

Employee Report -Tunisia

English Version

The total number of employees in the municipality was 70. There were 31 female and 29 male employees aged between 23 and 60. The majority of employees were school graduates. When testing for linearity, normality and reliability tests data can be assumed normally distributed with two isolated incidences where data did not achieve normality.

Table1: The demographic characteristics of the employees (n=70)

Factor		n (%)	Missing data
Sex	Male	29 (41.4%)	10 (14.3%)
	Female	31 (44.3%)	
Age (Mean= 40.56 Y/O, SD= 9.2 Years, Range 23-60 years)	23-30	7 (10%)	6 (8.6%)
	31-40	32 (45.7%)	
	41-50	13 (18.6%)	
	50-60	12 (17.1%)	
Academic degree	School	19 (27.1%)	20 (28.6%)
	Diploma	1 (1.4%)	
	Baccalaureate	5 (7.1%)	
	Master	4 (5.7%)	
	PhD	1 (1.4%)	
	Others (Technical School)	20 (28.6%)	

The study questionnaire included 60 items, and examined three main themes (concepts): employee satisfaction (11 items); service delivery efficiency (34 items); and fund opportunity (15 items). The values of the internal consistency indicate that the whole questionnaire (scale) and its concepts (subscales) have achieved reasonably high reliability values. The only exception, however, was for the employee satisfaction which achieved a lower internal consistency value (Table 2). Generally, these results indicate that this questionnaire measures what it was originally structured to measure. The response on the scale items range was as follows: 0=Never, 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Always. Therefore, the range of the

concepts was as follows: employee satisfaction 0-44; service delivery efficiency 0-136; and fund opportunity 0-60.

The first theme, employee satisfaction, the mean was almost at the midpoint of the score range of the theme (mean score 29.6, SD 6.43). **The midpoint here shows that the respondent has an ambivalent feeling toward the item s/he responded to. Therefore, it can be said that this individual neither supports nor discourages the idea reflected in the item or the theme. Once negative feeling or perceived practices are assumed by the individual, then the score is expected to fall below the midpoint, and the vice versa occurs when the score is above the midpoint.**

This result indicates the presence of a high level of satisfaction among employees (Table 2). The lowest item on the subscale is “I’m willing to participate in voluntary activities outside my official work time”, and the general impression obtained from the responses is that employees are not willing to engage in community-based voluntary work. This result has been supported by employees’ highest response on the item “I feel exhausted towards the end of my day at work”, which might further emphasize decreased impetus to work in general.

Table 2: Employee responses on the items of the employee satisfaction subscale

	Factor/Items	Mean	SD
	Employee satisfaction* α .687, 11 items	29.63	6.43
1	I’m happy at work	2.06	1.19
2	I like to come to work	2.94	1.08
3	I feel energetic when coming to work (in the morning)	2.75	1.24
4	I feel exhausted towards the end of my day at work	3.07	1.00
5	I feel drained by the end of the work week	2.96	1.19
6	I feel that I’m secured in my current post	1.87	1.52
7	My manager supports me	2.62	1.31
8	My colleagues respect me	3.37	.89
9	I’m willing to participate in voluntary activities outside my official work time	1.85	1.35
10	I share information concerning my work when transferring or leaving my current work (I do not conceal or destroy information)	2.97	1.21
11	My loyalty increases as I participate in the decision-making process at the municipality	2.80	1.41

*Valid data were 68.6% (n=48), and 31.4% (n=22) of cases were excluded because of missing data

On the second subscale, service delivery efficiency, the mean score is 7.08 (SD 22.54). This mean score is low but higher than the midpoint of 68 out of 136 (Table 3). Interestingly, the lowest scoring items were mostly addressing issues of communicating news and issues concerning work at the municipality. In particular the item “I receive frequent updates on the municipalities work and projects (funded or not) through newsletter” was at the top of this low-scoring items. This result reflects a major concern to the flow of information about the municipality as suggested by the employees.

Table 3: Employee responses on the items of the service delivery efficiency subscale

Factor/Items	Mean	SD
Service delivery efficiency α .929, 34 items	73.08	22.54
1. I have to postpone work to next day due to high workload	1.81	1.26
2. My relationship with my colleagues is helpful	3.13	.94
3. My colleagues ask me when they need an advice	2.60	1.13
4. My colleagues trust my decisions at work	2.95	1.02
5. I know what is my job description	3.03	1.27
6. I finish my job on time without delay	3.15	.94
7. My colleagues help me finish my work	2.21	1.33
8. My colleagues listen to my suggestions to improve work	2.32	1.20
9. I listen to suggestions by my colleagues to improve my performance	2.88	1.05
10. My colleagues listen to what I have to say about work	2.58	1.18
11. Managers play key role in resolving conflicts	2.56	1.35
12. Managers listen to my suggestions to improve work	2.31	1.36
13. I know who to ask for a help	2.91	1.19
14. I know when to ask for a help	3.19	1.10
15. My weak and strong points in the appraisal are explained to me	1.95	1.51
16. Annual appraisal process is clear to me	2.37	1.38
17. I'm clear about my work	3.51	.83
18. New employees (or transferred ones) receive orientation to the new workplace	2.24	1.33
19. We discuss issues and concerns related to in order to find solutions work within the department	2.28	1.34
20. Information about the municipality plans and projects is available	1.70	1.23
21. There is a clear flow of orders at my work (I have one boss to listen to)	1.62	1.18
22. We have clear flow of information (concerning rules and regulations)	2.43	1.32
23. I participate in the decisions made in my department	1.90	1.41
24. I'm aware of the changes in the municipality concerning the plans and programs	1.43	1.29
25. Signage at work guide clients clearly	1.87	1.24

26. Signage at work are adequate	1.62	1.23
27. Signage at work are self explanatory	1.59	1.127
28. I receive frequent updates on the municipalities work and projects (funded or not) through newsletter	.61	1.00
29. I receive frequent updates on the municipalities work and projects (funded or not) through advertisements	1.07	1.11
30. I receive frequent updates on the municipalities work and projects (funded or not) through periodic meetings	1.29	1.26
31. I receive frequent updates on the municipalities work and projects (funded or not) through the social media	1.69	1.51
32. I participate in the making the general policies at the municipality	1.83	1.40
33. Making complaints or suggestions is flexible at work	2.18	1.27
34. Making complaints or suggestions is effective in improving work	2.08	1.33

Fund opportunity subscale addresses the information available to employees concerning funding sources to project at the municipality. This subscale achieved a mean score of 20.08 (SD 16.36). This mean score is just below the midpoint, which further indicates that information about funding, fund resources, methods to obtain and participate in funded projects. Although available, but not necessarily known to employees (Table 4).

Table 4: Employee responses on the items of the fund opportunity subscale

Factor/Items	Mean	SD
Funding opportunities α .949, 15 items	20.08	16.36
1. I know who provides fund to sponsored projects at the municipality	1.57	1.46
2. I know how funded projects at my municipality are directed and run	1.21	1.29
3. I know whom to address in order to obtain a fund to my municipality	1.51	1.44
4. I can assist in obtaining an external fund to my municipality	.89	1.34
5. I know about a funded project called MINARET	1.11	1.55
6. I know that SIDA is funding partner for MINARET	1.15	1.62
7. I know MINARET partners	.99	1.53
8. I know what are the objectives of MINARET	.99	1.52
9. I Know the countries involved in the MINARET project	.92	1.44
10. I know about the funded projects at the municipality	1.05	1.30
11. I participate in the funded projects at the municipality	.59	1.04
12. I receive information about projects (new and current) on time	1.28	1.24
13. Fundraising requires skills and resources	1.88	1.52
14. Fundraising is legal and healthy	2.66	1.59
15. I know how to apply to new projects aiming at developing my department	1.13	1.29

The main limitation observed from the results in this study was concerned with providing adequate information concerning the new issues at the municipality, the funding resources and

funding bodies. In addition, participation in the decision-making and policy-making processes is a source of the limited satisfaction among those employees.

Conclusions

Results in this study indicate that there is a general feeling of dissatisfaction and exhaustion among employees of the municipality. Appearing as linked to the previous point is the low-rated response of employees when they were asked to express their willingness to participate in voluntary work and when they responded negatively to the question concerning being happy at work. Employees then said that they felt unsecured and that their manager(s) does not support them. Comparable findings have also been reported by employees from the other two settings, namely Jordan and Lebanon. The lowest scoring items on the scale were: “I feel that I’m secured in my current pos” (1.85 out of 4); and “I’m willing to participate in voluntary activities outside my official work time” (1.87 out of 4). The latter point can seriously influence the work and commitment of the employees unless it was addressed and investigated further.

As can be noticed in the responses on the satisfaction theme, while most of the items are above the midpoint, the lowest two controversial items were just below the midpoint. One would improvise by saying arguably that, if the employees were not secured in their current posts, then they should expect to move to another post anytime in the future. Job satisfaction has always been part of the work satisfaction, except in the case of this study. At this point, no conclusions can be made, but this is a controversial and interesting point to look into. The other point, which further highlights issues concerning responses in this study, is concerned with employees’ willingness to participate in voluntary work at the community and outside their formal work at the municipality. The low score indicates low level of willingness among the employees, which further sets a question of whether employees feel positive toward their municipality and community; an interesting point, which also requires further questioning.

The responses on items of the service delivery efficiency show that employees perceive their efficacy and proficiency in completing the delegated tasks as good. They also indicated that they enjoyed a supportive relationship with colleague and that they were willing to improve based on suggestions from colleagues and managers. However, they raised concerns with regards the flow of information about many issues, like the annual appraisals, the changes occurring at the municipality, the updates are not present on the projects or the changes in the work, and that levels of responsibilities are not clear in terms of who sets the orders and who should follow. The following items scored significantly low on the scale showing the need to emphasize the quality and quantity of communication by managers and mayor of the municipality: “I receive frequent updates on the municipalities work and projects (funded or not) through *newsletter* or *advertisements* or *periodic meetings*” (.61, 1.07, 1.29 out of 4, respectively); “I’m aware of the changes in the municipality concerning the plans and programs” (1.43 out of 4); and “Information about the municipality plans and projects is available” (1.70 out of 4). **Additional important point to highlight in this report concerning the positive and supportive work environment perceived by the employees and reflected in the high scores (more than 3 out of 4). This indicates that employees feel positively toward their colleagues and perceive the work relationships as conducive and supportive. However, this issue is totally opposite when it comes to relationship with managers, whom, as reported by the employees, do not reveal or communicate effectively with the employees.**

Finally, like comments from Jordan, signage was a major issue of concern and requires improvement. It is not clear whether there is any signage available at the vicinity of the municipality, but the response clearly indicates the shortage of explanatory signs to guide the public in their work at the municipality. In addition, responses on the final theme, funding opportunity, have been very low on the majority of items (less than the midpoint of 2) and even one-third of the items had a score less than 1 out of 4 indicating a very low level of knowledge

about fund and funding processes. This is a point of concern that should be taken into consideration when planning any future intervention. The easy flow and availability of information bundled with frequent updates of employees are all essential components in the issue of funding opportunity.