



ROLE OF LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT IN PROMOTING DISCRETIONARY WORK BEHAVIOUR IN THE KENYAN PUBLIC SERVICE

Pongah Meshack Mwandoo*

Dr Wario Guyo*

Professor Romanus Odhiambo*

Abstract: The concept 'discretionary work behavior' has been defined as behavior that attempts to benefit the organization and that goes beyond existing role expectations. The concept has its origin both from behavioral sciences as well as economic conceptualizations. Empirical evidences available have not given a clear explanation of the role of learning and development in promoting discretionary work behavior among employees. This has left a major gap on the influence learning and development has in the promotion of discretionary work behavior in the Kenyan public civil service. This study focused on the role of learning and development in Promoting discretionary work behavior in the Kenyan Public service, with specific reference to the government Ministries in Kenya. Learning and development was the independent variable while employee discretionary behavior was the Independent variable. Employee engagement was considered as well as mediating variable on effect of learning and development on discretionary behavior.

An explanatory research design was used in this study. Explanatory research attempts to build on elaborate theories and add to predictions and principles where possible. The goal of all explanatory research is to answer the question of why. Explanatory research attempts to go above and beyond what exploratory and descriptive research do by identifying the actual reasons a phenomenon occurs. There are many other goals of good scientific exploratory research. They include explaining things in detail and not just reporting. An Explanatory is a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals. The target population of the study was the civil service in Kenya numbering 217,000. The study population was 26,000 employees based at the Nairobi County 18 ministry Headquarters. A sample size of 379 respondents was selected using simple random sampling method since the population was homogeneous. A questionnaire was used to collect primary data while secondary data was gathered through reviews of both theoretical and empirical literatures. Pilot testing was conducted to obtain some assessment of questions validity and the likely reliability of the data. Reliability of the pretest observation schedule was tested using internal consistency technique. The data obtained was analyzed using the qualitative and quantitative analysis.

Key Words: discretionary work behavior, Learning and Development, Engagement

*Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Nairobi, Kenya



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Over the years the public service has continued to render poor quality services to the people due to poor work performance by the employees. The source of the problems of poor work performance and service delivery in the public sector, began at the time of independence in 1963, and emanated particularly from Kenyanization policy (Directorate of Personnel Management (DPM), 2002a,).

The above policy resulted in creation of direct employment of Kenyans, which eventually led to rapid expansion of the civil service and a high wage bill. Over the years the government has not been able to offer competitive remuneration to its employees because of this high wage bill. Although the cost of living continues to rise, the remuneration of the public sector workers has stagnated. To cope with the increasing cost of living, the public servants engage themselves in other economic activities to supplement their income. Most of the economic activities are undertaken during official hours. (Aseka, 2002,)

To curb the problems, in 1993 the government introduced reform programmes aimed at improving work performance and service delivery in the public sector. The first phase of the reform programme focused on staff reduction. During this phase the size of the civil service was significantly reduced by 37%. The second phase of the reform programme focused on rationalization of the civil service to improve performance and productivity. During this phase the government introduced performance management strategies to enhance work performance in the public service. The strategies focused on improving service delivery in ministries/ departments and creating a customer and results-oriented culture in the public service (DPM, 2002). The third phase of the government reforms involved deepening ministerial/departmental rationalization initiatives in which government institutions reviewed their functions, structures and staffing with the aim of enhancing efficiency and productivity. As a result, the number of employees declined from 272,000 in 1991 to 193,000 in 2002 (Ministry of Planning and National Development (MPND), 2003).reform programmes were also aimed at eliminating corruption that had penetrated into the public sector, resulting in misappropriation of government resources and poor service delivery. To fight corruption and restore integrity in the service, the government of Kenya in 2002 launched the Public Service Integrity Programme.



The integrity programme was based on the fact that the Kenyan government recognised the importance of an efficient public sector as a means of enhancing economic growth and prosperity to the nation and to meet the challenges of improving the well being of its people (Directorate of Personnel Management/Anti Corruption Police Unit (DPM/ ACPU, 2002,) According to Aseka (2002), many of the problems in the public service could be attributed to low morale in the service. Generally, it is acknowledged that almost virtually all the unethical practices such as bribery and corruption, patronage, reposition, embezzlement, influence peddling, the use of ones position for self-enrichment, bestowing of favors on relatives and friends, moonlighting, late coming to work, abuse of public property, and the leakage and/or misuse of government information that constitute the lack of accountability in governance currently characterize the country's public service. (Mbai, 2003).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Kenya Vision 2030 envisages a country with adequate, trained, competitive and skilled personnel to help it remain competitive in the global economy. Nonetheless, over the years, the work performance of public sector workers in Kenya has been a major concern to the Kenyan Government, civil society, development partners and the people of Kenya.

The prevailing situation at the work place has been one of low work performance and poor service delivery.

The poor work performance has led to the decline in the growth of the economy from an average GDP growth rate of 2.3 % in the 1990s to 1.1% in 2003 (World Bank , 2003).It is important to note that the public service provides the enabling environment under which the players in the economy are able to operate effectively and efficiently. One of the major problems facing the public sector has been identified as low motivation of workers. According to Chepikilot (2005), the problem indicators include: absenteeism from work stations, low quality work, low productivity, lateness, stealing of government property, corruption, insecurity, laziness, a high rate of complaints by the workers, and high staff turnover among the professional staff.

This echoes further the research by Perry and Porter (1982) that Public sector manager must motivate their employees to perform at the highest level of productivity and effectiveness and get “more for Less” (Perry and Porter, 1982). Employees who are strongly committed to



the organization have stronger intention to remain in the organization than the employees with weak commitment (Allen and Grisaffe, 2001)

The problem is that motivating public employees in Kenya is easier said than done. Public workers have the reputation for being lazy and lethargic (Wilson, 1989, Wright, 2001) and room for maneuvers' is ostensibly very little due to rigid civil-service laws. Moreover the public sector suffers from aging and plateauing employees who are especially hard to motivate (Behn, 1995).

Any organization determined to excel will strive to have competent employees who are satisfied with their jobs and work environment. However, to have a motivated worker means one who is well paid and exhibits discretionary work behavior. Work Motivation is critical to discretionary work effort decision of individuals (steers et.al 2004). Dubinsky and Skinner (2002:2004) questioned why some people voluntarily works hard while others choose not to and what can be done to unleash discretionary effort. High performing firms induce discretionary work effort from their employees (Bennet 1991, Donndly and Skinner, 1989). Robertson Associates (2007:) cites data showing a 54% return on assets from engaged workers, compared with 21% from ambivalent workers and 9% from disengaged workers.

To this end, the government of Kenya has strived to ensure its employees are well remunerated through the establishment of Salaries and Remuneration Commission which has been charged with the responsibility of ensuring public servants are well compensated (GoK, 2013)

However, the high wage bills have not been enough to motivate the public servants. This is because salary is one of the hygiene factors (Hertzeberg 1959) that is a dissatisfier to employees. Emperical evidences (Chepkilot, 2005; Morris, 2009; and Allameh and Asadi, 2011) on discretionary work behavior was only focusing on causes and factors affecting discretion work behavior. However, based on the critical power of motivation which is highly theoretical there is no clear empirical line of theory which explains the role played by organizational reward in promoting discretionary Work behavior. This study, therefore, seeks to examine the role of learning and development in promoting discretionary work behavior in Kenyan Public Service.



1.3 Overall objective

The overall objective of this study is to examine the role of learning and development in promoting employee discretionary work behavior.

1.3.1 Specific Objectives:

Specific objectives will be:

- a) To find out the effect of learning and development on discretionary work behavior in the Kenyan Public Service

1.3.2 Research Question

The following research question will guide this study

- a) Does learning and development significantly influence discretionary work behavior among public service employees?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Employee Discretionary Behaviour

Lloyd (2008) differentiated the concept of discretionary effort from organizational citizenship behavior. According to Lloyd (2008), discretionary effort refers to the extent to which individuals devote intense and persistent exertion into their work. This definition evolved from an article, constructed by Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1984), in which the concept was defined as voluntary effort, exceeding the requirements of a job.

According to Lloyd (2008), both discretionary effort and organizational citizenship behavior represent voluntary and constructive inclinations or acts that cannot be contractually enforced. Nevertheless, in contrast to organizational citizenship behavior, discretionary effort can apply to both core roles and activities that transcend formal responsibilities. Employees can devote this effort to their primary tasks as well as to optional activities, such as helping colleagues.

Employee discretionary work behavior is voluntary, is not recognized explicitly by the official reward system and generally promotes employees functioning at the organization (Wayne and Green 1993). The behavior is not a required task role or job description. This however, signifies the individual's commitment to the organization. Discretionary work behavior provides a means of managing the interdependencies among members of a work unit, which increases the collective outcomes achieved; reduces the need for an organization to devote scarce resources to simple maintenance functions, which frees up resources for



productivity; and improves the ability of others to perform their jobs by freeing up time for more efficient planning, scheduling, problem solving, and so on (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000). Needham says “most individuals are willing to trade their additional effort, at a price; it is not given freely”. This fits with Simard *et al.*'s exchange model (2005). Reciprocity and exchange operate in a climate of mutual trust whereby employees give extra effort in return for non-monetary recognition (Mervyl, 2007)

Discretionary effort and employee engagement are issues for businesses and economies seeking to improve productivity and competitive advantage. Corporate Leadership Council members reported increasing anxiety regarding levels of employee engagement from 2001 to 2004 with more than 70% of members reporting increased concern with what they describe as “spiritual turnover”; “although physically present in the workplace employees may not be deeply engaged in their work”

2.2 Learning and Development

Human Resource Development (HRD) beyond employee training and development consists of all activities involving training career and organization development. It is the deliberate and mindful undertaking of organization and/or individual intended to enhance the skills discretionary work behaviour ability and other attributes of an employee for effectiveness in current job requirements and predicted future challenges. Harrison and Kessels (2004) define HRD as an organizational process including “the skilful planning and facilitation of a variety of formal and informal learning and OCB processes and experiences primarily but not exclusively in the workplace in order that organizational progress and individual potential can be enhanced through the competence adaptability collaboration and OCB-creating activity of all who work for the organization.

Swanson (1995) refers HRD as a process directed to performance improvement by developing and unleashing human expertise through personnel training and development including organization development. HRD also defined as “a set of systematic and planned activities designed by an organization to provide its members with the opportunities to learn necessary skills to meet current and future job demands” Werner and DeSimone (2006).

Werner and DeSimone also considered HRD as a function of HRM. Hence the concept of HRD represents several aspects of development of individuals including their physical



intellectual and emotional facets. In spirit HRD is similar to develop competence commitment and culture Rao (1990).

Human resource managers may tailor training programs that teach teamwork and cooperation or the importance of taking initiative exceeding one's formally prescribed job duties. Such programs will also help build trust among colleagues and utilize cross-training in order to facilitate interpersonal helping. Employees will also learn to be more tolerant of the inconveniences that sometimes arise when another part of the organization is understaffed. Training programs may also elicit discretionary work behavior more indirectly. Two recent studies indicate that training supervisors in organizational justice principles is associated with increased levels of discretionary work behavior among their subordinates Skarlicki D. P. & Latham G. P. (1996) Employees whose supervisors had received justice training were more willing to go beyond the call of duty than employees whose supervisors had not received such training. Thus training designed to improve relationships either among coworkers or between supervisors and subordinates is likely to increase the level of discretionary work within the organization

Learning is the activity or process of gaining Knowledge or skill by studying, practicing, being taught, or experiencing something. Development is the act of growing or causing something to grow or become larger or more advanced. It is the process of creating something over a period of time .It is the state of being created or made advanced.

Human Resource Development (HRD) beyond employee training and development consists of all activities involving training career and organization development. It is the deliberate and mindful undertaking of organization and/or individual intended to enhance the skills discretionary work behavior ability and other attributes of an employee for effectiveness in current job requirements and predicted future challenges

Prior studies have shown that training is critical to organizational success. Training programs help employees to obtain the necessary OCB skills and abilities to work effectively in sustaining and improving current work activities. Well trained employees in general not only require less supervision Gutteridge et al. (1993) but also tend to have higher morale and lower levels of attrition. Training is believed to nullify the influence of factors which cause dissatisfaction of employees at work Xiao (1996). Thus employees may be provided with extensive training programs in multiple functions and training on job skills Ahmad and



Schroeder (2003). In addition to training employees need to be rewarded and provided with appropriate incentives so as to produce the required levels of performance Mohinder et al. (2010) Guest (1997), Lee and Miller (1999). Based on this review the following hypothesis can be formulated

H₀: learning and development significantly influences employee discretionary work behavior among public service employees

.....**Hypothesis 3**

TOTAL REWARDS




Fig 2.1 Conceptual Framework.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

In any study, the research design constitutes the blue print for the collection measurement and analysis of data Kothari (2003). An Explanatory is a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals and was the one employed in this study. The target population of the study is the civil service in Kenya numbering 217,000. The study population will be 26,000 employees based at the Nairobi County 18 ministry Headquarters. A sample size of 379 respondents was be selected using simple random sampling method since the population is homogeneous.A questionnaire will be used to collect primary data while secondary data will be gathered through reviews of both theoretical and empirical literatures. Pilot testing will be conducted to obtain some assessment of questions validity and the likely reliability of the data. Reliability of the pretest observation schedule will be tested using internal consistency technique. The data obtained will be analyzed using the qualitative and quantitative analysis.

3.2 Population

Population refers to an entire group of persons or elements that have at least one thing in common. Population also refers to the larger group from which a sample is taken Orodho



and Kombo, (2002). The target population of this study comprised of the civil servants of the total 18 ministries with a total employees of 217000. However, the population of the study were employees based in the ministry headquarters which comprised of a total of 26000 (DPM 2013).

Discretionary work behaviour is a universal phenomenon expected of everyone so long as he or she is an employee and Ministerial headquarters was regarded as a suitable unit of analysis since this was the segment of the ministry which controls and directs the way the rest of the ministry employees behaved. Thus Discretionary work behaviour was highly relevant at this level prompting the choice of the headquarter employees. A list that contains the employment number of each employee was sourced from the payroll department of each ministry and this was used as a sampling frame.

3.3 Sample and Sampling Technique

In this study, the target population comprised of 18 government ministries with the headquarter staff total to 26000 employees (DPM, 2013), thus with an average 788 employees per ministry. A sample size of 379 respondents was selected using simple random sampling method since the population was homogeneous. This was in accordance with the recommended sample size for a population of 30,000 according to David A Payne, Robert F McMorris (1967) at confidence level of 95%

Therefore, a two stage cluster sampling technique was used for this study. The first stage cluster sampling was randomly selected one ministry was considered as a sub population in the cluster sampling. The second stage sampling used was simple random sampling to select 10% of the average number of employees in the ministry selected at the first stage in order to reduce the vast number of subject into a manageable size. A sample size of 10% is widely supported as adequate by various authors (Patten, 2002; Guy, Harris & Hendricks, 1987; Gay, 2005; Kothari, 2004; Mugenda % Mugenda, 2003).

3.4 Data Collection

According to Creswell (2002) data collection is the means by which information is obtained from the selected subject of an investigation. The study collected both primary and secondary data during the research. Primary data was collected using a questionnaire covering the role of learning and development in promoting discretionary work behaviour. The questionnaire contained both structured and unstructured questions. The open-ended



questions were used to limit the respondents to given variables in which the study was interested while unstructured questions were used in order to give the respondents room to express their views in a more pragmatic manner Kothari (1990).

Secondary data was gathered from existing theoretical and empirical sources that were credible and recognized. The data comprised of materials that were desirable, current, accurate, sufficient and relevant and were collected from Library textbooks Internet and Magazines and personnel files in the organization.

4. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

This study sought to find out the role of Learning and development in promoting discretionary work behaviour in the Kenyan public service. Specifically the study examined the independent variable namely Learning and development and the mediating variable, employee engagement.

4.1 Descriptive Analysis on Learning and development

A majority of the respondents agree to the statement that learning and development promotes team work. This represents 47.9% of the sample. This was followed by 35.5% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the statement. 11.3% were neutral while 4.5% disagreed. Only 3 people, (1%) strongly disagreed with the statement as indicated in table 4.4.1

From table 4.4.1, A good number of the respondents agree to the statement that learning and development enhances individual potential.. This represents 49 % of the sample. This was followed by 39.4% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the statement. 6.5% were neutral while 3.8% disagreed. Only 1.4% strongly disagreed with the statement.

A majority of the respondents agree to the statement that learning and development enhances competence adaptability. This represents 44.2 % of the sample. This was followed by 42.1% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the statement. 9.9% were neutral while 3.1% disagreed. Only 0.7% strongly disagreed with the statement as shown in table 4.4.1.

From the table 4.4.1 a greater percentage of the respondents agree to the statement that learning and development enhances competence commitment. This represents 44.9 % of the sample. This was followed by 36.3% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the



statement. 4.1% were neutral while 4.1% disagreed. Only 1.4% strongly disagreed with the statement.

A majority of the respondents agree to the statement that learning and development enhances organizational culture. This represents 45.9 % of the sample. This was followed by 28.1% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the statement. 16.4% were neutral while 6.8% disagreed. Only 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement as shown in table 4.4.1

From the table 4.4.1 many respondents agree to the statement that learning and development promotes cooperation among employees. This represents 42.1% of the sample. This was followed by 29.8% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the statement. 17.1% were neutral while 7.9% disagreed. Only 3.1% strongly disagreed with the statement.

From the table 4.4.1 a good number of the respondents agree to the statement that learning and development enhances going beyond ones duties in the organization. This represents 36.3 % of the sample. This was followed by 25.3% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the statement. 24.0% were neutral while 10.6% disagreed. Only 3.8% strongly disagreed with the statement.

From the table 4.4.1 majority of the respondents agree to the statement that learning and development promotes trust among employees. This represents 38.7 % of the sample. This was followed by 17.1% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the statement. 26.0% were neutral while 15.4% disagreed. Only 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement.

From the table 4.4.1 , a greater majority of the respondents agree to the statement that learning and development enhances interpersonal helping. This represents 39.0 % of the sample. This was followed by 21.6% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the statement. 23.3% were neutral while 2.1% disagreed. Only 1.4% strongly disagreed with the statement.

From the table 4.4.1, there was no inclination towards a particular score, since the scores were almost equally scored .A high percentage of the respondents disagreed to the statement thatthe ministry yearly conducts training needs assessment every year. Those who disagreed represents 26.7 % of the sample. This was followed by 20.2% of the respondents who strongly disagreed to the statement. 19.2% were neutral while 24.7% agreed. Only 9.2% strongly agreed with the statement.



From the table 4.4.1, a large number of the respondents disagreed to the statement that ministry employees are frequently trained in the public service. This represents 30.1 % of the sample. This was followed by 20.9% of the respondents who strongly disagreed to the statement. 19.9 were neutral while 19.2 agreed. Only 9.9% strongly agreed with the statement.

From the table a greater percentage of the respondents agreed to the statement that the training is relevant to the work they do. This represents 37 % of the sample. This was followed by 18.2% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the statement. 25.7 were neutral while 7.9 disagreed. Only 11.3% strongly disagreed with the statement.

From the table 4.4.1 a higher percentage of the respondents agreed to the statement that current training policies and practices promote discretionary work behavior in employees.. This represents 29.5 % of the sample. This was followed by 8.9% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the statement. 31.2% were neutral while 18.5% disagreed. Only 12.0% strongly disagreed with the statement.

From the table 4.4.1, high percentage of the respondents agrees to the statement that management encourages self-development. This represents 34.2 % of the sample. This was followed by 16.8% of the respondents who strongly agreed to the statement. 18.8% were neutral while 16.8% disagreed. Only 13.4% strongly disagreed with the statement.

The results agrees with results of two recent studies done by Skarlicki D. P. & Latham G. P. (1996) which indicated that training supervisors in organizational justice principles is associated with increased levels of discretionary work behavior among their subordinates. Employees whose supervisors had received justice training were more willing to go beyond the call of duty than employees whose supervisors had not received such training. Empirical evidence emphasizes that Human resource managers may tailor training programs that teach teamwork and cooperation or the importance of taking initiative exceeding one's formally prescribed job duties. Such programs will also help build trust among colleagues and utilize cross-training in order to facilitate interpersonal helping. Employees will also learn to be more tolerant of the inconveniences that sometimes arise when another part of the organization is understaffed. Training programs may also elicit discretionary work behavior more indirectly.



4.2: Requisite Tests

4.2.1 Principal Component Analysis, Reliability and Construct Validity

The study's construct measures were initially purified using exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and tested for reliability analysis using SPSS 21. The raw measures were purified and tested for validity and reliability by running a series of tests. The initial assessment was the unidimensionality of measures. Exploratory factor analysis was performed to assess construct unidimensional scales and identify the structure of the measurement or outer model for the items in the study. Exploratory factor analysis was performed to achieve measure purification and refine the variables into the most effective number of factors. Reliability analysis was then conducted.

Each of the constructs was refined by utilising principal component analysis on the initial items comprising each construct. Each principal component analysis extracted factors, and factor loadings greater than 0.5 were retained for each principal component extracted (Hair *et al.*, 2010). To assess the factorability of items, the researcher examined three indicators (i.e. Kaiser Meyer-Olin Measure of Sampling Adequacy, Barlett's Test of Sphericity and communalities). For every EFA, it was found that manifest variables have KMO Measures of Sampling Adequacy above 0.843, which is above the threshold of 0.6 (Kaiser, 1974), as well as p values for Barlett's test of Sphericity (Barlett, 1954) below 0.05. Communalities were also found well above 0.4 suggesting satisfactory factorability for all items. When applying EFA, the results showed a clear factor structure with an acceptable level of cross loadings.

Additionally, the reliability and internal consistency of the items constituting each construct was estimated. Scale refinement was assessed using item to total correlations analysis, with indicators with an item to total correlation threshold of 0.3 and higher being maintained for further analysis (Hair *et al.*, 2006). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was then performed using SmartPLS software for measurement model estimation. The purpose of CFA was to establish the extent to which the observed data validated and fit the pre-specified theoretically based model. Below are the synopses of scale purification for each construct.

Bartlett's test

Bartlett's test is an indication of a strong among variables. The null hypothesis tested is that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix, which tells us that there is no correlation among the variables. From the table, the Bartlett's test has a significant value of 0.000 which is less



than 0.005. The null hypothesis is thus rejected thus the correlation matrix is not an identity. We thus conclude that there is a strong relationship among the variables. Hence the data is sufficient for application of factor analysis.

4.2.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to assess the convergent validity of the constructs. Convergent validity was assessed using the value of standard loadings of the indicators for the underlying construct. The scores are to be statistically significant and above 0.5 (Nunnally, 1978).

The CFA results of item loadings and their respective t-values are reported in Table 4.13. The items were significantly loaded on the proposed factors with loading higher than 0.5.

Convergent validity was also assessed using average variance extracted (AVE). The AVE of all constructs were above the 0.5 threshold indicating that the latent constructs account for at least fifty percent of the variance in the items. This indicates that the measurement scales exhibited adequate measurement validity (Hair *et al.*, 2006).

The third objective was to find out the whether learning and development promotes discretionary work behavior among of employees.




Figure 4.13 Path Coefficient of learning and development on discretionary work behavior



Figure 4.14 Path Coefficient of learning and development on discretionary work behavior


T- statistics and development had a positive statistically and significant relationship with discretionary work behavior at the 0.05 level of significance ($\beta=0.329$, $t\text{-value}=5.497$, $p\text{-value}=0.0000$).

Ho: Learning and development is not significant in Explaining discretionary Work behavior

Ha: Learning and development is significant in explaining Discretionary work behavior.

The Coefficient of Learning and development is 0.329 .This means that one unit increase in Learning and development results into 32.9 percent increase in discretionary behavior

The T- value of this Coefficient is 5.497 which is greater than 1.96,still $p\text{-value} < 0.05$,so the null hypothesis is rejected and hence we conclude that Learning and development pay is significant In explaining Discretionary work behavior.





The Coefficient of work employee engagement is 0.186 .This means that one unit increase in employee engagement results into 18.6 percent increase in discretionary behavior

The T- value of this Coefficient is 2.10 which is greater than 1.96,still p-value< 0.05,so the null hypothesis is rejected and hence we conclude that employee engagement is significant In explaining Discretionary work behaviour

4.3 Inferential Analysis

Correlations of the Study Variables

Correlation among the independent variables is illustrated by the correlations matrix in table 4.3. Correlation is often used to explore the relationship among a group of variables (Pallant, 2010), in turn helping in testing for multicollinearity. That the correlation values are not close to 1 or -1 is an indication that the factors are sufficiently different measures of separate variables (Farndale, Hope-Hailey &Kelliher, 2010). It is also an indication that the variables are not multicollinear. Absence of multicollinearity allows the study to utilize all the independent variables.

4.3.1 Correlation for Discretionary Work Behavior

Correlation was used to analyze the degree of relationship between discretionary work behavior and the other variables in the study. Table 4.17 shows the degree and significance of the relationship between the variables, as measured by Pearson Correlation statistic and p-value, respectively.

The table on correlations shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between Learning and Development and Discretionary Work Behavior. This is because the value of Pearson correlation coefficient was 0.316 and the significant value was 0.000. This means that 31.6% of Learning and Development can be explained by Discretionary Work Behavior. As Discretionary Work Behavior increases it leads to an increase in Learning and Development.

The results agree with results of Applebaum et al (2000) research results that ‘plant managers who invest in the skills of front-line workers and include these workers in decision-making activities elicit discretionary effort by employees. This effort increases operating efficiency and competitive advantage’ (Applebaum et al 2000:235). Discretionary effort was also central to MacDuffie’s analysis in the motor vehicle industry (1995).



5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of Findings

Empirical literature indicated that discretionary work behaviour is an area influenced by a number of factors. Over the years, performance in the Public sector has been wanting. The study examined a total population of 26000 in the Kenyan public service. A probability random sampling approach was used to select 379 officers.

5.2.3. Learning and development

To what extent does learning and development lead to discretionary work behavior among public service employees?

The study found out that there is a high correlation between discretionary work behaviour and learning and development. The Coefficient of Learning and development is 0.329 .This means that one unit increase in Learning and development results into 32.9 percent increase in discretionary behavior

As evident from the graph, high scores of learning and development are associated with high scores of discretionary work behaviour. Therefore workers who are continuously trained and learn will exhibit discretionary work behaviour. Training supervisors in organizational justice principles is associated with increased levels of discretionary work behavior among their subordinates (Skarlicki D. P. & Latham G. P,1996)

5.3 Conclusion

Based on the research findings it is possible to conclude that public servants can exhibit discretionary work behavior and thus satisfy the expectations of the public. Most public servants are not well remunerated, thus the motivation is quite low. The work environment is poor, employee benefits are insufficient, learning and development opportunities are scarce. This can be changed if workers are properly motivated through paying them competitive pay, giving them excellent working environment, providing learning and development opportunities fairly and equitably and improving Employee benefits (like paid vacation, health insurance and others).This will ensure employees exhibit discretionary work behavior which will enhance high productivity of the workers. The Public servants should also change their work attitude to enhance high levels of productivity.



5.4 Recommendations

The study justifies that when workers are provided with continuous opportunities of learning and development, it is very possible to have public servants exhibiting discretionary work behavior. The attitude towards public servants will be a positive one. The government of Kenya, other organizations, other scholars and policy makers, all stake holders and the international community, should pay attention to the following that contribute to discretionary work behavior in the public service:

Learning and Development

Training of public servants on the ills of corruption will rid the force of the vice, will improve the delivery of service as they become more efficient and highly motivated. Public servant employees should be trained on values of teamwork. Learning and development programmes should promote skills progress among employees to enhance discretionary work behavior which is instrumental in enhancing employees' potential, competence adaptability, and competence commitment. It enhances cooperation among employees, promotes interpersonal helping. improves relationships between colleagues and between supervisors and subordinates. It promotes trust as well among employees and supervisors and management.

5.5 Areas of Further Research

Due to constraints given in the first chapter, this chapter could not exhaust all the factors that contribute to discretionary work behavior. Factors like attitude were not considered in determining to what extent they determine discretionary work behavior of employees. The study concentrated on Public servants in Nairobi County. Other employees of other organizations could be interviewed as well to determine whether learning and development or which other factors contribute to discretionary work behavior. Other mediating factors apart from engagement should be researched on as well.

REFERENCES

1. Aven, F. F., Parker, B., & McEvoy, J. H. (1993). Gender and attitudinal commitment to organizations—A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 26, 63-73.
2. Borman, W. C., & Penner, L. (2001). Citizenship performance. In B.W. Roberts & R. Hogan (Eds.), *Personality psychology in the workplace: Decade of behavior* (pp. 45-61). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.



3. Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 279–307.
4. Bushman, B. J., Baumeister, R. F., & Phillips, C. M. (2001). Do people aggress to improve their mood? Catharsis beliefs, affect regulation opportunity, and aggressive responding of *Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 17-32.
5. Busso, L. (2004). *The relationship between emotional intelligence and contextual performance as influenced by job satisfaction and locus of control orientation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: Alliant International University.
6. Campbell, J. P. (1990a). An overview of the Army Selection and Classification Project (Project A). *Personnel Psychology, 43*, 231-239.
7. Charles, M., & Bradley, K. (2002). Equal but separate? A cross-national study of sex segregation in higher education. *American Sociological Review, 67*, 573-599.
8. Charles, M., & Bradley, K. (2009). Indulging our gendered selves? Sex segregation by field of study in 44 countries. *American Journal of Sociology, 114*, 924-976.
9. Dalal, R. S., Sims, C. S., & Spencer, S. (2003, April). The structure of behavior at work. In D. E. (Chair), *New frontiers in job satisfaction, job performance, and their linkages*. Symposium conducted at the 18th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.
10. Dalton, D., & Mesch, D. (1991). On the extent and reduction of avoidable absenteeism: An assessment of absence policy provisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 810-817.
11. Day, A. L., & Carroll, S. A. (2004). Using an ability-based measure of emotional intelligence to predict individual performance, group performance, and group citizenship behaviours. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 1443-1458.
12. D. L., Bennett, L., & Russell, C. J. (1997). Using hierarchical linear modeling to examine dynamic performance criteria over time. *Journal of Management, 23*, 745-757.
13. Diefendorff, J. M., & Richard, E. M. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of emotional display perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 284-294.



14. George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 698-709.
15. Glomb, T. M., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Rotundo, M. (2004). Emotional labor demands and compensating wage differentials. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 700-714.
16. Glomb, T. M. & Tews, M. J. (2004). Emotional labor: A conceptualization and scale development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 1-23.
17. Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*, 283-308.
18. F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe*, Vol. 7 (pp. 7-28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
19. Felstead, A., Gallie, D., & Green, F. (2002). *Work skills in Britain 1986-2001*. Canterbury, UK: University of Kent.
20. Graen, G. B., Novak, M. A., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 30*, 109-131.
21. Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multilevel multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*, 219-247.
22. Greenberg, J. (1997). The STEAL motive: Managing the social determinants of employee theft. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.) *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 85-108). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
23. Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology, 2*, 271-299.
24. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
25. Hult, C. (2008). Gender, culture and non-financial employment commitment in Great Britain and Sweden. *European Societies, 10*, 73-96.
26. Hult, C., & Svallfors, S. (2002). Production regimes and work orientations: A comparison of six western countries. *European Sociological Review, 18*, 315-331.



27. Jacobs, J., & Steinberg, R. (1990). Compensating differentials and the male-female wage gap: Evidence from the New York state comparable worth study. *Social Forces*, 69, 439-68.
28. Kersley, B., Alpin, C., Forth, J., Bryson, A., Bewley, H., Dix, G., et al. (2006). *Inside the workplace: Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*. London: Routledge.
29. Lincoln, J. R., & Kalleberg, A. L. (1996). Commitment, quits, and work organization in Japanese and US plants. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 50, 39-59.
30. Loscocco, K. A. (1990). Reactions to blue-collar work: A comparison of women and men. *Work and Occupations*, 17, 152-177.
31. Loscocco, K., & Spitze, G. (2007). Gender patterns in provider role attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28, 934-954.
32. Maume, D. J. (2006a). Gender differences in restricting work efforts because of family responsibilities. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 859-869.
33. Maume, D. J. (2006b). Gender differences in taking vacation time. *Work and Occupations*, 33, 161-190.
34. Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.
35. Mayer, R. C., & Gavin, M. B. (2005). Trust in management and performance: Who minds the shop while the employees watch the boss? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 874-888.
36. McGehee, W., & Owen, E. B. (1940). Authorized and unauthorized rest pauses in clerical work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 24, 605-614.
37. Melamed, S., Kushnir, T., & Shirom, A. (1992). Burnout and risk factors for cardiovascular disease. *Behavioral Medicine*, 18, 53-60.
38. Miller, N. E. (1941). The frustration-aggression hypothesis. *Psychological Review*, 48, 337-342.
39. Miner, A. G. (2001). *Experience sampling events, moods, behaviors, and performance at work*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.



40. Miner, A. G., Glomb, T. M., & Liao, H. (2002). Structure of work withdrawal and organizational citizenship over time. In A. Miner (Chair), *Modeling organizational behavior over time: Experience sampling and longitudinal research*. Symposium conducted at the 62nd annual meeting of the Academy of Management. Denver, CO.
41. Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1543–1567.
42. Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 475-480.
43. Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 247–259.
44. Murphy, K. R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
45. Nesselroade, J. R. (2004). Yes, it is time: Commentary on Molenaar's manifesto. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*, 2, 227-230.78
46. Neuman, J. H. & Baron, R. A. (1997). Aggression in the workplace. In R. A. Giacalone & J. (Eds.) *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 37-67). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
47. O'Connell, K. A., Gerkovich, M. M., Cook, M. R., Shiffman, S., Hickcox, M., & Kakolewski, K. E., (1998). Coping in real time: Using ecological momentary assessment techniques to assess coping with the urge to smoke. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 21, 487-97.
48. Organ, D. W. (1977). A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 2, 46-53.
49. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
50. Paap, K. (2006). *Working construction: Why White working-class men put themselves—and the labor movement—in harm's way*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.



51. Padavic, I., & Reskin, B. F. (2002). *Women and men at work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Forge Press.
52. Parker, S., Wall, T. D., & Jackson, P. R. (1997). "That's not my job": Developing flexible employee work orientations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 899-929.
53. Patton, E., & Johns, G. (2007). Women's absenteeism in the popular press: Evidence for a gender-specific absence culture. *Human Relations*, 60, 1579-1612.
54. Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The role of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443.
55. Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1996). Increasing citizenship behavior within a labor union: A test of organizational justice theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 161-169.
56. Smith, C. A., Organ, D., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
57. Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and practice behavior: A new look at the interface between nonwork and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 518-528.
58. Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 269-292.
59. Spector, P. G. (1997). The role of frustration in antisocial behavior at work. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.) *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, : Sage Publications.
60. Speier, C., Valacich, J. S., & Vessey, I. (1999). The influence of task interruption on individual making: An information overload perspective. *Decision Sciences*, 30, 337-360.
61. Tepper, B. J., Lockhart, D., & Hoobler, J. (2001). Justice, citizenship, and role definition effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 789-796.



62. Totterdell, P., Reynolds, S., Parkinson, B., & Briner, R. B. (1994). Associations of sleep with everyday mood, minor symptoms and social interaction experience. *Journal of Sleep Research & Sleep Medicine*, 17, 466-475.81
63. Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 525-531.
64. Van Scotter, J. R., Motowidlo, S. J., & Cross, T. C. (2000). Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 526-535.
65. Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehavior in organizations: Theory, research, and management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Table 4.4 Table 4.8 Bartlett's Test

Sampling adequacy tests		Values
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3202.778
	Df	406
	Sig.	.000

Table 4.20 Correlation for Learning and Development

		Discretionary Work Behavior	Competitive Pay	Employee Benefits	Learning and Development	Work Environment
Learning and Development	Pearson Correlation	0.316	0.345	0.191	1	0.241
	Sig. Value		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	282	282	282	282	282

Table 4.17 Correlation for Discretionary Work Behavior

		Discretionary Work Behavior	Competitive Pay	Employee Benefits	Learning and Development	Work Environment	Employee Engagement
Discretionary Work Behavior	Pearson Correlation	1	0.437	0.174	0.316	0.181	0.373
	Sig. Value		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	282	282	282	282	282	282



Table 4.4.1: Responses on Learning and Development

Learning and Development	SD	D	N	A	SA
LD promotes team work	3(1.0%)	13(4.5%)	33(11.3%)	140(47.9%)	103(35.3%)
LD promotes skills progress	2(0.7%)	8(2.7%)	14(4.8%)	143(49.0%)	125(42.8%)
LD enhances individual progress	4(1.4%)	11(3.8%)	19(6.5%)	143(49.0%)	115(39.4%)
LD enhances competence adaptability	2(0.7%)	9(3.1%)	29(9.9%)	129(44.2%)	123(42.1%)
LD enhances competence committment	4(1.4%)	12(4.1%)	39(13.4%)	131(44.9%)	106(36.3%)
LD enhances organizational culture	8(2.7%)	20(6.8%)	48(16.4%)	134(45.9%)	82(28.1%)
LD promotes cooperation	9(3.1%)	23(7.9%)	50(17.1%)	123(42.1%)	87(29.8%)
LD promotes going beyond	11(3.8%)	31(10.6%)	70(24.0%)	106(36.3%)	74(25.3%)
LD promotes trust	8(2.7%)	45(15.4%)	76(26.0%)	113(38.7%)	50(17.1%)
LD promotes interpersonal helping	6(2.1%)	41(14.0%)	68(23.3%)	114(39.0%)	63(21.6%)
Your ministry conducts a training needs assessment every year	59(20.2%)	78(26.7%)	56(19.2%)	72(24.7%)	27(9.2%)
Employees are trained in the Ministry frequently	61(20.9%)	88(30.1%)	58(19.9%)	56(19.2%)	29(9.9%)
The training is relevant to the work of employees	33(11.3%)	23(7.9%)	75(25.7%)	108(37.0%)	53(18.2%)
The current training policies and practices promote going beyond ones prescribed duties among the employees	35(12.0%)	54(18.5%)	91(31.2%)	86(29.5%)	26(8.9%)
The management encourage employee self-development	39(13.4%)	49(16.8%)	55(18.8%)	100(34.2%)	49(16.8%)

Regression Analysis

$$Y_s = \beta_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_4X_4 + B_5M_5 + \varepsilon \dots \dots \dots \text{Equation1}$$

Where

Ys = Discretionary Work Behavior

β_0 = constant (coefficient of intercept)

X_1 = Pay X_2 = Employee benefits X_3 = Learning and Development X_4 = Work environment

M₁ = Employee engagement

$B_1\beta_1 \dots B_5\beta_0$ = regression coefficient of five variables

ε = Error



Model Summary

Model 1: The model explains 32.5 per cent of Discretionary work behavior using four predictors i.e Competitive Pay, employee benefits, workenvironment, learning and development.

Model 2: The model explains 33.5percent of Discretionary work behavior using the four predictors and the Mediating Variable. The adjusted R squared increases from 31.5 to 32.3 percent implying that employee engagement is significant in explaining Discretionary Work behavior.

Table 4.26 Model Summary

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.570 ^a	.325	.315	.70770	.325	31.415	4	261	.000
2	.579 ^b	.335	.323	.70357	.010	4.069	1	260	.045
a. Predictors: (Constant), WE, CP, EB, LD									
b. Predictors: (Constant), WE, CP, EB, LD, EE									
ANOVA									
Ho: Variables are not jointly significant in explaining discretionary work behavior									
Ha: Variables are jointly significant in in explaining discretionary work behavoiur.									
From Model 1,P- value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05,so the null hypothesis is rejected and hence variables are jointly significant in explaining discretionary work behavior.									

Table 4.27 ANOVA^a

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	62.936	4	15.734	31.415	.000 ^b
	Residual	130.719	261	.501		
	Total	193.655	265			
2	Regression	64.951	5	12.990	26.242	.000 ^c
	Residual	128.705	260	.495		
	Total	193.655	265			
a. Dependent Variable: DWB						
b. Predictors: (Constant), WE, CP, EB, LD						
c. Predictors: (Constant), WE, CP, EB, LD, EE						



Table 4.28 Coefficients^a

Unstandardised and standardized Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.103	.043		2.379	.018
	CP	.338	.051	.373	6.698	.000
	EB	.104	.047	.122	2.222	.027
	LD	.230	.048	.271	4.803	.000
	WE	-.014	.049	-.016	-.284	.777
2	(Constant)	.101	.043		2.339	.020
	CP	.310	.052	.342	5.945	.000
	EB	.101	.046	.119	2.175	.031
	LD	.200	.050	.235	4.011	.000
	WE	-.048	.051	-.056	-.934	.351
	EE	.113	.056	.129	2.017	.045

a. Dependent Variable: DWB

$$Y_s = 0.101 + .310X_1 + .101X_2 + .200X_3 - .048X_4 + .113M_5 + \varepsilon$$

Pay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base Pay • Contingency Pay • Cash bonuses • Long term Incentives • Share Portions and profit sharing 	Benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pensions • Holidays • Company cars • Vacation Pay • Other Perks
Learning and Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work place Learning • Training • Career development 	Work environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisational values • Employee Voices • Recognition • Achievement • Job design and development(jobs that are challenging and provide a sense of achievement, Quality of working life, Work life balance)



Fig 2.3.A Model for Total Reward

Table 4.6.1: Employee engagement

Employee Engagement	SD	D	N	A	SA
Employee engagement promotes improved performance	13(4.5%)	11(3.8%)	26(8.9%)	154(52.7%)	88(30.1%)
Employee engagement promotes retention	9(3.1%)	31(10.6%)	57(19.5%)	136(46.6%)	59(20.2%)
Inspiration and motivation leads to employees showing extra work effort	11(3.8%)	13(4.5%)	28(9.6%)	136(46.6%)	104(35.6%)
Emotional commitment to ones job leads to employees showing extra work effort	14(4.8%)	17(5.8%)	55(18.8%)	136(46.6%)	70(24.0%)
I am satisfied with the way my supervisor treats me	26(8.9%)	46(15.8%)	86(29.5%)	99(33.9%)	35(12.0%)
employees are satisfied with the level of job security in their organization	31(10.6%)	42(14.4%)	77(26.4%)	99(33.9%)	43(14.7%)

4.7 Descriptive Analysis on discretionary work behavior.

Table 4.7.1: Discretionary Work Behavior

Discretionary Work Behavior	SD	D	N	A	SA
workers who show extra effort beyond what is expected, have autonomy	28(9.6%)	40(13.7%)	69(23.6%)	104(35.6%)	51(17.5%)
workers who show extra effort beyond what is expected, are loyal	16(5.5%)	19(6.5%)	65(22.3%)	122(41.8%)	70(24.0%)
workers who show extra effort beyond what is expected, overcome obstacles	25(8.6%)	28(9.6%)	49(16.8%)	113(38.7%)	77(26.4%)
workers who show extra effort beyond what is expected, have adaptivity	22(7.5%)	21(7.2%)	28(9.6%)	95(32.5%)	126(43.2%)
workers who show extra effort beyond what is expected, have proficiency	41(14.0%)	63(21.6%)	96(32.9%)	62(21.2%)	30(10.3%)