CHAPTER XIV
STATISTICAL PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

14.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the results of the statistical analysis of the data are presented. The presentation of the data obtained from the Motivation Questionnaire, the Locus of Control Inventory, and the Transformation Questionnaire is the major contribution of this study of an organization in transformation. The scientific data will be presented according to the specific responses of participants on the Transformation Questionnaire and Motivation Questionnaire, and under headings referring to the various dimensions measured under the Motivation Questionnaire, and the Locus of Control Inventory. Descriptive statistics are used to record the numerical properties of the various distributions. Correlation statistics are employed to ascertain the relationship, if any, between the dimensions of the Motivation Questionnaire and the Locus of Control Inventory. The main independent variables of the biographical questionnaire (age, gender, home language, marital status, religious denomination, educational qualifications, salary per month, years of service, branch office/section at Head Office, and job grade) and where applicable their two-way interactions, are investigated and compared by means of discriminant analysis and multiple analysis of variance in combination with the Scheffe test. The Scheffe test was chosen because it is compatible with the overall Anova F-test in that Scheffe's method never declares a constant significant if the overall F-test is insignificant. Scheffe's method is considered to be the more powerful method if the number of comparisons is large relative to the number of means (Sas/Stat, 1990:944).

14.2 FREQUENCY TABLES OF THE TRANSFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Table 14.1 to 14.22 indicate the frequency responses of participants in percentage on the Transformation Questionnaire. The responses are sorted in categories/factors studied in the Transformation Questionnaire, and the questions are listed and numbered accordingly. Table 14.1 indicates the frequency responses regarding the objectives of the organization.

TABLE 14.1: THE OBJECTIVES OF THE ORGANIZATION.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
11. I understand the objectives of the organization as described in the Mission Statement.				
5,6	27,9	22,3	31,3	12,9
12. I identify with the objectives of the organization.				
3,4	19,7	27	36,5	13,3
13. I need a document explaining the objectives of the organization.				
20,2	34,3	13,3	28,3	3,9

Responses to questions 11-13 (Table 14.1) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Understand the objectives of the organization - 33,5%;
- Identify with the objectives of the organization - 23,1%; and
- Need a document to explain the objectives of the organization - 54,5%.

There is a definite need to further clarify the objectives of the organization, linking it to the new vision, in order to create commitment from all staff.

Table 14.2 indicates the frequency responses regarding the objectives of the work.

TABLE 14.2: THE OBJECTIVES OF WORK.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
14. I need a clearer job description of my work.				
18,9	24,0	13,7	36,1	7,3

Responses to the question 14 (Table 14.2) indicate that 42,9% of respondents need a clearer job description. This links to questions 11-13 (the objectives of the organization) indicating that staff need to understand how their job objectives link with that of the broader organization objectives.

Table 14.3 indicates the frequency responses regarding job satisfaction.

TABLE 14.3: JOB SATISFACTION.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
15. In general I am satisfied with my job.				
8,2	48,9	11,6	21,5	9,9
16. If I had the opportunity I would consider another job (not meaning promotion) in this organization.				
18,5	34,3	10,7	22,7	13,7
17. If I had the opportunity I would consider a job outside this organization.				
18,5	36,9	20,6	16,3	7,7
18. I do not care what work I do, as long as I receive my salary to survive.				
15,5	34,3	21	14,6	14,6
19. I am achieving something in my job.				
10,7	32,6	25,8	20,2	10,7
20. I regret that I accepted this job.				
37,3	23,2	9,9	20,2	9,4
21. Sometimes at work I feel as if the day will never end.				
15,9	34,8	22,3	21,5	5,6
22. I do not mind working late.				
11,6	32,6	21,9	20,2	13,7
23. I decide on my own how my work should be done.				
27	44,6	10,7	14,2	3,4
24. I feel proud of the work I do.				
30	39,9	10,3	12,4	7,3
25. I feel that sometimes in my work I do not make much sense.				
19,3	28,3	13,7	26,6	12
26. Most things in life seem more important than my work.				
4,3	15,5	13,7	42,5	24
27. My work is usually challenging.				
27,9	29,6	17,6	17,2	7,7

TABLE 14.3: (CONTINUED)

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
28. The amount of work I was usually asked to do was fair.				
30,5	46,8	13,3	8,6	0,9
29. I never seem to have enough time to finish my work.				
19,7	18	11,6	28,8	21,9
30. If my work usually requires that I do the same thing over and over again, I would like it.				
29,2	26,6	14,6	21	8,6
31. If my work requires that I do the same thing over and over again, I would not like it.				
27	49,8	11,6	7,7	3,9
32. My work is so simple that virtually anybody could do it.				
26,2	36,9	11,2	14,2	11,6
33. Despite my qualifications and experience it took me a long time to master my work.				
20,2	29,2	16,3	23,6	10,7
34. I had assistance to enable me to do my job well.				
21,5	42,1	12	17,6	6,9
35. How satisfied are you with the way in which you are treated by the organization?				
33	39,9	12,4	12,4	2,1
36. How satisfied are you with the way in which you are treated by the managers of your department/section/work group?				
46,4	17,2	19,3	12	5,1
37. How satisfied are you with the way in which you are treated by your colleagues in the organization?				
21,5	12,4	44,2	18	3,9
38. How satisfied are you with the opportunities you receive to learn new things in your work?				
36,5	22,3	30	8,6	2,6

TABLE 14.3: (CONTINUED)

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
39. How satisfied are you with the salary you receive?				
33,5	16,7	35,2	12,4	2,1
40. How satisfied are you with the fringe benefits you receive?				
37,3	21,5	28,3	10,3	2,6
41. How satisfied are you with the content of your job?				
38,6	21,9	23,6	14,6	1,3
42. How satisfied are you with the advancement you have made in your job?				
54,5	20,6	10,7	11,6	2,6

Responses to questions 15-42 (Table 14.3) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Are satisfied with their jobs - 57,1%;
- Would consider another job in the organization - 52,1%;
- Would consider a job outside the organization - 55,4%;
- Do not care what work they do, as long as they receive their salary to survive - 49,8%;
- Are achieving something in their job - 43,3%;
- Regret that they accepted this job - 60,5%;
- Sometimes feel that as the day will never end - 50,7%
- Do not mind working late - 44,2%;
- Decide on their own how their work should be done - 71,2%;
- Feel proud of the work they do - 69,9%;
- Sometimes their work doesn't make much sense - 47,6%;
- Most things in life seem more important than their work - 19,8%;
- Work is usually challenging - 57,5%;
- The amount of work they should do is fair - 77,3%;
- Never seem to have enough time to finish their work - 37,7%;
- Like repetitive work - 55,8%;
- Work is so simple that virtually anybody could do it - 63,1%;
- Despite their qualifications and experience it took them a long time to master their work - 49,4%;
- Had assistance to enable them to do their job well - 63,6%;

- Are not satisfied with the way they are treated in the organization - 72,9%;
- Are not satisfied with the way their managers treat them - 63,6%;
- Are not satisfied with the way their colleagues treat them - 33,9%;
- Are not satisfied with the opportunities they receive to learn new things in their work - 58,8%;
- Are not satisfied with their salaries - 50,2%;
- Are not satisfied with their fringe benefits - 58,8%;
- Are not satisfied with the content of their jobs - 60,5%; and
- Are not satisfied with the advancement they made in their jobs - 75,1%.

From the results it is clear that the majority of the staff don't experience job satisfaction and regret that they accepted their positions. An assumption can be made that the productivity and job satisfaction are generally low, but morale can be boosted by a work motivation strategy (see Figure 4.10).

Table 14.4 indicates the frequency responses regarding the transformation process.

TABLE 14.4: THE TRANSFORMATION PROCESS.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
43. I understand the objectives regarding the Transformation Process in this organization.				
35,6	27,9	25,3	6,9	4,3
44. I identify with the objectives in the Transformation Process.				
43,3	26,2	21	6	3,4
45. I need more information about the Transformation Process.				
52,4	30	9	7,7	0,9
46. I support the promotion of qualified females to senior positions.				
69,5	26,2	3,9	0,4	0
47. I support the promotion of qualified people regardless of race to senior positions.				
68,7	27,5	3,9	0	0

TABLE 14.4: (CONTINUED)

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
48. I agree with and support the new systems and computer programs to modernize the work of the organization.				
65,7	30	3	1,3	0
49. I wish to be part of this modernization process and desire to be trained in it.				
68,7	20,2	6,4	2,6	2,1
50. In general I feel that a transformation process is necessary.				
61,4	26,2	9,9	0,9	1,7
51. I prefer a decision-making process that is more democratic in the transformation period.				
69,5	21,9	6,4	1,7	0,4
52. In general I think I can make a positive contribution to the new South Africa.				
10,7	20,6	6,4	1,7	60,5

Responses to questions 43-52 (Table 14.4) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Understand the objectives regarding the transformation process in the organization - 63,5%;
- Identify with the objectives of the transformation process - 69,5%;
- Need more information about the transformation process - 82,4%;
- Support the promotion of qualified females into senior positions - 95,7%;
- Support the promotion of qualified people regardless of race into senior positions - 96,2%;
- Support the new systems and computer programs to modernize the work - 95,7%;
- Wish to be part of this modernization process and desire to be trained in it - 88,9%;
- A transformation process is necessary - 87,6%;
- Prefer a decision-making process which is more democratic - 91,4%; and
- Can make a positive contribution to the new SA - 31,3%.

Although the majority of the responses are positive and staff understands the principles involved, there is still a need to communicate specific details of the transformation

process. Effective communication and transformational leadership would ensure commitment to the process.

Table 14.5 indicates the frequency responses regarding work done in the department/section/work group.

TABLE 14.5: THE WORK IN THE DEPARTMENT/SECTION/WORK GROUP.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
53. Our work is discussed in our department/section/work group.				
3,9	18	5,2	10,3	62,7
54. Every member only strives to meet her/his own objectives.				
4,3	15,5	7,7	11,2	61,4
55. The people in my department/section/work group are task-orientated.				
2,1	19,7	8,6	7,7	61,8
56. The people in my department/section/work group are loyal to one another.				
3	14,6	12	6,9	63,5
57. The people in my department/section/work group gossip about one another.				
7,3	12,4	9,4	9	61,8
58. People in the work environment understand each other's work/life problems.				
2,1	19,7	8,6	7,7	61,8
59. Some workers in their work environment are isolated from the rest.				
2,1	19,7	8,6	7,7	61,8
60. We in our department/section/work group view other departments/sections/work groups as opposition or even "enemies".				
60,9	8,2	6	18,5	6,4

TABLE 14.5: (CONTINUED)

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
61. We in our department/section/work group are not part of those departments/sections/work groups with a lot of influence on those who control events.				
24,5	56,2	12	6,4	0,8
62. Our department/section/work group ignores other departments/sections/work groups.				
9,9	12,9	10,7	27,5	39,2
63. The communication between our department/section/work group and the others is poor.				
16,3	16,3	11,2	23,2	33

Responses to questions 53-63 (Table 14.5) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Work is discussed in their department/section/work group - 21,9%;
- Every member only strives to meet his/her own objectives - 19,8%;
- People in their work environment are task-orientated - 21,8%;
- People in their work environment are loyal to one another - 17,6%;
- People in their work environment gossip about one another - 19,7%;
- People in their work environment understand each other's work/life problems - 21,8%;
- Some workers in their work environment are isolated from the rest -21,8%;
- Other work groups are viewed as opposition or even enemies - 69,1%;
- Some departments/sections/work groups are not part of others with a lot of influence to control events - 80,7%;
- Some work departments/sections/work groups ignore other work departments/sections/work groups - 22,8%; and
- Communication between departments/sections/work groups is poor - 32,6%.

Communication about work in the area, as well as communication across different work areas/groups can be improved. Interventions should be considered to improve intragroup and intergroup behaviour.

Table 14.6 indicates the frequency responses regarding competence in the department/section/work group.

TABLE 14.6: COMPETENCE IN THE DEPARTMENT/WORK GROUP.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
64. The workers in my department/section/work group are not trained well enough to perform well in their jobs.				
29,2	18,9	7,7	20,6	23,6
65. Some workers in my department/section/work group do not understand their job requirements.				
63,9	12,9	5,6	15	2,6

Responses to questions 64-65 (Table 14.6) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Workers in my department/section/work group are not trained well enough to perform well in their jobs - 48,1%; and
- Some workers in my work environment don't understand their job requirements - 76,8%.

The above responses link to the responses of Table 14.2. Staff needs to understand their performance output requirements and standards, how they would be measured, and how they link with the organizational objectives. Competency profiling and assessments would help staff to identify the competencies needed for their jobs, and would give input to applicable development interventions.

Table 14.7 indicates the frequency responses regarding feelings about management.

TABLE 14.7: FEELINGS ABOUT MANAGEMENT.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
66. I think this organization is being effectively managed.				
1,7	6	11,6	12,4	68,2
67. Some managers lack leadership skills.				
12,4	18,9	4,7	2,6	61,4
68. Management ensures that newcomers soon feel “at home”.				
2,6	8,2	12,9	11,2	65,1
69. The relationship between managers and workers is not good.				
18,4	22,7	34,3	10,7	13,6
70. My manager, or person I report to, is concerned about me as a person and has confidence in me.				
67,8	18,5	8,2	3	2,5

Responses to questions 66-70 (Table 14.7) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- The organization is being effectively managed - 7,7%;
- Some managers lack leadership skills - 31,3%;
- Management ensures that newcomers soon feel “at home” - 10,8%;
- Relationships between managers and workers are not good - 41,1%; and
- The manager, or person they report to, is concerned about them and has confidence in them - 86,3%.

The perception is that some managers/leaders are not capable or don’t display effective transformational leadership behaviour. The transformational leadership competence model (Table 6.2) can be used as a guide to focus on competency building, as well as linking the competencies to perceived leadership behaviour. This can then be tracked via other surveys including 360 degree reviews and the performance management system.

Table 14.8 indicates the frequency responses regarding feelings about decisions.

TABLE 14.8: FEELINGS ABOUT DECISIONS IN THE ORGANIZATION.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
71. In general only managers take decisions.				
14,6	33	3	5,2	44,2
72. All relevant information is gathered before decisions are taken.				
61,4	9	11,6	11,6	6,4
73. Some meetings are held unnecessarily.				
10,3	22,3	16,7	9,9	59,2
74. Most planning is only done by managers.				
51,9	24	19,3	3,4	1,3

Responses to questions 71-74 (Table 14.8) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Only management take decisions - 47,6%;
- All relevant information is gathered before decisions are taken - 70,4%;
- Some meetings are held unnecessarily - 32,6%; and
- Most planning is only done by management - 75,9%.

The transformation principles of consultation, participation, and empowerment (see Land Bank Prospectus, 1998:8) need to be followed in order to ensure a high involvement transformation process.

Table 14.9 indicates the frequency responses regarding conflict handling.

TABLE 14.9: DEALING WITH CONFLICT.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
75. Conflicts are generally ignored or suppressed in this organization.				
13,3	24	21,9	8,2	32,6
76. The causes of conflict are usually investigated.				
61,4	6	9,9	16,3	6,4

TABLE 14.9: (CONTINUED)

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
77. Workers and managers in general lack skills to deal with conflict.				
16,8	39,9	12,9	3	27,5
78. I would like to be trained in conflict handling.				
10,7	22,3	8,2	9	39,5
79. I prefer that conflict be brought out in the open and handled properly.				
57,9	32,6	5,6	1,7	2,2
80. To try and solve tension and conflict will only make matters worse.				
8,6	14,6	18,9	28,3	29,6

Responses to questions 75-80 (Table 14.9) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Conflict is generally ignored or suppressed in this organization - 37,3%;
- Causes of conflict are usually investigated - 67,4%;
- Workers and management lack skills to deal with conflict - 56,7%;
- Would like to be trained in conflict handling - 33%;
- Prefer that conflict be brought out into the open and handled properly - 90,5%; and
- To try and solve tension and conflict will only make matters worse - 23,2%.

Conflict management is a critical competency during times of change and also impacts on organizational behaviour, specifically on group level. This focus should convince leaders to show courage to challenge change constructively, to deal with resistance to change/conflict through involvement and participation, and to view obstacles as opportunities.

Table 14.10 indicates the frequency responses regarding change in the organization.

TABLE 14.10: CHANGE IN THE ORGANIZATION.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
81. Many employees in this organization resist change.				
43,8	42,9	4,3	8,2	0,9
82. Changes are usually enforced by management.				
27,5	30,9	16,3	13,3	12
83. Employees can influence the decisions of this organization regarding change.				
10,3	34,8	31,3	11,6	12
84. I feel that the staff should be part of all decision-making regarding change.				
20,2	42,1	27	4,7	6
85. Staff need not be part of decision-making regarding change, but they should be fully informed about the reasons for the changes.				
30,5	39,5	5,6	15,5	9
86. My personal objectives differ from those of the organization.				
30	24,5	18,9	20,2	6,4

Responses to questions 81-86 (Table 14.10) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Many employees in this organization resist change - 86,7%;
- Changes are usually enforced by management - 58,4%;
- Employees can influence the decisions of this organization regarding change - 45,1%;
- Staff should be part of all decision-making regarding change - 62,3%;
- Staff need not be part of decision-making regarding change, but should be fully informed about the reasons for change - 70%; and
- Personal objectives differ from those of the organization - 54,5%.

The perception of staff is that the organization prefers a top-down management approach, which is in contrast to the transformation principles mentioned previously.

Table 14.11 indicates the frequency responses regarding the past two years in the job.

TABLE 14.11: THE PAST TWO YEARS IN THE JOB.

Never	Sometimes	Always
87. When reflecting on my job over the past two years, I feel that my work demands caused disruption in my family life as I worked too hard and too many hours.		
29,6	45,9	24,5
88. When reflecting on my job over the past two years, I feel I have accomplished a lot.		
25,8	33	41,2
89. When reflecting on my job over the past two years, I feel the problems around my job sometimes kept me awake at night and/or affected my health.		
24,5	36,9	38,6

Responses to questions 87-89 (Table 14.11) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Work demands always cause disruption in their family life because they work too hard and too many hours - 24,5%;
- Have not accomplished a worthwhile task in the past two years - 25,8%; and
- The problems around their jobs always kept them awake at night and/or affected their health - 38,6%.

Effective change at individual level can only occur if people are motivated to change, and get the support and recognition from their managers. Formal employee assistance programmes (life/career planning or stress management interventions) are vital to support the change efforts.

Table 14.12 indicates the frequency responses regarding communication.

TABLE 14.12: COMMUNICATION.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
90. I am consulted by management regarding work-related matters.				
8,2	21	6	29,2	35,6
91. I prefer more "mixing" socially of managers and staff.				
13,7	37,8	15,9	14,6	18
92. I need Management to consider alternatives regarding my position in the organization.				
5,6	26,2	22,7	29,6	15,9
93. I need to know not only the formal decisions of this organization but also the background of those decisions.				
21,5	43,3	7,3	20,2	7,7

Responses to questions 90-93 (Table 14.12) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Are consulted by management regarding work-related matters - 29,2%;
- Prefer more "mixing" socially of management and staff - 51,5%;
- Management need to consider alternatives regarding their position in this organization - 31,8%; and
- Not only need to know about decisions but also the background of those decisions - 64,8%.

As previously mentioned, there is a definite need to improve communication of relevant information, and participative decision-making.

Table 14.13 indicates the frequency responses regarding organizational climate.

TABLE 14.13: THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
94. I believe this organization takes care of the employees.				
9,9	32,2	19,7	20,6	17,6
95. I believe there are cliques and groups outside these cliques in this organization.				
20,6	52,8	7,7	13,3	5,6
96. This organization encourages employees to take initiative.				
21	32,2	19,3	19,7	7,7
97. Many employees always seem to have grievances.				
17,6	37,8	6,9	26,6	11,2
98. I feel I can influence the decisions of Management.				
6,4	19,3	18	34,3	21,9
99. Management does not exercise strict control over employees.				
11,6	32,6	19,7	18,9	17,2

Responses to questions 94-99 (Table 14.13) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- This organization takes care of the employees - 42,1%;
- There are cliques and groups outside these cliques in this organization - 73,4%;
- This organization encourages employees to take initiative - 53,2%;
- Many employees always seem to have grievances - 55,4%;
- Feel they can influence the decisions of management - 25,7%; and
- Management does not exercise strict control over employees - 44,2%.

These responses are also fairly negative, which is indicative of a low morale.

Table 14.14 indicates the frequency responses regarding attitudes on work and life.

TABLE 14.14: ATTITUDE TOWARDS WORK AND LIFE.

100. I find it difficult to accept new ideas	10,3	31,3	12,4	20,2	25,8	I like new ideas
101. I struggle with change	7,7	12,9	15	39,1	25,3	I am open to change
102. I need support from outside	9	11,2	14,2	30,9	34,8	I have inner strength
103. I wait to react to a situation	22,3	23,6	15	15,5	23,6	I like to plan ahead/ be proactive
104. I often have feelings of failure	15,5	15,9	15,5	23,6	29,6	I turn failure into learning opportunities
105. I think success goes with luck and change	6,9	12	12,4	34,8	33,9	I think that success is achievable and in my control
106. I like to postpone things	15,9	21,5	9,9	24,5	28,3	I usually like to start as soon as possible
107. I can cope if I limit my view and narrow it down	18,9	17,6	21,9	22,7	18,9	I am able to see alternatives to situations
108. I blame others for mistakes if I think they have failed me	14,6	10,3	14,6	33,9	26,6	I accept and "own" my shortcomings and mistakes
109. If I fail I blame myself	6,9	5,6	19,7	41,6	26,2	If I fail I still value myself and try again
110. In a new situation I find it difficult to take initiative	15,9	20,6	18,5	30	15	In a new situation I like to try and take initiative

TABLE 14.14: (CONTINUED)

111. I try to get out of a difficult situation even if the problem is not solved	16,7	18	21	29,2	15	I confront a difficult situation even if it is extremely hard to solve the problem
112. If I clash with people I am either aggressive or passive	6	14,2	19,3	42,1	18,5	If I clash with people I am assertive, I don't attack them, but neither do I give in
113. Faced with a very difficult situation I usually don't have enough determination	8,2	12,9	19,7	37,8	21,5	Faced with a very difficult situation I am usually determined to overcome it
114. Pressurized by an extreme problem I usually give in	9	16,7	18	32,6	23,6	Pressurized by an extreme problem I usually still persevere
115. If I lack knowledge to do a job properly, I do not ask others for help	8,2	22,3	21	17,6	30,9	If I lack knowledge to do a job properly, I do not hesitate to ask others for help
116. If I am cornered by a problem I try to think of the past or consider future possibilities	7,7	23,2	28,3	21,9	18,9	If I am cornered by a problem I try to think of possibilities in the present

TABLE 14.14: (CONTINUED)

117. If I am attacked or criticized I am a "blank" and cannot think of finding answers	15,9	30	14,6	28,3	11,2	If I am attacked or criticized I am not "blank" and start thinking of answers
118. I find it difficult when faced by a problematic situation to remain inside the boundaries of the problem to find solutions	27,5	27,9	18,9	14,6	11,2	If I am faced by a problematic situation within boundaries I start looking for answers and alternatives within the framework of the problem
119. I normally struggle with my work and life…ah!	30,5	29,2	15	12,4	12,9	I love my work and my life…hurrah!

Responses to questions 100-119 (Table 14.14) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Find it difficult to accept new ideas - 41,6%;
- Struggle with change - 20,6%;
- Need support from outside - 20,2%;
- Wait to react to a situation - 45,9%;
- Often have feelings of failure - 31,4%;
- Think success goes with luck and chance - 18,9%;
- Like to postpone things - 37,4%;
- Can cope if view is limited and narrowed down - 36,5%;
- Blame others for mistakes - 24,9%;
- Negate or blame themselves for failure - 12,5%;
- Find it difficult to take initiative in a new situation - 36,5%;
- Try to get out of a difficult situation even if the problem is not solved -34,7%;
- When clashing with people who are either aggressive or passive - 20,2%;
- When faced with a difficult situation, usually don't have enough determination - 21,1%;

- Usually give in when pressurized by an extreme problem - 25,7%;
- Do not ask others for help when knowledge is lacking to do a job properly - 30,5%;
- Think of the past or consider future possibilities when faced by a problem - 30,9%;
- Can't think of answers when attacked or criticized - 45,9%;
- Find it difficult to remain inside the boundaries of the problem to find solutions - 55,4%; and
- Normally struggle with work and life - 59,7%.

The majority of the responses are positive but there are still a lot of people who resist change, and/or lack skills to deal with change effectively.

Table 14.15 indicates the frequency responses regarding team building in the work environment.

TABLE 14.15: TEAM BUILDING.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
120. I am willing to put my group goals in this organization above my personal ones.				
35,6	40,8	15,9	5,6	2,1
121. I have confidence in and trust my colleagues and managers.				
33	32,6	20,2	9	5,2
122. I can cooperate with others on many levels and about many issues.				
27,5	45,5	21,9	2,6	2,6

Responses to questions 120-122 (Table 14.15) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Willing to put group goals in this organization above personal ones - 76,4%;
- Have confidence in and trust colleagues and managers - 65,6%; and
- Can cooperate with others on many levels and about many issues - 73%.

Staff is generally committed to teamwork.

Table 14.16 indicates the frequency responses regarding personal feelings about the organization.

TABLE 14.16: PERSONAL FEELINGS.

123. In my present situation I am anxious	39,1	28,8	17,6	8,2	6,4	In my present situation I am calm
124. I feel insecure	37,8	38,6	15,9	4,7	3	I feel secure
125. I am self-pitying	12,4	34,3	26,6	15	11,6	I am self-satisfied
126. I am passive	14,6	27,9	22,7	25,3	9,4	I am sociable
127. I'm withdrawn	13	33,9	24,5	18,5	9,9	I am fun-loving
128. I am reserved	11,2	24,9	24	24,5	15,5	I show my feelings
129. I try to get along practically	14,6	18,9	26,2	29,2	11,2	I am imaginative and think of new possibilities
130. I prefer routine	10,7	23,6	25,8	20,6	19,3	I prefer variety
131. I am trying to conform	12,4	20,2	21	29,6	16,7	I am trying to act independently and creatively
132. I feel ruthless / I don't care	6	10,7	19,7	39,9	23,6	I show empathy and openness
133. I feel suspicious	13,7	15,5	22,3	32,6	15,9	I feel trusting
134. I feel unco-operative	10,7	18	24,9	29,2	17,2	I feel helpful
135. I feel disorganized	12,9	28,8	26,2	19,7	12,4	I feel well-organized
136. I feel careless	11,2	13,3	21,5	34,3	19,7	I feel caring
137. I feel weak and weak-willed	8,6	16,3	22,7	33,9	18,5	I feel self-disciplined and determined

Responses to questions 123-137 (Table 14.16) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- In present situation are anxious - 67,9%;

- Feel insecure - 76,4%;
- Are self-pitying - 46,7%;
- Are passive - 42,5%;
- Are withdrawn - 46,9%;
- Are reserved - 36,1%;
- Try to get along practically - 33,5%;
- Prefer routine - 34,3%;
- Try to conform - 32,6%;
- Feel ruthless/don't care - 16,7%;
- Feel suspicious - 29,2%;
- Feel uncooperative - 28,7%;
- Feel disorganized - 41,7%;
- Feel careless - 24,5%; and
- Feel weak and weak-willed - 24,9%.

Some staff members are insecure and anxious in their present environment. Specific interventions aimed at coping with change on a personal level are needed.

Table 14.17 indicates the frequency responses regarding the future and possible stress.

TABLE 14.17: PERCEPTIONS ABOUT STRESS.

Event	Stress intensity level from low (1) to high (10) (left to right)									
Death of family member/wife/ husband	3,9	8,6	13,3	17,6	23,2	1,3	0,9	5,2	26,2	0
Divorce	21,9	24,9	8,6	3,9	10,7	1,3	3,4	6,9	18,5	0
Victim of crime/hijacking	3,4	12	17,6	16,7	17,6	1,3	4,7	4,7	21,9	0
Serious illness	18	15,9	14,6	9,4	9	2,1	5,2	9,4	16,3	0
Serious accident	15,9	23,6	11,2	4,7	10,3	2,6	4,7	7,7	19,3	0
My husband/wife is having a serious affair with someone	26,2	23,6	6	7,3	5,6	1,3	2,6	9	18,5	0
Medical tests confirm that I won't have any children	8,6	14,6	15,5	14,2	25,3	3	2,1	2,6	14,2	0
I become bankrupt and I am legally declared bankrupt	15	21,9	11,6	12,4	10,3	2,1	2,6	5,6	18,5	0
A lot of my property is stolen	22,3	26,2	5,2	9	7,7	3,4	4,7	5,6	15,9	0
I cannot cope with too much work causing me sleeplessness	25,3	24	13,3	10,7	12,9	4,3	4,3	1,7	3,4	0
I have lost my job	4,7	9,9	16,3	15	20,2	1,3	3	4,7	24,9	0

Responses to question 138 (Table 14.17) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who rated high on stressful events listed below (7-10 on the rating scale):

- Death of family member/wife/husband - 32,3%;
- Divorce - 28,8%;
- Victim of crime/hijacking - 31,3%;
- Serious illness - 30,9%;
- Serious accident - 31,7%;
- Husband/wife having a serious affair - 30,1/%;

- Unable to have children - 18,9%;
- Legally declared bankrupt - 26,7%;
- Property is stolen - 26,2%;
- Too much work causing sleeplessness - 9,4%; and
- Lost job - 32,6%.

The individual perceptions about stress indicate that some staff might be subjected to high intensity stress levels, specifically about job losses during the transformation process.

Table 14.18 indicates the frequency responses regarding handling stress.

TABLE 14.18: MANAGING STRESS.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
139. I cannot cope when people argue or differ from me.				
20,2	25,8	16,3	32,6	5,2
140. I feel like a passive passenger not participating fully when I work in a team towards a goal.				
21	33,9	17,6	21,9	5,6
141. I cannot handle responsibility when there is pressure on me.				
28,8	26,6	6,9	26,6	11,2
142. I find it difficult to think straight when confronted with difficult alternatives.				
1,3	5,6	12	48,9	32,2
143. I do not know what to do when facing major changes in my work or life and become “blank”.				
18,5	28,3	11,2	30,9	11,2
144. I feel that I am losing my self-respect and that people don’t think highly of me as a person.				
16,3	28,3	13,3	27,9	14,2

TABLE 14.18: (CONTINUED)

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
145. Lately, if I make a mistake I feel utterly foolish.				
17,6	24,5	15	33,9	9
146. I feel as I am being tested all the time and am failing.				
29,2	29,6	6,9	26,2	8,2
147. I find that small and unimportant things, which did not worry me before, are now starting to irritate me.				
25,3	34,3	6	21,5	12,9

Responses to questions 139-147 (Table 14.18) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Can't cope when people argue or differ from them - 46%;
- Feel like a passive passenger, not participating fully when working in a team towards a goal - 54,9%;
- Can't handle responsibility when there is pressure - 55,4%;
- Find it difficult to think straight when confronted with difficult alternatives - 6,9%;
- Don't know what to do when facing major changes in work or life and become "blank" - 46,8%;
- Lose self-respect and people don't think highly of them as a person - 44,6%:
- When making a mistake they feel utterly foolish - 42,1%;
- Feel as if they are being tested all the time and are failing - 58,8%; and
- Small and unimportant things that did not worry them before are now starting to irritate them - 59,6%.

Many employees experience the transformation process as stressful. Managing stress interventions should focus on coping with change, changing perceptions about change by clarifying the vision and benefits of the change, building capacity of staff by improving skills and self-confidence.

Table 14.19 indicates the frequency responses regarding personal needs.

TABLE 14.19: PERSONAL NEEDS.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
148. I struggle and need support in my work/life.				
8,6	24	33,9	25,8	7,7
149. I can openly verbalize my work/life problems at work.				
22,3	47,2	20,2	9	1,3
150. I can discuss my work/life problems with my manager/the one to whom I report.				
20,6	47,2	23,2	5,6	3,4
151. I get support at work with my work/life problems.				
17,6	46,4	21,9	11,2	3
152. I have medium and long-term objectives in my work/life.				
10,3	31,8	14,6	22,7	20,6
153. I have short-term goals with my work/life.				
18,5	34,8	22,3	18,5	6
154. I feel that this organization should discuss possibilities about my future with me before implementing the redundancy decision.				
38,2	42,5	10,3	6	3
155. I feel that I have an independent existence and that I am accepted.				
31,3	45,5	15	7,7	0,4
156. I feel appreciated for whom I am and for what I do even if I am made redundant.				
10,7	24,9	20,2	26,2	18
157. I have enough experience and courage to face my challenges.				
27	37,8	29,6	4,3	1,3
158. I still feel like smiling every day even if I am not sure of my future.				
7,3	29,6	27,9	21,5	13,7
159. I would like to talk to someone who is willing to listen objectively to my difficulties/dreams/hopes/strengths/weaknesses.				
25,3	40,3	21,9	11,2	1,3

Responses to questions 148-159 (Table 14.19) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Struggle and need support in their work or life - 32,6%;
- Can verbalize openly about work/life problems at work - 69,5%;

- Can discuss work/life problems with person they report to - 67,8%;
- Get support at work with work or life problems - 64%;
- Have medium and long-term objectives regarding work/life - 42,1%;
- Have short-term goals regarding work/life - 53,3%;
- Feel this organization should discuss future possibilities with individual employees before implementing the redundancy decision - 80,7%;
- Have an independent existence and are accepted - 76,8%;
- Feel appreciated even if made redundant - 35,6%;
- Have enough experience and courage to face challenges - 64,8%;
- Feel like smiling every day even if not sure about the future - 36,9%; and
- Would like to talk to someone who is willing to listen objectively to difficulties/dreams/hopes/strengths/weaknesses - 65,6%.

The majority of staff are not comfortable to discuss their problems with others at work, nor do they get the support they desire. Goal-setting interventions (aligned to the vision), and improved communication of objectives are needed.

Table 14.20 indicates the frequency responses regarding diversity in the work environment.

TABLE 14.20: DIVERSITY IN THE WORK ENVIRONMENT.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
160. Regarding working in groups, I prefer working only in groups of my own gender.				
15,5	20,6	17,6	32,2	14,2
161. I think that this organization and employees must take sexual harassment at the work place more seriously.				
8,6	36,9	22,7	18	13,7
162. I believe that employees should be more encouraged and protected to “speak out” when they are harassed and received unwanted sexual attention from the opposite sex.				
10,3	27,9	14,2	11,2	36,5

TABLE 14.20: (CONTINUED)

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
163. I think that we should use only English as "official medium" in this organization.				
6	6,9	12,4	28,8	45,9
164. I think this organization has to take diversity of people and cultural differences more seriously into account and assist in facilitating harmony.				
13,7	27,9	18	13,3	27
165. Diversity is part of life and I accepted it, therefore I cooperate easily with people of different cultures.				
6,9	28,3	15,5	13,7	35,6
166. I think we should not ignore the differences in culture and "get on with the job". This organization should work out a way of understanding and co-operating between different cultures.				
7,7	30,5	14,6	20,6	26,6
167. I need to be more exposed to people of other cultures in groups and courses to be able to move to a common and united frame of mind in my work and life.				
5,6	21	19,7	25,3	28,3

Responses to questions 160-167 (Table 14.20) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Prefer working with own gender only - 36,1%;
- Sexual harassment at work must be taken more seriously by this organization and employees - 45,5%;
- Employees should be encouraged and protected to "speak out" when they are harassed and receive unwanted sexual attention from the opposite sex - 38,2%;
- Should use only English as "official medium" in this organization - 12,9%;
- This organization should take diversity of people and cultural differences more seriously into account and assist in facilitating harmony - 41,6%;
- Accepted the fact that diversity is part of life and therefore cooperate easily with people of different cultures - 35,2%;
- This organization should work out a way of understanding and co-operating between different cultures - 38,2%; and
- Need to be more exposed to people of other cultures in groups and courses in order to move to common and united frame of mind - 26,6%.

There seems to be some diversity issues that should be addressed via policy and procedure amendments, awareness training, formal statements form management, and further communication of the transformation principles and values.

Table 14.21 indicates the frequency responses regarding a framework for sharing about work and life.

TABLE 14.21: A FRAMEWORK FOR SHARING ABOUT WORK AND LIFE.

I agree strongly	I agree	I am not sure	I disagree	I disagree strongly
168. I need career guidance regarding my future (my curriculum vitae).				
8,6	20,6	17,2	15,5	38,2
169. I need clarity regarding training for my future career.				
8,6	26,2	14,2	17,2	33,9
Yes	I don't know			No
170. I am available to have an open discussion with the two people who conducted the questionnaire about my work, life and future. I understand that this will be kept strictly confidential.				
25,8	8,6			65,7
171. I am available for such a discussion if I can bring a colleague or two with me.				
12,9	5,6			81,5
172. I wish to have a group discussion with the two facilitators.				
10,7	15,5			73,8
173. I wish to have a group discussion with the representatives of senior management and the two facilitators.				
10,3	12,4			77,3

Responses to questions 168-173 (Table 14.21) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- Need career guidance regarding the future (CV) - 29,2%;
- Need clarity regarding training for future career - 34,8%;
- Available to have an open discussion about work/life and the future - 25,8%;

- Available for such a discussion if they can bring a colleague along - 12,9%;
- Wish to have a group discussion with the two facilitators - 10,7%; and
- Wish to have a group discussion with representatives of senior management and the two facilitators - 10,3%.

Support structures are needed for staff members who wish to share their transformation issues, and work issues. Specific career assessments and guidance, as well as skills training for affected staff should be considered.

The following are some of the comments regarding the transformation process (open-ended question 174):

- Negotiate with employees and unions;
- No one-sided decision-making;
- Be open to employees;
- Don't treat employees like children;
- Improve communication and be honest;
- CEO follows own agenda or political blueprint, therefore no suggestions are welcome;
- Employees don't understand the transformation process;
- The transformation process should be speeded up. Currently too much uncertainty and negativity;
- It seems as if transformation is going to claim employees, customers and the Bank's future;
- Follow the correct procedures;
- Take employees' suggestions into consideration;
- The "tough shit" approach of the CEO still echoes through the organization;
- Competent people should be employed in decision-making jobs;
- The transformation process should be more transparent;
- Transformation started before all relevant information was gathered. The new CEO should have included informed, experienced senior managers to gather information in order to make decisions;
- Transformation should be economically orientated and not politically driven;
- Why do they employ foreigners in this organization if job opportunities and employment are such a huge problem in SA?;

- Affirmative action should be implemented now; and
- Transformation is a good thing, but it should include better placement of employees.

The comments above indicate some issues mentioned before, including clarifying the vision and objectives, improved communication of all transformation issues and progress, and living the transformation principles and values.

Table 14.22 indicates the frequency responses regarding proposals to assist with the transformation process.

TABLE 14.22: PROPOSALS FOR THE TRANSFORMATION PROCESS.

Yes	I don't know	No
174. The transformation process has to be redefined.		
22,7	15,5	61,8
175. Regarding the analyses indicating too many employees for positions after the restructuring process, the redundancy policy and application thereof should be changed.		
22,7	13,7	63,5
176. Given the situation that affirmative action in general has to take place to improve the position of the disadvantaged in the past, a clear policy has to be formulated and implemented.		
31,8	8,6	59,7
177. Is it possible to strike a balance between making competent employees with long service redundant on the one hand and the transformation process on the other?		
15,9	15,5	68,7

TABLE 14.22: (CONTINUED)

Yes	I don't know	No
178. In the light of severe poverty in the country, especially in the rural areas, this organization is to embark on more programmes of assistance. It may expand its operations on all levels and its financial assistance by obtaining more funds. This may result in an increase of jobs and retaining more employees.		
29,2	17,2	53,6
179. The "new" situation with its consequences in the country and in this organization has to be faced in all openness and honesty. The privileged positions of some people in the past have to be changed and the consequences have to be accepted. The disadvantaged workers have to be assisted and trained to take their rightful place in this organization.		
29,2	14,6	56,2
180. I support "think tanks" in the departments, or other groups, to discuss and present proposals regarding the transformation process.		
35,2	7,7	57,1
181. I support seminars on affirmative action.		
42,1	0	57,9
182. I support seminars on racial tension.		
48,9	0	51,1
183. I support seminars on justice towards the disadvantaged.		
37,8	0	62,2
184. I support seminars on justice towards the experienced and competent employees in the "new" structure.		
47,2	0	52,8
185. I support seminars on open, but controlled, discussions and proposals on these issues.		
60,9	0	39,1

Responses to questions 174-185 (Table 14.22) indicate the frequency in percentage of those who agreed with the statements (1 on the rating scale):

- The transformation process has to be redefined - 22,7%;

- The redundancy policy and application thereof have to be changed - 22,7%;
- A clear affirmative action policy has to be formulated and implemented - 31,8%;
- It is possible to strike a balance between making competent employees with long service redundant on the one hand and the transformation process on the other - 15,9%;
- In the light of poverty in the country, especially in rural areas, this organization is to embark on more programs of assistance. It may expand its operations on all levels and its financial assistance by obtaining more funds. This may result in an increase of jobs and retaining more employees - 29,2%;
- The new situation in the country and this organization has to be faced in all openness and honesty. The privileged positions of some people in the past have to be changed and the consequences accepted. The disadvantaged workers have to be assisted and trained to take their rightful place in this organization - 29,2%;
- Support "think tanks" to discuss proposals regarding the transformation process - 35,2%;
- Support seminars on the problematic issues, such as affirmative action - 42,1%, and racial tension - 48,9%;
- Justice towards the disadvantaged - 37,8%;
- Justice towards experienced and competent employees in the "new" structure - 47,2%; and
- Open, controlled discussions and proposals on these issues - 60,9%.

The responses above are also fairly negative, indicating low staff morale. The vision and transformation objectives need to be clearly communicated to all staff, a renewed focus on staff participation and empowerment, and specific clarity on affirmative action initiatives and diversity issues need to be given.

Some responses to open-ended question 182 regarding possible problems or issues are the following:

- Employees don't trust anyone, not management, not consultants, and not the facilitators either;
- Recruitment and selection of Branch Directors were unfair;
- Specific corruption incidents at branches were mentioned;
- Wrong decisions of top management and ineffective management practices;
- Nepotism and favouritism;

- Loss of competent individuals who leave the Bank;
- CEO disregards old management/management structures of the past;
- Employees are very negative and demoralized;
- CEO lacks people and management skills;
- Follow a win-win strategy through a honest and human approach;
- Wrong placement of staff;
- Racial tension;
- Management lack leadership skills;
- No training and development are provided to new staff;
- Total uncertainty exists among staff;
- Negativity exists among the majority of employees;
- Lack of trust between "new" top management and old guard;
- Negative image of the Bank influences business negatively;
- No meaningful, constructive relationships between new management and staff - a "we/you" perspective;
- People are turning on their colleagues in order to secure their jobs;
- Employees' inputs are not valued;
- Restructuring is taking place at Head Office but not at the branches. Redundant staff should be given an opportunity at branch level. Head Office and branch restructuring should occur simultaneously;
- Disadvantaged employees should display self-discipline and perform according to standards. Misfits should be dismissed;
- Negative employees will influence the organization negatively;
- Don't take away any benefits of employees;
- Staff have no confidence in top management while the staff is the organization's most important asset;
- The CEO has a hidden agenda;
- Don't trust the CEO or top management;
- No clear job descriptions. Perform many tasks on a daily basis that are not associated with a specific job, and don't get recognition for it;
- Discriminatory HR practices especially job levels, job content and remuneration according to gender;
- Strategic management focus on technical issues and not on people/HR issues at all;
- Strategic management is not competent;

- Management should not disregard the fears of employees;
- In the past the men in this organization were privileged and women were given no opportunities or recognition, especially English speaking women. The targeted group for AA should include black people, as well as women;
- Employees don't get adequate information regarding the progress of transformation;
- The CEO talks about participative management and transparency during transformation but one-sided decisions are taken;
- Senior positions are filled with tokens, without effective screening and selection methods;
- This organization needs a new and efficient HR function;
- Promote affirmative action and training for previously disadvantaged groups;
- Everyone is scared of losing their jobs but no one seems to care about staff;
- Transformation is a good thing but the CEO should not be allowed to lie to employees. She must be honest, keep her word and know that employees are human beings; and
- People don't trust senior management anymore.

Some serious organizational culture issues were mentioned. The alignment of the transformation strategy and the organizational culture(s) need to be reviewed.

14.3 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE TRANSFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Table 14.23 displays the descriptive statistics of the Transformation Questionnaire with the specific factors studied.

TABLE 14.23: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS - TRANSFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE.

Factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error of the Mean	Kurtosis	Skewness	N
Objectives of the organization	9,159	4,884	0,145	-0,223	0,394	233
Objectives of the work	2,888	1,643	0,084	-1,300	-0,124	233
Job satisfaction	70,472	191,018	0,905	-0,619	-0,304	233

TABLE 14.23: (CONTINUED)

Factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error of the Mean	Kurtosis	Skewness	N
Transformation process	21,538	17,643	0,436	-0,517	-0,109	93
Work environment	31,774	13,068	0,375	0,695	0,147	93
Competence	4,391	9,360 degree	0,200	-1,456	0,030	233
Feelings about management	20,558	37,058	0,399	-1,481	-0,383	233
Feelings about decision-making	10,953	6,597	0,168	1,304	0,767	233
Dealing with conflict	18,605	17,068	0,271	-0,317	0,450	233
Change in the organization	14,318	7,097	0,175	1,322	0,379	233
Past two years in the job	7,167	5,037	0,147	-0,226	0,456	233
Communication	12,219	8,137	0,187	-0,274	0,021	233
Climate in the organization	17,146	9,479	0,202	0,468	-0,070	233

An analysis of the content of Table 14.23 reveals that the scores are not normally distributed. A value of 0 for skewness indicates a normal distribution (Norusis, 1983:40). The distribution, however, is positively skewed or skewed to the right for objectives of the organization, work environment, competence, feelings about decision-making, dealing with conflict, change in the organization, the past two years in the job, and communication. With regard to the objectives of the work, job satisfaction, the transformation process, feelings about management, and organizational climate, the distribution is negatively skewed. Analysis of the values of the kurtosis reveals that for work environment, feelings about decision-making, change and climate in the organization, the distribution is more peaked than for a normal distribution (leptokurtic; value > 0,263). With regard to the objectives of the work and organization, job satisfaction, the transformation process, competence, feelings about management and conflict handling, past two years in the job, and communication, the distribution is platykurtic (value < 0,263). The standard deviations are quite high which is also an indication of the skewness of distributions. The standard error of the mean is the standard deviation of the sampling distribution of means (Bohrnstedt and Knoke, 1988:500; Shavelson 1981:305) and is an index of the extent to which the sample means

vary about the population means. Table 14.23 reveals that the standard error of the mean is not low (not < 0,1) for all the factors, except objectives of the work (0,084). The observed means of the sample are thus not necessarily good indices of the comparable population means. Therefore inferences about the population mean should be drawn with care.

14.4 FREQUENCY TABLES OF THE MOTIVATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Table 14.24 displays the frequency response of participants to the Motivation Questionnaire. Every question is phrased as a potential motivation need, and participants responded to each statement by agreeing or disagreeing on a five-point Likert scale.

TABLE 14.24: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE MOTIVATION QUESTIONNAIRE.

Agree strongly	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Disagree strongly
1. My manager/supervisor regards me as a good worker.				
31,5	37,5	9	7,1	14,8
2. I receive the recognition I deserve for the work I do.				
0,6	4,5	4,5	58,9	31,5
3. I know exactly what is expected of me to carry out my daily task satisfactorily.				
43,5	49,9	3	1,5	2,1
4. The training I receive enables me to perform well.				
10,3	24,8	0,8	47,7	16,5
5. If I disagree with my manager/supervisor I have an opportunity to discuss the matter with him.				
4,5	39	43,3	4,1	9
6. Unnecessary red tape prevents me from carrying out my daily task effectively.				
39	24,4	3,8	26,3	6,6
7. I know what the company's objective is and how I can contribute towards the achievement thereof.				
11,3	33,4	6	30,8	18,6
8. If people in our section do not agree on a matter, it is ignored rather than discussed.				
34,1	28,5	4,5	20,3	12,6
9. I feel that I am overburdened with work.				
15,6	4,9	1,5	44,3	33,8
10. If I compare my salary with that of people in other companies, I feel dissatisfied.				
26,3	32,6	24	12,8	4,3

TABLE 14.24: (CONTINUED)

Agree strongly	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Disagree strongly
11. I do not have enough time to complete my daily task.				
4,1	14,4	5,3	52,9	23,3
12. My superior notices my hard work and gives me the necessary recognition for it.				
2,1	3	9,8	46,9	38,3
13. I have sufficient time to familiarize myself with new work and sections of work.				
1,9	6,2	37,5	34,9	19,5
14. The training I receive enables me to perform to the best of my ability.				
4,9	28	7,5	34,1	25,5
15. If I do my part I have sufficient opportunities for promotion.				
2,6	4,7	0,6	39,4	52,7
16. My senior is interested in the work that I do.				
7,1	6	0,8	49,7	36,4
17. If I do my work well, I receive the necessary recognition.				
0,6	2,3	2,8	51,8	42,6
18. I have sufficient opportunity to rotate and become familiar with new tasks.				
3,8	9	37,3	34,1	15,8
19. My present circumstances are much better than those of people who have been newly appointed in the company.				
5,8	4,5	1,5	65,9	22,3
20. My potential is fully utilized.				
0,4	3,9	0,2	45,8	49,7
21. I believe that the remuneration package I receive is in line with that of my peer group in other companies.				
4,1	0,9	31,5	32,1	31,3
22. My career planning is just as important to my superior as to myself.				
1,3	4,5	9	35,1	50,1
23. My manager/supervisor always tries to place me in a post where my potential can be best utilized.				
2,8	6	0	26,6	64,5
24. I believe that the interests of the branch or section enjoy priority over those of the employee and that career planning is jeopardized in the process.				
52,2	27	6,8	6	8,1
25. My workload is of such a nature that I can give sufficient attention to my tasks.				
36	43,9	2,3	12	5,8
26. I have felt part of the organization since being appointed here.				
5,8	9,2	3	35,6	46,3
27. I envisage a career for myself in this organization.				
3,6	2,3	7,1	40	47,1
28. My senior understands me and understands my point of view when I have a problem.				
3	23,5	35,1	21,4	17,1
29. I am satisfied with the progress I am making in my career in this company.				
0,6	0	4,5	44,3	50,7

TABLE 14.24: (CONTINUED)

Agree strongly	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Disagree strongly
30. The team spirit in our branch or section is very good.				
0,6	3,8	4,5	40,9	50,3
31. I know at all times what is expected of me.				
36,8	42	1,5	9,4	10,3
32. My senior communicates with me in a very acceptable manner.				
7,3	13,5	0	49,9	29,3
33. My present working environment contributes to my job satisfaction.				
2,1	0,8	0	31,9	65,3
34. I would like to work for another company if I could.				
61,2	33	1,5	1,5	2,8
35. I would like to work in another section.				
8,8	15,4	23,3	32,3	20,3
36. I feel that I am being kept in one section too long, which could jeopardize my career.				
15	18,4	54,6	7,5	4,5
37. I feel sure of my work each day.				
5,8	0,8	6,2	44,1	43,2
38. In our branch or section people understand one another and we work well together.				
4,3	0,8	4,5	45,4	45
39. I feel that people who started working in the company long after me are better off financially than I am.				
17,8	8,6	24,8	26,3	22,6

The findings of Table 14.24 are discussed next. Responses to questions 1-39 indicate the frequency of those who agreed with the statements (1/2 on the rating scale):

- My manager/supervisor regards me as a good worker - 69%;
- I receive the recognition I deserve for the work I do - 5,1%;
- I know exactly what is expected of me to carry out my daily task satisfactorily - 93,4%;
- The training I receive enables me to perform well - 35,1%;
- If I disagree with my manager/supervisor I have an opportunity to discuss the matter with him/her - 43,5%;
- Unnecessary red tape prevents me from carrying out my daily task effectively - 63,4%;
- I know what the company's objective is and how I can contribute towards the achievement thereof - 44,7%;
- If people in our section do not agree on a matter, it is ignored rather than discussed - 62,6%;
- I feel that I am overburdened with work - 20,5%;

- If I compare my salary with that of people in other companies, I feel dissatisfied - 58,9%;
- I do not have enough time to complete my daily task - 18,5%;
- My superior notices my hard work and gives me the necessary recognition for it - 5,1%;
- I have sufficient time to familiarize myself with new work and sections - 8,1%;
- The training I receive enables me to perform to the best of my ability - 32,9%;
- If I do my part I have sufficient opportunities for promotion - 7,3%;
- My senior is interested in the work that I do - 13,1%;
- If I do my work well, I receive the necessary recognition - 2,9%;
- I have sufficient opportunity to rotate and become familiar with new tasks - 12,8%;
- My present circumstances are much better than those of people who have been newly appointed in the company - 10,3%;
- My potential is fully utilized - 4,3%;
- I believe that the remuneration package I receive is in line with that of my peer group in other companies - 5%;
- My career planning is just as important to my superior as to myself - 5,8%;
- My manager/supervisor always tries to place me in a post where my potential can be best utilized - 8,8%;
- I believe that the interests of the branch or section enjoy priority over those of the employee and that career planning is jeopardized in the process - 79,2%;
- My work load is of such a nature that I can give sufficient attention to my tasks - 79,9%;
- I have felt part of the organization since being appointed here - 15%;
- I envisage a career for myself in this organization - 5,9%;
- My senior understands me and understands my point of view when I have a problem - 26,5%;
- I am satisfied with the progress I am making in my career in this organization - 0,6%;
- The team spirit in our branch or section is very good - 4,4%;
- I know at all times what is expected of me - 78,8%;
- My senior communicates with me in a very acceptable manner - 20,8%;
- My present working environment contributes to my job satisfaction - 2,9%;
- I would like to work for another company if I could - 94,2%;

- I would like to work in another section - 24,2%;
- I feel that I am being kept in one section too long, which could jeopardize my career - 33,4%;
- I feel sure of my work each day - 6,6%;
- In our branch or section people understand one another and we work well together - 5,1%; and
- I feel that people who started working in the company long after me, are better of financially than I am - 26,4%.

Although employees generally know what is expected of them to perform their daily tasks, they need clarity on the new vision and objectives of the organization. Communication seems to be an issue, specifically around problems or conflict in the work environment. There is a need to improve people-management practices that impact on work motivation, including job security, training, growth opportunities, recognition, and utilization of potential. The vast majority of respondents do not think that the morale within their team is good, nor do they feel part of the organization (commitment). They also don't envisage a future within this organization.

The data will be discussed further under headings referring to various dimensions identified through a factor analysis for the Motivation, and Locus of Control Questionnaires.

14.5 DIMENSION PERSONAL JOB SATISFACTION

Table 14.25 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the personal job satisfaction dimension by qualification groups for Head Office.

TABLE 14.25: PERSONAL JOB SATISFACTION BY QUALIFICATION GROUP FOR HEAD OFFICE STAFF.

Personal job satisfaction count	Qualification groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric qualified	Tertiary qualified	Row total
27	100 1 0,8		1 0,8
29	100 3,1 2,4		3 2,4
30	90 9,2 7,1	10 3,4 0,8	10 7,9
31	100 6,1 4,7		6 4,7
32	100 8,2 6,3		8 6,3
33	66,7 4,1 3,1	33,3 6,9 1,6	6 4,7
34	85 17,3 13,4	15 10,3 2,4	20 15,7
35	100 8,2 6,3		8 6,3
36	65,6 21,4 16,5	34,4 37,9 8,7	32 25,2
37	45 9,2 7,1	55 37,9 8,7	20 15,7
38	100 12,2 9,4		12 9,4

TABLE 14.25: (CONTINUED)

Personal job satisfaction count	Qualification groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric qualified	Tertiary qualified	Row total
39		100 3,4 0,8	1 0,8
Total Frequency Total Pct	98 77,2	29 22,8	127 100

According to Table 14.25 the scores tend to aggregate in the middle and higher class intervals, which indicates a tendency towards personal job dissatisfaction for the Head Office staff. This is specifically true for respondents with tertiary education where 96,6% of their responses aggregate in the middle to higher class intervals.

Table 14.26 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the personal job satisfaction dimension by qualification groups for the branch network.

TABLE 14.26: PERSONAL JOB SATISFACTION BY QUALIFICATION GROUP FOR BRANCH STAFF.

Personal job satisfaction count	Qualification groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric qualified	Tertiary qualified	Row total
17	100 0,6 0,5		2 0,5
20	100 0,3 0,2		1 0,2
22	100 2,2 2		8 2

TABLE 14.26: (CONTINUED)

Personal job satisfaction count	Qualification groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric qualified	Tertiary qualified	Row total
23	100 2,2 2		8 2
24	100 1,1 1		4 1
27	100 1,9 1,7		7 1,7
28	100 2,2 2		8 2
29	100 0,3		1 0,2
30	90,3 7,7 6,9	9,7 7 0,7	31 7,6
31	94,7 5 4,4	5,3 2,3 0,2	19 4,7
32	85,2 6,3 5,7	14,8 9,3 1	27 6,7
33	74,4 8,8 7,9	25,6 25,6 2,7 43 10,6	
34	90,3 17,9 16	9,7 16,3 1,7	72 17,7
35	100 18,5 16,5		67 16,5

TABLE 14.26: (CONTINUED)

Personal job satisfaction count	Qualification groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric qualified	Tertiary qualified	Row total
36	86,2 15,4 13,8	13,8 20,9 2,2	65 16
37	82,8 6,6 5,9	17,2 11,6 1,2	29 7,1
38	100 3 2,7		11 2,7
39		100 7 0,7	3 0,7
Total Frequency Total Pct	363 89,4	43 10,6	406 100

Table 14.26 indicates that for the matric educated respondents, 9,6% of their responses aggregate in the lower class intervals which indicates a tendency towards personal job satisfaction. For the rest of the matric and tertiary educated respondents the scores tend to aggregate in the middle and higher class intervals, which indicate a tendency towards personal job dissatisfaction for those in the branch network.

Table 14.27 displays the descriptive statistics of the personal job satisfaction dimension.

TABLE 14.27: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS - PERSONAL JOB SATISFACTION.

Organizational Factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Skewness	N
AGE: 18 – 20 years	33,390	3,516	0,439	4,771	-2,128	64
AGE: 21 – 25 years	33,311	4,037	0,312	4,067	-2,005	167
Age: 26 – 30 years	34,288	3,557	0,318	3,135	-1,760	125
Age: 31 – 40 years	34,516	2,811	0,291	0,255	-0,824	93
Age: 41 years and older	32,142	1,920	0,209	-1,504	-0,082	84
Married	33,529	3,813	0,223	3,736	-1,760	291
Unmarried or Divorced	33,632	3,022	0,194	2,449	-1,356	242
Reformed Churches and Dutch Reformed Church	33,501	3,672	0,177	3,461	-1,736	429
Other church groups	33,884	2,482	0,243	-0,892	0,041	104
Qualification: Matric	33,362	3,582	0,166	3,387	-1,655	461
Tertiary qualified	34,944	2,257	0,266	-0,462	-0,405	72
Less than three years of service	33,358	3,932	0,343	2,155	-1,727	131
Three to five years of service	33,438	3,941	0,334	5,190	-2,026	139
Six to ten years of service	34,351	3,036	0,292	5,115	-1,991	108
More than 11 years of service	33,375	2,817	0,230	-0,790	-0,148	149
Head Office staff	34,653	2,604	0,231	-0,310	-0,732	127
Branch staff	33,238	3,641	0,180	3,453	-1,703	406

An analysis of the content of Table 14.27 reveals that the scores according to personal job satisfaction are not normally distributed as the values for skewness are either greater

or less than zero (0). Except for other church groups, the distribution for all the independent variables is negatively skewed, or skewed to the left, as the tail of the distribution is towards smaller values. An analyses of the value for kurtosis reveals that the distribution is more peaked than normal -the distribution is leptokurtic (value > 0,263) for subjects in the age groups 18 -30 years, marital status, the Reformed Church, Reformed (Hervormd) Church, and Dutch Reformed Church groups, subjects with matric, subjects with up to ten years of service, and branch staff. The distribution is platykurtic (value < 0,263) for subjects in the age group 31 years and over, subjects in other church groups, tertiary qualified subjects, subjects with more than 11 years of service, and Head Office staff. The standard deviation is quite high which is also an indication of the skewness of the distribution. The standard error of the mean is high for all the organizational factors, which implies that the observed means are deviant to some extent from the comparable population means, and therefore inferences about the population cannot be drawn with absolute confidence.

The influence of the independent variables (factors) (discussed in Chapter XIII) and their two-way interaction effects on personal job satisfaction were investigated by means of Anova, and the calculations pertaining to this analysis of variance are presented in Table 14.28.

TABLE 14.28: ANOVA: PERSONAL JOB SATISFACTION BY ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS.

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Model	81	2922,77	36,08	4,66	0,0001*
Error	442	3425,82	7,75		
Corrected total	523	6348,60			
	R-square	C.V.	Root MSE	Job sat. Mean	
	0,460381	8,28	2,78	33,59	

TABLE 14.28: (CONTINUED)

Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Age	4	292,76	73,19	9,44	0,0001*
Gender	1	108,16	108,16	13,95	0,0002*
Language	1	16,37	16,37	2,11	0,1468
Marital status	1	12,57	12,57	1,62	0,2035
Religious denomination	1	3,48	3,48	0,45	0,5029
Education	1	75,03	75,03	9,68	0,0020*
Salary	5	107,37	21,47	2,77	0,0177*
Branch	1	70,42	70,42	9,09	0.0027*
Job grade	4	30,79	7,69	0,99	0,4109
Age*Gender	4	170,16	42,54	5,49	0,0003*
Age*Language	4	47,67	11,91	1,54	0,1902
Age*Marital status	4	531,77	132,94	17,15	0.0001*
Age*Religious denomination	2	33,37	16,68	2,15	0,1174
Age*Education	4	11,60	2,90	0,37	0,8269
Age*Salary	5	287,00	57,41	7,41	0,0001*
Age*Branch	4	71,06	17,75	2,29	0,0589
Age*Grade	6	216,93	36,15	4,66	0,0001*
Gender*Language	1	0,12	0,12	0,02	0,9010
Gender*Marital status	1	10,36	10,36	1,34	0,2482
Gender*Religious denomination	1	88,08	88,08	11,36	0,0008*
Gender*Education	1	1,00	1,00	0,13	0,7190
Gender*Branch	1	9,12	9,12	1,18	0,2784
Language*Marital status	1	25,00	25,00	3,23	0,0732
Language*Salary	1	0,07	0,07	0,01	0,9213
Language*Branch	1	85,41	85,41	11,02	0,0010*
Language*Grade	1	70,98	70,98	9,16	0,0026*
Marital status*Religious denomination	1	40,58	40,58	5,24	0,0226*
Marital status*Education	1	0,14	0,14	0,02	0,8921
Marital status*Salary	3	174,82	58,27	7,52	0,0001*

TABLE 14.28: (CONTINUED)

Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Marital status*Branch	1	18,64	18,64	2,41	0,1216
Marital status*Grade	1	9,42	9,42	1,22	0,2709
Religious denomination*Branch	1	9,18	9,18	1,19	0,2769
* $p \leq 0,05$					

The information in Table 14.28 shows that significant differences are prevalent among the independent variables in respect of personal job satisfaction. The overall F-ratio is significant ($F = 4,66$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). This ratio, however, does not pinpoint the particular independent variables concerned. The first of these is age ($F = 9,44$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Secondly, gender provided significant differences ($F = 13,95$, $p = 0,0002 < p = 0,05$). The third significant variable was education ($F = 9,68$, $p = 0,0020 < p = 0,05$). The fourth significant variable was salary ($F = 2,77$, $p = 0,0177 < p = 0,05$). The fifth significant variable was branch ($F = 9,09$, $p = 0,0027 < p = 0,05$). Significant two-way interaction effects were also detected. The first of these are age by gender ($F = 5,49$, $p = 0,0003 < p = 0,05$). Secondly, the interaction effect of age by marital status was also significant ($F = 17,15$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The third significant two-way interaction effect was between age by salary ($F = 7,41$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Fourthly, the two-way interaction effect of age by grade ($F = 4,66$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Fifthly, the two-way interaction effect of gender by religious denomination ($F = 11,36$, $p = 0,0008 < p = 0,05$). The sixth significant two-way interaction effect was language by branch ($F = 11,02$, $p = 0,0010 < p = 0,05$). The seventh significant two-way interaction effect was language by grade ($F = 9,16$, $p = 0,0026 < p = 0,05$). The eighth significant two-way interaction effect was marital status by religious denomination ($F = 5,24$, $p = 0,0226 < p = 0,05$). The ninth significant two-way interaction effect was marital status by salary ($F = 7,52$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$).

Post hoc comparisons were done by means of a Scheffé-test to determine significant differences, if any, between the means of the subgroups in regard to the main factors age, gender, education, and branch.

In regard to age, the age groups 18-30 years, and 31 years and over were compared. In this comparison $t = 2,39$ so that $F' = 5,71$ (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom

(df) is significant (F ' = 5,71 > F = 3,04 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05). In regard to gender, the male and female groups were compared. In this comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F = 2,14 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05). In regard to education the matric group was compared with the tertiary education group. In this comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F 3,86 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05). In regard to branch location the group at Head Office were compared to the branch network. In this comparison t = 2,82 so that F ' = 7,95 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 7,95 > F = 2,39 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05).

14.6 DIMENSION SOCIAL AND ESTEEM NEEDS

Table 14.29 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the social and esteem needs dimension by age group for males.

TABLE 14.29: SOCIAL AND ESTEEM NEEDS BY AGE GROUP FOR MALES.

Social and esteem needs count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and over	Row total
25		50 4,5 1,6	50 5,8 1,6			8 3,3
26		40 9,1 3,3	40 11,6 3,3	20 8,2 1,6		20 8,1
27		60 13,6 4,9	20 5,8 1,6	20 8,2 1,6		20 8,1
28		37,5 13,6 4,9	37,5 17,4 4,9	12,5 8,2 1,6	12,5 11,1 1,6	32 13

TABLE 14.29: (CONTINUED)

Social and esteem needs count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and over	Row total
29		25 9,1 3,3	50 23,2 6,5	25 16,3 3,3		32 13
30		30 13,6 4,9	20 11,6 3,3	20 16,3 3,3	30 33,3 4,9	40 16,3
31		18,2 4,5 1,6	40,9 13 3,7	22,7 10,2 2	18,2 11,1 1,6	22 8,9
32	11,1 100 1,6	33,3 13,6 4,9	11,1 5,8 1,6	11,1 8,2 1,6	33,3 33,3 4,9	36 14,6
33		33,3 4,5 1,6		33,3 8,2 1,6	33,3 11,1 1,6	12 4,9
34			100 5,8 1,6			4 1,6
35		100 4,5 1,6				4 1,6
36		33,3 4,5 1,6		66,7 16,3 3,3		12 4,9
39		100 4,5 1,6				4 1,6
Total Frequency Total Pct	4 1,6	88 35,8	69 28	49 19,9	36 14,6	246 100

Table 14.29 indicates that 45,5% of the responses aggregate in the lower to middle class intervals which indicates a tendency towards social needs. This specifically is true for the younger than 41 years male respondents. The 41 years and older male responses

aggregate in the middle order class intervals, which indicate that, the social and esteem needs for these respondents are less prominent.

Table 14.30 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the social and esteem needs dimension by age group for females.

TABLE 14.30: SOCIAL AND ESTEEM NEEDS BY AGE GROUP FOR FEMALES.

Social and esteem needs count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and over	Row total
24			100 7,1 1,4			4 1,4
25	50 6,7 1,4		50 7,1 1,4			8 2,8
26	12,5 6,7 1,4	12,5 5,1 1,4	50 28,6 5,6	25 18,2 2,8		32 11,1
27	33,3 13,3 2,8	50 15,2 4,2			16,7 8,3 1,4	24 8,4
28	55,6 33,3 7	11,1 5,1 1,4	22,2 14,3 2,8		11,1 8,3 1,4	36 12,5
29	7,7 5 1	51,3 25,3 7	20,5 14,3 2,8	10,3 9,1 1,4	10,3 8,3 1,4	39 13,6
30	26,5 15 3,1	11,8 5,1 1,4	11,8 7,1 1,4	26,5 20,5 3,1	23,5 16,7 2,8	34 11,8
31	10,3 6,7 1,4	20,5 10,1 2,8	20,5 14,3 2,8	28,2 25 3,8	20,5 16,7 2,8	39 13,6

TABLE 14.30: (CONTINUED)

Social and esteem needs count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and over	Row total
32	12,1 6,7 1,4	39,4 16,5 4,5	12,1 7,1 1,4		36,4 25 4,2	33 11,5
33	16 6,7 1,4	20 6,3 1,7		48 27,3 4,2	16 8,3 1,4	25 8,7
34		55,6 6,3 1,7			44,4 8,3 1,4	9 3,1
39		100 5,1 1,4				4 1,4
Total Frequency Total Pct	60 20,9	79 27,5	56 19,5	44 15,3	48 16,7	287 100

Table 14.30 indicates that 49,8% of the responses aggregate in the lower to middle class intervals which indicates a tendency towards social needs. This specifically is true for the younger than 41 years female respondents. The 41 years and older female responses aggregate in the middle order class intervals, which indicate that the social and esteem needs for these respondents are less prominent.

Table 14.31 displays the descriptive statistics of the dimension social and esteem needs.

TABLE 14.31: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS – SOCIAL AND ESTEEM NEEDS.

Organizational Factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Skewness	N
Age: 18 – 20 years	28,890	2,226	0,278	-0,808	0,248	64
Age: 21 – 25 years	30,149	3,257	0,252	0,667	0,901	167
Age: 26 – 30 years	28,504	2,378	0,212	-0,590	0,128	125
Age: 31 – 40 years	30,430	2,763	0,286	-0,358	0,196	93
Age: 41 years and older	30,809	1,773	0,193	-0,439	-0,394	84
Married	29,701	2,886	0,169	1,245	0,958	291
Unmarried or Divorced	29,842	2,674	0,171	-0,288	-0,061	242
Reformed Churches and Dutch Reformed Church	29,727	2,946	0,142	0,524	0,585	429
Other church groups	29,923	2,027	0,198	-0,826	0,163	104
Qualification: Matric	29,945	2,772	0,129	0,743	0,586	461
Tertiary qualified	28,611	2,646	0,311	-0,582	0,378	72
Less than three years of service	29,580	2,871	0,250	-0,603	0,280	131
Three to five years of service	29,863	3,128	0,265	1,885	1,337	139
Six to ten years of service	28,259	2,163	0,208	-0,931	-0,003	108
More than eleven years of service	30,885	2,282	0,186	0,232	-0,064	149
Head Office staff	29,322	2,449	0,217	0,008	0,086	127
Branch staff	29,903	2,878	0,142	0,565	0,599	406

An analysis of the content of Table 14.31 reveals that the scores of the social and esteem needs are also not normally distributed as the values for skewness are either

greater or less than zero (0). For the subjects in the age group 41 years and over, unmarried or divorced subjects, those with more than six years of service, the distribution is negatively skewed, or skewed to the left, as the tail of the distribution is towards smaller values. For all the other independent variables the distribution is positively skewed, or skewed to the right, as the tail of the distribution is towards larger values. An analysis of the value for kurtosis reveals that the distribution is more peaked than normal (the distribution is leptokurtic; value > 0,263) for subjects in the age group 21-25 years, married subjects, the Reformed-, Reformed (Hervormd), and Dutch Reformed Church groups subjects, subjects with matric, those with three to five years of service, and branch subjects. The distribution is less peaked than normal (the distribution is platykurtic; value < 0,263) for the age group 18-20 years, and 26 years and over, unmarried or divorced subjects, subjects from other church groups, tertiary qualified subjects, those with less than three years service, those with six years and more of service, and Head Office subjects. The standard deviation is quite high which is also an indication of the skewness of the distribution. The standard error of the mean is also high for all the organizational factors, and therefore inferences about the population cannot be drawn with confidence.

The influence of the independent variables (organizational factors) and their two-way interaction effects on social and esteem needs were investigated by means of Anova. The calculations pertaining to these analyses of variance are presented in Table 14.32.

TABLE 14.32: ANOVA: SOCIAL AND ESTEEM NEEDS BY ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS.

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Model	81	2111,72	26,07	5,69	0,0001*
Error	442	2025,51	4,58		
Corrected total	523	4137,24			
	R-square	C.V.	Root MSE	Social and esteem needs Mean	
	0,510419	7,19	2,14	29,75	
Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Age	4	408,96	102,24	22,31	0,0001*
Gender	1	14,52	14,52	3,17	0,0757
Language	1	14,88	14,88	3,25	0,0722
Marital status	1	2,98	2,98	0,65	0,4198
Religious denomination	1	2,53	2,53	0,55	0,4570
Education	1	92,05	25,99	5,67	0,0001*
Salary	5	129,97	21,47	2,77	0,0177*
Branch	1	24,34	24,34	5,31	0,0216*
Job grade	4	226,91	56,72	12,38	0,0001*
Age*Gender	4	1165,63	41,40	9,04	0,0001*
Age*Language	4	100,89	25,22	5,50	0,0002*
Age*Marital status	4	15,27	3,81	0,83	0,5045
Age*Religious denomination	2	22,68	11,34	2,48	0,0853
Age*Education	4	141,24	35,31	7,71	0,0001*
Age*Salary	5	134,26	26,85	5,86	0,0001*
Age*Branch	4	36,00	9,00	1,96	0,0990
Age*Grade	6	89,02	14,83	3,24	0,0040*
Gender*Language	1	2,88	2,88	0,63	0,4283
Gender*Marital status	1	14,78	14,78	3,23	0,0731
Gender*Religious denomination	1	2,56	2,56	0,56	0,4544
Gender*Education	1	25,86	25,86	5,64	0,0179*
Gender*Branch	1	8,45	8,45	1,85	0,1750

TABLE 14.32: (CONTINUED)

Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Language*Marital status	1	0,60	0,60	0,13	0,7176
Language*Salary	1	2,02	2,02	0,44	0,5067
Language*Branch	1	3,84	3,84	0,84	0,360 degree5
Language*Grade	1	0,90	0,90	0,20	0,6577
Marital status*Religious denomination	1	3,09	3,09	0,68	0,4115
Marital status*Education	1	2,24	2,24	0,49	0,4848
Marital status*Salary	3	56,94	18,98	4,14	0,0065*
Marital status*Branch	1	2,59	2,59	0,57	0,4518
Marital status*Grade	1	52,15	52,15	11,38	0,0008*
Religious denomination*Branch	1	15,06	15,06	3,29	0,0705
* $p \leq 0,05$					

The information in Table 14.32 shows that significant differences are prevalent among the independent variables in respect of social and esteem needs. The overall F-ratio is significant ($F = 5,69$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). This ratio, however, does not pinpoint the particular independent variables concerned. The first of these is age ($F = 22,31$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Secondly, education provided significant differences ($F = 5,67$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The third significant variable was salary ($F = 2,77$, $p = 0,0177 < p = 0,05$). The fourth significant variable was branch ($F = 5,31$, $p = 0,0216 < p = 0,05$). The fifth significant variable was grade ($F = 12,38$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Significant two-way interaction effects were also detected. The first of these interaction effects is age by gender ($F = 9,04$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Secondly, the interaction effect of age by language was also significant ($F = 5,50$, $p = 0,0002 < p = 0,05$). The third significant two-way interaction effect was age by education ($F = 7,71$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Fourthly, the two-way interaction effect of age by salary ($F = 5,86$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Fifthly, the two-way interaction effect of age by grade ($F = 3,24$, $p= 0,0040 < p = 0,05$). The sixth significant two-way interaction effect was gender by education ($F = 5,64$, $p = 0,0179 < p = 0,05$). The seventh significant two-way interaction effect was marital status by salary ($F = 4,14$, $p = 0,0065 < p = 0,05$). The last significant two-way interaction effect was marital status by grade ($F = 11,38$, $p = 0,0008 < p = 0,05$).

Post hoc comparisons were done by means of a Scheffé-test to determine significant differences, if any, between the means of the subgroups in regard to the main factors age, gender, language, education, and branch.

In regard to age, the age groups 18-30 years, and 31 years and older were compared. In this comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F = 3,86 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05). In regard to gender the comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F 3,86 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05). In regard to language groups, the Afrikaans group was compared to the English speaking group. In this comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F = 3,86 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05). In regard to education the matric group was compared with the tertiary education group. In this comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F = 3,86 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05). In regard to branch location the group at Head Office was compared to the branch network. In this comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F = 3,86 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05).

14.7 DIMENSION COACHING FOR DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

Table 14.33 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the coaching for development needs dimension by age group for males.

TABLE 14.33: COACHING FOR DEVELOPMENT BY AGE GROUP FOR MALES.

Coaching for development count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and older	Row total
8		33,3 4,5 1,6		66,7 16,3 3,3		12 4,9
9		100 4,5 1,6				4 1,6
10		66,7 9,1 3,3		33,3 8,2 1,6		12 4,9
11		100 13,6 4,9				12 4,9
12			33,3 5,8 1,6	33,3 8,2 1,6	33,3 11,1 1,6	12 4,9
13	8,3 100,0 1,6	33,3 18,2 6,5	33,3 23,2 6,5	8,3 8,2 1,6	16,7 22,2 3,3	48 19,5
14		17 9,1 3,3	19,1 13 3,7	21,3 20,4 4,1	42,6 55,6 8,1	47 19,1
15		53,1 19,3 6,9	25 11,6 3,3	21,9 14,3 2,8		32 13
16		14,3 9,1 3,3	57,1 46,4 13	21,4 24,5 4,9	7,1 11,1 1,6	56 22,8
17		100 5,7 2				5 2

TABLE 14.33: (CONTINUED)

Coaching for development count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and over	Row total
18		100 5,7 2				5 2
20		100 1,1 0,4				1 0,4
Total Frequency Total Pct	4 1,6	88 35,8	69 28	49 19,9	36 14,6	246 100

Table 14:33 indicates that 16,3% (specifically for 21-25, and 31-40 years age groups) of the scores aggregate in the lower class intervals, which indicates a tendency towards lower coaching for development needs. Also the majority of male scores, across all the age groups, aggregate in the middle and higher class intervals which indicates a general need for coaching for development. It should be noted that for all the 21 years and older male respondents, 27,2% of the scores aggregate in the higher class intervals which indicates a tendency towards higher coaching for development needs.

Table 14.34 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the coaching for development needs dimension by age group for females.

TABLE 14.34: COACHING FOR DEVELOPMENT BY AGE GROUP FOR FEMALES.

Coaching for dev. count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and over	Row total
8		100 3,8 1				3 1

TABLE 14.34: (CONTINUED)

Coaching for dev. count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and over	Row total
9	50 6,7 1,4		50 7,1 1,4			8 2,8
10		28,6 10,1 2,8	42,9 21,4 4,2	14,3 9,1 1,4	14,3 8,3 1,4	28 9,8
11	25 6,7 1,4		25 7,1 1,4	50 18,2 2,8		16 5,6
12		50 10,1 2,8		25 9,1 1,4	25 8,3 1,4	16 5,6
13	15,1 13,3 2,8	30,2 20,3 5,6	7,5 7,1 1,4	7,5 9,1 1,4	39,6 43,8 7,3	53 18,5
14	27,9 20 4,2	18,6 10,1 2,8		18,6 18,2 2,8	34,9 31,3 5,2	43 15
15	40 26,7 5,6	40 20,3 5,6	10 7,1 1,4		10 8,3 1,4	40 13,9
16	20 20 4,2	20 15,2 4,2	40 42,9 8,4	20 27,3 4,2		60 20,9
17		100 10,1 2,8				8 2,8
18	30 5 1		40 7,1 1,4	30 6,8 1		10 3,5
19	50 1,7 0,3			50 2,3 0,3		2 0,7
Total Frequency Total Pct	60 20,9	79 27,5	56 19,5	44 15,3	48 16,7	287 100

Table 14:34 indicates that 19,2% of the scores aggregate in the lower class intervals which indicates a tendency towards lower coaching for development needs. Also the majority of female scores, across all the age groups, aggregate in the middle and higher class intervals which indicates a general need for coaching for development. It should be noted that across all the age groups, 27,9% of the scores aggregate in the higher class intervals which indicates a tendency towards higher coaching for development needs.

Table 14.35 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the coaching for development needs dimension by age group for Head Office.

TABLE 14.35: COACHING FOR DEVELOPMENT BY AGE GROUP - HEAD OFFICE STAFF.

Coaching for development count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and older	Row total
8				100 2,3 0,8		1 0,8
10		5,6 3,6 0,8	61,1 31,4 8,7	16,7 6,8 2,4	16,7 17,6 2,4	18 14,2
11		33,3 14,3 3,1		66,7 18,2 6,3		12 9,4
12			42,9 8,6 2,4	14,3 2,3 0,8	42,9 17,6 2,4	7 5,5
13	14,3 100 2,4	23,8 17,9 3,9	23,8 14,3 3,9	23,8 11,4 3,9	14,3 17,6 2,4	21 16,5
14		32 28,6 6,3	4 2,9 0,8	44 25 8,7	20 29,4 3,9	25 19,7
15		22,2 7,1 1,6	33,3 8,6 2,4	44,4 9,1 3,1		9 7,1

TABLE 14.35: (CONTINUED)

Coaching for development count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and older	Row total
16		18,5 17,9 3,9	44,4 34,4 9,4	25,9 15,9 5,5	11,1 17,6 2,4	27 21,3
17		100 3,6 0,8				1 0,8
18		25 3,6 0,8		75 6,8 2,4		4 3,1
19				100 2,3 0,8		1 0,8
20		100 3,6 0,8				1 0,8
Total Frequency Total Pct	3 2,4	28 22	35 27,6	44 34,6	17 13,4	127 100

Table 14:35 indicates that 29,9% of the scores aggregate in the lower class intervals which indicates a tendency towards lower coaching for development needs. Also the majority of Head Office scores, across all the age groups, aggregate in the middle and higher class intervals which indicates a general need for coaching for development. It should be noted that across the age groups, 18-20 years, 26-30 years, and 41 years and older, there are no scores in the higher class intervals which indicates that these coaching for development needs are less prominent for the Head Office staff in these age groups.

Table 14.36 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the coaching for development needs dimension by age group for the branch network.

TABLE 14.36: COACHING FOR DEVELOPMENT BY AGE GROUP FOR BRANCH STAFF.

Coaching for dev. count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and older	Row total
8		50 5 1,7		50 14,3 1,7		14 3,4
9	33,3 6,6 1	33,3 2,9 1	33,3 4,4 1			12 3
10		68,2 10,8 3,7	4,5 1,1 0,2	22,7 10,2 1,2	4,5 1,5 0,2	22 5,4
11	25 6,6 1	50 5,8 2	25 4,4 1			16 3,9
12		38,1 5,8 2	4,8 1,1 0,2	33,3 14,3 1,7	23,8 7,5 1,2	21 5,2
13	11,3 14,8 2,2	33,8 19,4 6,7	18,8 16,7 3,7	3,8 6,1 0,7	32,5 38,8 6,4	80 19,7
14	18,5 19,7 3	12,3 5,8 2	12,3 8,9 2	10,8 14,3 1,7	46,2 44,8 7,4	65 16
15	25,4 26,2 3,9	49,2 22,3 7,6	14,3 10 2,2	4,8 6,1 0,7	6,3 6 1	63 15,5
16	13,5 19,7 3	16,9 10,8 3,7	49,4 48,9 10,8	19,1 34,7 4,2	1,1 1,5 0,2	89 21,9
17		100 8,6 3				12 3
18	27,3 4,9 0,7	36,4 2,9 1	36,4 4,4 1			11 2,7

TABLE 14.36: (CONTINUED)

Coaching for dev. count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and over	Row total
19	100 1,6 0,2					1 0,2
Tot. Frequency Total Pct	61 15	139 34,2	90 22,2	49 12,1	67 16,5	406 100

Table 14:36 indicates that the majority of branch network scores, across all the age groups, aggregate in the middle and higher class intervals which indicate a general need for coaching for development. It should be noted that across the age groups, 27,8% of the scores aggregate in the higher class intervals which indicate that the coaching for development needs are more prominent for the branch network staff compared to Head Office staff (5,5%).

Table 14.37 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the coaching for development needs dimension by gender group for matrics.

TABLE 14.37: COACHING FOR DEVELOPMENT BY GENDER GROUP – MATRICS.

Coaching for development count	Gender groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Male	Female	Row total
8	72,7 4 1,7	27,3 1,2 0,7	11 2,4
9	50 2 0,9	50 1,5 0,9	8 1,7

TABLE 14.37: (CONTINUED)

Coaching for development count	Gender groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Male	Female	Row total
10	22,2 4 1,7	77,8 10,8 6,1	36 7,8
11	50 4 1,7	50 3,1 1,7	16 3,5
12	42,9 5,9 2,6	57,1 6,2 3,5	28 6,1
13	47,3 21,8 9,5	52,7 18,9 10,6	93 20,2
14	52,2 23,3 10,2	47,8 16,6 9,3	90 19,5
15	41,2 13,9 6,1	58,8 15,4 8,7	68 14,8
16	40 15,8 6,9	60 18,5 10,4	80 17,4
17	38,5 2,5 1,1	61,5 3,1 1,7	13 2,8
18	33,3 2,5 1,1	66,7 3,9 2,2	15 3,3
19		100 0,8 0,4	15 3,3
20	100 0,5 0,2		1 0,2
Total Frequency Total Pct	202 43,8	259 56,2	461 100

Table 14:37 indicates that 84,6% of matric respondent scores, across both the gender groups, aggregate in the middle and higher class intervals, which indicate a general need for coaching for development. It should be noted that the male and female scores do not differ much across the distribution. Also 9,6% of the scores aggregate in the higher class intervals which indicate that the coaching for development needs are less prominent for the matric staff compared to tertiary educated staff (55,6%).

Table 14.38 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the coaching for development needs dimension by gender group for tertiary educated staff.

TABLE 14.38: TABLE OF COACHING FOR DEVELOPMENT BY GENDER GROUP - TERTIARY QUALIFIED.

Coaching for development count	Gender groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Male	Female	Row total
8	100 9,1 5,6		4 5,6
10		100 14,3 5,6	4 5,6
11	100 9,1 5,6		4 5,6
13	33,3 9,1 5,6	66,7 28,6 11,1	12 16,7
15	50 9,1 5,6	50 14,3 5,6	8 11,1
18	100 9,1 5,6		4 5,6

TABLE 14.38: (CONTINUED)

Coaching for development count	Gender groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Male	Female	Row total
19	66,7 54,5 33,3	33,3 42,9 16,7	36 50
Total Frequency Total Pct	44 61,1	28 38,9	72 100

Table 14:38 indicates that 55,6% of tertiary respondent scores, across both the gender groups, aggregate in the higher class intervals which indicates a high need for coaching for development. The male scores (63,6%) in the higher class intervals are more prominent than the female scores (42,9%) which indicate a higher need for coaching for development amongst the male tertiary educated staff. The distribution of Table 14.37 and 14.38 also differs vastly which indicates a higher need for coaching for development amongst the tertiary educated staff.

Table 14.39 displays the descriptive statistics of the dimension coaching for development needs.

TABLE 14.39: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS - COACHING FOR DEVELOPMENT.

Organizational factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Skewness	N
Age: 18 – 20 years	14,203	2,117	0,264	0,904	-0,627	64
Age: 21 – 25 years	13,568	2,568	0,198	-0,482	-0,340	167
Age: 26 – 30 years	14,256	2,299	0,205	-0,380	-0,820	125
Age: 31 – 40 years	13,397	2,699	0,279	-0,557	-0,441	93
Age: 41 years and older	13,416	1,184	0,129	2,059	-0,687	84
Married	13,969	2,417	0,141	-0,087	-0,591	291
Unmarried or Divorced	13,491	2,200	0,141	-0,099	-0,482	242
Reformed Churches and Dutch Reformed Church	13,738	2,377	0,114	-0,148	-0,546	429
Other church groups	13,807	2,141	0,209	-0,128	-0,301	104
Qualification: Matric	13,774	2,249	0,104	0,096	-0,452	461
Tertiary qualified	13,661	2,811	0,331	-1,118	-0,652	72
Less than three years of service	14,068	2,402	0,209	0,358	-0,521	131
Three to five years of service	13,812	2,357	0,199	-0,460	-0,677	139
Six to ten years of service	13,740	2,742	0,263	-0,945	-0,598	108
More than eleven years of service	13,416	1,896	0,155	1,257	-0,314	149
Head Office staff	13,559	2,369	0,210	-0,512	0,016	127
Branch staff	13,812	2,318	0,115	0,083	-0,688	406

An analysis of the content of Table 14.39 reveals that the skewness scores of the social and esteem needs are also not normally distributed as the values for skewness are either greater or less than zero (0). For all independent variables, except Head Office subjects, the distribution is negatively skewed, or skewed to the left. An analysis of the value for kurtosis reveals that the distribution is platykurtic (value < 0,263) for the majority of the independent variables, except for subjects 18-20 years of age, subjects 41 years and over, subjects with less than three years of service, and those with more than eleven years of service. The standard deviation is quite high which is also an indication of the skewness of the distribution. The standard error of the mean is also high for all the organizational factors, and therefore inferences about the population cannot be drawn with certainty.

The influence of the independent variables (organizational factors) and their two-way interaction effects on coaching for development needs were investigated by means of Anova. The calculations pertaining to these analyses of variance are presented in Table 14:40.

TABLE 14.40: ANOVA: COACHING FOR DEVELOPMENT NEEDS BY ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS.

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Model	81	1495,70	18,46	5,86	0,0001*
Error	442	1393,24	3,15		
Corrected total	523	2889,24			
	R-square	C.V.	Root MSE	Coaching for development needs Mean	
	0,517682	12,91	1,77	13,74	

TABLE 14.40: (CONTINUED)

Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Age	4	74,70	18,67	5,92	0,0001*
Gender	1	0,68	0,68	0,22	0,6405
Language	1	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,9230
Marital status	1	18,89	18,89	5,99	0,0147*
Religious denomination	1	0,62	0,62	0,20	0,6551
Education	1	2,95	2,95	0,94	0,3332
Salary	5	78,04	15,60	4,95	0,0002*
Branch	1	5,79	5,79	1,84	0,1759
Job grade	4	31,60	7,90	2,51	0,0415*
Age*Gender	4	102,71	25,67	8,14	0,0001*
Age*Language	4	73,29	18,32	5,81	0,0001*
Age*Marital status	4	75,50	18,87	5,99	0,0001*
Age*Religious denomination	2	18,67	9,33	2,96	0,0527
Age*Education	4	28,03	7,00	2,22	0,0656
Age*Salary	5	99,23	19,84	6,29	0,0001*
Age*Branch	4	110,97	27,74	8,80	0,0001*
Age*Grade	6	101,76	16,96	5,38	0,0001*
Gender*Language	1	12,66	12,66	4,02	0,0457*
Gender*Marital status	1	3,21	3,21	1,02	0,3130
Gender*Religious denomination	1	32,35	32,35	10,26	0,0015*
Gender*Education	1	12,50	12,50	3,97	0,0471*
Gender*Branch	1	26,69	26,69	8,47	0,0038*
Language*Marital status	1	19,59	19,59	6,21	0,0130*
Language*Salary	1	2,18	2,18	0,69	0,4061
Language*Branch	1	51,62	51,62	16,37	0,0001*
Language*Grade	1	39,28	39,28	12,46	0,0005*
Marital status*Religious denomination	1	31,97	31,97	10,14	0,0016*
Marital status*Education	1	55,67	55,67	17,66	0,0001*

TABLE 14.40: (CONTINUED)

Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Marital status*Salary	3	32,24	10,74	4,41	0,0176*
Marital status*Branch	1	3,27	3,27	1,04	0,3083
Marital status*Grade	1	83,37	83,37	26,45	0,0001*
Religious denomination*Branch	1	6,88	6,88	2,18	0,1401
* $p \leq 0,05$					

The information in Table 14.40 shows that significant differences are prevalent among the independent variables in respect of coaching for development needs. The overall F-ratio is significant ($F = 5,86$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). This ratio, however, does not pinpoint the particular independent variables concerned. The first of these is age ($F = 5,92$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Secondly, marital status provided significant differences ($F = 5,99$, $p = 0,0147 < p = 0,05$). The third significant variable was salary ($F = 4,95$, $p = 0,0002 < p = 0,05$). The fourth significant variable was grade ($F = 2,51$, $p = 0,0415 < p = 0,05$). Significant two-way interaction effects were also detected. The first of these interaction effects is age by gender ($F = 8,14$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Secondly, the interaction effect of age by language was also significant ($F = 5,81$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The third significant two-way interaction effect was age by marital status ($F = 5,99$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Fourthly, the two-way interaction effect was age by salary ($F = 6,29$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Fifthly, the two-way interaction effect of age by branch is significant ($F = 8,80$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The sixth significant two-way interaction effect was age by grade ($F = 5,38$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The seventh significant two-way interaction effect was gender by language ($F = 4,02$, $p = 0,0457 < p = 0,05$). The eighth significant two-way interaction effect was gender by religious denomination ($F = 10,26$, $p = 0,0015 < p = 0,05$). The ninth significant two-way interaction effect was gender by education ($F = 3,97$, $p = 0,0471 < p = 0,05$). The tenth significant two-way interaction effect was gender by branch ($F = 8,47$, $p = 0,0038 < p = 0,05$). The eleventh significant two-way interaction effect was language by marital status ($F = 6,21$, $p = 0,0130 < p = 0,05$). The twelfth significant two-way interaction effect was language by branch ($F = 16,37$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The thirteenth significant two-way interaction effect was language by grade ($F = 12,46$, $p = 0,0005 < p = 0,05$). The fourteenth significant two-way interaction effect was marital status by religious denomination ($F = 10,14$, $p = 0,0016 < p = 0,05$). The next significant two-way interaction effect was marital status by education ($F = 17,66$, $p = 0,0001 < p =$

0,05). The sixteenth significant two-way interaction effect was marital status by salary ($F = 4,41$, $p = 0,0176 < p = 0,05$). The seventeenth significant two-way interaction effect was marital status by grade ($F = 26,45$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$).

Post hoc comparisons were done by means of a Scheffé-test to determine significant differences, if any, between the means of the subgroups in regard to the main factors age, language, education and branch.

In regard to age, the age groups 18-30 years, and 31years and older were compared. In this comparison $t = 2,82$ so that $F' = 7,95$ (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 7,95 > F = 2,39$ with 2 and 393 df p being $< 0,05$). In regard to language the Afrikaans group was compared to the English speaking group. In this comparison $t = 1,97$ so that $F' = 3,88$ (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 3,88 > F = 3,86$ with 2 and 393 df p being $< 0,05$). In regard to education the matric group was compared with the tertiary education group. In this comparison $t = 1,97$ so that $F' = 3,88$ (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 3,88 > F = 3,86$ with 2 and 393 df p being $< 0,05$). In regard to branch location the group at Head Office was compared to the branch network. In this comparison $t = 1,97$ so that $F' = 3,88$ (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 3,88 > F = 3,86$ with 2 and 393 df p being $< 0,05$).

14.8 DIMENSION INDIVIDUAL-CENTRED LEADERSHIP NEEDS

Table 14.38 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the individual-centred leadership needs dimension by education group.

TABLE 14.41: TABLE OF INDIVIDUAL-CENTRED LEADERSHIP BY EDUCATION GROUP.

Individual-centred leadership count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric qualified	Tertiary qualified	Row total
10	76,5 5,6 4,9	23,5 11,1 1,5	34 6,4
11	81,3 11,3 9,8	18,8 16,7 2,3	64 12
12	84,8 29,1 25,1	15,2 33,3 4,5	158 29,6
13	80,8 21,9 18,9	19,2 33,3 4,5	125 23,5
14	96,4 23,4 20,3	3,6 5,6 0,8	112 21
15	100 2,6 2,3		12 2,3
16	100 3,5 3		16 3
18	100 2,6 2,3		12 2,3
Total Frequency Total Pct	461 86,5	72 13,5	533 100

Table 14:41 indicates that 48% of both matric and tertiary respondent scores, aggregate in the lower class intervals which indicates a low need for individual-centred leadership. Also 44,5% of both matric and tertiary respondent scores, aggregate in the middle class intervals which indicates a moderate need for individual-centred leadership. A high need for individual-centred leadership is indicated for matric respondent scores only, where 7,6% of the matric scores aggregate in the high class intervals.

Table 14.42 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the individual-centred leadership needs dimension by language group for Head Office staff.

TABLE 14.42: TABLE OF INDIVIDUAL-CENTRED LEADERSHIP BY LANGUAGE GROUP FOR HEAD OFFICE STAFF.

Individual-centred leadership count	Language groups			
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Afrikaans	English	Other	Row total
10	100 9,4 7,9			10 7,9
11	100 8,5 7,1			9 7,1
12	67,9 17,9 15	21,4 33,3 4,7	10,7 100 2,4	28 22
13	100 42,5 35,4			45 35,4
14	75 19,8 16,5	25 38,9 5,5		28 22
15		100 5,6 0,8		1 0,8
16		100 22,2 3,1		4 3,1
17	100 0,9 0,8			1 0,8
18	100 0,9 0,8			1 0,8
Total Frequency Total Pct	106 83,5	18 14,2	3 2,4	127 100

Table 14:42 indicates that all three language group scores, aggregate in the lower and medium class intervals which indicates a moderate need for individual-centred leadership. It should be noted that the English speaking respondents tend to have higher needs for individual-centred leadership (21,8% of their scores aggregate in the higher class intervals) compared to the Afrikaans group (1,9% of their scores aggregate in the higher class intervals).

Table 14.43 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the individual-centred leadership needs dimension by language group for the branch network staff..

TABLE 14.43: TABLE OF INDIVIDUAL-CENTRED LEADERSHIP BY LANGUAGE GROUP FOR BRANCH STAFF.

Individual-centred leadership count	Language groups			
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Afrikaans	English	Other	Row total
10	100 6,8 5,9			24 5,9
11	100 15,7 13,5			55 13,5
12	85,4 31,6 27,3	13,8 33,3 4,4	0,8 100 0,2	130 32
13	85 19,4 16,7	15 22,2 3		80 19,7
14	84,5 20,2 17,5	15,5 24,1 3,2		84 20,7
15	36,4 1,1 1	63,6 13 1,7		11 2,7
16	66,7 2,3 2	33,3 7,4 1		12 3
17	100 0,9 0,7			3 0,7
18	100 2 1,7			7 1,7
Total Frequency Total Pct	351 86,5	54 13,3	1 0,2	406 100

Table 14:43 indicates that all three language group scores, aggregate in the lower (51,4%) and medium (43,1%) class intervals that indicate a moderate need for individual-centred leadership. It should be noted that the English speaking respondents tend to have higher needs for individual-centred leadership (55,6% of their scores

aggregate in the higher class intervals) compared to the Afrikaans group (6% of their scores aggregate in the higher class intervals). Comparisons between Table 14.43 and Table 14.42 shows that the individual-centred leadership needs for Head Office are more prominent (majority of the scores aggregate in the middle class intervals) than those in the branch network (majority of the scores aggregate in the lower class intervals).

Table 14.44 displays the descriptive statistics of the dimension individual-centred leadership needs.

TABLE 14.44: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: INDIVIDUAL-CENTRED LEADERSHIP.

Organizational factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Skewness	N
Age: 18 – 20 years	12,125	0,934	0,116	0,361	-0,256	64
Age: 21 – 25 years	12,508	1,660	0,128	1,649	1,006	167
Age: 26 – 30 years	12,528	1,235	0,110	0,907	0,130	125
Age: 31 – 40 years	13,225	1,967	0,204	0,066	0,656	93
Age: 41 years and older	13,333	1,090	0,118	-0,219	-0,931	84
Married	12,567	1,447	0,084	2,380	1,116	291
Unmarried or Divorced	12,909	1,609	0,103	0,702	0,317	242
Reformed Churches and Dutch Reformed Church	12,636	1,552	0,074	1,703	0,801	429
Other church groups	13,076	1,391	0,136	-0,428	0,477	104
Qualification: Matric	12,826	1,564	0,072	1,148	0,700	461
Tertiary qualified	12,055	1,086	0,128	-0,555	-0,384	72

TABLE 14.44: (CONTINUED)

Organizational factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Skewness	N
Less than three years of service	12,549	1,701	0,148	1,793	0,960	131
Three to five years of service	12,352	1,361	0,115	1,043	0,875	139
Six to ten years of service	12,555	1,232	0,118	0,769	0,418	108
More than eleven years of service	13,315	1,568	0,128	1,438	0,432	149
Head Office staff	12,803	1,431	0,126	1,415	0,320	127
Branch staff	12,697	1,561	0,077	1,317	0,816	406

An analysis of the content of Table 14.44 reveals that the skewness scores of the individual-centred leadership needs are also not normally distributed as the values for skewness are either greater or less than zero (0). For all independent variables, except subjects 18-20 years of age, and those 41 years and older, as well as tertiary qualified subjects, the distribution is positively skewed, or skewed to the right. An analysis of the value for kurtosis reveals that the distribution is leptokurtic (value > 0,263) for the majority of the independent variables, except for subjects 31 years of age and older, subjects from other church groups, and tertiary qualified subjects. The standard deviation is quite high which is also an indication of the skewness of the distribution. The standard error of the mean is also high for most of the organizational factors (except married respondents, those from the Reformed/Reformed (Hervormd)/Dutch Reformed church groups, matric qualified respondents, and branch respondents), and therefore inferences about the population cannot be drawn with certainty.

The influence of the independent variables (organizational factors) and their two-way interaction effects on individual-centred leadership needs were investigated by means of Anova. The calculations pertaining to these analyses of variance are presented in Table 14.45.

TABLE 14.45: ANOVA: INDIVIDUAL-CENTRED LEADERSHIP BY ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS.

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Model	81	2922,77	36,08	4,66	0,0001*
Error	442	3425,82	7,75		
Corrected total	523	6348,60			
	R-square	C.V.	Root MSE	Individual-centred leadership needs Mean	
	0,460381	8,28	2,78	33,59	
Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Age	4	292,76	73,19	9,44	0,0001*
Gender	1	108,16	108,16	13,95	0,0002*
Language	1	16,37	16,37	2,11	0,1468
Marital status	1	12,57	12,57	1,62	0,2035
Religious denomination	1	3,48	3,48	0,45	0,5029
Education	1	75,03	75,03	9,68	0,0020*
Salary	5	107,37	21,47	2,77	0,0177*
Branch	1	70,42	70,42	9,09	0,0027*
Job grade	4	30,79	7,69	0,99	0,4109
Age*Gender	4	170,16	42,54	5,49	0,0003*
Age*Language	4	47,67	11,91	1,54	0,1902
Age*Marital status	4	531,77	132,94	17,15	0.0001*
Age*Religious denomination	2	33,37	16,68	2,15	0,1174
Age*Education	4	11,60	2,90	0,37	0,8269
Age*Salary	5	287,00	57,41	7,41	0,0001*
Age*Branch	4	71,06	17,75	2,29	0,0589
Age*Grade	6	216,93	36,15	4,66	0,0001*
Gender*Language	1	0,12	0,12	0,02	0,9010
Gender*Marital status	1	10,36	10,36	1,34	0,2482
Gender*Religious denomination	1	88,08	88,08	11,36	0,0008*
Gender*Education	1	1,00	1,00	0,13	0,7190
Gender*Branch	1	9,12	9,12	1,18	0,2784
Language*Marital status	1	25,00	25,00	3,23	0,0732
Language*Salary	1	0,07	0,07	0,01	0,9213

TABLE 14.45: (CONTINUED)

Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Language*Branch	1	85,41	85,41	11,02	0,0010*
Language*Grade	1	70,98	70,98	9,16	0,0026*
Marital status*Religious denomination	1	40,58	40,58	5,24	0,0226*
Marital status*Education	1	0,14	0,14	0,02	0,8921
Marital status*Salary	3	174,82	58,27	7,52	0,0001*
Marital status*Branch	1	18,64	18,64	2,41	0,1216
Marital status*Grade	1	9,42	9,42	1,22	0,2709
Religious denomination*Branch	1	9,18	9,18	1,19	0,2769
* $p \leq 0,05$					

The information in Table 14.45 shows that significant differences are prevalent among the independent variables in respect of individual-centred leadership needs. The overall F-ratio is significant ($F = 4,66$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). This ratio, however, does not pinpoint the particular independent variables concerned. The first of these is age ($F = 9,44$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Secondly, gender provided significant differences ($F = 13,95$, $p = 0,0002 < p = 0,05$). The third significant variable was education ($F = 9,68$, $p = 0,0020 < p = 0,05$). The fourth significant variable was salary ($F = 2,77$, $p = 0,0177 < p = 0,05$). The fifth significant variable was branch ($F = 9,09$, $p = 0,0027 < p = 0,05$). Significant two-way interaction effects were also detected. The first of these are age by gender ($F = 5,49$, $p = 0,0003 < p = 0,05$). Secondly, the interaction effect of age by marital status was also significant ($F = 17,15$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The third significant two-way interaction effect was age by salary ($F = 7,41$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Fourthly, the two-way interaction effect age by grade was significant ($F = 4,66$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Fifthly, the two-way interaction effect gender by religious denomination was significant ($F = 11,36$, $p = 0,0008 < p = 0,05$). The sixth significant two-way interaction effect was language by branch ($F = 11,02$, $p = 0,0010 < p = 0,05$). The seventh significant two-way interaction effect was language by grade ($F = 9,16$, $p = 0,0026 < p = 0,05$). The two-way interaction effect marital status by religious denomination also proved significant ($F = 5,24$, $p = 0,0026 < p = 0,05$). The ninth significant two-way interaction effect was marital status by salary ($F = 7,52$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$).

Post hoc comparisons were done by means of a Scheffé-test to determine significant differences, if any, between the means of the subgroups in regard to the main factors age, gender, education and branch.

In regard to age, the age groups 18-30 years, and 31 years and older were compared. In this comparison t = 2,39 so that F ' = 5,71 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 5,71 > F = 3,04 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05). In regard to gender, the male and female groups were compared. In this comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F = 2,14 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05). In regard to education the matric group was compared with the tertiary education group. In this comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F = 3,86 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05). In regard to branch location the group at Head Office was compared to the branch network. In this comparison t = 2,82 so that F ' = 7,95 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 7,95 > F = 2,39 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05).

14.9 DIMENSION TEAM SPIRIT NEEDS

Table 14.46 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on team spirit needs dimension by age group.

TABLE 14.46: TABLE OF TEAM SPIRIT NEEDS BY AGE GROUP.

Work load and team spirit count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and over	Row total
4		100 1,2 0,4				2 0,4
6		55,6 3 0,9	44,4 3,2 0,8			9 1,7

TABLE 14.46: (CONTINUED)

Work load and team spirit count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and over	Row total
7			100 3,2 0,8			4 0,8
9		33,3 2,4 0,8	66,7 6,4 1,5			12 2,3
12	25 6,3 0,8	50 4,8 1,5		25 4,3 0,8		16 3
13	33,3 12,5 1,5	33,3 4,8 1,5	16,7 3,2 0,8	16,7 4,3 0,8		24 4,5
14			80 3,2 0,8	20 1,1 0,2		5 0,9
15			50 0,8 0,2		50 1,2 0,2	2 0,4
16	16 18,8 2,3	5,3 2,4 0,8	26,7 16 3,8	14,7 11,8 2,1	37,3 33,3 5,3	75 14,1
17	10,1 25 3	38,6 36,5 11,4	22,8 28,8 6,8	16,5 28 4,9	12 22,6 3,6	158 29,6
18	12,9 25 3	24,2 18 5,6	22,6 22,4 5,3	21,8 29 5,1	18,5 27,4 4,3	124 23,3
19		55,4 21,6 6,8	6,2 3,2 0,8	18,5 12,9 2,3	20 15,5 2,4	65 12,2

TABLE 14.46: (CONTINUED)

Work load and team spirit count	Age groups					
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	18-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	31-40 years	41 years and over	Row total
20	19,4 10,9 1,3	25 5,4 1,7	33,3 9,6 2,3	22,2 8,6 1,5		36 6,8
21	100 1,6 0,2					1 0,2
Total Frequency Total Pct	64 12	167 31,3	125 23,5	93 17,4	84 15,8	533 100

Table 14:46 indicates that a vast majority across the age group scores, aggregate in the higher (86,2%) of the class intervals, which indicate a high need for team spirit.

Table 14.47 displays the descriptive statistics of the dimension team spirit needs.

TABLE 14.47: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: TEAM SPIRIT.

Organizational factor	Organizational Factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Skewness	N
Age: 18 – 20 years	AGE: 18 – 20 years	16,640	2,277	0,284	-0,181	-0,554	64
Age: 21 – 25 years	AGE: 21 – 25 years	16,640	3,260	0,252	4,478	-2,136	167
Age: 26 – 30 years	Age: 26 – 30 years	15,992	3,529	0,315	1,802	-1,607	125
Age: 31 – 40 years	Age: 31 – 40 years	17,268	1,877	0,194	1,675	-1,205	93
Age: 41 years and older	Age: 41 years and over	17,226	1,112	0,121	-1,209	0,182	84
Married	Married	16,725	2,988	0,175	4,939	-2,081	291
Unmarried or Divorced	Unmarried or Divorced	16,648	2,567	0,165	5,392	-2,168	242
Reformed Churches and Dutch Reformed Church	Reformed/ Reformed (Hervormd) / Dutch Reformed	16,594	2,868	0,138	4,700	-2,048	429
Other church groups	Other church groups	17,086	2,489	0,244	8,393	-2,472	104
Qualification: Matric	Qualification: Matric	17,006	2,563	0,119	6,902	--2,326	461
Tertiary qualified	Tertiary qualified	14,666	3,390	0,399	1,288	-1,516	72
Less than three years of service	Less than 3 years of service	16,374	2,912	0,254	0,465	-1,064	131
Three to five years of service	3-5 years of service	16,906	3,113	0,264	7,474	-2,665	139
Six to ten years of service	6-10 years of service	16,111	3,462	0,333	2,638	-1,785	108
More than eleven years of service	More than 11 years of service	17,187	1,552	0,127	2,723	-1,350	149
Head Office staff	Head Office staff	16,755	2,061	0,182	0,319	-0,836	127
Branch staff	Branch staff	16,669	2,999	0,148	4,932	-2,176	406

An analysis of the content of Table 14.47 reveals that the skewness scores for team spirit needs are also not normally distributed as the values for skewness are either

greater or less than zero (0). The distribution is negatively skewed or skewed to the left, except for subjects 41 years and older. Analysis of the value for kurtosis reveals that the distribution is more peaked than normal (the distribution is leptokurtic; value > 0,263), except for subjects aged 18 - 20 years, and subjects aged 41 years and older. The standard deviation is high which also indicates the skewness of the distribution. The standard error of the mean is also high for all the organizational factors and therefore inferences about the population cannot be drawn with certainty.

The influence of the independent variables (organizational factors) and their two-way interaction effects on team spirit needs were investigated by means of Anova. The calculations pertaining to these analyses of variance are presented in Table 14.48.

TABLE 14.48: ANOVA: TEAM SPIRIT BY ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS.

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Model	81	2465,33	30,43	7,96	0,0001*
Error	442	1689,51	3,82		
Corrected total	523	4154,84			
	R-square	C.V.	Root MSE	Team spirit Mean	
	0,593364	11,72	1,95	16,67	
Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Age	4	107,48	26,87	7,03	0,0001*
Gender	1	3,74	3,74	0,98	0,3230
Language	1	4,51	4,51	1,18	0,2779
Marital status	1	3,22	3,22	0,84	0,3589
Religious denomination	1	24,04	24,04	6,29	0,0125*
Education	1	389,49	389,49	101,90	0,0001*
Salary	5	180,50	36,10	9,44	0,0001*
Branch	1	1,55	1,55	0,41	0,5239
Job grade	4	139,84	34,96	9,15	0,0001*
Age*Gender	4	132,86	33,21	8,69	0,0001*
Age*Language	4	58,19	14,54	3,81	0,0047*
Age*Marital status	4	134,58	33,64	8,80	0,0001*
Age*Religious denomination	2	6,17	3,08	0,81	0,4463
Age*Education	4	63,07	15,76	4,13	0,0027*
Age*Salary	5	199,85	39,97	10,46	0,0001*

TABLE 14.48: (CONTINUED)

Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F value	Pr F
Age*Branch	4	53,15	13,28	3,48	0,0082*
Age*Grade	6	268,81	44,80	11,72	0,0001*
Gender*Language	1	25,68	25,68	6,72	0,0099*
Gender*Marital status	1	59,51	59,51	15,57	0,0001*
Gender*Religious denomination	1	6,50	6,50	1,70	0,1929
Gender*Education	1	6,15	6,15	1,61	0,2053
Gender*Branch	1	21,69	21,69	5,68	0,0176*
Language*Marital status	1	5,78	5,78	1,51	0,2195
Language*Salary	1	0,07	0,07	0,02	0,8878
Language*Branch	1	28,30	28,30	7,40	0,0068*
Language*Grade	1	6,48	6,48	1,70	0,1933
Marital status*Religious denomination	1	8,03	8,03	2,10	0,1479
Marital status*Education	1	96,91	96,91	25,36	0,0001*
Marital status*Salary	3	214,28	71,42	18,69	0,0001*
Marital status*Branch	1	2,67	2,67	0,70	0,4029
Marital status*Grade	1	34,76	34,76	9,10	0,0027*
Religious denomination*Branch	1	1,28	1,28	0,34	0,5630
* $p \leq 0,05$					

The information in Table 14.48 indicates that significant differences are prevalent among the independent variables in respect of team spirit needs. The overall F-ratio is significant ($F = 7,96$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). This ratio, however, does not pinpoint the particular independent variables concerned. The first of these is age ($F = 7,03$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Secondly, religious denomination provided significant differences ($F = 6,29$, $p = 0,0125 < p = 0,05$). The third significant variable was education ($F = 101,90$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The fourth significant variable was salary ($F = 9,44$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The fifth significant variable was job grade ($F = 9,15$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Significant two-way interaction effects were also detected. The first of these is age by gender ($F = 8,69$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Secondly, the interaction effect age by language was also significant ($F = 3,81$, $p = 0,0047 < p = 0,05$). The third significant two-way interaction effect was age by salary ($F = 10,46$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$).

Fourthly, the two-way interaction effect on age by marital status ($F = 8,80$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Fifthly, the two-way interaction effect on age by education ($F = 4,13$, $p = 0,0027 < p = 0,05$). The sixth significant two-way interaction effect was on age by salary ($F = 10,46$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The seventh significant two-way interaction effect was on age by branch ($F = 3,48$, $p = 0,0082 < p = 0,05$). The eighth significant two-way interaction effect was on age by grade ($F = 11,72$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The ninth significant two-way interaction effect was on gender by language ($F = 6,72$, $p = 0,0099 < p = 0,05$). The tenth significant two-way interaction effect was on gender by marital status ($F = 15,57$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The eleventh significant two-way interaction effect was on gender by branch ($F = 5,68$, $p = 0,0176 < p = 0,05$). The twelfth significant two-way interaction effect was on language by branch ($F = 7,40$, $p = 0,0068 < p = 0,05$). The thirteenth significant two-way interaction effect was on marital status by education ($F = 25,36$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The fourteenth significant two-way interaction effect was on marital status by salary ($F = 18,69$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). The last significant two-way interaction effect was on marital status by grade ($F = 9,10$, $p = 0,0027 < p = 0,05$).

Post hoc comparisons were done by means of a Scheffé-test to determine significant differences, if any, between the means of the subgroups in regard to the main factors age, gender, language, education and branch.

In regard to age, the two age groups 18-30 years, and 31 years and over were compared. In this comparison $t = 2,82$ so that $F' = 7,95$ (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 7,95 > F\ 2,39$ with 2 and 393 df p being $< 0,05$). In regard to gender, the male and female groups were compared. In this comparison $t = 1,97$ so that $F' = 3,88$ (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 3,88 > F = 3,86$ with 2 and 393 df p being $< 0,05$). In regard to language, the Afrikaans and English speaking groups were compared. In this comparison $t = 1,97$ so that $F' = 3,88$ (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 3,88 > F = 3,86$ with 2 and 393 df p being $< 0,05$). In regard to education the matric group was compared with the tertiary education group. In this comparison $t = 1,97$ so that $F' = 3,88$ (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 3,88 > F = 3,86$ with 2 and 393 df p being $< 0,05$). In regard to branch location the group at Head Office were compared to the branch network. In this comparison $t = 1,97$

so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 393 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F = 3,86 with 2 and 393 df p being < 0,05).

14.10 DIMENSION INTERNAL CONTROL

Table 14.49 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the internal control dimension by education group for Head Office.

TABLE 14.49: TABLE OF INTERNAL CONTROL BY EDUCATION GROUP FOR HEAD OFFICE STAFF.

Internal control count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
82	100 1,3 0,9		1 0,9
83	100 20 15,1		16 15,1
84	100 1,3 0,9		1 0,9
85	100 6,3 4,7		5 4,7
88	100 1,3 0,9		1 0,9
89	100 1,3 0,9		1 0,9
93	100 10 7,5		8 7,5
94	100 1,3 0,9		1 0,9

TABLE 14.49: (CONTINUED)

Internal control count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
98	100 10 7,5		8 7,5
138	100 1,3 0,9		1 0,9
140	100 5 3,8		4 3,8
150	100 3,8 2,8		3 2,8
156		100 3,8 0,9	1 0,9
157	100 3,8 2,8		3 2,8
162	100 1,3 0,9		1 0,9
163	100 3,8 2,8		3 2,8
166	100 5 3,8		4 3,8
169		100 11,5 2,8	3 2,8
170	100 2,5 1,9		2 1,9

TABLE 14.49: (CONTINUED)

Internal control count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
176		100 3,8 0,9	1 0,9
177	100 5 3,8		4 3,8
179	11,1 1,3 0,9	88,9 30,8 7,5	9 8,5
185		100 23,1 5,7	6 5,7
186	100 5 3,8		4 3,8
189	100 10 7,5		8 7,5
205		100 26,9 6,6	7 6,6
Total Frequency Total Pct	80 75,5	26 24,5	106 100

Table 14:49 indicates that the matric group scores at Head Office, aggregate in the lower (52%) and medium (18,5%) class intervals that indicate lower to moderate internal control. The tertiary qualified group scores at Head Office aggregate in the higher (96%) class intervals that indicate higher internal control.

Table 14.50 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the internal control dimension by education group for the branch network.

TABLE 14.50: TABLE OF INTERNAL CONTROL BY EDUCATION GROUP FOR BRANCH STAFF.

Internal control count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
80	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
81	100 2,5 2,3		8 2,3
82	100 9,8 8,8		31 8,8
83	100 2,5 2,3		8 2,3
84	100 18,6 16,8		59 16,8
85	100 6 5,4		19 5,4
86	100 3,8 3,4		12 3,4
87	75 3,8 3,4	25 11,8 1,1	16 4,6
88	100 3,5 3,1		11 3,1
89	100 4,7 4,3		15 4,3
90	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1

TABLE 14.50: (CONTINUED)

Internal control count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
91	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
94	100 2,2 2		7 2
97	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
101	100 2,5 2,3		8 2,3
120	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
121	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
128	100 2,5 2,3		8 2,3
129	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
138	100 0,9 0,9		3 0,9
140	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
146	100 0,9 0,9		3 0,9

TABLE 14.50: (CONTINUED)

Internal control count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
148	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
150	100 0,3 0,3		1 0,3
154	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
156		100 11,8 1,1	4 1,1
157	75 2,8 2,6	25 8,8 0,9	12 3,4
158	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
162	100 0,9 0,9		3 0,9
163	100 1,6 1,4		5 1,4
164	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
169		100 2,9 0,3	1 0,3
171		100 11,8 1,1	4 1,1

TABLE 14.50: (CONTINUED)

Internal control count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
176		100 8,8 0,9	3 0,9
179	100 2,2 2		7 2
181	100 2,5 2,3		8 2,3
185	80 2,5 2,3	20 5,9 0,6	10 2,8
186	80 1,3 1,1	20 2,9 0,3	5 1,4
187		100 8,8 0,9	3 0,9
189	100 2,5 2,3		8 2,3
194		100 11,8 1,1	4 1,1
195	100 1,3 1,1		4 1,1
199		100 11,8 1,1	4 1,1
205		100 2,9 0,3	1 0,3
Total Frequency Total Pct	317 90,3	34 9,7	351 100

Table 14:50 indicates that the majority of the matric group scores in the branch network, aggregate in the lower (67,7%) class intervals that indicate low internal control. The majority of the tertiary qualified group scores in the branch network, aggregate in the higher (70%) class intervals, which indicate higher internal control. It should be noted that more matric qualified respondents in the branch network are low on internal control (67,7% of their scores aggregate in the lower class intervals) compared to the Head Office (52% of their scores aggregate in the lower class intervals). Also more tertiary qualified respondents in the Head Office are high on internal control (96% of their scores aggregate in the high class intervals) compared to the branch network (70% of their scores aggregate in the higher class intervals).

Table 14.51 displays the descriptive statistics of the dimension internal control.

TABLE 14.51: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: INTERNAL CONTROL.

Organizational factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Skewness	N
Age: 18 – 20 years	130,187	44,680	5,585	-1,829	0,192	64
Age: 21 – 25 years	117,688	39,430	3,051	-1,431	0,557	167
Age: 26 – 30 years	126,448	44,318	3,963	-1,545	0,348	125
Age: 31 – 40 years	127,494	42,611	4,418	-1,761	0,257	93
Age: 41 years and older	100,761	34,883	3,806	1,014	1,666	84
Married	122,453	42,180	2,472	-1,565	0,432	291
Unmarried or Divorced	117,681	42,017	2,701	-1,282	0,671	242
Reformed Churches and Dutch Reformed Church	120,748	41,827	2,019	-1,450	0,522	429
Other church groups	118,384	43,533	4,268	-1,464	0,609	104
Qualification: Matric	111,997	37,949	1,767	-0,961	0,878	461
Tertiary qualified	173,361	25,868	3,048	4,468	-1,919	72
Less than three years of service	129,931	43,225	3,776	-1,727	0,148	131
Three to five years of service	111,352	36,540	3,099	-0,989	0,879	139
Six to ten years of service	136,916	44,893	4,319	-1,659	-0,104	108
More than eleven years of service	108,812	38,336	3,140	-0,549	1,110	149
Head Office staff	137,039	44,779	3,973	-1,732	-0,161	127
Branch staff	115,046	39,907	1,980	-1,102	0,780	406

An analysis of the content of Table 14.51 reveals that the skewness scores of the internal control dimension are also not normally distributed as the values for skewness are either greater or less than zero (0). The distribution is positively skewed or skewed to the right, except for tertiary qualified subjects, those with six to ten years of service, and Head Office staff. Analysis of the value for kurtosis reveals that it is platykurtic (value < 0,263), except for subjects 41 years and older, and those that are tertiary qualified. The standard deviation is quite high which also indicates the skewness of the distribution. The standard error of the mean is very high for all the organizational factors and therefore inferences about the population cannot be drawn with certainty.

The influence of the independent variables (organizational factors) and their two-way interaction effects on the internal control dimension were investigated by means Anova. The calculations pertaining to these analyses of variance are presented in Table 14.52.

TABLE 14.52: ANOVA: INTERNAL CONTROL BY ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS.

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Model	7	278813,45	39830,49	31,41	0,0001*
Error	521	660758,25	1268,25		
Corrected total	528	939571,71			
	R-square	C.V.	Root MSE	Internal Control Mean	
	0,296745	29,38	35,61	121,19	
Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
NULanguage	1	10856,32	10856,32	8,56	0,0036*
NUEducation	1	230719,86	230719,86	181,92	0,0001*
NUBranch	1	51462,54	51462,54	40,58	0,0001*
NULanguage *NUEducation	1	8068,80	8068,80	6,36	0,0120*
NUEducation *NUBranch	1	0,00	0,00	0,00	1,0000
* p ≤ 0,05					

The information in Table 14.52 shows that significant differences are prevalent among the independent variables in respect of internal control. The overall F-ratio is significant (F = 31,41, p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05). This ratio, however, does not pinpoint the particular

recoded independent variables concerned. The first of these is language ($F = 8,56$, $p = 0,0036 < p = 0,05$) and secondly, education ($F = 181,92$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Thirdly, branch provided significant differences ($F = 40,58$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). A significant two-way interaction effect was also detected, namely language by education ($F = 6,36$, $p = 0,0120 < p = 0,05$).

Post hoc comparisons were done by means of a Scheffé-test to determine significant differences, if any, between the means of the subgroups in regard to the main factors, language and education.

In regard to language, the Afrikaans and English speaking groups were compared. In this comparison $t = 1,97$ so that $F' = 3,88$ (t^2) which with 2 and 521 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 3,88 > F = 3,86$ with 2 and 521 df p being $< 0,05$). In regard to branch location the group at Head Office was compared to the branch network. In this comparison $t = 1,97$ so that $F' = 3,88$ (t^2) which with 2 and 521 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 3,88 > F = 3,86$ with 2 and 521 df p being $< 0,05$). In regard to education the matric group was compared with the tertiary education group. In this comparison $t = 1,97$ so that $F' = 3,88$ (t^2) which with 2 and 521 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 3,88 > F = 3,86$ with 2 and 521 df p being $< 0,05$).

14.11 DIMENSION EXTERNAL CONTROL

Table 14.53 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the external control dimension by education group.

TABLE 14.53: TABLE OF EXTERNAL CONTROL BY EDUCATION GROUP.

External control count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
13	100 0,7 0,6		3 0,6
17	100 2,6 2,3		12 2,3
21	100 0,9 0,8		4 0,8
23	100 2 1,7		9 1,7
24	100 1,5 1,3		7 1,3
25	66,7 1,7 1,5	33,3 5,6 0,8	12 2,3
26	100 6,9 6		32 6
27	92,9 11,3 9,8	7,1 5,6 0,8	56 10,5
28	96,5 23,9 20,6	3,5 5,6 0,8	114 21,4
29	96,2 21,7 18,8	3,8 5,6 0,8	104 19,5
30	100 5,2 4,5		24 4,5

TABLE 14.53: (CONTINUED)

External control count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
31	75 2,6 2,3	25 5,6 0,8	16 3
32	100 2,6 2,3		12 2,3
33	58,5 5,2 4,5	41,5 23,6 3,2	41 7,7
34	42,1 1,7 1,5	57,9 15,3 2,1	19 3,6
35	60 2,6 2,3	40 11,1 1,5	20 3,8
36		100 5,6 0,8	4 0,8
37	100 4,3 3,8		20 3,8
38		100 5,6 0,8	4 0,8
40	100 1,7 1,5		8 1,5
41	33,3 0,9 0,8	66,7 11,1 1,5	12 2,3
Total Frequency Total Pct	461 86,5	72 13,5	533 100

Table 14:53 indicates that the majority of the matric group scores aggregate to the middle (67,7%) and high (19%) class intervals which indicate moderate to high external control. The majority of the tertiary qualified group scores aggregate to the higher (61,2%) class intervals, which indicate higher external control. Low external control is depicted by the matric group scores that aggregate to the low (4,2%) class intervals.

Table 14.54 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the external control dimension by branch group.

TABLE 14.54: TABLE OF EXTERNAL CONTROL BY BRANCH.

External control count	Branch groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Head Office	Branches	Row total
13		100 0,7 0,6	3 0,6
17		100 3 2,3	12 2,3
21		100 1 0,8	4 0,8
23	11,1 0,8 0,2	88,9 2 1,5	9 1,7
24	42,9 2,4 0,6	57,1 1 0,8	7 1,3
25	16,7 1,6 0,4	83,3 2,5 1,9	12 2,3
26	15,6 3,9 0,9	84,4 6,7 5,1	32 6

TABLE 14.54: (CONTINUED)

External control count	Branch groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Head Office	Branches	Row total
27	25 11 2,6	75 10,3 7,9	56 10,5
28	14 12,6 3	86 24,1 18,4	114 21,4
29	23,1 18,9 4,5	76,9 19,7 15	104 19,5
30	16,7 3,1 0,8	83,3 4,9 3,8	24 4,5
31		100 3,9 3	16 3
32	33,3 3,1 0,8	66,7 2 1,5	12 2,3
33	36,6 11,8 2,8	63,4 6,4 4,9	41 7,7
34	15,8 2,4 0,6	84,2 3,9 3	19 3,6
35	35 5,5 1,3	65 3,2 2,4	20 3,8
36	100 3,1 0,8		4 0,8
37	45 7,1 1,7	55 2,7 2,1	20 3,8

TABLE 14.54: (CONTINUED)

External control count	Branch groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Head Office	Branches	Row total
38	100 3,1 0,8		4 0,8
40		100 2 1,5	8 1,5
41	100 9,4 2,3		12 2,3
Total Frequency Total Pct	127 23,8	406 76,2	533 100

Table 14:54 indicates that the majority for both the Head Office and branch group scores aggregate in the lower and medium class intervals which indicate lower to moderate external control. Comparisons between the group scores for the higher class intervals of Head Office (45,5%) and the branches (20,2%) indicate higher external control at Head Office.

Table 14.55 displays the descriptive statistics of the dimension external control.

TABLE 14.55: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: EXTERNAL CONTROL.

Organizational factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Skewness	N
Age: 18 – 20 years	81,062	9,130	1,141	1,173	-0,658	64
Age: 21 – 25 years	76,688	10,199	0,789	3,580	-1,087	167
Age: 26 – 30 years	79,064	9,517	0,851	0,738	-0,194	125
Age: 31 – 40 years	80,903	8,469	0,878	-0,576	0,292	93
Age: 41 years and older	76,380	3,945	0,430	6,886	2,342	84
Married	78,374	9,524	0,558	3,419	-0,953	291
Unmarried or Divorced	78,557	8,460	0,543	1,041	0,256	242
Reformed Churches and Dutch Reformed Church	78,459	9,619	0,464	2,423	-0,591	429
Other church groups	78,451	6,200	0,607	-0,180	0,944	104
Qualification: Matric	77,160	8,401	0,391	4,031	-0,838	461
Tertiary qualified	86,763	8,679	1,022	-1,069	-0,462	72
Less than three years of service	79,152	10,581	0,924	-0,040	-0,429	131
Three to five years of service	76,107	9,007	0,764	7,398	-1,964	139
Six to ten years of service	80,620	9,105	0,876	0,520	-0,127	108
More than eleven years of service	78,449	7,071	0,579	1,175	1,144	149
Head Office staff	82,669	8,699	0,771	-1,039	0,291	127
Branch staff	77,140	8,758	0,434	3,658	-0,855	406

An analysis of the content of Table 14.55 reveals that the skewness scores of the external control dimension are also not normally distributed as the values for skewness

are either greater or less than zero (0). The distribution is negatively skewed or skewed to the left, except for subjects 31 years and older, unmarried/divorced subjects, those from other church groups, those with more than 11 years of service, and Head Office staff. An analyses of the value for kurtosis reveals that it is leptokurtic (value > 0,263), except for subjects 31 years and over, subjects from other church groups, tertiary qualified subjects, those with less than 3 years service, and Head Office subjects. The standard deviation is high which also indicates the skewness of the distribution. The standard error of the mean is very high for all the organizational factors and therefore inferences about the population cannot be drawn with confidence.

The influence of the independent variables (organizational factors) and their two-way interaction effects on the external control dimension were investigated by means of Anova. The calculations pertaining to these analyses of variance are presented in Table 14.56.

TABLE 14.56: ANOVA: EXTERNAL CONTROL BY ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS.

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Model	7	8375,84	1196,54	17,72	<0,0001*
Error	521	35187,60	67,53		
Corrected total	528	43563,45			
	R-square	C.V.	Root MSE	External Control Mean	
	0,192268	10,47	8,21	78,46	
Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
NULanguage	1	98,33	98,33	1,46	0,2281
NUEducation	1	5745,19	5745,19	85,07	0,0001*
NUBranch	1	3024,07	3024,07	44,78	0,0001*
NULanguage *NUEducation	1	70,59	70,59	1,05	0,3071
NUEducation *NUBranch	1	0,00	0,00	0,00	1,0000
* $p \leq 0,05$					

The information in Table 14.56 shows that significant differences are prevalent among the recoded independent variables in respect of external control. The overall F-ratio is significant ($F = 17,72$, $p < 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). This ratio, however, does not pinpoint

the particular recoded independent variables concerned. The first of these is education ($F = 85,07$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). Secondly, branch provided significant differences ($F = 44,78$, $p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05$). No significant two-way interactions were detected.

Post hoc comparisons were done by means of a Scheffé-test to determine significant differences, if any, between the means of the subgroups in regard to the main factor branch location.

In regard to branch location the group at Head Office were compared to the branch network. In this comparison $t = 1,97$ so that $F' = 3,88$ (t^2) which with 2 and 521 degrees of freedom (df) is significant ($F' = 3,88 > F = 3,86$ with 2 and 521 df p being $< 0,05$).

14.12 DIMENSION AUTONOMY

Table 14.57 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the autonomy dimension by education group for Head Office.

TABLE 14.57: TABLE OF AUTONOMY BY EDUCATION GROUP FOR HEAD OFFICE STAFF.

Autonomy count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
4	100 48,8 36,8		39 36,8
5	55,6 6,3 4,7	44,4 15,4 3,8	9 8,5
16	100 5 3,8		4 3,8
17	100 10 7,5		8 7,5
18	85,2 28,8 21,7	14,8 15,4 3,8	27 25,5
20	50 1,3 0,9	50 3,8 0,9	2 1,9
22		100 7,7 1,9	2 1,9
23		100 11,5 2,8	3 2,8
24		100 46,2 11,3	12 11,3
Total Frequency Total Pct	80 75,5	26 24,5	106 100

Table 14:57 indicates that the majority of the scores for tertiary qualified staff at Head Office aggregate in the higher class intervals (84,6%) which indicate higher levels of autonomy. The majority of the scores for matric qualified staff at Head Office aggregate in the lower class intervals, which indicate lower levels of autonomy.

Table 14.58 displays a cross-tabulation between class intervals of scores on the autonomy dimension by education group for the branch network.

TABLE 14.58: TABLE OF AUTONOMY BY EDUCATION GROUP FOR BRANCH STAFF.

Autonomy count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
4	100 2,5 2,3		8 2,3
5	100 2,2 2		7 2
10	100 0,9 0,9		3 0,9
12	100 3,8 3,4		12 3,4
15	100 3,8 3,4		12 3,4
16		100 11,8 1,1	4 1,1
17	100 7,6		24 6,8
18	89,6 21,8 19,7	10,4 23,5 2,3	77 21,9
19	100 36,3 32,8		115 32,8
20	94 14,8 13,4	6 8,8 0,9	50 14,2

TABLE 14.58: (CONTINUED)

Autonomy count	Education groups		
Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	Matric	Tertiary qualified	Row total
21	50 2,5 2,3	50 23,5 2,3	16 4,6
22	57,1 2,5 2,3	42,9 17,6 1,7	14 4
23	44,4 1,3 1,1	55,6 14,7 1,4	9 2,6
Total Frequency Total Pct	317 90,3	34 9,7	351 100

Table 14:58 indicates that the majority of the scores for both matric and tertiary qualified staff in the branch network aggregate in the higher class intervals which indicate higher levels of autonomy. High levels of autonomy are more prominent with tertiary qualified staff compared to matric qualified staff (88,2% vs. 79,2% respectively). Comparisons between Table 14.57 and Table 14.58 shows that high levels of autonomy are prominent with tertiary educated staff in both Head Office and the branch network, but are higher in the branch network. Also high levels of autonomy are prominent with matric qualified staff in the branch network, but the majority of matric qualified staff in Head Office showed lower levels of autonomy.

Table 14.59 displays the descriptive statistics of the dimension autonomy.

TABLE 14.59: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: AUTONOMY.

Organizational factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Skewness	N
Age: 18 – 20 years	22,437	7,018	0,877	0,096	-1,146	64
Age: 21 – 25 years	23,299	6,385	0,494	0,765	-1,250	167
Age: 26 – 30 years	23,688	5,442	0,486	1,494	-1,202	125
Age: 31 – 40 years	23,365	6,128	0,635	1,441	-1,356	93
Age: 41 years and older	26,571	3,380	0,368	0,491	-1,245	84
Married	23,584	5,944	0,348	1,326	-1,399	291
Unmarried or Divorced	24,090	5,936	0,381	1,565	-1,441	242
Reformed Churches and Dutch Reformed Church	23,526	6,315	0,304	0,969	-1,303	429
Other church groups	25	3,846	0,377	-0,723	-0,728	104
Qualification: Matric	24,418	5,661	0,263	1,804	-1,482	461
Tertiary qualified	19,944	6,261	0,737	0,126	-1,196	72
Less than three years of service	21,740	6,827	0,596	-0,222	-0,914	131
Three to five years of service	24,625	5,448	0,462	2,527	-1,653	139
Six to ten years of service	23	5,259	0,506	1,903	-1,259	108
More than eleven years of service	25,302	5,497	0,450	3,493	-1,866	149
Head Office staff	21,850	7,005	0,621	0,107	-1,006	127
Branch staff	77,140	8,758	0,434	3,658	-0,855	406

An analysis of the content of Table 14.59 reveals that the skewness scores for the autonomy dimension are also not normally distributed as the values for skewness are either greater or less than zero (0). The distribution is negatively skewed or skewed to the left for all the independent variables. An analysis of the value for kurtosis reveals that it is leptokurtic (value > 0,263), except for subjects aged 18 - 20 years, subjects from other church groups, tertiary qualified subjects, subjects with less than three years of service, and Head Office staff. The standard deviation is high which also indicates the skewness of the distribution. The standard error of the mean is also high for all the organizational factors and therefore inferences about the population cannot be drawn with confidence.

The influence of the independent variables (organizational factors) and their two-way interaction effects on the autonomy dimension were investigated by means of Anova. The calculations pertaining to these analyses of variance are presented in Table 14.60.

TABLE 14.60: ANOVA: AUTONOMY BY ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS.

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
Model	7	2458,56	351,22	11,29	0,0001*
Error	521	16207,66	31,10		
Corrected total	528	18666,23			
	R-square	C.V.	Root MSE	Autonomy Mean	
	0,131712	23,45	5,57	23,77	
Source	DF	Anova SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr F
NULanguage	1	315,99	315,99	10,16	0,0015*
NUEducation	1	1222,94	1222,94	39,31	0,0001*
NUBranch	1	712,65	712,65	22,91	0,0001*
NULanguage *NUEducation	1	54,63	54,63	1,76	0,1857
NUEducation *NUBranch	1	1,16	1,16	0,04	0,8463
* p ≤ 0,05					

The information in Table 14.60 shows that significant differences are prevalent among the recoded independent variables in respect of autonomy. The overall F-ratio is significant (F = 11,29, p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05). This ratio, however, does not pinpoint

the particular recoded independent variables concerned. The first of these is language (F = 10,16, p = 0,0015 < p = 0,05). Secondly, education (F = 39,31, p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05). Thirdly, branch provided significant differences (F = 22,91, p = 0,0001 < p = 0,05). There are no significant two-way interactions.

Post hoc comparisons were done by means of a Scheffé-test to determine significant differences, if any, between the means of the subgroups in regard to the main factors language and education.

In regard to language, the Afrikaans and English speaking groups were compared. In this comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 521 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F = 3,86 with 2 and 521 df p being < 0,05). In regard to branch location the group at Head Office was compared to the branch network. In this comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 521 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F = 3,86 with 2 and 521 df p being < 0,05). In regard to education the matric group was compared with the tertiary education group. In this comparison t = 1,97 so that F ' = 3,88 (t^2) which with 2 and 521 degrees of freedom (df) is significant (F ' = 3,88 > F = 3,86 with 2 and 521 df p being < 0,05).

14.13 STATISTICS OF ASSOCIATION

Methods of correlation of which the Bravais-Pearson product-moment correlation is the most common, are statistics of association. Ott et al.(1990:696) define the correlation coefficient as a "measure of linear dependence between two random variables". The correlation coefficient provides a measure of the strength as well as the direction of the relationship between two variables. In order to investigate the association between the five dimensions of the Motivation Questionnaire and the three dimensions of the Locus of Control Inventory, Bravais-Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated. The results are presented in Table 14.61.

TABLE 14.61: BRAVAIS-PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS: MOTIVATION AND LOCUS OF CONTROL QUESTIONNAIRES.

Factor	Job satis-faction	Social and esteem needs	Coaching for develop-ment	Individual-centred leadership	Team spirit	Int. contr.	Ext. contr.	Autonomy
Job satisfaction	1,000 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,129 (N=533) p=0,003*	0,408 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,006 (N=533) p=0,898	0,389 (N=533) p=0,000*	0,0229 (N=533) p=0,599	0,561 (N=533) p=0,000*	0,128 (N=533) 0,603
Social and esteem needs		1,000 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,240 (N=533) p=0,000*	0,628 (N=533) p=0,000*	0,213 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,169 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,082 (N=533) p=0,059	0,128 (N=533) p=0,003*
Coaching for development			1,000 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,317 (N=533) p=0,000*	0,255 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,116 (N=533) p=0,008*	0,245 (N=533) p=0,000*	0,302 (N=533) p=0,000*
Individual-centred leadership				1,000 (N=533) p=0,000*	0,334 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,193 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,189 (N=533) p=0,000*	0,199 (N=533) p=0,000*
Team spirit					1,000 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,255 (N=533) p=0,000*	0,082 (N=533) p=0,057	0,565 (N=533) p=0,000*
Internal control						1,000 (N=533) p=0,000*	0,470 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,239 (N=533) p=0,000*
External control							1,000 (N=533) p=0,000*	-0,221 (N=533) p=0,000*
Autonomy								1,000 (N=533) p=0,000*
* $p \leq 0,05$								

Table 14.61 shows low but significant positive correlations between job satisfaction on the one hand and coaching for development, team spirit, and external control. The low correlation between job satisfaction, and social and esteem needs is negative. The correlations between job satisfaction on the one hand and individual-centred leadership, internal control, and autonomy is insignificant. Positive correlations between social and esteem on the one hand and team spirit and autonomy on the other is significant but low. The negative correlation between social and esteem needs on the one hand and coaching for development, and internal control is significant and low. The positive correlation between social and esteem needs and individual-centred leadership needs is significant and moderately high. Positive correlations between coaching for development needs on the one hand and team spirit, external control, and autonomy are significant, but low. The correlation between coaching for development needs on the one hand and individual-centred leadership needs, and internal control on the other, is significant, negative and low. Positive correlations between individual-centred leadership needs on the one hand and team spirit and autonomy are significant, but low. Correlations between individual-centred leadership needs on the one hand and internal control, and external control are

significant, negative and low. The positive correlation between team spirit and autonomy is significant and moderately high. The correlation between team spirit and internal control is significant, negative and low. Also, the negative correlation between external control and autonomy is significant, but low. The negative correlation between internal control and autonomy is significant, but low. The low correlation, though significant and positive, between internal control and external control (0,470; $p=0,000 < p = 0,05$) is quite conspicuous.

14.14 DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

A discriminant analysis was conducted to investigate to which extent motivation needs and locus of control predict group membership among the subjects on various independent variables. The standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients are used to compile value profiles for the different groups. The results of the discriminant analyses conducted with the Wilks selection method are presented in Tables 14.62 to Tables 14.81.The Wilks selection method is a stepwise selection method that selects the variable with the largest acceptable value (selection criterion) as the first variable to be included in the analysis.

TABLE 14.62: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES: SUMMARY TABLE OF VARIABLES SELECTED - LANGUAGE GROUPS.

Step	Variable entered	Variable removed	Wilks Lambda	Significance
1	Individual-centred leadership	-	0,959	0,000
2	Coaching for development	-	0,933	0,000

Table 14.62 indicates that only two motivation variables, viz. individual-centred leadership, and coaching for development, best predict group membership according to the Afrikaans and English language groups. The classification function coefficients according to Fisher's linear discriminant functions are presented in Table 14.63.

TABLE 14.63: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CLASSIFICATION FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS- LANGUAGE GROUPS.

Variables	Afrikaans speaking	English speaking
Individual-centred leadership	4,167	4,657
Coaching for development	2,452	2,689
(Constant)	-246,024	-246,038

The accompanying canonical discriminant functions are presented in Table 14.64.

TABLE 14.64: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS - LANGUAGE GROUPS.

Function	Eigenvalue	Canonical correlation	Wilks Lambda	Chi-square	Significance
1	0,087	0,283	0,919	43,894	0,000 *
* p ≤ 0,05					

An analysis of Table 14.64 reveales only one discriminant function with a small eigenvalue that indicates that this is not a good function. The significance (p = 0,000) indicates that the language groups contribute to group differences. The Wilks Lambda (transformed to a chi-square value of 43,894) is only a test of the null hypothesis (H_o) that the population means are equal and as such provides little information about the effectiveness of the discriminant function in the classification (Norusis, 1984:90).

The classification results of the discriminant analysis are presented in Table 14.65.

TABLE 14.65: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CLASSIFICATION TABLE - LANGUAGE GROUPS.

Actual group membership	No of cases	Predicted group membership: Afrikaans speaking	Predicted group membership: English speaking
Afrikaans	457	(261) - 57,1%	(196) – 42,9%
English	71	(19) – 26,8%	(52) – 73,2%
Ungrouped cases	4	4	0
Percentage of "grouped" cases correctly classified: 59,28%			

The diagonal elements in Table 14.65 are the number of cases classified correctly into groups. It shows that 261 out of 457 cases (57,1%) in group 1 (Afrikaans speaking) are correctly classified. Also 52 out of 71 cases (73,2%) in group 2 (English speaking) are correctly classified. The overall percentage of "grouped cases" correctly classified, is 59,28%. This overall percentage is the sum of the number of cases classified correctly in each group divided by the total number of cases (Norusis, 1984:103). An overall percentage of 59,28% of cases grouped correctly may be a relatively good indication of these two motivation needs differences between Afrikaans and English speaking respondents.

TABLE 14.66: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: SUMMARY TABLE OF VARIABLES SELECTED - RELIGIOUS GROUPS.

Step	Variable entered	Variable removed	Wilks Lambda	Significance
1	Individual-centred leadership	-	0,986	0,008
2	Coaching for development	-	0,962	0,001

Table 14.66 indicates that only two motivation variables, viz. individual-centred leadership, and coaching for development, best predict religious group membership according to the Afrikaans churches (Reformed, Reformed ("Hervormd"), and Dutch Reformed), and English churches (Baptists, Roman Catholic, Methodist, Anglican, and Rhema) groups. The classification function coefficients according to Fisher's linear discriminant functions, are presented in Table 14.67.

TABLE 14.67: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CLASSIFICATION FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS - RELIGIOUS GROUPS.

Variables	Afrikaans churches	English churches
Individual-centred leadership	4,234	4,489
Coaching for development	2,338	2,576
(Constant)	-247,660	-246,429

The accompanying canonical discriminant functions are presented in Table 14.68.

TABLE 14.68: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS - RELIGIOUS GROUPS.

Function	Eigenvalue	Canonical correlation	Wilks Lambda	Chi-square	Significance
1	0,041	0,199	0,960	21,502	0,001 *
* $p \leq 0,05$					

An analysis of Table 14.68 reveales only one discriminant function with a small eigenvalue that indicates that this is not a good function. The significance ($p = 0,001$) indicates that church groups contribute to group differences.

The classification results of the discriminant analysis are presented in Table 14.69.

TABLE 14.69: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES: CLASSIFICATION TABLE - RELIGIOUS GROUPS.

Actual group membership	No of cases	Predicted group membership: Afrikaans churches	Predicted group membership: English churches
Afrikaans churches	428	(288) – 67,3%	(140) – 32,7%
English churches	104	(52) – 50,0%	(52) – 50,0%
Percentage of "grouped" cases correctly classified: 63,91%.			

The diagonal elements in Table 14.69 are the number of cases classified correctly into groups. It shows that 288 out of 428 cases (67,3%) in group 1 (Afrikaans churches) are correctly classified. Also 52 out of 104 cases (50,0%) in group 2 (English churches) are correctly classified. The overall percentage of "grouped cases" correctly classified, is 63,91%. An overall percentage of 63,91% of cases grouped correctly may be a relatively good indication of these two motivation needs differences between Afrikaans church respondents and English church respondents.

TABLE 14.70: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES: SUMMARY TABLE OF VARIABLES SELECTED - EDUCATION GROUPS.

Step	Variable entered	Variable removed	Wilks Lambda	Significance
1	Team spirit	-	0,918	0,000
2	Job satisfaction	-	0,834	0,000
3	Individual-centred leadership	-	0,784	0,000
4	Coaching for development	-	0,772	0,000

Table 14.70 indicates that four motivation variables, viz. team spirit, job satisfaction, individual-centred leadership, and coaching for development, best predict group membership according to the education groups (Matric and tertiary qualified staff). The classification function coefficients according to Fisher's linear discriminant functions are presented in Table 14.71.

TABLE 14.71: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CLASSIFICATION FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS - EDUCATION GROUPS.

Variables	Matric	Tertiary qualified
Team spirit	-1,256	-1,776
Job satisfaction	2,285	2,697
Individual-centred leadership	7,785	7,593
Coaching for development	2,199	2,350
(Constant)	-107,891	-105,927

The accompanying canonical discriminant functions are presented in Table 14.72.

TABLE 14.72: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS - EDUCATION GROUPS.

Function	Eigenvalue	Canonical correlation	Wilks Lambda	Chi-square	Significance
1	0,294	0,476	0,772	135,910	0,000 *
* $p \leq 0,05$					

Table 14.72 reveales only one discriminant function with a small eigenvalue that indicates that this is not a good function. The significance ($p = 0,000$) indicates that education groups contribute to group differences.

The classification results of the discriminant analysis are presented in Table 14.73.

TABLE 14.73: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CLASSIFICATION TABLE - EDUCATION GROUPS.

Actual group membership	No of cases	Predicted group membership: Matric	Predicted group membership: Tertiary qualified
Matric	460	(372) – 80,9%	(88) – 19,1%
Tertiary qualified	72	(22) – 30,6%	(50) – 69,4%
Percentage of "grouped" cases correctly classified: 79,32%			

The diagonal elements in Table 14.73 are the number of cases classified correctly into groups. It shows that 372 out of 460 cases (80,9%) in group 1 (Matric qualified) are correctly classified. Also 50 out of 72 cases (69,4%) in group 2 (Tertiary qualified) are correctly classified. The overall percentage of "grouped cases" correctly classified, is 79,32%. The overall percentage of 79,32% of cases grouped correctly is a relatively good indication of these motivation needs differences between matric qualified and tertiary qualified respondents.

Table 14.74: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES: SUMMARY TABLE OF VARIABLES SELECTED - EDUCATION GROUPS.

Step	Variable entered	Variable removed	Wilks Lambda	Significance
1	Locus of control	-	0,876	0,000
2	Motivation needs	-	0,755	0,000

Table 14.74 indicates that both locus of control and motivation needs predict group membership according to the Education groups (matric qualified or tertiary qualified). The classification function coefficients according to Fisher's linear discriminant functions are presented in Table 14.75.

TABLE 14.75: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CLASSIFICATION FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS - EDUCATION GROUPS.

Variables	Matric qualified	Tertiary qualified
Locus of control	0,654	0,737
Motivation needs	0,894	0,746
(Constant)	-172,826	-183,415

The accompanying canonical discriminant functions are presented in Table 14.76.

TABLE 14.76: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS - EDUCATION GROUPS.

Function	Eigenvalue	Canonical correlation	Wilks Lambda	Chi-square	Significance
1	0,324	0,494	0,755	148,620	0,000 *
* $p \leq 0,05$					

Table 14.76 reveales only one discriminant function with a small eigenvalue that indicates that this is not a good function. The significance ($p = 0,000$) indicates that the education groups contribute to group differences.

The classification results of the discriminant analysis are presented in Table 14.77.

TABLE 14.77: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CLASSIFICATION TABLE - EDUCATION GROUPS.

Actual group membership	No of cases	Predicted group membership: Matric qualified	Predicted group membership: Tertiary qualified
Matric qualified	460	(362) – 78,7%	(98) – 21,3%
Tertiary qualified	72	(8) – 11,1%	(64) – 88,9%
Percentage of "grouped" cases correctly classified: 80,08%			

The diagonal elements in Table 14.77 are the number of cases classified correctly into groups. It shows that 362 out of 460 cases (78,7%) in group 1 (matric qualified) are

correctly classified. Also 64 out of 72 cases (88,9%) in group 2 (tertiary qualified) are correctly classified. The overall percentage of "grouped cases" correctly classified, is 80,08%. This overall percentage of 80,08% of cases grouped correctly is a very good indication of the motivation needs and locus of control differences between respondents with matric and those with tertiary qualifications.

TABLE 14.78: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: SUMMARY TABLE OF VARIABLES SELECTED - BRANCH GROUPS.

Step	Variable entered	Variable removed	Wilks Lambda	Significance
1	Job satisfaction	-	0,969	0,001
2	Coaching for development	-	0,953	0,000
3	Social and esteem needs	-	0,943	0,000
4	Individual-centred leadership	-	0,928	0,000

Table 14.78 indicates that four motivation variables, viz. job satisfaction, coaching for development, social and esteem needs, and individual-centred leadership best predict group membership according to the branch groups (Head Office or branch network). The classification function coefficients according to Fisher's linear discriminant functions are presented in Table 14.79.

TABLE 14.79: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CLASSIFICATION FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS - BRANCH GROUPS.

Variables	Head Office	Branch network
Job satisfaction	5,404	5,256
Coaching for development	-1,433	-1,175
Social and esteem needs	-3,507	-3,313
Individual-centred leadership	4,700	4,516
(Constant)	-368,954	-365,706

The accompanying canonical discriminant functions are presented in Table 14.80.

TABLE 14.80: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS - BRANCH GROUPS.

Function	Eigenvalue	Canonical correlation	Wilks Lambda	Chi-square	Significance
1	0,078	0,270	0,927	39,925	0,000 *
* p ≤ 0,05					

Table 14.80 reveales only one discriminant function with a small eigenvalue that indicates that this is not a good function. The small significance (p = 0,000) indicates that the branch groups contribute significantly to group differences.

The classification results of the discriminant analysis are presented in Table 14.81.

TABLE 14.81: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: CLASSIFICATION TABLE - BRANCH GROUPS.

Actual group membership	No of cases	Predicted group membership: Head Office	Predicted group membership: Branch network
Head Office	127	(77) – 60,6%	(50) – 39,4%
Branch network	405	(153) – 37,8%	(252) – 62,2%
Percentage of "grouped" cases correctly classified: 61,84%			

The diagonal elements in Table 14.81 are the number of cases classified correctly into groups. It shows that 77 out of 127 cases (60,6%) in group 1 (Head Office) are correctly classified. Also 252 out of 405 cases (62,2%) in group 2 (Branch network) are correctly classified. The overall percentage of "grouped cases" correctly classified, is 61,84% which is a relatively good indication of these motivation needs differences between respondents in the Head Office and those in the branch network.

14.15 CONCLUSION

In this chapter the results of the statistical analysis of the data were presented. The scientific data was presented according to the specific responses of participants on the three questionnaires. Descriptive statistics were used to record the numerical properties of the various distributions. Correlation statistics were employed to ascertain the relationship

between the dimensions of the Motivation Questionnaire and the Locus of Control Inventory. The main independent variables of the biographical questionnaire (age, gender, home language, marital status, religious denomination, educational qualifications, salary per month, years of service, branch office/section at Head Office, and job grade) and where applicable their two-way interactions, were investigated and compared by means of discriminant analysis and analysis of variance in combination with the Scheffe test.

Conclusions drawn from these findings and recommendations will be discussed in Chapter XV.