

## CHAPTER VI : DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

### OVERALL ANALYSIS

#### 1.1 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Kindly refer to Table 1, for detailed information. A total of 198 employees (with completed questionnaire) were included for the analysis of the study. The total number of employees who have attended TBC was 94 while those who have not attended TBC was 104. Of this total, 55% of employees were male and 45% were female.

The majority (42%) of TBC employees' age was 30-40 years, while the majority (47%) of Non TBC employees' age was below 30 years. Most of the TBC and Non TBC employees were married, which stands at 62% and 50% respectively. The racial composition was fairly distributed for both TBC and Non TBC employees; Malays (45%), Chinese (41%) and Indian and Others (14%). The educational level of majority of TBC and Non TBC employees' was SPM/STPM, which revolves around 45% and followed by Certificate and Diploma qualification (33%).

It was obvious that, half of the TBC and Non TBC employees' occupational level was Supervisory/Executive, ie. 54%. The General/Clerical level occupation ranks second with 33%. A large portion, 53% - 67% of TBC and Non TBC employees length of service was above 3 years. The highest ranking income level among TBC and Non TBC employees was RM1001 - RM2000 (38%): followed by income level of below RM1000, which stands at 27%.

ABLE 1 : DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

|                      | TBC |     | NON TBC |     | TOTAL |     |
|----------------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|-------|-----|
|                      | NO  | %   | NO      | %   | NO    | %   |
| i. SEX               |     |     |         |     |       |     |
| Male                 | 57  | 59  | 51      | 49  | 108   | 55  |
| Female               | 37  | 41  | 53      | 51  | 90    | 45  |
|                      | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| TOTAL                | 94  | 47  | 104     | 53  | 198   | 100 |
|                      | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| ii. AGE              |     |     |         |     |       |     |
| Below 30 years       | 31  | 32  | 49      | 47  | 80    | 41  |
| 30 - 40 years        | 41  | 42  | 33      | 32  | 74    | 38  |
| Above 40 years       | 21  | 22  | 19      | 18  | 40    | 21  |
|                      | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| TOTAL                | 93  | 48  | 101     | 52  | 194   | 100 |
|                      | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| iii. MARITAL STATUS  |     |     |         |     |       |     |
| Single               | 33  | 34  | 50      | 48  | 83    | 42  |
| Married              | 60  | 62  | 52      | 50  | 112   | 56  |
| Others               | 1   | 1   | 2       | 2   | 3     | 2   |
|                      | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| TOTAL                | 94  | 47  | 104     | 53  | 198   | 100 |
|                      | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| iv. RACE             |     |     |         |     |       |     |
| Malay                | 43  | 44  | 45      | 43  | 88    | 45  |
| Chinese              | 37  | 38  | 45      | 43  | 82    | 41  |
| Indian & Others      | 14  | 14  | 14      | 14  | 28    | 14  |
|                      | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| TOTAL                | 94  | 47  | 104     | 53  | 198   | 100 |
|                      | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| v. EDUCATIONAL LEVEL |     |     |         |     |       |     |
| SPM/STPM             | 42  | 43  | 46      | 44  | 88    | 45  |
| Certificate/Diploma  | 31  | 32  | 34      | 33  | 65    | 33  |
| Degree/Master        | 21  | 22  | 24      | 23  | 45    | 22  |
|                      | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| TOTAL                | 94  | 47  | 104     | 53  | 198   | 100 |
|                      | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |

TABLE 1 : DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS (continued)

|                        | TBC |     | NON TBC |     | TOTAL |     |
|------------------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|-------|-----|
|                        | NO  | %   | NO      | %   | NO    | %   |
| vi. OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL |     |     |         |     |       |     |
| General/Clerical       | 26  | 27  | 39      | 37  | 65    | 33  |
| Supervisory/Executive  | 52  | 54  | 55      | 53  | 107   | 54  |
| Managerial/Above       | 16  | 17  | 10      | 10  | 26    | 13  |
|                        | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| TOTAL                  | 94  | 47  | 104     | 53  | 198   | 100 |
|                        | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| vii. LENGTH OF SERVICE |     |     |         |     |       |     |
| Below 1 Year           | 3   | 3   | 17      | 16  | 20    | 10  |
| 1 - 2 Years            | 26  | 27  | 32      | 31  | 58    | 29  |
| Above 3 Years          | 65  | 67  | 55      | 53  | 120   | 61  |
|                        | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| TOTAL                  | 94  | 47  | 104     | 53  | 198   | 100 |
|                        | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| viii. INCOME LEVEL     |     |     |         |     |       |     |
| Below RM1000           | 21  | 22  | 32      | 31  | 53    | 27  |
| RM1001 - RM2000        | 32  | 33  | 42      | 40  | 74    | 38  |
| RM2001 - RM3500        | 25  | 26  | 23      | 22  | 48    | 24  |
| Above RM3500           | 15  | 15  | 7       | 7   | 22    | 11  |
|                        | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |
| TOTAL                  | 93  | 47  | 104     | 53  | 197   | 100 |
|                        | --- | --- | ---     | --- | ---   | --- |

## RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

Reliability analysis was done for all the measuring instruments used in the study, ie. JDI, OJS, WMI and CP. Reliability analysis was done to find the degree to which measures are free from error and therefore yield constant results. A commonly used standard value for reliability is Cronbach's Alpha of 0.70, (Hair et al, 1992). Unreliable measures may reduce the correlation between measures. Therefore, it is necessary to have reliable data for further statistical analysis to be significant.

Although the alpha value of 0.70 is not an absolute standard, values below 0.70 have been deemed acceptable if the research is exploratory in nature. There are no steadfast rules available for what constitutes a reliable measure (Davis, D. and Cosenza M.R., 1993). However, the minimum standard value of 0.50 should be met for behavioural measures of exploratory studies.

In this regard, the values of alpha for the study is presented in Table 2. The alpha value for JDI was 0.8944, OJS was 0.7757, WMI was 0.7114 and CP was 0.7939. All these alpha values were well above the standard value of 0.70. The above results prove that the data obtained could be deemed to have high reliability and consistency. Therefore using the

above data for further statistical analysis yield reliable and consistent results too. Those results also support the claims of reliability by the developers of the said research instruments.

BLE 2 : RELIABILITY ANALYSIS OF MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

| SCALE | NO. OF RESPONDENTS | NO. OF ITEMS | ALPHA VALUE |
|-------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|
| JDI   | 201                | 50           | 0.8944      |
| OJS   | 201                | 20           | 0.7757      |
| WMI   | 195                | 20           | 0.7114      |
| CP    | 197                | 10           | 0.7939      |

## SUMMARY STATISTICS OF JDI

### 3.1 OVERALL MEAN OF JDI FOR TBC AND NON TBC GROUP

Kindly refer to Table 3 for the overall mean of JDI for TBC and Non TBC groups.

The overall mean score range stands at 1.85 - 2.64. This clearly indicates high job satisfaction towards all facets of JDI, namely, work, supervision, co-workers, pay and promotion between TBC and Non TBC group of employees. The lowest mean (1.85) was registered for "PAY" facet and the highest mean (2.64) was registered for "CO-WORKERS" facet. This shows that although the TBC and Non TBC employees were highly satisfied with their job, their satisfaction towards pay was low and their satisfaction towards co-workers was high.

In analysing the mean score for TBC group the similar trend as above was observed. The mean score range was 1.86 - 2.64; proving high job satisfaction too. However, the lowest mean (1.86) was obtained for the "PAY" facet and the highest mean (2.64) was registered for "CO-WORKERS" facet.

Analysis of the mean score for Non TBC group showed a slightly different trend from TBC group. Here, the mean score range was 1.78 - 2.61, indicating high job satisfaction as the TBC group. However, the lowest mean score (1.78) was obtained for "PROMOTION" and the highest (2.61) mean score was obtained for "CO-WORKERS" facet.

Here it was clear that both TBC and Non TBC group have high satisfaction towards their "CO-WORKERS". The difference of satisfaction between the two groups may be found at "PAY" and "PROMOTION". However, the results of t-test, clearly indicates that none of the mean scores for all the facets of JDI were significantly different between both group of employees.

Based on the above, it can be concluded that both TBC and Non TBC group do not show significant difference in their job satisfaction. Both groups have high job satisfaction. However, within this level of satisfaction, both TBC and Non TBC group have high satisfaction towards their co-workers, low satisfaction towards pay (the TBC group) and promotion (the Non TBC group).



E 3 : OVERALL MEAN OF JDI FOR TBC AND NON TBC GROUP

| FACET     | OVERALL    | TBC        | NON TBC    | T-TEST               |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------|----------------------|
|           | MEAN SCORE | MEAN SCORE | MEAN SCORE | (2 TAIL-PROB. VALUE) |
| ARK       | 2.04       | 2.04       | 2.05       | 0.952                |
| PERVISION | 2.46       | 2.45       | 2.47       | 0.843                |
| -WORKERS  | 2.62       | 2.64       | 2.61       | 0.714                |
| Y         | 1.85       | 1.86       | 1.84       | 0.871                |
| OMOTION   | 1.87       | 1.97       | 1.78       | 0.08                 |

FE : t-test significant level is at 0.05

## SUMMARY STATISTICS OF OJS

### 4.1 OVERALL MEAN OF OJS FOR TBC AND NON TBC GROUP

Please refer to Table 4 for the overall mean of OJS for TBC and Non TBC groups.

The overall mean range for OJS was 1.82 - 2.53. This clearly shows both low satisfaction and neither low nor high satisfaction (neutral satisfaction) between the TBC and Non TBC groups towards their job. These results were in conflict with the findings of JDI, which showed high satisfaction between both groups. However, the lowest mean score was registered for "PAY" and the highest mean score was obtained for "WORKERS" facet of OJS.

In this regard, the mean score range for TBC group was 1.78-2.56, indicating both low and neutral satisfaction. This group registered the lowest mean score (1.78) for "PAY" and the highest mean score for "JOB".

The Non TBC group's mean range was 1.85 - 2.51, showing that of low and neutral satisfaction. Here again, the lowest mean score (1.85) was obtained for "PAY" and the highest mean score (2.51) was registered for "WORKERS".

Therefore, it was clear that both the TBC and Non TBC groups have both low and neutral satisfaction towards their job. Further, both groups have lowest satisfaction for their pay and a difference of satisfaction may be found for "JOB" and "WORKERS" between the groups. However, the results of t-test clearly indicates that, none of the mean for "JOB" and "WORKERS" were significantly different between the TBC and Non TBC group. Only the mean score for "PROMOTION" was significantly different between both groups.

Based on the above, it can be concluded that both TBC and Non TBC group do not show significant difference in their job satisfaction. Both groups have low and neutral job satisfaction. However, within this level of satisfaction, both the TBC and Non TBC group have low satisfaction towards their pay, neutral satisfaction towards job (TBC group) and workers (Non TBC group).

BLE 4 : OVERALL MEAN OF OJS FOR TBC AND NON TBC GROUP

| OB FACET    | OVERALL<br>MEAN SCORE | TBC<br>MEAN SCORE | NON TBC<br>MEAN SCORE | T-TEST<br>(2 TAIL-PROB.<br>VALUE) |
|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| JOB         | 2.51                  | 2.56              | 2.47                  | 0.301                             |
| PAY         | 1.82                  | 1.78              | 1.85                  | 0.455                             |
| PROMOTION   | 2.01                  | 2.10              | 1.92                  | 0.053                             |
| WORKERS     | 2.53                  | 2.55              | 2.51                  | 0.610                             |
| SUPERVISION | 2.26                  | 2.26              | 2.26                  | 0.979                             |

NOTE : t-test significant level is at 0.05

## DISCUSSION OF JDI AND OJS RESULTS

The results of JDI shows that both TBC and Non TBC employees have high job satisfaction. However, the results of OJS shows that both TBC and Non TBC employees have low and neutral job satisfaction. Therefore the JDI results and OJS results conflict each other in measuring the job satisfaction of both groups. The reliability analysis of the data obtained, clearly indicates that both data (ie. JDI and OJS) were highly reliable. The Cronbach alpha for JDI was above 0.5 and the Cronbach alpha for OJS was above 0.5 too. As the alpha value above 0.5, is regarded highly reliable, the data obtained for JDI and OJS was reliable too.

In analysing further the above conflicting situation the key response (from both groups) to one of the crucial question in OJS (ie. question no. 21) was analysed again. Kindly refer to APPENDIX 1 for the said question. This question directly asks the respondent's overall job satisfaction. The mean score for TBC group was 3.38 and that of Non TBC group was 3.48. Kindly refer to Table 5. The t-test result (p-value was 0.42), showed, there was no significant difference between the means of both groups. Based on the above results it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction between TBC and Non TBC groups. Further, both groups have neither low nor high job satisfaction (neutral satisfaction) only.

TABLE 5 : ANALYSIS OF QUESTION NO. 21 IN OJS BETWEEN TBC AND NON  
TBC GROUP

| RESPONSE          | TBC<br>(Number of Respondents) | Non TBC | T-TEST                  |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------|
|                   |                                |         | (2 TAIL-PROB.<br>VALUE) |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | 3                              | 4       | NA                      |
| DISAGREE          | 11                             | 8       | "                       |
| UNDECIDED         | 31                             | 34      | "                       |
| AGREE             | 50                             | 50      | "                       |
| STRONGLY AGREE    | 2                              | 8       | "                       |
| OVERALL MEAN      | 3.38                           | 3.48    | 0.42                    |

NOTE : NA - Not Applicable

## 6. REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF OJS FOR TBC AND NON TBC GROUP

### 6.1 STEPWISE REGRESSION FOR TBC GROUP

A stepwise regression was done for the TBC group, for question no. 21 in the OJS. This question, ie very satisfied with job, becomes the dependent variable (Y) and other facets of the job, ie. work, pay, co-workers, promotion and supervision become independent variables (X). The aim of this analysis is to find which facet has the highest influence towards job satisfaction. The strength of a given facet (X) explaining the variance in job satisfaction (Y) is shown by adjusted  $R^2$ .

Based on the stepwise regression output, the first variable to enter the equation was "JOB" and the regression equation is as follows:-

$$\text{JOB SATISFACTION} = 0.807 \text{ JOB} + 1.317$$

$$R^2 \text{ (adjusted)} = 32.4\%$$

The second facet to be included in the above analysis was "PROMOTION" and the regression model is as follows:-

$$\text{JOB SATISFACTION} = 0.694 \text{ JOB} + 0.310 \text{ PROMOTION} + 0.956$$

$$R^2 \text{ (adjusted)} = 37.9\%$$

Both the facets ie. job and promotion were sufficient to explain (to a large extent with 5% error) the job satisfaction of TBC group. Kindly refer to APPENDIX 2.

## 6.2 STEPWISE REGRESSION FOR NON TBC GROUP

A similar stepwise regression (as Section 6.1) was carried out for the Non TBC group. Kindly refer to Appendix 3 and Appendix 4. Based on the output, the first facet to be included in the regression equation was "JOB", as follows:-

$$\text{JOB SATISFACTION} = 0.721 \text{ JOB} + 1.70$$

$$R^2 \text{ (adjusted)} = 20.7\%$$

The second facet included in the regression model is "PAY" as follows:-

$$\text{JOB SATISFACTION} = 0.602 \text{ JOB} + 0.421 \text{ PAY} + 1.216$$

$$R^2 \text{ (adjusted)} = 27.2\%$$



Based on the above, it was sufficient for job and pay to explain the job satisfaction model with 5% error.

The above shows that, the job satisfaction for TBC and Non-TBC group was best explained by two facets only. For the TBC group it was job and promotion and for the Non TBC group was job and pay. The priority of importance of job facets (in the above regard) was job for TBC and Non TBC group; followed by promotion (for TBC group) and pay (for Non TBC group).