

RESTRUCTURING EXERCISE AT AN OIL AND GAS COMPANY

Rabiah Abdul Wahab,

Faculty of Business Management,
Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam, Selangor. Malaysia

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this paper are five-folds, namely (a) to investigate the awareness of management and employees about restructuring exercise, (b) to analyze whether the organizational restructuring has any impact on the employees' performance and motivation at the Company, (c) to identify whether employees' attitude will influence their motivation and job performance towards organizational restructuring, (d) to investigate to what extent organizational restructuring will influence on motivation level and job performance of employees at Oil and Gas Company, and last but not least to investigate the level of organizational commitment towards retaining and motivating employees to progress in their career after restructuring. The research questionnaires were distributed to 100 XYZ oil and gas company employees. Based on the analysis conducted in this study, the results show that the respondents agreed that organizational restructuring influence their motivation level and job performance level at workplace. The findings also shows that majority of employees at such Company agreed that manager was actively interested in their professional development and advancement and management often support them to develop new skills in order to adapt with organizational restructuring. As a conclusion, restructuring exercise did not directly give an impact on motivation and job performance of employees of such Company. The implication of the study is that organisations undertaking downsizing or restructuring need to consider the organisational culture and climate with regard to knowledge retention and the potential impact of these initiatives to ensure that employee experiences are constructive. Support strategies such as counselling and training are important, as are job redesign, time for employee handover and documentation of procedures, if knowledge retention is to be maximised.

Keywords: Restructuring; Oil and Gas; Industry; Job Performance.

INTRODUCTION:

Today, business world has changed rapidly and faced with many challenges especially for oil and gas industries. These challenges may be internal and external challenges to the organization. For an example, the introduction of advance technology, increase the number of jobs that require higher skill and reduce those jobs that need little skills. As changes cannot be stopped from happening, it is important for organization to manage and adapt quickly to these rapid changes in order to keep survive. Besides that, the general spread of globalization has opened up new markets and has increased competition in old markets for most MNCs in various industry sectors. If organization is unable to cope with these challenges, it will cause organization to lose its competitive advantages. Other than that, failure to act in response of these rapid changes will make the organization unable to meet its strategic mission, vision, goals and objectives. In response to these rapid changes and challenges, management will try to develop multiple strategies in order to ensure organization growth and stability. One common strategy involves restructuring. Restructuring refers to the transformation in how organization structured and managed its operation. Besides that, these transformations have an implication on effective utilization of human resources. It is important to note that sometimes organization perceive restructuring as opportunities to develop and not necessarily only as a threat. At Oil and Gas Company, reorganization or restructuring is one of the common exercises taken by the management in order to ensure its growth and stability. Meaning that, the intended reason for restructuring is to achieve an improvement in organizational performance. Before changes are implemented, Oil and Gas Company will look on the approach of its organization design and structure. These include understanding the trigger points for organizational change such as strategic shift, growth or shrinkage in business size and due to business performance improvement, understanding organizational philosophy and current issues, designing organization structure and developing implementation plan. It means that Oil and Gas Company need to understand the need for reorganization or restructuring. They will determine the rationale for reorganization which include strategic shift, growth or shrinkage and business performance improvement. All of these rationales will result in reorganization or restructuring.

Currently, when Oil and Gas Company decided to reorganize their operation due to business growth, (in term of business size and scope) they need to request additional positions of manpower. The rationale is that as the business is growing and expanding, Oil and Gas Company need to have additional manpower to run and support its operation effectively and efficiently. For example, development and production sector which include Development Division (DD) and Production–Malaysian Division are requesting 331 additional positions in order to strengthen project management and also to strengthen reliability and maintenance in region. Specifically, Development Division (DD) request 249 additional positions, meanwhile Production–Malaysian Division request 82 additional positions. The same goes to Exploration Sector in which they are requesting another seven additional positions. They need to meet the requested additional positions in order to improve their business performance. It must be remembered that once the decision to restructure has been implemented, it will absolutely include several risks. For an example, if Oil and Gas Company unable to create additional positions as requested, it will hinder its growth and capability. These include not meeting reserves additional and production target, deferment to project delivery and cost overrun and compromise to Health and Safety Environment (HSE) standard and compliance. All of these will give an impact towards business operation of Oil and Gas Company in which it will affect their revenue and the company's image, low staff morale due to overstretched (staff need to cover other jobs and positions which is not align with their core competencies) and also limited capability building among staff. Other than that, Oil and Gas Company may also decide to reorganize their business operation due to shrinkage in business size as well as its scope. For an example, the business operation at Pakistan had been closed after their project and assignment were completed. However, when they decided to shut down the operation, it will give an impact to the employees. This include the issues of termination and transfer of employees to the others places, sectors or division. However, on employees' perception, restructuring may not be preferable as it affect the nature of work. For example, employees experienced increased work load, greater autonomy, and a stressful working environment.

According to [1] Stuart (1996) organizational change can have negative consequences on the employees such as low morale, stress, loss of direction and control, anxiety, uncertainty, eroded loyalty and lack of commitment. Other than that, most of employees also believe that any change in nature of work has resulted in the loss of experience, competence and proprietary knowledge. Moreover, employees who have survived in organizational downsizing and restructuring process need to adjust to meet the dynamics of the organization, develop new skills and competencies, and the extent to which they take on new roles in the organization. [2] (Carbery and Garavan, 2004) Therefore, given the above discussion, this research seeks to identify how organizational change or restructuring affect the motivation level and job performance of employees. It focuses particularly on employees' motivation, job performance and organization response toward the restructuring exercise. At present,

such study has never been conducted particularly for Oil and Gas Company. Thus, this study provides valuable information to Oil and Gas Company in designing policies and strategies related with restructuring in future. Additionally, the findings from the study may be used by the company to develop strategies towards a higher level of motivation and job performance of employees after organizational changes. In order to perform effectively, restructuring is one of the strategies implemented by organizations. Management often cites operational restructuring as necessary for improving efficiency, controlling costs, and coping with the changing business environment. When firms are dealing with negative earnings and/or economic downturns, operational restructuring is often initiated as a rescue tool. Such environmental changes have placed corporations under increased competition domestically and internationally. However, organization must realize that organizational restructuring is not an easy exercise. Many organizational changes fail or do not realize their intended outcome. Other than that, after changed has been implemented, some firms recover and prevail, while the others fail to survive. Research on organizational change reveals that many change programs are likely to face problems. For an example, the study carried out by [1] Stuart (1996) shows that, organizational change can be traumatic for many individuals, and organizational changes have been referred to as cases of “trauma”, “catastrophe” and “abuse”. Most of employees believe that restructuring can create a stressful working environment and it can affect their motivation level. Furthermore, employee experiencing organizational change at a personal level often feels threatened and is fearful. The post acquisition phase is often characterised by “we-they” tensions, management and power struggles, employee turnover, absenteeism and deterioration in work-related attitudes and performance in both the acquired and the acquiring company [3] (Cartwright and Cooper, 1999) [4] (Fairfield-Sonn, 2002). These include coping with the demands of increased spans of control, taking on the added tasks and responsibilities of those who have left, and those brought about by the devolution of tasks previously performed by specialist staff. They may also experience a workload increase since fewer people are available to do the same amount of work [5] (Tang and Ibrahim, 1998). Indeed, numerous researchers have reported that downsizing produces considerable dysfunctional consequences, including the decline of service quality and innovation, and employees’ “survivor syndrome”, as expressed in increasing anxiety and risk aversion [6] (Brockner and Wiesenfeld, 1993) [7] (Cascio, 1993). Another research show that lack of knowledge may account for some of the uncertainty experienced by survivors, resulting in decreased job satisfaction, lower motivation and increased voluntary turnover [8] (Cameron and Smart, 1998). The increased stress, pressure and burnout also reportedly experienced by survivors, along with a loss of trust in management and colleagues and communication breakdown [8] (Cameron and Smart, 1998) [7] (Cascio, 1993) may have their roots in the inherent loss of knowledge that occurs. Besides that, the extent of workplace changes caused by downsizing may differ according to the varying degrees of severity of downsizing. On the other hand, some employees appear to regard downsizing as an opportunity for personal growth. They are energized as opposed to experiencing emotional distress. Management need to remember that employees perceived organizational changes differently. All of this due to the law of individual differences in term of needs, want, and motivation level. Not all employees perceive changes as opportunities or threats. Thus, if the negative changes overweight the positive changes, survivors’ affective commitment to the organization may well reduce, vice versa. These strategies and changes have a profound impact on employees’ motivation and job performance as well as their attitudes. Motivation refers to collaborative efforts and the capacity to implement the change. At an individual level it refers to the taking of concrete actions. The evidence indicates that the ability to motivate depends upon the existence of resources, support structures, systems and skills. Research has suggested that motivation to learn plays an important part in both availing of learning opportunities and transferring learning to the workplace [2] (Carbery and Garavan, 2004). If learners believe that the training programs are beneficial and important, then learner motivation will increase. On the other hand, if employees perceived training or learning programs as a commitment by the organization to focus on new skills, enhance employability and/or move in a different direction, learners will likely be highly motivated to learn. Therefore it is arguable that a learning process, which is part of a wider organizational change initiative, can be perceived as part of a management commitment towards skills and performance improvement. The perceived importance of the learning intervention is therefore important in the context of a major change initiative. If management shows it supportive behavior and give encouragement toward restructuring, employees may perceive changes positively and take it as an opportunities to develop rather than as a threat. Besides that, recent research suggests that organizational commitment is an important determinant of knowledge sharing, such as enhancing the willingness to share knowledge [9] (Hislop, 2003) [10] (van den Hooff and de Ridder, 2004) [11] (Thompson and Heron, 2005). According to [12] Helen and Verina (2011), organisations undertaking downsizing or restructuring need to consider the organisational culture and climate with regard to knowledge retention and the potential impact of these initiatives to ensure that employee experiences are constructive. Support strategies such as counselling and training are important, as are job redesign, time for employee handover and

documentation of procedures, if knowledge retention is to be maximised.

The objectives are to investigate the awareness of management and employees about restructuring exercise, to analyze whether the organizational restructuring has any impact on the employees' performance and motivation at Oil and Gas Company, and to identify whether employees' attitude will influence their motivation and job performance towards organizational restructuring, to investigate to what extent organizational restructuring will influence on motivation level and job performance of employees at Oil and Gas Company, and last but not least to investigate the level of organizational commitment towards retaining and motivating employees to progress in their career after restructuring.

METHODOLOGY:

This research used correlation study as a type of investigation, which is analysis done to identify important factors "associated with" the problem. For an example: Are restructuring related to motivation and job performance of employees at Oil and Gas Company? This research was done in the natural environment where work proceeds normally, that is called as no contrived setting. This study also used field experiment as a study setting because this study conducted to identify the problems faced by company and at the same time to solve the problems by using the same natural environment in which employees normally functions. Unit of analysis refers to the level of aggregation of the data collected during the data analysis stage. The unit of analysis of this research is the individual employee. It looked at the data gathered from each individual and treating each employee's response as an individual data sources. Therefore, data have to be collected from individual employee at Oil and Gas Company. This study is conducted using cross-sectional studies. The data is gathered once over a period such as a week or a month in order to answer the research questions. The cross sectional study involved the collection of data and sample for an estimated period of 16 weeks starting from January 2010 until April 2011. For the purpose of this research, survey was conducted among employees who are available at Oil and Gas Company. The printed copies of questionnaires were distributed by personally administering to 100 employees that are available at Oil and Gas Company by visiting the workplace of respondents from various divisions. Specifically, the data were collected by using structured written questionnaires which include positively and negatively worded question and personal information. These questionnaires also used simple languages and worded and since English is the spoken or official language at Oil and Gas Company, the questionnaires were prepared in English language. The language of these questionnaires is also appropriate with the level of understanding and education of the respondents. Most of the questions were derived from other related journals but had been edited by researcher so that it was best suited to the respected of research. The researcher decided to distribute the entire questionnaire by personally administering questionnaires to 100 employees in Oil and Gas Company. The questionnaires were divided into six sections to give clear understanding what the researcher actually searching for. It consists of Section A: Management and Employees Awareness, Section B: Impact of Organizational Restructuring, Section C: Employees Attitude, Section D: Influence of Organizational Restructuring, Section E: Organizational Commitment and Support, Section F: Demographic Profile. Interviews were conducted with two to three managers in order to get a clear picture and further understanding on the subject matters. This method helps the researcher to gather additional information, feedback and comments on their knowledge and experience that related with this research. In a way to collect the data, structured interviewed has been done in which the researcher had prepared or planned sequence of questions to be asked of the respondent. The objective of conducting this structured interviewed was to bring some preliminary issues to the surface so that the researcher can get better understanding on the subject matters. Internal sources consist of sources within the organization such as annual report of the company and other reports. The sources were obtained from company itself and it might also be obtain from company intranet. External source is a data that researcher can use to conduct more effective research. It also refers to the sources outside the organization. The information is published and can be accessible by the public. The sources that are being uses for obtaining information of this research were text book Research Methodology and from related journals.

In this research, the researcher decided to use probability sampling technique which is simple random sampling technique was used. The sample subject in this study is known because the targets are employees at Oil and Gas Company. For the questionnaires distribution, the researcher used the probability sampling called simple random sampling techniques in order to select the respondent. The sample is drawn randomly from a sampling frame. The population of this study consists of total number of employees employed at Oil and Gas Company. The focus groups of the respondents are an employee which consists of Managers, Executives and Non Executives employees. Respondents were also from various divisions and only will be selected from several divisions such as HRM & Capability, Finance Operation, Development Division, Petroleum Engineering, Operation Division and Drilling Division in Oil and Gas Company. For this research, 100 respondents were

selected from the total population to fill up the questionnaire.

Through this process, the researcher determined the influence between the variable in order to test all the research questions. Reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha), frequency distribution and cross tabulation were used in this study. Frequency distribution method has been used for this study in demographic profile that consists of gender, age, job position, number of years employed, educational level, race, income and also terms of employment of the respondents. Cross tabulation were also used in order to gather deeper data and information on the research that has been conducted. This is done by comparing some of the demographic profile such as respondents' gender, position and educational level with selected statements in the questionnaire. The results obtained from the cross tabulation helped the researcher to get clear and better understanding on the subject matter of the research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Frequency distribution was done in order to gain the number of responses pertaining to the different values of variables and the counting are then interpreted in percentage terms. The profile of the respondents was described in this section. Frequency distributions and percentages were obtained for all the demographic background or classification variables. The demographic background of the respondents included gender, age, and position, number of years employed at co, educational level, race, and income and terms employment.

From a total of 100 respondents had been selected, the distribution of questionnaire shows that the overwhelming majority of participants come from female with 56 respondents (56%) as compared to male with only 44 respondents (44%). The highest numbers of the respondents fall under 20 - 30 years old which were 59% from the total respondents. Besides that, 30 of them were around 31 - 40 years old which contributed to 30% from the overall. Last but not least, 11 of the respondents (11%) were around 41 - 50 years old. From 100 respondents had been selected, majority of the respondents were executive in which it indicates 62 respondents. It followed by 14 of manager and 10 of clerk. There were only 3 respondents each for secretary and others position (Senior Manager). From 100 respondents had been selected, it was found that 75% of respondents had worked in Oil and Gas Company for a period of 1 to 10 years. Another 18% of the respondents had worked for a period of 11 to 20 years and the remaining 7% of them had worked for more than 20 years. It means, majority of the respondents in Oil and Gas Company can be consider as new employees and only few of them are consider as senior employees. It was found that the educational qualifications of respondents with high percentage of 71% were Degree holder, followed by Diploma holder (14%), and Master holder in which it represents 7%. There was a minority with 6% of respondents who only had SPM certificate as their educational level. From a total of 100 respondents had been selected, the distribution of questionnaire shows that the majority of respondents were Malay with 84%, Chinese (8%), Indian (7%) and followed by other races with 1% of the respondents. The highest percentage of monthly income was 38% for those earned between RM4001 to RM6000, 25% of the respondents earned between RM 2001 to RM4000 and 19% of them earned more than RM8000. A small percentage with 10% and 8% earned less than RM2000 and between RM6001 to RM8000 for each. It was found that the majority of the respondents were local employees with 96% and 4% of the respondents were consider as expatriate.

A total of 77% of respondents which indicated the majority of them somewhat agreed that the implementation of restructuring was effectively communicated to them prior to being implemented. Another 10% of the respondents were disagreed and the remaining 13% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement. 80 or 80% of the respondent agreed with the statement of "I am aware of the briefing about restructuring exercise in my organization." Besides that, there were 14% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement and the remaining 6% were disagreed that they were aware of the briefing regarding restructuring exercise. For the statement of "I am not being informed about restructuring that has taken place in my organization", it showed that the majority of them, which represent 79% of the total respondents, were disagreed with the statement. It followed by 12% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and only 9% or 9 of the respondents believed or agreed that they were not being informed about restructuring that has taken place in their organization. 76% from the total respondents agreed that they were aware of the impacts of organizational restructuring on their current job. It followed by 18% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. In addition, there were a few of the respondents which represent 6% from the overall were totally disagreed with the statement. For the statement "The impacts of organizational restructuring have on my career has been discussed with my manager", it showed only 48% of them agreed with the statement, meanwhile 37% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed. Besides that, there were 15 respondents or 15% of them were disagreed that manager had discussed the impacts of restructuring with them. It was found that less than half of the total respondents agreed that management was aware of employees' readiness towards organizational restructuring. It showed only 49% of the respondents agreed with

the statement. Another 38% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and the remaining 13% of them were totally disagreed with the statement.

The statement of “Restructuring exercise has produced stressful working environment for me”. From the results obtained by the researcher, it was found that 61% of the respondents agreed that restructuring has produced stressful working environment. However, 20% of the respondents were disagreed and the remaining 19% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement. 54% of the respondents agreed that they were often being given additional work responsibility after organizational restructuring. It followed by 30% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement. Last but not least, there were only 16% of respondents disagreed that they were given additional work responsibility as an impact of organizational restructuring. From the research that has been conducted, the result of statement on “Uncertainty about restructuring exercise will decrease my job satisfaction”, it was found that 44% from total respondents were agreed, 31% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed and remaining 25% of them disagreed that uncertainty will decreased their job satisfaction. 60% of respondents which indicated 60 of them somewhat disagreed that the implementation of restructuring leads to higher level of absenteeism in their organization. Another 28% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and the remaining 12% of them were agreed with this statement. For the statement “Restructuring leads to higher level of turnover in my organization”, 56% of the respondents were disagreed with the statement. Meanwhile, 24 % of them were neither agreed nor disagreed and lastly there were only 20% of the respondents agreed that restructuring leads to higher level of turnover in their organization. From the total of 100 respondents that have been selected, 46% of them were disagreed with the statement of “I am experiencing emotional distress due to restructuring exercise”. Besides that, 31% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and the remaining 23% of them were agreed with this statement. 59% of the respondents were agreed with the statement of “Restructuring created an increase in job complexity”. Another 28% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement and the remaining 13% were disagreed that restructuring had created an increase in job complexity. From the total of 100 respondents, 55% of them were disagreed on the statement of “Organizational restructuring has declined my job performance quality”. It followed by 33% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. However, there was a little percentage of respondents (12%) were agreed that their job performance quality had decreased due to organizational restructuring. From the research that has been conducted, 83% of respondents which indicated the majority of them somewhat agreed that they have high level of self confident. Another 15% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and the remaining 2% of them disagreed with this statement. The majority of respondents (82%) were agreed with the statement that they were eager to work under challenging situation. Then, it followed by 16% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and lastly, there were only 2% of them disagreed with this statement. That majority of the respondents which indicates 81% of them strongly agreed that they can manage themselves to work under stress. However, there were 17% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and then followed by 2% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. For the statement “I feel positive that restructuring exercise provides an opportunity for greater success on my career”, 63% from the total respondents were agreed with this statement. Another 29% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and the remaining 8% of them disagreed with this statement, 60% of the respondents were agreed with the statement of “I feel that the organizational restructuring brings new opportunities for my career development”. Another 32% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement and the remaining 8% were disagreed that restructuring brings new opportunities for their career development. 72% of the respondents agreed that they were satisfied with their current job performance. However, 23% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and the remaining 5% of them were disagreed with this statement. 77% of respondents which indicated the majority of them somewhat agreed that they would like to develop themselves to face with job complexity due to restructuring exercise. Another 21% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and the remaining 2% of them were disagreed with this statement. 57% of the respondents were agreed with the statement. Meanwhile, 40 % of them were neither agreed nor disagreed and lastly there were only 3% of the respondents disagreed that they were supporter of the restructuring process.

From the total of 100 respondents, 61% of them were agreed on the statement of “Organizational restructuring will influence on my job performance level”. It followed by 26% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. However, there was a little percentage of respondents (13%) was disagreed that organizational restructuring will influence on their job performance level. The result of statement on “My job performance level decreased after the implementation of restructuring” shows that 57% from total respondents were disagreed, 31% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed and remaining 12% of them agreed that their job performance level decreased after the implementation of restructuring. 57% of the respondents which indicates 57 of them were disagreed that restructuring exercise poses a threat to their career within the

organization. However, there were 34% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and then followed by 9% of the respondents agreed with the statement. From the total of 100 respondents, 39% of them were disagreed on the statement of “I feel that that organizational restructuring which already had taken place was unnecessary”. It followed by 47% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Besides that, there was a little percentage of respondents (14%) were believed or agreed that organizational restructuring which already had taken place was unnecessary. 37% of the respondents were disagreed with the statement of “I am not affected by this organizational restructuring exercise”. Another 31% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement and followed by 32% of the respondents were agreed that they were not affected by organizational restructuring exercise. 70% of respondents which indicated the majority of them somewhat agreed that their manager was actively interested in their professional development and advancement. Another 22% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and the remaining 8% of them were disagreed with this statement. The majority of respondents (71%) were agreed with the statement of “Management often supports me to develop new skills in order to adapt with organizational restructuring”. Then, it followed by 24% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and lastly, there were only 5% of them were disagreed with this statement. 61% from the total respondents agreed that they were given enough feedback on their current job performance. However, there were 26% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and then followed by 13% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. For the statement of “My organization has provided me with training program to face organizational restructuring”, only 56% from the total respondents were agreed with this statement. Another 30% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and the remaining 14% of them were disagreed with this statement. The majority of 71% of the respondents were agreed with the statement of “I have adequate learning opportunities for professional growth in this organization”. Another 24% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement and the remaining 5% of the respondents were disagreed that they have adequate learning opportunities for professional growth in the organization. 76% of the respondents were agreed that support from the management was helpful for them to be motivated in facing the organizational restructuring. However, 18% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and the remaining 6% of them were disagreed with this statement. For the statement of “My organization does not care about my well-being after the restructuring process”, Table 4.29 found that 62% of the respondents were disagreed with the statement. Meanwhile, 28% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed and lastly there were only 10% of the respondents were agreed with this statement. 61% of respondents somewhat disagreed with the statement of “Management did not discuss any restructuring exercise with me”. Another 27% of the respondents were neither agreed nor disagreed and the remaining 12% of them were agreed with this statement.

The Reliability of a measure indicates the extent to which it is without bias and hence ensures consistent measurement across time and across the various items in the instrument. The reliability of a measure is established by testing for both consistency and stability. Cronbach's alpha is a reliability coefficient that indicates how well the items in a set are positively correlated to one another. The closer Cronbach's alpha is to 1, the higher the internal consistency reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha is often used to measure reliability. Reliability Test result for Management and Employees Awareness that consists of six questions is 0.505. According to Alpha Coefficient Range, 0.505 is indicating as poor variable. Thus, the researcher concludes that the questions regarding Management and Employees Awareness are poor in term of consistency and stability. Therefore, these questions should be improved for further research. Reliability Test result for Impact of Organizational restructuring that consists of eight questions is 0.791. According to Alpha Coefficient Range, 0.791 is indicating as acceptable variable. In general, when the Cronbach's Alpha more than 0.60 it is acceptable. Thus, the researcher concludes that the questions regarding the Impact of Organizational Restructuring are acceptable and can be used for further research. The Reliability Test result for Employees Attitude that consists of eight questions. It was found that the Cronbach's Alpha for Employees Attitude is 0.767, which mean that the correlation to one another is good. Thus, the researcher concludes that the questions regarding the Employees Attitude are acceptable and can be used for further research. The result of reliability test on the Influence of Organizational Restructuring that consists of seven questions is 0.706. According to Alpha Coefficient Range, 0.706 is indicating as acceptable variable. In general, when the Cronbach's Alpha more than 0.60 it is acceptable. Thus, the researcher concludes that the questions regarding the Influence of Organizational Restructuring are acceptable and can be used for further research. Reliability test result for Organizational Commitment and Support that consists of eight questions is 0.533. According to Cronbach's Alpha, 0.533 is indicating as poor variable. Thus, the researcher concludes that the questions regarding Organizational Commitment and Support are poor in term of consistency and stability. Therefore, these questions should be improved for further research.

Cross tabulation were used by comparing the respondent's gender, positions and educational level with several

statements in the questionnaires. The results obtained from the cross tabulation helps researcher to get clear and better understanding on the subject matter of the research. The cross tabulation between Position and I am often being given additional work responsibility after organizational restructuring. Based on the table, it showed from the total of 100 respondents, 54 of them were agreed that they were often being given additional work responsibility after organizational restructuring. Even though the number of respondents who were agreed with the statement just slightly above the average. According to [5] Tang and Ibrahim (1998), employees may also experience a workload increase since fewer people are available to do the same amount of work. In details, the majority of respondents, which indicates 61.1% of them, that agreed they were often being given additional work responsibility after organizational restructuring were from Executive position, followed by Manager (13%) and lastly by Secretary (3.7%). Executive position indicates the higher percentage might be due to the reason that the numbers of executive positions are higher as compared to the number of supporting staffs. Therefore, the executive often being given additional work responsibility and increased in work load after organizational restructuring. The cross tabulation between Educational Level and statement of "My motivation level decreased after the implementation of restructuring", the total of 100 respondents, 53 of them were disagreed that their motivation level decreased after the implementation of restructuring. In details, 75.47% of the respondents (majority) who have Degree as their highest educational level, disagreed that their motivation level decreased after the implementation of restructuring. It is because, as a Degree holder, they can be considering as an educated person and have the knowledge to work under challenging working environment. They might also have prepared to develop themselves in order to faced increased job complexity due to restructuring exercise. This is supported by [8] Cameron and Smart (1998), in which according to them, lack of knowledge may account for some of the uncertainty experienced by survivors, resulting in decreased job satisfaction, lower motivation and increased voluntary turnover. Therefore, it showed that level of knowledge can influenced motivation level of employees. As employees have the knowledge, the more confident they are to face with complexity and uncertainty of organizational restructuring.

CONCLUSION:

From the research that has been conducted, it can be concluded that restructuring exercise has no significant impact on motivation and job performance of employees at Oil and Gas Company. The employees' awareness helps them to minimize the impact of restructuring on their motivation and job performance level. The majority of employees at Oil and Gas Company have good characters, to perform their work and responsibilities and also have positive attitudes. The Organizational Commitment and Support also play important roles in order to minimize the negative impact of restructuring on employees' motivation and job performance level. The majority of respondents agreed that their manager and management team often provide them with support in term of learning opportunities and training program in order to develop new skills and knowledge to adapt with organizational restructuring. In order to produce high quality of products and services to its customers, stakeholders, suppliers and others parties the management, especially Human Resource Management and Capability Department should determine and evaluate the positive and negative impacts on any of its strategies before the decided to implement the strategies. Through this strategy, it will help to create incentives to promote a knowledge sharing culture, to identify processes to embed knowledge such as mapping knowledge flows, identifying best practices and promoting innovation.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Stuart, R. (1996), "*The trauma of organizational change*", Journal of European Industrial Training, 20(2): 11 – 16
- [2] Carbery, R. and Garavan, T.N. (2004), "*Who learns at work? Who are the employees with learning opportunities?*", paper presented at the 5th Annual UFHRD/AHRD Conference, University of Limerick, Limerick, 27-28 May.
- [3] Cartwright, S. and Cooper, C.L. (1999), "*Managing Mergers, Acquisitions and Strategic Alliances*" – Integrating People and Cultures, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- [4] Fairfield-Sonn, J.W., Ogilvie, J.R. and DelVecchio, G.A. (2002), "*Mergers, acquisitions and long-term employee attitudes*", Journal of Business & Economic Studies, 8(2): 1-16.
- [5] Tang, T.L.P. and Ibrahim, A.H.S. (1998), "*Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior revisited: public personnel in the United States and in the Middle East*", Public Personnel Management, 27(4):529-50.
- [6] Brockner, J. and Wiesenfeld, B.M. (1993), "*Living on the edge*", in Murnighan, J.K. (Ed.), Social Psychology in Organizations: Advances in Theory and Research, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- [7] Cascio, W.F. (1993), "*Downsizing: what do we know? What have we learned?*", Academy of Management Executive, 7(1): 95-104.

- [8] Cameron, K.S. and Smart, J. (1998), “*Maintaining Effectiveness Amid Downsizing and Decline in Institutions of Higher Education*”, *Research in Higher Education*, 39(1): 65-86.
- [9] Hislop, D. (2003), “*Linking human resource management and knowledge management via commitment: a review and research agenda*”, *Employee Relations*, 25(2): 182-202.
- [10] Van den Hooff, B. and de Ridder, J.A. (2004), “*Knowledge sharing in the context: the influence of organizational commitment, communication climate and CMC use on knowledge sharing*”, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 8(6): 117-30. 26(2): 215-32.
- [11] Thompson, M. and Heron, P. (2005), “*The difference a manager can make; organizational justice and knowledge worker commitment*”, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(3): 383-404.
- [12] Helen Sitlington, Verena Marshall, (2011), “*Do downsizing decisions affect organisational knowledge and performance?*”, *Management Decision*, 49(1): 116 – 129.
