

Print ISSN: 2288-4637 / Online ISSN 2288-4645
doi:10.13106/jafeb.2022.vol9.no9.0157

Development and Validation of ESI iDART Instrument Measuring Organizational Values: An Empirical Study in Malaysia*

Abdul Kadir OTHMAN¹, Mizan HITAM², Zuhaina ZAKARIA³,

Mohd Rafizi RAHMAD⁴, Zuraidah MOHD SANUSI⁵

Received: June 30, 2022 Revised: September 18, 2022 Accepted: September 30, 2022

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to explain the process of developing and validating the instrument to measure the university's organizational core values and sub-values known as ESI iDART. The three core values are excellence, synergy, and integrity, while the five sub-values comprise knowledge, discipline, trustworthiness, diligence, and responsibility that all staff should understand and practice. These values must be measured to examine the extent to which the staff has practiced them in their work life. With regard to methodology, the research instrument used in the study was developed using a focus group study involving 39 university staff from various departments and campuses. The instrument was later refined and validated by a group of experts from the university. In the main study, the instrument was distributed to all 17,969 university staff from all over the country. After one month, a total of 11,688 university staff participated in the survey indicating a 66% response rate. Using descriptive analysis, reliability analysis, and ANOVA, the results indicate that instrument is considered valid and reliable to be used. The major findings from the study show that organizational values increase over time. Some theoretical and managerial implications are also discussed.

Keywords: Knowledge, Discipline, Trustworthiness, Diligence, Responsibility

JEL Classification Code: J17, J24, M14

*Acknowledgements:

The authors would like to express their gratitude to the Institute of Business Excellence, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Shah Alam Malaysia for sponsoring the publication of this paper, as well as ReNeU UiTM for the publication incentive provided through Program MEE 2.0, which also facilitated the writing and publication through the Emerging Research Leaders Series (ERLS) at ILD UiTM.

¹First Author and Corresponding Author. Associate Professor, Institute of Business Excellence, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia. ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5174-573X. [Postal Address: Institute of Business Excellence, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Malaysia] Email: abdkadir@uitm.edu.my

²Professor, Institute of Leadership Development, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia. Email: drmizan@uitm.edu.my

³Professor, Institute of Postgraduate Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia. Email: zuhainaz@uitm.edu.my

⁴Senior Assistant Registrar, Institute of Leadership Development, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia. Email: mrafizi@uitm.edu.my

⁵Professor, Institute of Leadership Development, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia. Email: zuraidahms@uitm.edu.my

© Copyright: The Author(s)

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

Previously, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) had quite a number of organizational and individual values known as *Budaya PERDANA*, comprising values that include being fast, empathetic, relevant, competitive, trustworthy, fair, and having integrity, value-added qualities, and distinctive, wise and knowledgeable (Universiti Teknologi MARA, 2020). However, these values were not integrated into the key initiatives of the university. As a result, the realization of these values is questionable. Employees who are not aware of the organizational values will not integrate those values into their practice (Shaturaev, 2022). A lot of programs had been implemented at the faculty level, but still, the awareness and practice of the values among the employees could be considered as low. Furthermore, these values had never been measured and evaluated making their realization difficult to be quantified.

With a total staff of 17,969 working on 35 campuses throughout the country, UiTM is the largest university in Malaysia (Universiti Teknologi MARA, 2020). The university

needs common values that are easily understood and practiced by the staff. These values can be regarded as the core values that bind the university staff together (Mergel, Ganapati, & Whitford, 2021). Realizing the need to improve the existing organizational values to be more practical, UiTM's top management during the strategic planning workshop 2019 has proposed three core values comprising excellence, synergy, and integrity that serve as the basis for other key initiatives. The three core values have been further defined to include five individual values consisting of knowledge, discipline, trustworthiness, diligence, and responsibility (Universiti Teknologi MARA, 2020).

The current organizational values (excellence, synergy, and integrity) are more relevant to the aspiration of the university - to be a globally renowned university (Sikpi & Enoch, 2022). Furthermore, these values have been translated into five individual values, comprising knowledge, discipline, trustworthiness, diligence, and responsibility, which are more specific and related to the day-to-day functions and responsibilities of all employees. The only difference that differentiates them from one another is their level of awareness and how they put them into practice in their daily lives (Van Rooij & Fine, 2018). This paper is meant to explain the process of developing and validating the instrument to accurately measure the university's values so that further improvement can be made pertaining to awareness and practice.

2. Literature Review

A public higher educational institution (PHEI) is established to provide higher education to the citizens without considering the monetary returns (Jayabalan, Dorasamy, & Raman, 2021). However, each PHEI is given certain KPIs to achieve especially those related to world rankings and graduate employability. Modern facilities and infrastructure, high-quality academic programs, ISO-certified processes, and highly qualified academics do not guarantee that the PHEI can excel and achieve the assigned KPIs. The human capital that moves things in the institution is the most important factor that can ensure the achievement of the KPIs (Nicolaescu, Florea, Kifor, Fiore, Cocan, Receu, & Zanetti, 2020). The question is, how can human capital be managed so that they are motivated to move the institution to achieve excellence?

There are various strategies to motivate employees. Among the commonly used strategies are the provision of rewards and recognitions, promotion and advancement, job enrichment and rotation, training and development, and various other strategies targeted at improving employee work performance (Kalogiannidis, 2021). These strategies are excellent as short or intermediate-term interventions to improve individual employee performance. Some

institutions rely on leadership to create the right work culture for the institution and the effect of this strategy lasts longer even after the leaders have left the organization (Paais & Pattiruhu, 2020). The appropriate work culture can be established through the right values and this is the intention of the paper, which is to verify that institutional values can contribute to organizational performance.

What is organizational culture? The most popular definition of organizational culture is the one articulated by Schein (1987, p. 383), "A pattern of basic assumptions, invented, discovered, or developed by a given group, as it learns to cope with its problems or external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore is to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems". Organizational culture contains three elements; artifacts that refer to visible organizational structures and processes, values that reflect strategies, goals, philosophies, and underlying assumptions that contain unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs, habits or perception, thought, and feeling (Schein, 1990).

Culture can be developed through group learning, norms, beliefs, and assumptions. It consistently develops through critical incidents that happen from time to time in the group setting. Moreover, culture can also be created through identification with leaders. Leaders determine what should be learned, believed, and perceived by the members so that the group can be structured and should function according to the direction determined by the leaders (Adıgüzel, 2019). Culture can be preserved through socialization. A new member learns the assumptions, beliefs, and values of the existing members (Cousins, 2021). Culture evolves naturally and through guided evolution (Regier, 2020). Most organizations choose guided cultural evolution through properly planned cultural change.

Organizations comprise individuals with unique ideas, beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions which collectively comprise members' values. Rokeach (1973, p. 5) defines values as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence. A value system is an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states among a continuum of relative importance". Values are enduring because they are neither completely stable nor unstable but rather change according to the physical, social and spiritual environments of the individuals or groups that embrace them. Values are also reflected through cognitive, affective, and behavioral components, which continually interact and exhibit in the actions and behaviors of members (Eccles & Wigfield, 2020).

Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) strives to continuously improve its human resource management

to ensure that services at the university are responsive, sustainable, and of high quality. The human resources of the university should embody the institution's core values and aspirations, with staff developing their competence and working towards implementing great initiatives. Realizing the importance of values, UiTM has established three core organizational values comprising excellence, synergy, and integrity. These three core values have been translated into five sub-values, constituting knowledge, discipline, trustworthiness, diligence, and responsibility known as iDART.

iDART captures the core attributes which are integral to human resource management at UiTM. Only a team that is knowledgeable, disciplined, trustworthy, diligent, and responsible can ensure that the university is on target to become a globally renowned university. Therefore, iDART is the representation of attributes that must be held by every staff of the university.

Knowledge refers to the relentless quest for knowledge that drives learning and positively impacts the institution and the wider community (Universiti Teknologi MARA, 2020). Knowledge motivates originality and innovation, which are necessary for growth and getting a competitive advantage. Discipline drives behavior which is necessary for achieving a collective goal (Universiti Teknologi MARA, 2020). A disciplined workforce meets the requirements for compliance with ethical standards and orderliness.

Trustworthiness is key in efficient human resource management because it anchors the values of honesty, loyalty, integrity, and sincerity for accomplishing tasks that are entrusted (Universiti Teknologi MARA, 2020). Diligence is highly desired because a workforce with is dedicated to working consistently and dutifully will collectively create a culture of excellence (Universiti Teknologi MARA, 2020). Responsibility is vital to see through tasks that are assigned (Universiti Teknologi MARA, 2020). It is an obligation to complete work that is of the highest quality.

These five sub-values need to be tested to measure the level of awareness, understanding, and implementation of these values among UiTM staff. The following section will describe the process and activities involved in developing and validating the instrument measuring the university's values known as ESI iDART.

3. Research Methods and Materials

3.1. Focus Group Technique

The focus group technique was used to determine (1) the dimensions of each UiTM value comprising knowledge, discipline, trustworthiness, diligence, and responsibility, and (2) to describe the critical events pertaining to the five values that happened recently at their respective units/

departments/faculties. There were 39 participants involved in the focus group study. They came from various units/departments/faculties and had diverse working experiences and backgrounds. These participants were divided into six smaller groups that consisted of seven or eight members in each group. One facilitator was assigned to each group.

The first assignment is to determine the dimensions of each UiTM value. The participants were asked to think and write down as many adjectives as they could in describing each value. After the lapse of 15 minutes, they were asked to discuss the findings in their respective groups to reach a common agreement on the right adjectives to describe each value. 15 minutes were allocated for this exercise. The facilitator was responsible for jotting down the main points of the discussion. After that, each group would present the findings, and the other groups could provide arguments and suggestions for improvement.

The second assignment is to describe the critical events using the critical event technique (Mertova & Webster, 2019) pertaining to the five values that happened recently at their respective units/departments/faculties. Individually, they were asked to describe in detail the critical events, and the causes and consequences of those events so that the correctly interpreted events could be documented. The events can be positive or negative depending on the perception of the participants. They were given 15 minutes to describe the events and write them down on the given forms. After the lapse of the allotted time, members of the groups were asked to present them so that the rest of the participants could provide suggestions for improvement.

At the end of the session, each of the 39 participants provided two critical events for each value (knowledge, discipline, trustworthiness, diligence, and responsibility) resulting in a total number of 390 events.

3.2. Item Formation and Validation

A total of 390 critical events were ready to be evaluated and selected to be included in the questionnaire. However, before it could be chosen, these critical events had to be evaluated by experts, particularly in the field of psychology. The chosen critical events were rephrased, amended, and refined so that they would be in the form of statements suitable to be used as a questionnaire item. Each item was discussed and debated until a common agreement was achieved. Only items that meet the criteria of specificity and criticality were retained, and items that did not meet the criteria were discarded.

Once ready, the draft of the questionnaire was sent to another group of experts to assess the suitability of each item and to provide recommendations to improve each item. Each expert was supplied with a complete form of the draft questionnaire with three categories of responses; suitable,

suitable but requires amendment, and not suitable. At the end of each row was the space for the expert to provide comments for improvement. At least five experts were required to complete the process. They were given two weeks to provide their responses.

After all feedback from the five experts was collected, items were retained, improved, or discarded based on their comments. At this stage, common agreement is the key, where items that received favorable comments from all experts were retained but items that received mixed comments or unfavorable comments from the experts were discarded. The final questionnaire was sent to those experts for final checks and endorsement before it would be ready for the next process which is pilot testing.

3.3. Pilot Test

A pilot test is meant to examine the extent to which the respondents understand the items in the questionnaire and can provide suitable responses. A total of 150 respondents were selected from various units/departments/faculties. The pilot test was conducted using an online survey method via Survey Monkey. The results indicate that respondents clearly understood the meaning of the items. Further analysis indicates that Cronbach's alpha values for the items measuring the five variables are above 0.7, which shows that the items reliably measured what they are supposed to measure.

3.4. Actual Study

The actual study was carried out by distributing the validated questionnaire to all 17,969 university staff from all over the country. The present study employed census by involving every staff in this exercise. After the lapse of one month period, a total of 11,688 university staff participated in the survey, indicating a 66% response rate. Various tests and analyses were performed to ensure that the data collected using the newly developed instrument are valid and reliable. The analyses involve descriptive analysis, factor analysis, reliability analysis, and ANOVA. The results of the analyses will be discussed in the following sections.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Results of Descriptive Analysis

From Table 1, we can see a normal distribution of responses based on the age of respondents. Respondents aged 18–24 years old were represented by 110 individuals or 0.9%. It is followed by those aged 25–34 years old with 2813 persons or 24.1%. The biggest representation is from those

aged 35–44 years old with 5324 responses or 45.6%. Those aged 45–54 years old were represented by 2538 persons or 21.7%. It is followed by those aged 55–59 years old with 863 staff or 7.4%. Lastly, the staff aged 60 years old and above were represented by 40 persons or 0.3%.

Pertaining to the gender distribution of respondents, 4943 respondents or 42.3% are male while 6745 respondents, or 57.7% are female.

Looking at the data distribution according to the job position, 21 respondents, or 0.2% were from the Special Grade (VU7/VU4) category. 115 respondents or 1.0% were Professors (VK7-VK5). 537 respondents or 4.6% were from the Management & Professional (Academic 53/54–56) category. The second largest group of respondents or 3363 persons or 28.8% represented the Management & Professional (Academic) (Grade 51–52) group. 1409 respondents (12.1%) were holding Management & Professional (Academic) (Grade 45/46) positions. 67 respondents (0.6%) were serving under the Management & Professional (Administration) (Grade 54–56) category. 432 staff or 3.7% were from the Management & Professional (Administration) (Grade 48–52) group. 689 staff or 5.9% were attached to Management & Professional (Administration) (Grade 41–44) departments. The majority of the respondents (4787 pax, 41.0%) represented the Support Staff (Grade 1–40). Contract (Administration) employees were represented by 148 respondents or 1.3% and lastly, Contract (Academic) employees were represented by 120 respondents or 1.0%.

Referring to job tenure, the majority of respondents have been with the university between 10 and 15 years represented by 3,923 people or 33.6% of the respondents. It is followed by those who have been working for the university for between 5 and 10 years that constituting 2,202 staff or 18.8% of the respondents. 1,823 staff or 15.6% of the respondents have been with the university between 15 and 20 years. It is followed by 9.9% of the respondents who have been working with the university for less than 3 years. 808 staff or 6.9% have been in service between 20 and 25 years, 741 staff or 6.3% have been working for 3 to 5 years, 543 staff or 4.6% have been working between 25 and 30 years, and lastly, 494 staff have been working with the university for more than 30 years.

4.2. Results of Factor Analysis

Factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed to analyze the dimensionality of the items measuring individual values. The result of factor analysis (Table 2) indicates the existence of four factors explaining 69% of the variance in the model, which signifies that the model is acceptable. The KMO value of .982 shows that the data are sufficient to perform factor analysis. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity denotes

Table 1: Respondents' Demographic Profile

Variables	Description	Frequencies	Percentage
Age	18–24 years old	110	0.9
	25–34 years old	2813	24.1
	35–44 years old	5324	45.6
	45–54 years old	2538	21.7
	55–59 years old	863	7.4
	60+ years old	40	0.3
Gender	Male	4943	42.3
	Female	6745	57.7
Job Positions	Special Grade (VU7/VU4)	21	0.2
	Professor (VK7-VK5)	115	1.0
	Management & Professional (Academic 53/54–56)	537	4.6
	Management & Professional (Academic) (Grade 51–52)	3363	28.8
	Management & Professional (Academic) (Grade 45/46)	1409	12.1
	Management & Professional (Administration) (Grade 54–56)	67	0.6
	Management & Professional (Administration) (Grade 48–52)	432	3.7
	Management & Professional (Administration) (Grade 41–44)	689	5.9
	Support Staff (Grade 1–40)	4787	41.0
	Contract (Administration)	148	1.3
	Contract (Academic)	120	1.0
Job Tenure	Less than 3 years	1154	9.9
	3–5 years	741	6.3
	5–10 years	2202	18.8
	10–15 years	3923	33.6
	15–20 years	1823	15.6
	20–25 years	808	6.9
	25–30 years	543	4.6
	More than 30 years	494	4.2

that the correlation matrix is sufficient and significant to proceed with factor analysis. MSA values that range from 0.975 to 0.989 show the adequacy of sampling for each item.

Initially, there were five factors and seven items used to measure each factor. However, after factor analysis was conducted only four factors emerged as distinct factors with varying numbers of items that represent each factor. The first factor explains 24.6% of the variance in the model. It contains 10 items combining the factors of trustworthiness and responsibility. It is expected that the respondents might find it difficult to differentiate the two factors because they have close meanings. The only difference is that trustworthiness reflects the level of trust assumed by the staff

when performing their job while responsibility concerns the level of responsibility and accountability the staff will shoulder when executing their tasks.

The second factor explains 18% of the total variance and contains all the original 7 items. The factor loadings range from 0.633 to 0.743 which shows that the items hold together to form the factor known as diligence. The third factor explains 15% of the total variance and all the seven original items hold together to form this factor. The factor loadings range from 0.547 to 0.734. The items used to measure these factors are correctly interpreted by the respondents. The fourth factor explains 14.4% of the variance and contains only 5 items with loadings ranging from 0.535 to 0.717. This

Table 2: Results of Factor Analysis of ESI iDART Items

Items	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Trustworthiness/Responsibility				
Keep the rights	0.788			
Keeping secrets	0.763			
Sincere	0.759			
Trusted	0.753			
Transparent	0.742			
Keep promises	0.726			
Fair	0.719			
Don't take advantage	0.639			
Accountability	0.610			
Concerned	0.573			
Diligence				
Competitive		0.743		
Productive		0.721		
Active		0.720		
Initiative		0.719		
Persistence		0.664		
Resilience		0.659		
Dedication		0.633		
Knowledge				
Flexible			0.734	
Open minded			0.711	
Inquisitive			0.635	
Creative/innovative			0.628	
Confidence			0.616	
Competent/ skilled in the field			0.564	
Humble			0.547	
Discipline				
Organized				0.716
Strict				0.643
Punctual				0.617
Emotional stability				0.568
Focused				0.535
% of variance explained (69.0%)	240.6	180.0	150.0	140.4
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	0.982			
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx0. Chi-Square			2691450.576
	df			406
	Sig0.			0.000
MSA	0.975–0.989			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

factor measures discipline. Two items were deleted due to high cross-loadings, showing that the respondents could not comprehend the meanings of these items.

4.3. Results of Reliability Analysis

The reliability analysis was done after factor analysis had been carried out. The rules of thumb suggested by (Chan & Idris, 2017) are referred to when interpreting the results of reliability analysis. The scores higher than 0.8 show that the items are very highly correlated, the scores between 0.6 and 0.8 indicate that the items are highly correlated, the scores between 0.4 and 0.6 signify that the items are moderately correlated, the scores between 0.2 and 0.4 denote that the items are weakly correlated, and the scores less than 0.2 show that the items are very weakly correlated. From Table 3, all four factors have high Cronbach’s alpha values ranging from 0.953 for trustworthiness/responsibility to 0.884 for knowledge. The items used to measure the intended variables measure what they are supposed to measure.

4.4. Results of Analysis of Variance (One Way ANOVA) between Age Groups and Values

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to examine the difference in the four values according to the respondents’ age groups. Table 4 shows that all four values are significantly different when compared between one group and another. It can be summed up that values change in line with the increase in age. Older employees have higher values than their younger counterparts.

4.5. Results of Independent Sample T-Test (Testing the Effect of Gender)

An Independent sample *t*-test was performed to examine the difference in the four values between the gender of the respondents. Table 5 shows that there is a significant difference between male and female respondents with regard to the four values.

Table 3: Results of Reliability Analysis on the ESI iDART Items

Factors	N of items	Cronbach’s alpha
Knowledge	7	0.884
Discipline	5	0.851
Diligence	7	0.946
Responsibility/ Trustworthiness	10	0.953

For the first value (Knowledge), male respondents ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 0.52$) have a higher mean score than the score of female respondents ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.46$). However, for the second value (Discipline), female staff ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 0.50$) have a higher score than the score of the male staff ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.54$). For Trustworthiness/ Responsibility, again female employees ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 0.48$) scored higher than their male counterparts ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 0.53$). The difference is significant. For the last value (Diligence), there is no significant difference between male and female scores. For male staff ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 0.58$), the score is a little bit higher than the score for female employees ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.53$).

The only value that is significantly different between male and female staff is Trustworthiness/ Responsibility where female staff has a higher score on this value than their male counterparts. The finding is consistent with one of the past studies which stated that female employees are more trustworthy than male employees (Shahriar et al., 2020). Female employees are usually known to have certain characteristics such as sincerity, accountability, trustworthiness, fairness, and showing concern for others and this is proven in this study. Male employees, have to improve themselves in this aspect. They need to change how they perceive the work that they do, appreciate the contribution made by other colleagues, treat them with fairness and be accountable for the outcome of their actions. These actions will help them to improve their score on this aspect.

4.5. Results of Analysis of Variance (One Way ANOVA) between Tenure and Values

Analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) was performed to examine the differences in values among the staff based on their tenure with UiTM. The results of the analysis indicate that different groups of respondents have different levels of values (refer to Table 6). Those who have been working more years with UiTM are shown to have higher values. The finding is consistent with one of the previous studies (Bhatt, 2020). For example, those who have been working with UiTM for less than 3 years have low mean scores on all four values (Knowledge - 4.0534, Discipline - 3.9853, Trustworthiness/ Responsibility - 4.2772, and Diligence - 4.1127). Whereas those who have been working with UiTM for more than 30 years have scored higher mean values (Knowledge - 4.0986, Discipline - 4.1006, Trustworthiness/ Responsibility - 4.3156, and Diligence - 4.1544).

The level of values increases over time. There are a lot of factors that are expected to influence these value differences. Among them are maturity level and acculturation process. When an individual ages, his maturity level increases (Cumming et al., 2018). He will think twice before making

Table 4: Analysis of Variance (One Way ANOVA) Between Age Groups and Values

Age		Knowledge	Discipline	Trustworthiness/ Responsibility	Diligence
18–24 years	Mean	3.88	3.87	4.11	4.05
	N	101	101	101	101
	Std. Deviation	0.63	0.70	0.68	0.73
25–34 years	Mean	4.00	3.93	4.22	4.05
	N	2679	2679	2679	2679
	Std. Deviation	0.48	0.53	0.51	0.57
35–44 years	Mean	4.03	3.94	4.22	4.05
	N	5130	5130	5130	5130
	Std. Deviation	0.47	0.51	0.48	0.54
45–54 years	Mean	4.05	4.03	4.28	4.08
	N	2443	2443	2443	2443
	Std. Deviation	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.55
55–59 years	Mean	4.10	4.12	4.34	4.14
	N	831	831	831	831
	Std. Deviation	0.51	0.52	0.53	0.57
60+ years	Mean	4.41	4.32	4.61	4.49
	N	37	37	37	37
	Std. Deviation	0.50	0.51	0.42	0.49
<i>F</i>		11.967	31.860	19.479	9.346
Sig.		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Notes: *p* is sig. at the 0.01 level.**Table 5:** Results of Independent Sample *T*-Test (Testing the Effect of Gender)

	Gender	<i>N</i>	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Knowledge	Male	4723	4.04	0.52	0.01
	Female	6498	4.02	0.46	0.01
Discipline	Male	4723	3.96	0.54	0.01
	Female	6498	3.97	0.50	0.01
Trustworthiness/ Responsibility	Male	4723	4.22	0.53**	0.01
	Female	6498	4.26	0.48**	0.01
Diligence	Male	4723	4.07	0.58	0.01
	Female	6498	4.06	0.53	0.01

Notes: ** sig. at the 0.01 level.

Table 6: Analysis of Variance (One Way ANOVA) Between Tenure and Values

How Long Have You Been Working With UITM?		Knowledge	Discipline	Trustworthiness/ Responsibility	Diligence
Less than 3 years	Mean	4.0534	3.9853	4.2772	4.1127
	N	1102	1102	1102	1102
	Std. Deviation	0.48274	0.52405	0.50883	0.55189
3–5 years	Mean	4.0215	3.9361	4.2294	4.0563
	N	710	710	710	710
	Std. Deviation	0.47483	0.52773	0.51227	0.55189
5–10 years	Mean	4.0047	3.9084	4.1964	4.0261
	N	2112	2112	2112	2112
	Std. Deviation	0.48672	0.53167	0.49571	0.57332
10–15 years	Mean	4.0058	3.9393	4.2159	4.0420
	N	3761	3761	3761	3761
	Std. Deviation	0.47836	0.50526	0.49081	0.54368
15–20 years	Mean	4.0596	4.0130	4.2717	4.0927
	N	1756	1756	1756	1756
	Std. Deviation	0.49594	0.50494	0.50078	0.55054
20–25 years	Mean	4.0747	4.0258	4.2947	4.0823
	N	776	776	776	776
	Std. Deviation	0.48143	0.50490	0.49517	0.55230
25–30 years	Mean	4.0350	4.0620	4.3038	4.0828
	N	523	523	523	523
	Std. Deviation	0.50730	0.52550	0.54180	0.56887
More than 30 years	Mean	4.0986	4.1006	4.3156	4.1544
	N	481	481	481	481
	Std. Deviation	0.48335	0.48907	0.48018	0.53618
<i>F</i>		5.825	16.705	9.616	6.215
Sig.		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Notes: *p* is sig. at the 0.01 level.

decisions that will affect his life in the future. The individual also has emotional stability where he will engage in assertive action rather than aggressive behavior (Collie, 2022). Another factor that will affect individuals' levels of values is the acculturation process, whereby the longer the staff stays with the organization, the higher the values these individuals have (Bhatt, 2020).

5. Conclusion

Values set by the leaders are important for every organization to bind the employees together to ethically achieve the performance target (Tran, 2021). With values, employees

will unleash their potential to achieve higher performance levels. They are willing to learn new knowledge and apply it to their job. With values, employees will work together with their colleagues to achieve the stated organizational goals (Utami et al., 2021). This is known as synergy, whereby the combined efforts by the employees are greater than the summed individual efforts. Values also ensure that employees will execute their functions within the allowed jurisdiction. They know what can be done and what should be avoided while executing their tasks. The present study has proven that using adjectives and phrases to measure values is valid and reliable. The results of factor analysis indicate the existence of four factors or main values among UiTM staff from the use of the ESI iDART measuring

instrument. The further analysis supports the validity of this instrument since female employees scored higher than male employees in all values, although some differences are not significant. Furthermore, individual scores on value increase with age. Older employees have higher values as compared to younger employees. Future studies can use this ESI iDART to further validate the instrument using different samples.

References

- Adıgüzel, Z. (2019). Relationships among leader effectiveness, learning orientation, effective communication, team creativity, and service innovation in the service sector. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 10(1), 131–148. <http://www.doi.org/10.20409/berj.2019.159>
- Bhatt, P. (2020). Perceived organizational culture across generation, tenure, and gender: An exploratory study. *Organization Development Journal*, 38(1), 9–20.
- Chan, L. L., & Idris, N. (2017). Validity and reliability of the instrument using exploratory factor analysis and Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(10), 400–410.
- Collie, R. J. (2022). Perceived social-emotional competence: A multidimensional examination and links with social-emotional motivation and behaviors. *Learning and Instruction*, 82, 101656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2022.101656>
- Cousins, J. B. (2021). *Intellectual roots of the organization*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Cumming, S. P., Searle, C., Hemsley, J. K., Haswell, F., Edwards, H., Scott, S., Gross, A., Ryan, D., Lewis, J., White, P., Cain, A., Mitchell, S. B., & Malina, R. M. (2018). Biological maturation, relative age, and self-regulation in male professional academy soccer players: A test of the underdog hypothesis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 39, 147–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.08.007>
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2020). From expectancy-value theory to situated expectancy-value theory: A developmental, social cognitive, and sociocultural perspective on motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101859. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101859>
- Jayabalan, J., Dorasamy, M., & Raman, M. (2021). Reshaping higher educational institutions through frugal open innovation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 7(2), 145. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7020145>
- Kalogiannidis, S. (2021). Impact of employee motivation on organizational performance. A scoping review paper for the public sector. *Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 8(3), 984–996.
- Mergel, I., Ganapati, S., & Whitford, A. B. (2021). Agile: A new way of governing. *Public Administration Review*, 81(1), 161–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13202>
- Mertova, P., & Webster, L. (2019). *Using narrative inquiry as a research method: An introduction to critical event narrative analysis in research, teaching and professional practice*. London: Routledge.
- Nicolaescu, S. S., Florea, A., Kifor, C. V., Fiore, U., Cocan, N., Receu, I., & Zanetti, P. (2020). Human capital evaluation in knowledge-based organizations based on big data analytics. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 111, 654–667. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2019.09.048>
- Paais, M., & Pattiruhu, J. R. (2020). Effect of motivation, leadership, and organizational culture on satisfaction and employee performance. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics, and Business*, 7(8), 577–588. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no8.577>
- Regier, H. A. (2020). *The notion of natural and cultural integrity*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. London: Free Press.
- Shahriar, A. Z. M., Unda, L. A., & Alam, Q. (2020). Gender differences in the repayment of microcredit: The mediating role of trustworthiness. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 110, 105685. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2019.105685>
- Shaturaev, J. (2022). Bad management hypotheses are demolishing management practices. *Scientific Research Archive*, 2(1), 65–81.
- Schein, E. H. (1987). Defining organizational culture. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott (Eds.), *Classics of organizational theory* (2nd ed., pp. 381–396). Belmont: Dorsey Press.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.109>
- Sikpi, E., & Enoch, G. S. (2022). Leadership core values and goals attainment of Public Universities in Bayelsa State. *Policy and Management. International Journal of Institutional Leadership*, 4(1), 72–91.
- Tran, T. K. P. (2021). The effect of knowledge sharing and innovativeness on organizational performance: An empirical study in Vietnam. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics, and Business*, 8(8), 503–511. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no8.0503>
- Universiti Teknologi MARA. (2020). *UiTM strategic plan 2025: Highlighting the potential to shape the future*. Selangor, Malaysia: Universiti Teknologi MARA.
- Utami, N. M. S., Sapta, I., Verawati, Y., & Astakoni, I. (2021). Relationship between workplace spirituality, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics, and Business*, 8(1), 507–517. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no1.507>
- Van Rooij, B., & Fine, A. (2018). Toxic corporate culture: Assessing organizational processes of deviance. *Administrative Sciences*, 8(3), 23–61. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci8030023>