

Table 4. 1. for TANGIBLES

Value	N	%	Cum. %
1	1	0.36	0.36
2	2	0.72	1.08
3	18	6.47	7.55
4	31	11.15	18.71
5	28	10.07	28.78
6	79	28.42	57.19
7	119	42.81	100.00
TOTAL	278	100.00	

Frequency table 4.2. for RELIABILITY

Value	N	%	Cum. %
1	2	0.72	0.72
2	8	2.88	3.60
3	33	11.87	15.47
4	31	11.15	26.62
5	55	19.78	46.40
6	81	29.14	75.54
7	68	24.46	100.00
TOTAL	278	100.00	

Cross tabulation of TANGIBLES by RELIABILITY

Total	TANGIBLES							
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	
RELIABILITY								
1.00	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
2.00	0	0	3	2	1	1	1	8
3.00	0	1	4	7	3	12	6	33
4.00	0	0	3	7	3	13	5	31
5.00	0	0	3	11	9	18	14	55
6.00	0	1	3	3	7	19	48	81
7.00	0	0	2	1	5	15	45	68
Total	1	2	18	31	28	79	119	278

Here the possible values for TANGIBLES are listed across the top of the table, while the possible values for RELIABILITY are listed along the left side of the table. The numbers inside the table are the frequencies, i.e. the number of cases that have a particular value for TANGIBLES and RELIABILITY.

For example, in the table above, 1 case obtained a value of 1.00 On TANGIBLES and a value of 1.0 on RELIABILITY.

Frequency table 4.3. For RESPONSIVENESS

Value	N	%	Cum. %
2	2	0.72	0.72
3	12	4.32	5.04
4	33	11.87	16.91
5	31	11.15	28.06
6	73	26.26	54.32
7	127	45.68	100.00
TOTAL	278	100.00	

Cross tabulation of RELIABILITY by RESPONSIVENESS

	RELIABILITY							
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	
Total								
RESPONSIVENESS								
2.00	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
3.00	0	3	3	3	1	0	2	12
4.00	0	2	7	4	14	2	4	33
5.00	0	1	5	8	5	8	4	31
6.00	0	1	6	6	17	28	15	73
7.00	1	1	11	10	18	43	43	127
Total	2	8	33	31	55	81	68	278

Here the possible values for RELIABILITY are listed across the top of the table, while the possible values for RESPONSIVENESS are listed along the left side of the table. The numbers inside the table are the frequencies, i.e. the number of cases that have a particular value for RELIABILITY and RESPONSIVENESS.

For example, in the table above, 1 case obtained a value of 1.00 On RELIABILITY and a value of 2.0 on RESPONSIVENESS.

Frequency table 4.4. for ASSURANCE

Value	N	%	Cum. %
2	2	0.72	0.72
3	12	4.32	5.04
4	33	11.87	16.91
5	47	16.91	33.81
6	79	28.42	62.23
7	105	37.77	100.00
TOTAL	278	100.00	

Cross tabulation of RESPONSIVENESS by ASSURANCE

	RESPONSIVENESS						Total
	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	
ASSURANCE							
2.00	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
3.00	1	1	5	2	2	1	12
4.00	1	2	10	5	7	8	33
5.00	0	5	8	8	14	12	47
6.00	0	2	8	6	30	33	79
7.00	0	1	2	9	20	73	105
Total	2	12	33	31	73	127	278

Here the possible values for RESPONSIVENESS are listed across the top of the table, while the possible values for ASSURANCE are listed along the left side of the table. The numbers inside the table are the frequencies, i.e. the number of cases that have a particular value for RESPONSIVENESS and ASSURANCE.

For example, in the table above, 0 cases obtained a value of 2.00 on RESPONSIVENESS and a value of 2.0 on ASSURANCE.

Frequency table 4.5. for EMPATHY

Value	N	%	Cum. %
1	1	0.36	0.36
2	5	1.80	2.16
3	19	6.83	8.99
4	29	10.43	19.42
5	68	24.46	43.88
6	76	27.34	71.22
7	80	28.78	100.00
TOTAL	278	100.00	

Cross tabulation of ASSURANCE by EMPATHY

	ASSURANCE						Total
	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	
EMPATHY							
1.00	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
2.00	1	2	1	1	0	0	5
3.00	1	2	3	6	4	3	19
4.00	0	5	9	8	4	3	29
5.00	0	2	10	13	21	22	68
6.00	0	1	4	11	30	30	76
7.00	0	0	5	8	20	47	80
Total	2	12	33	47	79	105	278

Here the possible values for ASSURANCE are listed across the top of the table, while the possible values for EMPATHY are listed along the left side of the table. The numbers inside the table are the frequencies, i.e. the number of cases that have a particular value for ASSURANCE and EMPATHY.

For example, in the table above, 0 cases obtained a value of 2.00 on ASSURANCE and a value of 1.0 on EMPATHY.

Frequency table 4.6.for AVERAGE

Value	N	%	Cum. %
2	1	0.37	0.37
3	7	2.59	2.96
4	26	9.63	12.59
5	62	22.96	35.56
6	113	41.85	77.41
7	61	22.59	100.00
TOTAL	270	100.00	

Frequency table 4.7. Customers' perception of TANGIBLES

Value	N	%	Cum. %
1	4	1.44	1.44
2	6	2.16	3.60
3	37	13.31	16.91
4	71	25.54	42.45
5	56	20.14	62.59
6	62	22.30	84.89
7	42	15.11	100.00
TOTAL	278	100.00	

Frequency table 4.8.for RELIABILITY

Value	N	%	Cum. %
1	10	3.60	3.60
2	13	4.68	8.27
3	38	13.67	21.94
4	39	14.03	35.97
5	78	28.06	64.03
6	72	25.90	89.93
7	28	10.07	100.00
TOTAL	278	100.00	

Chi-square test

Chi-square = 219.23
p = 0.0000
df = 36

The chi-square test shows if there is a relationship between two Categorical variables.

Here the probability value (p) is smaller than 0.01, which means that there is a 99% or better probability that there is a statistically significant relationship.

THEREFORE: "TANGIBLES and RELIABILITY are statistically significantly related at the 1% level (chi-square=219.23; df=36; p=0.000)."

Pearson product moment correlation for TANGIBLES and RELIABILITY

$r(x, y) = 0.43$

n = 278

p = 0.000

A Pearson product-moment correlation shows the strength of the relationship between two continuous variables. It is suitable for use if it can be assumed that the variables are approximately normally distributed.

In this case the value of r is 0.43 which can be considered a moderately strong correlation. The p value is 0.000 which means that the correlation is statistically significant.

"TANGIBLES and RELIABILITY are statistically significantly correlated at the 1% level (r=0.43; p=0.000)."

Chi-square test

Chi-square = 147.15

p = 0.0000

df = 30

Here the probability value (p) is smaller than 0.01, which means that there is a 99% or better probability that there is a statistically significant relationship. **AND THEREFORE:** "RELIABILITY and RESPONSIVENESS are statistically significantly related at the 1% level (chi-square=147.15; df=30; p=0.000).

Pearson product moment correlation for RELIABILITY and RESPONSIVENESS

$r(x, y) = 0.38$

n = 278

p = 0.000

In this case the value of r is 0.38 which can be considered a moderately strong correlation.

The p value is 0.000 which means that the correlation is statistically significant. "RELIABILITY and RESPONSIVENESS are statistically significantly correlated at the 1% level (r=0.38; p=0.000)."

Chi-square test

Chi-square = 100.11

p = 0.0000

df = 25

Here the probability value (p) is smaller than 0.01, which means that there is a 99% or better probability that there is a statistically significant relationship.

AND THEREFORE: "RESPONSIVENESS and ASSURANCE are statistically significantly related at the 1% level (chi-square=100.11; df=25; p=0.000)."

Pearson product moment correlation for RESPONSIVENESS and ASSURANCE

$r(x, y) = 0.49$

n = 278

p = 0.000

In this case the value of r is 0.49 which can be considered a moderately strong correlation. The p value is 0.000 which means that the correlation is statistically significant.

"RESPONSIVENESS and ASSURANCE are statistically significantly correlated at the 1% level (r=0.49; p=0.000)."

CHI-SQUARE TEST

Chi-square = 123.26
p = 0.0000
df = 30

Here the probability value (p) is smaller than 0.01, which means that there is a 99% or better probability that there is a statistically significant relationship.

AND THEREFORE:

"ASSURANCE and EMPATHY are statistically significantly related at the 1% level (chi-square=123.26; df=30; p=0.000)."

Pearson product moment correlation for ASSURANCE and EMPATHY

$r(x, y) = 0.49$
n = 278
p = 0.000

In this case the value of r is 0.49 which can be considered a moderately strong correlation. The p value is 0.000 which means that the correlation is statistically significant.

AND THEREFORE: "ASSURANCE and EMPATHY are statistically significantly correlated at the 1% level (r=0.49; p=0.000)."

Cross tabulation of TANGIBLES by RELIABILITY

Total	TANGIBLES							
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	
RELIABILITY								
1.00	2	1	2	2	2	1	0	10
2.00	0	0	7	3	1	2	0	13
3.00	2	3	10	10	7	4	2	38
4.00	0	0	9	14	7	6	3	39
5.00	0	1	5	24	17	21	10	78
6.00	0	1	4	11	20	23	13	72
7.00	0	0	0	7	2	5	14	28
Total	4	6	37	71	56	62	42	278

Here the possible values for TANGIBLES are listed across the top of the table, while the possible values for RELIABILITY are listed along the left side of the table. The numbers inside the table are the frequencies, i.e. the number of cases that have a particular value for TANGIBLES and RELIABILITY.

For example, in the table above, 2 cases obtained a value of 1.00 on TANGIBLES and a value of 1.0 on RELIABILITY.

Chi-square = 125.77

p = 0.0000

df = 36

Here the probability value (p) is smaller than 0.01, which means that there is a 99% or better probability that there is a statistically significant relationship.

THERE FORE:"TANGIBLES and RELIABILITY are statistically significantly related at the 1% level (chi-square=125.77; df=36; p=0.000)."

Pearson product moment correlation for TANGIBLES and RELIABILITY

$r(x, y) = 0.45$

$n = 278$

$p = 0.000$

In this case the value of r is 0.45 which can be considered a moderately strong correlation.

The p value is 0.000 which means that the correlation is statistically significant. **THEREFORE:** "TANGIBLES and RELIABILITY are statistically significantly correlated at the 1% level ($r=0.45$; $p=0.000$)."

Frequency table 4.9 for RESPONSIVENESS

Value	N	%	Cum. %
1	2	0.72	0.72
2	3	1.08	1.80
3	33	11.87	13.67
4	50	17.99	31.65
5	59	21.22	52.88
6	75	26.98	79.86
7	56	20.14	100.00
TOTAL	278	100.00	

Cross tabulation of RELIABILITY by RESPONSIVENESS

	RELIABILITY							
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	
Total								
RESPONSIVENESS								
1.00	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
2.00	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
3.00	5	6	7	7	6	2	0	33
4.00	4	2	7	8	11	8	10	50
5.00	0	1	9	9	21	16	3	59
6.00	1	2	10	9	25	22	6	75
7.00	0	0	3	5	15	24	9	56
Total	10	13	38	39	78	72	28	278

Here the possible values for RELIABILITY are listed across the top of the table, while the possible values for RESPONSIVENESS are listed along the left side of the table. The numbers inside the table are the frequencies, i.e. the number of cases that have a particular value for RELIABILITY and RESPONSIVENESS.

For example, in the table above, 0 cases obtained a value of 1.00 on RELIABILITY and a value of 1.0 on RESPONSIVENESS.

Chi-square = 106.89
p = 0.0000
df = 36

Here the probability value (p) is smaller than 0.01, which means that there is a 99% or better probability that there is a statistically significant relationship.

THERE FORE: "RELIABILITY and RESPONSIVENESS are statistically significantly related at the 1% level (chi-square=106.89; df=36; p=0.000)."

Pearson product moment correlation for RELIABILITY and RESPONSIVENESS

$r(x, y) = 0.41$

n = 278

p = 0.000

In this case the value of r is 0.41 which can be considered a moderately strong correlation. The p value is 0.000 which means that the correlation is statistically significant.

AND THERE FORE: "RELIABILITY and RESPONSIVENESS are statistically significantly correlated at the 1% level (r=0.41; p=0.000)."

Frequency table 4.10. for ASSURANCE

Value	N	%	Cum. %
1	3	1.08	1.08
2	5	1.80	2.88
3	22	7.91	10.79
4	51	18.35	29.14
5	52	18.71	47.84
6	84	30.22	78.06
7	61	21.94	100.00
TOTAL	278	100.00	

Cross tabulation of RESPONSIVENESS by ASSURANCE

Total	RESPONSIVENESS							
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	
ASSURANCE								
1.00	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
2.00	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	5
3.00	0	2	9	4	4	3	0	22
4.00	1	1	10	15	8	14	2	51
5.00	0	0	3	14	19	11	5	52
6.00	0	0	4	9	17	33	21	84
7.00	0	0	1	8	10	14	28	61
Total	2	3	33	50	59	75	56	278

Here the possible values for RESPONSIVENESS are listed across the top of the table, while the possible values for ASSURANCE are listed along the left side of the table.

The numbers inside the table are the frequencies, i.e. the number of cases that have a particular value for RESPONSIVENESS and ASSURANCE.

For example, in the table above, 0 cases obtained a value of 1.00 on RESPONSIVENESS and a value of 1.0 on ASSURANCE.

Chi-square = 167.01

p = 0.0000

df = 36

Here the probability value (p) is smaller than 0.01, which means that there is a 99% or better probability that there is a statistically significant relationship.

THERE FORE:

"RESPONSIVENESS and ASSURANCE are statistically significantly related at the 1% level (chi-square=167.01; df=36; p=0.000)."

Pearson product moment correlation for RESPONSIVENESS and ASSURANCE

$r(x, y) = 0.53$

n = 278

p = 0.000

In this case the value of r is 0.53 which can be considered a strong correlation.

The p value is 0.000 which means that the correlation is

statistically significant. **THERE FORE:** "RESPONSIVENESS and ASSURANCE are statistically significantly correlated at the 1% level ($r=0.53$; $p=0.000$)."

Frequency table 4.11. for EMPATHY

Value	N	%	Cum. %
1	7	2.52	2.52
2	8	2.88	5.40
3	25	8.99	14.39
4	44	15.83	30.22
5	62	22.30	52.52
6	80	28.78	81.29
7	52	18.71	100.00
TOTAL	278	100.00	

Cross tabulation of EMPATHY by ASSURANCE

	EMPATHY							
	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	
Total								
ASSURANCE								
1.00	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
2.00	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	5
3.00	1	2	5	8	4	2	0	22
4.00	1	4	7	15	12	8	4	51
5.00	0	0	5	10	21	12	4	52
6.00	0	0	8	6	19	39	12	84
7.00	1	1	0	2	6	19	32	61
Total	7	8	25	44	62	80	52	278

Here the possible values for EMPATHY are listed across the top of the table, while the possible values for ASSURANCE are listed along the left side of the table. The numbers inside the table are the frequencies, i.e. the number of cases that have a particular value for EMPATHY and ASSURANCE.

For example, in the table above, 2 cases obtained a value of 1.00 on EMPATHY and a value of 1.0 on ASSURANCE.

Chi-square = 216.72

p = 0.0000

df = 36

Here the probability value (p) is smaller than 0.01, which means that there is a 99% or better probability that there is a statistically significant relationship.

THERE FORE: "EMPATHY and ASSURANCE are statistically significantly related at the 1% level (chi-square=216.72; df=36; p=0.000)."

Pearson product moment correlation for EMPATHY and ASSURANCE

$r(x, y) = 0.58$

n = 278

p = 0.000

In this case the value of r is 0.58 which can be considered a strong correlation.

The p value is 0.000 which means that the correlation is statistically significant. **THERE FORE:** "EMPATHY and ASSURANCE are statistically significantly correlated at the 1% level (r=0.58; p=0.000)."

Frequency table 4.12. for AVERAGE

Value	N	%	Cum. %
1	2	0.74	0.74

2	2	0.74	1.48
3	26	9.63	11.11
4	44	16.30	27.41
5	92	34.07	61.48
6	88	32.59	94.07
7	16	5.93	100.00

TOTAL	270	100.00	

Pearson product moment correlation for TEAMWORK and HORIZONTAL COMMUNICATION

$$r(x, y) = 0.47$$

$$n = 46$$

$$p = 0.001$$

In this case the value of r is 0.47 which can be considered a moderately strong correlation. The p value is 0.001 which means that the correlation is statistically significant.

THERE FORE: "TEAMWORK and COMMUNICATION are statistically significantly correlated at the 1% level ($r=0.47$; $p=0.001$)

Frequency table 4.14 for EMPLOYEE-JOB FIT

Value	N	%	Cum. %
2	2	4.35	4.35
4	5	10.87	15.22
5	18	39.13	54.35
6	9	19.57	73.91
7	12	26.09	100.00

TOTAL	46	100.00	

Frequency table 4.15. For TECHNOLOGY-JOB FIT

Value	N	%	cum. %
2	8	17.39	17.39
3	4	8.70	26.09
4	12	26.09	52.17
5	10	21.74	73.91

6	10	21.74	95.65
7	2	4.35	100.00

TOTAL	46	100.00	

Pearson product moment correlation for EMPLOYEE-JOB FIT and TECHNOLOGY-JOB-FIT

$r(x, y) = 0.37$

$n = 46$

$p = 0.012$

In this case the value of r is 0.37 which can be considered a moderately strong correlation. The p value is 0.012 which means that the correlation is statistically significant.

AND THERE FORE: "EMPLOYEE-JOB FIT and TECHNOLOGY-JOB FIT are statistically significantly correlated at the 5% level ($r=0.37$; $p=0.012$)."

Frequency table 4.16. For PERCEIVED CONTROL

Value	N	%	Cum. %
2	2	4.35	4.35
3	7	15.22	19.57
4	22	47.83	67.39
5	1	2.17	69.57
6	13	28.26	97.83
7	1	2.17	100.00

TOTAL	46	100.00	

Frequency table 4.17. For SUPERVISORY CONTROL SYSTEMS

Value	N	%	Cum. %
2	2	4.35	4.35
3	5	10.87	15.22
4	15	32.61	47.83
5	9	19.57	67.39
6	15	32.61	100.00

TOTAL	46	100.00	

Pearson product moment correlation for PERCEIVED CONTROL and SUPERVISORY CONTROL SYSTEMS

$r(x, y) = 0.13$

$n = 46$

$p = 0.385$

In this case the value of r is 0.13 which can be considered a relatively weak correlation. The p value is 0.385 which means that the correlation is not statistically significant. THERE FORE: "PERCCONTRO and SUPCONTROS are not statistically significantly correlated ($r=0.13$; $p=0.385$)."

Frequency table 4.18. For ROLE CONFLICT

Value	N	%	Cum. %
2	4	8.70	8.70
3	3	6.52	15.22
4	8	17.39	32.61
5	17	36.96	69.57
6	13	28.26	97.83
7	1	2.17	100.00
TOTAL	46	100.00	

Frequency table 4.19. For ROLE ABIGUITY

Value	N	%	Cum. %
2	2	4.35	4.35
3	10	21.74	26.09
4	31	67.39	93.48
5	3	6.52	100.00
TOTAL	46	100.00	

Pearson product moment correlation for ROLE CONFLICT and ROLE ABIGUITY

$$r(x,y) = 0.48$$

$$n = 46$$

$$p = 0.001$$

In this case the value of r is 0.48 which can be considered a moderately strong correlation. The p value is 0.001 which means that the correlation is statistically significant.

THEREFORE: "ROLE CONFLICT and ROLE AMBIGUITY are statistically significantly correlated at the 1% level ($r=0.48$; $p=0.001$)."

Frequency table 4.20. For HORIZONTAL COMMUNICATION

Value	N	%	Cum. %
2	3	6.52	6.52
3	15	32.61	39.13
4	15	32.61	71.74
5	11	23.91	95.65
6	1	2.17	97.83
7	1	2.17	100.00
TOTAL	46	100.00	

Frequency table 4.21. For PROPENSITY TO OVERPROMISE

Value	N	%	Cum. %
1	4	8.70	8.70
2	3	6.52	15.22
3	15	32.61	47.83
4	12	26.09	73.91
5	5	10.87	84.78
6	2	4.35	89.13
7	5	10.87	100.00
TOTAL	46	100.00	

Frequency table 4.13 for TEAMWORK

Value	N	%	Cum. %
2	5	10.87	10.87
3	4	8.70	19.57
4	18	39.13	58.70
5	5	10.87	69.57
6	10	21.74	91.30
7	4	8.70	100.00
TOTAL	46	100.00	