

## CHAPTER 5

### DATA ANALYSIS

#### INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the analysis of the data and the findings will be presented. For the purpose of the analysis, Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 11.0 for Windows) was used in the process of the analysis of the primary data. In this chapter the analysis and the findings will be presented as follows:

- \* General summary of the demographic characteristics of the respondents.
- \* The respondents' perception on the current performance management practices in the Army.
- \* Do the respondents want improvement of the system?
- \* The performance management system's effects to motivation.
- \* To identify the motivational factors to the respondents.

#### 5.1 PROFILE DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS

The questionnaire designed has 6 characteristics of the respondents to describe the profile of the respondents. The summary of the characteristics profile of the respondents is as Table 5.1.

TABLE 5.1

## FREQUENCY TABULATION OF THE RESPONDENTS' PROFILE

Ser	Demographic Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	<b>Rank</b>		
	Captain	139	59.9
	Major	87	37.5
	Lieutenant Colonel	6	2.6
2.	<b>Gender</b>		
	Male	221	95.3
	Female	11	4.7
3.	<b>Job Function</b>		
	Command	48	20.7
	Staff	120	51.7
	Instructor	43	18.5
	Others	21	9.1
4.	<b>Ethnicity</b>		
	Malay	207	89.3
	Chinese	9	3.9
	Indian	8	3.4
	Others	8	3.4
5.	<b>Corps</b>		
	Combat Unit	118	51.1
	Combat Support	57	24.7
	Service Support	56	24.2
6.	<b>Formation</b>		
	Division	14	6.0
	Bridged	48	20.7
	Unit	92	39.7
	Others	78	33.6

Generally the survey was done in Sungai Petani, Taiping, Ipoh, Kuala Lumpur, Port Dickson, Seremban, Kuantan, Melaka and Johor Bahru. As the study is particularly on the middle level managers in the army, only those who are from the rank of Captain, Major and Lieutenant Colonel were taken as

respondents. A total of 250 survey questionnaires were distributed; however only 232 questionnaires were able to be collected in time for the study. This could be considered good as the return rate was 92.8%

**Rank.** The survey consists of 139 Captains who make up 59.9% of the total respondents. On the Majors rank there were 87 respondents making 37.5% and 6 Lieutenant Colonels that makes 2.6% of the survey. As mentioned earlier these rank structure are the middle level managers in the Army.

**Gender.** The majority of the respondents were males that are 221 respondents that make 95.3% of the survey. The remainders are females that consist of 11 of them making 4.7%. This total number of respondents will roughly make 10% of the middle level managers in the Army.

**Main Job Function.** As shown in the table 1, the bulk of the respondents were from the staffs that were 120 of them making 51.7%. The remainders were 20.7% commanders, 18.5% Instructors, and 9.1% from other functions.

These can be considered as a good combination of job function as all of them do conduct performance management in their individual appointments.

**Ethnicity.** The analysis on ethnicity shows that the majority of respondents are Malays officers with 207 respondents or 89.2% followed with Chinese accounting for 9 or 3.9% with Indians and others making 8 respondents each making 3.4% each. This breakdown is almost similar to the actual composition of middle level leaders in the Army

**Corps.** The corps variable is divided into 3 major categories that are Combat Unit, Combat Support and Service Support. Majority of the respondents were

from the Combat Unit making 118 of them or 51.1%. The other 2 categories made almost equal parts with Combat Support having 57 respondents making 24.7% of them while 56 respondents were from service Support making 24.2%.

TABLE 5.2

DESCRIPTION OF RESPONDENT'S PROFILE BY RANK

Variables	Rank					
	Captain	%	Major	%	Lieutenant Colonel	%
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	130	56.0	85	36.6	6	2.6
Female	9	3.9	2	0.9	-	-
<b>Main Job Function</b>						
Command	14	6.0	32	13.8	2	0.9
Staff	83	35.8	33	14.2	4	1.7
Instructor	27	11.6	16	6.9	-	-
Others	15	6.5	6	2.6	-	-
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
Malay	125	53.9	78	33.6	4	1.7
Chinese	5	2.2	2	0.9	2	0.9
Indian	1	0.4	7	3.0	-	-
Others	8	3.4	-	-	-	-
<b>Corps</b>						
Combat Unit	53	22.9	66	26.4	4	1.7
Combat Support	41	17.7	14	6.1	2	0.9
Service Support	44	19.0	-	12	-	-
				5	-	-
<b>Formation</b>						
Division	9	3.9	-	-	-	-
Brigade	25	10.8	17	7.3	6	2.6
Unit	62	26.7	30	12.9	-	-
Others	43	18.5	35	15.1	-	-

## 5.2 DESCRIPTION OF RESPONDENTS' PROFILE BY RANK

Table 5.2 illustrates the findings of a cross tabulation between Rank and 5 other variables from the demographic profile. Majority of the respondents are males comprising of 221 and 11 females. Out of 221 males, 130 of them were Captains, 85 Majors and 6 Lieutenant Colonels. For the females 9 of them were Captains and 2 Majors. The Captains main job function were 6% Command, 35.8% Staff, 11.6% Instructor and 6.5% other job functions.

For the Majors 13.8% are holding Command functions, 14.2% as staffs, 6.9% as Instructors and 2.6% are holding other appointments. The Lieutenant Colonels are the minority in this research as only 6 of them are sampled. Out of these 6 Lieutenant Colonels, 2 hold Command Function and 4 as Staffs. Malays make the most in ethnicity where 53.9% are Captains, 33.6% Majors and 4 Lieutenant Colonel. The Minority are the Indians as there are only 1 Captain and 7 Majors. Majority of the respondents are from the Combat Units, where there are 22.9% Captains, 26.4% Majors and 1.7% Lieutenant Colonel. Respondents from the Units represent the most as 26.7% are Captains and 12.9% are Majors. There are only 3.9% of Captains from the Division.

TABLE 5.3

## FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN THE ARMY

Variables	Frequency Distribution								Mean	Std. Dev
	Strongly Agree		Uncertain		Strongly Disagree		Total			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Aware of the system	157	71.7	44	20.1	18	8.2	219	100	<b>2.24</b>	0.893
Activities are a Separate entity	106	45.7	77	33.2	49	21.1	232	100	2.73	0.961
47% is sufficient to evaluate	102	44.3	74	32.2	54	23.5	230	100	2.78	0.904
Effectively measures the performance	95	41.3	62	27.0	73	31.7	230	100	2.96	0.997
Establishes the main objectives	140	60.8	57	24.8	33	14.4	230	100	2.51	0.845
Knowledge to carry out PM	135	58.4	65	28.1	31	13.5	231	100	2.51	0.807
Sufficient materials available	83	35.9	75	32.5	73	31.6	231	100	2.97	0.920
Formally taught to all personals	94	40.9	75	32.6	61	26.5	230	100	2.86	0.881
Official interview are conducted	136	58.8	52	22.5	43	18.7	231	100	2.56	0.948
Identifies the individual performance	112	49.1	70	30.7	46	20.2	228	100	2.68	0.853
Appraisal and the AWT integrated	155	67.4	54	23.5	21	9.1	230	100	<b>2.31</b>	0.801
System should be improved further	165	72.4	52	22.8	11	4.8	228	100	<b>2.13</b>	0.795
New PM model should be introduced	171	73.7	38	16.4	20	8.6	229	100	<b>2.17</b>	0.871

### **5.3 PERCEPTION ON CURRENT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BY MIDDLE LEVEL LEADERS IN THE ARMY**

Table 5.3 provides an overview of the respondents' perception on the current performance management by the middle level leaders in the Malaysian Army. Overall the variables which have a mean score which is lower than 2.50 can be considered as significant. The respondents view on present implemented system should be improved further to uplift the standard of evaluating performance emphasizing effectiveness and efficiency scored the lowest with a mean of 2.13 and the support of more than 72.4% of the respondents. The respondents view to introduce a new performance management model/system to replace the present system to cater for changes and modernization in the organization to be effective have scored a mean of 2.17 and 73.7% supporting this view. The respondents' view that the current appraisal system and the Annual Work Target should be integrated scored a mean of 2.31 and 67.4% of the respondents.

The awareness of the existence of Performance Management system in the Army scored a mean of 2.24 with 71.7% respondents supporting this statement. This means that most of the middle level leaders are aware of the system. There are 58.4% of the respondents agree that they have the skills, knowledge and aptitudes to carry out the annual Performance Management. This statement scored a mean of 2.51 score of 2.78 states that 47% allocated in the confidential report is sufficient to evaluate an individual's performance. A total of 49.1% of the respondents agree that the current system identifies the

individual level of performance to provide a basis for informing, training and developing the person concern.

Only 20.2% of them oppose to this statement. Only portions of the respondent are not aware or familiar with the existence of the Performance Management system in the Army. This group makes only 8.2% where else another 20.1% of them are not sure whether they are familiar with the system. Respondents who felt that they have the skills, knowledge and aptitude to carry out the annual Performance Management represents 58.4% of them with the mean score of 2.51. In the conduct of this system, 58.8% of the respondents feel that evaluating officers conduct official interviews to explain their strength and weaknesses. The remainder of 18.7% feels that these interviews are not usually conducted.

The respondents view on sufficient materials are readily available for reference for them to successfully carry out the evaluation scored the highest with a mean of 2.97 and the support of more than 36% of the respondents. To the view in current system effectively measures the overall performance amongst the mid level leaders in the Army scored a mean score with 2.96 and 35.9% supporting this view. The respondents' view that the Performance Management currently practiced in the Army is formally taught to all service personals on its Implementation and Evaluation scored third highest mean score with 2.86 or support of 40.9% of the respondents.



TABLE 5.4

## FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON THE EFFECTS TO THE MOTIVATION

Variables	Frequency Distribution								Mean	Std Dev
	Strongly Agree		Uncertain		Strongly Disagree		Total			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	n	%		
PM system has effect on motivation.	149	64.8	53	23.0	28	12.2	230	100	<b>2.35</b>	0.950
Top management provides feedback.	87	38.1	75	32.9	61	29.0	228	100	2.94	0.987
Motivation due to improved report.	148	64.3	66	28.7	16	7.0	230	100	<b>2.33</b>	0.767
No feedback on appraisal system.	118	51.1	72	31.2	41	17.7	231	100	2.62	0.920
Superior might show biasness in his report.	146	64.1	70	30.3	13	5.6	231	100	<b>2.25</b>	0.811
PM enhances organization's performance.	99	43.0	84	36.5	47	20.5	230	100	2.79	0.917

Table 5.4 presents the respondents response to the effects of the current Performance management system to the motivation. Again any variables with a mean score higher of 2.50 and lower can be considered as significant. 64.8% of the respondents feel that the evaluation of performance management system has a direct effect on an individual's motivational factor. This variable scored a mean of 2.35. Only 12.1% of the respondents feel that the current system do not motivate them. Through the analysis also it is found that 64.3% of the respondents feel that there will be changes in their motivation as result of introduction of an improved performance management system. This variable

scored a mean of 2.33. Majority of the respondents feel that there will be motivational effect to them as a result of no feedback from the superiors on the performance report. 51.1% of them (mean - 2.62) feel that their superiors should give feedback by clarifying their goals and solving their problems.

The respondents state that another de-motivating aspect will be when the superiors show biasness in their evaluation report using the current system. 64.1% of them (mean - 2.25) feel this way and only 5.6% disagree with this. Only 43.0% of the respondents (mean – 2.79) agree that sufficient emphasis has been put on the Performance Management process all these years and the outcome has effectively enhanced the organization's performance. 20.5% of them disagree that the system has enhanced the organization while another 36.5% of them were uncertain. Out of 228 respondents, only 38.1% of them (mean – 2.94) agree that top management really takes cognizance and provides feedback once the appraisal has been sent up. Another 29% of them feel otherwise.

.

TABLE 5.5

## CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS ON THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN THE ARMY BASED ON RANK

Variables	Frequency %									Sig.
	Strongly Agree			Uncertain			Strongly Disagree			
	C	M	L	C	M	L	C	M	L	
Aware of the existing system.	63.4	87.8	33.3	30.5	4.9	-	6.1	7.3	66.7	<b>0.000</b>
Activities are separate entity.	42.5	54.0	-	39.6	20.6	66.7	18.0	25.2	33.3	<b>0.000</b>
47% is sufficient to evaluate.	47.1	40.7	33.3	35.5	24.4	66.7	17.4	34.9	-	<b>0.046</b>
Effectively measures the performance.	47.5	34.4	-	30.7	20.8	33.3	21.8	44.8	66.7	<b>0.002</b>
Establishes the main objectives.	63.1	61.6	-	34.1	11.6	-	2.8	26.8	100	<b>0.000</b>
Knowledge to carry out the annual PM.	60.9	56.3	33.3	29.7	25.3	33.3	9.4	18.4	33.3	<b>0.005</b>
Sufficient materials are available.	39.2	31.0	33.3	34.1	29.9	33.3	26.7	39.1	33.3	<b>0.000</b>
Formally taught to all personals.	45.7	36.0	-	37.7	24.4	33.3	16.6	39.6	66.7	<b>0.002</b>
Official interview are conducted.	56.5	64.3	33.3	29.7	10.3	33.3	13.8	25.4	33.3	<b>0.000</b>
Identifies the individual performance.	53.7	43.0	33.3	33.1	29.1	-	13.2	27.9	66.7	<b>0.016</b>
Appraisal and the AWT merged.	57.7	85.1	33.3	31.4	10.3	33.3	10.9	4.6	33.3	<b>0.000</b>
System should be improved further.	64.5	85.1	66.7	30.3	10.3	33.3	5.2	4.6	-	<b>0.003</b>
New PM model should be introduced.	75.8	73.6	66.7	21.3	10.3	-	2.9	16.1	33.3	<b>0.000</b>

C – Captain, M - Major and L – Lieutenant Colonel

Table 5.5 illustrates the cross tabulation results between the officer's rank of the middle level leaders in the Army and the performance management currently practiced. In the analysis it is found that all the 13 variables that were tested found to be significant at  $\leq 0.05$ . There were 63.4% of the officers in the rank of Captains are aware of the performance Management system compared to 6.1% who does not. In the rank of Majors, 87.8% of them are aware of the system compared to 7.3% who does not. For the in the rank of Lieutenant Colonel, 33.3% of them are familiar with the system while 66.7% are not. This variable is very significant at  $p = 0.000$ . In the performance management appraisal system or the Confidential Report 47% is allocated to evaluate an individual's performance. 47.1% of the Captains agree that this portion is sufficient to evaluate an individual's performance while 17.4% of disagree with this statement. On the other hand 40.7% of the Majors agree that it is sufficient while 34.9% of them say it is not sufficient. 33.3% of the Lieutenant Colonels agrees to this statement. This variable again is significant with a significant level of  $p = 0.046$ . When these middle level officers were asked if the current system effectively measures the overall performance, 47.5% of the Captains agree that the system effective measures while 21.8% disagree with the statement. For the Majors 34.4% of them agree that the system effectively measures the performance and 44.8% of them disagree. Surprisingly for the Lieutenant Colonel, only 33.3% of them agree that the system measures the performance and 66.7% disagree that the system is effective. This variable has a significant of  $p = 0.046$ .

Majority of the Captains (63.1%) agree that the current performance appraisal system establishes the main objectives in which the individuals are expected to achieve by end of the year. Only 2.8% of them disagree with this statement. All the Lieutenant Colonel disagrees to this statement. 61.6% of the Majors agrees to this statement and 26.8% of them disagrees with a significance level at  $p = 0.000$ . On the question of having sufficient skill, knowledge and aptitude to carry out annual Performance Management, it is found that 60.9% of the Captains believe that they have the required skills to handle the report, while 9.4% of them do not think so. For the Lieutenant Colonel 33.3% agree to the statement and another 33.3% disagree. For the Majors 56.3% of them agrees while 18.4% disagree. This resulted in a significance level at  $p = 0.005$ . 39.2% of the Captains feel that there are sufficient materials available for them to carry out their evaluation while 26.7% of them disagree. For the Lieutenant Colonel 33.3% of them feel that they have sufficient materials readily available for reference and another 33.3% of them disagree. For the Majors 31.0% of them agree and 39.1% of them disagree which resulted in a significance  $p = 0.000$ . 66.7% of the Lieutenant Colonel says that Performance Management practiced in the Army is not formally taught to all service personals both in Implementation and Evaluation. Where else 45.7% of the Captains and 36.0% of the Major agrees that it is formally taught to all at a significance level at  $p = 0.002$ .

Comparatively, majority of Majors (64.3%) and Captains (56.5%) agrees that official interviews are usually done by the evaluating officer stating your strength and weaknesses at the end of the process. However 33.3% of the

Lieutenant Colonel agrees to this while another 33.3% of them disagrees. This statement resulted at a significant level of  $p = 0.000$ . Majority of the respondents (Captains – 53.7%, Majors – 43.0% and Lieutenant Colonel - 33.3%) agrees with the statement that current system identifies the individual level of performance to provide a basis for informing, training and developing the person at the significant level at 0.016. A majority of the Majors (85.1%) agrees with the statement that the current appraisal system and the Annual Work Target (AWT) should be merged to become a single comprehensive report for evaluating performance. For this statement 57.7% of the Captains and 33.3% of Lieutenant Colonel agrees with the significant level at  $p = 0.000$ .

Majority of the respondents (Captains – 64.8%, Majors – 85.1%, and Lieutenant Colonel – 66.7%) agrees to the statement that the present implemented system should be improved further to uplift the standard of evaluating performance emphasizing effectiveness and efficiency. This resulted in a significant level at  $p = 0.003$ . Surprisingly, most of the respondents who are generally satisfied with the current system, wants a new evaluating performance management system introduced to cater for the modernization in the organization and to be more effective. A majority of respondents (Captains – 75.8%, Majors – 73.6 and Lieutenant Colonel – 66.7%) agreed to the statement at a significant level at  $p = 0.000$ .

TABLE 5.6

**CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS ON THE EFFECTS TO MOTIVATION  
BASED ON RANK**

Variables	Frequency %									Sig.
	Strongly Agree			Uncertain			Strongly Disagree			
	C	M	L	C	M	L	C	M	L	
PM system has effect on motivation	65.0	66.7	33.3	27.7	14.9	33.3	7.3	18.4	33.3	<b>0.005</b>
Top management provides feedback	37.0	40.2	33.3	39.3	23.0	33.3	23.7	36.8	33.3	<b>0.000</b>
Motivation due to improved report	58.7	75.6	33.3	34.8	18.6	33.3	6.5	5.8	33.3	<b>0.002</b>
No feedback on appraisal	44.2	63.2	33.3	36.2	23.0	33.3	19.6	13.8	33.3	<b>0.000</b>
Superior might show biasness	56.5	75.8	66.7	38.4	17.2	33.3	5.1	7.0	-	<b>0.013</b>
PM enhances performance	45.2	40.2	33.3	43.1	28.8	-	11.7	31.0	66.7	<b>0.000</b>

C-Captain, M-Major and L-Lieutenant Colonel

#### **5.4 PERCEPTION ON EFFECTS OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TO MOTIVATION**

Table 5.6 illustrates the effects of current Performance Management system to motivation. Six variables were selected in the questionnaire and the all the six variables are significant at  $p \leq 0.005$ . Again all these variables were correlated with the officers in middle level leaders. 65.0% of the Captains and 66.7% of Majors agreed to the statement that the evaluation of performance management system has an effect on an individual's motivation factor. 33.3% of the Lieutenant Colonels agree to this. This statement yields a significant level of 0.005. Surprisingly there were 33.3% of the Lieutenant Colonels who did not agree to this. 37.0% of the Captains and 40.2% of the Majors feel that the top

management really takes cognizance and provides feedback once the appraisal has been sent up. There are 36.7% of the Majors, 23.7% of Captains and 33.3% of Lieutenant Colonel disagree to this statement and this is significant at  $p = 0.000$ .

Comparatively 75.6% of the Majors and 58.7% of the Captains agreed that there could be changes in their motivation as an outcome of an improved performance report. Surprisingly 33.3% of the Lieutenant Colonel agrees and another 33.3% disagree to this. The significant level for these statement is at  $p = 0.002$ . Again there are a majority of Captains (44.2%) and Majors (63.2%) of them feel that there will be motivational effects on performance when there is no feedback on appraisal system, clarifying goals and to solve personnel occupational problems. Again there are 33.3% of the Lieutenant Colonels agrees and 33.3 % disagrees to this. The significant level for these statement is at  $p = 0.000$ . Majority of the respondents (Captains – 56.5%, Majors – 75.8% and Lieutenant Colonel – 66.7%) agrees that the superiors might show biasness when using the current evaluating system in their reports and this will demotivate them. Again this is significant at  $p = 0.013$ . 45.2% of the Captains and 40.2% of the Majors agree that all these years sufficient emphasis has been put on the Performance Management process and the outcome has effectively enhanced the organization's performance. However 66.7% of the Lieutenant Colonels disagree to this. The significant level for this statement is at  $p = 0.000$ .



TABLE 5.7

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON THE CURRENT PERFORMANCE  
MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN THE ARMY

<b>Variables: In making your assessment of the current system, do you think it has the following items?</b>	Frequency Distribution						Mean	Std. Dev
	Yes		No		Total			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
<b>Relevant</b>	198	88.4	26	11.6	224	100	<b>1.12</b>	0.321
<b>Fair</b>	145	63.9	82	36.1	227	100	<b>1.36</b>	0.481
<b>Serious Intent</b>	123	55.4	99	44.6	227	100	<b>1.45</b>	0.498
<b>Efficient</b>	127	57.2	95	42.8	222	100	<b>1.43</b>	0.496
<b>Productive</b>	117	52.5	106	47.5	223	100	<b>1.48</b>	0.501

### 5.5 PERCEPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS ON THE CURRENT SYSTEM

Table 5.7 presents the results of frequency distribution on the perception of respondents to the Performance Management system that currently practiced. Good to observe here most of the mean score are below the 3.00. For statement whether the current system is relevant, 88.4% agreed and 11.6% disagreed with a mean score of 1.12. 63.9% of the feels it is fair where else 36.1% of them disagreed. 55.4% of then find it has serious intention while 44.6% disagreed. This scored a mean of 1.45. 57.2% of the find the system is efficient while 42.8% of them disagree with a mean score of 1.43. 52.5% of the respondents find it productive while 47.5% disagree with a score of 1.48.

TABLE 5.8

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS ON THE CURRENT PERFORMANCE  
MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN THE ARMY

<b>Variables: In making your assessment of the current system, do you think it has the following items?</b>	Frequency						Sig.
	Yes			No			
	Capt	Major	Lt Col	Capt	Major	Lt Col	
<b>Relevant</b>	121 (91.7%)	71 (82.6%)	6 (100%)	11 (8.3%)	15 (17.4%)	-	0.081
<b>Fair</b>	92 (68.7%)	47 (54.0%)	6 (100%)	42 (31.3%)	40 (46.0%)	-	<b>0.015</b>
<b>Serious Intent</b>	87 (65.9%)	30 (35.7%)	6 (100%)	45 (34.1%)	54 (64.3%)	-	<b>0.000</b>
<b>Efficient</b>	90 (68.2%)	31 (36.9%)	6 (100%)	42 (31.8%)	53 (63.1%)	-	<b>0.000</b>
<b>Productive</b>	82 (61.7%)	29 (34.5%)	6 (100%)	51 (38.3%)	55 (65.5%)	-	<b>0.000</b>

Table 5.8 illustrates the results of cross-tabulation between their assessment of the current system and the rank. Out of five statements tested only one statement was not significant where  $p \geq 0.05$ . 68.7% of the Captains, 54% of Majors and all Lieutenant Colonel agree that current system is fair with significant level at 0.015. There were 31.3% of Captains and 46% of Majors who disagree that the system is fair. All the Lieutenant Colonel, 65.9% of Captains and 35.7% of the Majors feels that the system has serious intent. A majority of Majors (64.3%) disagree to this where the significant level is at  $p = 0.000$ . On the statement whether the system is efficient, all the Lieutenant Colonel, 68.2%

of Captains, and 36.9% of Majors agrees that it is efficient. Majority of the Majors disagree to this with a significant level at  $p = 0.000$ . All the Lieutenant Colonel agrees that the system is productive. This includes 61.7% of the Captains and 34.5% of the Majors. 65.5% of the Majors disagree to this with a significant level at  $p = 0.000$ .

TABLE 5.9

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON THE PERCEIVED EFFECTS OF THE CURRENT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

<b>Variables: What are the effects of a good individual Performance Management system?</b>	Frequency Distribution						Mean	Std. Dev
	Yes		No		Total			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Recognition.	211	93.8	14	6.2	225	100	1.06	0.242
Promotion.	201	88.9	25	11.1	226	100	1.11	0.314
Pay Increase.	192	85	34	15	226	100	1.15	0.358
Courses.	186	83	38	17	226	100	1.17	0.378
Other rewards.	170	79.4	44	20.6	214	100	1.21	0.405

Table 5.9 presents the outcome of perceived good effects of individual Performance Management system. Over all the mean score for all the five statements were below 1.50. 93.8% of the respondents feel that their contribution will be recognized. This statement yields a mean score of 1.06. 88.9% feels the good effect will be promotion with a mean score of 1.11. Pay increase is expected by 85% of them as the good effect of the system with a

mean score of 1.15. 83% of them expect good courses as a good effect of the system with a mean score of 1.17. 79.4% of them expect other rewards like medal nomination, participation in United Nations missions and others.

TABLE 5.10

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS ON THE PERCEIVED EFFECTS ON CURRENT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

<b>Variables: What are the effects of a good individual Performance Management system?</b>	Frequency						Sig.
	Yes			No			
	Capt	Major	Lt Col	Capt	Major	Lt Col	
Recognition	125 (93.3%)	80 (94.1%)	6 (100%)	9 (6.7%)	5 (5.9%)	-	0.790
Promotion	122 (90.4%)	73 (85.9%)	6 (100%)	13 (9.6%)	12 (14.1%)	-	0.400
Pay Increase	117 (86.7%)	69 (81.2%)	6 (100%)	18 (13.3%)	16 (18.8%)	-	0.313
Courses	111 (82.2%)	69 (83.1%)	6 (100%)	24 (17.8%)	14 (16.9%)	-	0.525
Other rewards	101 (78.3%)	63 (79.7%)	6 (100%)	28 (21.7%)	16 (20.3%)	-	0.436

Table 5.10 presents the results of cross-tabulation between their expected good effects of the current Performance Management system and the rank. There were five statements tested in this analysis and none of it was significant with  $p \leq 0.05$ . All the significant levels were above 0.03. So we could derive that there were no significant difference among the ranks on the perceived good effects of the current Performance Management system.

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to further analyze the results of the 13 statements that describe the current Performance Management system. By doing this, the significant difference between demographic profile of the respondents and the respondent's perception on the current Performance Management system can be identified. The results of the analysis are shown in Table A to F in Appendix 2.

Table A in Appendix 2 indicates that results of ANOVA analysis between the ranks in the demographic profile and the 13 statements. The result shows that there were 8 out of 13 statements to be significant at  $p \leq 0.05$ . Awareness to the existence of the Army Performance Management system has a significant level at 0.000. The mean score shows that the Majors are more aware of the system than the Lieutenant Colonel. There is a significant difference between the ranks for the statement whether the current system effectively measures the overall performance. The Lieutenant Colonel seems to disagree (3.67) than the Majors (2.66) and Captains (2.74), with significance at  $p = 0.043$ . The Lieutenant Colonel do not support (4.00) to the statement that the main objectives are established for the individual to achieve over the year, compared to the Captains (2.35), significant at  $p = 0.000$ . The Captains agrees (2.70) that the system is formally taught while the Lieutenant Colonel disagree (3.67). This statement has a significant level at  $p = 0.001$ .

The Lieutenant Colonel disagree (3.33) to the statement that the system provides a basis for informing, training and developing an evaluated individual. The Captains agree that it provides basis (2.55), significant at  $p = 0.006$ . The

## 5.6 RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

TABLE 5.11

### RELIABILITY ANALYSIS ON EFFECTS OF CURRENT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Code	Items	Mean	Alpha If Item Deleted
A1	Aware	2.2584	0.7349
A2	Separate	2.8038	<b>0.7677</b>
A3	Allocate 47%	2.7560	0.7440
A4	Effective	2.9330	0.7196
A5	Main Objectives	2.4976	<b>0.7098</b>
A6	Knowledge	2.4737	0.7142
A7	Materials	2.9474	0.7217
A8	Taught	2.8086	0.7242
A9	Interviews	2.5407	0.7157
A10	Basis	2.6746	0.7111
A11	Merge	2.3493	0.7393
A12	Improve	2.1388	0.7344
A13	New System	2.1388	0.7344

Alpha value = **0.7447**.

Table 5.11 illustrates the reliability analysis on the effects of current performance management system practiced in the Army. For this analysis the Cronbach's coefficient alpha value used is 0.6. For effects on current performance management system scale the Cronbach's alpha value is 0.7447, which is greater than 0.6. This shows that all the items in the scale are 74% reliable. However if items A2 – 'Separate' is dropped from the scale than the

otherwise (4.25) thinks that this 47% is not sufficient to measure the performance level. This was significant at  $p = 0.000$ . Interesting to note here is that the Malays and Other races (2.89 and 2.63) support that the current system effectively measures the performance level compared to the Chinese and the Indians (4.25 and 3.75). This was significant at  $p = 0.000$ .

Officers from the Other races strongly feel (2.13) that the main objectives which are expected to be achieved are established earlier. The Malays concur to this with a mean of 2.48. Generally the Indian officers are against this statement with a mean of 3.86. This statement is significant at  $p = 0.000$ . The officers from the other races feel that the system practiced is formally taught specially on the implementation and evaluation. The Chinese and the Indian officers are against this statement as they have a higher mean score of 3.33 and 3.63. This is significant at  $p = 0.009$ . The Chinese officers feel that the current system provides basis for informing, training and developing a person with a mean of 2.33. However the Indian officers are against this view with a mean of 3.63. This statement was significant at  $p = 0.009$ .

Table E in Appendix 2 shows that there is no significant difference exist between the current Performance Management system and the Corps in the demographic profile.

Table F in Appendix 2 shows that there is only one significant difference exist between the current Performance Management system and the formation in the demographic profile. Generally the officers at the division (3.14) feel that they do not have the skills, knowledge and aptitudes to carry out the performance

management system. However the officers at brigade (2.50), Unit (2.41) and Other units (2.53) felt that they have sufficient knowledge to carry out the system.

ANOVA was used again to analyze the results to the 6 effects to motivation. By doing this, the significant difference between demographic profile of the respondents and the respondents' perception on effects on motivation can be identified. The results of the analysis are shown in Table A to F in Appendix 3.

Table A in Appendix 3 indicates that results of ANOVA analysis between the ranks in the demographic profile and the 6 statement on effects on motivation. The result shows that there are four out of six statements to be significant at  $p \leq 0.05$ . Generally the officers in the middle level rank agree that there will be changes in the motivation as an outcome of an improved performance report. The Majors seem that they will be very motivated if the system is improved with the mean of 2.31 followed by the Captains with a mean of 2.41. The Lieutenant Colonel seems to be on the edge with a mean of 2.67. This yields a significant level at  $p = 0.032$ . The Majors feel that there will be a motivational effect if there were no feedback from the top management with a mean of 2.39 followed by Captains with a mean of 2.75. The Lieutenant Colonels are on the middle with a mean of 3.00. This statement yields a significant at  $p = 0.010$ .

The Lieutenant Colonels have a lower mean value (2.00) which supports their feeling that the evaluating superior officer might show biasness in his report and this will de-motivate them. The Majors feel the same at a mean value of



2.05, with significant at  $p = 0.006$ . Most of the officers feel that sufficient emphasis has been put on the Performance Management system and it has effectively enhanced the performance of the organization. The mean score for the Captains is 2.65, Majors is 2.94 and the Lieutenant Colonels is 3.67 where Lieutenant Colonels do not really agree to the statement. This was significant at  $p = 0.004$ .

Table B in Appendix 3 shows that there is no significant difference exist between the effects on motivation and the gender in the demographic profile.

Table C in Appendix 3 shows that there one significant difference exist between the effects on motivation and the Main Job Function in the demographic profile. The Instructors (2.12) and the Command appointment holders (2.15) feel that there will be change in the motivation as an outcome of an improved Performance management system. The Staffs and the other appointment holders have higher mean value (2.43 and 2.57) and they do not totally support this view. This was significant at  $p = 0.018$ .

Table D in Appendix 3 shows that there three significant differences exist between the effects on motivation and the ethnicity in the demographic profile. The officers from the Other races feel that lack of feedback from the higher authority on the performance management system will have an effect on the motivation. They score a mean value of 2.88 equal to the Malays at a mean score of 2.89. The Chinese and the Indian officers feel that there will not be effects to the motivation. This was significant at  $p = 0.014$ . The Malays officers and the officers from the Other races feel that sufficient emphasis has been put

on the system to enhance the performance of the organization. The scored a mean value of 2.71 and 2.88. The Chinese and the Indian officers do not agree with this view with their mean value of 3.78 and 3.63. This was significant at  $p = 0.000$ .

Table E in Appendix 3 shows that there is no significant difference exist between the effects on motivation and the Corps in the demographic profile.

Table F in Appendix 3 shows that there are two significant differences exist between the effects on motivation and the formation in the demographic profile. Unit officers feel that evaluation of Performance management system has an effect on an individual's motivational factor. Unit officers have a lower mean value of 2.15 followed by brigade officers with a mean of 2.36. The division officers have the higher mean value of 2.79. This yield a significant at  $p = 0.029$ .

## 5.6 RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

TABLE 5.11

### RELIABILITY ANALYSIS ON EFFECTS OF CURRENT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Code	Items	Mean	Alpha If Item Deleted
A1	Aware	2.2584	0.7349
A2	Separate	2.8038	<b>0.7677</b>
A3	Allocate 47%	2.7560	0.7440
A4	Effective	2.9330	0.7196
A5	Main Objectives	2.4976	<b>0.7098</b>
A6	Knowledge	2.4737	0.7142
A7	Materials	2.9474	0.7217
A8	Taught	2.8086	0.7242
A9	Interviews	2.5407	0.7157
A10	Basis	2.6746	0.7111
A11	Merge	2.3493	0.7393
A12	Improve	2.1388	0.7344
A13	New System	2.1388	0.7344

Alpha value = **0.7447**.

Table 5.11 illustrates the reliability analysis on the effects of current performance management system practiced in the Army. For this analysis the Cronbach's coefficient alpha value used is 0.6. For effects on current performance management system scale the Cronbach's alpha value is 0.7447, which is greater than 0.6. This shows that all the items in the scale are 74% reliable. However if items A2 – 'Separate' is dropped from the scale than the

alpha value will be increased to 0.7677 and the reliability of the scale can also be improved.

Further analysis also indicates that item A5 - 'Main objectives' is the most important variable in the scale. If this item is dropped than the reliability of the scale will be reduced from alpha value of 0.7447 to 0.7098. It shows that the variable has the most affect on the reliability on the effect on the current performance management system. On the other hand, item A3 - 'Allocate 47%' is the least important variable. If this item is deleted the reliability is least affected i.e. from 74.41% to 74.40% reliable.

TABLE 5.12

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS ON THE EFFECTS TO MOTIVATION

Code	Items	Mean	Alpha If Item Deleted
A14	Motivate	2.3519	0.4598
A15	Feedback	2.9120	<b>0.5971</b>
A16	Changes in motivation	2.3241	<b>0.4235</b>
A17	Motivational effect	2.6157	0.5253
A18	Biasness	2.2315	0.5049
A19	Emphasis	2.7824	0.5267

Alpha value = **0.5390**.

Table 5.12 reveals the outcome of reliability analysis for effects to motivation. The Cronbach's coefficient value is 0.5390. This is less than the

alpha value of 0.6. Therefore, the effect to motivation scale is not reliable and there is unsatisfactory internal consistency reliability between the items. If item A15 – 'feedback' is dropped, the alpha value will be increased and the reliability also will be improved. This shows that item A15 – 'Feedback' is not important and if it is dropped the alpha value will be improved from 0.5390 to 0.5971.

However, item A16 – 'changes in motivation' is deleted will have the most affect on effects to motivation scale, whereby the reliability level will be reduced to the lowest of 0.4235. As such, this variable is very important and cannot be dropped from the scale. Existing alpha value should be improved by dropping item A16.