PERECIEVED EFFECTIVENESS OF NON-MONETRAY REWARDS ON SOUTH EAST EDUCATIONAL REGION EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION

Salani, End
University of Botswana, Department of Primary Education
Private Bag 00702, Gaborone

Abstract

The study sought the perceptions of employees on the effects of non-monetary rewards on employee satisfaction in South East Regional Education Office. To get some clues of perceptions, the South East Regional Education Office was selected through convenient sampling for the purpose of the study. From this region, employees of the headquarters of South East Regional Education officewere involved. The study used a closed ended questionnaire and an interview schedulefor data collection while the analysis of results was carried out using both qualitative and quantitative approaches. As an illustration, a one way ANOVA was used to test for differences in employees' perceptions by gender, while data from interviews was analyzed inductively using grounded theory techniques. The findings revealed that majority of the employees felt they were not involved in decision making processes and that they were not recognised for efforts made in the execution of their duties. Furthermore, most of the employees felt that they were not empowered to acquire skills that would enable them to take independent decisions. Male employees indicated that there was minimal delegation of responsibilities. The employees also decried lack of teamwork among members of the organisation, a situation that is detrimental to the success of the organisation. It is recommended that supervisors should employ non-monetary rewards in the form of providing job enrichment activities supported by mentoring and coaching. Regular meetings across different cadres should be scheduled to promote employee involvement in decision making processes. Also it has to be further studied the types of support supervisors needed in order to effectively integrate non-monetary rewards in their supervision structures.

Keywords: Non-monetary rewards, employee satisfaction, secondary education, mentoring and coaching, job enrichment, level of recognition, teamwork

1. Introduction

Non-monetary rewards have become a hot topic in recent years. According to Ballentine (2007), managers are constantly searching for ways to create a motivational environment where employees can work at their optimal levels to accomplish organisational objectives.

In Botswana, the Ministry of Education Skills and Development (MoESD) as an organ of the Government is mandated to produce quality education and this could be achieved through effective and efficient use of experienced and personnel of high calibre. It is therefore, on the basis of the foregoing that the MoESD has an obligation to keep its employees from leaving their jobs for other organisations or ministries in order to maintain continuity and retain experienced workforce.

It has to be underscored that it is costlyto hire and retrain new employees. As a result it is imperative that the MoESDensures job satisfaction among its employees and also provide opportunities for career advancement as a way of retaining them within the ministry.

According to Eskidsen and Nussler (2000), employers strive to get talented and competent employees in order to maintain a prosperous business. Further, Hammer (2000), Marini (2000) and Denton (2000) cited by Kumar (2013)remarked that employees who are satisfied and happy in their jobs are more dedicated to doing a good job and being courteous to customers thus ensuring sustainability of the company's operations. At the same time, employee satisfaction as a measure of an employee's commitment to the organisation makes it crucial for an organisation to have a workforce that is satisfied. In view of the preceding statement Rose (1998) in her survey of 81 large UK organisations, was able to establish the following as principal reasons why organisations used non-monetary rewards: they create positive work environment; they reinforce desired behaviours; they motivate high performance; they increase morale; they support organisational mission or values; they increase retention hence decrease high staff turnover; they encourage loyalty.

This study therefore, intended to investigate perceptions of secondary education employees on the effects of non-monetary reward on employee satisfaction, with the view of soliciting opinions that could help the management develop strategies aimed at increasing employee satisfaction and ultimately increasing organisational productivity.

1.1 Statement of the problem

Studies on employee satisfaction have revealed that employees are more loyal and productive when they are satisfied. Consequently, one could contend that satisfied employees affect the customer satisfaction and organisational productivity. According to Aydinand Ceylan(2009), managers of organisations ought to create and sustain the desired working environments in the organisations.

Miller (2006), points out that there is no limit for the employees to reach the full satisfaction and he also acknowledges that having good relationships with colleagues, high salary, good working conditions, training and education opportunities, career developments or any other benefits may relate well with the increasing of employee satisfaction. In view of the foregoing views, it is evident that non-monetary rewards are instrumental and if accorded to employees, there could help in increasing employee satisfaction thus reducing staff turnover.

In Botswana,very limited studies on employee satisfaction have been conducted at national level and this was initiated by high staff turnover experienced by ministries, MoESD included. To cite an example, Motlabaseyo report (2009) on employee satisfaction has revealed that few MoESDemployees (9.8%) were satisfied with compensation that included non-monetary benefits such as bonuses, pension plans or schemes, and employer sponsored training courses and attendance at workshops, conferences and seminars which are forms of professional development. It is therefore, on the basis of the above that thisresearch intended to establish the secondary education employees' perceptions on the application of non-monetary rewards at the South East Regional (SER) Education office which is a stepping stone towards employee satisfaction. This is undertaken with full understanding that the Motlabaseyo report was shared with all departments within theMoESD and the recommendations were to be implemented in order to improve employee satisfaction in their respective jobs, hence the expectation is that the South East Regional Education office would at the time of conducting this research have put measures in place to implement the recommendations made thereof.

1.2 Research questions

For the purpose of this study, the following research questions are raised:

1.2.1. How were employees' views on the level of recognition and status accorded to them by their supervisors?

1.2.2. What are employees' views on their level of empowerment and involvement in decision making processes?

1.2.3. What are employees' feelings about opportunities accorded to them for job enrichment?

1.2.4. What are employees' views about the level of team work in their organisation?

2. Literature review

Non-monetary rewards can be an organisation's most effective tool to motivate and enhance employee satisfaction and build a lifelong relationship with a valued employee.Armstrong (2009) sees non- monetary rewards as including any rewards that focus on the needs people have to varying degrees for achievement, recognition, responsibility, influence and personal growth.It is evidently clear that employees are motivated by non-monetary rewards. By the same token, employees who are motivated and have improved job satisfaction, ultimately contribute positively towards the realisation of the organisational goals.An equally significant aspect of employee satisfaction was observed by Sageer, Rafat and Agarwal's(2012) study that investigated variables affecting employee satisfaction and found that Jobs that were rich in positive behavioral elements- such as autonomy, task identity, task significance and feedback contributedvastly to employee's satisfaction.

Having considered non-monetary rewards in general, it is also reasonable to look at employee satisfactionas closely linked to that of job satisfaction because it refers to attitudes and feelings people have about their work. Positive and favourable attitudes towards the job lead to engagement and therefore job satisfaction by employees. Armstrong (2009) argues that negative and unfavourable attitudes towards the job indicate job dissatisfaction. Moreover, employee satisfaction is viewed as a measure of how happy workers are with their job and working environment. Keeping morale high among workers can be of tremendous benefit to any organisation, as happy workers will be more likely to produce more, take fewer days off, and stay loyal to the company (Dele &Adegboyega, 2014). Another, significant finding in Dele and Adegboyega's(2014) study on perceived effects of management use of motivation on workers' job commitment in tertiary institutions in South-Western Nigeria is that it was confirmed that motivation had a significant association on workers' job commitment. A similar argument raised is that morale is perceived to be equivalent to employee satisfaction on the job. According to Armstrong (2009), morale is defined as the extent to which individuals' needs are satisfied and the extent to which the individual perceives that satisfaction as stemming from his [sic] total work situation.

Armstrong (2009) further outlined factors that determine the level of employee satisfaction in their jobs which include: intrinsic and extrinsic motivating factors; the quality of supervision; social relationships within the work group; degree to which individuals succeed or fail in their work.

Purcell, Kinnie, Hutchinson, Rayton, and Swart's (2003) study that wanted to establish the behaviours helping the firms to be successful found out that this was likely to happen when employees are well motivated and feel committed to the organisation and when the job gives them high levels of satisfaction. Moreover,Purcell, Kinnie, Hutchinson, Rayton and Swart (2003)'s research established that the key factors affecting job satisfaction were career opportunities, job influence, teamwork and job challenge. Purcell's study is relevant to this research in that the degree to which employees of the Regional Education Office perceivednon-monetary rewards such as career opportunities, team work and job challengesin comparison to the findings of Purcell's study has been established.

In another study conducted by Kelley (2006), that investigated American workers' attitudes toward vacation time, telecommuting and stress, found that the most stressed workers said too much work, their boss's behaviour and long hours were the top causes of discontent.

Nelson (2001) has cited a series of studies on work rewards which were conducted by several researchers and indicated thatemployees were consistently ranked items such as "full appreciation for work done", "interesting work" as more important to them than the traditional incentives such as pay. Bessel, Brad, Allen and Karl (2002) also conducted a study that compared manager's ranking of what they wanted from their jobs with what their bosses thought was important to the managers. At the top of the manager's list was interesting work, followed by appreciation of work, a feeling of being "in on things", job security and good wages. The employers however thought good wages, job security, promotion or growth, good working conditions and interesting work as most important to their employees. Furthermore, according to a study by Robert Half International (1994) cited by Nelson (2001:8), more than 34 percent of executives reported that lack of praise and recognition was the number one reason why people left their jobs. In yet another study by Mayfield and Kopf (1998), a survey conducted on nursing staff proved the hypothesis that the superior's use of motivating language had a positive effect on the subordinate's performance and job satisfaction. Several studies by Ballentine.,Mckenzie., Wysocki., Kepner., Farnsworth and Clark (2003) on non-

monetary rewards have also confirmed that lack of non-monetary rewards was an important cause for high employee turnover. Waytt (2006) in his strategic Rewards Survey of about 410 employers in 2000 found that employers were using non-monetary rewards more than what they used previously and the most prevalent non-monetary rewards identified were Advancement Opportunities and Opportunities to Learn New Skills. By the same token, Mottaz (1985) also found out in his study conducted in 1980 that employees preferred autonomy, meaning and challenge in work more than the traditional rewards such as pay. Graham (1990) cited in Nelson (2001) conducted a study illustrating the significance of non-monetary rewards. After asking and examining employees about 65 potential incentives in the workplace, the top five incentives as initiated by managers and based on employee performance were found to be non-monetary in nature.

According to findings of the 1993 study of changing US workforce by Galinsky, it indicated a rise in the importance of non-monetary rewards. Moreover, the findings revealed that quality of work was more important to workers than the traditional value of money. When employees were asked the reasons that were "very important" in deciding to take a job with the current employers, the top variable listed by 65% of respondents was "open communication" followed by "nature of work" and "management quality". These findings are relevant to my research as comparisons of employees' perceptions were established. This also clearly shows the importance of non-monetaryrewards in promoting a culture of hard working resulting from employee satisfaction. In support of the preceding arguments, a case study by Khanna (2007) found that non-monetary rewards like recognition tend to have a strong influence of an employee and it brings about job satisfaction and engagement.

2.1 Summary

It can be observed from the above literature, that there has been a growing popularity of non-monetary rewards in the work place with the growing decline of the world economy. More employers are using non-monetary rewards to motivate employees, yielding positive results. It is therefore, befitting that senior management at the SER education office, employ and promote activities that would boost employee morale and make them feel recognised and appreciated as team players within the organisation. The literature has also indicated that employees prefer non-monetary rewards over the traditional incentives such as pay. This calls for strategic leadership that would take advantage of the situation as non-monetary rewards

could provide a way to keep the employees happy without putting the organisation's budget under constraint. One could conclude that the surveyed literature regarded non-monetary rewards as a yard stick to increased productivity and ensuring low staff turnover in the workplace.

3. Theoretical Framework

In this study I used McGregor theory Y to understand employee behaviour in work environments. It is without doubt that Theory Y is a management theory which holds that management should provide conditions and methods for people to achieve their own goals directed towards organisation objectives (McGregor, 1957). This theory believes that employees are not naturally indifferent to the organisation's needs; hence behave otherwise due to experience. It is therefore, given that for the growth and success of an organisation management have to treat its employees with dignity or as mature adults and consequently the organisational emphasis should be on internal self-control rather than putting emphasis on either you get a reward or punishment. Having considered McGregor theory Y, it was reasonable to consider the motivation-Hygiene Theory by Herzberg, who believed continuous job enrichment will motivate employees. Herzberg (2003) proposes that work must be enriched to successfully utilize, or motivate, personnel. Evidently, job enrichment provides the opportunity for growth and must be vertical job loading and not horizontal job loading. According to Herzberg (2003) horizontal loading consists of challenging the employee to increase production amounts or adding another meaningless task to the existing one while vertical job loading entails removing controls while keeping accountability and introducing new and more challenging tasks not previously handled. Moreover, Herzberg stressed that job enrichment needs to be a continuous management function. Similarly, according to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, employees have needs (Seifert, 1991). For this reason, this study intended to investigate perceived effectiveness of non- monetary rewards, which according to Maslow includes love and belonging, a characteristic of team work within an organisation.

4. Methodology

The research design for this study falls within both quantitative and qualitative approaches (Cresswell, 1994; Gay &Airasian, 1996; Mertens, 1998). The study used a survey design that employed the employee questionnaires to collect data for quantitative purposes as it is meant to describe the "what" of a situation, and not determine cause and effect (Hale, 2011) and it

was also qualitatively conducted through an interview schedule. According to Bogdan&Biklen (1998), in qualitative studies, researchers are concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes or products or generalisation. That is why secondary education employees who are direct beneficiaries of the Motlabaseyo report were interviewed as detailed information about the effectiveness of non-monetary rewards could be drawn from them. In this research,data was collected through both questionnaires and interviews for the purpose of triangulation since various sources of data (qualitative and quantitative) is better than a single source as multiple sources will lead to a fuller understanding of effects of non-monetaryrewards on employee satisfaction (Cohen and Manion, 1994;Bogoan and Biklen, 1998). Triangulation in this study was intended to ensure consistency of data while experts from the department were given all the instruments to make judgments about the content. Five Principal Education Officers form Department of Teacher Training and Development and Primary Education validated the questionnaire. The five Principal Education Officers were used in the trial testing of the questionnaire and they provided valuable insights on the suitability of the instrument and also for modifications on the instrument (Mertens, 1998) as a result the open ended question which was originally part of the questionnaire was removed and replaced with an interview schedule.

All MoESD (Regional Education Offices) employees were the target population for this study. The MoESD is divided into ten (10) Regional Education offices, where they perform similar operations such as employment of temporary teachers, transferring of teachers, payments of temporary teachers, inspection of schools and other administrative duties. The population was stratified into respective regions and Gaborone in the South East Region (SER) was chosen through convenient sampling procedures to generate a sample for the study. This was so because of convenience and accessibility to the researcher. It could have been expensive and time consuming for the researcher to conduct the study in all the ten regions under MoESD because there are many and widely spread, and the research had no funding, hence was conducted at the researcher's expense.

The study utilized both questionnaires and interview schedules as the main tools for data collection. The questionnaire offers considerable advantage in administration to large numbers of people simultaneously and provides the investigation with an easy collection of data (Kiess&Bloomquist, 1985;Gall, Borg & Gall, 1996).The questionnaire and the scales for the instrument were as follows: Recognition and status (5 items were constructed to get

information on how employees feel about their recognition by supervisors in their various jobs); involvement in decision making processes (4 items were developed to find out the level of involvement of employees in strategic decisions); job enrichment (3 items were developed to determine how employees feel about tasks given as a way of enriching their jobs); team working (5 items were constructed to determine how employees feel about the level of team work in their organisations); empowerment and responsibilities (6 items were developed to determine how employees feel about the level of empowerment they are accorded by their supervisors in their respective sections. Altogether they were 23 items and in all these five scales, employees' responses were rated in a 5 point Likert scale with answers ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The other instrument used was an interviewee schedule with three (3) questions intended at establishing employees' views on the following: level of recognition accorded by supervisors; level of employee involvement in decision making processes; level of empowerment and team work within the employees' organisation.

4.1 Data analysis

The researcher used both qualitative and quantitative methods to analyse the data. For quantitative data processes (closed ended questions), a statistical program called Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 23)   was used for data entry and analysis of the results. Tables of frequencies, bar graphs and descriptive statistics (mean, mode, standard deviation and variance) were used in the analysis of employee's responses on a five point Likert scale (Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N),Disagree (D), Strongly disagree (SD))

Inferential statistics for example, a one way ANOVA was used in the analysis because gender was treated as an extraneous variable, thus reducing the threat to the validity of the instrument used. Interview responses were analysed using qualitative methods. According to Bogoan and Biklen (1998), qualitative methods are descriptive. In this study the interview responses were analysed in the form of words rather than numbers. The written results of the research contained notations from the data to illustrate and substantiate the presentation. The data was analysed as closely as possible to the form in which respondents presented them.

5. Findings and Discussion

The findings are discussed under five sub-headings (scales) namely: recognition and status, involvement in decision making processes, job enrichment, team working, and empowerment

and responsibilities. The findings were reported on the basis of frequencies, percentages, descriptive statistics, and level of significance.

Description of findings

Key: SA – strongly agree – 5; A – agree- 4; N-Neutral- 3, D-disagree-2; SD-strongly disagree-1

Items 1-5: recognition and status scale; Items 6-9: involvement in decision making scale

Items 10-12: Job enrichment scale; Items 13-17: Teamwork scale; Items 18-23: empowerment and responsibilities scale

Table 4(a).A summary of descriptive statistics of employees' views on each of the 23 items on the 5-point Likert scale.

Items	Mean	mode	Std.dev.	Variance
RECOGNITION AND STATUS SCALE = 3.00				
1	3.14	4	1.35	1.83
2	3.71	5	1.23	1.50
3	2.74	2	1.25	1.55
4	2.63	1	1.29	1.65
5	2.80	2	1.30	1.69
INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING PROCESSES SCALE = 2.79				
6	2.51	3	1.12	1.26
7	2.71	3	1.18	1.38
8	3.34	4	1.28	1.64
9	2.57	2	1.07	1.13
JOB ENRICHMENT SCALE = 3.25				
10	3.20	3	1.13	1.28
11	3.23	4	1.33	1.77
12	3.31	4	1.05	1.10
TEAM WORKING SCALE = 2.87				
13	3.83	4	1.07	1.15
14	3.43	4	0.979	0.958
15	2.57	1	1.27	1.61
16	2.31	2	1.08	1.16
17	2.23	1	1.09	1.18

EMPOWERMENT AND RESPONSIBILITIES SCALE = 2.78				
18	2.77	3	1.11	1.24
19	3.14	4	1.12	1.24
20	3.23	4	1.09	1.18
21	2.51	1	1.27	1.61
22	2.60	2	1.17	1.37
23	2.44	2	1.08	1.16

Table 4(b): Results of employees' responses to items 1-23 disaggregated by gender

	MALE			FEMALE		
QUESTIONS	MEAN	STDDEV	VARIANCE	MEAN	STDDEV	VARIANCE
1	3.46	1.13	1.27	3	1.48	2.2
2	4.15	0.987	0.974	3.38	1.28	1.65
3	2.85	1.28	1.64	2.71	1.27	1.61
4	2.85	1.46	2.14	2.52	1.21	1.46
5	3	1.47	2.17	2.67	1.24	1.53
AVERAGE	3.26	1.27	1.64	2.86	1.30	1.69
6	2.62	1.26	1.59	2.48	1.08	1.16
7	2.69	1.25	1.56	2.76	1.18	1.39
8	3.85	1.07	1.14	3.05	1.36	1.85
9	2.85	1.14	1.31	2.43	1.03	1.06
AVERAGE	3.00	1.18	1.40	2.68	1.16	1.37
10	3.31	1.18	1.4	3.14	1.15	1.32
11	3.69	1.03	1.06	2.95	1.47	2.15
12	3.38	0.961	0.923	3.29	1.15	1.31
AVERAGE	3.46	1.06	1.13	3.13	1.26	1.59
13	4.08	0.862	0.744	3.67	1.2	1.43
14	3.85	0.689	0.474	3.14	1.06	1.13
15	2.92	1.38	1.91	2.33	1.2	1.43
16	2.46	0.967	0.936	2.24	1.18	1.39
17	2.54	0.967	0.936	2.1	1.14	1.29
AVERAGE	3.17	0.97	1.00	2.70	1.16	1.33

18	2.69	1.18	1.4	2.81	1.12	1.26
19	3.15	1.14	1.31	3.1	1.14	1.29
20	3.62	0.87	0.756	3	1.18	1.4
21	2.62	1.04	1.09	2.38	1.4	1.95
22	2.54	1.05	1.1	2.62	1.28	1.65
23	2.92	0.954	0.91	2.14	1.06	1.13
AVERAGE	2.92	1.04	1.09	2.68	1.20	1.45

In addition to the preceding tables, the findings of the analysed survey data are presented with a focus on the following re-search questions:

Q1. How were employees' views on the level of recognition and status accorded to them by their supervisors?

The mean response for employees' beliefs about being accorded recognition and status by their supervisors was 2.74, 2.63 and 2.80 forquestions 3, 4 and 5 respectively (Table 4(a)). This shows that most employees felt that they were not recognised and given appropriate status for the work they performed in their organisation. This finding support what other studies have found (Galinsky, 1993;Rose, 1998; Nelson, 2001), which revealed that employees felt that lack of praise and recognition was the number one reason why people left their jobs and caused disgruntlement on the job. Moreover, Warren (2007) viewed that most people leave their job not because of underpayment, but because they feel overlooked and neglected. This suggests that employees love to have their voices heard and their ideas recognised. They do not want someone constantly watching over them and questioning their move. Findings from this study further suggest that age seemed not to determine employees' feeling about their recognition at the workplace. A one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) performed on the sex of employees using all the items in the five scales revealed that gender did not affect employees' feelings about the level of recognition they get from their supervisors.Further analysis, revealed that the average mean response (Table 4(b)) for male employees was 3.26 and 2.86 for female employees, which indicated that the belief that supervisors did not proffer employees recognition and status affected female employees than their counterparts. However, Levene's test showed no significant differences in all the recognition and status variables under items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 (Table 4(c)) between male and female employees. A post hoc analysis using scheffe test showed no significance differences

between any of the two groups taken at a time as the significance value for the different items are all greater than the scheffe alpha value of 0.05 (Table 4(c)).These views were corroborated by responses from the interviews which revealed that some employees strongly felt they were no opportunities for recognition in the organisation. As one of the employees remarked, "There is absolutely nothing like recognition here... the system is only interested in getting results...without considering our welfare." Further probing revealed that employees expected to be written letters of appreciation as this could raise their morale and motivate them to work harder, thus increasing productivity. It is therefore fitting that one could conclude that most of the 35 employees in the SER office irrespective of gender felt that they were not recognised for the little efforts they put in the execution of their jobs, a situation that could adversely affect customer service delivery.

Table 4(c). A summary of results comparing items on recognition and status scale by gender using a one way ANOVA

Post hoc = scheffe alpha (0.05)

One way ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I am appreciated for the little efforts I make in performing my duties	Between Groups	2.100	1	2.100	1.152	.291
	Within Groups	60.185	33	1.824		
	Total	62.286	34			
I am an important asset with valuable intellectual capital in my workplace	Between Groups	3.996	1	3.996	2.797	.104
	Within Groups	47.147	33	1.429		
	Total	51.143	34			
I am given prompt feedback pertaining to my grievances and concern at my workplace	Between Groups	.221	1	.221	.139	.712
	Within Groups	52.465	33	1.590		

	Total	52.686	34			
I have been acknowledged for meritorious performance by my supervisors	Between Groups	.979	1	.979	.585	.450
	Within Groups	55.192	33	1.672		
	Total	56.171	34			
There is a forum for me to air my views and concerns with regard to my work	Between Groups	.827	1	.827	.481	.493
	Within Groups	56.773	33	1.720		
	Total	57.600	34			

Q2. What are employees' views on their level of empowerment and involvement in decision making processes?

A mean response of the extent to which employees felt they were involved in decision making processes was 2.79(Table 4(a)). This showed that for decision making processes scale,most of the employeesfelt they were not effectively involved in the decision making processes of their organisation and also felt their supervisors did not empower them to execute duties that would make them take independent decisions. However, for item 8 most of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were encouraged to make meaningful contributions during meetings and were free from intimidation. Considering gender differences, it was obtained from the decision making processes scale average mean responses of 3.00 for males and 2.68 for females. This revealed that most female employees felt that they were not involved in decision making processes, while most of their male counterparts were neutral on this scale.The Levene's test on variables under Items 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 from Table 4(d) below, showed no significance differences in employees' extent of involvement in decision making processes. Further analysis of the one way ANOVA revealed that there was no significance difference between employees feelings about their involvement in decision making processes and empowerment among the two groups of gender because a post hoc analysis using scheffe test showed no significance differences between any of the two groups taken at a time. The significance values for the different items are all greater than the scheffe alpha value of 0.05 (Table 4(d) and Table 4(e)).This corroborates findings from

other studies that investigated the effects of non-monetary rewards, where it was found that lack of non-monetary rewards such as involvement in decisions making caused anxiety, job stress and ultimately leading to high employee turnover (Ballentine, Mckenzie, Wysocki, Kepner, Farnsworth & Clark, 2003; Appelbaum, 2000). Similarresearch has found out that people appreciate the opportunity to be part of a team where they could contribute ideas and views aimed at enhancing the strategic decisions. And they also enjoy the idea of working closely with managers and management, being involved in key decisions and being listened to and be heard as forms of intrinsic motivation (Low Kim Cheng & Robertson, 2006; Reychav& Weisberg, 2009;Mundhra, 2010; HossainI &HossainII, 2012).

This finding was also corroborated by responses from the interview as the junior members of staff, who happened to form the bulk of the workforce at SER, felt they were seldom consulted prior to taking major decisions by management. This is what one of the interviewees said regarding the level of involvement in decision making processes.

> "... Here there are barely meetings where we could air our concerns or make suggestions. What we get is just instructions or directives as if we are empty vessels and have no brains to suggest better ways of doing work...it has to be noted that we are expertise in our own world, therefore there is need for our supervisors to appreciate that we could contribute positively to the organisational growth." The other interviewee lamented that "as long as we lack clear understanding of roles it would be difficult to work as a team... we are always on the run and there is low quality relationships rendering it close to impossible to work as a team...here it is difficult to confide in or trust our bosses because today they say this and after their meetings they turn against their initial words making it very difficult for us to work with them."

For level of empowerment and responsibilities scale most of the employees disagreed with the statements. The results further reveal that the mean scores for items on the empowerment and responsibilities scale (Items 18, 21, 22, 23) indicated that they were some employees who felt they were not delegated to perform other responsibilities and also that they were not mentored and coached when given responsibilities. On the other hand the modal response for items 19 and 20 indicated that respondents agreed with the statements that they had control over time and that they were encouraged to come up with solutions to problems encountered when executing their duties. An average mean response of 2.78 for the empowerment and

responsibilities scale implied that most of the employees felt they were not empowered in their jobs and also were not given responsibilities that would enable them to exercise some authority in their jobs. On the empowerment and responsibilities scale, employees' mean response (mean = 2.78) revealed that majority of employees disagreed that they were adequately empowered to take decisions independently. This was supported by employees' responses to the interview who felt that they were given too much work in the name of empowerment, which they felt increased job stress as they would be battling with deadlines. Statements such as the following could be heard from some members of the interviewees,

> "This so called empowerment is meant to increase our workload because the system is such that an employee performs multi tasked jobs. The most paining thing about this work overload is that your output would be little rendering one inefficient. To me empowerment should be done in good faith, whereby one is supported and mentored to realise the set objectives... It is better not to be given extra work if there is little support and guidance as this is tantamount to abuse by management."

In view of the above, it is imperative that management should come up with a strategic plan that would engage all members of the organisation at different structures with the view of improving on communication and decision making areas.

Table 4(d). A summary of results comparing items on involvement in decision making processes scale by gender using a one way ANOVA.

Post hoc = scheffe alpha (0.05)

One way ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I am appreciated for the little efforts I make in performing my duties	Between Groups	2.100	1	2.100	1.152	.291
	Within Groups	60.185	33	1.824		
	Total	62.286	34			
I am an important asset with valuable intellectual capital in my workplace	Between Groups	3.996	1	3.996	2.797	.104

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Within Groups	47.147	33	1.429		
	Total	51.143	34			
I am given prompt feedback pertaining to my grievances and concern at my workplace	Between Groups	.221	1	.221	.139	.712
	Within Groups	52.465	33	1.590		
	Total	52.686	34			
I have been acknowledged for meritorious performance by my supervisors	Between Groups	.979	1	.979	.585	.450
	Within Groups	55.192	33	1.672		
	Total	56.171	34			
There is a forum for me to air my views and concerns with regard to my work	Between Groups	.827	1	.827	.481	.493
	Within Groups	56.773	33	1.720		
	Total	57.600	34			

Table 4 (e). A summary of results comparing items on empowerment and responsibilities scale by gender using a one way ANOVA

Post hoc = scheffe alpha (0.05)

One way ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I am delegated to perform other responsibilities where I could exercise the authority to make my own decisions	Between Groups	.129	1	.129	.102	.752
	Within Groups	42.042	33	1.274		

	Total	42.171	34			
I have control over how to use my time and deciding the priority of tasks that need to be done	Between Groups	.002	1	.002	.002	.965
	Within Groups	42.283	33	1.281		
	Total	42.286	34			
I am encouraged to consider problems I face when executing my duties and come up with some solutions	Between Groups	3.095	1	3.095	2.754	.106
	Within Groups	37.077	33	1.124		
	Total	40.171	34			
I am given on the job training in order to be trusted to make correct decision making	Between Groups	.211	1	.211	.128	.723
	Within Groups	54.531	33	1.652		
	Total	54.743	34			
I am mentored and coached when given responsibilities so that I could cope with more authority and decision making power	Between Groups	.078	1	.078	.056	.815
	Within Groups	46.322	33	1.404		
	Total	46.400	34			
There is minimal delegation of responsibilities in my organisation	Between Groups	4.888	1	4.888	4.670	.038
	Within Groups	33.495	32	1.047		
	Total	38.382	33			

Q3. What are employees' feelings about opportunities accorded to them for job enrichment?

The mean response of employees' feelings about enrichment in their jobs was 3.25 indicating that on average the employees were neutral on whether they were given activities aimed at

enriching their jobs or not (Table 4(a)). However, for job enrichment scale, a modal response of 4 for items 11 and 12 implied that some of the employees strongly agreed or agreed that they felt they were given opportunities for job enrichment. However, the modal score of 3 for item 10 indicates that majority of employees were neutral on whether their supervisors gave them interesting or challenging work or not.

Furthermore, the employees' feelings about enrichment in their jobs disaggregated by gender showed an average mean response of 3.46 for male employees and 3.13 for female employees, indicating that majority of both sexes were neutral about their feelings regarding their job enrichment.Moreover, the Levine's test from table 4(f) showed no significant difference between employees' feelings about their involvement in decision making processes among the two groups of gender because a post hoc analysis using scheffe test showed no significance difference between any of the two groups taken at a time. This is evidenced by a significance value (probability) for the different items which are all greater than the scheffe alpha value of 0.05. However, the interviews revealed that they were some employees who viewed job enrichment as a punitive measure as the supervisors did not provide guidance and mentoring upon giving them extra work. This was viewed as unfair to the employees as they would experience work overload and yet expected to produce quality results.The findings from theinterview schedule confirm other studies (Nelson, 2001; Purcell et.al., 2003, Pragya, 2008; Mundhra, 2010; Sageer, Rafat&Agarwal, 2012) that established that the key factors affecting job satisfaction were career opportunities, job influence, team work and job challenge.

Table 4(f). A summary of results comparing items on job enrichment scale by gender using a one way ANOVA

One way ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I am given more interesting and challenging work by my supervisors	Between Groups	.240	1	.240	.183	.672
	Within Groups	43.360	33	1.314		

	Total	43.600	34			
I am given the opportunity to complete a whole unit of separate tasks by myself without adverse interference	Between Groups	4.448	1	4.448	2.634	.114
	Within Groups	55.724	33	1.689		
	Total	60.171	34			
I am given the opportunities to test myself on difficult tasks and use my full range of ability	Between Groups	.102	1	.102	.090	.766
	Within Groups	37.441	33	1.135		
	Total	37.543	34			

Q4. What are employees' views about the level of team work in their organisation?

Most of the employees felt that there was no team work within their organisation as they indicated that employees worked independent of each other. This could be so as the employees indicated lack of recognition and involvement in decision making processes. This situation could have an adverse effect on team building. According to Woodcock (1989), he describedteamwork as individuals working together to accomplish more than they could alone, but, more than that, it can be exciting, satisfying and enjoyable. He further observed that indicators of teamwork include the following: meetings where collective skills of a group of people could be utilised while working on common problems or opportunities; supervisors become increasingly isolated from the supervisees. The above assertion has been confirmed by interviewees who indicated that they were barely consulted prior to taking major decisions. These findings support a study by Ogungbamila, Ogungbamila and Adetula (2010) on the effects of team size and work team perception on workplace commitment, who found that employees with positive perceptions of their production work teams were significantly more committed to the workplace than those who held negative perceptions.

For the team work scale, a mean response of 2.87 indicated that most of the employees felt that there was lack of opportunities for team work and also that there was no effective communication within their organisation.However, the modal scores for items 13 and 14

(under the same scale) indicated that majority of employees felt they were given the opportunity to work in groups and also they were social networks available within the organisation. For items 13 to 17 (measuring employees' feelings on the level of teamwork in their organisation), it showed that most of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statements. Additionally, the employees' feelings about lack of opportunities for team work and effective communication within their organisation disaggregated by gender showed an average mean response of 3.17 for male employees and 2.70 for female employees, indicating that majority of females felt that there was lack of teamwork and effective communication within their organisation. However, the results from table 4.5(g) showed that there was no significance difference between employees feelings about the level of team work in the organisation among the two groups of gender because a post hoc analysis using scheffe test showed no significance difference between any of the two groups taken at a time as shown by the significance value for the different items which are all greater than the scheffe alpha value of 0.05.

Table 4(g). A summary of results comparing items on team working scale by gender using a one way ANOVA

One way ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I am given the opportunity to perform my duties in groups or teams	Between Groups	1.276	1	1.276	1.117	.298
	Within Groups	37.696	33	1.142		
	Total	38.971	34			
There are social networks availed to me as a way of building friendships in the organisation	Between Groups	3.606	1	3.606	4.109	.051
	Within Groups	28.965	33	.878		
	Total	32.571	34			

I am provided with opportunities to be multi skilled as a way of making me competent in different jobs	Between Groups	2.557	1	2.557	1.623	.212
	Within Groups	52.014	33	1.576		
	Total	54.571	34			
Communication between sections or divisions of my organisation is effective	Between Groups	.448	1	.448	.379	.543
	Within Groups	39.094	33	1.185		
	Total	39.543	34			
Communication between junior employees and management is effective in my organisation	Between Groups	1.986	1	1.986	1.716	.199
	Within Groups	38.185	33	1.157		
	Total	40.171	34			

5.1 Conclusions

The following conclusions were made based on the findings of this study:

Both male and female employees felt that they were not involved in decision making processes of their organisation. This study has also shown that majority of employees strongly felt they were not recognised for the little efforts made as they execute their duties. Although, the ANOVA revealed no significant gender difference, more female employees felt that they were not recognised compared to their male counterparts who were neutral as to whether or not they felt recognised for their performance in their jobs.

Even though majority of employees felt they were neutral about whether or not they were accorded opportunities for job enrichment, they strongly felt team work was lacking and this situation was unhealthy for the organisational success or attainment of the organisational goals. In view of the above, most of the female employees disagreed with the statements for the following scales: involvement in decision making processes, team work scale and empowerment and responsibilities. A one way ANOVA revealed that there was a

significance difference in the manner in which males and females felt about the level of delegation in the SER, although more males felt that there was minimal delegation of duties and responsibilities.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the above findings the study therefore recommends that:

1. The senior management at SER office should have scheduled meetings for different cadres where employees' views could be taken on board before major decisions are taken, thus strengthening involvement in decision making processes.

2. The senior management should strengthen team work and provide opportunities for mentoring and coaching to enhance collaboration among employees.

3. The senior management at SER should design non-monetary rewards schemes at the disposal of employees for the recognition of employee efforts, talents and skills.

4. The following issues need to be addressed in future studies:

   a. Factors constraining supervisors from employing non-monetary rewards aimed at enhancing employee satisfaction.

   b. The support needed by employees as they execute delegated duties through empowerment and job enrichment.

5. Further research should be done in a larger sample and see whether the findings of this study were consistent with findings elsewhere in the country.

References

Appelbaum, S (2000). An analysis of the utilisation and effectiveness of non-financial incentives in small business.Journal of management. [Online] Available: http://www.EBSCOHOST(February 03, 2016).

Armstrong, M (2009).Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice (11[th]ed). Kogan Page: London.

Aydin, B. and Ceylan, A. (2009). Does organizational learning capacity
impact on organizational effectiveness? Research analysis of the metal industry. Developing and learning in organization. [Online] Available: https://www.academia.edu. (January 17, 2016).

Ballentine, A.(2007). The role of monetary and non-monetary incentives in the workplace as influenced by career stage.[Online] Available: http://www.edis.ifas.ufl.edu(November 20, 2015).

Ballentine, A., Mckenzie, N., Wysocki, A., Kepner, K., Farnsworth, D., & Clark, J.L.
(2003).The Role of Monetary and Non-monetary Incentives in the Workplace as Influenced
        by Career Stage. J. [Online] Available:
        https://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdffiles/HR/HR01600.pdf (January 17, 2016).

Bessel, I., Brad, D., Allen, W & Karl, K. (2002). Understanding Motivation: An effective tool
        for managers" Retrieved on [Online] Available: http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdffiles/HR/
        HRo1700.pdf (December 11, 2015)

Bogoan, C.B. &Biklen, S.K. (1998). Qualitative Research for Education: an introduction to
        theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). Research Design: Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches. Sage
        Publications: London

Dele, A.O., &Adegboyega, O.(2014). Effects of Management Use of Motivation on
        Workers' Job Commitment: An Empirical Investigation of Tertiary Institutions in
        South-Western Nigeria. Global Journal of Commerce & Management
        Perspective.[Online] Available:http://gifre.org/library/upload/volume/8-16-
        Motivation-vol-3-4-gjcmp.pdf (January 12, 2016).

Eskildsen, J.K., &Nussler, M.L. (2000). The managerial drivers of employee satisfaction and
        loyalty. Total Quality Management. [Online] Available:http://
        www.paulgerhardt.com/homework/ employee retention proposal.pdf (January 17,
        2016).

Galinsky, E. (1993). he Changing Workforce. Highlights of the National Study, No.
        1.   [Online] Available:http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED388406 (January 11, 2016).

Gall, M. D., Borg, W.R.,&Gall, J.P. (1996). Educational Research: an Introduction.
        Toronto: Longman Publishers.

Gay, L.R., &Airasian, P. (1996). Educational Research: Competence for analysis and
        application. New Jersey: Prentice- Hall.

Hale, J. (2011). The 3 Basic Types of Descriptive Research Methods. Psych Central. [Online]
        Available: http//psychcentral.com /blog/archives /2011/09/27/the 3- basic- types-of-
        descriptive − research- methods/ (January 11, 2016).

Herzberg, F. (2003). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business
        Review* (January): 87-96.[Online] Available:
        http://maaw.info/ArticleSummaries/ArtSumHerzberg6803.htm (January 05, 2016).

HossainI,M,K., &HossainII,A.(2012). Factors Affecting Employee's Motivation in the Fast

Food Industry: The Case of KFC Uk Ltd. Research Journal of Economics, Business and ICT. [Online] Available:http://www.researchjournals.co.uk (January 12, 2016).

Kelley, R.(2006). American workers' attitudes toward vacation time.Money Magazine and Salary.com.

Khanna (2007).Effects of Non-Financial Rewards on Employees Performance. Anti Essays. [Online] Available:http://www.antiessays.com/free-essays/Effects-Of-Non-Financial-Rewards-On-Employees-33020.html (February 16, 2016)

Kiess, H.O., &Bloomquist, D.W. (1985) Psychological research methods. E Bay city: Allyn and Bacon.

Kohn, A. (1993). Why incentive plans cannot work. Ultimate Rewards. A Harvard Business Review Book, edited by S. Kerr. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press. [Online] Available:http://maaw.info/ArticleSummaries/ArtSumKohn93.htm (January 22, 2016).

Kumar, S.P. (2013). An Empirical study on talent retention strategy by BPO's in India. Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business Copy. [Online} Available:http://journal-archieves35.webs.com/207-219.pdf (Retrieved January 18, 2016).

Low Kim Cheng,P., & Robertson, R.W.(2006). Not for Bread Alone—Motivation Among Hospital Employees in Singapore. Springer Science and Business Media.[Online] Available:http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer (January 12, 2016)

Mayfield, J & Kopf, J. (1998).The effects of leader motivating language on subordinate performance and job satisfaction. Human Resource Management, 37(3&4): 235-48.

McGregor, D. M. (1957).The human side of enterprise. *Management Review* (November): 22-28. Reprinted from the Proceedings of the Fifth Anniversary Convocation of the School of Industrial Management, MIT, April 9, 1957. [Online] Available: http://maaw.info/ArticleSummaries/ArtSumHerzberg6803.htm (January 05, 2016).

Mertens, D.M. (1998). Research methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. New Delhi: Sage Publications, Inc.

Miller (2006). Miller, J. L. (2006). Coach Yourself to Succeed @ Work: How to Achieve Optimal Performance and Job Satisfaction.CA, Dorrance Publishing Co. {Online} Available: http://www.ccsenet.org/journal.html (January 16, 2016).

Motlabaseyo report (2009). Employee Satisfaction Survey for the ministry of Education and Skills Development. Ministry of Education: Gaborone

Mottaz, C.J. (1985). The relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as determinants of work satisfaction. The Sociological Quarterly, Human Resources management, 37(3&4):235-48.

Mundhra, D.D. (2010). Intrinsic Motivational Canvass in the Indian Service Sector: An Empirical Study.The Journal of Business Perspective. {Online} Available:http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer January 12, 2016).

Nelson, B (2001). Factors that encourage or inhibit the Use of Non-monetary Recognition by U.S. Managers, PH.D.Thesis. [Online] Available:www.nelsonmotivation.com (February 28, 2016)

Ogungbamila, B., Ogungbamila, A., &Adetula, G.A. (2010). Effects of Team Size and Work Team Perception on Workplace Commitment: Evidence From 23 Production Teams. Small Group Research. [Online] Available:http://sgr.sagepub.com/content (January 12, 2016).

Purcell, J., Kinnie, K., Hutchinson, S., Rayton, B., & Swart, J., (2003). People Performance: how people Management impacts on organisational performance, CIPD: London.

Pragya, S. (2008). Non-Monetary Rewards: Employee Choices & Organisational Practices. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations. [Online] Available: https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-210171582/non-monetary-rewards-employee-choices-organizational (January 12, 2016).

Reychav, I., & Weisberg, J.(2009). Good for Workers, Good for Companies: How Knowledge Sharing benefits Individual Employees. Knowledge and Process Management. [Online] Available:http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/eds/ pdfviewer(January 12, 2016).

Rose, M (1998). Performance Related Pay in schools: An Assessment of the Green Paper, NUT: London.

Sageer, A., Rafat,S., &Agarwal, P.(2012). Identification of Variables Affecting Employee Satisfaction and Their Impact on the Organization. OSR Journal of Business and Management,. [Online] Available: http:// www.iosrjournals.org www.iosrjournals.org (Retrieved January 11, 2016).

Seifert, K.L. (1991). Educational Psychology (2nd Ed.).Houhton Mifflin Company: Boston.

Warren, M. (2007). Stuff is not enough. Marketing Magazine, 112(11). [Online] Available:http://www.EBSCOHOST (January 10, 2016).

Waytt, W (2000). Strategic rewards survey. Online] Available:

http://www.relojournal.com/current%20Issue/toc.htm (January 13, 2016).

Woodcock, M.(1989). Team building manual (2nd Ed). Gower publishing: Cambridge.