

CHAPTER 5

DATA ANALYSIS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 3 focused on the way in which the researcher obtained the data needed to complete this study. This chapter now looks at the actual research process, followed by the research at the factory. The chapter is divided into the following sections:

- An overview of the actual research undertaken at the factory from a practical perspective.
- An analysis of the description of variables.
- The factor and reliability analysis.
- Comparisons between empirical factors and variables.
- Cross tabs between Section A and Section C of the questionnaire.

The following section provides an overview of the actual research at the factory and outlines the actions undertaken by the researcher before start of the research.

5.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY – A PRACTICAL OVERVIEW

The researcher used the following research methodology in order to link the theory of employee empowerment to the actual research.

5.2.1 Focus group

The researcher collected data at Allwear from management by means of a focus group and requested the employees to complete questionnaires.

To be able to conduct the focus group, the researcher developed an interview schedule (see Appendix A) with nine open-ended questions. These questions were formulated using theory on organisational empowerment from Chapter 2. These questions were of such a nature that they encouraged the group of seven directors to discuss employee empowerment at length. The seven directors consisted of the managing director of Allwear, two marketing managers, the factory manager, the human resources manager, the quality control manager and the logistics manager. Field notes and audio cassettes were used to capture the data. Transcripts were made of these audio cassettes. Both the field notes and transcripts were coded and placed into an analysis schedule, to form certain themes. These themes were drawn on to some extent in the course of formulating the questionnaire for the employees.

(See Appendix B: Field notes; Appendix C: Transcript; and Appendix D: Analysis schedule.)

The second leg of the research at the factory was the development of the questionnaire.

5.2.2 Questionnaire

The development of the questionnaire started with the application of all the theory in Chapter 2 relating to employee empowerment. The objectives of this study were to gain insight into employee empowerment at the factory and to develop a measurement tool.

The researcher developed a large item pool. From this, questions were formulated to cover all the dimensions of employee empowerment. The challenge was to develop questions that were simple enough for illiterate Zulu-speaking

employees to understand. At the same time these questions had to elicit suitable data for the study. The themes developed from the focus group had to be incorporated into the questions as well. The final questionnaire had three sections. Section A comprised the descriptive data. Section B had 22 questions that covered the theory on employee empowerment and data collected from the focus group. Section C had 20 questions covering the theory on organisation empowerment and the data collected from the focus group. Section B was intended for scale development and Section C for indicator development.

The questionnaire then had to be translated as the majority of respondents were fluent in Zulu and spoke very little English. Prof. Lionel Posthumus, head of Department of African Languages, did the translation. In order to ensure the correctness of the translated questionnaire, it was translated back into English. This process ensured the reliability and validity of the questionnaire.

(See Appendix E: Employee empowerment questionnaire; Appendix F: Translated questionnaire (Zulu); Appendix G: A questionnaire to determine employee empowerment (questionnaire translated back to English); Appendix H: Proof of translation; and Appendix I: Proof of printed questionnaire.)

5.2.3 Data collection

Allwear has a total of 1 331 employees. The sample size was 300 respondents. The personnel manager compiled a jobs classification, giving a list of different departments and indicating how many employees there were in each. In each department, a representative percentage of employees were identified to complete the questionnaires. The researcher used Stoker's (1987) stratified random sampling tables to choose employees in each department. The personnel manager only received a list with numbers from the researcher. This list indicated how many employees were to participate from each department. These employees were represented as numbers on the list in order to maintain their anonymity.

(See Appendix J: List of departments and employees; and Appendix K: List of sample.)

Eight Zulu-speaking fieldworkers were sourced. The fieldworkers were third- and fourth-year students, mostly from the Social Work Department. Two English-speaking fieldworkers (including the researcher) also assisted with the process. All fieldworkers were trained as to how to complete the questionnaire prior to the actual process. At the factory the employees were called according to the numbers given to the personnel manager. Each questionnaire was completed individually with the help of the fieldworkers. Most of the respondents were illiterate. The researcher gave each fieldworker a list of the five faces ranging from friendly to cross. These faces helped with the completion of Section B. (See Appendix L: Faces.)

Statkon conducted a statistical analysis of all the completed questionnaires. The interpretation was done by the researcher.

The following section presents the actual interpretation of the questionnaire.

5.3 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

5.3.1 Descriptive characteristics of the sample

A. The following sections contain the most prominent demographic characteristics of the sample.

5.3.1.1 Gender

Table 5.1: Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	28	9.3	9.5	9.5
	Female	268	89.0	90.5	100.0
Total		296	98.3	100.0	
Missing System		5	1.7		
Grand Total		301	100.0		

From the table it is clear that 90.5% of the respondents were female and 9.5% were male. The sample therefore has far more female respondents than male respondents. The research was done at a textile factory. Sewing is traditionally regarded as a female activity. The factory was established in 1939. Some of the workers that started when the factory opened are still employed. This explains the very high percentage female respondents. (See Table 5.6.) It means that the scale was tested on a predominantly female sample.

5.3.1.2 Home language

Table 5.2: Home Language (Recoded)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other	25	8.3	8.4	8.4
	Zulu	271	90.0	91.6	100.0
Total		296	98.3	100.0	
Missing System		5	1.7		
Grand Total		301	100.0		

Since the majority of respondents were Zulu speaking, Table 5.2 was recoded to Zulu and 'other' languages.

The language distribution indicates that the majority of respondents speak Zulu as a first language (91.6%). The research was done in KwaZulu-Natal, thereby explaining the high percentage Zulu speaking respondents.

5.3.1.3 Age

Table 5.3: Age (Recoded)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Younger than 35 years	84	27.9	28.7	28.7
	Between 35 – 45 years	109	36.2	37.2	65.9
	Older than 45 years	100	33.2	34.1	100.0
Total		293	97.3	100.0	
Missing System		8	2.7		
Grand Total		301	100.0		

Respondents' ages varied from 21 to 69, with a mean age of 41.4 years. Most of the respondents (37.2%) were in the age group 35 to 45 years. This sample is therefore inclined towards respondents who are in the middle stages of their life cycle. Because of this, Table 5.3 was recoded into three different age groups.

5.3.1.4 Marital status

Table 5.4: Marital status (Recoded)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Single/Divorced/ Separated/Widowed	196	65.1	66.4	66.4
Married/Cohabiting	99	32.9	33.6	100.0
Total	295	98.0	100.0	
Missing System	6	2.0		
Grand Total	301	100.0		

The majority of the respondents (66.4%) were single, divorced, separated or widowed. Only 33.6% of respondents were married or cohabiting. Because of this, Table 5.4 was recoded into single and married respondents.

5.3.1.5 Educational qualifications

Table 5.5: What is your highest qualification? (Recoded)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Grade 7 and lower	124	41.2	41.9	41.9
Grade 8 – 10	95	31.6	32.1	74.0
Grade 11 and higher	77	25.6	26.0	100.0
Total	296	98.3	100.0	
Missing System	5	1.7		
Grand Total	301	100.0		

From the sample above, it is clear that the highest percentage (41.9%) of respondents only have obtained grade 7 or lower. The research was done in a rural area where the older respondents did not have schooling opportunities in the past. The recoding of Table 5.5 was also necessary to reflect that the scale would be tested on a large group of illiterate or semi-illiterate respondents.

5.3.1.6 Years of service at Allwear

Table 5.6: Number of completed years of service at Allwear (Recoded)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 5 years and less	83	27.6	28.1	28.1
Between 6 and 14 years	110	36.5	37.3	65.4
15 years and more	102	33.9	34.6	100.0
Total	295	98.0	100.0	
Missing System	6	2.0		
Grand Total	301	100.0		

Most of the respondents (37.3%) have been employed by Allwear for 6 to 14 years, and 34.6% for more than 15 years. This sample reflects that long term employment seems to be a common phenomenon at Allwear.

5.3.1.7 Paid (weekly or monthly)

Table 5.7: Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Weekly	260	86.4	88.1	88.1
Monthly	35	11.6	11.9	100.0
Total	295	98.0	100.0	
Missing System	6	2.0		
Grand Total	301	100.0		

The majority of employees (88.1%) are paid weekly.

5.3.1.8 Qualified worker or learner

Table 5.8: Are you a qualified worker or are you a learner?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Qualified	284	94.4	95.9	95.9
Learner	12	4.0	4.1	100.0
Total	296	98.3	100.0	
Missing System	5	1.7		
Grand Total	301	100.0		

The majority of workers at the factory (95.9%) are qualified. Although a high percentage of workers are qualified, they are still paid weekly, as seen in Table 5.8.

5.3.1.9 If you are a learner, for how many months are you in training now?

Table 5.9:

If you are a learner, for how many months have you been in training?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Less than one month	3	1.0	25.0	25.0
At least 1 but less than 2 months	4	1.3	33.3	58.3
At least 2 but less than 3 months	1	.3	8.3	66.7
8 – 18 months	2	.7	16.7	83.3
More than 24 months	2	.7	16.7	100.0
Total	12	4.0	100.0	
Missing System	289	96.0		
Grand Total	301	100.0		

The majority of learners (33.3%) at the factory have been in training for at least one month, but for less than two months.

5.3.1.10 What type of learner are you?

Table 5.10: What type of learner are you?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid General worker	8	2.7	66.7	66.7
Machinist	4	1.3	33.3	100.0
Total	12	4.0	100.0	
Missing System	289	96.0		
Grand Total	301	100.0		

Most of the learners (66.7%) are training to be general workers.

5.3.1.11 What type of qualified worker are you?

Table 5.11: What type of qualified worker are you? (Recoded)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	General worker	101	33.6	35.6	35.6
	Machinist	123	40.9	43.3	78.9
	Other	60	19.9	21.1	100.0
Total		284	94.4	100.0	
Missing System		17	5.6		
Grand Total		301	100.0		

The machinist (43.3%) and general workers (35.6%) comprise the highest percentage of qualified workers in the factory. These workers have to make the clothes. Since making school clothes is the factory's main business, it explains these results. For this reason recoding was necessary.

This concludes the descriptive statistics. In the following section the researcher will begin the analysis of the validity and reliability of the measurement instrument. It should be noted that, contrary to the practice of validation as outlined in Chapter 3, the researcher uses factor analysis to establish the validity of the dimensions of measurements. This procedure was followed primarily because factor analysis as an empirical technique is widely accepted and used as a method of determining empirical constructs. For further validation of the scale following this study, more conventional methods, such as those in econometric scale development, will be utilised.

5.3.2 Factor and reliability analysis

B. A factor analysis was conducted to determine the factors underlying Section B of the questionnaire. This section comprises a set of opinion-related questions. The factor analysis will identify groups of variables in such a way that variables in the same group are highly correlated with one another but essentially uncorrelated with the variables in another group (Eiselen & Uys, 2002:98).

Section B consisted of 22 questions. Question 13 was excluded due to high skewness and kurtosis in the resulting distribution graphs. Questions 9, 15 and 18 were excluded due to very low MSA values. Question 17 was stated negatively and had to be interpreted positively. Reverse scoring was used together with subsequent recoding.

5.3.2.1 First order factor analysis

Table 5.12: Rotated factor matrix^a

	Factor				
	1	2	3	4	5
b10	.721	.186			.114
b12	.575		.199		
b4	.534	.126			
b16	.484			.221	.184
b5	.410	.194	.185	.222	
b17	.295				.186
b2	.143	.784	.180		
b7		.614	.236		.392
b1	.179	.594			
b3	.196	.436	.125	.329	
b6		.311	.267	.153	.245
b20			.526		
b22	.167		.511		
b19		.108	.489		.166
b8	.236	.171	.453		.216
b21			.361	.104	
b14	.182		.125	.692	
b11	.152	.136	.136	.237	.376

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation

^a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations

A rotated factor matrix was done in which five main factors were initially identified. Factors 4 and 5 were disregarded since only one question determined each of these factors and one item cannot make a scale. At least five questions should represent one factor.

It can be seen from Table 5.12 that questions B10, B12, B4, B16, B5 and B17 converged into Factor 1. Factor 2's highest loadings were on questions B2, B7, B1, B3 and B6. Factor 3's loadings were on questions B20, B22, B19, B8 and

B21, whilst Factor 4 consisted of question B14 and Factor 5 of question B11. It can be concluded that the three empirical dimensions have sufficient empirical and internal validity to be used as a multi-dimensional scale.

5.3.2.1.1 Reliability analysis

A reliability analysis was done on the three remaining factors.

5.3.2.1.2 Factor 1

Table 5.13: Factor 1 – Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
.684	6

The reliability statistic for Factor 1 according to Cronbach's Alpha was .684. This is greater than 0.6, making this a reliable factor.

However, the accepted scale standard of .9 was not achieved. This may be attributed largely to the relatively small sample size (N = 301). It is assumed that further research is required to improve this coefficient.

5.3.2.1.3 Factor 2

Table 5.14: Factor 2 – Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
.718	5

The reliability statistic for Factor 2 according to Cronbach's Alpha was .718. This is greater than 0.6, making this a reliable factor.

This reliability is sufficient for this study, although it requires improvement for scale development purposes.

5.3.2.1.4 Factor 3

Table 5.15: Factor 3 – Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
.594	5

The reliability statistic for Factor 3 according to Cronbach's Alpha was .594. This is smaller than .6, making this an unreliable factor. This particular factor was not investigated further for this reason.

These items will have to be improved in order to improve the alpha in subsequent research.

5.3.2.2 Second order factor analysis

All five factors identified in the first order factor analysis were used to do a second order factor analysis. One factor was identified.

Table 5.16: Second Order Factor – Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
.779	18

The reliability statistics for this second order analysis, according to Cronbach's Alpha, was .779. This makes it more than .6, and thus a reliable factor.

The Factor 2 result clearly indicates that the scale as a whole has sufficient empirical integrity to be used in further analysis. The combined scale allows the researcher to measure both organisational and personal perceptions of empowerment simultaneously, thereby obtaining an overall empowerment performance score in an organisation.

5.3.2.3 First Order: Factor 1, Factor 2, Second Order Factor

5.3.2.3.1 Factor 1

The first factor identified came from questions B4, B5, B10, B12, B16 and B17. All of these questions had to do with management. The employees' opinions regarding management — whether management treats them fairly, whether they are asked for their opinions, or whether any changes had been made, to name a few — were explored. This factor was termed 'support'. It is interesting to note that the empirically derived factor confirms the dimension of empowerment derived from the theory.

These questions focused on how management could solve problems, whether management ask the opinions of the employees, whether the employees are treated fairly by management and whether employees can talk to management. The researcher is of the opinion that, by means of these questions, it is possible to determine whether management supports their employees or not. The support may be given on different levels.

5.3.2.3.2 Factor 2

The second factor's questions were B1, B2, B3, B6 and B7. All of these questions had to do with how employees view themselves at work. These questions had to do with positive feelings of employees at work and a sense of knowing. This factor may be termed 'responsibility'.

The questions relating to Factor 2 in the questionnaire had to do with what employees know. Were the employees satisfied, motivated and enthusiastic? If they are, they are then likely to feel responsible towards their work and towards the factory. The researcher is of the opinion that responsibility and employee empowerment are directly correlated. A responsible employee will take the organisation into consideration as well as his/her own wellbeing as an employee. This will benefit the employee as well as the organisation. This second factor describes the theory derived empowerment construct.

5.3.2.3.3 Second Order Combined Factor

This factor was identified through the second order factor analysis. Five factors were identified with this first order, but only the above two factors were statistically reliable. The researcher named this factor employee empowerment. The goal of the study is to broaden the knowledge base about employee empowerment, hence the choice of name. The second order factor confirms that the designed scale measures empowerment when applied in combination.

5.4 COMPARISONS BETWEEN EMPIRICAL FACTORS AND VARIABLES

Based on the above result, it is now possible to use the derived scale to facilitate comparisons between different groups in the organisation. It should be noted, though, that for purposes of developing a commercially usable scale, a range of other analytical tests needs to be conducted in order to further validate the instrument. Such validation is, however, beyond the scope of the current study.

In this section a comparison is made between each of the three empirical factors identified in the previous section and the variables in Section A of the questionnaire. For this section, the researcher will rely mainly on the t-test and ANOVA. The researcher will refer to Factor 1, Factor 2 and the combined factor in each case, unless otherwise indicated. Factor 1 refers to management support for empowerment, Factor 2 to employee perceptions and the combined factor to empowerment.

5.4.1 Gender

Are there any differences between men and women with regard to the three factors?

Table 5.17: Gender: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Male	26	3.2564	1.12470	.22057
	Female	257	2.9339	.92254	.05755
First Order Factor 2	Male	28	4.1643	.97533	.18432
	Female	261	4.2452	.73878	.04573
Second Order Factor	Male	25	3.7000	.80236	.16047
	Female	250	3.6969	.57098	.03611

Levene's test for equality of variances indicated that equal variances can be assumed in the first order factors one and two. Equal variances cannot be assumed in the case of the second order factor (employee empowerment).

Table 5.18: Gender: Independent Samples Test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sg.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	3.828	.051	1.663	281	.097	.32256	.19392	-.05916	.70428
	Equal variances not assumed			1.415	28.506	.168	.32256	.22796	-.14401	.78913
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	2.642	.105	-.533	287	.595	-.08093	.15196	-.38003	.21818
	Equal variances not assumed			-.426	30.414	.673	-.08093	.18991	-.46855	.30670
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	11.232	.001	.025	273	.980	.00311	.12480	-.24257	.24880
	Equal variances not assumed			.019	26.486	.985	.00311	.16448	-.33469	.34091

The values .097, .595 and .985 are greater than 0.05. It may therefore be assumed that there are no differences between men and women with regard to support, responsibility and employee empowerment.

Directional measures show that gender has very small practical value in any of the three factors: 0.99, 0.31 and .002, respectively.

5.4.2 Home language

Is there any difference between Zulu-speaking workers and other language groups with regards to the three different factors?

Table 5.19: Home language: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	(Recoded) Home language	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Other	25	3.5267	1.06031	.21206
	Zulu	258	2.9089	.91736	.05711
First Order Factor 2	Other	25	4.4560	.59587	.11917
	Zulu	264	4.2167	.77491	.04769
Second Order Factor	Other	24	4.0394	.58760	.11994
	Zulu	251	3.6645	.58518	.03694

Levene's test for equality of variances indicates equal variances assumed in all three factors.

Table 5.20: Home language: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	2.087	.150	3.170	281	.002	.61775	.19489	.23412	1.00139
	Equal variances not assumed			2.813	27.594	.009	.61775	.21962	.16759	1.06792
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	1.871	.172	1.502	287	.134	.23933	.15936	-.07433	.55299
	Equal variances not assumed			1.864	32.227	.071	.23933	.12836	-.02206	.50073
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	.059	.808	2.997	273	.003	.37490	.12507	.12867	.62113
	Equal variances not assumed			2.987	27.546	.006	.37490	.12550	.11763	.63217

With regards to factor one and the second order factor, there are significant differences between Zulu speakers and other language groups. Referring back to Table 5.20, it is clear that other language groups have a more positive perception of support and employee empowerment. All language groups experience responsibility at the same level. It can be assumed that the other language groups are employed in higher positions and are better qualified. Therefore they can see the bigger picture and identify where the factory gives support to employees.

Home language presents little real impact on support (.186) and employee empowerment (.175). The practical value linked to responsibility (.088) is almost negligible.

5.4.3 Age

Are there any differences between different age groups with regard to the three factors?

Table 5.21: Age: Descriptives

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
First Order Factor 1	Younger than 35 years	80	2.9729	1.00611	.11249	2.7490	3.1968	1.00	5.00
	Between 35 - 45 years	108	2.9907	.98505	.09479	2.8028	3.1786	1.00	5.00
	Older than 45 years	92	2.9004	.84409	.08800	2.7256	3.0752	1.00	5.00
	Total	280	2.9560	.94484	.05646	2.8448	3.0671	1.00	5.00
First Order Factor 2	Younger than 35 years	81	3.9753	.86278	.09586	3.7845	4.1661	1.00	5.00
	Between 35 - 45 years	109	4.3725	.60826	.05826	4.2570	4.4880	2.40	5.00
	Older than 45 years	96	4.3000	.78620	.08024	4.1407	4.4593	1.60	5.00
	Total	286	4.2357	.76355	.04515	4.1468	4.3245	1.00	5.00
Second Order Factor	Younger than 35 years	79	3.5914	.69668	.07838	3.4354	3.7475	2.11	4.94
	Between 35 - 45 years	105	3.7344	.58313	.05691	3.6215	3.8472	2.22	5.00
	Older than 45 years	88	3.7342	.50028	.05333	3.6282	3.8402	2.56	4.78
	Total	272	3.6928	.59562	.03611	3.6217	3.7639	2.11	5.00

In the test of homogeneity of variances, it appears that there is a difference in variance responses to questions relating to Factor 2 and the second order factor.

Table 5.22: Age: Test of homogeneity of variances

Test of Homogeneity of Variances				
	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
First Order Factor 1	2.347	2	277	.098
First Order Factor 2	8.188	2	283	.000
Second Order Factor	6.517	2	269	.002

H_0 : There is no difference between age groups with regard to Factor 1, Factor 2 and the second order factor.

H_1 : There is a difference between age groups regarding the three factor groups.

Table 5.23: Age: ANOVA and factors

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
First Order Factor 1	Between groups	.438	2	.219	.244	.784
	Within groups	248.630	277	.898		
	Total	249.068	279			
First Order Factor 2	Between groups	7.928	2	3.964	7.090	.001
	Within groups	158.228	283	.559		
	Total	166.156	285			
Second Order Factor	Between groups	1.145	2	.572	1.620	.200
	Within groups	94.997	269	.353		
	Total	96.141	271			

Factor 1 and the second order factor's p-values are greater than 0.05, therefore we do not reject H_0 . However, in Factor 2 p is less than 0.05. H_0 is thus rejected in favour of H_1 in this case. Therefore it can be stated that different age groups experience support and employee empowerment in the same way. Responsibility is experienced differently by the different age groups. Referring to Table 5.23, it can be noted that respondents younger than 35 years experience less responsibility.

Age has little real impact on support (.042) and employee empowerment (.109). It has some influence on responsibility (.218), but this is also small.

5.4.4 Marital status

Are there any differences between single and cohabitating respondents with regard to the three different factors?

Table 5.24: Marital status: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	(Recoded)Marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Single/Divorced/Separated/Widowed	188	2.9051	.92773	.06766
	Married/Cohabiting	94	3.0922	.97017	.10007
First Order Factor 2	Single/Divorced/Separated/Widowed	191	4.1602	.78142	.05654
	Married/Cohabiting	97	4.4000	.69940	.07101
Second Order Factor	Single/Divorced/Separated/Widowed	182	3.6377	.59523	.04412
	Married/Cohabiting	92	3.8200	.57649	.06010

In Levene's test for equality, equal variances are assumed in the case of all three factors.

Table 5.25: Marital status: Independent sample test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	.293	.589	-1.572	280	.117	-.18706	.11900	-.42131	.04719
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.549	178.885	.123	-.18706	.12079	-.42542	.05131
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	3.483	.063	-2.548	286	.011	-.23979	.09412	-.42504	-.05454
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.642	213.039	.009	-.23979	.09077	-.41872	-.06086
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	.059	.808	-2.420	272	.016	-.18238	.07535	-.33072	-.03404
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.446	188.049	.015	-.18238	.07456	-.32946	-.03530

The significance of .117 with regard to marital status does not influence support (first order factor one). However, the results .011 and .016 indicate that single respondents and cohabiting respondents have different perceptions of responsibility and employee empowerment.

The researcher is of the opinion that single respondents feel less responsible and empowered. Because of the traditional environment, single people are not embraced by the community and have less status. Single parents have their homes, children and financial responsibilities to cope with. Responsibility at work might be too much for them. This can lead to workers who are not empowered.

It can be assumed that those respondents younger than 35 years experience less responsibility because of their traditional and cultural background. The older people in the community must be treated with respect and have more authority than the younger people. This may lead to the younger members of the workforce feeling that they don't have any responsibilities; that all responsibility lies with the older respondents.

The real impact on support (.094) is very small, but nevertheless slightly higher than for responsibility (.149) and employee empowerment (.145).

5.4.5 Highest educational qualifications

Table 5.26: Highest educational qualifications: Descriptives

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
First Order Factor 1	Grade 7 and lower	115	2.9826	.85651	.07987	2.8244	3.1408	1.00	4.83
	Grade 8 – 10	92	2.7971	.95721	.09980	2.5989	2.9953	1.17	5.00
	Grade 11 and higher	76	3.1360	1.03341	.11854	2.8998	3.3721	1.00	5.00
	Total	283	2.9635	.94523	.05619	2.8529	3.0741	1.00	5.00
First Order Factor 2	Grade 7 and lower	120	4.3600	.67692	.06179	4.2376	4.4824	1.80	5.00
	Grade 8 – 10	92	4.1957	.81199	.08466	4.0275	4.3638	1.60	5.00
	Grade 11 and higher	77	4.0961	.80890	.09218	3.9125	4.2797	1.00	5.00
	Total	289	4.2374	.76321	.04489	4.1490	4.3257	1.00	5.00
Second Order Factor	Grade 7 and lower	110	3.7571	.48338	.04609	3.6657	3.8484	2.56	4.72
	Grade 8 – 10	90	3.6265	.66479	.07008	3.4873	3.7658	2.22	4.94
	Grade 11 and higher	75	3.6941	.64707	.07472	3.5452	3.8430	2.11	5.00
	Total	275	3.6972	.59386	.03581	3.6267	3.7677	2.11	5.00

In the test of homogeneity of variances, it appears that there is a difference in variances with regard to first order factor 2 and second order factor 1.

Table 5.27:
Highest educational qualifications: Test of homogeneity of variances

Test of Homogeneity of Variances				
	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
First Order Factor 1	2.972	2	280	.053
First Order Factor 2	3.500	2	286	.031
Second Order Factor	5.618	2	272	.004

H_0 : There is no difference between educational levels with regard to first order factor one and second order factor two.

H_1 : There is a difference between educational levels of workers with regard to responsibility.

Table 5.28: Highest educational qualifications: ANOVA

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
First Order Factor 1	Between groups	4.850	2	2.425	2.748	.066
	Within groups	247.106	280	.883		
	Total	251.956	282			
First Order Factor 2	Between groups	3.501	2	1.751	3.048	.049
	Within groups	164.255	286	.574		
	Total	167.756	288			
Second Order Factor	Between groups	.844	2	.422	1.199	.303
	Within groups	95.786	272	.352		
	Total	96.630	274			

Support and employee empowerment's p-values are greater than 0.05, therefore we do not reject H_0 . However, in the case of responsibility (first order factor 2), p is less than 0.05. H_0 is rejected in favour of H_1 . Employees experience responsibility differently according to their different levels of education. Referring back to Table 5.26, it may be noted that employees with grade 7 or lower have more responsibility than those with higher qualifications. In this particular factory

the older workers tend to have the lowest educational qualifications. It may be assumed that the older workers have more responsibility because of their age and experience.

Employee empowerment (.093) practical value is almost insignificant, whereas support (.139) and responsibility (.144) have a small practical value.

5.4.6 Number of completed years of service at Allwear

Are there any differences between the number of years of service completed at Allwear and the three factors?

Table 5.29:
Number of completed years of service at Allwear: Descriptives

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
First Order Factor 1	5 years and less	79	3.0190	1.03500	.11645	2.7872	3.2508	1.00	5.00
	Between 6 and 14 years	105	2.8825	.91955	.08974	2.7046	3.0605	1.00	5.00
	15 years and more	98	3.0187	.89413	.09032	2.8394	3.1980	1.00	5.00
	Total	282	2.9681	.94373	.05620	2.8575	3.0787	1.00	5.00
First Order Factor 2	5 years and less	80	4.0825	.85725	.09584	3.8917	4.2733	1.00	5.00
	Between 6 and 14 years	108	4.2611	.75205	.07237	4.1177	4.4046	1.60	5.00
	15 years and more	100	4.3520	.66065	.06607	4.2209	4.4831	2.00	5.00
	Total	288	4.2431	.75838	.04469	4.1551	4.3310	1.00	5.00
Second Order Factor	5 years and less	78	3.6702	.70769	.08013	3.5107	3.8298	2.11	4.94
	Between 6 and 14 years	105	3.6720	.54102	.05280	3.5673	3.7767	2.22	4.72
	15 years and more	91	3.7637	.53110	.05567	3.6531	3.8743	2.56	5.00
	Total	274	3.7019	.58963	.03562	3.6318	3.7721	2.11	5.00

In the test of homogeneity of variances, it appears that there is a difference in variance responses to questions relating to first order factor two and second order factor one.

Table 5.30:
Number of completed years of service at Allwear:
Test of homogeneity of variances

Test of Homogeneity of Variances				
	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
First Order Factor 1	2.441	2	279	.089
First Order Factor 2	5.268	2	285	.006
Second Order Factor	7.451	2	271	.001

H_0 : There is no difference between the number of completed years of service at Allwear with regard to the three empirical factors.

Table 5.31: Number of completed years of service at Allwear: ANOVA

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
First Order Factor 1	Between groups	1.224	2	.612	.686	.505
	Within groups	249.044	279	.893		
	Total	250.268	281			
First Order Factor 2	Between groups	3.284	2	1.642	2.893	.057
	Within groups	161.782	285	.568		
	Total	165.066	287			
Second Order Factor	Between groups	.520	2	.260	.747	.475
	Within groups	94.392	271	.348		
	Total	94.912	273			

The p-values of all three factors (0.505, .057, .475) are greater than .05, therefore we don't reject H_0 .

The practical value of the number of years of service for first order factor two is small (.141), while the practical value of this variable in relation to first order factor one (.070) and second order factor one (.074) is negligible.

5.4.7 Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly

Are there any differences between employees being paid weekly or monthly in terms of the three empirical factors?

Table 5.32: Wages: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Weekly	248	2.8488	.88946	.05648
	Monthly	34	3.7843	.95481	.16375
First Order Factor 2	Weekly	253	4.2032	.78274	.04921
	Monthly	35	4.4914	.56223	.09503
Second Order Factor	Weekly	240	3.6333	.57661	.03722
	Monthly	34	4.1438	.53342	.09148

Levene's test for equality of variances indicated that equal variances can be assumed with first order factor one and the second order factors, but not in the case of first order factor two.

Table 5.33: Wages: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	.426	.514	-5.700	280	.000	-.93552	.16412	-1.25858	-.61247
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.401	41.241	.000	-.93552	.17322	-1.28528	-.58577
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	5.727	.017	-2.104	286	.036	-.28827	.13704	-.55800	-.01853
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.694	54.153	.009	-.28827	.10702	-.50281	-.07372
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	.392	.532	-4.874	272	.000	-.51046	.10473	-.71665	-.30427
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.169	44.661	.000	-.51046	.09876	-.70942	-.31150

The values .000, .009 and .000 are less than .05. Therefore it can be assumed that there are differences between employees who are paid weekly and monthly with regard to support, responsibility and employee empowerment. It may be assumed that workers, who are paid monthly feel more secure in their jobs, believe they are trusted by management, and therefore feel supported, responsible and empowered.

Support has a medium practical value (.322), whereas responsibility (.123) and employee empowerment (.283) have a small practical value.

5.4.8 What type of qualified worker are you?

Are there any differences between different types of qualified workers with regard to the three empirical factors?

Table 5.34: Qualified workers: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	(Recoded) What type of qualified worker are you	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	General worker	96	2.7795	.83508	.08523
	Machinist	121	2.7893	.85276	.07752
First Order Factor 2	General worker	99	4.1091	.79090	.07949
	Machinist	123	4.2748	.73212	.06601
Second Order Factor	General worker	91	3.5849	.55779	.05847
	Machinist	119	3.6354	.54527	.04999

Levene's test for equality of variances indicated equal variances can be assumed with all three factors.

Table 5.35: Qualified workers: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	.082	.775	-.084	215	.933	-.00974	.11549	-.23739	.21790
	Equal variances not assumed			-.085	205.735	.933	-.00974	.11521	-.23689	.21741
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	.900	.344	-1.617	220	.107	-.16571	.10246	-.36764	.03623
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.604	202.442	.110	-.16571	.10333	-.36944	.03803
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	.393	.531	-.659	208	.511	-.05053	.07669	-.20172	.10067
	Equal variances not assumed			-.657	191.572	.512	-.05053	.07693	-.20226	.10120

The values .933 .107 and .511 are greater than 0.05. Therefore it may be assumed that there are no differences between general workers and machinists with regard to support, responsibility and employee empowerment.

Directional measures show that the type of qualified worker has almost no practical impact on any of the three factors (0.006, .108 and .046).

An interpretation of the three factors compared to Sections A and C of the questionnaire is given at a later stage in this chapter (see par. 5.4.20).

In this section a comparison was made between each of the empirical factors and Section C of the questionnaire.

5.4.9 Did you get feedback on your work performance in the last three months?

Do people who have had feedback on their work performance in the last three months show any differences with regard to the three empirical factors?

Table 5.36: Work performance feedback: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Did you get feedback on your work performance in the last three months	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Yes	68	3.6127	.87788	.10646
	No	215	2.7581	.87165	.05945
First Order Factor 2	Yes	69	4.2870	.81347	.09793
	No	220	4.2218	.74801	.05043
Second Order Factor	Yes	65	4.0043	.58756	.07288
	No	210	3.6021	.56411	.03893

Levene's test for equality of variances indicated that equal variances can be assumed for all three factors.

Table 5.37: Work performance feedback: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	.321	.572	7.035	281	.000	.85461	.12148	.61548	1.09373
	Equal variances not assumed			7.009	111.889	.000	.85461	.12193	.61301	1.09620
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	.032	.859	.618	287	.537	.06514	.10542	-.14236	.27263
	Equal variances not assumed			.591	106.522	.556	.06514	.11015	-.15324	.28352
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	.077	.781	4.973	273	.000	.40216	.08086	.24297	.56135
	Equal variances not assumed			4.867	103.158	.000	.40216	.08262	.23830	.56602

First order factor two's p -value .537 is greater than 0.05, therefore H_0 is not rejected.

In the case of first order factor one (support), p is less than 0.05, being .000; therefore H_0 is rejected in favour of H_1 . In the second order factor (employee empowerment), p is also less than 0.05, being .000; therefore H_0 is also rejected in favour of H_1 . Employees who received feedback in the last three months feel more supported and empowered than those employees who did not get feedback. It may be assumed that employees feel valued when receiving feedback, and feel the organisation supports them.

Directional measures shows first order factor one has a medium practical value (.387), while the second order factor has an almost medium practical value of (.288). This supports the supposition that employees feel valued when receiving feedback from the organisation.

5.4.10 Have you had a written warning in the last three months?

Are there any differences between employees who have had a written warning in the last three months and those who have not with regard to the three factors?

Table 5.38: Written warning: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Have you had a written warning in the last three months	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Yes	51	2.7778	.80737	.11305
	No	232	3.0043	.96971	.06366
First Order Factor 2	Yes	50	4.1160	.77942	.11023
	No	239	4.2628	.75898	.04909
Second Order Factor	Yes	48	3.5995	.55520	.08014
	No	227	3.7178	.60084	.03988

Levene's test for equality indicates equal variances assumed for first order factor two and the second order factor, but not for first order factor one.

Table 5.39: Written warning: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	5.133	.024	-1.554	281	.121	-.22653	.14582	-.51357	.06051
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.746	84.892	.084	-.22653	.12975	-.48451	.03145
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	.114	.736	-1.238	287	.217	-.14676	.11858	-.38016	.08663
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.216	69.803	.228	-.14676	.12067	-.38743	.09391
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	.441	.507	-1.255	273	.211	-.11828	.09424	-.30382	.06726
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.321	72.240	.191	-.11828	.08951	-.29671	.06015

The p-values .084, .217 and .211 are greater than 0.05. Therefore it may be assumed that H_0 applies in the case of all three factors. There are no differences between employees who have received a written warning in the last three months and employees who have not.

Directional measures show almost no practical value towards any of the three factors (.092, .073, and .076).

5.4.11 Has your salary changed from weekly to monthly in the last three months?

Are there any differences between employees who were paid weekly and have changed to a monthly salary with regard to any of the three empirical factors?

Table 5.40: Salary: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Has your salary changed from weekly to monthly in the last three months	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Yes	71	2.8779	.89530	.10625
	No	212	2.9921	.96172	.06605
First Order Factor 2	Yes	72	4.2417	.72767	.08576
	No	217	4.2359	.77627	.05270
Second Order Factor	Yes	70	3.7722	.54278	.06487
	No	205	3.6715	.60946	.04257

Levene's test for equality indicates that equal variances may be assumed for all three factors.

Table 5.41: Salary: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	.630	.428	-.881	281	.379	-.11420	.12966	-.36943	.14102
	Equal variances not assumed			-.913	128.204	.363	-.11420	.12511	-.36175	.13334
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	.058	.810	.055	287	.956	.00572	.10398	-.19894	.21038
	Equal variances not assumed			.057	128.709	.955	.00572	.10065	-.19343	.20487
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	1.804	.180	1.226	273	.221	.10068	.08213	-.06102	.26237
	Equal variances not assumed			1.298	132.869	.197	.10068	.07759	-.05280	.25415

The p-values .379, .956 and .221 are greater than .05; therefore the H_0 is accepted in the case of all three factors.

Salary changes from weekly to monthly show no practical value with regard to any of the three factors, respectively (.052, .003 and .074).

5.4.12 Has any of your ideas been implemented at work in the last three months?

Are there any differences between employee's whose ideas have been implemented at work other employees with regard to the three factors?

Table 5.42: Ideas: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Has any of your ideas been implemented at work in the last three months	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Yes	59	3.5621	.93151	.12127
	No	223	2.8109	.88432	.05922
First Order Factor 2	Yes	60	4.4367	.62760	.08102
	No	228	4.1921	.78248	.05182
Second Order Factor	Yes	56	4.0694	.46532	.06218
	No	218	3.6075	.58198	.03942

Levene's test for equality assumes equal variance with regard to first order factor one (support) and second order factor (employee empowerment). Equal variances are not assumed in the case of first order factor two (responsibility).

Table 5.43: Ideas: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	.558	.456	5.738	280	.000	.75124	.13093	.49351	1.00896
	Equal variances not assumed			5.566	87.655	.000	.75124	.13496	.48302	1.01945
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	5.030	.026	2.238	286	.026	.24456	.10928	.02947	.45965
	Equal variances not assumed			2.543	112.260	.012	.24456	.09618	.05400	.43512
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	3.644	.057	5.502	272	.000	.46190	.08395	.29663	.62717
	Equal variances not assumed			6.274	103.831	.000	.46190	.07362	.31590	.60790

H_0 is rejected for all three factors and H_1 is assumed.

It can be assumed that employees feel they get support from the factory if their ideas are implemented. They feel responsible for their work and empowered at the same time. This supports the theory explored in Chapter 2. If employees are involved or feel they are involved in the decision-making process, and that they are able to contribute, they will feel empowered and show more responsibility at the same time.

Directional measures show that first order factor one (support) has a practical value of .324, indicating a medium effect. The second order factor also indicates a medium practical value of .316. The first order factor two has a small practical value (.131).

5.4.13 Have you been given your job description verbally?

Are there any differences between employees who have received verbal job descriptions and those who have not with regard to the three factors?

Table 5.44: Verbally: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Have you been given your job description verbally	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Yes	220	2.9727	.92639	.06246
	No	63	2.9312	1.01540	.12793
First Order Factor 2	Yes	224	4.2054	.79436	.05308
	No	65	4.3477	.63765	.07909
Second Order Factor	Yes	213	3.6977	.60146	.04121
	No	62	3.6953	.57169	.07260

Equal variances are assumed for all three factors according to Levene's test for equality.

Table 5.45: Verbally: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	1.165	.281	.307	281	.759	.04151	.13528	-.22479	.30781
	Equal variances not assumed			.292	93.574	.771	.04151	.14236	-.24117	.32419
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	3.504	.062	-1.325	287	.186	-.14234	.10738	-.35370	.06903
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.494	127.217	.138	-.14234	.09525	-.33081	.04614
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	.033	.856	.028	273	.978	.00236	.08585	-.16665	.17138
	Equal variances not assumed			.028	103.546	.977	.00236	.08349	-.16320	.16793

H_0 is accepted for all three factors showing a p-value greater than .05.

There is almost no practical value (.018, .078 and .002) with regard to the directional measures.

5.4.14 Have you been given your job description in written format?

Are there any differences between employees who have received a job description in written format and employees who have not with regard to the three factors?

Table 5.46: Written: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Have you been given your job description in written format	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Yes	57	3.3684	.93527	.12388
	No	226	2.8614	.92200	.06133
First Order Factor 2	Yes	57	4.3333	.60040	.07952
	No	232	4.2138	.79750	.05236
Second Order Factor	Yes	57	3.9464	.54179	.07176
	No	218	3.6320	.59073	.04001

Levene's test for equality indicates equal variances assumed with first order factor one (support) and second order factor (employee empowerment). Equal variance is not assumed in the case of first order factor two (responsibility).

Table 5.47: Written: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	.000	.985	3.700	281	.000	.50706	.13705	.23729	.77684
	Equal variances not assumed			3.668	85.537	.000	.50706	.13823	.23225	.78188
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	6.082	.014	1.060	287	.290	.11954	.11280	-.10248	.34157
	Equal variances not assumed			1.256	110.059	.212	.11954	.09521	-.06915	.30823
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	2.047	.154	3.637	273	.000	.31439	.08644	.14422	.48455
	Equal variances not assumed			3.826	93.884	.000	.31439	.08216	.15125	.47752

In the case of first order factor two, H_0 is accepted with a p-value of .212. H_0 is rejected and H_1 accepted in the case of first order factor one (support), which has a p-value of .000, and second order factor (employee empowerment), which has a p-value of .000.

It may be assumed that employees feel they are supported if they have a written job description. It may possibly make the employees at the factory feel more secure about their jobs. The fear of losing a job might be reduced because a sense of permanency is attached to the receipt of a letter. The effect of this is that employees will feel more empowered.

Both first order factor one (support) and the second order factor show a small practical value, (.216 and .215, respectively). First order factor one has almost no practical effect (.062).

5.4.15 Have you received in-job training in the last three months?

Are there any differences between employees who have received in-job training and those who have not in terms of the three factors?

Table 5.48: Training: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Have you received in-job training in the last three months	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Yes	71	3.0282	.88416	.10493
	No	212	2.9418	.96586	.06634
First Order Factor 2	Yes	73	4.2685	.71120	.08324
	No	216	4.2269	.78131	.05316
Second Order Factor	Yes	69	3.8221	.51225	.06167
	No	206	3.6553	.61426	.04280

Levene's test for equality shows equal variances can be assumed with regard to all three factors.

Table 5.49: Training: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	1.437	.232	.666	281	.506	.08635	.12974	-.16903	.34172
	Equal variances not assumed			.696	130.232	.488	.08635	.12414	-.15925	.33194
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	.263	.608	.402	287	.688	.04164	.10348	-.16203	.24531
	Equal variances not assumed			.422	135.182	.674	.04164	.09877	-.15369	.23697
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	2.891	.090	2.030	273	.043	.16672	.08214	.00502	.32842
	Equal variances not assumed			2.221	138.612	.028	.16672	.07506	.01830	.31514

H_0 is accepted with regards to first order factor one (support) and first order factor two (responsibility).

H_0 is rejected and H_1 accepted with regard to the second order factor (employee empowerment).

If employees receive in-job training it equips them better for their jobs and gives them a sense of knowing with regard to their jobs. This can make them feel empowered. These employees show that in-job training is a crucial component for employee empowerment.

Directional measures show no practical value (.040 and .024, respectively) to the first order factors. There is a small practical value (.122) with regard to the second order factor (employee empowerment).

5.4.16 Have you been threatened in any way by another employee at Allwear in the last three months?

Are there any difference between employees who have been threatened by other employees and those who have not with regard to the three factors?

Table 5.50: Threatened: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Have you been threatened in any way by another employee at Allwear in the last three months	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Yes	58	2.6638	.89262	.11721
	No	224	3.0432	.94630	.06323
First Order Factor 2	Yes	60	4.2500	.70890	.09152
	No	228	4.2351	.77981	.05164
Second Order Factor	Yes	57	3.5682	.52295	.06927
	No	217	3.7322	.60872	.04132

Levene's test for equality shows equal variances can be assumed with all three factors.

Table 5.51: Threatened: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	.576	.448	-2.752	280	.006	-.37936	.13784	-.65070	-.10802
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.849	92.989	.005	-.37936	.13317	-.64382	-.11490
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	.251	.617	.134	286	.893	.01491	.11110	-.20377	.23359
	Equal variances not assumed			.142	99.924	.887	.01491	.10508	-.19357	.22340
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	2.444	.119	-1.861	272	.064	-.16398	.08812	-.33747	.00951
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.033	99.680	.045	-.16398	.08066	-.32401	-.00395

The H_0 is accepted with first order factor two (responsibility) and second order factor (employee empowerment). H_0 is rejected and H_1 accepted with first order factor one (support). The employees who have been threatened by other employees seem to feel they do not get support from the factory. It may be that management is not aware of these threats or has decided not to get involved. These employees should be supported by management and certain procedures can be put in place to do so.

Directional measures show a small practical value (.162) in terms of first order factor one (support), almost no practical value in terms of first order factor two (responsibility) and a small practical value in terms of second order factor (employee empowerment) (.112).

5.4.17 Does your supervisor tell you what to do on a daily basis?

Are there any differences between employees who are told what to do on a daily basis and those who are not in terms of the three factors?

Table 5.52: Supervisor: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Does your supervisor tell you what to do on a daily basis	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Yes	92	2.9710	.90028	.09386
	No	190	2.9632	.96991	.07036
First Order Factor 2	Yes	95	4.2695	.76173	.07815
	No	193	4.2176	.76533	.05509
Second Order Factor	Yes	90	3.7080	.58910	.06210
	No	184	3.6908	.59913	.04417

Levene's test for equality indicates equal variances assumed with all three factors.

Table 5.53: Supervisor: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	2.580	.109	.065	280	.948	.00786	.12039	-.22913	.24484
	Equal variances not assumed			.067	192.720	.947	.00786	.11731	-.22351	.23923
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	.224	.637	.541	286	.589	.05186	.09577	-.13665	.24036
	Equal variances not assumed			.542	187.911	.588	.05186	.09562	-.13676	.24048
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	.207	.650	.224	272	.823	.01720	.07665	-.13369	.16810
	Equal variances not assumed			.226	179.492	.822	.01720	.07620	-.13316	.16757

H_0 is accepted with all three factors showing p-values greater than .05, respectively (.948; .589 and .823).

Directional measures show no statistically significant practical values for any of the three factors.

5.4.18 Compared to three months ago are you doing different tasks today?

Are there any differences between the employees who are currently doing different tasks to those being done three months ago, and those who are not, in terms of the three factors?

Table 5.54: Three months ago: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Compared to three months ago are you doing different tasks today	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Yes	102	3.0131	.96520	.09557
	No	181	2.9355	.93533	.06952
First Order Factor 2	Yes	102	4.0529	.85175	.08434
	No	187	4.3380	.69220	.05062
Second Order Factor	Yes	101	3.6579	.61135	.06083
	No	174	3.7200	.58403	.04428

Levene's test for equality assumes equal variances for first order factor one (support) and second order factor (employee empowerment). Equal variances are not assumed in the case of first order factor two (responsibility).

Table 5.55: Three months ago: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	.038	.845	.662	281	.509	.07753	.11715	-.15307	.30812
	Equal variances not assumed			.656	204.108	.513	.07753	.11818	-.15548	.31054
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	4.113	.043	3.078	287	.002	-.28503	.09259	-.46727	-.10278
	Equal variances not assumed			2.898	174.574	.004	-.28503	.09836	-.47916	-.09090
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	.690	.407	-.836	273	.404	-.06212	.07433	-.20845	.08421
	Equal variances not assumed			-.826	201.349	.410	-.06212	.07524	-.21048	.08623

H_0 is accepted in terms of first order factor one and the second order factor. H_0 is rejected and H_1 accepted in terms of first order factor two (responsibility).

Employees currently doing different tasks than those being done three months ago reflect a degree of responsibility. These workers can feel they have been entrusted with different work by the factory. They have not been stuck in the same job for years, as have some of the other employees. Because the factory has given them these different tasks, they have reacted by feeling more responsible towards their jobs. Again this supports the theory presented in Chapter 2.

Directional measures show a small (.179) practical value with first order factor two and almost no practical value in terms of the other two factors.

5.4.19 Do you know if your company has a mission statement?

Is there any difference between employees who know if the company has a mission statement and those who don't know in terms of the three factors?

Table 5.56: Mission statement: Group statistics

Group Statistics					
	Do you know if your company has a mission statement	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
First Order Factor 1	Yes	47	3.2270	.95264	.13896
	No	233	2.9106	.93771	.06143
First Order Factor 2	Yes	47	4.4596	.55469	.08091
	No	239	4.2008	.77622	.05021
Second Order Factor	Yes	44	3.9659	.55778	.08409
	No	228	3.6481	.58545	.03877

Levene's test for equality shows equal variances are assumed with first order factor one (support) and second order factor (employee empowerment). Equal variances are not assumed with first order factor two (responsibility).

Table 5.57: Mission statement: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
First Order Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	.159	.690	2.104	278	.036	.31636	.15034	.02042	.61231
	Equal variances not assumed			2.082	65.244	.041	.31636	.15193	.01296	.61977
First Order Factor 2	Equal variances assumed	5.985	.015	2.177	284	.030	.25874	.11885	.02480	.49267
	Equal variances not assumed			2.717	85.792	.008	.25874	.09522	.06943	.44804
Second Order Factor	Equal variances assumed	.286	.594	3.321	270	.001	.31776	.09569	.12937	.50615
	Equal variances not assumed			3.432	62.691	.001	.31776	.09260	.13270	.50282

P-values of all three factors show a rejection of H_0 while accepting H_1 . It appears that employees who know the company's mission statement feel more supported by the company, more responsible and more empowered. This shows that it is of

crucial importance for employees to know what they are working for and what they are working towards. These positive feelings are generated by the employees' sense that they are contributing to the company. The theory in Chapter 2 stated that employees must know what the mission statement of the organisation is to improve empowerment. This is also applicable at Allwear.

Directional measures indicate small practical values in terms of all three factors respectively (.125; .128 and .198).

5.4.20 Conclusion to this section

In this particular factory the language groups other than the Zulu speakers feel more supported by the factory and more empowered than the Zulu-speaking employees. In contrast, single employees feel less responsible about their work and less empowered than married and cohabitating employees. Employees younger than 35 appear to be less responsible than the older employees. Although the older employees are generally not as well qualified as the younger employees, they are more responsible.

The employees who are paid monthly are more responsible and empowered than the employees who are paid weekly. They also feel more supported by the factory. Feedback on work performance seems to give the employees feelings of support and they feel more empowered because of this. When the factory implements ideas given by the employees, it makes the employees feel responsible, empowered and supported by Allwear.

Job descriptions in written format also support empowerment and feelings of support from Allwear.

In-job training also serves as a positive boost to employee empowerment at Allwear. Employees that have been threatened by other employees feel the need of support by the factory.

Giving the employees different tasks to do makes them more responsible. Finally, the employees must know what the mission statement of Allwear is as this gives them support, makes them feel more responsible and, most importantly, makes them feel empowered.

5.5 CROSS TABULATIONS BETWEEN SECTION C AND SECTION A

The aim of this section is to determine whether there is a significant correlation between the descriptive variables and the questions relating to empowerment within the organisation, in Section C. This will assist the researcher to make interpretations about empowerment specifically relating to each descriptive variable.

In this section a cross tabulation was made between the yes and no answers in Section C with each of the descriptive variables in section A. From the twenty questions in Section C, only eleven questions were statistically analysed. If more than 80% of respondents answered yes to a question it was rejected. The last two questions were filtered from the questionnaire. The following eleven questions were statistically analysed:

- 1) Did you get feedback on your work performance in the last three months?
- 2) Have you had a written warning in the last three months?
- 3) Has your salary changed from weekly to monthly in the last three months?
- 4) Have any of your ideas been implemented at work in the last three months?
- 5) Have you been given your job description verbally?
- 6) Have you been given your job description in written format?
- 7) Have you received in-job training in the last three months?
- 8) Have you been threatened in any way by another employee at Allwear in the last three months?
- 9) Does your supervisor tell you what to do on a daily basis?
- 10) Compared to three months ago are you doing different tasks today?
- 11) Do you know if your company has a mission statement?

Questions 7, 9 and 11 had no statistically significant relationship with any of the descriptive variables. It may be argued that the employees know what to do every day because their daily tasks are written up on a blackboard in the factory. Because the majority of factory workers tend to do the same task every day, in-job training is not really relevant. Because there are such cultural differences, language differences and educational differences between the employees and management, it may be employees may find that the company's mission statement is irrelevant.

The next part of this chapter will identify the questions that were not statistically reliable with regard to each of the descriptive variables. Following this, the statistically reliable questions relating to each of the descriptive variables will be discussed.

5.5.1 Gender

There was no significant relationship between gender and each of the following questions raised:

- 2) Have you had a written warning in the last three months?
- 3) Has your salary changed from weekly to monthly in the last three months?
- 6) Have you been given your job description in written format?
- 7) Have you received in-job training in the last three months?
- 8) Have you been threatened in any way by another employee at Allwear in the last three months?
- 9) Does your supervisor tell you what to do on a daily basis?
- 10) Compared to three months ago are you doing different tasks today?
- 11) Do you know if your company has a mission statement?

5.5.2 Home language

There was no significant relationship between home language and each of the following questions raised:

- 1) Did you get feedback on your work performance in the last three months?
- 2) Have you had a written warning in the last three months?
- 7) Have you received in-job training in the last three months?
- 9) Does your supervisor tell you what to do on a daily basis?
- 10) Compared to three months ago are you doing different tasks today?
- 11) Do you know if your company has a mission statement?

5.5.3 Age

There was no significant relationship between age and any of the questions raised, with the exception of question 10.

5.5.4 Marital status

There was no significant relationship between marital status and any of the questions raised, with the exception of question 5.

5.5.5 What is your highest educational qualification?

There was no significant relationship between highest educational qualification and each of the following questions raised:

- 2) Have you had a written warning in the last three months?
- 4) Have any of your ideas been implemented at work in the last three months?
- 5) Have you been given your job description verbally?
- 7) Have you received in-job training in the last three months?
- 8) Have you been threatened in any way by another employee at Allwear in the last three months?
- 9) Does your supervisor tell you what to do on a daily basis?
- 10) Compared to three months ago are you doing different tasks today?
- 11) Do you know if your company has a mission statement?

5.5.6 Number of completed years of service at Allwear

There was no significant relationship between number of completed years of service at Allwear and each of the following questions raised:

- 1) Did you get feedback on your work performance in the last three months?
- 3) Has your salary changed from weekly to monthly in the last three months?
- 4) Have any of your ideas been implemented at work in the last three months?
- 5) Have you been given your job description verbally?
- 6) Have you been given your job description in written format?
- 7) Have you received in-job training in the last three months?
- 8) Have you been threatened in any way by another employee at Allwear in the last three months?
- 9) Does your supervisor tell you what to do on a daily basis?
- 11) Do you know if your company has a mission statement?

5.5.7 Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly

There was no significant relationship between the indication that the employees are paid weekly or monthly, and each of the following questions raised:

- 2) Have you had a written warning in the last three months?
- 7) Have you received in-job training in the last three months?
- 8) Have you been threatened in any way by another employee at Allwear in the last three months?
- 9) Does your supervisor tell you what to do on a daily basis?
- 10) Compared to three months ago are you doing different tasks today?
- 11) Do you know if your company has a mission statement?

5.5.8 Are you a qualified worker or are you a learner?

There was no significant relationship between qualified workers or learners and any of the questions raised, with the exception of question 8.

All of above were the questions with no significant statistical relationships in relation to the descriptive variables. Although there were no significant statistical relationships between above descriptive variables and questions asked in Section C, it can still contribute to the study. It indicates which questions do not contribute to the overall empowerment of that specific descriptive variable. It should also assist future research at the same or at a similar factory by indicating which questions contribute best to each variable.

The following part of this section focuses on the statistically significant relationship between Section A and Section C.

CROSS TABULATIONS BETWEEN SECTION C AND SECTION A

5.5.9 Gender

- **Did you get feedback on your work performance in the last three months?**

The question to be asked is if there is a correlation between gender and feedback from the company.

Table 5.58: Gender: Feedback → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Did you get feedback on your work performance in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
Gender	Male	Count	15	13	28
		% within gender	53.6%	46.4%	100.0%
	Female	Count	55	213	268
		% within gender	20.5%	79.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	70	226	296	
	% within gender	23.6%	76.4%	100.0%	

According to the table, 53.6% of the men answered yes and 79.5% of the women answered no. Women received less feedback on their work performance than the

men. A chi-square test was done to determine the statistical significance between gender and feedback.

Table 5.59: Gender: Feedback → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.335(b)	1	.000		
Continuity Correction (a)	13.560	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	13.096	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.284	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	296				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.62.					

The chi-square test indicates that the relationship between gender and feedback is statistically significant, being (.000).

Table 5.60: Gender: Feedback → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.228	.000
	Cramer's V	.228	.000
N of Valid Cases		296	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

The practical value of this result is tested by means of the symmetrical measure. It appears that the practical value is small: (.228).

It can be assumed that women get less feedback than men. This could be due to discrimination against women. Women have a lower status than men within their community, following the local traditions, and particularly since they live in a rural area.

This in itself indicates a low level of empowerment in that women and men are not treated on equal terms.

5.5.10 Gender

- **Have any of your ideas been implemented at work in the last three months?**

Is there a correlation between gender and the implementation of ideas at work?

Table 5.61: Gender: Ideas → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have any of your ideas been implemented at work in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
Gender	Male	Count	12	16	28
		% within gender	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	Female	Count	49	218	267
		% within gender	18.4%	81.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	61	234	295	
	% within gender	20.7%	79.3%	100.0%	

According to the table, 42,9% of the men answered yes and 81,6% of the women answered no. The ideas of the men were implemented more than those of the women.

This indicates low levels of empowerment in women. Again it can be noted that women are not treated in the same way as men.

Table 5.62: Gender: Ideas → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.278(b)	1	.002		
Continuity Correction (a)	7.844	1	.005		
Likelihood Ratio	7.903	1	.005		
Fisher's Exact Test				.005	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.247	1	.002		
N of Valid Cases	295				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.79.					

The chi-square test indicates that the relationship between gender and the implementation of ideas at work is statistically significant: (.005).

Table 5.63: Gender: Ideas → Symmetric measure

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.177	.002
	Cramer's V	.177	.002
N of Valid Cases		295	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

The practical value of this result is small. Cramer's V indicates a score of (.177). It can be assumed that women's ideas are not implemented because of discrimination against women. It can be assumed that men are generally in better positions at the factory and therefore have more opportunities than women the majority of workers are women.

5.5.11 Gender

- **Have you been given your job description verbally?**

Is there a correlation between gender and being given a verbal job description?

Table 5.64: Gender: Job description → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have you been given your job description verbally		Total
			Yes	No	
Gender	Male	Count	16	12	28
		% within gender	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	Female	Count	215	53	268
		% within gender	80.2%	19.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	231	65	296	
	% within gender	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%	

The women indicated that 80,2% receive their job description verbally, while only 57,1% of the men receive their job description verbally.

Table 5.65: Gender: Job description → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.881(b)	1	.005		
Continuity Correction (a)	6.591	1	.010		
Likelihood Ratio	6.839	1	.009		
Fisher's Exact Test				.008	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.854	1	.005		
N of Valid Cases	296				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.15.

The chi-square test indicates that the relationship between gender and verbal job description is statistically significant: (.010).

Table 5.66: Gender: Job description → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.163	.005
	Cramer's V	.163	.005
N of Valid Cases		296	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

The practical value of this result is also small: (.163). It may be speculated that discrimination against women gives them a lower status, which only requires a verbal job description. It can be reasoned that the employees should know what is expected from them on a daily basis, due to the repetitive nature of their work.

5.5.12 Home language

- **Has your salary changed from weekly to monthly in the last three months?**

Is there any correlation between home language and change in salary from weekly to monthly?

Table 5.67: Home language: Salary change → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Has your salary changed from weekly to monthly in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) Home language	Other	Count	2	23	25
		% within (Recoded) home language	8.0%	92.0%	100.0%
	Zulu	Count	74	197	271
		% within (Recoded) home language	27.3%	72.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	76	220	296
		% within (Recoded) home language	25.7%	74.3%	100.0%

According to the table, 8% of languages other than Zulu, changed salary from weekly to monthly. Of the Zulu-speaking employees, 27.3% changed from weekly to monthly.

Being paid on a weekly basis may be seen as an indication that Zulu-speaking employees feel their work is not secure. This can indicate lower levels of empowerment.

Table 5.68: Home language: Salary change → Chi-square test

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.471(b)	1	.034		
Continuity Correction (a)	3.516	1	.061		
Likelihood Ratio	5.522	1	.019		
Fisher's Exact Test				.033	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.455	1	.035		
N of Valid Cases	296				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.42.					

The chi-square test indicates a statistical significance of .033 between home language and change of salary from weekly to monthly.

Table 5.69: Home language: Salary change → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.123	.034
	Cramer's V	.123	.034
N of Valid Cases		296	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

A small practical value (.123) was indicated.

Zulu-speaking workers tend to work in the factory making the clothes. The other language groups tend to have more administrative positions and positions which are higher in status. This may be the reason why fewer Zulu-speaking people have changed from a weekly to a monthly salary.

5.5.13 Home language

- Have any of your ideas been implemented at work in the last three months?

Is there a statistical significance between home language and the implementation of ideas at work?

Table 5.70: Home language: Ideas implemented → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have any of your ideas been implemented at work in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) Home language	Other	Count	10	15	25
		% within (Recoded) home language	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Zulu	Count	51	219	270
		% within (Recoded) home language	18.9%	81.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	61	234	295
		% within (Recoded) home language	20.7%	79.3%	100.0%

According to this table, 40% of other language groups felt their ideas had been implemented, while 81.1% of Zulu-speaking employees felt that their ideas had not been implemented.

Table 5.71: Home language: Ideas implemented → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.217(b)	1	.013		
Continuity Correction (a)	4.997	1	.025		
Likelihood Ratio	5.360	1	.021		
Fisher's Exact Test				.019	.017
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.196	1	.013		
N of Valid Cases	295				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.17.					

The chi-square test indicates that the relationship between home language and implementation of ideas is statistically significant:

Table 5.72: Home language: Ideas implemented → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.145	.013
	Cramer's V	.145	.013
N of Valid Cases		295	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

The practical value is small: .145.

Again it may be assumed that other languages are in a better position at the factory. The Zulu-speaking people are the labour force. It can also be assumed that people on the “floor” are not involved in decision-making.

5.5.14 Home language

- **Have you been given your job description verbally?**

Is there a statistically significant relationship between home language and being given a verbal job description?

Table 5.73: Home language: Verbal job description → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have you been given your job description verbally		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) Home language	Other	Count	13	12	25
		% within (Recoded) home language	52.0%	48.0%	100.0%
	Zulu	Count	218	53	271
		% within (Recoded) home language	80.4%	19.6%	100.0%
Total	Count		231	65	296
	% within (Recoded) home language		78.0%	22.0%	100.0%

Of the Zulu-speaking employees, 80.4% received verbal job descriptions, while only 52% of other language groups received verbal job descriptions.

Table 5.74: Home language: Verbal job description → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.805(b)	1	.001		
Continuity Correction (a)	9.209	1	.002		
Likelihood Ratio	9.151	1	.002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.004	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.768	1	.001		
N of Valid Cases	296				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.49.					

The chi-square test indicates statistically significance between verbal job descriptions and Zulu-speaking employees.

Table 5.75:

Home language: Verbal job description → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.191	.001
	Cramer's V	.191	.001
N of Valid Cases		296	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

The practical value is .191, which is small.

The assumption is that the employees on the floor must know what to make every day. The workers are usually told what to do for a specific period. This may be the reason that they do not receive a verbal job description.

5.5.15 Home language

- Have you been given your job description in written format?

Is there a statistical correlation between home language and being given a job description in written format?

Table 5.76: Home language: Written job description → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have you been given your job description in written format		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) Home language	Other	Count	12	13	25
		% within (Recoded) home language	48.0%	52.0%	100.0%
	Zulu	Count	45	226	271
		% within (Recoded) home language	16.6%	83.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	57	239	296
		% within (Recoded) home language	19.3%	80.7%	100.0%

48% of employees from the other language groups answered yes, while 16.6% of the Zulu-speaking employees answered yes. A chi-square test will determine whether there is a statistical significance.

Table 5.77: Home language: Written job description → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.509(b)	1	.000		
Continuity Correction (a)	12.560	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	11.751	1	.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.001	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.460	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	296				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 1 cell (25.0%) has an expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.81.					

Fisher's exact test indicates a highly significant relationship between home language and being given a job description in written format (.001).

It seems that the employees from other language groups have higher status positions and are better qualified. Most of these employees received written contracts.

Table 5.78:
Home language: Written job description → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.221	.000
	Cramer's V	.221	.000
N of Valid Cases		296	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

The symmetric measure shows a medium practical value of .221. The more qualified the employees, the more they are likely to receive their job description in written format. This was mentioned with reference to the focus group above (See 5.2.1.).

5.5.16 Home language

- **Have you been threatened in any way by other employees at Allwear in the last three months?**

Is there a statistical correlation between home language and being threatened by another employee at Allwear?

Table 5.79: Home language: Threatened → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have you been threatened in any way by another employee at Allwear in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) Home language	Other	Count	1	24	25
		% within (Recoded) home language	4.0%	96.0%	100.0%
	Zulu	Count	60	210	270
		% within (Recoded) home language	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	61	234	295
		% within (Recoded) home language	20.7%	79.3%	100.0%

22.2% of the Zulu-speaking employees answered yes, while only 4% of the other language groups gave a positive answer.

Table 5.80: Home language: Threatened → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.632(b)	1	.031		
Continuity Correction (a)	3.588	1	.058		
Likelihood Ratio	6.260	1	.012		
Fisher's Exact Test				.036	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.616	1	.032		
N of Valid Cases	295				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.17.					

Fisher's exact test indicated a p-value of .036, indicating a statistically significant relationship between language groups and being threatened by other employees.

Table 5.81: Home language: Threatened → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.125	.031
	Cramer's V	.125	.031
N of Valid Cases		295	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Cramer's V indicates a small practical value of .125.

The majority of workers are Zulu-speaking. With so many workers in a space working side by side, conflicts naturally arise. Competition to maintain their jobs and not to be laid off can also result in tension. The community is still very traditional, and the hierarchy within the home is completely different to that within the factory. This was also mentioned at the focus group.

5.5.17 Age

- **Compared to three months ago are you doing different tasks today?**

The question is whether there is a statistical significance between age and a change of task within three months.

Table 5.82: Age: Different tasks → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Compared to three month ago are you doing different tasks today		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) Age	Younger than 35 years	Count	37	47	84
		% within (Recoded) age	44.0%	56.0%	100.0%
	Between 35 - 45 years	Count	42	67	109
		% within (Recoded) age	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%
	Older than 45 years	Count	27	73	100
		% within (Recoded) age	27.0%	73.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	106	187	293	
	% within (Recoded) age	36.2%	63.8%	100.0%	

44% within the age group younger than 35 answered yes; 38.5% within the 35 to 45 age group answered yes; and only 27% of employees older than 45 answered yes.

Table 5.83: Age: Different tasks → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.163(a)	2	.046
Likelihood Ratio	6.269	2	.044
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.875	1	.015
N of Valid Cases	293		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 30.39.

Pearson chi-square shows a statistical significance of .046 between age and a change in tasks.

Table 5.84: Age: Different tasks → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.145	.046
	Cramer's V	.145	.046
N of Valid Cases		293	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Cramer's V indicates a small practical value of .145.

The older employees tend to stagnate at the factory and don't want to do different tasks. They seem to feel most comfortable always doing the same task. The younger employees tend to have a higher level of schooling, are more ambitious and want to improve themselves. The directors at the focus group have also noticed that the younger workers want to learn the different tasks in the factory.

5.5.18 Marital Status

- **Have you been given your job description verbally?**

Is there any statistical significance between marital status and being given a job description verbally?

Table 5.85: Marital status: Verbal job description → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have you been given your job description verbally		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) Marital status	Single/Divorced/ Separated/Widowed	Count	163	33	196
		% within (Recoded) marital status	83.2%	16.8%	100.0%
	Married/Cohabiting	Count	67	32	99
		% within (Recoded) marital status	67.7%	32.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	230	65	295	
	% within (Recoded) marital status	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%	

Of the single, divorced, separated, and widowed employees, 83.2% answered yes to this question, while 67.7% of the married and cohabitating employees answered yes.

Table 5.86: Marital status: Verbal job description → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.183(b)	1	.002		
Continuity Correction (a)	8.304	1	.004		
Likelihood Ratio	8.842	1	.003		
Fisher's Exact Test				.003	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.152	1	.002		
N of Valid Cases	295				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.81.					

There is a definite statistical significance, showing Fisher's Exact Test as .003.

Table 5.87: Marital status: Verbal job description → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.176	.002
	Cramer's V	.176	.002
N of Valid Cases		295	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

A small practical value is indicated by .176.

Single employees are probably the sole providers. This would put them under a lot of financial pressure. These employees may need more security at work, and so want a job description, even if it is verbal.

5.5.19 What is your highest educational qualification?

- Did you get feedback on your work performance in the last three months?

Is there any statistical correlation between educational qualification and employees receiving feedback on their work performance?

Table 5.88:

Educational qualifications: Feedback on work performance → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Did you get feedback on your work performance in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	Grade 7 and lower	Count	26	98	124
		% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	21.0%	79.0%	100.0%
	Grades 8 – 10	Count	16	79	95
		% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	16.8%	83.2%	100.0%
	Grade 11 and higher	Count	28	49	77
		% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	70	226	296	
	% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	23.6%	76.4%	100.0%	

The employees with grade 7 and lower (21.0%) answered yes to this question; grades 8 to 10 (16.8%) answered yes; and grade 11 and higher (36.4%) answered yes.

Table 5.89:
Educational qualification: Feedback on work performance → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.826(a)	2	.007
Likelihood Ratio	9.381	2	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.905	1	.027
N of Valid Cases	296		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.21.

Pearson's chi-square indicates a statistical significance of .007.

Table 5.90:
Educational qualification: Feedback on work performance → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.182	.007
	Cramer's V	.182	.007
N of Valid Cases		296	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

The practical value according to the phi test is .182, making it a small practical value.

It seems that the better qualified employees receive more feedback than the less qualified employees. Those employees with higher qualifications might have a better understanding of business processes and understand the bigger picture in terms of where the factory is heading. These employees will want to learn and gain experience for the future. The majority of lower qualified workers are Zulu-speaking, making the feedback process more difficult.

However, this result indicates a need for empowerment, since the less qualified employees are not encouraged to take responsibility – an issue that is at the heart of empowerment.

5.5.20 What is your highest educational qualification?

- **Has your salary changed from weekly to monthly in the last three months?**

The question to be asked is whether there is a statistical correlation between educational qualification and a change in the employee's salary from being paid weekly to being paid monthly.

Table 5.91: Educational qualification: Salary change → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Has your salary changed from weekly to monthly in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	Grade 7 and lower	Count	42	82	124
		% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	33.9%	66.1%	100.0%
	Grades 8 – 10	Count	30	65	95
		% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	31.6%	68.4%	100.0%
	Grade 11 and higher	Count	4	73	77
		% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	5.2%	94.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	76	220	296	
	% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	25.7%	74.3%	100.0%	

According to the table, 33.9% of respondents with grade 7 and lower answered yes; 31,6% with grade 8 to 10 answered yes; while only 5.2% with grade 11 or higher answered yes.

Table 5.92: Educational qualification: Salary change → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.024(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	28.519	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.147	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	296		
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.77.			

Pearson's Chi-square indicates that the relationship between educational qualification and being paid weekly or monthly is statistically significant (.000).

Table 5.93:
Educational qualification: Salary change → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.279	.000
	Cramer's V	.279	.000
N of Valid Cases		296	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

This result has a medium practical value of .279. .

The employees with a grade 7 and lower have been working at the factory longest. They do most of the actual production work. The employees with a grade 11 and higher do more administrative work and management work. These employees were contracted directly on a monthly salary.

5.5.21 What is your highest educational qualification?

- **Have you been given your job description in written format?**

The question to be asked is whether there is a statistically significant relationship between educational qualification and employees receiving their job description in written format.

Table 5.94:
Educational qualification: Written job description → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have you been given your job description in written format		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	Grade 7 and lower	Count	15	109	124
		% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	12.1%	87.9%	100.0%
	Grades 8 -10	Count	18	77	95
		% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	18.9%	81.1%	100.0%
	Grade 11 and higher	Count	24	53	77
		% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	31.2%	68.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	57	239	296	
	% within (Recoded) What is your highest educational qualification	19.3%	80.7%	100.0%	

Of the employees with a grade 7 and lower, 12.1% answered yes to this question. Of the employees with grade 8 to 10, 18.9% answered yes, and of the employees with a grade 11 or higher, 31.2% answered yes.

Table 5.95:
Educational qualification: Written job description → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.121(a)	2	.004
Likelihood Ratio	10.775	2	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.791	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	296		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.83.

Pearson's Chi-square test indicates a statistical significance of .004 between educational qualification and being given a job description in written format.

Table 5.96:**Educational qualification: Written job description → Symmetric measures**

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.194	.004
	Cramer's V	.194	.004
N of Valid Cases		296	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

A small practical value of .194 is indicated.

Employees with grade 11 and higher are permanent staff and have to have a written contract. These employees might have more knowledge about the labour law and will demand the security of a formal contract. The workers in the factory might not realise the importance of a contract because of their educational qualifications.

5.5.22 Number of completed years of service at Allwear

- **Have you had a written warning in the last three months?**

Is there a statistical significance between the number of completed years of service at Allwear and receiving a written warning from the factory?

Table 5.97: Years of service: Written warning → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have you had a written warning in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) Number of completed years of service at Allwear	5 years and less	Count	8	75	83
		% within (Recoded) number of completed years of service at Allwear	9.6%	90.4%	100.0%
	Between 6 and 14 years	Count	28	82	110
		% within (Recoded) number of completed years of service at Allwear	25.5%	74.5%	100.0%
	15 years and more	Count	16	86	102
		% within (Recoded) number of completed years of service at Allwear	15.7%	84.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	52	243	295	
	% within (Recoded) number of completed years of service at Allwear	17.6%	82.4%	100.0%	

9.6% of the employees who have worked at Allwear for 5 years or less answered yes. 25.5% of the employees who have worked at Allwear for between 6 and 14 years answered yes, and 15.7% of the employees who have worked at Allwear for longer than 15 years answered yes.

Table 5.98: Years of service: Written warning → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.554(a)	2	.014
Likelihood Ratio	8.701	2	.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	.808	1	.369
N of Valid Cases	295		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.63.

The Pearson Chi-square indicates a statistical significance of .014.

Table 5.99: Years of service: Written warning → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.170	.014
	Cramer's V	.170	.014
N of Valid Cases		295	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

A phi measure shows a small practical value of .170.

Employees who have worked at the factory for 6 to 14 years might be the most frustrated. They are not close to retirement, but might feel they have been doing the same thing at the factory for a long time. This frustration can have a negative impact on work performance as some of these employees have been performing the same task for years.

5.5.23 Number of completed years of service at Allwear

- **Compared to three months ago are you doing different tasks today?**

The question to be asked is whether there is a significant relationship between the number of completed years of service at Allwear and employees currently performing different tasks to those they were doing three months ago.

Table 5.100: Years of service: Different tasks → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Compared to three month ago are you doing different tasks today		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) Number of completed years of service at Allwear	5 years and less	Count	40	43	83
		% within (Recoded) number of completed years of service at Allwear	48.2%	51.8%	100.0%
	Between 6 and 14 years	Count	38	72	110
		% within (Recoded) number of completed years of service at Allwear	34.5%	65.5%	100.0%
	15 years and more	Count	29	73	102
		% within (Recoded) number of completed years of service at Allwear	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	107	188	295	
	% within (Recoded) number of completed years of service at Allwear	36.3%	63.7%	100.0%	

48.2% of the employees who have worked for five years or less answered yes. 34,5% of the employees who have worked for six to fourteen years answered yes, and 28.4% of the employees who have worked for 15 years and longer answered yes.

Table 5.101: Years of service: Different tasks → Chi-square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.957(a)	2	.019
Likelihood Ratio	7.881	2	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.510	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	295		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 30.11.

Pearson's Chi-square test shows a .019 correlation.

Table 5.102: Years of service: Different tasks → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.164	.019
	Cramer's V	.164	.019
N of Valid Cases		295	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

The phi measure shows a small practical value of .164.

At the focus group held with management it was said that the younger employees wanted to learn more. These younger employees wanted to perform different tasks in the factory, in order to learn more about the process. These employees tend to be more self-motivated than the older employees. Since these employees formed the younger group, they were the ones with the fewest completed years of service at Allwear. They also had a higher level of schooling than the older employees, on average.

5.5.24 Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly

- **Did you get feedback on your work performance in the last three months?**

Is there a correlation between the employees who are paid weekly or monthly, and those who receive feedback on their work performance?

Table 5.103: Payment: Feedback on work performance → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Did you get feedback on your work performance in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	Weekly	Count	51	209	260
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	19.6%	80.4%	100.0%
	Monthly	Count	19	16	35
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	70	225	295
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	23.7%	76.3%	100.0%

Of the employees being paid weekly, 19.6% answered yes; of the workers being paid monthly, 54.3% answered yes.

Table 5.104: Payment: Feedback on work performance → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.488(b)	1	.000		
Continuity Correction (a)	18.617	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	17.606	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.419	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	295				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.31.					

Fisher's Exact test shows a correlation of (.000).

Table 5.105: Payment: Feedback on work performance → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.264	.000
	Cramer's V	.264	.000
N of Valid Cases		.295	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

The phi measure shows a medium practical value of .264.

It can be assumed that the employees being paid monthly are better qualified. They are more motivated and want to improve their position through experience and training. They have not been doing exactly the same task year in and year out. Those employees want feedback on their work performance. Another factor to be considered with regard to the production workers is that it is difficult to give an individual employee working in a group feedback on how he/she stitched a pocket on a shirt.

5.5.25 Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly

- **Has your salary changed from weekly to monthly in the last three months?**

The question to be asked is whether there is a statistically significant relationship between employees currently being paid weekly or monthly and those whose salaries have changed from being paid weekly to monthly within the last three months.

Table 5.106: Payment: Weekly or monthly → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Has your salary changed from weekly to monthly in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	Weekly	Count	75	18.5	260
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	28.8%	71.2%	100.0%
	Monthly	Count	1	34	35
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	2.9%	97.1%	100.0%
Total	Count		76	219	295
	% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly		25.8%	74.2%	100.0%

Of the employees being paid weekly, 28.8% answered yes, and of the employees being paid monthly, 2.9% answered yes.

Table 5.107: Payment: Weekly or monthly → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.894(b)	1	.001		
Continuity Correction (a)	9.577	1	.002		
Likelihood Ratio	15.149	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.857	1	.001		
N of Valid Cases	295				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.02.					

Pearson's chi-square test indicates a statistical significance (.001).

Table 5.108: Payment: Weekly or monthly → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.192	.001
	Cramer's V	.192	.001
N of Valid Cases		295	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

The phi measure shows a small practical value of .192.

Employees contracted as monthly workers won't change to a weekly wage payment, which explains the 2.9% who answered yes. Employees being employed as weekly workers have the opportunity to change to being paid monthly. It does not happen very often, but it is a positive experience for the employees when it does occur, as discussed in the focus group.

5.5.26 Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly

- **Have any of your ideas been implemented at work in the last three months?**

Is there a correlation between employees being paid weekly or monthly and those whose ideas are implemented at work?

Table 5.109: Payment: Ideas implemented → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have any of your ideas been implemented at work in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	Weekly	Count	44	215	259
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	17.0%	83.0%	100.0%
	Monthly	Count	16	19	35
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	45.7%	54.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	60	234	294
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	20.4%	79.6%	100.0%

17% of employees who are paid weekly answered yes, and 45.7% of the employees who are paid monthly answered yes.

Table 5.110: Payment: Ideas implemented → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.664(b)	1	.000		
Continuity Correction (a)	13.945	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	13.215	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.610	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	294				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.14.					

The Pearson chi-square test indicates a statistical significance of .000 between workers being paid weekly or monthly and the implementation of their ideas.

Table 5.111: Payment: Ideas implemented → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.231	.000
	Cramer's V	.231	.000
N of Valid Cases		294	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Cramer's V shows a medium practical value (.231).

Those employees who are paid monthly are better qualified. They tend to have written contracts, and feel more secure about their jobs at the factory. This inevitably makes them more positive. As better qualified workers, they should be able to come up with ideas to help the factory. The employees who are paid weekly might not have the insight required for new ideas. In addition, the fact that they do exactly the same task every day will tend to stagnate the employees rather than enhancing creative ideas.

5.5.27 Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly

- **Have you been given your job description verbally?**

Is there a correlation between employees being paid weekly or monthly and being given their job description verbally?

Table 5.112: Payment: Verbal job description → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have you been given your job description verbally		Total
			Yes	No	
Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	Weekly	Count	209	51	260
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	80.4%	19.6%	100.0%
	Monthly	Count	21	14	35
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	230	65	295
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%

Of the employees who are paid weekly, 80.4% answered yes and of the employees who are paid monthly, 60.0% answered yes.

Table 5.113: Payment: Verbal job description → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.462(b)	1	.006		
Continuity Correction (a)	6.322	1	.012		
Likelihood Ratio	6.605	1	.010		
Fisher's Exact Test				.009	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.436	1	.006		
N of Valid Cases	295				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.71.					

A statistically significant relationship is shown as the Fisher's Exact test score is .009.

Table 5.114: Payment: Verbal job description → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.159	.006
	Cramer's V	-.159	.006
N of Valid Cases		295	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

The phi measure indicates a small practical value of .159.

Employees working on the factory floor are given a verbal job description. Every day they are told what to sew for that specific day. Although it is not a formal job description, it is a description of the work to be completed for a specific day.

5.5.28 Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly

- Have you been given your job description in written format?

Is there a correlation between employees who are paid weekly or monthly and those who have been given their job description in written format?

Table 5.115: Payment: Written job description → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have you been given your job description in written format		Total
			Yes	No	
Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	Weekly	Count	37	223	260
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	14.2%	85.8%	100.0%
	Monthly	Count	19	16	35
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	56	239	295
		% within Please indicate if you are paid weekly or monthly	19.0%	81.0%	100.0%

14.2% of the employees who are paid weekly answered yes, and 54.3% of the employees who are paid monthly answered yes.

Table 5.116: Payment: Written job description → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.180(b)	1	.000		
Continuity Correction (a)	29.629	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	25.716	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	32.071	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	295				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.64.					

The Fisher's Exact test shows a statistical significance of .000.

Table 5.117: Payment: Written job description → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.330	.000
	Cramer's V	.330	.000
N of Valid Cases		295	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

The phi measure shows a medium practical value.

Workers that are paid monthly salaries must have contracts according to the labour law. Those who are paid weekly are usually not permanent employees, and therefore do not have contracts.

5.5.29 What type of qualified worker are you?

- Have you been threatened in any way by another employee at Allwear in the last three months?

Is there a correlation between the type of qualified worker and being threatened by another employee at Allwear?

Table 5.118: Qualified worker: Threatened → Crosstab

Crosstab					
			Have you been threatened in any way by another employee at Allwear in the last three months		Total
			Yes	No	
(Recoded) What type of qualified worker are you	General worker	Count	30	71	101
		% within (Recoded) What type of qualified worker are you	29.7%	70.3%	100.0%
	Machinist	Count	20	102	122
		% within (Recoded) What type of qualified worker are you	16.4%	83.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	50	173	223
		% within (Recoded) What type of qualified worker are you	22.4%	77.6%	100.0%

Of the general workers, 29.7% answered yes, and of the machinists, 16.4% answered yes.

Table 5.119: Qualified worker: Threatened → Chi-square tests

Chi-Square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.627(b)	1	.018		
Continuity Correction (a)	4.888	1	.027		
Likelihood Ratio	5.618	1	.018		
Fisher's Exact Test				.024	.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.602	1	.018		
N of Valid Cases	223				
a. Computed only for a 2x2 table					
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.65.					

Fisher's Exact test shows a statistical significance of 0.24.

Table 5.120: Qualified worker: Threatened → Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.159	.018
	Cramer's V	.159	.018
N of Valid Cases		223	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

The phi measures show a small practical value of .159.

The majority of general workers are required to work on the factory floor, making clothes. The physical distance between these workers is less than that between the machinists. The practicalities of this close physical contact mean that there are more opportunities for these workers to get involved in conflict situations.

5.5.30 Conclusion to this section

Discrimination within the factory is not practised against a cultural group but against women. Women get less feedback on their work performance than men. Male employees' ideas are implemented more than those of the female employees. The female employees tend to receive only verbal job descriptions.

This is linked to empowerment. The factory could affect a difference by changing small things, such as giving women more feedback and implementing their ideas. With changes such as these, the factory could ensure higher empowerment levels with female employees. This would benefit the factory since the majority of employees at Allwear are women.

Language barriers can be seen in that Zulu-speaking employees are usually paid weekly and not monthly. Zulu-speaking employees are less involved in the decision-making process than other language groups. Zulu-speaking employees' job descriptions are mostly verbal. The employees with written job descriptions have better positions in the factory.

Zulu-speaking employees should be included in the decision-making process. Although not all their ideas can be implemented, they could be included in the process. This inclusion will make them feel trusted. The factory could consider changing contracts to written contracts with specific job descriptions. By changing practices like these, the management can change empowerment levels in the factory.

The younger employees and those who have been working at the factory for less than five years are trying to perform different tasks within the factory. The employees who have been working for 6 to 14 years at Allwear receive most of the warnings.

The fact that young employees want to learn different tasks within the factory should be encouraged. Not only is it a requirement for empowerment, but these employees are showing an eagerness to comply. The factory could try and determine why employees who have been working for 6 to 14 years receive most warnings. This might indicate a pattern that management could aim to turn around in order to boost further empowerment in the factory.

Single employees tend to receive verbal job descriptions and employees that are married or cohabitating tend to get written job descriptions.

The factory could determine why single employees tend to receive verbal job descriptions. Since this will have an effect on empowerment, the factory could consider changing this practice.

General workers seem to be threatened more than the machinists.

The physical working conditions of the general workers and machinists could be investigated. The working conditions of the general workers and the physical outlay of the factory floor could be changed. If proximity is not the reason, management could try and determine the reason for the conflict. This will give the factory feedback how to solve the problem. Resolving the conflict would affect empowerment levels for the better.

The higher an employee's qualifications, the more feedback they receive on their work performance. They also receive written job descriptions and get paid monthly. These employees' ideas are implemented more than those of the less qualified employee.

The factory could try and improve the levels of empowerment of less qualified workers by changing practices like feedback, written job descriptions, monthly or weekly pay and the implementation of ideas. This would mean that the empowerment levels of the less qualified workers could be more in line with those of the higher qualified employees.

These results give very clear indications as to where empowerment levels could be improved, and where they are effective. By following these indications where applicable, and changing practices in the factory, management can improve their empowerment practices and create an empowered workforce.

The following section will combine the results of this chapter, and indicate how the results relate to theory.

5.6 COMPARISON: T-TEST/ANOVA RESULTS WITH CROSSTAB/CHI-SQUARE RESULTS

The following figure presents all of the statistics in this chapter, and compares the results. The t-test/ANOVA presents a comparison of the three empirical factors with the questions from Section A. The Crosstab/Chi-square presents the questions from Section C in comparison to the questions in Section A of the questionnaire. All of these are compared to each other in Figure 5.1. These results are then related to the literature study in Chapter 2.

It is interesting to see how the same solutions are derived from cross comparisons.

- Point 1 refers to job descriptions. It indicates which employees have job descriptions and what type of job descriptions they have. This indicates where management could make changes relating to job descriptions.
- Point 2 refers to how employees are paid. Employees being paid monthly feel more supported, responsible and empowered. It indicates which employees are paid weekly and monthly.
- Point 3 refers to feedback. Receiving feedback gives employees support and make them feel empowered. It is apparent that female employees receive less feedback than any other employee.
- Point 4 refers to implementing the ideas of employees. This gives them support, as well as making them feel responsible and more empowered. Management could take note that male employees and higher qualified employees' ideas are more frequently implemented.
- Point 5 refers to performing different tasks, which gives employees a sense of responsibility. At Allwear, the younger employees tend to do different tasks.

- Point 6 refers to single employees and the fact that they feel less empowered and responsible. Management could make an initial change by giving them written job descriptions.
- Point 7 refers to threats at the factory among employees. These employees need to receive support from management. It also indicates who the employees are who are more threatened than others.
- Point 8 refers to language groups. Other language groups feel more empowered and supported than Zulu-speaking employees. Involving Zulu-speaking employees in the decision-making process could change this perception.
- Point 9 refers to training. Training employees makes them feel more empowered. The factory could change their training strategies. If they let the employees perform different tasks at different times, the employees would need training and that could change their empowerment levels.
- Point 10 refers to the responsibility levels of the different employees. The employees who feel less responsible could be given more responsibilities. As stated previously, the factory could determine why employees who have been working for 6 to 14 years, receive the most warnings. This might show a pattern that could be changed.
- Point 11 refers to the mission statement. By knowing what the mission statement is, employees feel responsible, feel they receive more support and they feel more empowered. The factory can ensure that employees know what the mission statement is and what it means.

All of these results indicate what makes employees feel supported, responsible and empowered. It also indicates where there is a gap and what management can do to fill this gap.

t-Test/ANOVA	Crosstab/Chi-square
1) Having a job description in written format enhances empowerment and support from the factory.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employees with a written job description have better positions and are better qualified. The majority of Zulu-speaking and female employees have verbal job descriptions.
2) Monthly paid employees feel more, responsible, empowered and supported by the factory than employees being paid weekly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zulu-speaking employees tend to be paid weekly. Higher qualified employees tend to be paid monthly.
3) Feedback on work performance gives employees a feeling of support and empowerment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher qualified workers receive more feedback on work performance than less qualified employees. Women receive less feedback than male employees.
4) When the factory implements employee's ideas, it makes them feel more empowered, responsible and supported by the factory.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male employees' ideas are implemented more frequently than those of female employees. Higher qualified employees' ideas are implemented more frequently than those of less qualified employees.
5) Giving employees different tasks makes them feel responsible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young employees are trying to perform different tasks.
6) Single employees feel less responsible and empowered than married/cohabitating employees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single employees usually receive verbal job descriptions.
7) Threatened employees need support from the factory.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General workers are more threatened than machinists.

8) Other language groups feel more support from the factory and more empowered than Zulu-speaking employees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zulu-speaking employees are less involved in the decision-making process than the other language groups.
9) In-job training makes employees feel empowered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work every day written on board. Doing the same task every day – no training.
10) Employees younger than 35 are not as responsible as other employees. Older, less qualified workers are more responsible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young employees are performing different tasks. They have a shorter work history. Employees who have been working for 6 to 14 years have received the most warnings.
11) Employees that know the mission statement tend to be more responsible and empowered. They feel more support from the factory.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No statistical significance.

Figure 5.1: Comparison: t-test/ANOVA results with Crosstab/Chi-square results

(Referring back to Chapter 2, these results are verified in terms of the theoretical overview.)

- 1) Employees must not be unsure about what is expected from them. Every role in the organisation must have a clear set of responsibilities in order for management to provide appropriate guidance and direction. If employees don't know what is expected from them, they will hesitate to act (Spreitzer, 1996:487).

Therefore job descriptions for employees can only enhance their employee empowerment levels and show support from the factory.

- 2) Employees must be compensated for increased responsibility and accountability (Quinn & Spreitzer, 1997:39).

If employees are secure about their compensation they act more responsibly, feel more empowered and feel that they have the support of the factory. Being paid monthly might make them feel more secure.

- 3) In order to empower your employees develop a sense of competence and confidence, praise them for their performance, encourage them to take risks and acknowledge accomplishments, no matter how small. When your employees know they are doing a good job, they will want to repeat the process over and over again (Lawson, 2001:8).

Work performance feedback made the employees feel more empowered; they acted more responsibly and believed that they were supported by Allwear.

- 4) Employees should be involved in the decision-making process. Employees can be involved in decision-making that relates to them. Employees will feel they have contributed and won't feel mistreated and negative (Lawson, 2001:8).

Although not all the employees' ideas can be implemented, they are part of a process. The factory can ensure that all employees are part of this

process in order to enhance employee empowerment, responsibility and to show support to employees.

- 5) Employees must get involved; employees must rotate their responsibilities (Weiss, 2001:3). Empowered individuals have a feeling of ownership for tasks because they can determine how they are accomplished, when they are accomplished and how soon they are completed (Whetten, Cameron & Woods, 2000:411).

By giving employees different tasks to do, the factory enhances responsibility and feelings of self-determination. This will lead to the empowering of employees.

- 6) Climate in the organisation provides a frame of reference through which individuals make sense of organisational life. It shapes behaviour and moulds activities (Spreitzer, 1996:489). Without information you can be certain that people will not extend themselves to take responsibility or vent their creative energies (Quinn & Spreitzer, 1997:47).

Single employees might feel they do not know where they fit into the organisation. Having verbal job descriptions can increase this feeling. This can lead to the single employees feeling less empowered, and so less responsible.

- 7) It is important for organisations to invest in maintaining as well as developing their human resource. The human resource is to a large extent the engine of the organisation. The present wellbeing of an employee has a direct impact on the wellbeing of the company (Naidoo & Jano, 2003:113). Even though trust implies being in a position of vulnerability, empowered individuals have faith that no harm will come to them (Whetten, *et al.* 2000:413).

If employees, specifically the general workers, trust the factory to protect them from threats from other employees, the support that they experience from the factory can enhance empowerment levels.

These employees can return the support in the form of beneficial actions towards the factory.

- 8) Empowered people have a sense of trust. They are confident that they will be treated fairly and equitably (Whetten, et al. 2000:413). A team environment must be created to help staff cross boundaries (Cronjé, 1996:42).

The factory must ensure that all language groups feel they are treated equally and fairly. All language groups must be involved in the decision-making processes, and feel they are equally involved and represented in the process. In doing this, the factory will create a team environment and all language groups can be empowered.

- 9) One of the most critical factors in dealing with the implementation of an empowerment system is the training. Training is recognised as one of the barriers to the empowered workforce (Benson & Wolf, 1994:80). Continual training and support must be available. The training must be properly done (Lawson, 2001:8).

A system of training can be implemented at the factory. The training can be of such a nature that the employees understand it and can use it to enhance their abilities. The factory can enhance levels of employee empowerment by means of this training.

- 10) Employees must not be unsure about what is expected from them. Every role in the organisation must have a clear set of responsibilities, in order for management to provide appropriate guidance and direction. If employees don't know what is expected of them, they will hesitate to act, and thus feel unable to make a difference (Spreitzer, 1996:487).

Giving responsibilities to the employees, no matter their age, qualification or history at the factory, will teach them to be responsible. Each employee will know what his/her responsibilities are, and will act accordingly. This will have to be accompanied by training.

- 11) Everybody must know the company's vision. Milestones must be seen as a means to an end. It must also be measurable (Randolph, 2000b:21).

If the factory has a mission statement which all the employees understand and comprehend, it can make them feel more empowered and responsible. The factory will show support by trusting the employees to share the mission statement with them.

5.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter presented the statistical analysis. First, the descriptive characteristics of the sample were presented. Following that, a factor and reliability analysis was conducted in order to identify the factors applicable to this study. This was followed by a comparison between empirical factors and variables, after which a cross tabulation between Section C and Section A of the questionnaire was done. The chapter concluded with an overview of all the results, comparing the results and relating these to the theory in Chapter 2. Chapter 6 follows with an examination of the validity and reliability of this study.