

Chapter 4 Research Findings

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents results from data collection along with the interpretation for the 7 organizations that took part in the study. The population from the seven organizations was 160. Of these 160 participants a total of 109 respondents took part in the study by answering the job satisfaction questionnaires and therefore the respondent percentage was 68.13%. The number for volunteers in the population was 35 and the number of paid employees was 125. See the table below for a detailed look at these statistics: (Table 4.1).

4.1 Informant Demographics

As earlier mentioned in Chapter 3, there were seven organizations participated in this study.

NGOCMI was formed in 1997 and its goal is to provide help, hope and love to people in the war zones of Burma. Ethnic pro-democracy groups send teams to be trained, supplied and sent into the areas under attack to provide emergency assistance and human rights documentation. Together with other groups, the teams work to serve people in need.

Since 1997 NGOCMI has 59 humanitarian relief teams, over 500 relief missions have been conducted and over 1 million people have been helped.

The organization has both local staff as well as foreign staff. The majority of staff are foreign all of which are volunteers who raise their own support. There are a few local staff members which are hired by NGOCMI. Given the fact that the organization is made up of mostly volunteers the amount of time that volunteers commit to varies. However on average there are between 20-25 workers throughout a given year. Funding for this organization is obtained from sponsors and donors abroad as well as locally.

NGOCM2 was started in 1995 and is registered in various countries around the world. The main focus of this organization is to help and support children and communities in refugee camps and other hide-outs along the Thai-Burma border. This organization does this by providing; emergency relief, sustainable development, caring for children and advocacy.

NGOCM2 is modeled similarly to NGOCM1 in that they employ both volunteers as well as paid staff. The number of local staff is about 50% all of which are employed on a permanent basis. The majority of the volunteer staff are also committed to work long-term with the organization with a few that come and go. Funding for NGOCM2 is raised from both foreign and local sources.

NGOCM3 works exclusively throughout the Mekong sub-region with women who are at risk for, or victims of, human trafficking, forced labor, and sexual abuse. Since its inception in 1987, the NGOCM3 has partnered with various local and international NGOs to provide legal, psychological, and repatriation assistance. NGOCM3 believes in grass-roots activism, empowering individuals and families at a community level, and engaging local churches and other organizations to create a world without exploitation.

Employees in this organization are made up of both local and international staff and all of them are paid employees. In addition to this all employees are females given the type of work they do as well as their target group. Funding is generated from donors abroad as well as through local projects

NGOCM4 is an internationally recognized organization that is known world-wide for its work. This organization has been operating in Thailand since 1998 in northeastern Thailand. The main focus of this organization is to help people in need by focusing on providing shelter and meeting their most basic needs. NGOCM4 is funded mostly from international donors. Employees in this organization are local and all of them are paid employees however there are volunteer employment opportunities available through the organizations international offices. NGOCM4's current operations in Thailand are mostly occurring in the north of Thailand as well as in Bangkok.

NGOCM5 has been established in Thailand since 1972. The head office of this Organization is located in United States. NGOCM5 is widely known by most Churches and Christian Organizations as child holistic sponsorship development in Thailand. Principally, the organization attempts to develop a child to grow spiritually, economically, socially and educationally.

Currently, the organization has over 30,000 children in the program. Many of these sponsored students are in colleges and Universities. Interestingly, over 50% of these children are ethnic children. The main sources of funds are from sponsors overseas.

The organization has largely adopted the polycentric staff composition as the main strategy for its mission and sponsorship development. The organization believes that national employees are the most valuable resources for the development of mission work for the organization. It is for this reason that NGOCM5 has about 60 employees all of which are Thai nationals.

NGOCM6 is an organization which provides care for special needs children who are referred from the local government orphanage in Chiang Mai, northern Thailand. It was established in October 2007 and since then it has been providing respite care to disabled children in the area.

The purpose of this organization is to provide a loving, caring and therapeutic environment for orphaned or abandoned children who have special physical needs. NGOCM6 is staffed by a Thai manager who has experience in community care, four full-time Thai care givers, and a live-in couple for night care / general upkeep and cleaning. The organization is administrated by a Thai Manager, while the Director is from abroad. NGOCM6 also has regular input from both overseas and local volunteers. A Thai physiotherapist was employed to train staff members in the individual needs for each child. Funding is generated through local contacts as well as donors abroad.

NGOCM7 strives to play a coordinating role and develop a capacity to support the professional expertise of member organizations within the education and health sectors in and on the borders of Burma.

Its main function is to facilitate the humanitarian needs of its member and affiliated organizations especially in health and education. The activities of the organization are mainly focused on fundraising for health and education programs of member organizations, distribution of materials, monitoring and reporting. In addition to this the organization spends a lot of resources on trainings in order to improve the health and education situation in Burma.

Employees are both local and foreign as well and all receive a salary. Funding is obtained from local and international partners.

Table 4.1 Demographic Representation of Organizations

Organization	No. of Respondents	Respondent %	No. of Paid Staff	No. of Volunteers	Total
NGOCM1	21	84.00	3	22	25
NGOCM2	16	72.73	11	11	22
NGOCM3	11	55.00	20	0	20
NGOCM4	8	80.00	10	0	10
NGOCM5	41	67.21	61	0	61
NGOCM6	7	77.78	7	2	9
NGOCM7	5	38.46	13	0	13
Totals	109	68.13	125	35	160

Table 4.2 compares the number of males and females that responded to the questionnaires as well as looking how many of them were local (Thai) staff and how many were foreign staff. The number of males and females in the study was fairly even as the number of male participants was 54 and females 55. However, 70% of the respondents were Thai and only 30% were foreigners.

Table 4.2 Ratio of Males to Females and Local to Foreign Staff

Organization	Males	%	Females	%	Local Staff	%	Foreign Staff	%	Total
NGOCM1	13	61.9	8	38.1	1	4.76	20	95.2	21
NGOCM2	7	43.8	9	56.3	9	56.3	7	43.8	16
NGOCM3	0	0.0	11	100.0	11	100	0	0.0	11
NGOCM4	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	100	0	0.0	8
NGOCM5	26	63.4	15	36.6	41	100	0	0.0	41
NGOCM6	0	0.0	7	100.0	6	85.7	1	14.3	7
NGOCM7	3	60.0	2	40.0	1	20	4	80.0	5
Totals	54		55		77		32		109

4.2 Analysis of Job Satisfaction

Each organization was given a code (NGOCM1.....NGOCM7) this was done to ensure confidentiality as was agreed upon between the researcher and each NGO. Following is data obtained from each organization.

Table 4.3 provides the JSS scores for each of the seven organizations. It highlights the fact that two groups were compared; paid staff and mixed staff. For the 36-item total where possible scores range from 36 to 216, the ranges are 36 to 108 for dissatisfaction, 108 to 144 for ambivalent and between 144 to 216 for satisfaction (Spector, 2001). According to Spector, organizations NGOCM1, NGOCM2, NGOCM3, NGOCM5 and NGOCM7 all fall into the satisfaction range. This means that it can be said that these organizations are in general satisfied based on the 9-factors that have been used in the study. Organizations NGOCM4 and NGOCM6 are in the ambivalent range meaning that these organizations are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied but it is clear that the employees in these organizations are unsure or undecided about their respective organizations.

Table 4.3 Comparison of Mixed and Paid Staff JSS Scores

Organization	N	Mixed Staff	Paid Staff
NGOCM1	25	147.24	
NGOCM2	22	145.19	
NGOCM3	20		144.91
NGOCM4	10		126.63
NGOCM5	61		164.22
NGOCM6	9	129.43	
NGOCM7	13		147.4
	Average	140.62	145.79

Table 4.4 highlights the nine JSS factors in terms of rank order for each organization. It is important to note that organizations NGOCM1, NGOCM2 and NGOCM6 are all mixed organizations. These organizations would naturally have a lower score for factors such as Pay, Promotion and Fringe Benefits as the majority of the employees in these organizations are volunteers and would not have answered any questions pertaining to these factors.

Organizations NGOCM3, NGOCM4, NGOCM5 and NGOCM7 have only paid staff and it is interesting to note that of these four organizations three ranked Pay as the lowest factor. This is an indication that staff in these organizations is not satisfied with their salary.

Table 4.4 Nine Sub-scale factors Ranking According to each NGO

NGOCM1	Score	NGOCM2	Score	NGOCM3	Score	NGOCM4	Score
Nature of Work	464	Supervision	328	Nature of Work	228	Nature of Work	177
Supervision	447	Nature of Work	327	Supervision	199	Supervision	171
Contingent Rewards	422	Contingent Rewards	282	Communication	180	Co-Workers	115
Communication	344	Communication	269	Operating Procedures	165	Communication	102
Co-Workers	325	Co-Workers	231	Fringe Benefits	165	Contingent Rewards	99
Operating Procedures	319	Operating procedures	229	Co-Workers	206	Operating Procedures	88
Promotion	323	Fringe Benefits	207	Contingent Rewards	153	Promotion	80
Fringe Benefits	284	Promotion	193	Promotion	150	Fringe Benefits	77
Pay	59	Pay	173	Pay	148	Pay	63

Table 4.4 Nine Sub-scale factors Ranking According to each NGO (continued)

NGOCM5	Score	NGOCM6	Score	NGOCM7	Score
Nature of Work	807	Nature of Work	124	Nature of Work	85
Co-Workers	738	Co-Workers	117	Co-Workers	78
Fringe Benefits	729	Supervision	108	Supervision	78
Pay	700	Contingent Rewards	103	Contingent Rewards	72
Communication	688	Operating Procedures	98	Operating Procedures	66
Contingent Rewards	683	Fringe Benefits	97	Fringe Benefits	64
Supervision	673	Promotion	93	Promotion	59
Promotion	596	Communication	91	Communication	59
Operating Procedures	419	Pay	75	Pay	52

4.3 Descriptive Statistics

Following is an analysis of the descriptive statistics for the JSS analysis for each organization;

Table 4.5 SPSS Descriptive Statistics for JSS

Type	Organization	JSS Descriptive Statistics		
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation %
Mixed	NGOCM1	144.12	20.47829	14.21
Mixed	NGOCM2	143.93	20.25782	14.07
Mixed	NGOCM6	129.43	7.78582	6.02
Paid	NGOCM3	144.91	14.47380	9.99
Paid	NGOCM4	126.62	18.30642	14.46
Paid	NGOCM5	162.55	18.25726	11.23
Paid	NGOCM7	153.25	25.21078	16.45

4.4 Data Envelopment Analysis

In order to measure the technical efficiency of these 7 organizations the researcher took into consideration 3 variables; 1) the number of staff in each organization, 2) total expenses (budget) used in order to meet the targets for that particular period and 3) the total number of lives that were impacted through the work of the staff members and the allocated budget. Following is a breakdown of the data obtained from each organization in regards to the above mentioned variables:

Table 4.6 Actual Inputs and Outputs for Each Organization

Organization	Input: No. of Staff	Input: Budget	Output: No. of Lives Impacted
NGOCM1	25	38,716,800 THB	250,000
NGOCM2	22	40,586,640 THB	500,000
NGOCM3	20	10,085,000 THB	20,000
NGOCM4	10	19,000,000 THB	4,500
NGOCM5	71	952,142 THB	32,714
NGOCM6	9	96,000 THB	70
NGOCM7	13	19,136,719 THB	200,000

It is imperative to note that although the figures for both the inputs are accurate the output in this study was approximated as not each life impacted by the organizations could be quantified exactly. The output quantity was obtained through annual reports and other project reports produced by each organization.

After obtaining the data the inputs and outputs were processed through software known as DEAP (Data Envelopment Analysis Program). This software then provided a detailed analysis of the efficiency of each organization in relation to the others in the data set. Table 4.7 below shows the results from the DEAP analysis.

Table 4.7 DEA Results for Each Organization

Organization	CRSTE	VRSTE	SCALE	Type of Return to Scale
NGOCM1	0.523	0.583	0.897	Increasing Returns to Scale
NGOCM2	1.000	1.000	1.000	Constant Returns to Scale
NGOCM3	0.155	0.470	0.329	Increasing Returns to Scale
NGOCM4	0.020	0.909	0.022	Increasing Returns to Scale
NGOCM5	1.000	1.000	1.000	Constant Returns to Scale
NGOCM6	0.021	1.000	0.021	Increasing Returns to Scale
NGOCM7	0.845	1.000	0.845	Increasing Returns to Scale
Mean	0.509	0.852	0.588	

Note: CRSTE – technical efficiency from Constant Returns to Scale

VRSTE = technical efficiency from Variable Returns to Scale

SCALE = CRSTE/VRSET

Table 4.7 provides the technical efficiency scores for each organization and it is evident that organizations NGOCM2 and NGOCM5 are both technically efficient. For these two organizations no economies of scale can be gained because the CRS score and the VRS scores are equal, this means that both these organizations are operating at optimal level. However, NGOCM1, NGOCM3, NGOCM4, NGOCM6 and NGOCM7's CRS and VRS scores are not equal which means that economies of scale can be gained in each of these organizations. Given that these inefficient organizations have increasing returns to scale it is evident that they are too small in relation to the optimum size. This means that each one of these organizations needs to decrease their inputs and maintain the same levels of output in order to achieve optimal efficiency.

4.5 Comparison between JSS and DEA Results

In the following section, the researcher seeks to explain the relationship between the JSS and the DEA results. Table 4.8 shows the results of the analysis:

Table 4.8 Comparison of DEA and JSS for Each Organization

Organization	DEA Score CRSTE	JSS Score (Average)
NGOCM1	0.523	147.24
NGOCM2	1.000	145.19
NGOCM3	0.155	144.91
NGOCM4	0.020	126.63
NGOCM5	1.000	164.22
NGOCM6	0.021	129.43
NGOCM7	0.845	147.40

Based on the above mentioned information it is evident that there does not appear to be any relationship between the technical efficiency of an organization in the data set with its job satisfaction level. There is a distinct difference between the efficiency scores for each organization however the JSS scores are marginally different. Another interesting point to note is that of the 2 organizations that are efficient 1 is a mixed organization and the other is a paid organization. Both of these organizations have job satisfaction scores in the satisfaction range as mentioned earlier. In the same way, the organizations (NGOCM4 and NGOCM6) with the lowest job satisfaction scores represent paid and mixed organizations respectively. Therefore it is clear that there is no relationship between the efficiency of an organization and its job satisfaction level.

Following is a statistical analysis of table 4.9 using the Independent Samples T-Test for both JSS and CRSTE (DEA). In the following analysis we can determine whether or not there is a relationship between efficiency and job satisfaction.

Table 4.9 T-Test for JSS and CRSTE (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
JSS									
Equal variances assumed	.169	.698	-.505	5	.635	-.517000	10.24731	-31.51154	21.17154
Equal variances not assumed			-.542	4.945	.611	-.517000	9.53060	-29.75087	19.41087
CRS									
Equal variances assumed	.382	.564	.026	5	.980	.00967	.37380	-.95122	.97056
Equal variances not assumed			.026	4.453	.980	.00967	.37383	-.98789	1.00722

Table 4.9 shows the variances for both the JSS and CRSTE results. The JSS analysis shows that they are not significantly different since Levene's test shows the figure to be 0.698 which is greater than 0.05. This means that the variances are approximately equal. The t-test for equality of means shows that t-value is -0.505 and there are 5 degrees of freedom. The significance is 0.635 which greater than 0.05 which implies that there is no significant difference between the paid organizations and mixed organizations in terms of job satisfaction.

Similarly for CRSTE the two variances are also not significantly different since Levene's test shows the figure to be 0.564 which is greater than 0.05. This means that the variances are once again approximately equal. The t-test for equality of means shows that t-value is 0.026 with 5 degrees of freedom. The significance is 0.980 which is again greater than 0.05 implies that there is no significant difference between the CRSTE values of paid organizations and mixed organizations.

4.6 Correlations

The analysis of the relationship between JSS score and the two types of organizations toward the levels of organizational efficiency by using CRTS DEA where the independent variable is JSS and '1' represents dummy variables of Organizations that have paid staff where '0' represents volunteering staff of organizations.

Table 4.10 showed that JSS scores and the dummy variable impacted on the organizational efficiency by 68.00 percent, the other 32.00 percent influenced by other factors. The impact of JSS scores upon the organizational efficiency was significant at the level of $p < .05$ (Table 4.12), yet the dummy variable/other types of organizations have not manifested the significant impact upon the organizational efficiency. The estimated equation is $TE = -3.714 + 0.030 (JSS)$.

Table 4.10 R Square

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.824(a)	.680	.520	.30969	2.989

a Predictors: (Constant), DUM, JSS

b Dependent Variable: CRS

Table 4.11 ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.814	2	.407	4.245	.103(a)
	Residual	.384	4	.096		
	Total	1.198	6			

a Predictors: (Constant), DUM, JSS

b Dependent Variable: CRS

Table 4.12 Coefficients(a)

Model		Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-3.714	1.463		-2.540	.064
	JSS	.030	.010	.845	2.913	.044
	DUM	-.165	.242	-.198	-.681	.533

a Dependent Variable: CRS

4.7 Structured Interviews

The qualitative nature and purpose of the research question places importance on the need for an exploratory research strategy. The researcher decided that it would be best to conduct a structured interview with the manager's of the NGOs in the study.

A main purpose of the structured interview was that it served as a means to validate and add depth to the JSS findings. By having an opportunity to meet and talk with managers the researcher gained a little more insight into the general environment and mood of the organization. In addition to this, the researcher was able to find out a little about how long the manager had been a part of the organization and whether or not in their opinion the organization was meeting its short-term and long-term goals.

The questions that were asked in the structured interview can be seen in Appendix B. Following are some responses and observations that were obtained from these interviews outlining the managers' perceptions on the following questions which were directly related to the study.

Q. How do you feel job satisfaction levels are in your organization?

In response to the above mentioned question the majority of managers stated that they felt job satisfaction levels were good or satisfactory. Some felt that staff members that had been with the organization longer displayed higher levels of job satisfaction as they understood the mission and vision of the organization and those that were new to the organization would be more likely to feel less satisfied. One manager responded with the following statement;

"A lot of change is taking place in our organization, salaries have increased and therefore expectations have also risen. We are currently going through a transition phase and it can hard to judge what the satisfaction levels might be. However, 30% of our staff members are not fully satisfied in their position because they are required to improve in certain areas of work, they have 6 months to improve therefore this could affect their levels of job satisfaction".

Q. Do you feel there are areas where you can improve the managerial efficiency of your organization?

This question also provided some useful information about each organization. Each organization admitted that they felt there were areas where improvements were needed. The majority of these centred on a sense of lack of professionalism, lack of technological expertise as well as a need for improved communication between field

offices and head offices. Other areas of improvement that were mentioned included; skill building, clearer goals and policy changes as not all policies are “applicable for implementation at all times”.

Prior to conducting the interviews a letter was sent to each manager outlining and explaining in detail the type of study the researcher was intending to conduct. In this letter the researcher made it clear that all information obtained through the questionnaires and through annual reports would remain strictly confidential. It is for this reason that no names of organizations are mentioned in this study. A copy of this letter can be found in Appendix C.

PAYAP UNIVERSITY