% (0.8%). Based on the demographic description, the sample for this study seems close to that of the Malaysia’s population, which allows useful generalisation of data in the Malaysian context.

With regards to the monthly gross income, majority of the respondents came from income bracket of RM2,000 and below (35.1%) and followed by those from the salary range of RM2,001 to RM4,000 (31.5%). There were respondents from the income bracket of RM4,001 to RM6,000 (17.6%). As for the highest academic qualification attained, most of the respondents have at least tertiary education. Similar
results were attained from the interviews as well. Based on the questionnaires, only 31.2% stopped schooling at secondary school and below level. As expected, the majority falls under support / administrative staff category (51.8%) followed by first line management (23.4%), middle management (13.5%), professional (6.3%), top management (3.5%) and others (1.5%).

These respondents came from various industries. They were mainly from the government sector (20.4%); banking, finance, insurance, real estate (18.4%); health care, pharmaceutical (12.8%); and education (11.9%). Majority stayed in the same organisation and total number of years served to date were ten years and below. Further breakdown by generation reviewed that the majority of Boomers stayed in the same organisations for more than twenty years. Boomers tend to stay longer; they are more loyal, a trait as revealed from the interviews as well. This may be due to their qualification where the highest qualification attained is secondary school and below. Coupled with lesser job opportunities, they tend to stay on longer in their current jobs as compared to both Gen X and Y where the majority are at least a degree holder. Armed with paper qualification, it makes them easier to move on. From the breakdown, there were early Gen X and older Gen X. The staying duration of Gen X is in between Boomers and Gen Y. The older Gen X shows a bit of the Boomers’ characteristics. The scenario changed once Gen Y enters the workforce, where large portion of Gen Y do not stay in the organisation for more than two years. The overall tenure in the same organisation is a direct proportion of Gen Y. This might be due to the exordous Gen Y entering the workforce.
96.5% were full time employees and 58.1% were given a rating of consistently meets expectations when it comes to work performance in their official last performance appraisal rating, which has been agreed upon by their respective Management. As this is self-rated, bell curve for each generation was generated to show normal distribution of performance rating for each generation. This figure is presented after the demographic characteristics table. Moreover, sensitivity of data being reviewed to others is almost nil as all information was treated with strictest confidentiality. There was no identifying information disclosed. In addition, these questionnaires were either returned to the researcher directly or put into a sealed envelope or through a secure website for online submission. A meta-analysis review shows that there is no significant difference between full time and part time employees with regards to commitment, job satisfaction, intention to leave and satisfaction with job components (Thorsteinson, 2003). Table 5.6 summarises the demographic characteristics of the respondents by generations:

Table 5.6: Demographic Characteristics of 539 Respondents by Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baby Boomers (Age 47-65)</th>
<th>Generation X (Age 31-40)</th>
<th>Generation Y (Age 16-30)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6: Demographic Characteristics of 539 Respondents by Generations
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced / Separated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Monthly Gross Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM2,000 or less</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM2,001 - RM4,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM4,001 - RM6,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM6,001 - RM8,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM8,001 - RM10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM10,001 or more</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Highest Academic Qualification Attained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school and below</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university level: STPM / A Levels / Certificate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma / Advanced Diploma</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree / professional qualification</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Designation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management (e.g. CEO, COO, GM)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management (e.g. Regional Manager, Division Manager)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Line Management (e.g. Supervisor, Team Leader)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support / Administrative Staff</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6: Demographic Characteristics of 539 Respondents by Generations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry Classification of Current Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking, Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications, Advertising, Utilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care, Pharmaceutical Internet, Hi Tech</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail, Wholesale, Own Business</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services, Transportation, Hospitality</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Tenure in Current Organisation (Years) | | | | |
| 2 or less | 10 | 48 | 113 | 171 | 31.7 |
| 2<x<=5 | 13 | 55 | 59 | 127 | 23.6 |
| 5<x<=10 | 20 | 62 | 13 | 95 | 17.6 |
| 10<x<=15 | 19 | 25 | 3 | 47 | 8.7 |
| 15<x<=20 | 25 | 24 | 0 | 49 | 9.1 |
| More than 20 | 47 | 3 | 0 | 50 | 9.3 |
| Total | 134 | 217 | 188 | 539 | 100.0 |

| Total Number of Years Worked | | | | |
| 2 or less | 1 | 4 | 46 | 51 | 9.5 |
| 2<x<=5 | 1 | 15 | 70 | 86 | 16.0 |
| 5<x<=10 | 7 | 70 | 61 | 138 | 25.6 |
| 10<x<=15 | 14 | 68 | 10 | 92 | 17.1 |
| 15<x<=20 | 28 | 49 | 1 | 78 | 14.5 |
| More than 20 | 83 | 11 | 0 | 94 | 17.4 |
| Total | 134 | 217 | 188 | 539 | 100.0 |

| Employment Type | | | | |
| Full time | 131 | 211 | 178 | 520 | 96.5 |
| Part time | 3 | 6 | 10 | 19 | 3.5 |
| Total | 134 | 217 | 188 | 539 | 100.0 |
Table 5.6: Demographic Characteristics of 539 Respondents by Generations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Current Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                     |                                      |                                      |                                      |     |                |
| 12 Last Performance Review Rating |                                      |                                      |                                      |     |                |
| Marginal           | 2                                     | 5                                    | 3                                     | 10  | 1.9            |
| Nearly meets expectations | 8                                     | 17                                   | 26                                    | 51  | 9.5            |
| Consistently meets expectations | 88                                    | 120                                  | 105                                   | 313 | 58.1           |
| Exceeds expectations | 22                                    | 46                                   | 35                                    | 103 | 19.1           |
| Exemplary          | 3                                     | 7                                    | 11                                    | 21  | 3.9            |
| NA                 | 11                                    | 22                                   | 8                                     | 41  | 7.9            |
| Total              | 134                                   | 217                                  | 188                                   | 539 | 100.0          |

Legend:
- **Marginal**: Individual fails to meet expectations across many areas; significant performance improvements required to fulfil current role in organisation.
- **Nearly meets expectations**: Individual meets expectation in most areas but requires improvement across some area.
- **Consistently meets expectations**: Individual consistently meets performance expectations; individual is fulfilling current role.
- **Exceeds expectations**: Performance exceeds expected level consistently across many dimensions.
- **Exemplary**: Performance consistently far exceeds expectations; conspicuously meritorious performance; ready to fulfil new role within organisation.
5.3.2 Data Screening

Data were screened to ensure that they were accurately entered into SPSS. Frequencies on all items for all cases were inspected thoroughly for anomalies and missing values. Out of range data and missing values were counter checked with actual responses from the respective questionnaire and were replaced with correct values. Incomplete questionnaires were then discarded.

Beside frequencies, other preliminary analyses were also conducted. Descriptive statistics, which include skewness, kurtosis, mean, and standard deviation, were computed for each measure. Mean and standard deviation for each measure will be discussed later in this report. As for skewness, it ranged from -0.791 to -0.061, which is within acceptable range of –2.0 to + 2.0 (Kendall & Stuart, 1958). Majority of the variables in this study had a desired range for a normal distribution where
skewness and kurtosis values were between -1.0 and +1.0 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). West, Finch, and Curran (1995) indicates that skewness indices above 2 and kurtosis indices of above 7 should be avoided as it signifies severe non-normality problem. Thus, at this early stage of data analysis, the data set seems error free and normality of each observed variable in this study were met. Skewness and kurtosis for this study are summarised in table 5.7.

Table 5.7: Skewness and Kurtosis for All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Characteristics</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward and Recognition</td>
<td>-.377</td>
<td>-.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life Balance</td>
<td>-.716</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>-.432</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Leave</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>-.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-role Performance</td>
<td>-.791</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Job Performance</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3. Determination of Control Variable

As different occupation level may influence the level of engagement and expectations, it was considered as control variable in this research to minimise the risk of spurious associations based on unmeasured variables. The potential control variable was considered as independent variables. Dummy variables were used as occupation level is of categorical data. SPSS correlation was used to determine the association with the mediator and dependent variables. The aim was to find if it had significant relationships with the mediator and dependent variables before going on with hypotheses testing. Results of this investigation are presented in table 5.8:
Table 5.8: Control Variable Correlations in Predicting the Mediator and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee Engagement</th>
<th>Intention to Leave</th>
<th>In-role Performance</th>
<th>Innovative Job Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dummy_var_1</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.119**</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy_var_2</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.147**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy_var_3</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.104*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy_var_4</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.270**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy_var_5</td>
<td>-.091*</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.191**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Dummy_var_1: Where “Top Management (e.g. CEO, COO, GM)” was recoded as 1.
- Dummy_var_2: Where “Middle Management (e.g. Regional Manager, Division Manager)” was recoded as 1.
- Dummy_var_3: Where “First Line Management (e.g. Supervisor, Team Leader)” was recoded as 1.
- Dummy_var_4: Where “Support / Administrative Staff” was recoded as 1.
- Dummy_var_5: Where “Professional” was recoded as 1.
- ** Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
- * Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Job level exhibited significant associations with employee engagement, intention to leave, and innovative job performance. However, based on the general rule of thumb, the strength of the relationship between the variables is weak. Strength of relationship of -0.1 to 0.19 is considered none or negligible relationship, and -0.2 to 0.29 is considered weak relationship (Instructor’s Resource Guide, 2009). Strength of association from -0.1 to 0.3 is considered small. Thus, this variable does not need to be controlled.

5.3.4 Goodness of Measures

There were 55 measurement items in this study of 539 dataset, yielding a 9.8:1 cases to item ratio. This ratio is close to the ideal ratio of 10:1 cases to items ratio to perform factor analysis (Nunnally, 1978). In fact, this ratio exceeds the recommended
ratio of 5:1 by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). In addition to cases to item ratio, other statistical techniques such as Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy were also used to test the appropriateness in terms of assessing the factorability of data in the Malaysian context. The former was used to test the presence of correlations among the variables (Pallant, 2007). The result of the test must be large and significant, (p < .05) as shown in the following subsections. The majority of KMO indexes for this study were above 0.70, which is at acceptable range of 0.60 and above (Coakes & Ong, 2011). In general, the indexes should range from 0 to 1 where 0.80 and above indicates meritorious; 0.70 to less than 0.80 indicates middling; 0.60 to less than 0.70 indicates mediocre; 0.50 to less than 0.60 as miserable; and below 0.50 as unacceptable (Hair et al., 2010). Malhotra (2007) advocated that high values between 0.5 and 1.0 indicate that data has sufficient justification for factor analysis.

Once KMO and Bartlett's Test values meet the criteria for subsequent factor analyses, eigenvalues were used to decide the number of factors to be extracted and retained in factor solution. Only factors with an eigenvalue of 1.0 or more were retained. Items with factor loadings of more than 0.60 in a single factor were retained (Hair et al., 2010). The factors for each construct were then summarised in a table where attempt to name the factors were undertaken on the basis that these items loaded onto the factors, which have common features that can be reflected in the factor name (Iacobucci and Churchill, 2010).

Item communalities were within acceptable levels as they are above .5 (appendix 21). In this study, communalities may not be a concern, as sample size is
large. Hatcher (1994) recommended that the sample size should be 5 times the number of variables, or 100. Larger sample size is needed especially when communalities are low.

5.3.4.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis: Job Characteristics

KMO and Bartlett's Test were carried out to test the appropriateness of data factorability in the Malaysian context. KMO index for Job Characteristics are at .615, an acceptable range of 0.60 and above (Coakes & Ong, 2011). Bartlett's Test value is large and significant, \( \chi^2 = 2294.912, p = 0.000 \). Thus, both KMO and Bartlett's Test values indicate that the job characteristics construct met the criteria and are deemed suitable for subsequent factor analyses to be conducted, with confidence.

When the 15 items were analysed, 6 factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than one. These factors accounted for 70.67% of the variance observed. Table 5.9 shows the EFA results for job characteristics variable.
Table 5.9: Results from the Exploratory Factor Analysis: Job Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCe15</td>
<td>This job permits me to decide on my own how to go about doing my work.</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCe14</td>
<td>This job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCe13</td>
<td>This job gives me the chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCb3_1</td>
<td>This job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people. (R).</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCb4</td>
<td>This job is structured so that I can do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCb6</td>
<td>This job provides me with the chance to completely finish the piece of work I begin.</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCe10</td>
<td>Supervisors often let me know whether I am performing the job well.</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCe8_1</td>
<td>My supervisors and co-workers almost never give me feedback about how well I am doing. (R).</td>
<td>-.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCa2_1</td>
<td>This job is very simple and repetitive. (R).</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCa1</td>
<td>This job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.9: Results from the Exploratory Factor Analysis: Job Characteristics (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>EAJCc7_1</td>
<td>Doing the work required by this job provides chances for me to figure out how well I am doing. (R).</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCc9</td>
<td>After I finish my job, I know whether I performed well.</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCb5</td>
<td>This job can be done adequately without talking with or checking with other people.</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>EAJCd11</td>
<td>A lot of other people can be affected by how well my work gets done.</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAJCd12</td>
<td>This job is very significant and important in the broader scheme of things.</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigenvalue</strong></td>
<td>3.224</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>1.683</td>
<td>1.312</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>1.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage Variance (70.667)</strong></td>
<td>21.490</td>
<td>13.786</td>
<td>11.218</td>
<td>8.750</td>
<td>7.957</td>
<td>7.467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
F denotes factor; R denotes reversed coded items.
Factor 1: Skill Variety
Factor 2: Task Identity
Factor 3: Task Significance
Factor 4: Autonomy
Factor 5: Feedback Obtained from Supervisor and Co-workers
Factor 6: Feedback Obtained from the Work itself
Job characteristics in this study were then regrouped based on the sequence of the core characteristics of job characteristics to ease discussion on findings. It has six factors where the feedback cluster could be broken down further into feedback obtained from supervisor and co-workers; and feedback obtained from the work itself. Item 5 loaded into feedback obtained from the work itself rather than task identity based on the original scale. This item reads as, “This job can be done adequately without talking with or checking with other people.”

5.3.4.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis: Reward and Recognition

Both Bartlett’s test and KMO for reward and recognition variable were appropriate for factor analysis. A large Bartlett’s test statistic ($x^2 = 1940.736$, $p < 0.000$) is an indicator that the off diagonal terms are near zero and the data are suitable for factor analysis. KMO index was .866, interpreted as “meritorious” (Hair et al., 2010) as it has reached the desired value of .80 or above. Results from these preliminary tests suggest that the data were suitable for further analysis and the items might be represented by some underlying factor structure.

The ten items loaded into two factors where six items loaded into factor 1 and four items loaded into factor 2. Factor 1 can best be labelled as reward and recognition from the Management as most of the items loaded on this component relate to rewards and recognition from the Management sources. The items loaded onto factor 2 are primarily concerned with reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague.
Table 5.10: Results from the Exploratory Factor Analysis: Reward and Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>EBRR3</td>
<td>A promotion.</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBRR1</td>
<td>A pay raise.</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBRR2</td>
<td>Job security.</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBRR9</td>
<td>Some form of public recognition (e.g. employee of the month).</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBRR4</td>
<td>More freedom and opportunities.</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBRR10</td>
<td>A reward or token of appreciation (e.g. lunch).</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>EBRR7</td>
<td>Training and development opportunities.</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBRR8</td>
<td>More challenging work assignments.</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBRR6</td>
<td>Praise from your supervisor.</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBRR5</td>
<td>Respect from the people you work with.</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue | 4.439 | 1.152 |
| Percent Var (55.907) | 44.390 | 11.517 |

Legend:
Factor 1: Reward and Recognition from the Management
Factor 2: Reward and Recognition from the Immediate Supervisor and Colleague

5.3.4.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis: Work-life Balance

Bartlett Test of Sphericity shows significant values ($x^2 = 850.315, p = 0.000$). In addition, KMO was .750, which exceeds .70, a reflection of homogeneity of variables. This indicates that factor analysis is appropriate. EFA results show that work-life balance has only one factor. The percentage variance of 66.57% is considered satisfactory for social science research (Hair et al., 2010).
Table 5.11: Results from the Exploratory Factor Analysis: Work-Life Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>ECWLB1</td>
<td>I maintain a good balance between work and other aspects of my life.</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECWLB4</td>
<td>I am able to stay involved in non-work interests and activities.</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECWLB2</td>
<td>I am able to meet my family responsibilities while still doing what is expected of me at work.</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECWLB3</td>
<td>I have a social life outside of work.</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue  
2.663

Percentage Variance  
66.566

5.3.4.4 Exploratory Factor Analysis: Work Engagement

Bartlett test results are large and significant ($x^2 = 3596.011, p = 0.000$). KMO measure of sampling adequacy was 0.928 indicating sufficient inter-correlations. The EFA analysis showed a one-factor solution for work engagement.

Table 5.12: Results from the Exploratory Factor Analysis: Employee Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>EDWEd3</td>
<td>I am enthusiastic about my job.</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDWEd4</td>
<td>My job inspires me.</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDWEa6</td>
<td>I feel happy when I am working intensely.</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDWEd7</td>
<td>I am proud of the work that I do.</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDWEv2</td>
<td>At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDWEv5</td>
<td>When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDWEa8</td>
<td>I am immersed in my work.</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDWEv1</td>
<td>At my work, I feel bursting with energy.</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDWEa9</td>
<td>I get carried away when I am working.</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue  
5.769

Percentage Variance  
64.102
Table 5.12 also shows that only one item had factor loading below .50, which was item nine of work engagement (EDWEa9), I get carried away when I’m working). As real life data may not meet this criterion of .50, this item was maintained for the time being for exploratory purposes where loadings were recalculated during confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). In addition, according to Costello and Osborne (2005), especially in social sciences, only when an item has loading of below .40, a decision to drop the item needs to be made. Moreover no cross loading was found among the variables and the sample size for this study was large enough. Thus integrity of the data should not be compromised at this point of time. Nevertheless, it was deleted during the first stage of model modification in the CFA.

5.3.4.5 Exploratory Factor Analysis: Intention to Leave

Both KMO and Bartlett’s test show that EFA can be performed with confidence for the factor “Intention to leave”. KMO index was .754 and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant ($x^2 = 1001.881, p = 0.000$). The EFA analysis provided a one-factor solution for intention to leave.

Table 5.13: Results from the Exploratory Factor Analysis: Intention to Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>EEIL2</td>
<td>Presently, I am actively searching for other job.</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EEIL1</td>
<td>In the last few months, I have seriously thought about looking for a new job.</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EEIL3</td>
<td>I intend to leave the organisation in the near future.</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue 2.503

Percentage Variance 83.435
5.3.4.6 Exploratory Factor Analysis: In-role Performance

Similar to other variables, KMO and Bartlett’s test results show that EFA can be performed on in-role performance variable. KMO index was .847 and significant Bartlett’s test ($x^2 = 1403.818, p = 0.000$). The analysis resulted in a one-factor solution with eigenvalues greater than 1 and explained 62.96% of the total variance.

Table 5.14: Results from the Exploratory Factor Analysis: In-role Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>EFIRP2</td>
<td>This employee meets all the formal performance requirements of the job.</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFIRP3</td>
<td>This employee fulfils all responsibilities required by his / her job.</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFIRP1</td>
<td>This employee always completes the duties specified in his / her job description.</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFIRP4</td>
<td>This employee never neglects aspects of the job that he / she is obligated to perform.</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFIRP5_1</td>
<td>This employee often fails to perform essential duties. (R)</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Eigenvalue**       | 3.148 |
| **Percentage Variance** | 62.959 |

Note: F denotes factor; R denotes reversed coded items.

Table 5.14 shows that only one item had factor loading below .50. The item was item five (EFIRP5_1: I often fail to perform essential duties). This item was dropped at this point. The cut-off point used in this research is the same throughout, which is .40.
Both KMO and Bartlett Test values met the criteria for subsequent factor analyses. KMO index was .945 and significant Bartlett’s test ($x^2 = 4559.348$, $p = 0.000$). Nevertheless, EFA indicated a one-factor solution for innovative job performance. The results of the EFA are presented in Table 5.15.

Table 5.15: Results from the Exploratory Factor Analysis: Innovative Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>EPIJP7</td>
<td>Introducing innovative ideas in a systematic way.</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPIJP5</td>
<td>Transforming innovative ideas into useful</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPIJP9</td>
<td>Thoroughly evaluating the application of innovative ideas.</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPIJP2</td>
<td>Mobilising support for innovative ideas.</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPIJP3</td>
<td>Searching out new working methods, techniques,</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or instruments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPIJP4</td>
<td>Acquiring approval for innovative ideas.</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPIJP8</td>
<td>Making important organisational members</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enthusiastic for innovative ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EGIJP1</td>
<td>Creating new ideas for improvements.</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPIJP6</td>
<td>Generating original solutions to problems.</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>6.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage Variance</td>
<td>73.419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum it up, Bartlett’s test results for all constructs generated significant readings at 0.000, which is less than 0.005. This means that there were relationships among the variables. As per Hair et. al (2006), some degree of multicollinearity is desirable as the objective of the analysis is to identify interrelated sets of variables. A
statistically significant and large Bartlett’s test as well as KMO measure of more than 0.5 indicates that factor analysis is justified.

Subsequently, factor analysis was conducted for all variables concurrently and there was no cross loading found as it falls back into the same thirteen factors. This also shows that common method variance is not present and thus, common method bias does not arise (Aulakh & Genctuck, 2000). This widely used procedure is known as Harman’s one-factor (or single-factor) test (Podsakoff et al. 2003, Podsakoff and Organ 1986). The percentage of variance for the single factor in this study was 19.72%, where the figure should not be more than 50%. Thereafter, this was retested using CFA, as those based on CFA tend to be the most rigorous (Podsakoff et al., 2003). In the CFA, unmeasured latent construct method was used to test common method bias. The average common variance obtained from the common factor for this study is less than 25%, which is acceptable.

Table 5.16 shows the means and standard deviation of all variables. Job characteristics have a mean score ranging from 3.26 to 3.82 indicating that respondents somewhat agree that their job have all the characteristics described in the Job Characteristics Model. Results also show that respondents generally agree that they have work-life balance (M=3.67, SD=.791). On the contrary, respondents do not feel compensated or rewarded for their good performance at work (M=3.27, SD=.755). This shows that the Management and the supervisors need to be more transparent and more communication is needed to address the expectations of employees.
The mean scores for various work outcomes and attitudes appear to be rather favourable. Results show that respondents do not really want to leave their respective organisations in this short period, despite not feeling compensated for the job done (M=2.62, SD=1.167). As far as in-role performance is concern, respondents are somewhat agree that they have fulfilled their roles (M=5.76, SD=.905). The mean score of innovative job performance shows that respondents will think of new ways to perform one’s task once in a while as some find that certain jobs do not allow them to change (M=4.11, SD=1.304).

Table 5.16: Descriptive for the Major Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale of</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Skill Variety</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Task Identity</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Task Significance</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Autonomy</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5: Feedback Obtained from Supervisor and Co-workers</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward and Recognition</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: From the Management</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: From the Immediate Supervisor and Colleague</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-Life Balance</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Engagement</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to Leave</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-role Performance</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovative Job Performance</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.4.8 Reliability

The reliability coefficients for the subscales are shown in Table 5.17. All constructs except Factor 6 (Feedback Obtained from the Work itself) were reliable
with reliability coefficients above .60. The rule of thumb for a construct reliability estimate is that .7 or higher suggests good reliability but lower thresholds are sometimes used in the literature (Nunnally, 1978). Reliability between .6 and .7 may be acceptable if other indicators of a model’s construct validity are good. Nevertheless, Robinson, Shaver, and Wrightsman (1991) suggest that the minimum acceptable level is .6. All factors have reliability scores above .7 except for Factor 3 (task significance) at .631 and factor 6. Nevertheless, reliability for Factor 6 (feedback obtained from the work itself) would increase to an acceptable value of .706 if item 5 was deleted. Hence, this item was deleted in the first stage of model modification to improve reliability for Factor 6. As the reliability on work outcomes exceeds .90, important decisions about individuals can made based on this research outcome (Nunnally, 1978).

Table 5.17: Reliability Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Item Dropped</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Skill Variety</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Task Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Task Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5: Feedback Obtained from Supervisor and Co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6: Feedback Obtained from the Work itself</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward and Recognition</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: From the Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: From the Immediate Supervisor and Colleague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-Life Balance</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Engagement</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.17: Reliability Coefficients (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Item Dropped</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Leave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-role Performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>.739 (after item dropped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Job Performance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.5 Preliminary Correlation Analysis

Table 5.18 shows the correlation analysis among the variables. As predicted, (a) job characteristics; (b) rewards and recognition; and (c) work-life balance were found to be positively related to employee engagement. In addition, work engagement was also found to be negatively related to intention to leave, and positively related to in-role performance and innovative job performance. There was a negative and significant correlation between intention to leave with other constructs, which is consistent with the literature.

The correlation coefficients also shows that the relationship between the three motivators and in-role performance were in the expected direction where (a) job characteristics; (b) rewards and recognition; and (c) work-life balance was positively related to in-role performance. As for the relationship between motivators and innovative job performance, only job characteristics, and rewards and recognition are positively related to this particular performance dimension. No significant relationship was found between innovative job performance with work-life balance, and intention to leave. As correlation reveals only the direct associations, SEM is used to test causal relationships among variables.
Table 5.18: Summary of Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Characteristics</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Reward and Recognition</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Work-Life Balance</th>
<th>Work Engagement</th>
<th>Intention to Leave</th>
<th>In-role Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1: Skill Variety</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2: Task Identity</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3: Task Significance</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4: Autonomy</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5: Feedback Obtained from Supervisor and Co-workers</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6: Feedback Obtained from the Work itself</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** | Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* | Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
5.3.6 Collinearity Test among Variables

One of the problematic, yet unavoidable conditions for data analysis is multicollinearity, which can be detected by examining the tolerance value and variance inflation factor (VIF) from SPSS output. Generally, tolerance value should exceed 0.10 and VIF value should be less than 10.00 (Hair et al., 2010). The tolerance values for this study ranged from .619 to .927. Whilst, the VIF values ranged from 1.079 to 1.615. Hence, no regression equations in this study are vulnerable to multicollinearity (Pallant, 2007).

Table 5.19: Collinearity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>Variance Inflation Factors (VIF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Skill Variety</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>1.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Task Identity</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>1.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Task Significance</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>1.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Autonomy</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>1.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5: Feedback obtained from supervisor and co-workers</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>1.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6: Feedback obtained from the work itself</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward and Recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Reward and Recognition from the Management</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>1.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Reward and Recognition from the Immediate Supervisor and Colleague</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>1.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-Life Balance</strong></td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>1.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.7 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis and validity assumptions for the study have been presented earlier. The findings from factor analysis set the stage to perform subsequent Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) analysis. This section will present confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), which accommodates multiple group models testing using SPSS AMOS 18 to access the quality of the measurement model. SEM is largely confirmatory, rather than an exploratory technique. SEM is normally used to determine whether a certain model is valid, rather than to find a suitable model. It is appropriate for testing two or more causal models to determine the best fit, and it is known for its advantage in testing for mediation effects. Figure 5.7 shows the measurement model based on factor analysis and the overall model evaluation. The indices shown in the overall model evaluation will be the same throughout for easy comparison of model fit for each iteration.
According to Hair et al. (2006), researchers should report at least one incremental index and at least one of the indices should be badness-of-fit index. RMSEA was chosen for badness-of-fit index as it often provides consistent results across different estimation approach (Sugawara and MacCallum 1993). Following this guideline, multiple indices include Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and a badness-of-fit index, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) were considered in determining the model.
fit (Hu and Bentler 1999). Reporting a variety of indices is necessary as different indices reflect different aspect of model fit (Crowley & Fan, 1997). This is also in line with the review by McDonald and Ho (2002) where most commonly reported fit indices include CFI, GFI, and NFI.

As exploratory factor analysis shows that job characteristics, and reward and recognition constructs can be divided into six and two factors respectively, the model was drawn and further model refinement were based on this model. The measurement model based on factor analysis evaluation shows that model modification is necessary to identify a model that would represent the data better. The model has a significant p-value of less than 0.05 as it is difficult to achieve a non-significant p-value for large sample size of more than 300 or a complex model. Reason being, when sample size increases, the chi-square increases as well (Yates, 1934). If the chi-square increases, the p-value decreases.

As for CMIN/DF, the minimal threshold is below the maximum limit of 5 (Marsh & Hocevar, 1985; Wheaton, Muthen, Alwin & Summer, 1977) and this model has a CMIN/DF of 2.969, an indication of adequate fit, a lesser than 3.000 CMIN/DF. The initial Goodness of Fit (GFI) index suggests performing modification indexes for a better model fit. Both PNFI and PCFI exceed the required 0.50. Furthermore, the Root Mean Square Error Approximation (RMSEA) Index exceeds the recommended value of less than 0.08 or .10 (Byrne, 1998) or less than 0.08 (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). Thus, model modification is required.
5.3.8 Model Refinement

In SEM, there is no single statistical significance test to identify a correct model. It requires having multiple criteria to evaluate model fit. A large number of goodness-of-fit indices were used to judge whether the model is consistent with the empirical data for each estimation procedure. The model refinement process in this study involves four stages to achieve a better fit. The stages involved are examining the estimates in the standardised regression weights output, calculating squared multiple correlations, looking at the standardised residual covariances and lastly modification indices (Gaskin, 2012).

The first stage was by examining the estimates in the standardised regression weights output. There were only two items with loadings below 0.5 and eight items below 0.7. Items with estimates of less than 0.50 were first removed one at a time followed by items with estimates below 0.70 to have a better fit (Byrne, 2001; Hair et al., 2006). Based on the standardised regression weights as per table 5.20, eleven items exhibited loadings that warrant the removal of items from the pool. The lowest loading was the first item removed. First wave of removal were items EAJCb5 and EDWEa9, which were gradually removed and model fit indexes were re-examined after each iteration. Second wave of item removal were EBRR10, EAJCe15, EBRR7, EBRR9, EBRR5, EBRR2, EAJCb4, and ECWL3. Summary of model fit evaluation for each iteration is shown in table 5.21.
Table 5.20: Standardised Regression Weights of Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Deletion of Item</th>
<th>Rank from the lowest score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBRR9</td>
<td>RR1</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td>7\textsuperscript{th} deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRR4</td>
<td>RR1</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRR3</td>
<td>RR1</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRR2</td>
<td>RR1</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.7</td>
<td>9\textsuperscript{th} deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRR1</td>
<td>RR1</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECWLB4</td>
<td>WLB</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td>11\textsuperscript{th} deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECWLB3</td>
<td>WLB</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECWLB2</td>
<td>WLB</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECWLB1</td>
<td>WLB</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAJCd11</td>
<td>JC6</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAJCd12</td>
<td>JC6</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWEa9</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWEa8</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWed7</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWEa6</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWEv5</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWed4</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWed3</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWEv2</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWEv1</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEIL1</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEIL2</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEIL3</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFIRP1</td>
<td>IRP</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFIRP2</td>
<td>IRP</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFIRP3</td>
<td>IRP</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFIRP4</td>
<td>IRP</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGIJP1</td>
<td>IJP</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIJP2</td>
<td>IJP</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIJP3</td>
<td>IJP</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIJP4</td>
<td>IJP</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIJP5</td>
<td>IJP</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIJP6</td>
<td>IJP</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIJP7</td>
<td>IJP</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIJP8</td>
<td>IJP</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIJP9</td>
<td>IJP</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRR10</td>
<td>RR1</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAJCe13</td>
<td>JC1</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAJCe15</td>
<td>JC1</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} wave: &lt; 0.5</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th} deletion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.20: Standardised Regression Weights of Items (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Deletion of Item</th>
<th>Rank from the lowest score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some items were spared from deletion despite having weights lesser than 0.7 as further deletion would under represent the construct due to insufficient items. For example, EAJCd11 was spared, as there were only two items for factor three of job characteristics. Decision to maintain poor performing items were based on the recommendation that, if necessary, items can be retained to meet statistical analysis requirement (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson & Tatham, 2006). A review of various fit indexes for this model has shown improvement. CMIN/DF and RMSEA have dropped from initial 2.969 to 2.866 and from 0.061 to 0.059 respectively. GFI, AGFI, TLI, CFI have been increasing steadily with higher values indicating better fit. Nevertheless, indices show that there is still room for refinement.
Table 5.21: Stage 1: Model Fit Summary on Item Deleted based on Standardised Regression Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFA Model</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>Goodness of Fit Index</th>
<th>Incremental Fit Index</th>
<th>Parsimony Fit Index</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st wave</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.962</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.936</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd wave</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.873</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.909</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.935</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.872</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.866</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- EAJCb5 = This job can be done adequately without talking with or checking with other people
- EDWEa9 = I get carried away when I’m working
- EBRR10 = A reward or token of appreciation (e.g. lunch)
- EAJCe15 = This job permits me to decide on my own how to go about doing my work
- EBRR7 = Training and development opportunities
- EBRR9 = Some form of public recognition (e.g. employee of the month)
- EBRR5 = Respect from the people you work with
- EBRR2 = Job security
- EAJCb4 = This job is structured so that I can do an entire piece of work from beginning to end
- ECWLB3 = I have a social life outside of work
Figure 5.8 shows the model after stage one modification:

Second stage of model refinement involved calculating squared multiple correlations where the cut off value should be above 0.5. No item was deleted in this stage, as further deletion of item would mean under representative of construct as only items from the job characteristics are affected.
Next, the third stage of model refinement involved looking at the standardised residual covariances, where it should not be more than 2.58 or not be less than -2.58, which is an absolute value of 2.58 (Byrne, 2001). Items were deleted gradually until CFI reaches 0.9. Items with the highest residues were the first removed and table 5.22 summarises the overall model evaluation. Besides having 0.9 for CFI, this stage of model refinement has also successfully reduced RMR from 0.111 to 0.088 and increased GFI from 0.831 to 0.857.

Table 5.22: Stage 3: Model Fit Summary on Item Deleted based on Standardised Residual Covariances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFA Model</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>Goodness of Fit Index</th>
<th>Incremental Fit Index</th>
<th>Parsimony Fit Index</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CMIN</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>NFI Delta1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.713</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>0.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.686</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.703</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.670</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.740</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.795</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
EPIJP2 = I often mobilise support for innovative ideas, EGIJP1 = I often create new ideas for improvement, EPIJP3 = I search out new working methods, techniques, or instruments, EPIJP9 = I often thoroughly evaluate the application of innovative ideas, EPIJP5 = I transform innovative ideas into useful applications, EPIJP8 = I make important organisational members enthusiastic for innovative ideas, EFIRP4 = I seek approval for innovative ideas.
Figure 5.9 shows the model after stage three modification:

![Figure 5.9: Measurement Model after Stage 3 Modification](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMIN Goodness of Fit Index</th>
<th>Incremental Fit Index</th>
<th>Parsimony Fit Index</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>GFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.795</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
JC1: Skill Variety; JC2: Task Identity; JC3: Task Significance; JC4: Autonomy; JC5: Feedback obtained from supervisor and co-workers; JC6: Feedback obtained from the work itself; RR1: Reward and Recognition from the Management; RR2: Reward and Recognition from the Immediate Supervisor and Colleague; WE: Employee Engagement; IL: Intention to Leave; IRP: In-role Performance; IJP: Innovative Job Performance

The model is further refined at stage four, in which Lee (2007) claimed that model fit had become a compulsory criterion that researchers have to cope with in order to make variable selection or scale construction more appropriate. Stage four involves looking into modification indices (MI) to reveal high covariance between...
measurement errors within the same construct. Measurement errors that exhibit high values were covariate to have better model fit (Byrne, 2001; Hair et al., 2006). This process is continued until adequate fit is reached. Table 5.23 summarises the overall model evaluation. As shown in the table, overall model fit indices for the final model indicate a good fit (Hair et al., 2006). CMIN/DF is now 2.440, which is lesser than three, indicates a good model fit. The RMR is valued at 0.085 where the smaller the RMR, the better. GFI, a commonly reported index is close to 0.90 but the scores seem to be the lowest as compared to TLI (0.908) and CFI (0.921). Even though GFI is lower than 0.90, it is still acceptable as CFI exceeds 0.90. Zikmund (2003) argued that GFI value of less than 0.9 do not necessarily mean that the model has a poor fit. Though GFI has been commonly reported, it has become less popular in recent years and there is even recommendation that this index should be dropped (Sharma, Mukherjee, Kumar, & Dillon, 2005). The researchers found that the behaviour of TLI is similar to GFI except that it is not sensitive to sample size and number of indicators. TLI would be a better choice, as it only becomes erratic when the model has small factor loadings of below 0.30, which in most cases, such as in this research, these items would have deleted.

CFI ranges from zero to one with higher values indicating better fit. Values less than 0.90 are usually associated with a model that does not fit well (Byrne, 2001; Hair et al., 2006; Bentler, 1990). As sample size was large, index such as TLI was chosen as it is relatively unaffected by sample size (Gerbing & Anderson, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1995; Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988) to have a fair reflection of the model. TLI value in this study is above 0.90 indicating an acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Besides TLI, CFI was also chosen as this fit index is less affected by
sample size (Bentler, 1990; Bollen, 1990; Hu & Bentler, 1995, 1998, 1999; Fan, Thompson, & Wang, 1999). AGFI values typically range between zero and one with larger values indicating a better fit. The AGFI (0.846) and NFI (0.874) exceed the threshold level of 0.8, indicating acceptable fit (McKnight, Choudhury & Kacmar, 2002; Kline, 1998; Gefen, Straub & Boudreau, 2000; Segars & Grover, 1993 for AGFI and Benamati & Lederer, 2008 for NFI). RMSEA score was 0.052, which is close to 0.05 indicates that the model has a close fit as defined by Steiger (1990) as well as Browne and Cudeck (1993). RMSEA score in this study is close to the cut-off value of 0.06 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). RMSEA is chosen as it is least affected by sample size as this research has large sample size.

In summary, the model refinement process requires applying the four folded criteria: achieving standardised factor loadings (regression weights) and squared multiple correlations (SMCs) values above 0.7 level; achieving standardised residual covariance matrix with values below the absolute value of 2.58; and modification indices with low covariance between error measures and low regression weights between its reflecting constructs (Hair et al., 2006). Therefore, this study adopted the four-folded criteria to modify the model and achieve a better model fit.
Table 5.23: Stage 4: Model Fit Summary based on Modification Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFA Model</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>Goodness of Fit Index</th>
<th>Incremental Fit Index</th>
<th>Parsimony Fit Index</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>Modification Indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>NFI Delta1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.570</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.521</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.496</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.483</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.473</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.476</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.440</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
* Final model
Figure 5.10: Final Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>Goodness of Fit Index</th>
<th>Incremental Fit Index</th>
<th>Parsimony Fit Index</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.440</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nota:
JC1: Skill Variety; JC2: Task Identity; JC3: Task Significance; JC4: Autonomy; JC5: Feedback obtained from supervisor and co-workers; JC6: Feedback obtained from the work itself; RR1: Reward and Recognition from the Management; RR2: Reward and Recognition from the Immediate Supervisor and Colleague; WE: Employee Engagement; IL: Intention to Leave; IRP: In-role Performance; IJP: Innovative Job Performance

5.3.9 Tests of Hypotheses

Using the final accepted model, the next step was to test the hypotheses. Hypotheses 1 through 15 were successfully tested using standardised regression weights. Tests for hypotheses 16 through 24 were performed using mediation with
bootstrapping. Finally, hypotheses 25 and 30, which dealt with generation cohort, were tested using a multigroup moderation.

**Hypotheses 1 through 15**

Based on the research findings, the data fits the modified model. Once it has achieved an acceptable fit, estimates of free parameters were subsequently accessed by analysing the standard error and critical ratio as shown in table 5.24. The table shows that all free parameters met the small value criteria for standard error demonstrating accurate estimation of the constructs and critical ratio that exceeded the minimum ±1.96 as recommended by Podsakoff, Williams and Todor (1986) for the significant relationships.

There are interesting findings when it comes to job characteristics and intention to leave. Job characteristics factors such as autonomy, skill variety and feedback obtained from work itself are found to be significantly related to intention to leave. Thus, H1 is partially supported. Research hypothesis is partially supported when there is only one or two fully supported items whereas fully supported hypothesis requires at least 3 items to be supported (Yin, 2003). Autonomy is found to be negatively related to intention to leave. However, skill variety and feedback obtained from the work itself are found to be positively related to intention to leave. Feedback obtained from the work itself allows employee to know how well he / she has performed. If the employee feels that he / she is not given feedback, he / she might consider leaving the organisation. Nevertheless, the regression weight for feedback obtained from the work itself is lesser than 0.2, which makes it negligible.
As suggested by Chin (1998), the path should be at least 0.2 to be considered meaningful. Hence, only H1d is supported. H1a, H1b, H1c, and H1e are rejected.

Next, only one of the job characteristic dimensions was found to significantly influence in-role performance. This factor is feedback obtained from supervisor and co-workers. However, as the path is rather weak (-0.180), the value was considered to be negligible. Therefore, H2 is not supported.

In identifying dimensions of job characteristics that can influence innovative job performance, autonomy emerged as the sole characteristic that is related to innovative job performance. During data collection, some respondents reported that employees are required to adhere to procedures and not to revamp the work flow. This may have hindered the extent of autonomy they possess and inadvertently reduce the innovativeness of the employees in one way or another. H3d is supported. H3a, H3b, H3c, and H3e are rejected. Hence, H3 is partially supported.

Moving on to the impact of rewards and recognition on various work outcomes, findings showed mixed result. First and foremost, both rewards and recognition dimensions (RR1 and RR2) was not related to intention to leave. Hence, H4 is rejected. When it comes to in-role performance, reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague (RR2) seems to have a highly significant positive impact. Surprisingly, reward and recognition from the Management (RR1) had a negative impact on in-role performance. This could be attributed to the lack of connection between rewards by management (although tangible) to level of performance (Cameron, Banko & Pierce, 2001). Hence, H5 is partially supported.
Finally, only reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague (RR2) was found to be significantly related to innovative job performance with estimate as high as 0.962. Thus, H6 is partially supported.

Subsequently, the impact of work-life balance on these three outcomes was analysed. As expected, work-life balance negatively influenced intention to leave. This implies that employees who have a balance in life tend to stay longer with the organisation. In addition to remaining with the organisation, employees who experience work-life balance were also found to be better performers (in-role performance). Unexpectedly, work-life balance was found to be negatively related to innovative job performance. When there is a high level of work-life balance, innovation appears to be constrained. Hence, H7 and H8 are supported whereas H9 is rejected.

Besides analysing the impact of these antecedents (job characteristics, rewards and recognition, and work-life balance) upon turnover intention, in-role performance and innovative job performance, this study also hypothesized the relationship between these antecedents and work engagement. Among the six job characteristics, only autonomy was found to have a positive effect on employee engagement. Other factors such as task identity, feedback, skill variety, and task significance did not constitute to employee engagement. Thus, only H10d was supported. As autonomy is defined as the ability to decide how, when, and where a job is to be done (Clark, 2001), this allows employees to become more involved and attached to their work, which eventually made them feel more engaged. Other researchers such as Bakker and Demerouti (2008) found that there is a link between job resources and work
engagement, where autonomy is listed as a job resource that plays an intrinsic motivational role. Thus, H10a, H10b, H10c, and H10e are rejected. In conclusion, H10 is partially supported.

Interesting findings were evident when the relationship between reward and recognition and work engagement was investigated. Only reward and recognition from the Management (RR1) had a positive relationship to employee engagement. Thus, H11 is partially supported. Evidently, job security, promotion, and some form of recognition at company’s level is required to foster employee engagement.

Moving on, work-life balance has a positive effect on employee engagement. Those who enjoy a work-life balance have a positive influence on their professional lives. As per Fredrickson (2001), positive emotions on work-life balance results in the ability to develop resiliency, which creates a link between engagement and work-life balance. Thus, H12 is supported. Employees know that they have to work hard and an employer who shows sensitivity to work-life balance issues is more likely going to outscore one who does not.

Finally, as expected, employee engagement has a negative effect on intention to leave and positive effect on in-role performance and innovative job performance. Thus, H13, H14, and H15 are supported. This finding is in line with Firth, Mellor, Moore and Loquet (2004), and Harter et al. (2002) where low employee engagement leads to intention to leave. As for performances, this is in line with the definition by Shaw (2005) where employee engagement refers to translating employee potential into employee performance.
Table 5.24: Regression Weights for Significant Paths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- JC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- JC1</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>2.716</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>- H1a Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- JC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H1b Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- JC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H1c Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- JC4</td>
<td>-0.433</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>-2.776</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>H1d Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- JC5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H1e Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- JC6</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>2.428</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>- H1e Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- JC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- JC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H2a Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- JC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H2b Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- JC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H2c Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- JC4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H2d Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- JC5</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-3.006</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>H2e Rejected (weak relationship)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- JC6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- JC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- JC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H3a Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- JC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H3b Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- JC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H3c Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- JC4</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>1.961</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>H3d Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- JC5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H3e Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- JC6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- RR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- RR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H4 Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- RR2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- RR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- RR1</td>
<td>-0.504</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>-3.794</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>- H5 Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- RR2</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>4.348</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>H5 Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- RR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- RR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>H6 Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- RR2</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>3.897</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>H6 Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- WLB</td>
<td>-0.371</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>-3.531</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>H7 Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- WLB</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>4.481</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>H8 Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- WLB</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-2.068</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>H9 Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.24: Regression Weights for Significant Paths (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WE &lt;-- JC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE &lt;-- JC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE &lt;-- JC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE &lt;-- JC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE &lt;-- JC4</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>2.560</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>H10c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE &lt;-- JC5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE &lt;-- JC6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE &lt;-- RR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE &lt;-- RR1</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>2.091</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>H11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE &lt;-- RR2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE &lt;-- WLB</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>4.695</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>H12</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL &lt;-- WE</td>
<td>-0.463</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-8.923</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>H13</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP &lt;-- WE</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>6.085</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>H14</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJP &lt;-- WE</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>H15</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
Note:
*** Significant at 0.001 level
** Significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level
ns Not significant

Hypotheses 16 through 24

Mediation occurs when the mediator variable accounts for a relationship between predictor and criterion. Full mediation occurs when predictor and outcome becomes insignificant after a mediator is added in as an additional predictor (Hair, et al, 2006). Prior to that, in Baron and Kenny's (1986) steps for mediation, several criteria must be fulfilled for mediation to be valid. Firstly, independent variable must be a significant predictor of the dependent variable. Secondly, independent variable is
a significant predictor of the mediator. Lastly, the mediator is a significant predictor of the dependent variable. Table 5.25 summarises the mediation results for each path.

The analysis revealed that employee engagement was a mediator in several selected relationships. Firstly, employee engagement was found to fully mediate the effect of autonomy on intention to leave (H16) and innovative job performance (H18). Thus, H16 and H18 are partially supported with H16d and H18d supported. Next, employee engagement did not mediate the effect of all job characteristics on in-role performance. Hence, H17, H17a, H17b, H17c, H17d, and H17e are rejected.

Similarly, employee engagement did not mediate the effect of reward and recognition on intention to leave, in-role performance, and innovative job performance. The first condition to be met for any mediation analysis is for a significant relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986). In this case, both dimensions of rewards and recognition (RR1 and RR2) were not related to intention to leave whereas RR2 was not related to in-role performance and RR1 was not related to innovative job performance. Although RR2 was related to innovative job performance (fulfilling the first condition), this dimension was not significantly related to employee engagement (failing to fulfil the second step for mediation). Therefore, it was concluded that employee engagement is not a mediator for the above-mentioned relationships. This result fails to support H19 and H21. As the mediation results show that the direct beta with mediator increased for reward and recognition from the Management and in-role performance, no mediation is found. Hence, H20 is rejected.
Employee engagement is found to partially mediate between the relationship of work-life balance and (a) intention to leave and (b) in-role performance. On the other hand, employee engagement fully mediated the influence of work-life balance on innovative job performance. Thus, H22, H23, and H24 are supported. Table 5.25 summarises the mediation results for all paths.

Table 5.25: Mediation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path (Partial Mediation)</th>
<th>Conditions Not Met</th>
<th>Direct Beta without Mediator</th>
<th>Direct Beta with Mediator</th>
<th>Mediation Type Observed</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC-WE-IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC1-WE-IL</td>
<td>JC1-IL/WE</td>
<td>0.218**</td>
<td>0.105 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>H16a</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC2-WE-IL</td>
<td>JC2-IL/WE</td>
<td>-0.004 (ns)</td>
<td>-0.014 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H16b</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC3-WE-IL</td>
<td>JC3-IL/WE</td>
<td>-0.020 (ns)</td>
<td>0.003 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H16c</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC4-WE-IL</td>
<td>-0.433**</td>
<td>-0.157 (ns)</td>
<td>Full mediation</td>
<td></td>
<td>H16d</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC5-WE-IL</td>
<td>JC5-IL/WE</td>
<td>0.005 (ns)</td>
<td>-0.024 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H16e</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC6-WE-IL</td>
<td>JC6-IL/WE</td>
<td>0.151**</td>
<td>0.101 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC-WE-IRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC1-WE-IRP</td>
<td>JC1-IRP</td>
<td>-0.068 (ns)</td>
<td>-0.045 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H17a</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC2-WE-IRP</td>
<td>JC2-IRP</td>
<td>0.010 (ns)</td>
<td>0.022 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H17b</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC3-WE-IRP</td>
<td>JC3-IRP</td>
<td>0.062 (ns)</td>
<td>0.042 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H17c</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC4-WE-IRP</td>
<td>JC4-IRP</td>
<td>0.102 (ns)</td>
<td>0.031 (ns)</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
<td>H17d</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC5-WE-IRP</td>
<td>JC5-IRP</td>
<td>-0.180**</td>
<td>-0.207 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>H17e</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC6-WE-IRP</td>
<td>JC6-IRP</td>
<td>-0.073 (ns)</td>
<td>-0.067 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC-WE-IJP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC1-WE-IJP</td>
<td>JC1-IJP</td>
<td>0.095 (ns)</td>
<td>0.036 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H18a</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC2-WE-IJP</td>
<td>JC2-IJP</td>
<td>0.022 (ns)</td>
<td>0.029 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H18b</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC3-WE-IJP</td>
<td>JC3-IJP</td>
<td>-0.041 (ns)</td>
<td>-0.021 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H18c</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC4-WE-IJP</td>
<td>0.373**</td>
<td>0.167 (ns)</td>
<td>Full mediation</td>
<td></td>
<td>H18d</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC5-WE-IJP</td>
<td>JC5-IJP</td>
<td>-0.084 (ns)</td>
<td>-0.071 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H18e</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC6-WE-IJP</td>
<td>JC6-IJP</td>
<td>-0.065 (ns)</td>
<td>-0.047 (ns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.25: Mediation Results (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path (Partial Mediation)</th>
<th>Earlier Supported Hypotheses</th>
<th>Direct Beta without Mediator</th>
<th>Direct Beta with Mediator</th>
<th>Mediation Type Observed</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR-WE-IL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.025 (ns)</td>
<td>0.078 (ns)</td>
<td>H19</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR1-WE-IL</td>
<td>RR1-IL</td>
<td>-0.025 (ns)</td>
<td>-0.058 (ns)</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
<td>H19</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR2-WE-IL</td>
<td>RR2-IL/WE</td>
<td>0.034 (ns)</td>
<td>-0.157 (ns)</td>
<td>H20</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-WE-IRP</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.692 (ns)</td>
<td>0.952***</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
<td>H20</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR1-WE-IRP</td>
<td>RR1-IRP</td>
<td>-0.541 **</td>
<td>-0.504***</td>
<td>H21</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR2-WE-IRP</td>
<td>RR2-IRP</td>
<td>0.689 **</td>
<td>0.952***</td>
<td>H21</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-WE-IJP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H21</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR1-WE-IJP</td>
<td>RR1-IJP</td>
<td>-0.115 (ns)</td>
<td>-0.152 (ns)</td>
<td>H22</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR2-WE-IJP</td>
<td>RR2-IJP</td>
<td>0.507 **</td>
<td>0.962***</td>
<td>H22</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB-WE-IL</td>
<td>-0.371***</td>
<td>-0.105 *</td>
<td>Partial mediation</td>
<td>H23</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB-WE-IRP</td>
<td>0.438***</td>
<td>0.261 **</td>
<td>Partial mediation</td>
<td>H23</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB-WE-IJP</td>
<td>-0.265**</td>
<td>-0.112 (ns)</td>
<td>Full mediation</td>
<td>H24</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- *** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05
- ns = Not significant

**Hypotheses 25 and 30**

Hypothesis 25 and 30 were tested using multigroup moderation. Data for multigroup analysis can be managed in many ways. One option is to keep all the data in one file and include group membership variables as per Arbuckle (2006). In this study, three data sets were combined in one file and used as the working file. Groups, namely the Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y were added into the model to
test multigroup moderation. Standardised regression weights were examined for three groups and necessary trimmings were performed. This was followed by invariance analysis to investigate measurement equality or differences among the generation cohorts.

Group that has the least number of insignificant paths was first examined to identify the paths to be trimmed. It was found that Generation Y has the least insignificant path as compared to the other two groups. Path that has the highest p-value were then crossed examined with other cohorts. Only paths that are insignificant across all groups were trimmed and trimmings were one at a time. The first path that was trimmed has a regression weight of 0.949 in Generation Y. The path was Task Significance – Employee Engagement, followed by Feedback obtained from the work itself – Employee Engagement, Task Identity – Employee Engagement, Feedback obtained from supervisor and co-workers – Employee Engagement, and lastly Skill Variety – Employee Engagement.

The findings from the output are in line with the results from previous hypotheses testing where autonomy seems to have the strongest significant level with other factors under job characteristics. Table 5.26 summarises the regression weights for all groups. Autonomy has great significance to Baby Boomers and Gen X. However, it does not impact Gen Y, as they may be too young to hold certain position in the organisation. Thus, H25d is partially supported.
There are interesting findings based on table 5.26. Reward and recognition from the Management only impacts on Gen X whereas reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague affects Baby Boomers and Gen Y. The Boomers seem to want to have more reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague to make them more engaged. This group feel that they are not well respected as reported earlier in the one-to-one interview. Generation Y values reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague, just like the Boomers. Hence, H26 is partially supported.

Results show that work-life balance has impact only to Gen X and Y. Both find that they need some balance in their life. As per Lancaster and Stillman (2005), Generation X cohorts believe that happiness comes from having freedom in their
careers to have flexibility to obtain work-life balance. Thus, H27 is partially supported.

Engaged Gen X and Gen Y have impact on all the three dependent variables - intention to leave, in-role performance, and innovative job performance. Only engaged Boomers lead to better in-role performance. Thus, H28 and H30 are partially supported with H29 supported.

For the Boomers, reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague has the greatest impact on employee engagement, followed by autonomy. Once they are engaged, employers can expect to have increase in-role performance. As far as Generation X is concerned, contrary to many beliefs, money is not the main reason for them to stay engaged. They seek work-life balance from organisations. Having autonomy and getting reward and recognition from the Management are secondary.

When it comes to Generation Y, it is best to focus more on the development, as this eventually leads to lower intention to leave and better innovative job performance. Talent for both Generation X and Y will be retained if these cohorts are engaged. On the other hand, Gen Y values reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague more than work-life balance, in order to be engaged.

The chi-square calculation in table 5.27 proves that there is a difference among the groups.
Table 5.27: Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Model</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Invariant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unconstrained</td>
<td>4493.03</td>
<td>2308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully constrained</td>
<td>4667.127</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Difference             | 174.097    | 93  | 0.000   | NO         |

Groups are different at the model level. Check path differences.

Figure 5.11 is the unconstrained model for multigroup moderation.

Figure 5.11: Unconstrained Model
**Summary of Findings for Each Hypothesis**

Table 5.28 summarises the findings for each hypothesis.

Table 5.28: Summary of Findings for Each Hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong></td>
<td>Job Characteristics are negatively related to intention to leave.</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1a</strong></td>
<td>Skill variety is negatively related to intention to leave.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>Skill Variety has a positive effect on intention to leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1b, H1c</strong></td>
<td>(b) Task identity and (c) task significance is negatively related to intention to leave.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1d</strong></td>
<td>Autonomy is negatively related to intention to leave.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1e</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is negatively related to intention to leave.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>Feedback obtained from the work itself (weak relationship) has a positive effect on intention to leave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.28: Summary of Findings for Each Hypothesis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Job Characteristics are positively related to in-role performance.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>Weak relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a, H2b, H2c, H2d</td>
<td>(a) Skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance, and (d) autonomy is positively related to in-role performance.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2e</td>
<td>Feedback is positively related to in-role performance.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>Weak relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Job Characteristics are positively related to innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a, H3b, H3c</td>
<td>(a) Skill variety, (b) task identity, and (c) task significance is positively related to innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3d</td>
<td>Autonomy is positively related to innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3e</td>
<td>Feedback is positively related to innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Rewards and recognition is negatively related to intention to leave.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.28: Summary of Findings for Each Hypothesis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5</strong></td>
<td>Rewards and recognition is positively related to in-role performance.</td>
<td>Partially Supported.</td>
<td>- Reward and Recognition from the Management are negatively related to in-role performance. - Reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague are positively related to in-role performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6</strong></td>
<td>Rewards and recognition is positively related to innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Partially Supported.</td>
<td>Only reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague are positively related to innovative job performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H7</strong></td>
<td>Work-life balance is negatively related to intention to leave.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H8</strong></td>
<td>Work-life balance is positively related to in-role performance.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H9</strong></td>
<td>Work-life balance is positively related to innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>Negative relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.28: Summary of Findings for Each Hypothesis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Job Characteristics are positively related to employee engagement.</td>
<td>Partially Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10a, H10b, H10c</td>
<td>(a) Skill variety, (b) task identity, and (c) task significance is positively related to employee engagement.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10d</td>
<td>Autonomy is positively related to employee engagement.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10e</td>
<td>Feedback is positively related to employee engagement.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>Rewards and recognition is positively related to employee engagement.</td>
<td>Partially Supported.</td>
<td>Only Reward and Recognition from the Management is positively related to employee engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12</td>
<td>Work-life balance is positively related to employee engagement.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13</td>
<td>Employee engagement is negatively related to intention to leave.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14</td>
<td>Employee engagement is positively related to in-role performance.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.28: Summary of Findings for Each Hypothesis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H15</td>
<td>Employee engagement is positively related to innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypotheses 16 through 24 (Mediation Results)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H16</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and intention to leave.</td>
<td>Partially Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16a</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between skill variety and intention to leave.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16b, H16c</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between (b) task identity, (c) task significance and intention to leave.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16d</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between autonomy and intention to leave.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>Full mediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16e</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between feedback and intention to leave.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and in-role performance.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17a, H17b, H17c, H17d, H17e</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between (a) skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance, (d) autonomy, (e) feedback, and in-role performance.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between job characteristics and innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18a, H18b, H18c</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between (a) skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance, and innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18d</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between autonomy and innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Full mediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18e</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between feedback and innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H19</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between rewards and recognition; and intention to leave.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.28: Summary of Findings for Each Hypothesis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H20</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between rewards and recognition; and in-role performance.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H21</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between rewards and recognition; and innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H22</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between work-life balance and intention to leave.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H23</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between work-life balance and in-role performance.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H24</td>
<td>Employee engagement mediates the relationship between work-life balance and innovative job performance.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.28: Summary of Findings for Each Hypothesis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H25</strong></td>
<td>Generation cohort moderates the relationship between job characteristics and employee engagement.</td>
<td>Partially Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H25a, H25b, H25c</strong></td>
<td>Generation cohort moderates the relationship between (a) skill variety, (b) task identity, (c) task significance and employee engagement.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H25d</strong></td>
<td>Generation cohort moderates the relationship between autonomy and employee engagement.</td>
<td>Partially supported.</td>
<td>Both Boomers and Generation X moderate the relationship between autonomy and employee engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H25e</strong></td>
<td>Generation cohort moderates the relationship between feedback and employee engagement.</td>
<td>Rejected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **H26**    | Generation cohort moderates the relationship between reward and recognition and employee engagement. | Partially supported. | -\[Gen X moderates the relationship between reward and recognition from the Management and employee engagement.\]  
-\[Boomers and Gen Y moderate the relationship between reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague and employee engagement.\] |
Table 5.28: Summary of Findings for Each Hypothesis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H27</td>
<td>Generation cohort moderates the relationship between work-life balance and employee engagement.</td>
<td>Partially supported.</td>
<td>Gen X and Gen Y moderate the relationship between work-life balance and employee engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H28</td>
<td>Generation cohort moderates the relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention.</td>
<td>Partially supported.</td>
<td>Both Generation X and Y moderate the relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H29</td>
<td>Generation cohort moderates the relationship between employee engagement and in-role performance.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.10 Test on Common Method Bias

As method variance can either inflate or deflate observed relationships between constructs, Harman's single factor test was carried out. It is used to test the presence of common method effect. It was to see if the majority of the variance can be explained by a single factor and this was carried out using SPSS. All variables were entered into the EFA and no significant amount of variance emerged. The largest single factor explained was 19.715% of the variance, which is significantly less than half. This shows that there is no significant amount of the variance.

5.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter has undertaken a detailed discussion of the three aspects of hypotheses. The chapter began with the contention that there is significant evidence within the literature. Further, it confirmed that there are some mediating and moderating effects in the proposed theoretical framework.
CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

This study contributes to the literature by examining the influence of generational differences on the engagement model. It also highlights the relative importance of employee engagement drivers in predicting intention to leave, in-role performance, and innovative job performance for all three generations. This chapter further explains how generation specific engagement model closes the generational divide, helps organisations to retain talent and at the same time drives organisation performance. Theoretical framework with large data set of 63 qualitative data and 539 quantitative data from Peninsular Malaysia was used. Several interesting findings with important theoretical implications emerged. The three generations are Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y.

6.2 Younger vs. Older Generation at Workplace

Based on the in-depth interviews, generation gaps happen as each generation are said to have different work attitudes. Perceptions on the younger and older generations were gathered from all parties. To sum it up, the general perception about the younger generation (Generation X and Y) portrays them as people who lack values, discipline and compliance. The organisation members find that the younger generation is not willing to put in extra hours despite not understanding the work
situation as compared to the older employees. They do not take work seriously and their playfulness at workplace is really becoming frustrating for the seniors. They have to be warned not to come in after 9am, take extra lunch hours, serve the net during working hours and use company resources for personal matters (for example, using the telephone to make personal phone calls) (Aruna, Wong, Kaos Jr & Yeoh, 2012). The supervisors also feel that the younger generation tend to focus on obtaining rewards at the cost of ethics. Fundamentally, they tend to prefer less work but expect more pay. Therefore, the older generation believes guidance is much needed here.

When it comes to the older generation, Generation X and Y have something to comment as well. The younger generation expects the older generation to respond to queries within reasonable time frame. If longer time is needed, the senior employees are expected to inform the younger ones. In fact, should help be needed, they should not hesitate in seeking help of their younger counterparts. At present, the younger generation believes that the older generation tend to suppress them from voicing out or giving recommendations. Although the younger generations do not deny the fact that the older employees are more experienced. They want an opportunity to speak up and expect their recommendations to be given due consideration. While the older cohort argued that the younger generation does not listen to them, the younger cohort feels the same about the older cohort. Fundamentally, the older cohort is always blamed of maintaining a certain way of doing things and dislike being questioned.

Some frustration among the younger generation at workplace is that they are expected to follow what is been told without much questioning. Such practices affect
the working relationship with other organisational members from the older generation. They are unable to foster friendship and their working relationship is perceived to be rather formal. They also feel that there is a resistance for them to integrate into the culture, which eventually disallow them to tap on their seniors' experience. If left alone, this may lead to work dissatisfaction and high level of turnover.

6.3 Implications of Significant Events

In general, Baby Boomers are the ones who have gone through the toughest times as compared to Generation X and Generation Y. Not only that they experienced the after effect of World War II, they even mentioned the difficult times as their significant events. These events include economic meltdown, May 13 incident, merger and acquisition. The hard times that they faced made them value things more, which indirectly cause them to be results driven, loyal, dedicated, and the most hardworking among the three generations. With these events, the Boomers expect employers to give them security and they felt relieve after the Malaysia achieved its independence. As for the younger generations, they were born during the Internet era. As such, Internet and social networking sites play an important role in their lives.

6.4 Insights into Generational Issues

Based on the findings, there is an overall deterioration in terms of values and ethics. The main work issues faced was that managers are generally less hands-on on administration work, which after some time; they may lose touch of the underlining
issues faced by subordinates. As this gap widens, there may be work relationship tension between the supervisor and the employee. Besides, supervisors need to know that employees of today prefer less work checking, more freedom, and flexibility to do their work and less bureaucracy from the Management. At times, employees feel that they have to adhere to the seniors to save guard their appraisal, bonus, increment as well as promotion opportunities. Lastly, the older generation does not get the respect from the juniors as the latter feel that they have better qualifications, which inevitably lead to the older generation’s unwillingness to teach the younger generation.

Having considered the findings in the previous chapter, this chapter brings them together with the underlying themes of the thesis: practices for participative workplace change in accordance to work preferences and values of each generation, and the engagement model for each generation cohort in the Malaysian context. In integrating these themes, the focus becomes an assessment of what constitutes a coherent organisation, which, in turn retains talent and drives organisation performance.

### 6.5 Participative Workplace Change

The first objective of this research was to gain more insight into work preferences and values of each generation in the Malaysian context, which has been addressed in the previous chapter. All these generational conflicts found during the interviews are caused by different perception, work preferences and values that each
6.5.1 Addressing Generational Issues

There are characteristics, which are unique and prominent to each generation. For example, loyalty tops the list for the Boomers when it comes to work values. They expect security from their employers and at the same time, have respect for the authorities. Their goal in life is rather straightforward, that is to lead a simple life. As the country progresses, promotion based on seniority has become history. To manage the expectation of the Boomers, organisations need to constantly inform the employees, especially the top performers and core contributors that their jobs are safe, as they long for job security. Telling them that their expertise is required will also make them feel rewarded for being loyal and dedicated to the organisation.

Based on the interviews, Generation X is ambitious. At work, they expect to be given the opportunity to learn, challenging work, fair rewards and work-life balance. Some of the key work behaviours include results-focused, multitasking and respect competency. They want independence and meaningful work. All these can be translated into having a clear career path for Gen X in order to get the best from them. The career path should include clear objectives to cater for their ambitious and results-focused characteristics. They need to know what is in it for them and at the same time give them the flexibility to manage their own work as they long for independence. They dislike being micro managed. As claimed by Yu and Miller (2005), they want more collaboration rather than to be micro managed; they view
themselves more as associates. Developing a road map to help them achieve the objectives and offering challenging work to them would address their work expectations. In addition, they would also expect employers to be open about the rewards programme.

In-depth interviews reviewed that Gen Y is pretty much a team player. Just like Gen X, Gen Y are multi-taskers who expect employers to be fair when it comes to giving rewards, look forward to learning opportunities, work-life balance, and challenging work. In this aspect, clear career path would work for Gen Y as well.

When it comes to driving forces, Boomers are generally self-motivated and they feel that it is their responsibility to complete the given task. Gen X wants monetary compensation and good teamwork. Perhaps, based on this, if Gen X partner leaves, the rest has a high chance of leaving. As Gen Y looks for passion and they are knowledge seekers, it is understandable that they leave a job in search of something, which they like. To reduce high cost due to unnecessary attrition, it is always best to know what exactly Gen Y is looking for during the job interview session itself.

6.5.2 A Healthy Generational Mix Working Environment

Organisations cannot shy away from generational differences. Employers need to create a work environment where employees can maximise the strengths of each cohort. Understanding these differences is only the first step and acceptance would be next. Interviewees were asked on changes that they want to see in their multi-generational environment. These changes can be grouped into three concepts. They
are togetherness, acceptance, and communication where all parties need to work together.

Togetherness

The first initiative that organisations need to take into consideration is togetherness. Having team members that consists of the same generation is unhealthy, as the generational gap among the generations will become more complex. It starts with the daily operation of any organisation. Based on the findings, Gen X and Gen Y have a preference to communicate using technology advances such as email or by phone over face-to-face communication (the Boomers’ choice), as both younger generations were born during the technology age. Gen X and Gen Y need to be made aware that not all communications can be carried out in that manner, as face-to-face communication remains the most powerful human interaction despite being in the modern age. When individuals meet, mutual understanding can be achieved. We cannot use electronic devices when we want to resolve a conflict, calming a person’s emotion and setting out priorities for the team members.

Togetherness can also be inculcated into work schedule of any job function. It can be through a company / departmental meeting / gathering, mentor - mentee programme from different age group and teaming up with the seniors for projects / work task. Besides, developing a job orientation programme that allows employees to join other teams would also be a good way to promote togetherness. Another way to foster togetherness is through team building. Team building refers to get together projects such as family day, a simple lunch or activities that foster employees of
different generation. Team bonding is important as certain individuals claimed that there are groups within the same department and they believe that bonding helps to eliminate this issue.

Acceptance

Being together without accepting others are of no use. Employees need to accept that certain things are viewed differently by other generations and communication is the best way to avoid misunderstanding. Thus, willingness to accept others is utmost important and these are what the employees from all generations want. For example, Gen X and Y should be allowed to do multiple tasks simultaneously and thus should not be viewed as failure to concentrate on given task, as multitasking are their traits. Instead, organisations need to ensure clear objectives and deadlines are given. As Gen X is already at their prime working age and with the experience that they have, flexibility can be given on how they want the tasks to be completed with clear work ethics. Giving the flexibility can be translated into empowerment, which Gen X wants and emphasis on work ethics will iron out the issue of negativity that Gen X workers are often characterised with.

Communication

When there are different generations working together in an organisation, it would be good to have a short briefing concerning different characteristics that each generation brings with them. As highlighted in the previous section, this awareness is necessary as others may view certain ways / methods differently, which may result in
misunderstanding. Interviewees revealed that, at times, they feel frustrated when they do not know the reason and the seniors failed to give the guidance that they expect. Therefore, employees should never assume that others know what is in their mind as different individual thinks differently. Therefore, seniors are advised to provide reasons behind the operational procedure rather than just asking the juniors to follow. This is in line with findings from McGuire, By, and Hutchings (2007) whereby attaining intergenerational communication is progressively more challenging as generational issues are becoming more apparent with the appearance of Generation Y.

Two-way communication is crucial in today’s multigenerational workforce. Everyone wants to be heard. As highlighted by Sias (2009), communication, a form of interaction at workplace serve to create and maintain work relationships among team and organisational members, and between these members and key organisational stakeholders. Communication is said to have direct and indirect effects on team and organisational performance (Greenbaum & Query 1999), which is part of the research outcome of this study. In order to address generational conflicts at workplace, organisation should incorporate the three dimension of communication as highlighted by Smidts, Pruyn, and van Riel (2001). These dimensions include 1) communication of the organisation’s goals and objectives; 2) communication of the individual’s role in the organisation, and; 3) the experience of a positive communication climate.

Based on the interviews, communication of organisation’s goal and objectives was found to be crucial to all generations. With the common goal ingrained in every individual, all employees will understand the company’s direction and this eventually make everyone work together towards a common goal. This goal can be
communicated through departmental meeting. On the other hand, communication of
the individual’s role in the organisation can be achieved through effective supervision,
especially for the younger generations. In general, supervisors of Gen X and Gen Y
employees need to know that they want immediate feedback, precise goals, and fair
treatment. The outcome of interviews found that what the younger generations want is
rather simple. They want to have supportive supervisors. Having an open approach is
said to decrease generational friction. When two-way communication exists, it
eventually leads to a learning organisation where they learn from each generation.
Finally, the third dimension, which is related to positive communication climate. As
far as Gen Y is concerned, they do not want to have any politics at work. To them,
what matters most is, to get the work done. As Gen Y likes to be heard and if
resources permit, establishing a youth employee organisation club where views and
opinions of the younger employees can be brought to the attention of the Management
as most of them have yet to reach management level.

Besides, driven by global competitive market, organisations are now focusing
on ways to increase engagement levels of their employees. Engagement was found to
be related to positive organisational outcomes. Communication is a simple way to
engage employees. Speak with employees to find out what is on their minds.
Employees should feel respected and comfortable in expressing ideas, regardless of
their designation in the organisation. Management too has to be accessible and special
attention should be given to the top performers.
In summary, route to improve generation gap depends upon finding a balance among the generations. Organisations should leverage on the advantages of each generation.

6.6 The Engagement Model

This research is based on a theoretically grounded engagement model. The motivators for the engagement model are job characteristics together with its core characteristic (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback); reward and recognition; and work-life balance. The consequences were intention to leave, in-role performance, and innovative job performance. The second objective of this research was to investigate the relationship between (a) motivators and consequences, (b) motivators and employee engagement, and (c) employee engagement and consequences.

When it comes to job characteristics, autonomy emerged as the most prominent and prevalent antecedent. Autonomy has impact to the Boomers and Gen X but not Gen Y. As based on the demographic, with about equal sample size from each generation, only 29.3% of Gen Y are at first line management and above as compared to 47.0% Boomers and 46.1% Gen X. This clearly shows that the majority of Gen Y is still at entry level. Hence, autonomy is not really experienced by them or expected at this stage. Based on the research findings, experience of autonomy affects the degree of turnover intention, innovative job performance and employee engagement through the psychological state of job characteristics model. Thus, as far as job design is concerned, it is always good to include autonomy according to the job scope as it
acts as a motivator to the employees. Degree of autonomy in one’s work allows employees to design his / her work. If an organisation wants to engage the Boomers and Gen X, autonomy can be used as a tool. This study found that engaged employees perform better.

Contrary to the proposed hypotheses, skill variety is found to be positively related to intention to leave. This may be due to employee’s perception that with the variety of skills that he / she possesses, it is easier for him or her to move to another organisation for a higher pay. From the other perspective, a job that requires more skills are generally more complex and thus increased stress and pressure to perform, which eventually resulted in higher intention to leave among the employees. Based on the findings, in order to retain talent, employers need to ensure that employees are engaged as engagement leads to all three consequences that were studied in this research, especially for the Gen X and Gen Y. Besides, a new study from Ontario Hospital Association (2012) found that employee engagement has substantial impact on reducing workplace stress. Findings from the mix mode research revealed that it is indeed fortunate that the Boomers are loyal and dedicated. It is only natural for the Boomers to stay long in an organisation. To stay competitive, business leaders must tap on their experience and proceed with the necessary knowledge transfer before they retire. Despite this, the Boomers must not be ignored. As mentioned earlier, autonomy is important to the Boomers and leaders should not worry much about the Boomers, as Boomers always believe that it is their responsibilities to complete the assigned tasks and they want to lead a simple life. Nevertheless, organisations must not forget to assure them that their jobs are secured, a factor that Boomers fear most.
As today’s working environment is becoming more competitive, most of the jobs are getting more specialised. Hence, task identity may not be prominent now and therefore, no relationship is found between task identity and intention to leave. Though having a job description has many benefits, there are also some disadvantages to strict job descriptions. Employees do not care much about the beneficiaries of their work. This egocentric attitude of today’s employees may have contributed to the insignificant relationship between task significance and intention to leave. In this research, feedback does not have impact to intention to leave even though supervisors and co-workers are the closest to employees. Perhaps, employees may have reported differences in perceived usefulness of information from this source. As claimed by Hanser and Muchinsky (1978), this is called differences in perceived reliability of information from different sources.

It was found that there is no relationship between job characteristics as a whole and in-role performance. Reason being, the incumbent is already aware of the job prior to joining. This information would have been gathered from the job advertisement, recruiter, and during the interview. Employers would have matched the skills required and skills possessed by the individual. Expectations have been clearly communicated to the employee. Hence, employees have to perform in accordance to this expectation regardless of whether these job characteristics have been incorporated into their job design.

Innovation is the cornerstone in today’s economy. However, the dimensions of job characteristics with the exception of autonomy do not seem to have relationship with innovative job performance. The result implies that although these dimensions of
job characteristics may enhance perceptions of meaningfulness of task or provide knowledge of the actual results, such psychological states may not be a prerequisite for innovation. Innovation appears to be not stifled by perceptions of whether the task is significant, involves skill variety, has an identity or even has room for feedback. Clearly, for innovation to take place, what matters is the freedom to exercise their creativity in any aspect of their job no matter how small or insignificant. Employees who are given more autonomy would be able to use their personal attributes to contribute to job performance better. For example, an employee from the production line who has autonomy is given the flexibility to schedule their work and determine how it is to be done could lead to production ownership whereas other dimensions of job characteristics may not influence ownership. Researchers found that with the production ownership, it promotes innovative behaviour (Buys, 2010; Dorenbosch, van Engen & Verhagen, 2005).

In consideration of rewards and recognition, there is no better starting point than knowing and understanding the employees. Based on the research findings, reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague prove to be important to the Boomers and Gen Y. However, Gen X prefers reward and recognition that comes from the Management. One of the reasons as to why reward and recognition from immediate supervisor and colleague have impact on the Boomers is that they long for training and development opportunities, which often needs to be recommended by the immediate supervisor. The Boomers may also feel left out in the training opportunities as they are the oldest in the organisation and most organisations may not want to spend much on them as they will eventually retire. For
Gen Y, they may be too junior to be noticed by the Management and their immediate contact is their supervisors.

Reward and recognition from the Management has impact on Gen X only. As revealed earlier, Gen X is the most cynical among all. To them, they trust the highest authority in an organisation – the Management. The same thing goes for employee engagement where it is best to come from the Management for Gen X, as Gen X perceives that they are in the better position to explain companies’ direction and objectives. Generation X may not view reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague as crucial as they are in their prime working age and normally, organisations will send them for training the most.

Reward and recognition from supervisors and colleagues are found to have influence on in-role performance and innovative job performance. On the other hand, reward and recognition from the Management seems to have a negative impact on in-role performance. This is another example of clear reflection of better relationship and understanding of employees when deciding on how and when to reward them by their respective supervisors and colleagues as compared to the Management. As mentioned by Cameron, Banko, and Pierce (2001), they found negative effects on high-interest tasks especially when rewards are tangible but loosely tied to performance level. Nevertheless, companies need not spend a lot for these reward and recognition. It should be within the budget. Simple things such as putting up photographs of employees who performed well during the previous month to show other employees that all the hard work did not go unrewarded does not cost a lot yet effective.
Employers may be happy to know that reward and recognition in general does not constitute to employees’ intention to leave directly even though money (reward) is perceived as important for all three generations. There are other reasons that are deemed to be more important when it comes to intention to leave.

Much has been said about work-life balance in Malaysia. Based on the findings, organisations, which have yet to incorporate work-life balance programme, can consider implementing it, as there are direct links between work-life balance with employee engagement, in-role performance and innovative job performance. Although work-life balance refers to individual’s ability / control in managing conflict between pressures of work and family roles due to the multiple roles assumed by the employees (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), organisations of today need to step in to assist them. Based on the findings, work-life balance affects only Gen X and Y. To the most workaholic employees, the Boomers, they would not understand why work-life balance is so important to the younger generations.

6.7 The Engagement Model for Each Generation

This section relates to the third objective of the study - the engagement model for each generation cohort. As far as generation preference is concerned, reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague seems to be the greatest motivator for the Boomers followed by autonomy. To reiterate, the Boomers feel left out in training opportunities. In fact, some revealed that they have not attended training for years and they feel that they will not be getting any as they are about to retire. To give it a boost, employers can consider computer related training such as
Microsoft Office, since they are not as technology driven as compared to others. As most Boomers already have vast experience, they would expect to have a certain degree of autonomy.

As for Generation X, nothing beats work-life balance as they were raised to value work-life balance upon seeing their parents. In addition, Generation X is all for getting reward and recognition from the Management. They want to be heard and once they are engaged, their creative minds seem to work better.

Gen Y, the youngest of all, values reward and recognition from the immediate supervisor and colleague, followed by work-life balance. This cohort seems to be more innovative once engaged. This is in line with the interviews findings where Gen Y has high expectation on getting fair rewards, opportunities to learn, followed by work-life balance. Both getting fair rewards and opportunities to learn relate directly to the supervisor.

Whichever way an organisation chooses to motivate its employees, findings found that engaged employees regardless of generation have an impact on in-role performance where business performance is the collective result of individual level achievement. For both Gen X and Gen Y, engagement reduces intention to leave and increases innovative job performance. Based on the findings, Gen Y does not stay long in organisation. As per Sayers (2007), they always keep their options open. Based on their demographic numbers, they will be the future runners of the organisation. Hence, having an engaged workforce is crucial. To improve engagement
among them, leaders should consider giving meaningful task that they crave for. Once they get what they desire, engagement occurs.

This research proves that employee engagement must be supported and encouraged for all generations in an organisation to bring out the best in them to maximise organisations’ success. Employers now need to pay more attention to create an engaged workforce in today’s competitive economy.

6.8 Limitations of the Study

Although the research has met the objectives, limitations are still unavoidable. Due to unavailability of data from the immediate supervisors, this study was completed by collecting self-report questionnaires. There may be potential validity problems such as individuals who deceive themselves or others and biasness may result. Therefore, care has been taken whereby large sample size was used to minimise these biases.

Even though crosstabulation of job level represents the actual work situation, that is Generation Y are mostly at entry level. This could affect the comparison with the Boomers and Generation X who are at higher levels. Expectations may also vary according to jobs / positions held.

Albeit Klang Valley is centrally located around the capital of Malaysia, where many come from different states around Malaysia to work, it still possess another limitation of urban bias. Though urban population in Malaysia was last reported at
72.20% in 2010, according to CIA World Factbook (2013), people in the urban may react differently as compared to those from rural areas. Due to the disparity, care needs to be taken to monitor the progress of engagement programme for each generation.

6.9 Future Research

Based on the research limitation, future researchers are encouraged to apply multi method variance in their studies. Spector (1987) suggests collecting the data through several different sources. These methods include self-report, supervisor rates, and organisational records. Besides, standardising job level of respondents would be recommended as the insignificant of job characteristics dimensions could be due to the different job levels of the respondents despite literature proving otherwise.

6.10 Conclusion

The present study has successfully developed a generation specific engagement model that can facilitate the closing of generational divide and help organisations retain talent who are able to drive organisation performance. Based on the findings, it is suggested that organisations should apply different strategies to engage each generation. Considering the future multigenerational composition workforce, employer definitely needs to consider the preferences and motivations of these generations.
As a conclusion, this model helps to support several key propositions of generation specific engagement model by demonstrating vital linkages between work motivators and consequences. In addition, this study gives strong theoretical contributions to the research on generations. Leaders will know that the engagement model is working when better performance, innovation and more loyalty take place. Another theoretical implications of the study is that this research undertakes a novel approach by incorporated both qualitative and quantitative elements. Qualitative analysis was used, to add further information on generations. As for quantitative analysis, large sample size was used to add to the richness of the data.

6.11 Chapter Summary

This chapter draws together the whole thesis by revisiting the drivers of engagement model and its consequences; and then highlighting its contribution. To conclude, all research objectives have been successfully addressed, and in so doing, the findings of this study have added to the current body of literature. As this research is statistically controlled for age and year, any effects found are truly generational differences.
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Appendix 1: UTRECHT Work Engagement Scale (UWES) or UWES-9

Scale:

0 = Never
1 = Almost never (A few times a year or less)
2 = Rarely (Once a month or less)
3 = Sometimes (A few times a month)
4 = Often (Once a week)
5 = Very often (A few times a week)
6 = Always (Everyday)

The items are as follow:

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
3. I am enthusiastic about my job.
4. My job inspires me.
5. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.
6. I feel happy when I am working intensely.
7. I am proud of the work that I do.
8. I am immersed in my work.
9. I get carried away when I’m working.

- Items 1, 2 and 5: Vigor
- Items 3, 4 and 7: Dedication
- Items 6, 8 and 9: Absorption
Appendix 2: The Q12

Overall, satisfaction is based on a five-point scale, where (5) extremely satisfied, (4) satisfied, (3) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, (2) dissatisfied and (1) extremely dissatisfied.

The items are as follow:
1. How satisfied are you with <Name of Company> as a place to work?
2. I know what is expected of me at work.
3. I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right.
4. At work, I have the opportunity to do what I do is best every day.
5. In the last seven days, I have received recognition or praise for doing good work.
6. My supervisor or someone at work seems to care me as a person.
7. There is someone at work who encourages my development.
8. At work, my opinions seem to count.
9. The mission / purpose of my company make me feel my job is important.
10. My associates (fellow employees) are committed to doing quality work.
11. I have a best friend at work.
12. In the last six months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress.
13. This last year, I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow.
Appendix 3: E3 Survey Items Organised by Key Engagement Elements

Engagement Core Items

Align Efforts with Strategy
1. Overall, I have a good understanding of what I am supposed to be doing in my job.
2. I am kept well informed about changes in the organisation that affect my work group.
3. My work group makes efficient use of its resources, time, and budget.
4. In my work group, meetings are focused and efficient.
5. In my work group, people are held accountable for low performance.

Empowerment
6. I can make meaningful decisions about how I do my job.
7. I find personal meaning and fulfilment in my work.

Teamwork and Collaboration
8. People in my work group cooperate with each other to get the job done.
9. In this organisation, different work groups reach out to help and support each other.
10. People in my work group quickly resolve conflicts when they arise.
11. People trust each other in my work group.
Development Plans

12. My job provides me with chances to grow and develop.
13. In my work group, people try to pick up new skills and knowledge.
14. In my work group, people are assigned tasks that allow them to use their best skills.

Support and Recognition

15. In my work group, my ideas and opinions are appreciated.
16. I get sufficient feedback about how well I am doing.
17. People in my work group understand and respect the things that make me unique.

Satisfaction and Loyalty

Supplemental Survey Items

18. I am satisfied with my job.
19. I would recommend employment at my organisation to my friends or family.
20. I feel a sense of loyalty to this company.
Appendix 4: Measures on Job Characteristics (Job Diagnostic Survey), (Revised Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Idaszak & Drasgow, 1987)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following items: Rating scale ranges from (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) agree, (5) strongly agree.

The items are as follow:

1. This job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.
2. This job is very simple and repetitive. (R).
3. This job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people. (R).
4. This job is structured so that I can do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.
5. This job can be done adequately without talking with or checking with other people.
6. This job provides me with the chance to completely finish the piece of work I begin.
7. Doing the work required by this job provides chances for me to figure out how well I am doing. (R).
8. My supervisors and co-workers almost never give me feedback about how well I am doing. (R).
9. After I finish my job, I know whether I performed well.
10. Supervisors often let me know whether I am performing the job well.
11. A lot of other people can be affected by how well my work gets done.
12. This job is very significant and important in the broader scheme of things.
13. This job gives me the chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.

14. This job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.

15. This job permits me to decide on my own how to go about doing my work.

- Items 1 – 2 : Skill Variety
- Items 3 – 6 : Task Identity
- Items 7 – 10 : Feedback
- Items 11 – 12 : Task Significance
- Items 13 – 15 : Autonomy
Appendix 5: Measures on Rewards and Recognition Adopted from (Saks, 2006)

Based on a five-point Likert type scale with anchors (1) to a small extent, (2) to some extent, (3) neutral, (4) to a moderate extent, (5) to a large extent.

The extent to which you have received various outcome for performing your job well:

1. A pay raise.
2. Job security.
3. A promotion.
4. More freedom and opportunities.
5. Respect from the people you work with.
6. Praise from your supervisor.
7. Training and development opportunities.
8. More challenging work assignments.
9. Some form of public recognition (e.g. employee of the month).
10. A reward or token of appreciation (e.g. lunch).
Appendix 6: Measures on Work-Life Balance (Flexible Work Arrangements)

Adopted from (Parkes & Langford, 2008)

Based on five-point Likert type scale of (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neither disagree nor agree, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree.

The items are as follow:

1. I maintain a good balance between work and other aspects of my life.
2. I am able to meet my family responsibilities while still doing what is expected of me at work.
3. I have a social life outside of work.
4. I am able to stay involved in non-work interests and activities.

Based on five-point Likert type scale of (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neither agree nor disagree, (4) agree and (5) strongly agree.

The items are as follow:

1. In the last few months, I have seriously thought about looking for a new job.
2. Presently, I am actively searching for other job.
3. I intend to leave the organization in the near future.
Appendix 8: Measures on In-role Performance Adopted from Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1989)

Based on a seven point Likert-scale anchored with (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) somewhat disagree, (4) undecided, (5) somewhat agree, (6) agree and (7) strongly agree.

1. This employee always completes the duties specified in his / her job description.
2. This employee meets all the formal performance requirements of the job.
3. This employee fulfils all responsibilities required by his / her job.
4. This employee never neglects aspects of the job that he / she is obligated to perform.
5. This employee often fails to perform essential duties.

Three items refer to idea generation, three items to idea promotion, and the remaining three to idea realisation. Immediate supervisors rate how often the subjects performed the nine innovative work behaviours in the workplace (1, “never,” to 7, “always”).

How often does this worker perform the following work activities?

1. Creating new ideas for improvements.
2. Mobilizing support for innovative ideas.
3. Searching out new working methods, techniques, or instruments.
4. Acquiring approval for innovative ideas.
5. Transforming innovative ideas into useful applications.
6. Generating original solutions to problems.
7. Introducing innovative ideas in a systematic way.
8. Making important organisational members enthusiastic for innovative ideas.
9. Thoroughly evaluating the application of innovate ideas.
Appendix 10: Interview Ethics Form
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Briefly state the Aims and Objectives of this Dissertation:
To identify generational characteristics, differences and similarities among Malaysians in order to develop strategies to close generational divide.
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How would you ensure confidentiality of personal data, where appropriate? (measure implemented)
No names will be asked. Individual responses will be treated in strict confidentiality where individual results will only will be accessible to me and my supervisor. Only group aggregate results will be reported.
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Appendix 11: Interview Guideline

Objectives:
To identify generational characteristics, differences and similarities among Malaysians in order to develop strategies to close generational divide.

Scope:
Youngest Malaysian respondent being aged 16 based on minimum legal age to enter workforce in Malaysia.

Guidelines for Focus Group

Instruction for Interviewer:
There is no "right" or "wrong" answer to the question. It is all about perception. Use the following questions as a guideline and circle those that apply.
**Part A: It is all About You**

1. Identify five (5) events that may have impact\(^2\) on your life. Please rank them from most significant to least significant event that may have affected your work attitude and behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Impact on You (√)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Impact on You (√)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>British administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Birth of computer / Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>World War II / Japanese occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Look East Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communist insurgency</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mergers and acquisitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Malaysian Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>MTV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economic Meltdown</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Indonesian confrontation</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Singapore Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Network Site such as Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>May 13 incident</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iraq War</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>New Economic Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Others, please specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Industrialisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Events that have impact on you or significant events refer to events that are important to you. These events could have change the way you work, live, behave, thinking or your beliefs / values.
2. What are your own work expectations?

_______________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________

3. What are your work expectations from colleagues who are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Younger than you?</th>
<th>Older than you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part B: About You and Your Supervisor

4. Your supervisor’s year of birth (age).
   a. 1946 – 1964 (Age: 47 – 65)
5. Please tick (√) the items that describe you and your perception towards your supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Work-related</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Supervisor</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Work-related</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Results driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sacrificing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Honourable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Civic mindedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Youthful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Diversity focused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Techno-savvy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Team player</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Others: Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Work-related</td>
<td>You</td>
<td>Your Supervisor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Work-related</td>
<td>You</td>
<td>Your Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continuous change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fast track career growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Others: Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Expectations**

1. Job security
2. Fair rewards for contribution
3. Opportunity for continuous learning
4. Challenging work
5. Work-life balance
6. Continuous change
7. Fast track career growth
8. Others: Please specify

**Work Behaviours**

1. Respectful of authority
2. Multitasking
3. Challenge authority
4. Loyal to team
5. Unimpressed by authority
6. Loyal to manager
7. Results-focused
8. Respect for competency, not title
9. Loyal to peers
10. Focus on change
11. Others: Please specify
### Goal in Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Work-related</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Supervisor</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Work-related</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintain independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Find work and create a life that has meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Leadership style:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you hold supervisory role, please describe your leadership style</th>
<th>Your supervisor’s leadership style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What drives you and your supervisor to perform at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Why do you consider yourself valuable in this company? Example, loyal.

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

Part C: Others:

9. To what extent is there a difference between employees today and five (5) years ago?

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

Part D: Future:

10. What advice would you give to the Management to improve work environment in your organisation?

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________
11. Do you see if there is a generation gap between employees in your organisation? What are your concerns about this, if any?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

12. If generation gap is an issue in your organisation, what changes would you like to see improved in the near future?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

13. Are there any insights on generational issues at your workplace?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Part E: Background of Respondent

   a. 1946 – 1964 (Age: 47 – 65)

15. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

   a. Malay
   b. Chinese
   c. Indian
   d. Others

17. Highest qualification attained.
   a. Secondary school and below
   b. Pre-university level: STPM / A Levels / Certificate
   c. Diploma / Advanced Diploma
   d. Degree / professional qualification
   e. Post graduate
18. Which industry are you in?
   a. Manufacturing
   b. Service

19. Designation.
   a. Assistant Manager and above
   b. Executive and Senior Executive
   c. Non-Executive

20. Tenure in organisation.
   a. Less than 1 year
   b. 1 year to less than 3 years
   c. 3 years to less than 5 years
   d. 5 years to less than 10 years
   e. 10 years and above

21. Number of employees in organisation.
   a. 5 and below
   b. 6 – 50
   c. 51 – 100
   d. 101 – 500
   e. 501 – 1000
   f. More than 1000
22. In your working team\textsuperscript{3}, are there members / employees from different age group?
   a. Yes
   b. No

   \textbf{If yes,} which age group do they mostly come from?
   a. 1946 – 1964 (Age: 47 – 65)

\textbf{Thank You!}

\textsuperscript{3} If your company has more than 5 employees, working team refers to group of individuals from the same unit whom you always work together with. For example, Recruitment team under Human Resources or Credit Control team under Finance. If your company has 5 employees or less, working team may include everyone.
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This research constitutes part of my Doctor of Philosophy Degree (Ph.D.) assessment, which will be submitted in fulfilment of the Ph.D. degree from the University of Malaya. The purpose of this study is to examine the extent to which work engagement of employees belonging to each generation mediates the relationship between some work motivators and work outcomes.
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Kindly return your completed survey via:
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Instruction: Please answer all the questions.

Part A: Job Characteristics

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.
2. This job is very simple and repetitive.
3. This job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.
4. This job is structured so that I can do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.
5. This job can be done adequately without talking with or checking with other people.
6. This job provides me with the chance to completely finish the piece of work I begin.
7. Doing the work required by this job provides chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.
8. My supervisors and co-workers almost never give me feedback about how well I am doing.
9. After I finish my job, I will know whether I performed well.
10. Supervisors often let me know whether I am performing the job well.
11. A lot of other people can be affected by how well my work gets done.
12. This job is very significant and important in the broader scheme of things.
13. This job gives me the chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.
14. This job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.
15. This job permits me to decide on my own how to go about doing my work.
Part B: Reward and Recognition

Please indicate the extent to which you have received various outcomes for performing your job well in the last eighteen months (1½ years) in your current organisation by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To a Small Extent</th>
<th>To Some Extent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>To a Moderate Extent</th>
<th>To a Large Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A pay raise.  
2. Job security.  
3. A promotion.  
4. More freedom and opportunities.  
5. Respect from the people you work with.  
6. Praise from your supervisor.  
7. Training and development opportunities.  
8. More challenging work assignments.  
9. Some form of public recognition (e.g. employee of the month).  
10. A reward or token of appreciation (e.g. lunch).

Part C: Work-Life Balance

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I maintain a good balance between work and other aspects of my life.  
2. I am able to meet my family responsibilities while still doing what is expected of me at work.  
3. I have a social life outside of work.  
4. I am able to stay involved in non-work interests and activities.
Part D: Work Engagement

The following 9 statements are about how you feel at work in the last twelve (12) months. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, circle “0” (zero) preceding the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by circling the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A few times a year or less)</td>
<td>(Once a month or less)</td>
<td>(A few times a month)</td>
<td>(Once a week)</td>
<td>(A few times a week)</td>
<td>(Everyday)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. I am enthusiastic about my job. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. My job inspires me. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. I feel happy when I am working intensely. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. I am proud of the work that I do. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. I am immersed in my work. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. I get carried away when I’m working. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Part E: Intention to Leave

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neither Disagree Nor Agree Agree Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5

1. In the last few months, I have seriously thought about looking for a new job. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Presently, I am actively searching for other job. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I intend to leave the organisation in the near future. 1 2 3 4 5
Part F: In-role Performance

Please indicate the extent to which your immediate supervisor feels about you based on each of the following statements by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 I always complete the duties specified in my job description.
2 I meet all the formal performance requirements of the job.
3 I fulfil all responsibilities required by my job.
4 I never neglect aspects of the job that I am obligated to perform.
5 I often fail to perform essential duties.

Part G: Innovative Job Performance

Please indicate the extent to which your immediate supervisor feels about you based on each of the following statements by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never (a few times a year or less)</th>
<th>Almost never (once a month or less)</th>
<th>Rarely (a few times a month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (a few times a week)</th>
<th>Often (once a week)</th>
<th>Very often (a few times a week)</th>
<th>Always (everyday)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 I often create new ideas for improvement.
2 I often mobilise support for innovative ideas.
3 I search out new working methods, techniques, or instruments.
4 I seek approval for innovative ideas.
5 I transform innovative ideas into useful applications.
6 I generate original solutions to problems.
7 I introduce innovative ideas in a systematic way.
8 I make important organisational members enthusiastic for innovative ideas.
9 I often thoroughly evaluate the application of innovative ideas.
Part H: Additional info

1. Number of companies that you have served in the last 5 years, excluding vacation jobs, such as those held while waiting for examination results: __________

2. My last performance review rating (average score): _______ / _______
   Example: 3 / 5

3. Description of my last performance review rating. On average, which descriptor describes you best? Please choose one of the following options.
   - **Marginal:** Individual fails to meet expectations across many areas; significant performance improvements required to fulfil current role in organisation.
   - **Nearly Meets Expectations:** Individual meets expectation in most areas but requires improvement across some areas.
   - **Consistently Meets Expectations:** Individual consistently meets performance expectations; individual is fulfilling current role.
   - **Exceeds Expectations:** Performance exceeds expected level consistently across many dimensions.
   - **Exemplary:** Performance consistently far exceeds expectations; conspicuously meritorious performance; ready to fulfil new role within organisation.

Part I: Background Information

Please choose the option that best describes you.

1. Gender:
   - Male
   - Female

2. Ethnicity:
   - Malay
   - Chinese
   - Indian
   - Others (please specify) ____________________

3. Year of birth (age):
   - 1946 – 1964 (Age: 47 – 65)
   - Others (please specify) ___

4. Marital status:
   - Single
   - Married
   - Divorced / Separated
   - Widowed
5. Monthly gross income:

- ≤ RM2,000
- RM2,001 – RM4,000
- RM4,001 – RM6,000
- RM6,001 – RM8,000
- RM8,001 – RM10,000
- ≥ RM10,001

6. Highest academic qualification attained:

- Secondary school and below
- Pre-university level: STPM / A Levels / Certificate
- Diploma / Advanced Diploma
- Degree / professional qualification
- Post graduate

7. Designation:

- Top Management (e.g. CEO, COO, GM)
- Middle Management (e.g. Regional Manager, Division Manager)
- First Line Management (e.g. Supervisor, Team Leader)
- Support / Administrative Staff
- Professional
- Others (please specify) ____________________________

8. Industry classification of my current organisation:

- Banking, Finance, Insurance, Real Estate
- Communications, Advertising, Utilities
- Construction, Engineering
- Education
- Government
- Health Care, Pharmaceutical
- Internet, Hi Tech
- Manufacturing
- Retail, Wholesale, Own Business
- Services, Transportation, Hospitality
- Nonprofit
- Others (please specify) ____________________________

9. Tenure in my current organisation. Please specify: ________________ year(s).

10. Total number of years I have worked: ____________ year(s).

11. Employment type:

- Full time
- Part time

12. Current employment status:

- Permanent
- Contract
Appendix 14: Quantitative Survey – Supervisor Survey (English Version)
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Dear Sir / Madam,

This research constitutes part of my Doctor of Philosophy Degree (Ph.D.) assessment, which will be submitted in fulfilment of the Ph.D. degree from the University of Malaya.

As an immediate supervisor of the employee who has participated in the same survey, please evaluate his or her performance and work-related matters by indicating the degree to which each of the statement in this questionnaire best describe him or her. This questionnaire will not take more than 10 minutes of your valuable time to complete it. Please be assured that all information will be treated with strictest confidentiality and only aggregated data will be analysed and reported.

Should you have any concern regarding this study, please contact Lee Su Teng, the researcher or Associate Professor Dr. Angeline Tay, the research supervisor.

Thank you for your valuable assistance in participating in this survey.

Yours sincerely,

LEE SU TENG

Mobile             : +6012 – 2968 120
Email Address: leesuteng@gmail.com

Supervised by:

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR DR. ANGELINE TAY
Faculty of Business and Accountancy
University of Malaya
Kuala Lumpur
Contact Number: +603 – 7967 3888
Email Address : angetay@um.edu.my

Kindly return your completed survey via:
- Drop Box located at __________________, or
- Email : leesuteng@gmail.com, or
- Fax : +603 – 8062 8128, or you may participate online at
- Online survey:
  - For employee (English version) https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dDc1X3kwM0xtVHZ3OHjiRTNvWDhkWIE6MQ
  - For supervisor (English version) https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/formResponse?formkey=dFNZdFdhUaUmdFZvTFdGZpNlZ0cWtJeWd0YmR6MQ&theme=0AX42CRMsmRFBuY1iODQwMzFjYiIiZjJhLTRmNmUtODQ0My1iNjYmYTUzNjQzZWE&ptok=1152912900623898688&ifq
  - For employee (Malay version) https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dGZpMHVhMzMyN0ltUE52YVo5QT8xQUE6MQ
  - For supervisor (Malay version) https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dEhmdk5aY2Ibb2c5M0o0SkhhNE9Jmc6MQ

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of University of Malaya.
**Instruction: Please answer all the questions.**

**Part A: This Employee’s In-role Performance**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This employee always completes the duties specified in his or her job description.  
2. This employee meets all the formal performance requirements of the job.  
3. This employee fulfils all responsibilities required by his or her job.  
4. This employee never neglects aspects of the job that he or she is obligated to perform.  
5. This employee often fails to perform essential duties.

**Part B: This Employee’s Innovative Job Performance**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A few times a year or less)</td>
<td>(Once a month or less)</td>
<td>(A few times a month)</td>
<td>(Once a week)</td>
<td>(A few times a week)</td>
<td>(Everyday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This employee often creates new ideas for improvement.  
2. This employee often mobilises support for innovative ideas.  
3. This employee searches out new working methods, techniques, or instruments.  
4. This employee seeks approval for innovative ideas.  
5. This employee transforms innovative ideas into useful applications.  
6. This employee generates original solutions to problems.  
7. This employee introduces innovative ideas in a systematic way.  
8. This employee makes important organisational members enthusiastic for innovative ideas.  
9. This employee often thoroughly evaluates the application of innovative ideas.
Part C: This Employee’s Job Characteristics

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This job requires the employee to use a number of complex or high-level skills. 1 2 3 4 5
2. This job is very simple and repetitive. 1 2 3 4 5
3. This job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people. 1 2 3 4 5
4. This job is structured so that the employee can do an entire piece of work from beginning to end. 1 2 3 4 5
5. This job can be done adequately without talking with or checking with other people. 1 2 3 4 5
6. This job provides the employee the chance to completely finish the piece of work he or she begins. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Doing the work required by this job provides chances for this employee to figure out how well he or she is doing. 1 2 3 4 5
8. His or her co-workers and I almost never give this employee feedback about how well he or she is doing. 1 2 3 4 5
9. After this employee finishes his or her job, he or she will know whether he or she has performed well. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I often let this employee know whether he or she is performing the job well. 1 2 3 4 5
11. A lot of other people can be affected by how well his or her work gets done. 1 2 3 4 5
12. This job is very significant and important in the broader scheme of things. 1 2 3 4 5
13. This job gives this employee the chance to use his or her personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work. 1 2 3 4 5
14. This job gives this employee considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how he or she does the work. 1 2 3 4 5
15. This job permits the employee to decide on his or her own how to go about doing his or her work. 1 2 3 4 5
**Part D: This Employee’s Reward & Recognition**

Please indicate the extent to which this employee has received various outcomes for performing his or her job well in the last eighteen months (1½ years) in his or her current organisation by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a Small Extent</th>
<th>To Some Extent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>To a Moderate Extent</th>
<th>To a Large Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A pay raise. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Job security. 1 2 3 4 5
3. A promotion. 1 2 3 4 5
4. More freedom and opportunities. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Respect from the people he or she works with. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Praise from me. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Training and development opportunities. 1 2 3 4 5
8. More challenging work assignments. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Some form of public recognition (e.g. employee of the month). 1 2 3 4 5
10. A reward or token of appreciation (e.g. lunch). 1 2 3 4 5

**Part E: This Employee’s Work-Life Balance**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This employee maintains a good balance between work and other aspects of his or her life. 1 2 3 4 5
2. This employee is able to meet his or her family responsibilities while still doing what is expected of him or her at work. 1 2 3 4 5
3. This employee has a social life outside of work. 1 2 3 4 5
4. This employee is able to stay involved in non-work interests and activities. 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for your participation!

Please return your completed survey via:
- Drop Box located at: _________________, or
- E-mail: leesuteng@gmail.com, or
- Fax: +603 – 8062 8128, or you may participate online at
- Online survey: NA
Appendix 15: Quantitative Survey – Employee Survey (Malay Version)

Nombor Siri: «Serial_Number»

16 Disember 2011

Tuan / Puan,

Kajian ini merupakan sebahagian daripada penilaian Ijazah Doktor Falsafah (Ph.D.) saya yang akan dikemukakan kepada Universiti Malaya untuk penganugerahan ijazah Ph.D.. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mengkaji sejauh mana penglibatan pekerja dari setiap generasi terhadap motivasi kerja dan hasil kerja.

Saya berharap jasa tuan / puan sekiranya dapat meluangkan masa untuk melengkapkan soal selidik yang dilampir. Soal selidik ini tidak akan mengambil masa lebih daripada 15 minit. Adalah dimaklumkan bahawa tiada sebarang jawapan yang betul atau salah. Semua maklumat yang diberi akan dijamin sulit dan hanya data agregat yang akan dianalisis dan dilaporkan.

Sekiranya anda mempunyai sebarang soalan mengenai kajian ini, sila hubungi Lee Su Teng yang bertindak sebagai penyelidik atau penyelia penyelidikan, Profesor Madya Dr. Angeline Tay.

Terima kasih kerana mengambil bahagian dalam kajian ini.

Yang benar,

LEE SU TENG
No. Telefon: +6012 – 2968 120
Emel : leesuteng@gmail.com

Penyelia Penyelidikan:
PROFESSOR MADYA DR. ANGELINE TAY
Fakulti Perakaunan dan Perniagaan
Universiti Malaya
Kuala Lumpur
No Telefon : +603 – 7967 3888
Emel : angetay@um.edu.my

Sila kembalikan soal selidik yang telah lengkap melalui:
- “Drop Box” yang terletak di: ____________, atau
- Emel : leesuteng@gmail.com, atau
- Fax : +603 – 8062 8128, atau mengambil bahagian secara online
- Kaji selidik online:
  - Untuk pekerja (versi Bahasa Melayu)
    https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dGZpMHVMVzMyN0lIUE52YVo5QT BxQUE6MQ
  - Untuk penyelia (versi Bahasa Melayu)
    https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dEhmdk5aY2lIb2c5M0o0SkhhNE9 Jamc6MQ
  - Untuk pekerja (versi Bahasa Inggeris)
    https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dDc1X3kwM0xtVHZ3OHpjRTNvWD hkWIE6MQ
  - Untuk penyelia (versi Bahasa Inggeris)
    https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/formResponse?formkey=dFN0ZFdPR0hhdUMxdFZYT FiSjdfQIE6MQ&theme=0AX42CMsmRFbUy1ODQwMzFjY1lZjJhLTRmNmUfODQ0My1iNjJ mYTUzNjQ2ZWE&ptok=1152912900623898688&ifq

Projek ini telah diluluskan oleh Jawatankuasa Etika Universiti Malaya.
Bahagian A: Sifat Kerja

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan bulatkan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombor</th>
<th>Kenyataan</th>
<th>Sangat Tidak</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Berkecuali</th>
<th>Bersetuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kemahiran yang kompleks diperlukan untuk melaksanakan kerja ini.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kerja ini adalah sangat mudah dan berulang-ulang.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Saya memerlukan banyak kerjasama dengan orang lain untuk melaksanakan kerja ini.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kerja ini membenarkan saya melaksanakan keseluruhan kerja dari awal hingga akhir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kerja ini boleh dilaksanakan tanpa berbincang dengan rakan sekerja.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kerja ini memberi peluang kepada saya untuk menghabiskan kerja saya mulakan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pelaksanaan kerja ini memberi peluang kepada saya untuk mengetahui prestasi kerja saya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Penyelia dan rakan sekerja saya tidak pernah memberi maklum balas terhadap prestasi kerja saya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Selepas melaksanakan tugas saya, saya akan tahu prestasi kerja saya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Penyelia sering memaklumkan kepada saya terhadap prestasi kerja saya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ramai orang akan dipengaruhi oleh prestasi kerja saya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kerja ini sangat penting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kerja ini membenarkan saya membuat keputusan / pertimbangan sendiri.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Saya bebas dalam tatacara pelaksanaan kerja saya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Saya dibenarkan membuat keputusan sendiri dalam kerja saya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bahagian B: Ganjaran dan Pengiktirafan

Sila nyatakan sejauh manakah anda telah menerima pelbagai ganjaran dan pengiktirafan bagi melaksanakan tugas anda dengan baik dalam tempoh lapan belas bulan yang lalu (1 ½ tahun) dalam organisasi semasa, dengan bulatkan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berdasarkan skala berikut:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sebahagian Kecil</th>
<th>Sedikit</th>
<th>Berkecuali</th>
<th>Tahap yang Sederhana</th>
<th>Sebahagian Besar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Peningkatan gaji. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Kestabilan kerja. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Kenaikan pangkat. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Kebebasan dan peluang yang lebih. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Penghormatan dari rakan sekerja. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Pujian dari penyelia anda. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Peluang latihan dan pembangunan. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Tugas kerja yang lebih mencabar. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Pengiktirafan awam (contoh: pekerja contoh). 1 2 3 4 5
10. Ganjaran atau tanda penghargaan (contoh: makan tengah hari). 1 2 3 4 5

Bahagian C: Imbangan Kehidupan Kerja

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan bulatkan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sangat Tidak Bersetuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Berkecuali</th>
<th>Bersetuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Saya mengekalkan keseimbangan yang baik antara kerja dan aspek-aspek lain dalam hidup saya. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Saya dapat memenuhi tanggungjawab keluarga saya dan pada masa yang sama masih dapat melakukan apa yang dikehendaki di tempat kerja saya. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Saya mempunyai kehidupan sosial. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Saya dapat melibatkan diri dalam aktiviti di luar kerja. 1 2 3 4 5
Bahagian D: Penglibatan Kerja

Berikut adalah 9 kenyataan mengenai perasaan anda di tempat kerja dalam dua belas bulan (12) yang lepas. Sila baca setiap kenyataan dengan teliti dan membuat keputusan jika anda pernah mengalami perasaan sebegini tentang kerja anda. Jika anda tidak pernah berasa demikian, bulatkan "0" (sifar) selepas kenyataan tersebut. Jika anda pernah mengalami perasaan ini, nyatakan betapa kerap anda berasa demikian dengan bulatkan nombor 1 hingga 6 yang paling menggambarkan kekerapan anda berasa begitu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tidak Pernah</th>
<th>Hampir Tidak Pernah</th>
<th>Jarang</th>
<th>Kadang-kala</th>
<th>Selalu</th>
<th>Sering Kali</th>
<th>Sentiasa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)</td>
<td>(Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)</td>
<td>(Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)</td>
<td>(Setiap hari)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Saya rasa penuh dengan tenaga semasa bekerja. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Semasa bekerja saya berasa kukuh dan penuh berdaya. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Saya bersemangat dengan tugas saya. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Tugas saya memberi inspirasi kepada saya. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Di waktu bangun pagi, saya merasa ingin pergi ke tempat kerja. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Saya berasa gembira apabila saya gigih bekerja. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Saya berasa bangga dengan kerja saya. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Saya asyik dalam kerja saya. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Saya terbawa-bawa semasa saya bekerja. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Bahagian E: Niat Meninggalkan Kerja

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan bulatkan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sangat Tidak Bersetuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Berkecuali</th>
<th>Bersetuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Dalam beberapa bulan yang lepas, saya asyik memikirkan untuk mencari kerja baru. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Pada masa ini, saya sedang aktif mencari pekerjaan lain. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Saya bercadang untuk meninggalkan organisasi dalam masa terdekat. 1 2 3 4 5
**Bahagian F: Prestasi Kerja**

Sila nyatakan setakat mana persepsi pihak atasan anda terhadap anda pada setiap kenyataan di bawah berpandukan skala di bawah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sangat Tidak</th>
<th>Tidak</th>
<th>Agak Tidak</th>
<th>Berkecuali</th>
<th>Agak</th>
<th>Bersetuju</th>
<th>Sangat Bersetuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Saya sentiasa menyiapkan tugas saya seperti yang dinyatakan dalam huraian kerja. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Saya memenuhi permintaan rasmi prestasi kerja. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Saya menunaikan segala tanggungjawab yang diperlukan dalam tugas saya. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Saya tidak pernah mengabaikan aspek kerja yang wajib saya laksanakan. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Saya sering gagal melaksanakan tugas penting. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Bahagian G: Kerja Prestasi Inovatif**

Sila nyatakan setakat mana persepsi pihak atasan anda terhadap anda pada setiap kenyataan di bawah berpandukan skala di bawah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tidak Pernah</th>
<th>Hampir Tidak Pernah</th>
<th>Jarang</th>
<th>Kadang-kala</th>
<th>Selalu</th>
<th>Sering Kali</th>
<th>Sentiasa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)</td>
<td>(Sekali dalam sebulan atau kurang)</td>
<td>(Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)</td>
<td>(Sekali seminggu)</td>
<td>(Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)</td>
<td>(Setiap hari)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Saya sering mencipta ide baru untuk penambahbaikan. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Saya sering mendapat sokongan untuk ide-ide inovatif. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Saya mencari kaedah kerja baru, teknik, atau instrumen. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Saya mendapatkan kelulusan untuk ide inovatif. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Saya mengubah ide inovatif ke dalam aplikasi. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Saya menjana penyelesaian kepada masalah. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Saya memperkenalkan ide inovatif dalam cara yang sistematik. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Saya membuat rakan sekerja bersemangat terhadap ide inovatif. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Saya sering menilai aplikasi ide inovatif dengan teliti. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Bahagian H: Maklumat Tambahan

1. Bilangan syarikat yang telah anda berkhidmat dalam 5 tahun yang lepas, **tidak termasuk** pekerjaan sambilan, seperti jawatan sementara menunggu keputusan peperiksaan:__________

2. Penilaian prestasi lepas saya (skor purata): _______ / _______  *Contoh: 3 / 5*


   - **Marginal:**
     - Individu gagal memenuhi permintaan dalam kerja; peningkatan prestasi yang ketara diperlukan untuk memenuhi peranan semasa saya berada di dalam organisasi.

   - **Hampir Memenuhi Jangkaan:**
     - Individu memenuhi permintaan dalam kebanyakan kerja, namun peningkatan prestasi di sesetengah kerja masih diperlukan.

   - **Konsisten Memenuhi Jangkaan:**
     - Individu secara konsisten memenuhi permintaan prestasi; individu memenuhi peranan semasa.

   - **Melebihi Jangkaan:**
     - Prestasi melebihi tahap dijangka; konsisten merentasi pelbagai dimensi.

   - **Patut Diteladani:**
     - Prestasi secara konsisten jauh melebihi permintaan; prestasi mudah dilihat; bersedia untuk memenuhi peranan baru dalam organisasi.

Bahagian I: Maklumat Later Belakang

Sila pilih pilihan yang terbaik menggambarkan anda.

1. **Jantina:**
   - Lelaki
   - Perempuan

2. **Bangsa:**
   - Melayu
   - Cina
   - India
   - Lain-lain (sila nyatakan) __________

3. **Tahun lahir (umur):**
   - 1946 – 1964 (Umur: 47 – 65)
   - Lain-lain (sila nyatakan) ___

4. **Status perkahwinan:**
   - Bujang
   - Kahwin
   - Bercerai / Berpisah
   - Duda / Janda
5. Pendapatan bulanan kasar:

- ≤ RM2,000
- RM2,001 – RM4,000
- RM4,001 – RM6,000
- RM6,001 – RM8,000
- RM8,001 – RM10,000
- ≥ RM10,001

6. Tahap kelayakan akademik tertinggi yang dicapai:

- Sekolah menegah dan ke bawah
- Peringkat pra-universiti:
  - STPM / A-level / Sijil
- Diploma / Diploma Lanjutan
- Ijazah / Kelayakan profesional
- Ijazah Pascasiswah

7. Jawatan kerja sekarang:

- Pengurusan atasan (contoh: CEO, COO, GM)
- Pengurusan tengah (contoh: Pengurus Divisi)
- Pengurusan barisan pertama (contoh: Penyelia, Ketua Pasukan)
- Penyokong / Pekerja Pentadbiran
- Professional
- Lain-lain (sila nyatakan) ___________________________________________

9. Klasifikasi industri organisasi semasa saya:

- Perbankan, Kewangan, Insuran, Hartanah
- Komunikasi, Pengiklanan, Utiliti
- Pembinaan, Kejuruteraan
- Pendidikan
- Kerajaan
- Kesihatan, Farmasi
- Internet, “Hi Tech”
- Pengilang
- Runcit, Pemborong, Urusniaga Sendiri
- Perkhidmatan, Pengangkutan, Perhotelan
- Industri yang bukan berasaskan keuntungan
- Lain-lain (sila nyatakan) ___________________________________________


7. Sila nyatakan jumlah tahun anda berkhidmat: ____________ tahun.

8. Jenis pekerjaan:

- Kerja sepenuh masa
- Kerja separuh masa

9. Status pekerjaan semasa:

- Kerja tetap
- Kontrak
Appendix 16: Quantitative Survey – Supervisor Survey (Malay Version)

Nombor Siri: «Serial_Number»
16 Disember 2011
Tuan / Puan,

Kajian ini merupakan sebahagian daripada penilaian Ijazah Doktor Falsafah (Ph.D.) saya yang akan dikemukakan kepada Universiti Malaya untuk penganugerahan ijazah Ph.D..

Sebagai penyelia pekerja yang telah mengambil bahagian dalam kajian selidik yang sama, sila menilai prestasi pekerja tersebut dan perkara-perkara yang berkaitan dengan kerja beliau, dengan bulatkan jawapan yang paling sesuai. Soal selidik ini tidak akan mengambil masa lebih daripada 10 minit. Adalah dimaklumkan bahawa tiada sebarang jawapan yang betul atau salah. Semua maklumat yang diberi akan dijamin sulit dan hanya data agregat yang akan dianalisis dan dilaporkan.

Sekiranya anda mempunyai sebarang soalan mengenai kajian ini, sila hubungi Lee Su Teng yang bertindak sebagai penyelidik atau penyelia penyelidikan, Profesor Madya Dr. Angeline Tay.

Terima kasih kerana mengambil bahagian dalam kajian ini.

Yang benar,

LEE SU TENG
No. Telefon: +6012 – 2968 120
Email      : leesuteng@gmail.com

Penyelia Penyelidikan:

PROFESSOR MADYA
DR. ANGELINE TAY
Fakulti Perakaunan dan Perniagaan
Universiti Malaya
Kuala Lumpur
No Telefon : +603 – 7967 3888
Emel      : angetay@um.edu.my

Sila kembalikan soal selidik yang telah lengkap melalui:
▪ “Drop Box” yang terletak di ___________________, atau
▪ Emel : leesuteng@gmail.com, atau
▪ Fax : +603 – 8062 8128, atau mengambil bahagian secara online
▪ Kaji selidik online :
  o Untuk pekerja (versi Bahasa Melayu)
    https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dGZpMHVMVzMyN0ltUE52YVo5QTbxQUE6MQ
  o Untuk penyelia (versi Bahasa Melayu)
    https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dEhmdk5aY2IBb2c5M0o0SkkhNE9Jmc6MQ
  o Untuk pekerja (versi Bahasa Inggeris)
    https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dDc1X3kwM0xtVHZ3OHpjRTNvWDhkWIE6MQ
  o Untuk penyelia (versi Bahasa Inggeris)
    https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/formResponse?formkey=dFN0ZFdPR0hhdUMx
    dFzYTfIFsijdQIE6MQ&thecode=0AX42CRMsmRFCfuVyiODQwMsFiy1ZJhLTRmNmUtODQ0My1NjmyYUzNjQ2ZWE&ptok=1152912900623898688&ifq

Projek ini telah diluluskan oleh Jawatankuasa Etika Universiti Malaya.
**Arahan: Sila jawab semua soalan.**

**Nombor Siri: «Serial_Number»**

### Bahagian A: Prestasi Pekerja Ini

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan bulatkan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sangat Tidak</th>
<th>Tidak</th>
<th>Berkecuali</th>
<th>Agak</th>
<th>Tidak</th>
<th>Bersetuju</th>
<th>Sangat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bersetuju</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Pekerja ini sentiasa menyiapkan tugas yang dinyatakan dalam huraian kerja beliau.  
2. Pekerja ini memenuhi permintaan rasmi prestasi kerja.  
3. Pekerja ini menunaikan segala tanggungjawab yang diperlukan dalam tugas beliau.  
4. Pekerja ini tidak pernah mengabaikan aspek kerja yang wajib dilaksanakan.  
5. Pekerja ini sering gagal melaksanakan tugas penting.

### Bahagian B: Prestasi Inovatif Kerja untuk Pekerja Ini

Sila nyatakan setakat manakah anda setuju atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan bulatkan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tidak Pernah</th>
<th>Hampir Tidak Pernah</th>
<th>Jarang</th>
<th>Kadang-kala</th>
<th>Selalu</th>
<th>Sering Kali</th>
<th>Sentiasa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sekali sebulan atau kurang)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Setiap hari)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Pekerja ini sering mencipta ide baru untuk penambahbaikan.  
2. Pekerja ini sering mendapat sokongan untuk ide-ide inovatif.  
3. Pekerja ini mencari kaedah kerja baru, teknik, atau instrumen.  
4. Pekerja ini mendapatkan kelulusan untuk ide inovatif.  
5. Pekerja ini mengubah ide inovatif ke dalam aplikasi.  
7. Pekerja ini memperkenalkan ide inovatif dalam cara yang sistematik.  
8. Pekerja ini membuat rakan sekerja bersemangat terhadap ide inovatif.  
Bahagian C: Sifat Kerja untuk Pekerja Ini

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan bulatkan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sangat Tidak</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Berkecuali</th>
<th>Bersetuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Kemahiran yang kompleks diperlukan untuk melaksanakan kerja ini.
2. Kerja ini adalah sangat mudah dan berulang-ulang.
5. Kerja ini boleh dilaksanakan tanpa berbincang dengan rakan sekerja.
6. Kerja ini memberi peluang untuk menghabiskan kerja yang beliau mula.
7. Pelaksanaan kerja ini memberi peluang kepada pekerja ini untuk mengetahui prestasi kerja beliau.
8. Saya dan rakan sekerja pekerja ini hampir tidak pernah memberi maklum balas mengenai prestasi kerja beliau.
10. Saya sering memberitahu pekerja ini tahap prestasi beliau.
11. Ramai orang akan dipengaruhi oleh tahap prestasi beliau.
14. Pekerja ini bebas dalam tatacara pelaksanaan kerja
15. Pekerja ini dibenarkan membuat keputusan sendiri dalam kerja beliau.
**Bahagian D: Ganjaran dan Pengiktirafan Pekerja Ini**

Sila nyatakan sejauh manakah pekerja ini telah menerima pelbagai ganjaran dan pengiktirafan bagi melaksanakan tugas beliau dengan baik dalam tempoh lapan belas bulan yang lalu (1 ½ tahun) dalam organisasi semasa beliau dengan bulatkan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berdasarkan skala berikut:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sebahagian Kecil</th>
<th>Sedikit</th>
<th>Berkecuali</th>
<th>Tahap yang Sederhana</th>
<th>Sebahagian Besar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Peningkatan gaji.  
2. Kestabilan kerja.  
4. Kebebasan dan peluang yang lebih.  
5. Penghormatan dari rakan sekerja.  
6. Pujian dari saya.  
7. Peluang latihan dan pembangunan.  
8. Tugas kerja yang lebih mencabar.  

**Bahagian E: Imbangan Kehidupan Kerja Pekerja Ini**

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan bulatkan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala berikut:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sangat Tidak Bersetuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Berkecuali</th>
<th>Bersetuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Pekerja ini mengekalkan keseimbangan yang baik antara kerja dan aspek-aspek lain dalam hidup beliau.  
2. Pekerja ini dapat memenuhi tanggungjawab keluarga beliau dan pada masa yang sama masih dapat melakukan apa yang dikehendaki di tempat kerja.  
4. Pekerja ini dapat melibatkan diri dalam aktiviti di luar kerja.

**Terima kasih atas penglibatan anda!**

Sila kembalikan soal selidik yang telah lengkap melalui:
- "Drop Box" yang terletak di: _________________, atau
- Emel : leesuteng@gmail.com, atau
- Fax : +603 – 8062 8128, atau mengambil bahagian secara online
Appendix 17: Quantitative Online Questionnaire – Employee Survey (English Version)

A Research on Generations at Workplace - Employee’s Survey

16 December 2011

Dear Sir / Madam,

This research constitutes part of my Doctor of Philosophy Degree (Ph.D.) assessment, which will be submitted in tutition of the Ph.D. degree from the University of Malaya. The purpose of this study is to examine the extent in which work engagement of employees belonging to each generation mediates the relationship between some work motivators and work outcomes.

I would appreciate if you could participate in this survey by completing the attached questionnaire. It will not take more than 15 minutes of your valuable time to complete it. There is no right or wrong answer. Please be assured that all information will be treated with strictest confidentiality and only aggregated data will be analysed and reported.

Should you have any concern regarding this study, please contact Ms Lee Su Teng, the researcher or Associate Professor Dr. Angeline Tay, the research supervisor.

Thank you for your valuable assistance in participating in this survey.

Yours sincerely,

LEE SU TENG
Mobile : +6012 – 2968 120
Email Address : leesuteng@gmail.com

Supervised by:

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR DR. ANCELIN TAY
Faculty of Business and Accountancy
University of Malaya
Kuala Lumpur
Contact Number: +603 – 7967 3888
Email Address : angeline@um.edu.my

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of University of Malaya.
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* Required

Instruction: Please answer all the questions.

Serial Number (For easy reference, you may use your employee number): *
Please ensure that your supervisor puts in the same serial number as yours as both questionnaires (your supervisor and yours) will be paired up later.
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Powered by Google Docs

Report Abuse • Terms of Service • Additional Terms
A Research on Generations at Workplace - Employee’s Survey

* Required

Part A: Job Characteristics

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by choosing the most appropriate response based on the following scale: *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 - Disagree</th>
<th>3 - Undecided</th>
<th>4 - Agree</th>
<th>5 - Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This job requires me to use a number of complex or high level skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job is very simple and repetitive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job is structured so that I can do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job can be done adequately without talking with or checking with other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job provides me with the chance to completely finish the piece of work I begin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing the work required by this job provides chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisors and co-workers almost never give me feedback about how well I am doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After I finish my job, I will know whether I performed well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors often let me know whether I am performing the job well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of other people can be affected by how well my work gets done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job is very significant and important in the broader scheme of things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job gives me the chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job permits me to decide on my own how to go about doing my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Research on Generations at Workplace - Employee's Survey

Part B: Reward and Recognition

Please indicate the extent to which you have received various outcomes for performing your job well in the last eighteen months (1½ years) in your current organisation by circling the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>1 - To a Small Extent</th>
<th>2 - To Some Extent</th>
<th>3 - Neutral</th>
<th>4 - To a Moderate Extent</th>
<th>5 - To a Large Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A pay raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More freedom and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect from the people you work with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise from your supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More challenging work assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some form of public recognition (e.g. employee of the month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reward or token of appreciation (e.g. lunch)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* Required

Part C: Work Life Balance

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by choosing the most appropriate response based on the following scale: *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I maintain a good balance between work and other aspects of my life.</th>
<th>1 - Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 - Disagree</th>
<th>3 - Neither Disagree Nor Agree</th>
<th>4 - Agree</th>
<th>5 - Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am able to meet my family responsibilities while still doing what is expected of me at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a social life outside of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to stay involved in non-work interests and activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* Required

Part D: Work Engagement
The following 9 statements are about how you feel at work in the last twelve (12) months. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, choose "0" (zero) preceding the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by choosing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.*
   - 0 - Never
   - 1 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 2 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 3 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 4 - Often (Once a week)
   - 5 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 6 - Always (Everyday)

2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.*
   - 0 - Never
   - 1 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 2 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 3 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 4 - Often (Once a week)
   - 5 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 6 - Always (Everyday)

3. I am enthusiastic about my job.*
   - 0 - Never
   - 1 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 2 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 3 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 4 - Often (Once a week)
   - 5 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 6 - Always (Everyday)
4. My job inspires me. *
   - 0 - Never
   - 1 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 2 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 3 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 4 - Often (Once a week)
   - 5 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 6 - Always (Everyday)

5. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work. *
   - 0 - Never
   - 1 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 2 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 3 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 4 - Often (Once a week)
   - 5 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 6 - Always (Everyday)

6. I feel happy when I am working intensely. *
   - 0 - Never
   - 1 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 2 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 3 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 4 - Often (Once a week)
   - 5 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 6 - Always (Everyday)

7. I am proud of the work that I do. *
   - 0 - Never
   - 1 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 2 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 3 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 4 - Often (Once a week)
   - 5 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 6 - Always (Everyday)

8. I am immersed in my work. *
   - 0 - Never
   - 1 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 2 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 3 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 4 - Often (Once a week)
   - 5 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 6 - Always (Everyday)
9. I get carried away when I'm working.

- 0 - Never
- 1 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
- 2 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
- 3 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
- 4 - Often (Once a week)
- 5 - Very Often (A few times a week)
- 6 - Always (Every day)

* Required

Part E: Intention to Leave

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by choosing the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

1 - Strongly Disagree  2 - Disagree  3 - Neither Disagree Nor Agree  4 - Agree  5 - Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the last few months, I have seriously thought about looking for a new job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presently, I am actively searching for other job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to leave the organisation in the near future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* Required

Part F: In-role Performance
Please indicate the extent to which your immediate supervisor feels about you based on each of the following statements by choosing the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

1. I always complete the duties specified in my job description. *
   - 1 - Strongly Disagree
   - 2 - Disagree
   - 3 - Somewhat Disagree
   - 4 - Undecided
   - 5 - Somewhat Agree
   - 6 - Agree
   - 7 - Strongly Agree

2. I meet all the formal performance requirements of the job. *
   - 1 - Strongly Disagree
   - 2 - Disagree
   - 3 - Somewhat Disagree
   - 4 - Undecided
   - 5 - Somewhat Agree
   - 6 - Agree
   - 7 - Strongly Agree

3. I fulfill all responsibilities required by my job. *
   - 1 - Strongly Disagree
   - 2 - Disagree
   - 3 - Somewhat Disagree
   - 4 - Undecided
   - 5 - Somewhat Agree
   - 6 - Agree
   - 7 - Strongly Agree
4. I never neglect aspects of the job that I am obligated to perform. *
   □ 1 - Strongly Disagree
   □ 2 - Disagree
   □ 3 - Somewhat Disagree
   □ 4 - Undecided
   □ 5 - Somewhat Agree
   □ 6 - Agree
   □ 7 - Strongly Agree

5. I often fail to perform essential duties. *
   □ 1 - Strongly Disagree
   □ 2 - Disagree
   □ 3 - Somewhat Disagree
   □ 4 - Undecided
   □ 5 - Somewhat Agree
   □ 6 - Agree
   □ 7 - Strongly Agree
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* Required

Part G: Innovative Job Performance
Please indicate the extent to which your immediate supervisor feels about you based on each of the following statements by choosing the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

1. I often create new ideas for improvement.*
   - 1 - Never
   - 2 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 5 - Often (Once a week)
   - 6 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 7 - Always (Everyday)

2. I often mobilise support for innovative ideas.*
   - 1 - Never
   - 2 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 5 - Often (Once a week)
   - 6 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 7 - Always (Everyday)

3. I search out new working methods, techniques, or instruments.*
   - 1 - Never
   - 2 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 5 - Often (Once a week)
   - 6 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 7 - Always (Everyday)
4. I seek approval for innovative ideas. *
   - 1 - Never
   - 2 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 5 - Often (Once a week)
   - 6 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 7 - Always (Everyday)

5. I transform innovative ideas into useful applications. *
   - 1 - Never
   - 2 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 5 - Often (Once a week)
   - 6 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 7 - Always (Everyday)

6. I generate original solutions to problems. *
   - 1 - Never
   - 2 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 5 - Often (Once a week)
   - 6 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 7 - Always (Everyday)

7. I introduce innovative ideas in a systematic way. *
   - 1 - Never
   - 2 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 5 - Often (Once a week)
   - 6 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 7 - Always (Everyday)

8. I make important organisational members enthusiastic for innovative ideas. *
   - 1 - Never
   - 2 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
   - 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 5 - Often (Once a week)
   - 6 - Very Often (A few times a week)
   - 7 - Always (Everyday)
9. I often thoroughly evaluate the application of innovative ideas.*

1 - Never
2 - Almost Never (A few times a year or less)
3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
5 - Often (Once a week)
6 - Very Often (A few times a week)
7 - Always (Everyday)
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* Required

Part H: Additional info

1. Number of companies that you have served in the last 5 years, excluding vacation jobs, such as those held while waiting for examination results:

2. My last performance review rating (average score): *

   Example: 3 / 5

3. Description of my last performance review rating. On average, which descriptor describes you best? Please choose one of the following options. *

   - Marginal: Individual fails to meet expectations across many areas; significant performance improvements required to fulfill current role in organisation.
   - Nearly Meets Expectations: Individual meets expectation in most areas but requires improvement across some areas.
   - Consistently Meets Expectations: Individual consistently meets performance expectations; individual is fulfilling current role.
   - Exceeds Expectations: Performance exceeds expected level consistently across many dimensions.
   - Exemplary: Performance consistently far exceeds expectations; conspicuously meritorious performance; ready to fulfill new role within organisation.
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Part I: Background Information
Please choose the option that best describes you.

1. Gender: *
   - Male
   - Female

2. Ethnicity: *
   - Malay
   - Chinese
   - Indian
   - Other

3. Year of birth (age): *
   - 1946 – 1964 (Age: 47 – 65)
   - Other

4. Marital status: *
   - Single
   - Married
   - Divorced / Separated
   - Widowed

5. Monthly gross income: *
   - ≤ RM2,000
   - RM2,001 – RM4,000
   - RM4,001 – RM6,000
   - RM6,001 – RM8,000
   - RM8,001 – RM10,000
   - ≥ RM10,001
6. Highest academic qualification attained: *
   - Secondary school and below
   - Pre-university level: STPM / A Levels / Certificate
   - Diploma / Advanced Diploma
   - Degree / professional qualification
   - Post graduate

7. Designation: *
   - Top Management (e.g. CEO, COO, GM)
   - Middle Management (e.g. Regional Manager, Division Manager)
   - First Line Management (e.g. Supervisor, Team Leader)
   - Support / Administrative Staff
   - Professional
   - Other: [ ]

8. Industry classification of my current organisation: *
   - Banking, Finance, Insurance, Real Estate
   - Communications, Advertising, Utilities
   - Construction, Engineering
   - Education
   - Government
   - Health Care, Pharmaceutical
   - Internet, Hi Tech
   - Manufacturing
   - Retail, Wholesale, Own Business
   - Services, Transportation, Hospitality
   - Non-profit
   - Other: [ ]

9. Tenure in my current organisation. Please specify: _____ year(s). *
   [ ]

10. Total number of years I have worked: _____ year(s). *
    [ ]

11. Employment type: *
   - Full time
   - Part time

12. Current employment status: *
    - Permanent
    - Contract
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16 December 2011

Dear Sir / Madam,

This research constitutes part of my Doctor of Philosophy Degree (Ph.D.) assessment, which will be submitted in fulfillment of the Ph.D. degree from the University of Malaya.

As an immediate supervisor of the employee who has participated in the same survey, please evaluate his or her performance and work-related matters by indicating the degree to which each of the statement in this questionnaire best describe him or her. This questionnaire will not take more than 10 minutes of your valuable time to complete it. Please be assured that all information will be treated with strictest confidentiality and only aggregated data will be analysed and reported.

Should you have any concern regarding this study, please contact Lee Su Teng, the researcher or Associate Professor Dr. Angeline Tay, the research supervisor.

Thank you for your valuable assistance in participating in this survey.

Yours sincerely,

LEE SU TENG
Mobile: +6012 – 2968 120
Email Address: leesuteng@gmail.com

Supervised by:

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR DR. ANGELINE TAY
Faculty of Business and Accountancy
University of Malaya
Kuala Lumpur
Contact Number: +603 – 7967 3888
Email Address: anglyray@um.edu.my

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of University of Malaya.

Continue »
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* Required

Instruction: Please answer all the questions.

Serial Number (Please obtain the serial number from your employee who has participated in the same survey): *
Please ensure that you put in the same serial number as your employee as both questionnaires (your employee and yours) will be paired up later.

Continue »
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* Required

Part A: This Employee’s In-role Performance
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by choosing the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

1. This employee always completes the duties specified in his or her job description. *
   - 1 - Strongly Disagree
   - 2 - Disagree
   - 3 - Somewhat Disagree
   - 4 - Undecided
   - 5 - Somewhat Agree
   - 6 - Agree
   - 7 - Strongly Agree

2. This employee meets all the formal performance requirements of the job. *
   - 1 - Strongly Disagree
   - 2 - Disagree
   - 3 - Somewhat Disagree
   - 4 - Undecided
   - 5 - Somewhat Agree
   - 6 - Agree
   - 7 - Strongly Agree

3. This employee fulfils all responsibilities required by his or her job. *
   - 1 - Strongly Disagree
   - 2 - Disagree
   - 3 - Somewhat Disagree
   - 4 - Undecided
   - 5 - Somewhat Agree
   - 6 - Agree
   - 7 - Strongly Agree
4. This employee never neglects aspects of the job that he or she is obligated to perform.

- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Somewhat Disagree
- 4 - Undecided
- 5 - Somewhat Agree
- 6 - Agree
- 7 - Strongly Agree

5. This employee often fails to perform essential duties.

- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Somewhat Disagree
- 4 - Undecided
- 5 - Somewhat Agree
- 6 - Agree
- 7 - Strongly Agree
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* Required

Part B: This Employee’s Innovative Job Performance
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by choosing the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

1. This employee often creates new ideas for improvement. *
   - 1 - Never
   - 2 - Almost never (A few times a year or less)
   - 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 5 - Often (Once a week)
   - 6 - Very often (A few times a week)
   - 7 - Always (Everyday)

2. This employee often mobilises support for innovative ideas. *
   - 1 - Never
   - 2 - Almost never (A few times a year or less)
   - 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 5 - Often (Once a week)
   - 6 - Very often (A few times a week)
   - 7 - Always (Everyday)

3. This employee searches out new working methods, techniques, or instruments. *
   - 1 - Never
   - 2 - Almost never (A few times a year or less)
   - 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - 5 - Often (Once a week)
   - 6 - Very often (A few times a week)
   - 7 - Always (Everyday)
4. This employee seeks approval for innovative ideas.
   - Never
   - Almost never (A few times a year or less)
   - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - Often (Once a week)
   - Very often (A few times a week)
   - Always (Everyday)

5. This employee transforms innovative ideas into useful applications.
   - Never
   - Almost never (A few times a year or less)
   - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - Often (Once a week)
   - Very often (A few times a week)
   - Always (Everyday)

6. This employee generates original solutions to problems.
   - Never
   - Almost never (A few times a year or less)
   - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - Often (Once a week)
   - Very often (A few times a week)
   - Always (Everyday)

7. This employee introduces innovative ideas in a systematic way.
   - Never
   - Almost never (A few times a year or less)
   - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - Often (Once a week)
   - Very often (A few times a week)
   - Always (Everyday)

8. This employee makes important organisational members enthusiastic for innovative ideas.
   - Never
   - Almost never (A few times a year or less)
   - Rarely (Once a month or less)
   - Sometimes (A few times a month)
   - Often (Once a week)
   - Very often (A few times a week)
   - Always (Everyday)
9. This employee often thoroughly evaluates the application of innovative ideas.

- 1 - Never
- 2 - Almost never (A few times a year or less)
- 3 - Rarely (Once a month or less)
- 4 - Sometimes (A few times a month)
- 5 - Often (Once a week)
- 6 - Very often (A few times a week)
- 7 - Always (Everyday)
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**Part C: This Employee's Job Characteristics**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by choosing the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 - Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 - Disagree</th>
<th>3 - Undecided</th>
<th>4 - Agree</th>
<th>5 - Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This job requires the employee to use a number of complex or high-level skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job is very simple and repetitive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job is structured so that the employee can do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job can be done adequately without talking with or checking with other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job provides the employee the chance to completely finish the piece of work he or she begins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing the work required by this job provides chances for the employee to figure out how well he or she is doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His or her co-workers and I almost never give this employee feedback about how well he or she is doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After this employee finishes his or her job, he or she will know whether he or she has performed well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often let this employee know whether he or she is performing the job well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of other people can be affected by how well his or her work gets done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job is very significant and important in the broader scheme of things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job gives this employee the chance to use his or her personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job gives this employee considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how he or she does the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job permits the employee to decide on his or her own how to go about doing his or her work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* Required

Part D: This Employee's Reward & Recognition

Please indicate the extent to which this employee has received various outcomes for performing his or her job well in the last eighteen months (1 ½ years) in his or her current organisation by choosing the most appropriate response based on the following scale: *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - To a Small Extent</th>
<th>2 - To Some Extent</th>
<th>3 - Neutral</th>
<th>4 - To a Moderate Extent</th>
<th>5 - To a Large Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A pay raise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More freedom and opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect from the people he or she works with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise from me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More challenging work assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some form of public recognition (e.g. employee of the month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reward or token of appreciation (e.g. lunch).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Part E: This Employee’s Work Life Balance

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by choosing the most appropriate response based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>1 - Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 - Disagree</th>
<th>3 - Neither Disagree Nor Agree</th>
<th>4 - Agree</th>
<th>5 - Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This employee maintains a good balance between work and other aspects of his or her life.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This employee is able to meet his or her family responsibilities while still doing what is expected of him or her at work.</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This employee has a social life outside of work.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This employee is able to stay involved in non-work interests and activities.</td>
<td>☒ ☒ ☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation!
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Kajian tentang Generasi di Tempat Kerja - Kaji Selidik Pekerja

16 Disember 2011

Tuan / Puan.

Kajian ini merupakan sebahagian daripada penilaian ijazah Doktor Falsafah (Ph.D.) saya yang akan dikemukakan kepada Universiti Malaya untuk penganugerahan ijazah Ph.D. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mengkaji sejauh mana penglibatan pekerja di setiap generasi terhadap motivasi kerja dan hasil kerja.

Saya berharap jasa tuan / puap sekitarnya dapat meluangkan masa untuk melengkapi soal selidik yang dilampir. Soal selidik ini tidak akan mengambil masa lebih daripada 15 minit. Adalah dimaklumkan bahawa tiada sebarang jawapan yang betul atau salah. Semua maklumat yang diberi akan dijemput sufi dan hanya data agregat yang akan dilatih dan dilaporkan.

Secitiranya anda mempunyai sebarang soalan mengenai kajian ini, sila hubungi Lee Su Teng yang bertindak sebagai penyelidik atau penyelidik pengajuan, Profesor Madya Dr. Angeline Tay.

Terima kasih kerana mengambil bahagian dalam kajian ini.

Yang benar,

LEE SU TENG
No. Telefon: +6012 – 2968 120
E-mail: leesuteng@gmail.com

Penyelidik:
PROFESSOR MADYA DR. ANGELINE TAY
Fakulti Perakaunan dan Perniagaan
Universiti Malaya
Kuala Lumpur
No. Telefon: +603 – 7967 3888
E-mail: angeline@km.edu.my

Projek ini telah dikaji dan dilulus oleh Jawatankuasa Etika Universiti Malaya.
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Arahan: Sila jawab semua soalan.

Nombor Siri (Sebagai rujukan, anda boleh menggunakan nombor pekerja anda): *
Sila pastikan penyelia dan anda meletakkkan nombor siri yang sama supaya kedua-dua soal selidik dapat dipadankan kemudian.
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*Required

**Bahagian A: Sifat Kerja**

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda setuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan menandakan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sifat Kerja</th>
<th>1 - Sangat Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>2 - Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>3 - Kerjekual</th>
<th>4 - Setuju</th>
<th>5 - Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kemahiran yang kompleks diperlukan untuk melaksanakan kerja ini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini adalah sangat mudah dan berulang-ulang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya memerlukan banyak kerjasama dengan orang lain untuk melaksanakan kerja ini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini membenarkan saya melaksanakan keseluruhan kerja dari awal hingga akhir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini boleh dilaksanakan tanpa berbincang dengan rakan sekerja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini memberi peluang kepada saya untuk menghabiskan kerja saya mulakan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelaksanaan kerja ini memberi peluang kepada saya untuk megetahui prestasi kerja saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penyelida dan rakan sekerja saya tidak pernah memberi maklum balas terhadap prestasi kerja saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selepas melaksanakan tugas saya, saya akan tahu prestasi kerja saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penyelida sering memaklumkan kepada saya terhadap prestasi kerja saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramal orang akan dipengaruhi oleh prestasi kerja saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini sangat penting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini membenarkan saya membuat keputusan / pertimbangan sendiri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya bebas dalam tata cara pelaksanaan kerja saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya dibenarkan membuat keputusan sendiri dalam kerja saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* Required

**Bahagian B: Ganjaran dan Pengiktirafan**

Sila nyatakan sejauh manakah anda telah menerima pelbagai ganjaran dan pengiktirafan bagi melaksanakan tugas anda dengan baik dalam tempoh lapan belas bulan yang lalu (1 ½ tahun) dalam organisasi semasa, dengan menandakan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berdasarkan skala berikut:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Sebahagian Kecil</td>
<td>2 - Sedikit</td>
<td>3 - Berkecuali</td>
<td>4 - Tahap yang Sederhana</td>
<td>5 - Sebahagian Besar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Powered by Google Docs

Report Abuse • Terms of Service • Additional Terms
### Bahagian C. Imbangan Kehidupan Kerja

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan menandakan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah. *(Required)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju</th>
<th>2 - Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>3 - Berkecual</th>
<th>4 - Bersetuju</th>
<th>5 - Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saya mengkalkan keselimbangan yang baik antara kerja dan aspek-aspek lain dalam hidup saya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya dapat memenuhi tanggungjawab keluarga saya dan pada masa yang sama masih dapat melakukan apa yang dikehendaki daripada saya di tempat kerja.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya mempunyai kehidupan sosial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya dapat melibatkan diri dalam aktiviti di luar kerja.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kajian tentang Generasi di Tempat Kerja - Kaji Selidik Pekerja
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Bahagian D: Penglibatan Kerja
Berikut adalah 9 kenyataan mengenai perasaan anda di tempat kerja dalam dua belas bulan (12) yang lepas. Sila baca seluruh kenyataan dengan teliti dan membuat keputusan jika anda pernah mengalami perasaan sebegitu tentang kerja anda. Jika anda tidak pernah berasa demikian, manandakan "0" (sifar) selepas kenyataan tersebut. Jika anda pernah mengalami perasaan int., nyatakan betapa kerap anda berasa demikian dengan manandakan nombor 1 hingga 6 yang paling menggambarkan kekerapan anda berasa begitu.

1. Saya rasa penuh dengan tenaga semasa bekerja. *
   - 0 - Tidak Pernah
   - 1 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   - 2 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   - 3 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   - 4 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   - 5 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   - 6 - Sentiasa (Setiap hari)

2. Semasa bekerja saya berasa kukuh dan penuh daya. *
   - 0 - Tidak Pernah
   - 1 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   - 2 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   - 3 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   - 4 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   - 5 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   - 6 - Sentiasa (Setiap hari)

3. Saya bersemangat dengan tugas saya. *
   - 0 - Tidak Pernah
   - 1 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   - 2 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   - 3 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   - 4 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   - 5 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   - 6 - Sentiasa (Setiap hari)
4. Tugas saya memberi inspirasi kepada saya.
- 0 - Tidak Pernah
- 1 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
- 2 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
- 3 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
- 4 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
- 5 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
- 6 - Sentiasa (Setiap hari)

5. Di waktu bangun pagi, saya merasa ingin pergi ke tempat kerja.
- 0 - Tidak Pernah
- 1 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
- 2 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
- 3 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
- 4 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
- 5 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
- 6 - Sentiasa (Setiap hari)

6. Saya berasa gembira apabila saya bekerja dengan gigih.
- 0 - Tidak Pernah
- 1 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
- 2 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
- 3 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
- 4 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
- 5 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
- 6 - Sentiasa (Setiap hari)

7. Saya berasa bangga dengan kerja saya.
- 0 - Tidak Pernah
- 1 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
- 2 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
- 3 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
- 4 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
- 5 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
- 6 - Sentiasa (Setiap hari)

8. Saya asyik dalam kerja saya.
- 0 - Tidak Pernah
- 1 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
- 2 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
- 3 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
- 4 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
- 5 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
- 6 - Sentiasa (Setiap hari)
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Bahagian E: Niat Meninggalkan Kerja

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan menandakan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju</th>
<th>2 - Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>3 - Berbecaulai</th>
<th>4 - Bersetuju</th>
<th>5 - Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dalam beberapa bulan yang lalu, saya asyik memikirkan untuk mencari kerja baru.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pada masa ini, saya sedang aktif mencari pekerjaan lain.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya bercadang untuk meninggalkan organisasi dalam masa dekat.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Required
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Bahagian F: Prestasi Kerja
Silah nyatakan setakat mana persepat pihak atas dan anda terhadap anda pada setiap kenyataan di bawah berpun aman skala di bawah.

1. Saya sentiasa menyiapkan tugas yang dinyatakan dalam hurai kerja saya. *
   - 1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju
   - 2 - Tidak Setuju
   - 3 - Agak Tidak Setuju
   - 4 - Berkecuali
   - 5 - Agak Bersetuju
   - 6 - Bersetuju
   - 7 - Sangat Bersetuju

2. Saya memenuhi permintaan rasmi prestasi kerja. *
   - 1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju
   - 2 - Tidak Setuju
   - 3 - Agak Tidak Setuju
   - 4 - Berkecuali
   - 5 - Agak Bersetuju
   - 6 - Bersetuju
   - 7 - Sangat Bersetuju

3. Saya menunaikan segala tanggungjawab yang diperlukan dalam tugas saya. *
   - 1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju
   - 2 - Tidak Setuju
   - 3 - Agak Tidak Setuju
   - 4 - Berkecuali
   - 5 - Agak Bersetuju
   - 6 - Bersetuju
   - 7 - Sangat Bersetuju
4. Saya tidak pernah mengabaikan aspek kerja yang wajib saya laksanakan. *

- 1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju
- 2 - Tidak Bersetuju
- 3 - Agak Tidak Bersetuju
- 4 - Berkecuali
- 5 - Agak Bersetuju
- 6 - Bersetuju
- 7 - Sangat Bersetuju

5. Saya sering gagal melaksanakan tugas penting. *

- 1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju
- 2 - Tidak Bersetuju
- 3 - Agak Tidak Bersetuju
- 4 - Berkecuali
- 5 - Agak Bersetuju
- 6 - Bersetuju
- 7 - Sangat Bersetuju
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Bahagian C: Kerja Prestasi Inovatif
Silakan nyatakan setakat mana persepsi pinah atasandanda terhadap anda pada setiap kenyataan di bawah berpandukan skala di bawah.

1. Saya sering mencipta ide baru untuk penambahbaikan. *
   - 1. Tidak Pernah
   - 2. Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   - 3. Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   - 4. Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   - 5. Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   - 6. Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   - 7. Seliasa (Setiap hari)

2. Saya sering mendapat sokongan untuk ide-ide inovatif. *
   - 1. Tidak Pernah
   - 2. Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   - 3. Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   - 4. Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   - 5. Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   - 6. Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   - 7. Seliasa (Setiap hari)

3. Saya mencari kaedah kerja baru, teknik, atau instrumen. *
   - 1. Tidak Pernah
   - 2. Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   - 3. Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   - 4. Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   - 5. Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   - 6. Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   - 7. Seliasa (Setiap hari)
4. Saya mendapatkan kelulusan untuk ide inovatif.
   1. Tidak Pernah
   2. Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   3. Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   4. Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   5. Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   6. Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   7. Sentiasa (Setiap hari)

5. Saya mengubah ide inovatif ke dalam aplikasi.
   1. Tidak Pernah
   2. Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   3. Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   4. Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   5. Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   6. Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   7. Sentiasa (Setiap hari)

   1. Tidak Pernah
   2. Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   3. Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   4. Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   5. Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   6. Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   7. Sentiasa (Setiap hari)

7. Saya memperkenalkan ide inovatif dalam cara yang sistematik.
   1. Tidak Pernah
   2. Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   3. Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   4. Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   5. Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   6. Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   7. Sentiasa (Setiap hari)

8. Saya membuat rakan sekerja bersemangat terhadap ide inovatif.
   1. Tidak Pernah
   2. Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   3. Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   4. Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   5. Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   6. Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   7. Sentiasa (Setiap hari)
9. Saya sering menilai aplikasi ide inovatif dengan teliti.

- 1 - Tidak Pernah
- 2 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
- 3 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
- 4 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
- 5 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
- 6 - Gering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
- 7 - Sering (Setiap hari)
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Bahagian H: Maklumat Tambahan

1. Bilangan syarikat yang telah anda berkhidmat dalam 5 tahun yang lepas, tidak termasuk pekerjaan sambilan, seperti jawatan sementara menunggu keputusan peperiksaan:

2. Penilaian prestasi lepas saya (skor purata): *
   Contoh: 3 / 5

   - Marginal: Individu gagal memenuhi permintaan dalam kerja; peningkatan prestasi yang ketara diperlukan untuk memenuhi peranan semasa saya berada di dalam organisasi.
   - Hampir Memenuhi Jangkaan: Individu memenuhi jangkaan dalam kebanyakan kerja, namun peningkatan prestasi di sesetengah kerja diperlukan.
   - Konsisten Memenuhi Jangkaan: Individu secara konsisten memenuhi permintaan prestasi; individu memenuhi peranan semasa.
   - Melebihi Jangkaan: Prestasi melebihi tahap dijangka; konsisten merentasi pelbagai dimensi.
   - Patut Diteladani: Prestasi secara konsisten jauh melebihi permintaan; prestasi mudah dilihat; bersedia untuk memenuhi peranan baru di dalam organisasi.

« Back  Continue »
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* Required

Bahagian I: Maklumat Latar Belakang
Sila pilih pilihan yang terbaik menggambarkan anda.

1. Jantina: *
   - Lelaki
   - Perempuan

2. Bangsa: *
   - Melayu
   - Cina
   - India
   - Other:

3. Tahun lahir (umur): *
   - 1946 – 1964 (Umur: 47 – 65)
   - Other:

4. Status perkahwinan: *
   - Bujang
   - Kahwin
   - Berceraai / Berpisah
   - Duda / Janda

5. Pendapatan bulanan kasar: *
   - ≤ RM2,000
   - RM2,001 – RM4,000
   - RM4,001 – RM6,000
   - RM6,001 – RM8,000
   - RM8,001 – RM10,000
   - ≥ RM10,001
6. Tahap kelayakan akademik tertinggi yang dicapai:
- Sekolah menegah dan ke bawah
- Peringkat pra-universiti: STPM / A-level / Sijil
- Diploma / Diploma Lanjutan
- Ijazah / Kelayakan profesional
- Ijazah Pascasiswa

7. Jawatan kerja sekarang:
- Pengurusan atasan (contoh: CEO, COO, GM)
- Pengurusan tengah (contoh: Pengurus Serantau, Pengurus Divisi)
- Pengurusan barisan pertama (contoh: Penyelia, Ketua Pasukan)
- Penyokong / Pekerja Pentadbiran
- Other: ______________________

8. Klasifikasi industri organisasi semasa saya:
- Perbankan, Kewangan, Insuran, Hartanah
- Komunikasi, Pengiktlan, Utiliti
- Pembinaan, Kejuruteraan
- Pendidikan
- Kerajaan
- Kesihatan, Farmasi
- Internet, "Hi Tech"
- Pengilang
- Runtut, Pemborong, Uraianya Sendiri
- Perkhidmatan, Pengangkutan, Perhotelan
- Industri yang bukan berasaskan keuntungan
- Other: ______________________


10. Sila nyatakan jumlah tahun anda berkhidmat: ___________ tahun.

11. Jenis pekerjaan:
- Kerja sepenuh masa
- Kerja separuh masa

12. Status pekerjaan semasa:
- Kerja tetap
- Kontrak

Terima kasih atas penglibatan anda!
Appendix 20: Quantitative Online Questionnaire – Supervisor Survey (Malay Version)
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Arahan: Sila jawab semua soalan.

Nombor Siri (Sila dapatkan nombor siri daripada pekerja anda yang telah mengambil bahagian dalam soal selidik yang sama) *
Sila pastikan anda dan pekerja anda melotakkan nombor siri yang sama supaya kod dua soal selidik dapat dipadankan kemudian.

```
[Input field]
```

« Back  Continue »
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Bahagian A: Prestasi Pekerja Ini
Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan menandakan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.

1. Pekerja ini sentiasa menyiapkan tugas yang dinyatakan dalam huraian kerja beliau.*
   ■ 1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju
   ■ 2 - Tidak Setuju
   ■ 3 - Agak Tidak Setuju
   ■ 4 - Berkecuali
   ■ 5 - Agak Bersetuju
   ■ 6 - Bersetuju
   ■ 7 - Sangat Bersetuju

2. Pekerja ini memenuhi permintaan rasmi prestasi kerja. *
   ■ 1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju
   ■ 2 - Tidak Setuju
   ■ 3 - Agak Tidak Setuju
   ■ 4 - Berkecuali
   ■ 5 - Agak Bersetuju
   ■ 6 - Bersetuju
   ■ 7 - Sangat Bersetuju

3. Pekerja ini menunaikan segala tanggungjawab yang diperlukan dalam tugas beliau.*
   ■ 1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju
   ■ 2 - Tidak Setuju
   ■ 3 - Agak Tidak Setuju
   ■ 4 - Berkecuali
   ■ 5 - Agak Bersetuju
   ■ 6 - Bersetuju
   ■ 7 - Sangat Bersetuju
4. Pekerja ini tidak pernah mengabaikan aspek kerja yang wajib beliau laksanakan.

*  
1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju  
2 - Tidak Setuju  
3 - Agak Tidak Setuju  
4 - Berkecuali  
5 - Agak Bersetuju  
6 - Bersetuju  
7 - Sangat Bersetuju

5. Pekerja ini sering gagal untuk melaksanakan tugas penting. *

*  
1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju  
2 - Tidak Setuju  
3 - Agak Tidak Setuju  
4 - Berkecuali  
5 - Agak Bersetuju  
6 - Bersetuju  
7 - Sangat Bersetuju
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Bahagian B: Kerja Prestasi Inovatif Pekerja Ini
Sila nyatakan setakat mana anda setuju atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan menandakan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpadukan skala di bawah.

1. Pekerja ini sering mencipta ide baru untuk penambahbaikan.*
   - 1 - Tidak Pernah
   - 2 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Bebberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   - 3 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   - 4 - Kadang-kala (Bebberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   - 5 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   - 6 - Sering Kali (Bebberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   - 7 - Sontosla (Setiap hari)

2. Pekerja ini sering mendapat sokongan untuk ide-ide inovatif.*
   - 1 - Tidak Pernah
   - 2 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Bebberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   - 3 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   - 4 - Kadang-kala (Bebberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   - 5 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   - 6 - Sering Kali (Bebberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   - 7 - Sontosla (Setiap hari)

3. Pekerja ini mencari kaedah kerja baru, teknik, atau instrumen.*
   - 1 - Tidak Pernah
   - 2 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Bebberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   - 3 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   - 4 - Kadang-kala (Bebberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   - 5 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   - 6 - Sering Kali (Bebberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   - 7 - Sontosla (Setiap hari)
4. Pekerja ini mendapatkan kelulusan untuk ide inovatif.*
   ■ 1 - Tidak Pernah
   ■ 2 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   ■ 3 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   ■ 4 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   ■ 5 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   ■ 6 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   ■ 7 - Selalu (Setiap hari)

5. Pekerja ini mengubah ide inovatif ke dalam aplikasi.*
   ■ 1 - Tidak Pernah
   ■ 2 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   ■ 3 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   ■ 4 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   ■ 5 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   ■ 6 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   ■ 7 - Selalu (Setiap hari)

6. Pekerja ini menjana penyelesaian kepada masalah.*
   ■ 1 - Tidak Pernah
   ■ 2 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   ■ 3 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   ■ 4 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   ■ 5 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   ■ 6 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   ■ 7 - Selalu (Setiap hari)

7. Pekerja ini memperkenalkan ide inovatif dalam cara yang sistematik.*
   ■ 1 - Tidak Pernah
   ■ 2 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   ■ 3 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   ■ 4 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   ■ 5 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   ■ 6 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   ■ 7 - Selalu (Setiap hari)

8. Pekerja ini membuat rakan sekerja bersemanget terhadap ide inovatif.*
   ■ 1 - Tidak Pernah
   ■ 2 - Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
   ■ 3 - Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
   ■ 4 - Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
   ■ 5 - Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
   ■ 6 - Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
   ■ 7 - Selalu (Setiap hari)

1. Tidak Pernah
2. Hampir Tidak Pernah (Beberapa kali dalam setahun atau kurang)
3. Jarang (Sekali sebulan atau kurang)
4. Kadang-kala (Beberapa kali dalam sebulan)
5. Selalu (Sekali seminggu)
6. Sering Kali (Beberapa kali dalam seminggu)
7. Sentiasa (Setiap hari)

« Back Continue »
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Bahagian C: Sifat Kerja untuk Pekerja Ini

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan menandakan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kemahiran yang kompleks dipertukarkan untuk melaksanakan kerja ini</th>
<th>1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju</th>
<th>2 - Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>3 - Berkecuali</th>
<th>4 - Bersetuju</th>
<th>5 - Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini adalah sangat mudah dan berulang-ulang.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini memerlukan banyak kerjasama dengan orang lain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini dapat dilaksanakan secara keseluruhan dari awal hingga akhir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini boleh dilaksanakan tanpa berbincang dengan rakan sekerja.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini memberi peluang untuk menghabiskan kerja yang belau mula.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelaksanaan kerja ini memberi peluang kepada pekerja ini untuk meningkatkan prestasi kerja belau.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya dan rakan sekerja pekerja ini hampir tidak pernah memberi belau makmuk balas mengenai prestasi kerja belau.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selepas melaksanakan tugas ini, pekerja ini akan tahu prestasi kerja belau.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya sering memberi tahu pekerja ini tahap prestasi belau.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramai orang akan dipengaruhi oleh tahap prestasi belau.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini sangat penting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini membenarkan pekerja ini membuat keputusan / pertimbangan sendiri.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekerja ini bebas dalam tatacara pelaksanaan kerja.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekerja ini dibenarkan membuat keputusan sendiri dalam kerja belau.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Bahagian C: Sifat Kerja untuk Pekerja Ini

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan menandakan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kemahiran yang kompleks dipertukarkan untuk malaksanakan kerja ini</th>
<th>1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju</th>
<th>2 - Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>3 - Berkecuali</th>
<th>4 - Bersetuju</th>
<th>5 - Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini adalah sangat mudah dan berulang-ulang.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini memerlukan banyak kerjasama dengan orang lain.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini dapat dilaksanakan secara keseluruhan dari awal hingga akhir.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini boleh dilaksanakan tanpa berbicang dengan rakan sekerja.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini memerlukan pekerja ini peluang untuk menghabiskan kerja yang beliau mula.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelaksanaan kerja ini memberi peluang kepada pekerja ini untuk mengetahui prestasi kerja beliau.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya dan rakan sekerja pekerja ini hampir tidak pernah memberi beliau maklum balas mengenai prestasi kerja beliau.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selepas melaksanakan tugas ini, pekerja ini akan tahu prestasi kerja beliau.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya sering memberi tahu pekerja ini tahap prestasi beliau.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramai orang akan dipengaruhi oleh tahap prestasi beliau.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini sangat penting.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerja ini membenarkan pekerja ini membuat keputusan / pertimbangan sendiri.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekerja ini bebas dalam tatacara pelaksanaan kerja.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekerja ini dibenarkan membuat keputusan sendiri dalam kerja beliau.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bahagian D: Ganjaran dan Pengiktirafan Pekerja Ini

Sila nyatakan sejauh manaakah pekerja ini telah menerima pelbagai ganjaran dan pengiktirafan bagi melaksanakan tugas beliau dengan baik dalam tempoh lapan belas bulan yang lalu (1 ½ tahun) dalam organisasi semasa beliau dengan menandakan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berdasarkan skala berikut:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Sebahagian Kecil</th>
<th>2 - Sedikit</th>
<th>3 - Berbecual</th>
<th>4 - Tahun yang Sederhana</th>
<th>5 - Sebahagian Besar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peningkatan gaji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kestabilan kerja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenaikan pangkat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebebasan dan peluang yang lebih</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penghormatan dari rakan sederhana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puja dari saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peluang latihan dan pembangunan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tugas kerja yang lebih mencabar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pengiktirafan awam (contoh: pekerja contoh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganjaran atau tanda penghargaan (contoh: makan tamat hari)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Bahagian E: Imbangan Kehidupan Kerja Pekerja Ini**

Sila nyatakan setakat mana yang anda bersetuju, atau tidak pada setiap kenyataan di bawah dengan menandakan jawapan anda yang paling sesuai berpandukan skala di bawah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pekerja ini mengekalkan keselimbangan yang baik antara kerja dan aspek-aspek lain dalam hidup beliau.</th>
<th>1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju</th>
<th>2 - Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>3 - Berkecuali</th>
<th>4 - Bersetuju</th>
<th>5 - Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pekerja ini dapat memenuhi tanggungjawab keluarga beliau dan pada masa yang sama masih dapat melakukan apa yang dikhendaki di tempat kerja. Pekerja ini mempunyai kehidupan sosial.</th>
<th>1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju</th>
<th>2 - Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>3 - Berkecuali</th>
<th>4 - Bersetuju</th>
<th>5 - Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pekerja ini dapat melibatkan diri dalam aktiviti di luar kerja.</th>
<th>1 - Sangat Tidak Bersetuju</th>
<th>2 - Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>3 - Berkecuali</th>
<th>4 - Bersetuju</th>
<th>5 - Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Terima kasih atas penglibatan anda!**
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## Appendix 21: Item Communalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Job Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EAJCa1</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EAJCa2_1</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EAJCb3_1</td>
<td>0.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EAJCb4</td>
<td>0.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EAJCb5</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EAJCb6</td>
<td>0.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EAJCe7_1</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EAJCe8_1</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EAJCc9</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EAJCc10</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>EAJCd11</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>EAJCd12</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>EAJCe13</td>
<td>0.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>EAJCe14</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>EAJCe15</td>
<td>0.760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reward and Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>EBRR1</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>EBRR2</td>
<td>0.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>EBRR3</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>EBRR4</td>
<td>0.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EBRR5</td>
<td>0.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>EBRR6</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>EBRR7</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>EBRR8</td>
<td>0.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>EBRR9</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>EBRR10</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work-Life Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ECWLB1</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ECWLB2</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ECWLB3</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ECWLB4</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>EDWEv1</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>EDWEv2</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>EDWEd3</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>EDWEd4</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>EDWEv5</td>
<td>0.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>EDWEa6</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>EDWEd7</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>EDWEa8</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>EDWEa9</td>
<td>0.546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intention to Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>EEIL1</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>EEIL2</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>EEIL3</td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In-role Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>EFIRP1</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>EFIRP2</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>EFIRP3</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>EFIRP4</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>EFIRP5_1</td>
<td>0.554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Innovative Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>EGIJP1</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>EPIJP2</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>EPIJP3</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>EPIJP4</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>EPIJP5</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>EPIJP6</td>
<td>0.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>EPIJP7</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>EPIJP8</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>EPIJP9</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.