

## CHAPTER 4

### RESEARCH RESULTS

This chapter describes the data collected and discusses their analysis. Table 4.1 summarises the response rate. A total of 519 questionnaires was distributed, of which 385, 110 and 24 questionnaires were distributed to operators, technicians and foremen, respectively. At the end of the allocated two week period, 215 questionnaires were returned by the operators, 55 by the technicians and 11 by the foremen. This represents a response rate of 56% for the operators, 50% for the technicians and 46% for the foremen. All the returned questionnaires were found to be usable.

TABLE 4.1  
RESPONSE RATE

Category	Sample Size	No. of Respondents	Response Rate
Operators	385	215	56%
Technicians	110	55	50%
Foremen	24	11	46%
Total	519	281	54%

#### 4.1 Characteristics of the Sample

The characteristics of the sample are summarised in Tables 4.2.

##### (a) Gender

31.7% of the respondents were female and the remaining 68.3% were male. This was expected as the company concerned is a highly male dominated organisation.

##### (b) Ethnic Composition

The respondents comprised 88.5% Malays, 2.5% Chinese, 7.9% Indians and 1.1% Others. The conclusion can be drawn that the vast majority of the employees at the shopfloor were Malays.

##### (c) Marital Status

84.3% of the respondents were single and 15% married. One respondent was a widower and one was divorced.

##### (d) Number of Children

Of those who were married, 44.4% had no children, 33.3% had one child, 13.3% had two children and 8.9% had three or more children.

(e) Age

The highest percentage of respondents (64.9%) was in the "21 - 29 years" group followed by 31.9% in the "below 21 years" group and only 3.3% in the "30 - 39 years" group. Thus, it can be said that the workforce in the shopfloor was relatively young.

(f) Occupational Level

The majority of the respondents fell into the operator category (76.5%), followed by the technician category (19.6%), and the foreman category (3.9%).

(g) Department

The majority of the respondents were in Manufacturing Department A (44%), followed by Manufacturing Department C (36%), and Manufacturing Department B (20%).

(h) Tenure

10.2% of the respondents had served less than 6 months with the company, 17.1% between 6 to 12 months, 25.8% between 1 to 2 years, 11.6% between 2 to 3 years, 18.5% between 3 to 4 years and 16.7% between 4 to 5 years. This indicates that 53.1% of the respondents had less than 2 years service in the

company. The low level of the employees' tenure in the company suggests that the company has in fact been experiencing high employee turnover.

(i) Place of Origin

31.7% of the respondents originated from Selangor and Kuala Lumpur, 20.5% from Perak, 18.3% from Pahang, 10.4% from Kelantan, 6.8% from Negeri Sembilan, 4.7% from Terengganu and the remaining 7.6% from other states. Because 70% of its shopfloor employees originate from other states, the company provides accomodation for them at its hostels and transports them to work by its buses.

PEPERIKSAAN UNIVERSITI MALAYA

(j) Means of Transport to Work

46.1% of the respondents came to work by means of the company's buses, 32.9% walked to work, 16.8% came to work by motorbike and only 3.6% came to work by car.

(k) Accomodation

The majority of the respondents (73%) did not stay in company hostels. Of those who did, 84.2% stayed in the in-house hostel and 15.8% stayed in the external hostels.<sup>1</sup>

A504959951

<sup>1</sup> Houses rented by the company at the nearby housing

(1) Who Stayed With

34.3% of the respondents stayed with family, 24.9% with friends, 36.8% with colleagues and only 4% of the respondents stayed alone.

(m) Distance to the Workplace

40.2% of the respondents stayed at a distance of less than 5 km from the company, 18.9% at a distance between 5 - 10 km, 19.3% at a distance between 11- 20 km, and 21.6% at a distance of more than 20 km.

#### 4.2 Employee Attendance Records

The rate of absenteeism of the employees in 1994 is shown in Table 4.3. This table also shows the rates of absenteeism of operators, technicians and foremen in the three Manufacturing Departments.

(i) Occupational Level

Operators exhibited a higher absenteeism rate (8.12%) compared to technicians (6.29%) and foremen (3.91%). The overall absenteeism rate of 6.11% shows that the absenteeism problem in the company is very serious.

TABLE 4.2  
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Demographic Variable	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Percent
(a) Gender				
Female	1	89	31.7	31.7
Male	2	192	68.3	100.0
(b) Ethnic Composition				
Malay	1	247	88.5	88.5
Chinese	2	7	2.5	91.0
Indian	3	22	7.9	98.9
Other	4	3	1.1	100.0
Not stated	9	2	MISSING	
(c) Marital Status				
Single	1	236	84.3	84.3
Married	2	42	15.0	99.3
Widow/widower	3	1	0.4	99.6
Divorced	4	1	0.4	100.0
Not stated	9	1	MISSING	
(d) Number of Children				
None	0	20	44.4	44.4
One child	1	15	33.3	77.8
Two children	2	6	13.3	91.1
Three children & above	3	4	8.9	100.0
Not applicable	9	236	MISSING	
(e) Age				
Less than 21 years	1	88	31.9	31.9
21 – 29 years	2	179	64.9	96.7
30 – 39 years	3	9	3.3	100.0
Not stated	9	5	MISSING	

TABLE 4.2 (cond't)  
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Demographic Variable	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Percent
(f) Occupational Level				
Operator	1	215	76.5	76.5
Technician	2	55	19.6	96.1
Foreman	3	11	3.9	100.0
(g) Department				
Manufacturing Department A	1	124	44.0	44.0
Manufacturing Department B	2	55	20.0	64.0
Manufacturing Department C	3	102	36.0	100.0
(h) Tenure				
Less than 6 months	1	28	10.2	10.2
6 - 12 months	2	47	17.1	27.3
1 - 2 years	3	71	25.8	53.1
2 - 3 years	4	32	11.6	64.7
3 - 4 years	5	51	18.5	83.2
4 - 5 years	6	46	16.7	100.0
Not stated	9	6	MISSING	
(i) Place of Origin				
Selangor & Kuala Lumpur	1	88	31.7	31.7
Perak	2	57	20.5	52.2
Pahang	3	51	18.3	70.5
Kelantan	4	19	6.8	77.3
Negeri Sembilan	5	13	4.7	82.0
Terengganu	6	29	10.4	92.4
Other States	7	21	7.6	100.0
Not stated	9	3	MISSING	

TABLE 4.2 (cont'd)  
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Demographic Variable	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Percent
(j) Means of Transport to Work				
Company bus	1	129	46.1	46.1
Car	3	10	3.6	49.6
Motorbike	4	47	16.8	66.4
Walk	5	92	32.9	99.3
Others	6	2	0.7	100.0
Not stated	9	1	MISSING	
(k) Accomodation – Company Hostel				
No	0	205	73.0	73.0
Yes	1	76	27.0	100.0
If yes, in –house hostel or external hostel	1	64	64.2	64.2
	2	12	15.8	100.0
Not applicable	9	205	MISSING	
(l) Who Stayed With				
Family	1	95	34.3	34.3
Friend	2	69	24.9	59.3
Colleague	3	102	36.8	96.0
Alone	4	11	4.0	100.0
Not stated	9	4	MISSING	
(m) Distance to the Workplace				
Less than 5 km	1	106	40.2	40.2
5 – 10 km	2	50	18.9	59.1
11 – 20 km	3	51	19.3	78.4
More than 20 km	4	57	21.6	100
Not stated	9	17	MISSING	



(ii) Department

Operators, technicians and foremen in Manufacturing Department B show a higher absenteeism rate (8.20%, 6.57% and 4.12%, respectively) compared to Manufacturing Department C (8.14%, 6.19% and 3.55%, respectively) and Manufacturing Department A (8.03%, 6.10% and 4.05%, respectively).

TABLE 4.3  
EMPLOYEE ABSENTEEISM RATE IN 1994

Occupational Level Department	Operators	Technicians	Foremen	Average Total (%)
Manufacturing Department A	8.03%	6.10%	4.05%	6.06%
Manufacturing Department B	8.20%	6.57%	4.12%	6.30%
Manufacturing Department C	8.14%	6.19%	3.55%	5.96%
Average Total (%)	8.12%	6.29%	3.91%	6.11%

For the purposes of this study, a further breakdown of the average 1994 absenteeism rate of 6.11% by variables such as children (employees with children), payday (including day before and day after payday), sickness, transport (missed bus) and other reasons is shown in Table 4.4.

This table also shows that sickness (34.4%) was the highest contributor to the average 1994 absenteeism rate of 6.11%, followed by payday (25.5% - including day before and day after pay day), children (5.7% - employees with children) and transport (4.9% - missed bus).

TABLE 4.4  
BREAKDOWN OF AVERAGE 1994 ABSENTEEISM RATE  
OF 6.11% BY VARIABLES

Demographic Variable	Absenteeism Rate (%)	Percentage of 6.11%
Children (employees with children)	0.35	5.70
Payday (including day before and day after payday)	1.56	25.50
Sickness	2.10	34.40
Transport	0.30	4.90
Other Reasons	1.80	29.50
Total (%)	6.11	100.00

#### 4.3 Summary of Research Findings

As stated in Chapter 1, the objective of this study is to determine whether the high rate of employee absenteeism experienced in the company concerned is related to the lack of job satisfaction and/or to various

sociocultural pressures. The specific questions requiring answers are as follows :-

- (i) Which facets of job dissatisfaction affect employee motivation to attend ? and
- (ii) What sociocultural pressures affect employee desire to attend ?

#### 4.3.1 Reliability Analysis

The sociocultural pressures and the five job facets (namely. the employer, wages & benefits, coworkers, supervisor and the work itself) were all tested for internal consistency of the construct indicators. A commonly used threshold value for acceptable reliability is Cronbach's coefficient alpha = 0.70 (Hair et. al p.p 449, 1992); however, this is not an absolute standard, and values below 0.70 have been deemed acceptable if the research is exploratory in nature.

The values of alpha calculated for the scales used by the respondents were significantly above 0.70, except in the case of the coworkers and the work itself where the values of alpha were 0.3344 and 0.6856, respectively (Table 4.5). The highest value of alpha was 0.8694 for the supervisor. Cronbach alpha for the

sociocultural pressures was 0.7427, 0.8588 for the employer and 0.7252 for wages & benefits. This indicates a satisfactory level of internal consistency.

TABLE 4.5  
RELIABILITY ANALYSIS OF THE SCALES

Scale Used	No. of Items	Alpha	Standard Item Alpha
Sociocultural pressures	10	0.7427	0.7499
Employer	33	0.8588	0.8634
Wages & benefits	6	0.7252	0.7205
Coworkers	2	0.3344	0.3425
Supervisor	16	0.8694	0.8696
Work Itself	9	0.6856	0.6751

#### 4.3.2 Summary Statistics of Sociocultural Pressures And Job Satisfaction

##### (i) Sociocultural Pressures

As shown in Table 4.6, the mean score of 2.158 for the 10 items of the sociocultural pressures in the questionnaire is below the neutral score of 2.5 for each item. Thus, it can be concluded that the employees' desire to attend was affected by the sociocultural pressures.

TABLE 4.6  
SUMMARY STATISTICS OF SOCIOCULTURAL PRESSURES AND  
JOB SATISFACTION

Variable Label	No. of Cases	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Sociocultural pressures	281	2.1580	0.3930
Job satisfaction	281	2.7620	0.2930
Employer	281	2.7920	0.2990
Wages & benefits	281	2.3020	0.4500
Coworkers	281	2.9060	0.5420
Supervisor	281	2.9170	0.3980
Work Itself	281	2.6530	0.3750

Table 4.7 shows the mean score for each of the 10 items of the sociocultural pressures. Absent from work because of "sick child" (mean score = 3.0356) and absent from work because of "no babysitter" (mean score = 2.5338) were the two main factors that affected employees' desire to attend. The analysis reveals that "family problem" (mean score = 2.4057), "missed the bus" (mean score = 2.3523), "sickness" (mean score = 2.2954) and "kampung festival" (mean score = 2.2562) were also factors that affected the employees' desire to attend. However, the factors of "lazy to work" (mean score = 1.4128), "morning shift" (mean score = 1.5445) and "payday" (mean score =

1.7509) did not affect the employees' desire to attend.

TABLE 4.7  
MEAN SOCRES FOR EACH OF THE 10 ITEMS OF  
THE SOCIOCULTURAL PRESSURES

Variable Label	Sociocultural Pressures		
	No. of Cases	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Absent from work - no babysitter	218	2.5338	0.8016
Absent from work - sick child	218	3.0356	0.7062
Absent from work - family problem	218	2.4057	0.7264
Absent from work - missed bus	218	2.3523	0.8021
Absent from work - payday	218	1.7509	0.6111
Absent from work - peer group influence	218	1.9929	0.7837
Absent from work - sickness	218	2.2954	0.6930
Absent from work - kampung festival	218	2.2562	0.7827
Absent from work - lazy to work	218	1.4128	0.6384
Absent from work - morning shift	218	1.5445	0.5596

Table 4.8 shows the results of the one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the sociocultural pressures

by the relevant demographic variables. viz children (employees with children), means of transport to work, who stayed with, and distance to the workplace. The results are as follows :-

- (a) there was a significant difference in the desire to attend at  $\alpha = 0.05$  (F-value = 3.3872, F prob. > 0.0187) between those employees with the children and single employees;
- (b) there was a significant difference in the desire to attend at  $\alpha = 0.05$  (F-value = 3.2823, F prob. > 0.0390) between those employees who came to work by means of the company's buses and those who walked to work; and
- (c) there was a significant difference in the desire to attend at  $\alpha = 0.05$  (F-value = 3.3445, F prob. > 0.0151) between those employees who stayed at a distance of more than 20 km from the workplace and those who stayed 5 - 10 km from the workplace. (This suggests that the majority of those who stayed more than 20 km from the workplace came to work by means of the company's buses.)

However, who the employee stayed with did not reveal any significant difference in the test.

TABLE 4.8

ONE WAY ANOVA FOR SOCIOCULTURAL PRESSURES BY  
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Demographic Variables	Sociocultural Pressures		
	Mean Score	F-value	F Prob. >
Marital Status		3.3872	0.0187
Single	2.0580		
Married but yet to have children	2.1627		
Married with children	2.2877		
Means of Transport to Work		3.2823	0.0390
Company bus	2.7550		
Car	2.0800		
Motorbike	2.0872		
Walk	2.1120		
Others	2.2124		
Distance to Workplace		3.3445	0.0151
5 km and below	2.1500		
5 - 10 km	2.0580		
11 - 20 km	2.1617		
20 km and above	2.2788		
Who Stayed With		2.4519	0.0637
Family	2.2305		
Friend	2.1304		
Colleague	2.1441		
Alone	1.9364		

## (ii) Overall Job Satisfaction

As shown in Table 4.6, the mean score of 2.762 for the 66 items on job satisfaction in the questionnaire is above the neutral score of 2.5 for each item. Thus, it can be concluded that the employees were overall satisfied with their jobs.



Table 4.6 also shows the mean score for each of the job facets involved in job satisfaction. The mean scores of the employer (mean score = 2.792), coworkers (mean score = 2.906), supervisor (mean score = 2.917) and the work itself (mean score = 2.653) are above the neutral score of 2.5 for each item. Thus, it can be concluded that the employees were satisfied with the job facets of the employer, supervisor, coworkers and the work itself, but not with the job facet of wages & benefits (mean score = 2.3020).

#### (iii) Correlation Between Sociocultural Pressures and Job Satisfaction

A startling finding was that the sociocultural pressures were not significantly correlated with the five job facets (see Table 4.9). Thus, overall job satisfaction or dissatisfaction or any one of the five job facets not influence employee motivation to attend.

However, intercorrelations amongst the five job facets varied from 0.1258 to 0.7470. Most of these values were above the average of 0.35 reported by Hulin and Smith (1964). This indicates that they are significantly correlated.

TABLE 4.9

## CORRELATION BETWEEN SOCIOCULTURAL PRESSURES AND JOB SATISFACTION

CORRELATIONS	EMPLOYER	WAGES & BENEFITS	COWORKERS	SUPERVISOR	WORK ITSELF	SOCIOCULTURAL PRESSURES
EMPLOYER	1.0000 p = .	0.5148 p = .000	0.2944 p = .000	0.7470 p = .000	0.5981 p = .000	-0.2791 p = .000
WAGES & BENEFITS	0.5148 p = .000	1.0000 p = .	0.1258 p = .035	0.3830 p = .000	0.4421 p = .000	-0.1572 p = .008
COWORKER	0.2944 p = .000	0.1258 p = .035	1.0000 p = .	0.3391 p = .000	0.1568 p = .008	-0.0799 p = .162
SUPERVISOR	0.7470 p = .000	0.3830 p = .000	0.3391 p = .000	1.0000 p = .	0.5010 p = .000	-0.2300 p = .000
WORK ITSELF	0.5981 p = .000	0.4421 p = .000	0.1568 p = .006	0.5010 p = .000	1.0000 p = .	-0.3548 p = .000
SOCIOCULTURAL PRESSURES	-0.2791 p = .000	-0.1572 p = .008	-0.0799 p = .162	-0.2300 p = .000	-0.3548 p = .000	1.0000 p = .

(Coefficient / (Cases) / 2 - tailed Significance)

" ." means coefficient cannot be computed