

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is organised into seven sections. First, an overview of the data obtained. Second, the respondent and the respondent's supervisor profile. Third, the result of normality test. Fourth, the result of exploratory factor analysis. Fifth, the result of descriptive and reliability analysis. Sixth, the result of hypotheses testing. Seven, the findings summary.

4.2 Data Screen

The surveys were delivered through online to 62 employees of Majlis Agama Islam Kedah (MAIK) between October until November 2023. However, only 52 employees have participated to answer the questionnaire. They are from 9 units at MAIK known as management services, baitumal, waqf, finance and investment, real estate development, strategic research and development, Islamic guidance centre, legal and secretarial and internal audit unit.

In screening the data, all surveys showed complete responses or no missing values. The following section will provide a detailed explanation about the demographic of respondents.

4.3 Demographic Data

4.3.1 Demographic Data of Respondents

The questionnaire had retrieved some demographic information from the respondents, such as gender, age, marital status, academic qualification, and salary. Table 4.1 shows the distribution of respondents based on gender. The total number of respondents are 52, whereby 63.5 percent (N=33) of them were male, and 36.5 percent (N=19) were female.

Table 4.1 also shows the distribution of respondents based on age. 25 percent (N= 13) of the respondent were age between 20 – 30 years old. 34.6 percent (N=18) of the respondents were age between 31 – 40 years old. 30.8 percent (N=16) of the respondents were age between 41 – 50 years old. Nevertheless, only 9.6 (N=5) of the respondents were age between 51 years old and above.

In addition, table 4.1 summarizes the distribution of respondents based on marital status. 21.2 percent (N=11) of the respondents were single however 78.8 percent of the respondents were married.

Furthermore, table 4.1 summarizes the distribution of respondents based on academic qualification status. 30.8 percent (N= 16) of the respondents hold SPM certificate. 28.8 percent (N=15) of the respondents hold a Diploma. 38.5 percent (N=20) of the respondents hold a bachelor's degree and only 1.9 percent (N=1) of the respondent hold a Master Degree or PHD.

Finally, table 4.1 explains the respondent's salary distribution. 65.4 percent (N=34) of the respondents gain salary between RM1000 – RM 3000. 30.8 percent (N=16) of the respondents gain salary between RM 3001 – RM 6000. For the respondents that gain salary

RM 6001 – RM 9000 and RM 9001 above shared the same percent which are 1.9 percent (N=1).

Table 4.1: Respondent Demographic

Characteristic	Frequency (N)	Percentage (100%)
Gender		
Male	33	63.5
Female	19	36.5
Age		
20 – 30 years	13	25.0
31 – 40 years	18	34.6
41 – 50 years	16	30.8
51 years and above	5	9.6
Marital Status		
Single	11	21.2
Married	41	78.8
Academic Qualification		
SPM	16	30.8
Diploma	15	28.8
Bachelor Degree	20	38.5
Master's Degree/PHD	1	1.9

Salary		
RM1000 – RM 3000	34	65.4
RM 3001 – RM 6000	16	30.8
RM 6001 – RM 9000	1	1.9
RM 9001 and above	1	1.9

4.3.2 Demographic Data for Respondent's Supervisor

Table 4.2 shows the demographic data of respondent's supervisor based on gender. 82.7 percent (N=43) of the respondent's supervisor were male. While 17.3 percent (N=9) of the respondent's supervisor were female.

Table 4.2: Respondent's Supervisor Demographic

Characteristic	Frequency (N)	Percentage (100%)
Gender		
Male	43	82.7
Female	9	17.3

4.4 Analysis of the assumptions

4.4.1 Normality test

To satisfy the assumption of normality of the data, the test of normality namely kurtosis and skewness were performed. Skewness and kurtosis are used to know whether the result is normally distributed or not. Skewness is a measure of symmetry, or more precisely, the lack of symmetry of the normal distribution. Kurtosis is a measure of the peakedness of a distribution (Mishra & Colleagues, 2019).

The rule of thumb for the normality test as suggested by Kline (1998) is characterized as having a skewness of less than 3 and a kurtosis less than 10. The focus here is on kurtosis value because it could rigorously impact on the variance and covariance's test (Bryne, 2010). Table 4.3 shows the test of normality test of the data collected. It shows that the skewness and kurtosis values are within the acceptable level of normality assumptions.

Table 4.3: Normality Assessment

	N	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
JUSTICE1	52	-.486	.330	-.271	.650
JUSTICE2	52	-.607	.330	-.348	.650
JUSTICE3	52	-.797	.330	-.075	.650
JUSTICE4	52	-.983	.330	1.287	.650
JUSTICE5	52	-.340	.330	-.599	.650
JUSTICE6	52	-.786	.330	.586	.650
RELIGIOSITY1	52	-1.360	.330	.977	.650
RELIGIOSITY2	52	-.647	.330	-.506	.650
RELIGIOSITY3	52	-1.937	.330	5.401	.650
RELIGIOSITY4	52	-.932	.330	-.356	.650
RELIGIOSITY5	52	-.746	.330	.645	.650

KINDNESS1	52	-.463	.330	-1.126	.650
KINDNESS2	52	-.486	.330	-1.024	.650
KINDNESS3	52	-.492	.330	-.047	.650
KINDNESS4	52	-.437	.330	-.652	.650
WISDOM1	52	-.580	.330	.590	.650
WISDOM2	52	-.662	.330	.079	.650
WISDOM3	52	-.453	.330	-.921	.650
WISDOM4	52	-1.240	.330	3.258	.650
SERVANT1	52	-.068	.330	-.278	.650
SERVANT2	52	.118	.330	-.898	.650
SERVANT3	52	-.044	.330	.780	.650
SERVANT4	52	.499	.330	-.181	.650
SERVANT5	52	-.064	.330	-.725	.650
SERVANT6	52	-.157	.330	-.644	.650
SERVANT7	52	-.167	.330	.067	.650
SERVANT8	52	-.298	.330	.170	.650
SERVANT9	52	.129	.330	-.797	.650
SERVANT10	52	-.312	.330	.372	.650
SERVANT11	52	-.627	.330	1.279	.650
SERVANT12	52	.067	.330	-.840	.650
SERVANT13	52	.106	.330	-.825	.650
SERVANT14	52	-.093	.330	-.411	.650
SERVANT15	52	-.626	.330	1.008	.650
SERVANT16	52	-.112	.330	.857	.650
SERVANT17	52	-.713	.330	.817	.650
SERVANT18	52	-.051	.330	-.172	.650
SERVANT19	52	-.808	.330	1.199	.650
SERVANT20	52	-.927	.330	1.326	.650
SERVANT21	52	-1.002	.330	1.137	.650
SERVANT22	52	-.186	.330	-.490	.650
SERVANT23	52	-1.101	.330	1.295	.650
PARTICIPATIVE1	52	-.043	.330	.382	.650
PARTICIPATIVE2	52	-.423	.330	-.047	.650
PARTICIPATIVE3	52	-.253	.330	-.148	.650
PARTICIPATIVE4	52	-.630	.330	-.149	.650
PARTICIPATIVE5	52	-.360	.330	-.186	.650
Valid N (listwise)	52				

4.5 Exploratory Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was used to reduce the total number of items to a smaller number of underlying factors. In this study, the Principal Component Analysis was used to extract factors. Varimax rotation was used to facilitate the interpretation of the factor matrix. The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and the Kaiser Mayer Olkin measures of sampling were used to valid the used of factor analysis. The Cronbach Alpha was used to determine the reliability (internal consistency of the items in the scale) of a scale. The level of reliability was based on the argument by George and Mallory (2003) ($>.9$ = Excellent; $.8$ =Good, $>.7$ = Acceptable; $>.6$ = Questionable; $<.5$ =Unacceptable).

4.5.1 EFA for Islamic Leadership

4.5.1.1 EFA for Justice

Exploratory Factor Analysis was applied to determine the factor structure among 6 items related to Justice in Islamic Leadership. Table 4.4 shows that the Kaiser- Meyer –Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .826 which is above suggested value of .6, and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (15) = 171.916$, $p < 0.001$). These results show that the data of this study is appropriate for factor analysis.

Table 4.4: Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.826
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	171.916
	df	15

	Sig.	.000
--	------	------

The results in table 4.5 show there is one component emerged from EFA procedure based on the computed eigenvalue greater than 1.0. The eigenvalue is 3.822. The total variance explained for measuring justice construct is 63.705%.

Table 4.5: Total Variance Explained for Justice

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.822	63.705	63.705	3.822	63.705	63.705
2	.889	14.814	78.519			
3	.447	7.447	85.966			
4	.388	6.464	92.431			
5	.288	4.800	97.230			
6	.166	2.770	100.000			

Table 4.6 shows the communalities value for 6 items related to justice. Communalities are estimates of the variance in each variable accounted for by all components. Small values (<0.3) indicate variables do not fit well with the factor solution. In the current study, all the items have communalities values above 0.3 (see table 4.6). The loading value for each item also meet the acceptable value, which is >0.50 (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.6: Communalities of 6 items related to Justice

Items	Communalities
JUSTICE1	.735
JUSTICE2	.702
JUSTICE3	.205
JUSTICE4	.706
JUSTICE5	.794
JUSTICE6	.680

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.7: Factor Loading Based Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation for 6 items related to Justice

Items	Loading value
JUSTICE1	.857
JUSTICE2	.838
JUSTICE3	.452
JUSTICE4	.840
JUSTICE5	.891
JUSTICE6	.825

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

4.5.1.2 EFA for Religiosity

Exploratory Factor Analysis was applied to determine the factor structure among 5 items related to Religiosity in Islamic Leadership. Table 4.8 shows that the Kaiser- Meyer – Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .786 which is above suggested value of .6, and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (10) = 87.083$, $p < 0.001$). These results show that the data of this study is appropriate for factor analysis.

Table 4.8: Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.786
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	87.083
	df	10
	Sig.	.000

The results in table 4.9 show there is one component emerged from EFA procedure based on the computed eigenvalue greater than 1.0. The eigenvalue is 2.867. The total variance explained for measuring religiosity construct is 57.343%.

Table 4.9: Total Variance Explained for Religiosity

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.867	57.343	57.343	2.867	57.343	57.343
2	.880	17.600	74.942			
3	.563	11.258	86.200			
4	.391	7.819	94.019			
5	.299	5.981	100.000			

Table 4.10 shows the communalities value for 5 items related to religiosity. Communalities are estimates of the variance in each variable accounted for by all components. Small values (<0.3) indicate variables do not fit well with the factor solution. In the current study, all the items have communalities values above 0.3 (see table 4. 10). The loading value for each item also meet the acceptable value, which is >0.50 (see Table 4.11).

Table 4. 10: Communalities of 5 items related to religiosity

Items	Communalities
REGIOLISITY1	.499
REGIOLISITY2	.366
REGIOLISITY3	.574
REGIOLISITY4	.763
REGIOLISITY5	.665

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.11: Factor loading based principal component analysis with varimax rotation for 5 items related to religiosity.

Items	Loading value
REGIOLISITY1	.706
REGIOLISITY2	.605
REGIOLISITY3	.758
REGIOLISITY4	.874
REGIOLISITY5	.815

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

4.5.1.3 EFA for Kindness

Exploratory Factor Analysis was applied to determine the factor structure among 4 items related to Kindness in Islamic Leadership. Table 4.12 shows that the Kaiser- Meyer – Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .787 which is above suggested value of .6, and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (6) = 124.204$, $p < 0.001$). These results show that the data of this study is appropriate for factor analysis.

Table 4.12: Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.787
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	124.204
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

The results in table 4.13 show there is one component emerged from EFA procedure based on the computed eigenvalue greater than 1.0. The eigenvalue is 2.985. The total variance explained for measuring kindness construct is 74.622%.

Table 4.13: Total Variance Explained for Kindness

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.985	74.622	74.622	2.985	74.622	74.622
2	.514	12.843	87.465			
3	.358	8.960	96.424			
4	.143	3.576	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.14 shows the communalities value for 4 items related to kindness. Communalities are estimates of the variance in each variable accounted for by all components. Small values (<0.3) indicate variables do not fit well with the factor solution. In the current study, all the items have communalities values above 0.3 (see table 4.14). The loading value for each item also meet the acceptable value, which is >0.50 (see Table 4.15).

Table 4.14: Communalities of 4 items related to kindness

Items	Communalities
KINDNESS1	.833
KINDNESS 2	.858
KINDNESS 3	.655
KINDNESS 4	.640

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.15: Factor loading based principal component analysis with varimax rotation for 4 items related to kindness.

Items	Loading value
KINDNESS1	.913
KINDNESS 2	.926
KINDNESS 3	.809
KINDNESS 4	.800

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

4.5.1.4 EFA for Wisdom

Exploratory Factor Analysis was applied to determine the factor structure among 4 items related to Wisdom in Islamic Leadership. Table 4.16 shows that the Kaiser- Meyer – Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .771 which is above suggested value of .6, and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (6) = 109.273, p < 0.001$). These results show that the data of this study is appropriate for factor analysis.

Table 4.16: Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.771
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	109.273
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

The results in table 4.17 show there is one component emerged from EFA procedure based on the computed eigenvalue greater than 1.0. The eigenvalue is 2.854. The total variance explained for measuring wisdom construct is 71.340%.

Table 4.17: Total Variance Explained for Wisdom

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.854	71.340	71.340	2.854	71.340	71.340
2	.591	14.783	86.123			
3	.395	9.874	95.997			
4	.160	4.003	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.18 shows the communalities value for 4 items related to wisdom. Communalities are estimates of the variance in each variable accounted for by all components. Small values (<0.3) indicate variables do not fit well with the factor solution. In the current study, all the items have communalities values above 0.3 (see table 4.18). The loading value for each item also meet the acceptable value, which is >0.50 (see Table 4.19).

Table 4.18: Communalities of 4 items related to wisdom

Items	Communalities
WISDOM1	.828
WISDOM 2	.706
WISDOM 3	.523
WISDOM 4	.797

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.19: Factor loading based principal component analysis with varimax rotation for 4 items related to wisdom.

Items	Loading value
WISDOM1	.910
WISDOM 2	.840
WISDOM 3	.723
WISDOM 4	.893

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

4.5.2 EFA for Servant Leadership

Exploratory Factor Analysis was applied to determine the factor structure among 5 items related to servant leadership. These items are a short item that adopted by Otero-Neira, Varela-Neira and Bande (2016) because the original items in questionnaire consist of 23 items. Table 4.20 shows that the Kaiser- Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .789 which is above suggested value of .6, and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (10) = 118.904$, $p < 0.001$). These results show that the data of this study is appropriate for factor analysis.

Table 4.20: Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.789
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	118.904
	df	10
	Sig.	.000

The results in table 4.21 show there is one component emerged from EFA procedure based on the computed eigenvalue greater than 1.0. The eigenvalue is 3.148. The total variance explained for measuring servant leadership construct is 62.966%.

Table 4.21: Total Variance Explained for Servant Leadership

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.148	62.966	62.966	3.148	62.966	62.966
2	.852	17.038	80.004			
3	.430	8.596	88.600			
4	.366	7.310	95.911			
5	.204	4.089	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.22 shows the communalities value for 5 items related to servant leadership. Communalities are estimates of the variance in each variable accounted for by all components. Small values (<0.3) indicate variables do not fit well with the factor solution. In the current study, all the items have communalities values above 0.3 (see table 4.22). The loading value for each item also meet the acceptable value, which is >0.50 (see Table 4.23).

Table 4.22: Communalities of 5 items related to servant leadership.

Items	Communalities
SERVANT1	.421
SERVANT7	.709
SERVANT2	.620
SERVANT11	.717
SERVANT6	.681

Extraction Method: Principle Component Analysis

Table 4.23: Factor loading based principal component analysis with varimax rotation for 5 items related to servant leadership.

Items	Loading value
SERVANT1	.649
SERVANT7	.842
SERVANT2	.788
SERVANT11	.847
SERVANT6	.825

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

4.5.3 EFA for Participative Leadership

Exploratory Factor Analysis was applied to determine the factor structure among 5 items related to participative leadership. Table 4.24 shows that the Kaiser- Meyer –Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .734 which is above suggested value of .6, and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(10) = 110.736, p < 0.001$). These results show that the data of this study is appropriate for factor analysis.

Table 4.24: Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.734
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	110.736
	df	10
	Sig.	.000

The results in table 4.5 show there is one component emerged from EFA procedure based on the computed eigenvalue greater than 1.0. The eigenvalue is 2.958. The total variance explained for measuring participative leadership construct is 59.159%.

Table 4.25: Total Variance Explained for Participative Leadership

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.958	59.159	59.159	2.958	59.159	59.159
2	.878	17.570	76.729			
3	.605	12.105	88.834			
4	.394	7.872	96.706			
5	.165	3.294	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.26 shows the communalities value for 5 items related to participative leadership. Communalities are estimates of the variance in each variable accounted for by all components. Small values (<0.3) indicate variables do not fit well with the factor solution. In the current study, all the items have communalities values above 0.3 (see table 4.26). The loading value for each item also meet the acceptable value, which is >0.50 (see Table 4.27).

Table 4.26: Communalities of 5 items related to participative leadership

Items	Communalities
PARTICIPATIVE1	.319
PARTICIPATIVE2	.720
PARTICIPATIVE3	.694
PARTICIPATIVE4	.548
PARTICIPATIVE5	.677

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.27: Factor loading based principal component analysis with varimax rotation for 5 items related to participative leadership.

Items	Loading value
PARTICIPATIVE1	.565
PARTICIPATIVE2	.848
PARTICIPATIVE3	.833
PARTICIPATIVE4	.741
PARTICIPATIVE5	.823

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

4.5.4 EFA for Job Performance

Exploratory Factor Analysis was applied to determine the factor structure among 4 items related to job performance. Table 4.28 shows that the Kaiser- Meyer –Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .764 which is above suggested value of .6, and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (6) = 85.095, p < 0.001$). These results show that the data of this study is appropriate for factor analysis.

Table 4.28: Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.764
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	85.095
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

The results in table 4.29 show there is one component emerged from EFA procedure based on the computed eigenvalue greater than 1.0. The eigenvalue is 2.555. The total variance explained for measuring job performance construct is 63.870%.

Table 4.29: Total Variance Explained for Job Performance

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.555	63.870	63.870	2.555	63.870	63.870
2	.889	22.234	86.104			
3	.292	7.292	93.396			
4	.264	6.604	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.30 shows the communalities value for 4 items related to job performance. Communalities are estimates of the variance in each variable accounted for by all components. Small values (<0.3) indicate variables do not fit well with the factor solution. In the current study, all the items have communalities values above 0.3 (see table 4.30). The loading value for each item also meet the acceptable value, which is >0.50 (see Table 4.31).

Table 4.30: Communalities of 4 items related to job performance

Items	Communalities
PERFORMANCE1	.773
PERFORMANCE2	.804
PERFORMANCE3	.803
PERFORMANCE4	.375

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.31: Factor loading based principal component analysis with varimax rotation for 4 items related to job performance

Items	Loading value
PERFORMANCE1	.879
PERFORMANCE2	.897
PERFORMANCE3	.896
PERFORMANCE4	.518

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

4.6 The Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Table 4.32: The summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Variable	Number of Original Item	Deleted	Final Item
Islamic Leadership			
Justice	6	0	6 items
Religiosity	5	0	5 items
Kindness	4	0	4 items
Wisdom	4	0	4 items
Servant Leadership	5	0	5 items
Participative Leadership	5	0	5 items
Job Performance	7	3 items (PERFORMANCE5, PERFORMANCE6 & PERFORMANCE7)	4 items (PERFORMANCE1, PERFORMANCE2, PERFORMANCE3 & PERFORMANCE4)

4.7 Reliability and Correlation Between Variables

Table 4.33: Correlation matrix

	M	SD	IL	SL	PL	JP
IL	4.1949	0.53835	0.869	-	-	-
SL	3.5731	0.70852	0.682**	0.849	-	-
PL	3.7192	0.64627	0.535**	0.723**	0.810	-
JP	4.3702	0.47869	0.058	0.001	0.149	0.771

Note: M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; IL=Islamic Leadership; SL; Servant Leadership; PL=Participative Leadership; JP=Job Performance

Table 4.33 shows the reliability and the correlation between the variables. All correlation is positive and significant. In addition, the reliability for all variables also meets the accepted value (>0.70) (see the number with bold).

4.8 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was applied to test the effect of Islamic leadership, servant leadership and participative leadership styles on job performance. The standardized coefficient

(β) was used to access the contribution of each factor (Islamic leadership, servant leadership and participative leadership) on job performance. Standard beta coefficient (β) means that the values for each of the independent variables have been converted to the same scale so that comparisons can be made between them. Thus, because of the common unit of the measurement, it is possible to define which predictor is most influential. Each standardized beta coefficient (β) value can vary from -1.00 to $+1.00$ and it is calculated for each predictor variable.

4.8.1 Multiple Regression Analysis for Job Performance

Table 4.34 shows the results of multiple regression analysis. According to the results, it was found that Islamic leadership ($\beta = .083$, $p > 0.05$) and participative leadership ($\beta = .304$, $p > 0.05$) show insignificant but positive effect on job performance. Similarly, the servant leadership ($\beta = -.275$, $p > 0.05$) also show insignificant and negative effect on job performance. Overall, all the leadership style (Islamic leadership, participative leadership and servant leadership) do not contribute to the employee's job performance.

Table 4.34: Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

Variable	B	SE	β	t value	p value	Results
Islamic Leadership	.074	.172	.083	.429	.670	Not Supported
Servant Leadership	-.186	.160	-.275	-1.166	.249	Not Supported
Participative Leadership	.225	.151	.304	1.487	.144	Not Supported

a. Dependent Variable: Job Performance

4.9 Summary of Finding

Table 4.35: Summary of Findings

No	Hypotheses	Analysis results
H1	Islamic leadership is positively and significantly related to employee's job performance at Majlis Agama Islam Kedah (MAIK).	Not supported
H2	Servant leadership is positively and significantly related to employee's job performance at Majlis Agama Islam Kedah (MAIK).	Not supported
H3	Participative leadership is positively and significantly related to employee's job performance at Majlis Agama Islam Kedah (MAIK).	Not supported

4.10 Chapter Summary

This chapter has discussed in detail about the results of data analysis. This chapter concludes that the Islamic leadership, servant leadership and participative leadership style show no influence on employees' job performance at Majlis Agama Islam Kedah (MAIK). The next chapter five will provide the conclusions of this study and the recommendation for future study.