

**EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL
ENVIRONMENT AND PERSONAL FACTORS ON
WORK STRESS AND ORGANIZATIONAL
COMMITMENT**

by

SOH TAH BAT @ SOH TAN MAI

Research report submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Business Administration

June 1995

DEDICATION

To Elaine, Jeffrey, Bernard and Eugene

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am very grateful to Professor Mirza S. Saiyadain for his invaluable patience, guidance, assistance, encouragement and contribution towards this project, and for being a wonderfully understanding and friendly supervisor.

I also wish to thank my family members for being so understanding with their constant encouragement and patience throughout my course of study.

My sincere thanks also go to the respondents for their invaluable time in completing the questionnaires.

Last but not least, my sincere thanks to Alice Tan, Patrick Choong and all my friends and colleagues who have helped me in one way or another in this study.

Soh Tah Bat

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | |
|--|----|
| 3.1 Study Sample | 21 |
| 4.1 Profile of respondents | 47 |
| 4.2 Means and standard deviation estimates (work stress by age) | 48 |
| 4.3 Work stress ANOVA (average age by firm) | 48 |
| 4.4 Means and standard deviation estimates (work stress by tenure) | 49 |
| 4.5 Work stress ANOVA (tenure by firm) | 49 |
| 4.6 Means and standard deviation estimates (work stress by job level) | 50 |
| 4.7 Work stress ANOVA (job level by firm) | 50 |
| 4.8 Means and standard deviation estimates (work stress by education) | 51 |
| 4.9 Work stress ANOVA (education by firm) | 51 |
| 4.10 Means and standard deviation estimates (organizational commitment by age) | 52 |
| 4.11 Organizational commitment ANOVA (average age by firm) | 52 |
| 4.12 Means and standard deviation estimates (organizational commitment by tenure) | 53 |
| 4.13 Organizational commitment ANOVA (tenure by firm) | 53 |
| 4.14 Means and standard deviation estimates (organizational commitment by job level) | 54 |
| 4.15 Organizational commitment ANOVA (job level by firm) | 54 |
| 4.16 Means and standard deviation estimates (organizational commitment by education) | 55 |
| 4.17 Organizational commitment ANOVA (education by firm) | 55 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------|
| TITLE | i |
| DEDICATION | ii |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT | iii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | vi |
| ABSTRAK | vii |
| ABSTRACT | viii |
| CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 Scope and significance of the study | 2 |
| 1.3 Definition of terms | 4 |
| 1.4 Design of investigation | 6 |
| CHAPTER 2 : REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE | 7 |
| 2.1 The meaning of stress | 7 |
| 2.2 Work stress | 8 |
| 2.3 Causes of stress | 9 |
| 2.4 The effects of work stress | 12 |
| 2.5 Organizational commitment | 14 |
| CHAPTER 3 : RESEARCH METHODS | 18 |
| 3.1 Sample selection | 18 |
| 3.2 Questionnaire | 19 |
| 3.2.1 Work stress | 19 |
| 3.2.2 Organizational commitment | 19 |
| 3.2.3 Demographic profile | 20 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | |
|--|----|
| 3.1 Study Sample | 21 |
| 4.1 Profile of respondents | 47 |
| 4.2 Means and standard deviation estimates (work stress by age) | 48 |
| 4.3 Work stress ANOVA (average age by firm) | 48 |
| 4.4 Means and standard deviation estimates (work stress by tenure) | 49 |
| 4.5 Work stress ANOVA (tenure by firm) | 49 |
| 4.6 Means and standard deviation estimates (work stress by job level) | 50 |
| 4.7 Work stress ANOVA (job level by firm) | 50 |
| 4.8 Means and standard deviation estimates (work stress by education) | 51 |
| 4.9 Work stress ANOVA (education by firm) | 51 |
| 4.10 Means and standard deviation estimates (organizational commitment by age) | 52 |
| 4.11 Organizational commitment ANOVA (average age by firm) | 52 |
| 4.12 Means and standard deviation estimates (organizational commitment by tenure) | 53 |
| 4.13 Organizational commitment ANOVA (tenure by firm) | 53 |
| 4.14 Means and standard deviation estimates (organizational commitment by job level) | 54 |
| 4.15 Organizational commitment ANOVA (job level by firm) | 54 |
| 4.16 Means and standard deviation estimates (organizational commitment by education) | 55 |
| 4.17 Organizational commitment ANOVA (education by firm) | 55 |

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini telah dijalankan untuk mengkaji kesan persekitaran dan faktor-faktor peribadi terhadap ketegangan kerja dan komitmen terhadap organisasi. Data yang dikumpul melalui soalselidik ke atas 104^{*} pekerja, 57 pekerja di firma antarabangsa (MNC) dan 47 di firma tempatan. Keputusan menunjukkan bahawa berbeza dengan tanggapan umum, pekerja-pekerja di firma tempatan, terutamanya golongan muda mengalami ketegangan kerja berbanding golongan yang lain. Manakala golongan tua di firma MNC adalah lebih komited terhadap organisasi berbanding yang lain.

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to examine the effect of organizational environment and personal factors on work stress and organizational commitment. Data was collected through a structured questionnaire on 104 employees in two firms, 57 from a multinational corporation (MNC) and 47 from a local firm. The results indicate that, contrary to the popular belief, the employees in the local firm, especially the younger ones, experienced more work stress than the others. As far as organizational commitment is concerned, the results show that older employees in MNC are more committed than others.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

With the emergence of the United States of America as the super power-house of electronic innovations and integrated circuits computer chips in the 60's, coupled with the rising labour cost in the west, it was inevitable that the American companies looked to the Far East for the assembly of their semiconductor chips, capitalizing on the cheap labour here.

Malaysia, after gaining independence in 1957 as Malaya, has come a long way since its diversification into industrialization in 1958. Coupled with Malaysia's advancement in telecommunications and transportation system, as well as government's generous investment incentives to foreign firms, there was an influx of American investors into Malaysia in the early 70's, especially in the field of electronics components. The infrastructure was well supported by abundance of cheap labour comprising principally of Malay, Chinese and Indians. They also speak good English as the language has been widely used in Malaysia.

Such influx of multinational corporations (MNCs), though helping to bring in technology, management expertise, foreign exchange, and generate growth in Malaysia, also contributed to social cultural shock to the ethnic groups of local employees working in such corporations.

In accordance with the government's policies, management has the responsibility to ensure that various Malaysian ethnic groups get an equal chance for employment and promotions. Management also has the social responsibility in ensuring that the workplace is safe, salary structure is fair, and a set of established code of ethics for the employees is followed in the course of their work. How do the Malaysian workers cope with the diversified styles of management of various MNCs?

1.2 SCOPE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This research is undertaken as an exploratory study to find out to what extent the effect of organizational environment and personal factors contribute to work stress and organizational commitment. The data was collected from the employees of a multinational corporation and a locally owned company. Both the companies under study are in the same industrial line of electronic components assembly.

A firm's success and failure, to a large extent, depends on workers' attitude in carrying their tasks and assignments. Other factors include assumptions, personal beliefs, interpersonal relationships, social structure, values and aspirations. These factors play an important role on how the workers function at the workplace.

The Malaysian population is made up of Malays, Chinese, Indians and other smaller racial groups. As such, one finds the varying proportions of such ethnic groups of workers in most of the workplaces, be it foreign or locally owned.

Each ethnic group has its own distinct culture based on traditional beliefs and practices that are rooted in the Asian heritage. The Malaysian workforce is thus considered as culturally diversified.

Researches have shown that Malaysian workforce have in common, their desire to respect elders, focus on relationships more than the task, compromising and avoiding direct confrontation. This is in great contrast to Americans' task focused bottom line results and confrontational approach in dealing with employees (Asma Abdullah, 1992).

With the advent of globalization, technological advancement and the large number of multinational corporation investments in Malaysia, the Malaysian workforce working in the foreign owned firms will inevitably be exposed to different management styles as compared to locally owned firms. Managers and employees in these firms may differ in the ways they pursue their targeted goals of high productivity and economic progress for their firms.

With the increase in foreign investment, especially by the American, there is also an increase in the number of expatriates in Malaysia managing the foreign owned firms set up here. These expatriates inevitably bring along with them the western management practices, which are definitely more professional in its ways of management and business culture. The Malaysian workforce would have to learn to adapt to such system, which is different from how local businessmen, especially the Chinese, conduct their businesses.

1.3 DEFINITION OF TERMS

Stress means different things to different people. There are many versions of definitions on work stress. Ivancevich and Matteson (1990) define stress as "the interaction of the individual with the environment". Stress is an important result of the interaction between the job and the individual. Beehr and Newman (1978) define job stress as "a condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs and characterized by changes within people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning".

Stress is normally thought of in negative terms and can be extremely unpleasant and destructive when it is caused by something bad (death or critical illness of a loved one, fear, disastrous business losses, being reprimanded by a superior for poor work performance etc.). This is a form of distress. However, stress can also be positive. Stress can be extremely pleasant and exciting when it is caused by something good (marriage, birth of a child, a business triumph, a job promotion). This is a form of *eustress*, coming from the Greek *eu*, which means "good". Ivancevich and Matteson (1990) compared "stress" with the word "sin" as "both are short, and emotionally charged words used to refer to something that otherwise would take many words to say".

Most definitions of stress recognize the individual and the environment in terms of a stimulus interaction, a response interaction, or a stimulus - response interaction. Matteson and Ivancevich (1990) define them as follows:-

Stimulus Definition:

Stress is the force or stimulus acting on the individual that results in a response of strain, where strain is pressure or, in physical sense, deformation. Stress here is an *external* event. This definition fails to recognize that two people subjected to the same stress may show different levels of strain.

Response Definition:

Stress is the physiological or psychological response of an individual to an environmental stressor, where a *stressor* is a potentially harmful external event or situation. Stress here is an *internal* response. This definition fails to enable anyone to predict the nature of stress response or whether there will be a stress response.

Stimulus - Response Definition:

Stress here is the consequence of the *interaction* between an environmental stimulus and the individual response. Stress is therefore the result of a unique interaction between stimulus conditions in the environment and the individual's predisposition to respond in a particular way.

Taking all these definitions, one can define "stress" as an adaptive response to an external situation that results in physical, psychological, and/or behavioral deviations for organizational participants. It may be necessary to emphasize what stress is *not*:

(a) *Stress is not simply anxiety.* Both stress and anxiety operate in the emotional and psychological sphere. However, stress also operates in a physiological sphere. Therefore, anxiety may accompany stress but the two should not be equated.

(b) *Stress is not simply nervous tension.* As in the case of anxiety, nervous tension may result from stress, but they are not the same. Some people can conceal stress and do not show it through nervous tension.

(c) *Stress is not necessarily something bad.* As explained earlier, eustress is something good and should be sought rather than avoided. The keyword is on how one handles the stress. Stress is inevitable. We encounter stressful stimuli (stressors) many times a day. Even when we sleep, a dream can be stressful. Distress may be prevented or be effectively controlled.

1.4 DESIGN OF INVESTIGATION

Data was collected through a structured questionnaire consisting of two parts - 15 statements measuring work stress and 10 statements measuring organizational commitment.

Work stress was measured by the questionnaire given by Moorhead and Griffin (1992). Organizational commitment was measured by the questionnaire developed by Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979).

The questionnaires were distributed to employees of one foreign and one locally owned electronic company. SPSS package was used to analyze the data collected.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter surveys the relevant literature on the study of work stress and organizational commitment and the factors causing them.

2.1 THE MEANING OF STRESS

Stress - mental, emotional or physical strain or tension - has always played a part in our lives. But it seems to be growing. In the 1990's, most of us have become overly concerned with our careers and where we are heading professionally. We are also neurotic about our children's education. We over protect them, thinking that they may not cope in this complex world. We have also become anxious about our health and old age. As if these are not enough, we are also unhappy with the environmental degradation that might affect our quality of life, which we have grown to enjoy with the economic boom over the years.

Obviously we are not alone. The modern middle class in Britain, according to Oxford philosopher John Gray, is also increasingly traumatized by the loss of certainties previously taken for granted. He described its effect as "a loss of the coherent narrative to life, resulting in a fractured sense of self" (Cooper, 1995).

In Malaysia, working life is increasingly becoming a mad rush. If one has to handle multiple stresses at work - meeting deadlines, demanding bosses, incompetent subordinates - and then having to struggle through a traffic jam

on the way home, only to be met with a nagging spouse, disobedient children or grumpy parents-in-law, it builds up. If this adverse condition persists, it wears down one's nervous system and he/she may be stricken with nervous exhaustion or 'burn-out'.

If one is brought up in a very stable, secure environment, where parents and guardians are able to nurture and help one develop appropriate social skills, self-confidence, self-esteem and a high sense of independence, one will be able to withstand stress better - be it social, psychological or environmental.

2.2 WORK STRESS

Interest in work stress has become widespread in recent years, even though the experience of stress is not something new. Work predators like work overload, nagging bosses, assignment deadlines, poorly designed jobs and non-work predators like excessive inflation and marital disharmony interact and create stress for individuals on and off the job (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1990). It is very difficult to isolate a single factor as the sole cause of stress (Numerof, 1983).

Much of the stress experienced by workers in industrialized society originates in organizations. Much of the stress that originates elsewhere affects our behavior and performance in these same organizations.

Dr. Hans Selye has been credited for his pioneering research on stress. In his books The Stress of Life (1976) and Stress Without Distress (1974), Selye conceptualized the psychophysiological responses to stress, as stress includes both psychological and physiological components. It is important

to note that stress is neither anxiety nor nervous tension. Anxiety is purely psychological while nervous tension is purely physiological. Selye considered stress as a non specific response to any demand on an organism. He developed a three-stage theory of stress called General Adaptation Syndrome (G.A.S.), which states that:

1. *Alarm Stage.* On first exposure to the stressor, the body tries to avoid or contain this stimulus by strengthening itself with hormones, and with co-ordinated changes in the central nervous system. This is a dangerous phase when the body's resistance is diminished.

2. *Resistance Stage.* Bodily signs of the alarm reaction virtually disappear. If exposure to the stressor continues and the body is able to adapt to it, resistance ensues and rises above normal. Specific bodily reactions are stimulated to contain the effect of the stressor. For example, white blood corpuscles accumulate at the site of injury to the body.

3. *Exhaustion Stage.* After prolonged exposure to stress, adaptation energy becomes exhausted. Harmful reactions start to spread throughout the body. Selye concluded that all human beings have a nominal level of resistance to stress - some have higher thresholds while others can handle much less.

2.3 CAUSES OF STRESS

Stress can be caused by individual and organizational factors. These factors can come from both outside and inside the organization and from the groups that employees are influenced by and from employees themselves.

The phenomenal rate of social and technical changes had a great impact on people's lifestyles, and this carried over to their jobs (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1980). Despite the medical advancement in protecting people from diseases, the pace of modern living has increased stress and decreased personal *wellness*, which Kreitner (1982) define as "a harmonious and productive balance of physical, mental, and social well being brought about by the acceptance of one's personal responsibility for developing and adhering to a health promotion program. The result is the potential for stress on the job has increased because of deterioration of workers' wellness in general due to their urbanized and busy on-the-go life style of today".

Financial problem and family disharmony have been found to have a major impact on the stress level of employees at work. Bhagat and Allie (1989) have defined these personal life stressors as unresolved environmental demands requiring adaptive behaviors in the form of social readjustments. Sudden changes in life can also be stressful on people (Holmes and Rahe, 1967).

In the study done by Parasuraman, Greenhaus and Granrose (1992), they examined the relationship among family role and work stressors. A survey was conducted on 119 pairs of couples in a two-career relationship. It was found that family role and work stressors were primarily related to family satisfaction and job satisfaction respectively, whereas family role and work stressors as well as work - family conflict were associated with overall life stress.

An individual worker plays multiple roles in work, home, recreation and community, very often resulting in conflicting demands and expectations. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) found that "work schedule, work orientation, marriage, children and spouse employment pattern may all produce pressures to participate extensively in the work role or family role". This is role conflict and ambiguity.

Role ambiguity results from lack of, or, inadequate knowledge or information to perform a task. This ambiguity could be due to a lack of communication, poor or inadequate training, or deliberate withholding of information by co-workers. This results in generation of stress for the individual.

Recently there emerged another important disposition on the understanding of stress in the workplace. This is known as self-efficacy. Rathus (1990) found that there is a direct relationship between people's self-perception of their capacity to be effective and bring change and their ability to withstand stress. According to Bandura, Taylor, Williams, Medford and Barchas (1985), those with high self-efficacy have a relatively low level of physiological arousal, i.e.. low adrenaline level in the blood stream. Yet, those who are under stress have high physiological arousal. Therefore, when faced with a stressful situation, those with high self-efficacy tend to remain calmer. As Rathus (1990) pointed out, "over-arousal can impair our ability to solve complex stress-related problems by elevating our motivation well beyond optimal levels and by distracting us from tasks at hand. So, people

with higher self-efficacy expectations have biological as well as psychological reasons for remaining calmer".

Kobasa, Maddi and Kahn (1982) conducted a study on executives under considerable stress who were both hardy and non-hardy. They found that the hardy executives have a lower rate of stress related sickness, and were characterized as having commitment (getting very involved in whatever they engaged in doing); challenge (believing that change rather than stability was normal); and control (believing they could influence events around them). They suggested that predisposition of psychological hardiness helps those with it to resist stress by providing *buffers* between themselves and stressors.

Nowadays, as organizations demand so much more from their employees at all levels as compared to before, such buffering from hardiness is considered to be an important quality.

2.4 THE EFFECTS OF WORK STRESS

As mentioned in the introduction, stress is not automatically bad for individual employees or their organizational performance. In reality, some low level of stress can even enhance job performance. Weiss, Ilgen and Sharbaugh (1982) conducted a study and found the mild stress (e.g. being voluntarily transferred or getting a new supervisor) may result in an increased search for information on the job. This resulted in discovery of new and better ways of doing their jobs by the employees. The extra adrenaline they get from such mild stress also lead to increased change,

activity and overall better performance. However, not all categories of job can benefit from such mild stress. Jobs like newspaper journalists and television announcers do experience greater stress, as they have great time pressure to get the assignment done on time. Physicians or police officers do not seem to benefit from constant mild stress.

Researches done by Beehr and Newman (1978), McClelland and Jemmott (1980), Ivancevich, Matteson and Preston (1982) and Abdel-Halim (1981) have also indicated that the relationship between stress and performance, by and large, may be affected by the level of difficulty and nature of the task being performed and personal dispositions such as Type A, personal control and learned helplessness, self-efficacy and psychological hardiness. Friedman and Rosenman (1974) define the type A personality as "an action-emotion complex that can be observed in any person who is aggressively involved in a chronic, incessant struggle to achieve more and more in less and less time, and if required to do so, against the opposing efforts of other things or other persons". Type B is just the opposite of Type A.

Baron (1986) concluded that there is a direct relationship between job performance and stress. Performance usually drops off sharply as stress level rises. The problems due to high levels of stress can be exhibited psychologically, physically or behaviorally by the individual.

How do employees cope with the impact of stress experienced in their work? Myrtle, Glogow and Glogow (1988) conducted a study to examine factors causing stress in public managers in Malaysia, and the strategies they used to cope with such stress. Data was collected on a small sample size of 26

managerial staff from the Ministry of Education while attending an executive development seminar. It was found that job requirement, organizational policies and interpersonal relationships were major factors in causing stress. Most respondents were able to deal with such stress with the on-the-job strategies, and they seemed to do far better than their counterparts of other employment settings.

McLean (1979) had researched and concluded that those who could not cope with changes on their jobs may suffer psychiatric disorders. Changes at work that have been blamed include promotion, demotion, transfer, new management and new processes, technological change and skills obsolescence. They often provoke unconscious sensitivities leading to symptoms of psychiatric disability in an individual to adapt to changes on the job.

2.5 ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Organizational commitment refers to an attitude of an employee that reflects his or her identification with, or, attachment to the organization he or she is working in. Organizational commitment has three basic components of:

- (1) the desire to remain in the organization,
- (2) putting in extra effort to perform for the organization,
- (3) high acceptance of and strong belief in the values and goals of the organization.

The employees exhibit a high degree of loyalty to the organization and strive to ensure that the organization is successful in its undertakings.

Barney and Griffin (1992) revealed that an employee who has strong attachment to an organization is able to overlook minor sources of dissatisfaction with the organization and continues to perform productive work within. The employee remains loyal to and intends to stay with the organization for an extended period of time.

DeCotiis and Summers (1987) define commitment as "the extent to which an individual accepts and internalized the goals and values of an organization and views his or her organizational role in terms of its contribution to those goals and values, apart from any personal instrumentalities that may attend his or her contribution".

Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) define organizational commitment as "the relative strength with which an individual identifies with and gets involved in a particular organization". In other words, it is an attitude on employees' degree of loyalty to the organization they work for. They have high regards for the values and goals of the organization. They are willing to put in extra effort to ensure success and well-being of the organization.

According to Becker (1960), an employee who has invested his money, time and effort into an organization would be more committed so as to not to render his investment worthless. Such commitment has more of a economic rather than emotional orientation (Pierce and Dunham, 1987).

In Malaysia, during the early 80's, there were quite a large number of workers being retrenched in electronic companies due to the global economic recession, resulting in increasing dissatisfaction among workers. Trade Unions made numerous unsuccessful attempts to unionize the

electronic workers. Castro's (1989) survey on American workers indicated that only twenty percent agreed that they are more loyal to their organization as compared to ten years ago while a whopping sixty three percent of respondents have lost their loyalty to same. Fifty percent of the respondents indicated their desire to look for another employer within five years. They felt angry and cheated in seeing their peers and friends being hired and fired out of the whims and fancies of some of these multinational corporations. The bond between employers and employees was lost.

Morris and Sherman (1981) conducted a survey and found that employees that are loyal to their organizations generally show lower levels of absenteeism and tardiness. Bateman and Strasser (1984) concluded that employees who have high levels of organizational commitment have higher performance and productivity. Williams and Hazer (1986) discovered that organizational commitment can be used to predict labour turnover.

Numerous studies were conducted to determine the relation of organizational commitment with both individual and organizational factors. Many studies have shown that there is a positive relationship between age and organizational commitment. (Stevens, Beyer and Trice, 1978, Luthans, McCall and Dodd, 1985, DeCotiis and Summers, 1987). Their studies showed that older employees have higher commitment to the organization than younger ones. Luthans, McCall and Dodd (1985) conducted their research on American, Japanese and Korean employees from various diverse firms and still found this relationship valid.

Welsch and LaVan (1981), DeCotiis and Summers (1987) concluded that there is a positive relationship between tenure and organizational commitment. The reason given being the longer one stays in the organization, the more one would have invested one's time and resources into it, while the alternative employment opportunities decrease.

However, Barling, Wade and Fullagar (1990) discovered in their studies that there was no relationship between tenure and organizational commitment. The reason given was based on data that was collected from 100 union members who had just gone through an industrial strike and dispute with the organization.

Luthans, Baack and Taylor (1987) studied the relationship between age, years of service in the organization and personal predisposition and the organizational commitment. In a way, an employee's commitment to his work had a lot to do with the support they get from family members and organization they work for. Organizations that put in extra efforts to increase family support activities (for example, having day care center for children of employees in the office premises) have been known to benefit from such efforts.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter describes the population and sample size used for the survey, selection and administration of questionnaires and the statistical methods used to analyze the data collected for this survey on the effect of organizational environment and personal factors on work stress and organizational commitment.

3.1 SAMPLE SELECTION

In order to have a meaningful comparison, and to avoid bias, a multinational corporation and a locally owned firm that assembles similar electronic components were selected. The target respondents were the managers, executives, engineers, supervisors and technicians who in one way or another have a direct influence on management practices in each organization. A total of 100 questionnaires were distributed to each of the two organizations. Of the 200 questionnaires given out, 108 were returned, but only 104 were completed. The other 4 had to be discarded due to incomplete filling. The return rates are shown in Table 3.1. The data indicated that foreign owned firm has a higher rate of return (57 percent) as compared to the locally owned firm (47 percent).

3.2 QUESTIONNAIRE

The structured questionnaire consists of 25 statements - the first 10 statements measuring the organizational commitment and the remaining 15 statements measuring the work stress. The questionnaire is presented in Appendix 1.

3.2.1 Work Stress

Work stress was measured by using the questionnaire developed by Moorhead and Griffin (1992). There were 15 statements pertaining to work stress. The questionnaire was translated into Bahasa Malaysia. All the 15 statements were positively worded. Respondents were requested to read the questionnaires carefully and indicate their agreement or disagreement with each of the statements using the scale given below:

| | |
|-------------------|----|
| Strongly agree | =6 |
| Agree | =5 |
| Slightly agree | =4 |
| Slightly disagree | =3 |
| Disagree | =2 |
| Strongly disagree | =1 |

3.2.2 Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was measured by using the questionnaire developed by Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979). The questionnaire was also translated into Bahasa Malaysia. Two statements were negatively

worded, the other 8 statements were positively worded. The similar six point scale as in work stress was used by respondents to indicate their agreement or disagreement with each of the statements.

3.2.3 Demographic Profile

The questionnaire also sought information about the respondent's gender, age, race, marital status, years of work experience and number of years working in the current organization, position held and years of formal education.

3.3 ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Each questionnaire was put into an envelop and distributed to the managers, executives, engineers, supervisors and technicians of the two firms under survey through the respective Human Resource Manager. A note accompanied the questionnaire to assure the respondents of the confidentiality of the information provided. They were requested to return the questionnaire in the envelope provided for to further protect the identity of the respondents.

No problem was encountered in the administration of the questionnaire except that four of the returns were incomplete and they had to be discarded.

3.4 STATISTICAL METHODS

SPSS package for windows was used to analyze the data collected. First of all, the inter item correlation was used to test the inter relationship amongst

the statements of work stress and organizational commitment respectively. In addition, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also used to analyze the results.

Table 3.1 : Study Sample

| | MNC | Local | Total |
|-------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
| Questionnaires sent | 100 | 100 | 200 |
| Questionnaires returned | 57 | 47 | 104 |
| Response rate (%) | 57 | 47 | 52 |

MNC = Multinational Corporation

Local = Locally owned firm

Chapter 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the results of the study on the effect of organizational environment and personal factors on work stress and organizational commitment.

4.1 OVERVIEW OF THE DATA

The respondents took from one to two weeks to return the questionnaire. The return rate, as noted in table 3.1, is very encouraging at an overall of 52%. Lotus spreadsheet was formatted to tabulate the data collected for ease of analysis. The results are presented under three headings : Demographic Profile, Work Stress and Organizational Commitment.

4.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The profile of the respondents are tabulated in Table 4.1 (please refer to Appendix 4), from which the following observations can be made:

4.2.1 The average age of respondents from MNC is 33.7 years while that of the locally owned firm is 27.8 years. This is expected as the MNC has been operating in Penang for the past 25 years whereas the locally owned firm has been operating for the last 15 years.

4.2.2 The respondents from MNC have longer average years of working experience (11.8 years) as compared to 6.6 years of those from the local firm.

4.2.3 The respondents' average years of work in the organization is also higher in MNC (9.4 years) as compared to those from the local firm (4.2 years).

4.2.4 Majority of the respondents from both the organizations are male - 82.5% and 87.2% respectively for foreign and the locally owned firms. This is also expected as female population in electronic industries are mainly from the operator level.

4.2.5 The marital status of the respondents showed more married employees in MNC (70.2 percent) as compared to only 25.5 percent from the locally owned firm. This is not surprising as the MNC has been in operation in Malaysia longer than the local firm and the respondents could be long serving employees of the firm.

4.2.6 For ease of analysis, the engineers, executives and managers are categorized as manager as all of them have at least tertiary education with a degree while the technicians and supervisors are categorized as non-manager. This categorization shows that 47.4 percent of respondents

from MNC are managers while the local firm has 38.3 percent managers involved in this survey.

4.2.7 Of the respondents from MNC, 42.1 percent of them are degree holders while only 27.7 percent of the local firm respondents have a degree. They were categorized as degree holders. The rest are either SPM or Diploma holders, who are mainly supervisors and technicians. They are categorized as non-degree holders.

4.3 WORK STRESS

Pearson Correlation matrix was used to calculate the value of correlation coefficient amongst the 15 statements on work stress to find out the significance of each statement with respect to the others. This was done to determine if the statements measure the same concept as perceived by the respondents. The inter item correlation coefficient values are as shown in Appendix 2.

Statement 25 did not correlate with the other fourteen statements and thus was accorded a zero score. The respective scores of the remaining fourteen statements were added up to give a single score of work stress for each of the 104 respondents. All work stress statements are positively worded.

To determine how demographic variables of age, years of service in the organizations, job level and level of formal education of the respondents interact with the firms, a two way analyses of variance for unequal number of cases in each cell were calculated using the formula given by Winner