

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter reveals the findings of the study from the questionnaires surveying middle-level administrators' leadership styles that drive government officials' engagement at the Office of the Permanent Secretary of the Interior (OPSI) as illustrated below:

- 1.) Leadership styles used by middle-level administrators at OPSI
- 2.) The levels of engagement of government officials at OPSI
- 3.) Middle-level administrators' leadership styles that drive government officials' engagement at OPSI
- 4.) Government officials' suggestions on the leadership styles that should be used by middle-level administrators at OPSI

After distributing questionnaires to 300 government officials at OPSI, 231 questionnaires were returned to the researcher.

4.1 LEADERSHIP STYLES USED BY MIDDLE-LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS AT OPSI

In this part, respondents gave their opinions about the leadership styles used by middle-level administrators at OPSI, such as directional leadership style, motivational leadership style, and organizational leadership style.

Table 3: Leadership styles used by middle-level administrators at OPSI.

Leadership styles used by middle-level administrators at OPSI	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Level
Motivational	3.95	.528	High
Organizational	3.87	.444	High
Directional	3.68	.373	High

According to table 3, all leadership styles; (directional, motivational, and organizational), used by middle-level administrators at OPSI were developed to a high degree.

4.2 THE LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AT OPSI

This part shows the level of engagement of government officials at OPSI in the term of three components; the cognitive, the emotional, and the behavioral.

Table 4: The level of engagement of government officials at OPSI.

Components of engagement	— X	S.D.	Level
Behavioral component	3.81	.434	High
Total (All components)	3.67	.313	High
Cognitive component	3.60	.348	High
Emotional component	3.54	.338	High

According to table 4, the level of engagement of government officials at OPSI in terms of the three components (the cognitive, the emotional, and the behavioral and overall components) were at a high level.

4.3 MIDDLE-LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS' LEADERSHIP STYLES THAT DRIVE GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS' ENGAGEMENT AT OPSI

This part addresses the last hypothesis – the leadership style of middle-level administrators affects government officials' engagement. The Statistic Package for Social Science (SPSS) program was employed to process the data by using Multiple Regression Analysis to test the hypothesis.

Before testing the hypothesis, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used in this part at a level of significance of .01 and .05.

The correlation coefficient level must be less than 0.80 to ensure that they are not dependent on each other completely. (Suchart, 1997, cited in Wikanya, 2006, p.72).

Table 5: The Correlation Coefficient among the independent variables.

	Directional leadership style	Motivational leadership style	Organizational leadership style
Directional leadership style	-	.760**	.737**
Motivational leadership style	-	-	.723**
Organizational leadership style	.737**	.723**	-

** A level of significance of .01.

* A level of significance of .05.

According to table 5, these variables have positive and negative correlation at a level of significance of 0.01 and 0.05 and their correlation coefficient level is not over .80. Hence, the hypothesis can be tested by using Multiple Regression Analysis.

Table 6: The Multiple Regression Analysis of predictors affecting the sum of engagement of government officials.

Predictor			b	SE _b	Beta	t	Sig.
Directional leadership style (DLS)			-.001	.065	-.001	-.016	.987
Motivational leadership style (MLS)			.333	.045	.562	7.382	.000
Organizational leadership style (OLS)			.166	.052	.236	3.219	.001
Constant			1.712	.146			
R = .750	R ² = .562	R ² _{adj} = .556	F _{Overall} = 88.564			Sig. = .000	

In table 6, the Multiple Regression Analysis of predictors that affect the sum of engagement of government officials at OPSI is shown. These leadership styles are

predictors of the sum of government officials' engagement at a level of significance of .05, at 55.6% ($R^2_{adj} = .556$), and a level of coefficient correlation of .750 ($R = .750$). Hence, two independent variables, motivational leadership style and organizational leadership style, can predict the sum of engagement but while the directional leadership style cannot.

All independent variables can predict the sum of engagement of government officials as shown in the following regression equation of raw score data:

$$\text{ENE_T} = 1.712 - .001 (\text{DLS}) + .333 (\text{MLS}) + .166 (\text{OLS})$$

Table 7: The Multiple Regression Analysis of predictors affecting the cognitive engagement of government officials.

Predictor			b	SE _b	Beta	t	Sig.
Directional leadership style (DLS)			.017	.083	.018	.2.04	.838
Motivational leadership style (MLS)			.340	.057	.516	5.929	.000
Organizational leadership style (OLS)			.126	.066	.160	1.919	.056
Constant			1.704	.186			
R = .656	R ² = .430	R ² _{adj} = .422	F _{Overall} = 52.014			Sig. = .000	

In table 7, the Multiple Regression Analysis of predictors that affect the cognitive engagement of government officials at OPSI is shown. These leadership styles are predictors of government officials' cognitive engagement at a level of significance of .05, at 44.2% ($R^2_{adj} = .442$), and a level of coefficient correlation of .656 ($R = .656$). Hence, two independent variables; motivational leadership style and organizational leadership style, can predict the cognitive engagement while the directional leadership style cannot.

All independent variables can predict the cognitive engagement of government officials as shown in the following regression equation of raw score data:

$$\text{ENC} = 1.704 + .017 (\text{DLS}) + .340 (\text{MLS}) + .126(\text{OLS})$$

Table 8: The Multiple Regression Analysis of predictors affecting the emotional engagement of government officials.

Predictor			b	SE _b	Beta	t	Sig.
Directional leadership style (DLS)			.196	.084	.219	2.339	.020
Motivational leadership style (MLS)			.186	.058	.294	3.216	.002
Organizational leadership style (OLS)			.115	.056	.153	1.747	.082
Constant			1.642	.187			
R = .608	R ² = .370	R ² _{adj} = .361	F _{Overall} = 40.524			Sig. = .000	

In table 8, the Multiple Regression Analysis of predictors that affect the emotional engagement of government officials at OPSI is shown. These leadership styles are predictors of government officials' emotional engagement at a level of significance of .05, at 36.1 % ($R^2_{\text{adj}} = .361$), and a level of coefficient correlation of .608 ($R = .608$). Hence, two independent variables, directional leadership style and motivational leadership style, can predict the emotional engagement while the organizational leadership style cannot.

All independent variables can predict the emotional engagement of government officials as shown in the following regression equation of raw score data:

$$\text{ENF} = 1.712 + .196 (\text{DLS}) + .186 (\text{MLS}) + .115(\text{OLS})$$

Table 9: The Multiple Regression Analysis of predictor affecting the behavioral engagement of government officials.

Predictor			b	SE _b	Beta	t	Sig.
Directional leadership style (DLS)			-1.50	.243	-.129	-1.387	.167
Motivational leadership style (MLS)			.430	.108	.523	5.746	.000
Organizational leadership style (OLS)			.229	.075	.235	2.683	.008
Constant			1.775	.243			
R = .613	R ² = .375	R ² _{adj} = .366	F _{Overall} = 41.459			Sig. = .000	

In table 9, the Multiple Regression Analysis of predictors that affect the behavioral engagement of government officials at OPSI is shown. Those leadership styles are predictors of government officials' behavioral engagement at a level of significance of .05, at 36.6 % (R²_{adj} = .366), and a level of coefficient correlation of .613 (R = .613). Hence, two independent variables; motivational leadership style and organizational leadership style, can predict the behavioral engagement while the directional leadership style cannot.

All independent variables can predict the behavioral engagement of government officials as shown in the following regression equation of raw score data:

$\text{ENB} = 1.775 - 1.50 (\text{DLS}) + .430 (\text{MLS}) + .229 (\text{OLS})$
--

Table 10 shows a summary of the leadership styles that drive the engagement of government officials at OPSI.

Table 10: The Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis of predictors driving government officials' engagement.

Leadership style	Government officials' engagement			
	The sum of engagement	Cognitive Component	Emotional Component	Behavioral Component
Directional leadership style	-	-	✓	-
Motivation leadership style	✓	✓	✓	✓
Organizational leadership style	✓	✓	-	✓

Directional leadership style can drive emotional engagement, a sense of belonging and pride in the organization, in government officials. Motivational leadership style can drive the sum of engagement level and the engagement level related to the cognitive component, the emotional component, and the behavioral component. Finally, organizational leadership style can drive the sum of engagement level and the engagement level correlated to the cognitive and behavioral components.

4.4 GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS' SUGGESTIONS ON LEADERSHIP STYLES THAT SHOULD BE USED BY MIDDLE-LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS AT OPSI

Based on the findings, government officials at OPSI made suggestions about the leadership styles that middle-level administrators should use as follows:

4.4.1 Some respondents said that if middle-level administrators had more of knowledge and skills, government officials would be more confident.

4.4.2 Some indicated that they would like middle-level administrators be more open-minded and let them give their opinion.

4.4.3 Some wanted middle-level administrators be good leaders at work.

4.4.4 Some would like middle-level administrators treat them like a human being, be friendlier, and help to support them at work.

4.4.5 Some were concerned about the leadership of their middle-level administrators; they wanted middle-level administrators who could be depended on and who cooperated with them while working.

4.4.6 Some indicated that they would like their middle-level administrators to correct their errors or admit their mistakes if possible.