

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

This chapter focuses on the findings of the study. It begins with describing the characteristics of the respondents. Then it discusses the results of the factor analysis. Reliability test was then conducted upon the measurement scale. After that, percentage distributions of responses by scale of agreement for items under each factors were presented. Finally crosstabulation were carried out to evaluate the influence of length of service and level of appointment on the factor climate.

4.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

52-technical staff took part in the second survey. The gender composition of the respondents was 43 male and 9 female. In terms of their age distribution, 40.4% was in the " 25 to 29 years" followed by 23.1 % in the " 30 to 34 years" group, 19.2% in the "35 - 40 years" group, 9.6% in the "less than 24 years" group, 3.8% each in the "41-45 years " group and "above 45 years" respectively. Thus, the majority of the respondents were quite young.

In terms of years of service, nearly 30% of the respondents had 1 to 3 years of service. 15.4% worked less than a year. For the grouping of 3 to 5 years and 5 to 10 years , the percentage of respondents were 15.4% respectively. 25% of the respondents had more than 10 years of service.

The technical department consists of 11 management staff and 41 non management staff. All the management staff holds a degree in chemistry and the minimum education for the non management staff is SPM. The characteristics of the respondents was summarized in Table 1.

1: PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

	NUMBER	PER CENT
AGE		
18-24	43	82.8%
25-34	9	17.3%
TOTAL	52	100%
EDUCATION		
Below High School	5	9.6%
High School	21	40.4%
Some College	12	23.1%
College Graduate	10	19.2%
Postgraduate	2	3.8%
VE 45	2	3.8%
TOTAL	52	100%
LENGTH OF SERVICE		
Less than 1 year	8	15.4%
1-3 years	15	28.8%
4-5 years	8	15.4%
6-10 years	8	15.4%
More than 10 years	13	25.0%
TOTAL	52	100%
RESPONDENTS BY RANK		
Management	11	21.2%
Non-management	41	78.8%
TOTAL	52	100%

4.2 FACTOR AND RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

After examining the resulting factor structures, it was determined that eleven factors were obtained which best represented the data from the questionnaire. However, of the eleven factor varimax rotated as shown in Table 2 only eight factors had a reliability of more than 0.5.

Nunnally's standard (13) indicate that for exploratory research, reliability score of more than 0.5 is considered reliable. Therefore of the eleven factors obtained , only eight factors were considered reliable.

The eleven factors rotated accounted for more than 82% of the total variance. Items represent each factor was selected by retaining only those with a factor loading of +0.3. For a sample size of more than 50, factor loading greater than +0.3 are considered significant (14).

The resulting climate factors from this study were :

Factor I : Identity, work culture and work value

This factor refers to the employees' perception with regard to the identity of the company. This is an indicator related to the employees' perception of pride and loyalty to the company. This factor includes perceptions on the company's interest on employees' welfare, feeling of trust towards the company and sense of respect in the company. This factor also indicate the efficiency of the company in terms of work flow and procedures.

The alpha value for this factor was 0.8689 , hence the measurement scale for this construct can be considered reliable.

Factor II : Risk and Control

This factors refers to the employees' perceptions with regard to the company's emphasis on risk taking or risk avoidance especially on control over job objectives and task setting . Emphasis on rules and regulations as well as clear to the policies of the company were also highlighted in this factor. The element of control also required the work standard to be based on the customers' requirements. This factor also includes perception of the employees' pay compared to other company.

The alpha value for this dimension was 0.7693 and therefore considered reliable.

Factor III : Cooperation and Leadership

This measurement scale had an alpha value of 0.8242, as such it is considered reliable.

This factor described the feeling that organization members work together as a team. In doing so, the employees must set their own performance standard with the help from their superior and fellow employees. A strong leadership and a close relationship between the management and non management is necessary to ensure that the team process is a success.

Factor IV : Support

This factor identifies the perceived degree of helpfulness of supervisors and peers in job related matters. It also refers to the perceived level of full responsibility towards work.

This factor is reliable as the alpha value was 0.7328.

Factor V : Expected work performance and work procedures

This factor refers to the perceived goal difficulty and pressure for performance that required the employees to put in maximum effort.

This climate factor had a reliability of 0.6355.

Factor VI : Autonomy

This factor identifies the employee feeling towards management 's attitude related to employees' participation in decision making pertaining to work objectives. This factor also includes employees perception over self-expression. In order for the employees' to participate fully in decision making process, a strong working culture and positive leadership is required.

This factor is considered reliable as the alpha value is 0.6838 which is more than 0.5

Factor VIII: Communications and effectiveness

This factor had a alpha value of 0.6623. This factor refers to openness by the management in communicating to the non management staff.

Factor IX : Rules Orientation (task setting)

This factor required achievement of task that required high performance by the employees. This factor had a reliability of 0.6490 and hence is considered reliable.

The rest of the factors were omitted as it was not reliable. The alpha value of the three were less than 0.5.

4.3 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION ANALYSIS

Percentage distributions of responses by scale of agreement for items under each climate factor were tabulated in Table 4.

E 2: RESULTS OF FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR THE CLIMATE ITEMS

ITEMS	I	II	FACTOR III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI
				0.36							0.65
Full responsibility to do work				0.50							
Management cautious with decision		0.43				0.75					
Employees encouraged to speak out											
Management prefers to be cautious		0.49									
Company willing to take risks		0.43									
Steer clear of open arguments			0.34								
Set own performance standard						0.88					
Make own work decisions		0.63									
Pay fair compared to other firms							0.89				
Pay is higher than competitors											
Pay fair compared to peers	0.77										
Good employees benefits											
Company gives enough recognition	0.74										
Warmth between management and workers			0.43								
Job objectives set by management		0.57							0.44		
Task set by management		0.55									0.46
Caring for employees											
Employee loyal to the company	0.68										
Proud to be associated to company's brand	0.71										
Interested in the welfare of the employee	0.45			0.81							
Get assistance from co workers			0.44								
Cooperations among employees			0.44			0.39					
Strong positive leaderships				0.72							
Can get assistance from bosses			0.81								
Cooperations among employees					0.53				0.50		
High performance standard						0.46					
Too many rules and regulations to follow											
Emphasis on rules and regulation		0.80									
Clear to the policies of the co		0.86				0.59					
Told clerly what should acheive in the job											
Required to put in maximum effort					0.40						
Often hear rumours bfore announcement								0.87			
Work standard based on customers		0.70									
Company is efficient in terms of workflow and procedures	0.59										
Good job in work process							0.42		0.42		
Good working culture											
Atmosphere of trust	0.65										
People are treated with respect	0.38										0.90
No cooperation among departments											
Eigen values	11.09	3.73	3.07	2.75	2.45	2.07	1.79	1.57	1.39	1.25	1.08
Percent of variance explained	28.50	9.60	7.90	7.10	6.30	5.30	4.60	4.00	3.60	3.20	2.80
Cumulative variants	28.50	38.00	45.90	53.00	59.30	64.60	69.20	73.20	76.80	80.00	82.80

TABLE 3: RELIABILITY OF CLIMATE FACTOR

CLIMATE FACTOR	RELIABILITY
I Identity , culture and work value	0.8689
II Risk and Control	0.7693
III Cooperation and leadership	0.8242
IV Support	0.7328
V Expected work performance and work procedures	0.6355
VI Autonomy	0.6838
VII Reward	—
VIII Communication and effectiveness	0.6623
IX Rules Orientation	0.6490
X Conflict	—
XI —	0.2338

The general perception of the employees' on identity, culture and work value were that more than 60% of the employees felt that the workflow and procedures in the company is efficient. 71% of them were proud to be associated with the company's brand. However, only 44% thinks that the company gives enough recognition to those that did well in their job. 40% of the employees thinks that they is atmosphere of trust within the company and 50% thinks that people in XYZ is treated with respect.

The general perception of the employees on risk and control were that the management is seen to be cautious in making decisions as 63% of the employees' perceived. Only 40% of the employees felt that the company is willing to take risks. In relation to risk and control factor, more than 65% of the employees perceived that their job objective and task is set by the management.

On the cooperation and leadership factor, since the company had implemented the team system, the employees' are required to set their own performance standard after consulting their superior. Survey results shows that more than 55% of the employees agreed to set their own standard and 57% felt that cooperation will be given by their colleagues. 57% of the respondents perceived that there is cooperations between superiors and employees but only 32% thinks that there is a warmth relationship between the non-management and the management staff.

In relation to support, 88.5% of the employees' perceived that they were given full responsibility to perform in their work. The support level from the co-workers and their boss were only slightly more than 50%. However, only 38.5% of the employees felt that they could speak their minds out even to the extent to disagree with their superiors.

Employees' were also required to put in maximum effort to perform in their job. The management also set high performance standard for their employees. The degree of agreement of the respondents' for this two items were more than 65%.

Related to autonomy, Table 4 indicated that more than 70% of the employees' perceived that they were told clearly on what to achieve in their job. 55.8% of the respondents agreed that they set their own performance standard. However, only 38% felt that they could speak their mind out even to the extent to disagree with their superiors. As autonomy is related to self-expression, the employees' perceived that they is too much rules and regulations to follow in the company. In terms of working culture only 40% perceived that the working culture is good.

73% of the employees felt that they often hear rumours before any official announcement indicating that the two way communication between the management and non-management still need to be improved.

4: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR CLIMATE ITEMS

	Disagree	May Agree	Agree	Mean Score
7, culture and work value	15.4%	28.8%	55.8%	2.40
fair compared to peers	19.2%	36.5%	44.2%	2.25
company gives enough recognition	11.5%	32.7%	55.8%	2.44
employee loyal to the company	3.8%	25.0%	71.2%	2.67
used to be associated to company's brand	5.8%	46.2%	48.1%	2.42
interested in the welfare of its employee	9.6%	26.9%	63.5%	2.54
efficient in terms of workflow and procedures	7.7%	51.9%	40.4%	2.33
atmosphere of trust	21.2%	28.8%	50.0%	2.29
employees are treated with respect				
Management Control				
management cautions with decision	7.7%	40.4%	51.9%	2.44
management prefers to be cautious	5.8%	30.8%	63.5%	2.58
company willing to take risk	—	59.6%	40.4%	2.40
7 lower compared to other firms	33.3%	37.3%	29.4%	1.96
objectives set by management	1.9%	17.3%	80.8%	2.79
set by management	5.8%	28.8%	65.4%	2.60
emphasis on rules and regulations	3.8%	19.2%	76.9%	2.73
far to the policies of the company	5.8%	17.3%	76.9%	2.71
< standard based on customer requirement	3.8%	13.5%	82.7%	2.79
Interaction and leadership				
own performance standard	17.3%	26.9%	55.8%	2.39
smoothness between management and workers	25.0%	42.3%	32.6%	2.08
operations among employees	13.5%	28.8%	57.7%	2.44
strong positive leaderships	5.8%	34.6%	59.6%	2.53
operations among employees and superior	1.9%	40.4%	57.7%	2.62
Support				
If responsibility to do work	—	11.5%	88.5%	2.89
employees encouraged to speak out	21.2%	40.4%	38.5%	2.17
get assistance from co workers	5.8%	42.3%	51.9%	2.46
get assistance from boss	7.7%	34.6%	57.7%	2.50
Expected work performance and procedures				
high performance standard	3.8%	17.3%	78.8%	2.75
required to put in maximum effort	3.8%	30.8%	65.4%	2.62
Company				
employees encourage to speak out	21.2%	40.4%	38.5%	2.17
set own performance standard	17.3%	26.9%	55.8%	2.39
strong positive leadership	5.8%	34.6%	59.6%	2.53
too many rules and regulations to follow	26.9%	30.8%	42.3%	2.15
could clearly what should achieve in the job	5.8%	23.1%	71.2%	2.65
good working culture	7.7%	51.9%	40.4%	2.33
Reward				
Pay is higher than competitors	25.0%	40.4%	32.7%	2.08
Communications and effectiveness				
Often hear rumours before announcement	5.8%	21.2%	73.1%	2.67
good job in work process	5.8%	25.0%	69.2%	2.64
Goals Orientation				
task set by management	5.8%	28.8%	65.4%	2.60
high performance standard	3.8%	17.3%	78.8%	2.75
Conflict				
No cooperations among departments	13.5%	40.4%	46.2%	2.32
	49			

In terms of rules orientation, the management expect high performance standard on the task set by the management. 65% of the respondents' agreed with this statement.

4.4 RESULTS OF CROSSTABULATION

Items asked in the questionnaire were crosstabulated with length of service as tabulated in Table 5. As can be seen in Table 5, of the 39 items only 19 items were significant at 0.05 level.

On the statement of " management is always cautions in their decision making", the significant level was 0.0012 indicating that there is a relationship between this items and length of service. From the tabulation, majority of the employees who worked between 3 to 5 years disagree with the statement.

On item on company is willing to take risk to keep ahead, non of the employees' who worked between three to five years agreed, however 70% of the employees' who worked for more than 10 years agreed that the company must take risk in order to be ahead.

Only 25% of the employees who worked between 3 to 5 years said that the best way to make good impression is to steer clear of all argument compared to 75% of the employees' who worked less than a year.

Majority of the employees who worked between one to three years agreed that they were allowed to set their own performance standard.

Regarding pay, except for employees' who worked for less than a year, the rest of the employees' shows great unhappiness regarding their pay.

Employees' who worked for less than a year perceived that a lot of warmth in the relationship between management and workers. They also perceived a high recognition given by the company to employees' who worked well.

On items on loyalty, the most disloyal employees' worked between three to ten years.

In terms of getting assistance from co-workers and their boss, employees' who worked between 3 to 10 years were the most dissatisfied workers.

On items on rules and regulations, once again workers who worked between 3 to 5 years said that the company has too much rules and regulations to follow and they also felt that top management emphasized a lot on rules and regulations.

The crosstabulated results between length of service and atmosphere of trust within XYZ also revealed that the degree of disagreement were the highest on employees' that had served the company between 3 to 5 years.

In conclusion, based on the survey results, the most dissatisfied employees' in terms of length of service were employees' who worked between 3 to 5 years.

Crosstabulation was also done on the variables and level of appointment. Result that was tabulated in Table 6 shows only 3 significance value at 0.05 level.

Only 9% of the management staff agreed that the best way to make a good impression around is to steer clear of open argument and disagreement. Majority of the management staff also disagree that all of their task is set by management and they also thinks that the work value is not solely depend on customers' requirements. The results also bears similarity to the data obtained from SRM on the employee survey attitude carried out on Feb 1995 whereby the management staff thinks that the company allows them to set their own task in order to fulfill their objectives.

5: CROSSTABULATION BETWEEN VARIABLES AND LENGTH OF SERVICE

ITEMS	less than 1 year	1 – 3 years	3+ – 5 years	5+ – 10 years	above 10 years	Significance
Full responsibility to do work	100%	80%	87.5%	87.5%	92.3%	0.68
Management cautious with decision	50.0%	66.7%	37.5%	37.5%	53.8%	0.37
Employees encouraged to speak out	37.5%	60.0%	–	50.0%	30.8%	0.07
Management prefers to be cautious	50.0%	60.0%	37.5%	62.5%	92.3%	0.00
Company willing to take risks	25.0%	40.0%	–	50.0%	69.2%	0.02
Steer clear of open arguments	75%	53.3%	25.0%	37.5%	69.2%	0.04
Set own performance standard	75.0%	80.0%	25%	62.5%	30.8%	0.04
Make own work decisions	37.5%	73.3%	37.5%	62.5%	53.8%	0.28
Pay fair compared to other firms	–	33.3%	37.5%	14.3%	46.2%	0.00
Pay is higher than competitors	87.5%	26.7%	25.0%	14.3%	23.1%	0.00
Pay fair compared to peers	100%	20.0%	50.0%	75.0%	61.5%	0.09
Good employees benefits	–	20.0%	37.5%	25.0%	46.2%	0.00
Company gives enough recognition	87.5%	33.3%	25.0%	25.0%	53.8%	0.02
Warmth between management and workers	87.5%	26.7%	25.0%	12.5%	23.1%	0.02
Job objectives set by management	87.5%	86.7%	37.5%	87.5%	92.3%	0.01
Task set by management	87.5%	53.3%	62.5%	62.5%	69.2%	0.57
Caring for employees	87.5%	40.0%	50.0%	37.5%	53.8%	0.50
Employee loyal to the company	87.5%	60.0%	25.0%	25.0%	69.2%	0.05
Proud to be associated to company's brand	87.5%	73.3%	50.0%	75.0%	69.2%	0.73
Interested in the welfare of the employee	87.5%	33.3%	25.0%	37.5%	61.5%	0.22
Get assistance from co workers	100%	60.0%	25.0%	12.5%	53.8%	0.03
Cooperations among employees	100%	46.7%	25.0%	25.0%	84.6%	0.00
Strong positive leaderships	100%	66.7%	50.0%	37.5%	46.2%	0.08
Can get assistance from boss	100%	73.3%	37.5%	25.0%	46.2%	0.04
Cooperations among employees	100%	46.7%	37.5%	87.5%	46.2%	0.15
High performance standard	100%	66.7%	50.0%	87.5%	92.3%	0.08
Too many rules and regulations to follow	50.0%	46.7%	25.0%	37.5%	46.2%	0.02
Emphasis on rules and regulation	87.5%	73.3%	50.0%	75.0%	92.3%	0.01
Clear to the policies of the co	75.0%	73.3%	62.5%	75.0%	92.3%	0.65
Told clearly what should achieve in the job	62.5%	73.3%	62.5%	75.0%	76.9%	0.58
Required to put in maximum effort	50.0%	73.3%	62.5%	50.0%	76.9%	0.54
Often hear rumours before announcement	87.5%	86.7%	75.0%	50.0%	61.5%	0.26
Work standard based on customers	87.5%	73.3%	75.0%	75.0%	100%	0.56
Company is efficient in terms of workflow and procedures	87.5%	53.3%	50.0%	50.0%	76.9%	0.28
Good job in work process	87.5%	93.3%	62.5%	25.0%	61.5%	0.02
Good working culture	62.5%	46.7%	–	25.0%	53.8%	0.18
Atmosphere of trust	75.0%	60.0%	–	25.0%	61.5%	0.04
People are treated with respect	50.0%	60.0%	12.5%	50.0%	61.5%	0.13
No cooperation among departments	50.0%	66.7%	37.5%	37.5%	30.8%	0.10

Significance data is obtained from chi square
the % of respondents that answered agree is presented here

E 6: CROSSTABULATION BETWEEN VARIABLES AND LEVEL OF APPOINTMENT

ITEMS	m'agement	non m'agement	Significance
Full responsibility to do work	100%	85.4%	0.1777
Management cautious with decision	45.5%	53.7%	0.3910
Employees encouraged to speak out	45.5%	36.6%	0.8644
Management prefers to be cautious	54.5%	65.9%	0.3758
Company willing to take risks	54.5%	36.6%	0.2811
Steer clear of open arguments	9.1%	65.9%	0.0016
Set own performance standard	54.5%	56.1%	0.6036
Make own work decisions	81.8%	48.8%	0.1270
Pay fair compared to other firm	—	36.6%	0.0623
Pay is higher than competitors	30.0%	34.1%	0.3194
Pay fair compared to peers	63.6%	53.7%	0.7687
Good employees benefits	9.1%	31.7%	0.2965
Company gives enough recognition	54.5%	41.5%	0.5823
Warmth between management and workers	45.5%	29.3%	0.5854
Job objectives set by management	72.7%	82.8%	0.1462
Task set by management	36.4%	73.2%	0.0324
Caring for employees	54.5%	51.2%	0.9810
Employee loyal to the company	63.6%	53.7%	0.4523
Proud to be associated to company's brand	72.7%	70.7%	0.7519
Interested in the welfare of the employee	72.7%	41.5%	0.1616
Get assistance from co workers	54.5%	51.2%	0.6518
Cooperations among employees	72.7%	53.7%	0.2957
Strong positive leaderships	81.8%	53.7%	0.2180
Can get assistance from boss	72.7%	53.7%	0.3991
Cooperations among employees	54.5%	58.5%	0.8265
High performance standard	63.6%	82.9%	0.3316
Too many rules and regulations to follow	45.5%	41.5%	0.9566
Emphasis on rules and regulation	63.6%	80.5%	0.4092
Clear to the policies of the co	63.6%	80.5%	0.4092
Told clearly what should achieve in the job	81.8%	68.3%	0.5564
Required to put in maximum effort	54.5%	68.3%	0.4990
Often hear rumours before announcement	63.6%	75.6%	0.7104
Work standard based on customers	54.5%	90.2%	0.0206
Company is efficient in terms of workflow and procedures	72.7%	61.0%	0.2344
Good job in work process	45.5%	75.6%	0.1541
Good working culture	63.6%	34.1%	0.1707
Atmosphere of trust	63.6%	43.9%	0.4393
People are treated with respect	45.5%	60.0%	0.3441
No cooperation among departments	36.4%	48.8%	0.7373

Significance data is obtained from chi square
 and the % of respondents that answered agree is presented here