4.1 **Presentation and Analysis of Data.**

4.2. **Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.**

The frequency table shows that out of 291 participants, 122 (41.9%) are female and 169 (58.1%) are male. This indicates a higher proportion of males in the sample. The valid percent and percent values are identical, indicating no missing data. The cumulative percent confirms that all cases have been accounted for, with males comprising the final 100%.

**Table 4.2*: Distribution of respondents by Gender.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid | Female | 122 | 41.9 |
| Male | 169 | 58.1 |
| Total | 291 | 100.0 |

4.2.2 **Age Group Distribution*.***

Age distribution of the respondents presented in table 4.3 indicates the sample consists of 291 individuals distributed across several age categories. The most represented group is 36–45 years, with 110 participants (37.8%). The next largest is 26–35 years (combined total of 106 participants or 36.4%) due to duplicate entries with slightly different labels. The 18–25 years group also has duplicate labels, combining for 39 participants (13.4%). Smaller proportions are observed in the 46–60 years group (11.0%) and 46 years and above (1.4%).

**Table 4.3*: Distribution of respondents by Age Group.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid | 18 - 25 year | 6 | 2.1 |
| 18 - 25 years | 33 | 11.3 |
| 26 - 35 year | 14 | 4.8 |
| 26 - 35 years | 92 | 31.6 |
| 36 - 45 years | 110 | 37.8 |
| 46 - 60 years | 32 | 11.0 |
| 46 years and above | 4 | 1.4 |
| Total | 291 | 100.0 |

4.2.3 **Distribution of Job description*.***

The frequency table 4.4 shows that among the 291 respondents, the largest group is Supervisors with 110 individuals (37.8%), followed by Senior Staff with 85 (29.2%), Junior Staff with 54 (18.6%), Managers with 41 (14.1%), and Top-level Managers with 1 respondent (0.3). This distribution indicates that the sample is heavily weighted toward mid-level positions, particularly Supervisors and Senior Staff, with very limited representation from top management.

**Table 4.4*: Distribution of respondents by Job Description.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid | Junior Staff | 54 | 18.6 |
| Manager | 41 | 14.1 |
| Senior Staff | 85 | 29.2 |
| Supervisor | 110 | 37.8 |
| Top-level manager | 1 | .3 |
| Total | 291 | 100.0 |

4.2.4 **Industry Sector Distribution.**

The largest group of respondents work in the Construction Materials sector, comprising 71 individuals (24.4%). This is followed by Chemical (17.2%), Textile (15.8%), Food and Beverage (13.7%), and Polyethylene (11.7%). Corrugated Carton accounts for 10.3%, Plastic for 5.8%, while Banking, Health, and Medicine each have 1 respondent (0.3%). This indicates that the sample is concentrated in a few industrial sectors, particularly Construction Materials, with minimal representation from service-related fields like Banking and Health. There are no missing values, as the total reaches 100%.

**Table 4.4*: Distribution of respondents by Job Description.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid | Banking | 1 | .3 |
| Chemical | 50 | 17.2 |
| Construction Materials | 71 | 24.4 |
| Corrugated Carton | 30 | 10.3 |
| Food and Beverage | 40 | 13.7 |
| Health | 1 | .3 |
| Medicine | 1 | .3 |
| Plastic | 17 | 5.8 |
| Polyethylene | 34 | 11.7 |
| Textile | 46 | 15.8 |
| Total | 291 | 100.0 |

4.3**Respondent’s perception of supervisor leadership style.**

4.3.1**How *do respondents perceive their supervisor’s ability to inspire employees toward a shared vision?***

Table 4.5 reveals that a substantial majority of respondents express positive perceptions of their supervisor’s inspirational leadership. Specifically, 132 respondents (45.4%) strongly agree and 113 (38.8%) agree that their supervisor inspires employees to work toward a shared vision. Neutral responses account for 13.4% (39 respondents), while disagreement is minimal, with 6 respondents (2.1%) disagreeing and only 1 respondent (0.3%) strongly disagreeing. This indicates a predominantly favorable evaluation of supervisory leadership in aligning employees with a common organizational goal among respondents.

**Table 4.5*: Distribution of respondents by Job Description.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 1 | .3 |
| Disagree | 6 | 2.1 |
| Neutral | 39 | 13.4 |
| Agree | 113 | 38.8 |
| Strongly Agree | 132 | 45.4 |
| Total | 291 | 100.0 |

4.3.2**How *do respondents evaluate their supervisor's concern for employees' personal and professional development?***

The data in table 4.6 shows that most respondents perceive their supervisors as supportive of employee development. A combined 240 respondents, representing 82.4% of the sample, either agree (38.1%) or strongly agree (44.3%) that their supervisor shows concern for both personal and professional growth. Neutral responses comprise 14.4% (42 respondents), while disagreement is minimal, with 8 respondents (2.7%) disagreeing and 1 respondent (0.3%) strongly disagreeing. This distribution suggests a strong positive perception of supervisory support in employee development across the sample.

**Table 4.6*: Distribution of respondents by Job Description.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 1 | .3 |
| Disagree | 8 | 2.7 |
| Neutral | 42 | 14.4 |
| Agree | 111 | 38.1 |
| Strongly Agree | 129 | 44.3 |
| Total | 291 | 100.0 |

4.3.3 ***How do respondents assess their supervisor’s ability to motivate employees to exceed performance expectations?***

The frequency distribution indicates that the majority of respondents hold a favorable view of their supervisor's motivational effectiveness. Specifically, 147 respondents (50.5%) strongly agree and 95 (32.6%) agree that their supervisor motivates employees to surpass expected performance levels. Neutral responses account for 14.4% (42 respondents), while negative assessments are minimal, with 6 respondents (2.1%) disagreeing and only 1 respondent (0.3%) strongly disagreeing. These results suggest a dominant perception of strong motivational leadership among supervisors within the sample.

Table 4.7

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 1 | .3 |
| Disagree | 6 | 2.1 |
| Neutral | 42 | 14.4 |
| Agree | 95 | 32.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 147 | 50.5 |
| Total | 291 | 100.0 |

4.3.4 ***How do respondents perceive their supervisor’s ethical leadership and ability to lead by example?***

The frequency distribution in table 4.8 shows that 147 respondents (50.5%) strongly agree and 94 (32.3%) agree that their supervisor leads by example and upholds high ethical standards. Neutral responses account for 14.8% (43 respondents), while only 7 respondents (2.4%) express disagreement. These findings indicate a predominantly positive assessment of supervisors’ ethical conduct and role-modeling behavior, suggesting that ethical leadership is widely recognized and valued among respondents.

Table 4.8

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid | Disagree | 7 | 2.4 |
| Neutral | 43 | 14.8 |
| Agree | 94 | 32.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 147 | 50.5 |
| Total | 291 | 100.0 |

4.3.5 ***How do respondents view their supervisor’s support for creativity and innovation?***

The data in table 4.9 indicates that the majority of respondents perceive their supervisor as supportive of creativity and innovation. Specifically, 142 respondents (48.8%) strongly agree and 102 (35.1%) agree that their supervisor encourages these behaviors. Neutral responses are reported by 43 respondents (14.8%), while only 4 respondents (1.4%) express disagreement. This distribution reflects a strong overall endorsement of supervisors fostering an environment conducive to innovation within the organization.

Table 4.9

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid | Disagree | 4 | 1.4 |
| Neutral | 43 | 14.8 |
| Agree | 102 | 35.1 |
| Strongly Agree | 142 | 48.8 |
| Total | 291 | 100.0 |

4.3.5 ***How do respondents assess their supervisor’s practice of rewarding employees for achieving specific targets?***

The frequency distribution table 4.10 shows that 142 respondents (48.8%) agree and 69 (23.7%) strongly agree that their supervisor rewards employees for meeting defined performance targets. Neutral responses are reported by 58 respondents (19.9%), while a minority express negative views, with 14 respondents (4.8%) disagreeing and 8 (2.7%) strongly disagreeing. These results suggest that while a majority perceive a performance-based reward system as present, a notable proportion remain neutral or skeptical, indicating room for increased clarity or consistency in reward practices.

Table 4.10

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 8 | 2.7 |
| Disagree | 14 | 4.8 |
| Neutral | 58 | 19.9 |
| Agree | 142 | 48.8 |
| Strongly Agree | 69 | 23.7 |
| Total | 291 | 100.0 |

4.4 **Hypothesis Testing.**

4.4.1 ***Is there a significant association between employees' perceptions of their supervisor's ethical leadership and their self-reported productivity?***

As shown in table 4.11, the Pearson Chi-Square value of 43.274 with 15 degrees of freedom and a p-value of .000 indicates a statistically significant association between these two variables. The low p-value (p < .05) means we reject the null hypothesis of independence. Therefore, conclude that there are evidences that employees' views on their supervisor's ethical leadership are significantly related to how productive they perceive themselves to be in their roles.

Table 4.11

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 43.274a | 15 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 31.683 | 15 | .007 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 7.497 | 1 | .006 |
| N of Valid Cases | 291 |  |  |

4.4.2 ***Is there a statistically significant association between employees' perceptions of their supervisor's ethical leadership and their self-reported initiative to improve work processes?***

The Pearson Chi-Square test in table 4.12 yielded a value of 56.549 with 12 degrees of freedom and a p-value of .000. This result indicates a statistically significant association between the perception of the supervisor’s ethical leadership and the likelihood that employees take initiative to improve work processes. The significance level well below the conventional alpha threshold of .05 provides strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis of independence. The Linear-by-Linear Association value of 26.344 (p = .000) further suggests a meaningful ordinal relationship between the two variables.

Table 4.12

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 56.549a | 12 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 40.264 | 12 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 26.344 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 291 |  |  |

4.4.3 ***Is there a significant association between employees' perceptions of their supervisor's ethical leadership and their agreement that employees should consistently meet or exceed performance targets?***

Table 4.13 shows Pearson Chi-Square test yielded a value of 83.985 with 12 degrees of freedom and an asymptotic significance of .000, indicating a statistically significant association between the two variables. The Linear-by-Linear Association value of 22.514 (p = .000) suggests a strong ordinal relationship. The cross tabulation in table 4.14 shows that as agreement with the statement “My supervisor leads by example and sets high ethical standards” increases, so does agreement with the statement that employees should consistently meet or exceed performance targets. For instance, as shown in table 4, among those who “Strongly Agree” that their supervisor shows ethical leadership, 127 out of 147 (86.4%) either “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” that employees should meet or exceed targets. This pattern supports the presence of a positive association between perception ethical leadership and a boost in performance expectations.

Table 4.13

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 83.985a | 12 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 43.649 | 12 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 22.514 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 291 |  |  |

Table 4.14

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |  |
| My supervisor leads by example and sets high ethical standards. | Disagree | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Neutral | 0 | 2 | 13 | 20 | 8 | 43 |
| Agree | 2 | 1 | 17 | 56 | 18 | 94 |
| Strongly Agree | 2 | 0 | 18 | 69 | 58 | 147 |
| Total | | 4 | 6 | 50 | 146 | 85 | 291 |

4.4.4 ***Is there a statistically significant relationship between perceptions of clear expectations and performance-based incentives and employees’ self-reported productivity?***

In table 4.16 The Pearson Chi-Square value is 50.241 with 20 degrees of freedom and a p-value of .000, indicating a statistically significant association between the presence of clear expectations and performance-based incentives and employee productivity. The Linear-by-Linear Association value of 26.118 (p = .000) suggests a strong ordinal relationship. The crosstab shows a concentration of high productivity responses (“Agree” and “Strongly Agree”) among those who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with the presence of clear expectations and incentives. For example, 111 of 133 employees (83.5%) who “Agree” with the presence of expectations and incentives also “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” that they are highly productive. Similarly, among those who “Strongly Agree” with the presence of expectations and incentives, 65 of 69 (94.2%) report high productivity.

Table 4.15

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 50.241a | 20 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 54.281 | 20 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 26.118 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 291 |  |  |

Table 4.16

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Total |
| Strongly Disagree | | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |  |
| There are clear expectations and performance-based incentives in my organization. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Disagree | 0 | | 1 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 14 |
| Neutral | 0 | | 0 | 24 | 29 | 19 | 72 |
| Agree | 1 | | 1 | 20 | 64 | 47 | 133 |
| Strongly Agree | 0 | | 1 | 2 | 29 | 36 | 69 |
| Total | | 1 | | 3 | 51 | 132 | 103 | 291 |

4.4.5 ***Is there a significant association between employees’ perceptions of clear expectations and performance-based incentives and their belief that their leader’s style positively influences their performance?***

In table 4.17, the Pearson Chi-Square statistic of 25.823 (df = 12, p = .011) indicates a statistically significant relationship between the two variables. The Linear-by-Linear Association test (13.668, p < .001) further supports a directional trend. The distribution in the crosstab table 4.18 shows that as agreement with organizational clarity and incentives increases, so does the likelihood of employees affirming their leader’s positive influence on their performance. Notably, 62 of 69 respondents who “Strongly Agree” about the presence of clear expectations also reported “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” that their leader's style enhances their performance.

Table 4.17

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 25.823a | 12 | .011 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 24.982 | 12 | .015 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 13.668 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 291 |  |  |

Table 4.18

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | My leader’s style positively influences my performance. | | | | Total |
| Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| There are clear expectations and performance-based incentives in my organization. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Disagree | 1 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 14 |
| Neutral | 3 | 18 | 31 | 20 | 72 |
| Agree | 0 | 23 | 74 | 36 | 133 |
| Strongly Agree | 0 | 7 | 29 | 33 | 69 |
| Total | | 4 | 53 | 141 | 93 | 291 |