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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to look at the public sector and Quality of Worklife (QWL) programs. In addition the research was to provide a comparison of public sector versus private sector regarding implementation of QWL. An interviewing technique was used to gather data from the public sector in regard to QWL and the employee's perception of their agency's involvement with QWL. The expectations were that an informal QWL program would exist and this was found to be true. Also differences in perception of QWL and its key elements were expected to be found between managers and workers and this also was found to be true. The literature search showed several reasons for the reduced implementation of QWL programs in the public sector as opposed to the recent proliferation of QWL programs in the private sector. These reasons were reviewed and discussed in this research.
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INTRODUCTION

Quality of Work Life (QWL) programs have become the latest craze of American industry, especially since the late 1970's. Part of the idea behind QWL stems from the Japanese and their Quality Circles (Ferris and Wagner pg.156) while another portion relates back to the early history of American industry and the theory of human motivation. This research will look at the feasibility of using QWL programs in a public or semi-public agency. Public agencies in today's society are not as easily adaptable to the current proposed QWL programs as are private agencies. There are many reasons for the differences between the public and private sectors. QWL is quite often associated with increased or changed productivity, and productivity is often difficult to measure in the public sector.

The reasons for initiating a QWL program are as varied as current management styles and this allows for some difficulty in decision making for today's managers. Does QWL increase productivity? Does QWL make employees happy? Does QWL reduce absenteeism and tardiness? Is QWL simply an attempt to manipulate employees? All of these questions and more are concerns for a manager and need to be addressed. The key is whether or not a QWL program can influence or change any of these concerns. In the public
arena these concerns are of importance to the manager; however, it is relevant to note again that productivity cannot be measured as easily as in those industries where a product is produced for sale to a customer. The other concerns for today's managers are common to both the public and private arenas.

For the purpose of this paper it will be necessary to define what QWL means. A working definition for this research will be: a concept or idea which believes the employee's satisfaction in his/her job does influence the ultimate objective of the organization. The purpose of a QWL program would then be to create a framework and an atmosphere which not only recognizes the value of employee satisfaction, but actively seeks it.

In support of this definition Lee Ozley and Judith Ball in their article on QWL give the following definition of QWL:

"Quality of work life improvements are defined as any activity which takes place at every level of an organization which seeks greater organizational effectiveness through the enhancement of human dignity and growth - a process through which the stakeholders in the organization - management, union(s) and employees - learn how to work together better to determine for themselves what actions, changes and improvements are desirable and workable in order to achieve the twin and simultaneous goals of an improved quality of life at work for all members of the organization and greater effectiveness for the company."

In his book, *Participative Productivity And OWL*, Robert Lehrer states that: "QWL has come to mean a concern for the
human dimensions of our work."² Michael Maccoby shares his definition of QWL which has some interesting differences. In his article on his experience with A.T.& T. and QWL he defines QWL as: "In the Bell company and AT&T, I see quality of worklife as a means to move from the bureaucratic-industrial model of scientific management with its fragmentation of jobs and hierarchical control, to a flexible, broadly skilled, participative team".³ All of these definitions and the understanding most of us have of QWL seem to lean toward an idea that QWL is 'good' and deserves some merit. It is then necessary to look deeper into the concept as it has been implemented to find the answers as to whether it should be promoted further in the public arena as well as the private arena. Perhaps quality in the workplace exists without name and it might be detrimental to relabel an ongoing process which is accepted and working.

Why look at the question of having a QWL program in the public arena? Does the question even warrant attention? Does anyone care? Most managers are trying to address many of the questions such as employee satisfaction, motivation, etc., and are looking for the best way to manage their business and the associated people. In the public arena most agencies and facilities are very human oriented, both in the mechanism for getting the job done and the clientele. QWL is a way of getting the people of the organization more involved in the business and hopefully the
business will benefit through increased loyalty, concern and perhaps effectiveness.

The importance of this research can be two-fold. If a QWL or similar type program already exists in the workplace and is just not recognized as such, it will be worthwhile for the agency in question to be aware of the implications and uses of such a program which can involve the human element of the agency. This research will also shed some light on the feelings and the importance that the people of the organization place on a QWL program. These pieces of information will allow the agency to make decisions on further implementation of QWL or QWL related programs and will assist by pointing out some of the conflicts within the different available human resource programs themselves.

This research will address a particular public agency in the City of Flint, Michigan which has a defined management and worker organization. In many public agencies it is difficult to separate the supervisory ranks from the worker ranks and in order to obtain the information for this research a definite organizational structure is necessary. Through the use of interviews and along the general lines of a case study this research will address whether the agency wants a QWL program or has something already in existence which serves the same purpose. Is there a conflict between the perception of the agency's work life environment as it is perceived by the workers and the managers? And what
conflicts exist between this agency and a fully private agency when considering or implementing a QWL program? If these questions are answered, the agency will have further insight into the day to day functioning of the organization and may be able to adjust decision making in the future regarding those items which affect the working environment of the employee as well as the efficiency of the operation.

HISTORY

Prior to the 1900's the human aspect of the job was not given much thought. Labor was taken for granted and managers could always hire more people than they needed. By the turn of the century very little had occurred to increase the development of the human relations aspect of the workforce. In 1909 Frederick Taylor related to students at Harvard Business School three elementary ideas for managing manpower. They were:

1. Holding a plum for them to climb after.
2. Cracking the whip over them, with an occasional touch of the lash.
3. Working shoulder to shoulder with them pushing hard in the same direction and all the while teaching, guiding, and helping them. (Simmons Pg. 18).

Taylor's theory of 'scientific management' was based on a belief that the manpower was basically lazy and all decisions, planning, and directing should be done by management. Taylor believed and supported the idea that all jobs could be measured and thus provide proof to the worker
and the manager as to what was a fair day's work. These measurements proposed by Taylor came to be called 'time studies'; a practice used frequently in today's industry. Taylor's theories were picked up by the managers of industry during his lifetime and continue to be applied today. At one point in his career Taylor's theories attracted government interest when a government agency's manager saw a way to increase his area's efficiency. When time studies were introduced, workers often walked off the job. The situation became so difficult that Congress initiated a full scale commission to investigate these new management theories. The findings were not in Taylor's favor and basically gave little credence to the need for or the use of scientific management (Simmons pg.22). These findings made no difference to the managers of the time; most of Taylor's work has been to the benefit of the management, since his theories dealt with getting more from existing manpower. It has taken close to 60 years to begin to challenge what has been the main basis for our way of organizing work through this century.

How did QWL evolve from the mentality of our early 1900's managers? If you believe that Taylor's philosophies were the best way to manage then perhaps we are going in the wrong direction by initiating human relations programs. However, it appears a change in the workplace was being demanded by the employee. People no longer wanted to be treated as pieces of equipment and they also wanted to
express their views and opinions. According to Debra Stewart in her book on organizational behavior and public management, there are four major assumptions for why participation in management is on the ascent. These assumptions are:

1. The values of our democratic heritage point to organizational democratization as a goal for social development.

2. Changes in the workforce are leading to increased employee demands for participation.

3. Technological environment of public administration favors participatory management.

4. Participatory management is more efficient and as we enter an era of austerity, economic necessity forces us to seek out more democratic forms of organization. (Stewart Page 154).

Thus we see that in the past or the 'old days', people were employed with little regard for their importance and this was acceptable to the workforce as well as management. Times are changing; this change includes the educational level of the workforce and the competition in the marketplace to name only a couple of variables. To suggest that the old ways are not working anymore in the United States is somewhat of an overstatement. Obviously many companies and agencies still use old style management techniques and are efficient and productive but, it does suggest these techniques are not working as well as they used to, even 20 years ago. It also suggests that in the current marketplace where competition has forced the United States to evaluate their business, an urgent need is rising for new ways to win back the loyalties and involvement of
this new breed of working men and women. QWL may offer a new way, when properly initiated and implemented, of using the resource of the human workforce.

KEY ELEMENTS OF A QWL PROGRAM

The key elements you would look for when identifying a QWL program can differ from program to program and this variation allows each organization some flexibility. There are some recommended key elements when starting a QWL program. Some type of team building effort is always included. Team building can be done in small groups within a large organization or in a large group which may include the entire organization. These QWL team building programs can be offsite or on the company premises depending on the funds available for these programs. Either way, team building should include some time to get to know the other members of the team on a personal as well as professional level. Another element of QWL is the establishment of cooperative diagnostic and problem-solving bodies and allowing these groups the authority to make things happen. A third key element of a QWL process involves training. Most persons will need some assistance to become good problem-solvers and decision makers. A fourth key element prescribes that the manager become visible to the workers. In his book, A Passion For Excellence, Tom Peters coins the term, MBWA, management by wandering around. Getting to know the people, listening and following up on suggestions, these
things are critical to a successful QWL program. A subject that has not been touched on before but it is extremely critical to this process, is the complete support and encouragement of the Chief Executive Officer or manager. Without this support and agreement, no program will survive.

What makes QWL programs different? In a later section of this paper we will see there are differences between QWL in the United States and the Japanese Quality Circles. And we know, QWL differs from our historical treatment of people in the workplace, but how does QWL differ from other human resource programs found today. According to Freund and Epstein in their book, *People and Productivity*, QWL differs in a positive way from other programs. Freund and Epstein say:

"What distinguishes QWL from other types of human resource programs is the effort to encourage employees to participate in the key decisions that affect day-to-day work patterns. Though the scope of QWL programs is not clearly defined, at its core, QWL recognizes that the person who does the job is the person who knows the job best. QWL programs seek to involve the worker directly in problem solving, in the better design of workflow, in improving production quality. More broadly, the term QWL covers not only participation in decision making, but general efforts to stimulate workers by making their jobs more interesting, giving them more control over their own activities, and providing them with a more direct stake in their companies' fortunes."^4

THE ISSUE OF PRODUCTIVITY IN QWL PROGRAMS

Although productivity will not be a variable of this research, it should be addressed in the literature review as
it appears frequently in the written work on QWL. Increased productivity has become one of the major goals of private industry's human resource programs and perhaps can be measured more effectively in the private sector as opposed to the public sector. There are many thoughts regarding QWL and productivity and for the purpose of this research, increased productivity will not be a goal or key element when speaking of QWL. The reasons for not including the issue of productivity consist of the difficulty of measurement in the public sector and the belief that QWL will not be accepted as a valid program by the workers if its goals center on increased productivity. Freund and Epstein state in their research that they see significance between QWL or other human resource programs and increased productivity. They state:

"... there is a vital link between higher productivity and a rise in living standards and that higher living standards are a necessary part of a better quality of life. We can now see from our findings that higher productivity is achieved by improving the quality of life in the workplace itself—when people are better educated, more humanely treated, more involved in decision making, and better rewarded for their efforts."  

How do QWL programs compare with other programs in the area of productivity? If indeed QWL affects productivity, Showalter and Yetman say: "Traditional productivity programs (such as organizational development, work measurement, quality circles, and so forth) have rarely contributed to the well-being of working people."  

There appears to be a conflict between what is written about productivity and QWL
and what is actually going on in the industry. Many of the selling points for initiating a QWL program stem from some type of economic benefit for the company. Although they do not indicate the goal of productivity in their literature, General Motors has rarely involved money in programs which do not have some monetary profit. General Motors has issued some general ideas of what is QWL. They are:

AN ON-GOING VOLUNTARY PROBLEM-SOLVING PROCESS
A WAY OF ACHIEVING A GOAL
INVOLVEMENT IN JOB DECISION
COOPERATION AND UNDERSTANDING
TRUST
PATIENCE

Notice none of these even mention productivity or changing work habits, or making money; this does seem hard to believe when we talk of a major industry. If productivity is a key element of QWL why would a big business avoid the issue? Perhaps there are multiple reasons why these specific terms are not used. Note each of these ideas can be interpreted as ways to make money if the company chooses to use the QWL programs as such. The most likely reason for avoiding the issue of money would be the inability to get the worker population to buy into a concept centered on productivity. Another reason could be a Union-Management conflict, where a company could not get the necessary support from the Union if the goals of QWL were productivity oriented. The public
agency involved in this research does not have a union but as other public agencies do contend with unions the subject of union-management response to QWL will be included in the research. There is more emphasis being placed on the working conditions of the employee today than there was in the past and this action is supported by Alvin Simberg of General Motors Corporation in a recent speech:

"Since the beginnings of United States organized labor late in the 19th Century, the relationship between unions and management has always been one of conflict. . . . there is a developing national climate which seems to be exerting pressures on management to begin to pay attention to considerations other than production, quality and return on investment. This climate is also causing unions to consider more than wages, hours, job classifications, seniority, and 'working conditions'. It is part of a whole new series of concerns being raised about the quality of life in America . . . ."

General Motors and the United Auto Workers have developed a joint effort to work on QWL. This effort is called the General Motors Corporation-United Auto Workers International Union joint National Committee to Improve the Quality of Work Life. This committee was established in 1973 and yet there are still many areas within General Motors that have no formal QWL program in progress. However, the above indicates something less than an adversarial relationship between the company and the union. In support of this view of management and the union working together on QWL programs is Katz, Kochan and Gobeille in their article on Industrial Relations and QWL. They state: " . . . a number of companies and unions have been experimenting with new
strategies for improving the performance of their bargaining relationships at the plant level through what generally have been labeled 'quality of working life (QWL) programs.\textsuperscript{8}

A little different view of this relationship between company and union is discussed in Showalter and Yetman's work on the dilemma of weak unions and QWL.

"Many union leaders, in both the private and public sectors, are ambivalent toward quality of working life (QWL) management systems. QWL aims at improving worker well-being. Since this is organized labor's main concern, we might expect unions to be unanimous in their desire to negotiate QWL systems. But there are complications. First, QWL also aims at improving productivity, which places unions in an ambiguous situation. A question arises as to whether cosponsoring productivity programs might not result in conflict of interest for organized labor. . . . A second question arises as to whether QWL systems might not weaken unions. If employees are able to meet their needs through QWL systems, which do not require them to pay dues, might they not begin to drop their union cards?"

This is just a brief overview of the Union's place in the QWL picture and since the agency in question does not have a union, no further discussion is warranted at this time.

DIFFERENT CULTURES AND QWL

It must be noted that although this research will be carried out in the United States, there is considerable information and activity in the area of QWL internationally, as well as the obvious Japanese involvement. In England, worker participation has entered the realm of politics with the issue of worker involvement in their business being extolled by the main political parties. In a recent issue of The
An article entitled "Worker Participation: Back in Fashion" spoke of some of the reasons for turning attention to the involvement of workers. One of those reasons included discussion of an American owned company, Borg-Warner, "which recently staved off closure with a radical six year agreement including arrangements for group discussions on productivity and product quality, a consultative council and regular meetings between the managing director and groups of fifty employees. The aims of such exercises are usually two-fold: To make employees think more like management by keeping them well-informed or giving them a financial interest in the business; and to harness their inventiveness by letting them suggest ways in which their work could be improved." In addition Quality Circles as promoted by the Japanese are springing up all over Britain. "The National Society of Quality Circles (NSQC), set up in 1982 with only 30 member-companies, has 107 today. More than 3000 quality circles are now operating in Britain, in perhaps 400 different locations." 

In a recent publication of a cross-cultural study of the desire by employees for some type of participative program or management style, it was significant that all employees had expressed a desire for a participative form of leadership and management. Each culture felt the degree of leadership should be different but that the participative type should exist. (Schaupp:115). At this point in the discussion of QWL evolvement, the Japanese and quality
circles warrant some mention. Quality circles may have been the creator of QWL. Quality circles are usually small groups of employees which meet periodically to identify and resolve job-related problems. Most Japanese QC's are institutionalized processes and not really voluntary as they are proposed by the American companies using QC's. They normally meet twice a month on company time for approximately one hour and focus their attention on quality problems, cost problems, and improvement of employee morale. Although similar, these are not the exact goals of a QWL program as touted by current QWL proponents. It might be interesting to note that the development of QC's in Japan is attributed to two Americans, Edward Deming and J.M. Juran. Just after World War II, Quality Circles were not welcome in the U.S. but were readily accepted by the Japanese and have become an integral part of their management style today. There are many other examples of people involved programs in other countries but not all will be mentioned as many are not detailed enough in the literature to show success.

It would appear there is a major movement taking place within management groups throughout the world. Have managers suddenly become human resource oriented? What has caused this human interest movement? Some theorists believe the 'baby boom' generation which grew up in the 1950's and 1960's was a more people oriented generation and as today's managers are displaying this influence. But for whatever
reasons the wave of management is toward a more involved worker group. This involvement will be in the daily decisions as well as involvement in the long-range goals of the company. Possible reasons for this change were discussed earlier, items such as education level, economic pressures etc.

QWL IN THE PUBLIC ARENA

According to Eric Trist's forward to Neal Herrick's collection of works in Improving Government (Praeger 1983), there has been a general failure of QWL to catch on in the public sector as opposed to the private sector. To quote from this forward on the need for QWL: "The public sector more than the private sector is people intensive. Without thorough going QWL programs at all levels linked to the conditions of equity that encourage labor management cooperation, there is small chance of making progress toward this goal."12 In the early 1970's QWL entered the public sector. One early QWL program occurred in Ohio with a local government and a government agency. Thirteen QWL programs were initiated throughout the 1970's in the U.S. These included six in Massachusetts, two in California, two in New York, two in Ohio and one in Arizona. During this time federal grants were given to subsidize pilot QWL sites. None of these subsidized programs survived to the present date although several lasted two to three years (Herrick:pg.XXI). In the 1980's relatively few programs
have been initiated and it has been suggested by more than one author that public policy does not lend itself to the progression of QWL systems in the public arena.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The research for this paper will address whether a QWL program is feasible for the particular public agency which has been chosen for this study. The key participants within the public agency influence the failure or success of any new or existing programs. In the literature search many comments are made regarding the difference in opinion between managers and workers about QWL. Are all the participants thinking along the same lines or is there an inherent conflict between the management group and the worker group? Is this conflict real or just a perception that could be eliminated through insight by all the members of the group regarding the objectives of a QWL program. Perception of what is happening within the organization differs among groups as well as individuals. In addition, one group's perception of what a QWL program might provide may differ from another group. Does the worker group perceive QWL as just another management tool or as a positive program which will aid the employee and allow for the employee's involvement? This research then addresses the problem of this conflict between managers and workers. Does it exist, is it inherent to the agency, is it inherent to the program, is it perceived or real, and can it be
controlled? Also there appears to be greater proliferation of QWL programs in the private sector as opposed to the public sector. In addition to the internal conflict, this research will also address the difference between the two sectors which may then answer why they have gone in different directions with QWL programs. Some of the reasons may be obvious but the research of this paper will look for any obvious conflicts which would deter the public sector from initiating QWL programs.

METHODOLOGY

For the purpose of this research, a tool which will allow for a free-flowing, open-ended and detailed data set is required. In order to review how decisions are made, or how a program has evolved, or what a program means to the key participants of the agency, an interviewing tool is desired (See Appendix for interview format - pages 59-62). An intensive or in depth type of interview has been chosen to look at the perceptions the key participants have of QWL or any other QWL style program in their agency. The strength of interviewing is in its flexibility; in depth or intensive interviewing allows for digging deeper into a subject or changing the flow of the conversation as opposed to the rigid structure of a survey. Since the information being sought deals with the perception of persons within the agency regarding a QWL system and any conflict associated with the QWL system, it is necessary to allow for personal
opinion and more detail. Data for this research will be provided by the interviewing technique. The purpose of interviewing then is to get the interviewee's thoughts, ideas, and opinions of what types of programs currently exist, what if any conflicts exist between managers and workers in regard to QWL, what he/she thinks about QWL, and how he/she thinks QWL would or should be managed within their particular agency. There are some incidental effects from using the interviewing technique. The first incidental effect may provide some good or some biased information and can be described as a 'cathartic' effect - that is the interviewee can 'get something off their chest'. A second incidental effect may provide help by clarifying the organization's development and therefore assist teams or groups in their future work in the area of problem-solving. A third incidental effect may allow the interviewee to prepare for team-building interaction if team-building becomes a part of their QWL program. All of these effects are important and will be kept in mind as the interviews are conducted.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

There are many reasons for using interviewing as the major tool for this research. Some of the advantages include the following:

1. Understanding - this is the opportunity for the interviewer to check out what the respondent is saying.
2. Amplification - Expansion and explanation of the subject.
3. Discovery - unknowns may come to light as a result of the interview.
4. Checking Assumptions - both on the interviewer's part and the respondent.
5. Supplementation - support for other data collected.
6. Language - clear up confusion in semantics.
7. Credibility - this data is sometimes more credible than data gathered from other instruments.
8. Contact - personal contact is perceived as better.
9. Sharing - person to person sharing can enhance later interactions.

There are also some drawbacks or disadvantages to interviewing as well. These include:

1. Expense - time, space and staff; thus the interview population is relatively small for statistical purposes.
2. Goals - not easily shared between interviewer and respondent.
3. Data Reduction - data gathered in this fashion are not easily standardized.
4. Threat - some respondents may feel threatened by an interview.
5. Accessibility - some respondents may be difficult to interview due to their schedules.

(Jones - The Sensing Interview - Page 2)
PICKING THE RESPONDENTS

The key participants for this research will include three (3) members of the management group and seven (7) members of the worker group within the agency. This represents fifty (50%) percent of the managers and approximately forty (40%) percent of the workers. These participants should provide reliable data as they are all part of the overall group providing a service to a specific clientele.

Each person shall be interviewed individually as opposed to one group of managers and one group of workers. There are two reasons for individual interviews. First, it would be extremely difficult to record a group session and second, some persons may be inhibited by the group.

In preparation for these interviews, two to four test interviews will be given. These respondents will be from another agency but will represent both groups (managers and workers). The purpose of the test interviews is to evaluate the content and presentation before attempting the research. This test will hopefully shed light on any problem areas in the interview questions as well as help the interviewer prepare for the actual research. The data when collected will then be compiled and presented as to the overall content of conflict in the respondent's perception of QWL and any QWL program within the agency. The value of this research will first allow the agency's Chief Executive Officer to review the current situation and see if it agrees
with his/her perception of the current situation. Second, the knowledge gained in the interviews should pave the way for any future programs if proposed. Third, the interviews should allow all the participants a better understanding of QWL and QWL programs.

In addition to the methodology of interviewing for the research problem, will be a literature review discussing the issue of public versus private QWL programs to see how they differ. The literature suggests some internal problems between the private and public sectors which may influence QWL programs in each arena.

EXPECTATIONS/IMPLICATIONS

The literature points to an inherent conflict existing between management and employee thus creating a natural barrier which will actively work against a QWL program. The implications of this literature then point toward a positive need for a QWL program to eliminate this conflict and create a good atmosphere in which to work. Although it has been mentioned that public policy may create an on-going barrier which may keep QWL from entering the public arena, the expectations of this research differ somewhat from this theory. The expectations of the interviewing process are 1. that there is a difference in the perception of QWL between management and employee but it does not hinder the two from working together on a human relations program. 2. This difference does create some difficulties in initiating
or beginning a QWL program. 3. There is in place currently many of the key elements of a QWL program that are created just by the nature of the agency's format (i.e. people oriented).

The implications of the literature review regarding QWL in the public versus the private sector show there is no real difference in their goals. The differences show up in the structure of the organizations, the availability of funds for programs, and the actual need for programs which deal with quality in the workplace. The expectation is that there is no inherent barrier that keeps QWL out of the public sector but that other circumstances do indeed hinder the progression.

Although the idea of quality in the workplace is not new, the popularity of QWL seems to have grown in the last ten to fifteen years. It will be interesting to see if the popularity is just that; or if there is meaning behind this concept that will stay incorporated in management practices in the future. This research should provide some meaningful information to one public agency for decision making in the area of QWL programs.

RESEARCH RESULTS

The research for this paper was conducted as described in the previous sections, with some minor changes. An interview of the chief executive officer (CEO) was included
in the management group and the results of this interview are a part of the following data tables. The actual percentages of each group (management interviewed versus line staff interviewed) could be somewhat different than previously stated as there are several part time employees on the line staff. Line staff are those persons who deal directly with the resident as opposed to managers who do not deal directly with the resident. Therefore, for purposes of this research no part time employees were interviewed, allowing the percentages of interviewees to be basically the same between management and line staff (see page 21). Also, for purposes of clarification, the line staff was composed of two main levels which will be referred to as first line staff and second line staff. The descriptions of each type of employee are as follows:

Management consists of:
Chief Executive Officer
Program Manager
Development Director

Line Staff consists of:
First Line Staff - Resident Advisor
Second Line Staff - Counselor

The research was conducted over a three week period and began with two sample test interviews. These sample test
interviews were used to evaluate the questions for clarity and to time the interview so maximum information could be gathered in approximately thirty minutes per interview. In the test interviews several questions were found to be redundant as well as two questions were moved to different sections of the interview. Three questions were eliminated to reduce the time frame of the interview because the test interviews were running just over forty-five minutes and thirty minutes was the target time. Test interviews are recommended and were invaluable to this research. Much time was saved by testing the interview questions before doing the actual research. After the results were gathered, one question that asked the respondents their opinion on the use of labels or buzz words was eliminated as irrelevant to the research problem. This question was originally in the interview to try and determine if a label or buzz word on a new program would deter the employee from becoming involved. Most persons felt if programs in the past had been successful there would be a more positive response to a new program regardless of the label. Note: All respondents were positive during the interviews and showed interest in the subject matter. Interviews were preceded by a memo of introduction for the interviewer and a statement of support by the agency.

The following tables are the compilation of all data collected in the official interviews. Each table represents
a different category of interest and each table will be
followed by explanations of the questions and the results.

Each of the following six tables are broken into three
categories of numbers. Numbers 1-5 represent the first line
staff (resident advisors), numbers 6-7 represent the second
line staff (counselors) and numbers 8-11 represent
management (directors and managers).
Table 1 addresses the employee's belief in participation. The philosophy of participation in management is the upcoming philosophy of the 80's. Schaupp supports that employees want to participate in his research with the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WORK HOURS</th>
<th>SEL. OF SUPS.</th>
<th>NEW MEM</th>
<th>DIS-MISS</th>
<th>PRO-MOTE</th>
<th>FAIR DAY</th>
<th>QUAL. OF WORK</th>
<th>METH. PROC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main tenent of this (participation) philosophy is that human nature is such that all want to participate . . . a greater commitment can be expected from the workers. 13

The first column (work hours) looks at the question of whether the employee believes he/she should participate in the decision of when the work day ends and begins. In other words should the employee be able to influence the shift hours for their particular job. In question one, five of the eleven employees felt they should not participate in this decision. All five of these employees were first line staff and as such deal directly with the day to day tasks relating to resident treatment. The other six persons have less daily contact with the resident and therefore their schedule does not have to be as rigid. The results are as expected as the first line staff must be less flexible when working so closely with the resident.

Column two (sel. of sups.) addresses the employee's belief they should have input into the selection of supervisors. This category was not as clearly divided as question one. Here, six of eleven employees felt they should not participate in these decisions but these six persons represent each of the staff areas. If the staff areas are segregated, then five of seven in the first and second line staff do not believe they should participate in the
selection of supervisors while one of four of the managers did not feel they should participate in this selection. The results show a reluctance of the workers to select supervision and the one manager's response was unexpected as selection of supervisors could be a current job responsibility.

Question three (new mem) looks at the belief that the employee should participate in decisions regarding who should join the work group. Seven of the eleven employees felt they should not participate in these decisions and the split was even among the groups (management and line staff). This is opposite to expected results as the literature indicates the need to participate, yet these persons felt they did not want to participate.

Column four (dismiss) addresses the employee's belief they should have input in the dismissal of employees for poor performance or other reasons. Of the eleven employees, five felt they should not have input in this area, again the split was even among the two main staff groups. Column five (promote) looks at the other side of the coin or the belief the employee should have input in the promotion of others. Seven of eleven employees believe they should not be a part of the decision to promote others. Promotions and dismissals are the two most difficult decisions and the beliefs were mixed and this would be the expected results.
Question six (fair day) asks whether the employees believe they should have input into what is considered a fair day's work. Only two of the eleven interviewees believed they should not participate in the decision of what is a fair day's work. Both of these persons were members of management. Question seven (qual. of work) then looks at the employee's belief in whether they should decide what the quality of service provided should entail. Only one of the eleven persons felt they should not participate in this area. The overall consensus was a belief in input into this area would be beneficial to the resident.

Column eight (meth.proc.) addresses the belief of the employees that they should participate in the writing and development of methods and procedures. All eleven employees felt they should participate in writing those procedures with which they had to work.

The results of this section show the employees moving toward a more participative organization. Herzberg (1966) has added a new participative theory. "His motivation-hygiene theory hypothesizes that those items which are satisfiers, and hence motivators, are recognition, job content, responsibility, and achievement - all of which are intrinsically related to the precepts of participative management. 14
Table Two shows the data for the set of questions about the actual participation within the agency. In column one (who joins group) the question is asked 'do you actually participate in who joins your group?'. Of eleven respondents eight do not participate in this decision. Only one of the line staff participates in deciding who joins the group, the remaining two participants were managers.
In column two (dismiss) and three (promote) the questions of participation in the dismissal or promotion of others is addressed. Of the eleven employees, only members of management participate in this category and one of the four managers did not actively participate. Therefore, only three of eleven employees participate in either of these two categories. This is the expected result as managers are generally the only ones who promote or dismiss others.

In column four (who does what job) the actual participation in deciding who does what job was almost split fifty-fifty between the employees. Five of the eleven participate in the decisions while six do not. This division of participation was not unique to one group or the other.

The last column (methods and procedures) in this category looks at who participates in the development and writing of methods and procedures. Ten of the eleven members participate in this area. Along the same lines an open-ended question of how often the employees make procedural decisions was asked. Four of eleven members said they had never made procedural decisions, two persons made these decisions daily, four persons made weekly decisions while the other remaining person felt they made procedural decisions on a monthly basis. This question differs from the question in column five in that one dealt with the development of methods and procedures while the other
question looked at the actual implementation of procedures. These results show a high degree of involvement in this category of methods and procedures.

Participation in today's companies and agencies is on the rise yet has a long way to go. A summation of participation in a study done by the New York Stock Exchange shows the following:

Larger companies are far more likely to have human resource programs than smaller ones. (Larger companies would be described as 100 employees or more.)

Even among companies with programs, only about 60% of workers are involved.

For all companies with 100 or more employees it is estimated only 13 million workers are presently included in some human resource activity and that 28 million have no involvement whatever. 15
TABLE 3

TEAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work on Team</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Isolation</th>
<th>Group Mtgs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>WEEKLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>WEEKLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BIMONTHLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MONTHLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BIWEEKLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BIWEEKLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MONTHLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>WEEKLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>WEEKLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MONTHLY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Three looks at the team concept. Is it in place within the agency and do the employees feel the same within groups about their positions within the team?

In column one when asked if they felt they worked on a team all eleven people answered affirmative and without hesitation. There appear to be occasional bouts of
dissension but the team approach is applied to most areas within the agency.

In column two the employees were asked if they felt their job was important to others within the agency. Again all eleven employees answered this question in the affirmative. Each person's reasoning varied but typical responses were "We are important to the clients", "My job is important to the first line staff in support of their efforts".

In column three each employee was asked if they ever felt alone or isolated in their job. Eight of the eleven employees did not acknowledge a feeling of isolation. However, three of the four managers said they felt alone or isolated at times. Mainly this feeling was due to the types of decisions they had to make on occasion.

Column four looks at whether the employee was a part of a group meeting. Group meetings were described as information meetings held by the supervisor to pass on information to the employee. In this question the line staff was asked "does your supervisor have group meetings?"; the managers were asked if they held group meetings. All four managers said they held group meetings, and all but one of the seven line staff said their supervisor held group meetings. Group meetings differ from team building meetings in that team building is a tool for bringing the group together while
group meetings are generally just information meetings. Team building is a good tool for improving working relationships. These improvements should become evident immediately and the results will persist into the future. (Mitchell, 1986)

The last column looks at the frequency of the meetings in column four. Except for the one person who said their supervisor did not hold group meetings, the results are consistent. The counselors and resident advisors have one to two meetings per week they consider to be group meetings and the managers consider they hold group meetings weekly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>OPEN</th>
<th>ANYTIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The category represented in Table Four specifically asked questions which look at the employee's perception of the communication throughout the agency. Column one asked the employees to rate the communication within the overall organization* in other words, from the CEO all the way to the resident in the program. The ratings the employee
had to choose from were good, fair or poor. None of the employees felt the overall communication was poor. Five of the employees felt the overall communication was fair and six felt it was good. The numbers were evenly distributed between line staff and managers who felt the communication was good. This would indicate a difference in the perception of good and fair rather than a conflict between management and the line staff.

Column two looks at the employee's specific group and asks them to rate the lines of communication in the same way as in question one. In this question one employee felt the specific group they worked with had poor lines of communication. One other employee felt the communication was fair. All others (9) felt their specific groups had good communication. These two questions indicate that good communication exists in this agency and this finding is supported in the literature by Freund and Epstein when they found: "Smaller companies (agencies) are more likely to have (or think they have) better informal lines of communication."

The next two questions look at the openness in communication throughout the organization between employee and manager. The first question (column 3) asked each employee if they could talk openly with their manager. This applies to all persons except the CEO, for him the question was stated 'can
your employees speak openly to you'. All eleven persons felt the ability to speak openly to their manager was present. Column four asked if the employee could speak to their manager at all times. Again the question was reversed for the CEO. And again all employees were affirmative in this area and felt the lines of communication were available at all times between themselves and their immediate manager.

### TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFLICT</th>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table five looks at the possibility of conflict between the management and line staff regarding their work environment and the idea of QWL. Column one's question asked each employee if they felt that management and the line staff were working toward the same goals. All employees felt this was true and comments generally centered around the treatment of residents.

The second question asked each employee if their manager was aware of the particular employee's work environment. Again in the case of the CEO the question was reversed and he was asked if he was aware of the staff's work environment. All employees answered affirmative to this question. This may be a result of the size of the agency. The staff is smaller than 50 people and it is not difficult for managers to be aware of each person's environment.

The next question (column 3) asked if the concept of QWL would in any way be a conflict between the employee and his supervisor. Four of eleven employees thought the concept of QWL and some of its key elements could create a conflict between themselves and their supervisor. The other seven did not feel there would be any conflict at all.

The last two questions (Columns 4 and 5) asked if the employee had a package called QWL and he/she presented this package to the overall organization for their input, would
the organization accept the package. The second question asked them to answer the same question for the employee's specific group. The response showed three persons of eleven thought the package would not be accepted by the organization. But only one person felt their individual group would not accept the package. The negative comments were relative to the use of a package rather than a rejection of the concept of QWL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PUB</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>PRI</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>QWL FEAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND**

- = no answer necessary
sup = supervisor
pm = program manager
pd = program director
cd = clinical director
r = rotate
? = possible
The questions in Table six were categorized as general because they ask about history and requested the employee to comment on the feasibility of a QWL program for their agency after they had been through most of the interview.

The first four columns ask the employee if they have worked previously in another public or private agency and if so was there any evidence of a formal or informal QWL program. Of the eleven persons, nine had worked in another public agency and four (44%) of those agencies had some type of QWL program or some of the key elements of a QWL program. Eight of the eleven had previously worked in the private sector and five (62.5%) of these locations had some type of program. This agrees with the research which shows that the private sector has had more involvement with QWL than the public sector.

Within the key elements of QWL is the concept of team building or team meetings. The definition of team meeting usually calls for no regular chairperson but either rotation or volunteer leadership. The employees of New Paths were asked earlier if they had team meetings and the response was affirmative. The question in column five asked 'who' chairs your team meetings. In all cases except two, the chairperson is a member of management with no rotation or change. Only one group (top level staff group) actually exhibits a textbook team meeting relative to chairperson.
The last general question asked each employee if they felt that a QWL program would be feasible at New Paths. Six persons of eleven were positive it would work while four were sure it would not and one person was not sure either way. The negative responses again centered on a package program being less than desirable for their current structure and management. This phenomena is similar to the situation reported by Neal Herrick in Improving Government where the failure of a QWL program was a result of issuing a laundry list of objectives to the personnel as opposed to allowing the personnel to handle their goals themselves. The end result was that the project lurched along, without a shared vision of what could be, or how to achieve the goals. Keith Brooke adds support to some inherent problems with 'programs' in his article on Quality Circles when he states: "Unfortunately, it has often been our practice in this country to discover a 'people program' that has been used successfully in another company and, much as with a piece of equipment, lift that program into our company and expect the same results." 

In addition to the more rigid questions outlined in the tables the use of open-ended questions was valuable to this research. Conflict in perception of a program can sometimes be identified when an interviewee is allowed to express in their own words their feelings about their particular work
environment. The key open-ended question in this interview asked employees to describe what QWL meant to them in their own words. The following is a breakdown of their comments grouped as line staff versus management.

FIRST LINE STAFF COMMENTS:

Team Work
Cooperation
Openness Between Employees
Respect
Communication
Listening Ear
Fairness
Good Relationship with Management
Good Working Conditions

SECOND LINE STAFF COMMENTS:

Working at a job and feeling secure
Supervisor is open and willing to listen
Good Communication
Supportive Supervisor
Little dissension between employees
MANAGEMENT COMMENTS:

People receiving a degree of satisfaction from their work environment.

Participation

Job Satisfaction

Contribution through participation

This question and these answers show a slight difference in the perception of what is QWL. The theme of participation was evident in most of the managers answers while a more personal approach was shown by the line staff answers such as needing a listening ear and a supportive boss.

KEY ELEMENTS

The key elements of a quality of worklife program were researched and developed from the literature. These key elements were shown to each interviewee as part of the interview and each element was reviewed in detail. The results show evidence of twelve of the fourteen elements present at New Paths. The ranking was a result of the place of importance in the literature. The breakdown is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Building Meetings regularly</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Joint Decision Making on Problems</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training Programs</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Joint Decision Making on Procedures</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Group Meetings</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Problem Solving Sessions on Quality</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Open Communication</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Open Door Policy on Conditions of Work</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Questions by Management on Employee Interests</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Questions by Management on Employee Morale</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commendation/Recognition Program</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Offsite get togethers</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Programs to Improve Employee's Health</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Outside Activities Sponsored by Company</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These key elements are offered as a checklist for other agencies to see where they stand in the area of QWL. Any number over ten of the fourteen key elements present in an agency would indicate the presence of an informal QWL system. If an agency indicates they have a QWL program and has less than ten of the fourteen elements the program should be reviewed for effectiveness.
The results of the interviews were one answer to the research problem; the other major part of the research problem addresses the question of a higher number of QWL programs in the private sector versus the public sector and why this has occurred.

One of the obvious ways to look at this situation is to take note of the amount of literature written about QWL and which sector is involved most often. Of the thirty-two (32) references used in this research, twenty-seven (27) dealt with the private sector while five (5) were related to the public sector. As Stewart states: "Participation is a critical concept in the study of motivation since it is a key to organizational commitment and acceptance of change. Participation is also a central theme in the study of decision making, . . . Yet in spite of these and many other evidences of the importance of participation in public management, most public organizations retain an essentially hierarchial structure and operate through relatively centralized, non participatory processes."^19

Stewart feels there are three main reasons why the public sector does not readily accept participation in management. They are accountability, performance measurement and political legitimacy. Probably any one of these would be enough to make a QWL program or participative management difficult. Accountability means the public sector is more
accountable with many items of business being public information. This makes it difficult for a manager to allow others to be a part of management. Performance measurement relates to productivity. Performance of personnel is difficult to measure, public agencies as well as private have trouble defining the gains from participatory management programs. Political legitimacy has set precedents which do not allow for participation in decision making. The democratic political system also allows for a more centralized management system which aids in holding back participatory programs.

In addition to the above, Herrick adds another reason for the lack of QWL in the public sector. This reason is the weakness of organized labor in the public sector. Weak unions cannot afford to cooperate and cooperation is difficult between two parties of unequal strength. Herrick states a case in which this weakness was seen: "In Canada the Public Sector Compensation Restraint Act, which is regarded by union leaders as having removed the collective bargaining rights from federal Public Service employees, was followed by a decrease in QWL activity. The imbalance of power between management and the union may be a major force in keeping QWL out of the public sector.

With all of these factors contributing and working together it is evident why QWL has a long up-hill battle to be
applied in the public sector. The results of this study of one public sector agency, New Paths, show that the key elements of a QWL program exist but no formalized program is available or being considered. This may be the case in many public sector areas. Since a large number of public sector agencies administer people oriented programs, it seems logical that QWL would be prevalent in the public sector; that is not however the situation as we see it today.

CONCLUSIONS
The purpose of this research was to look at one public agency and review its current situation regarding QWL and to review the literature on public versus private QWL programs. Although the literature suggests there is conflict regarding QWL between managers and workers, this is not a major problem at New Paths. The conflict appears to be related to the intermixing of QWL and productivity changes. The productivity factor was not dealt with in this research and therefore was not a conflict. In the case of New Paths, there is no apparent inherent conflict between the management group and the worker group. Although there is no major conflict at New Paths there are several minor differences in perception which can be changed to make the program more effective. For example, if team building is to be used effectively as the literature explains its use, then New Paths needs to look at how they conduct team building meetings, especially how they chair the meetings. Also some
consideration should be given to the inclusion of the worker group in more areas such as 'who joins the different groups'.

The New Paths agency has many (12/14) of the key elements of QWL and the perception of these key elements was well understood by all of the members of New Paths. There was no evidence that any member of the agency would interpret QWL as just a management tool. The key to introduction in this agency is not to attempt implementation of a packaged program for QWL but to attack the situation one key element at a time. The packaged program was disagreeable to many personnel as 'programs' are perceived as usually not accomplishing anything of great value for the agency. It is recommended that any change at New Paths be part of an ongoing process moving in the same directions as they are currently flowing in the area of QWL. The two elements of QWL not currently being implemented and which could possibly make New Paths more effective are: problem solving in the area of quality of service delivered and a formal commendation or recognition program. Note: there are some strong pros and cons regarding commendation programs but the literature always includes commendation programs as part of a QWL process.

The literature search for the reasons behind the greater proliferation of QWL in the private sector shows four major
reasons for this situation. These four reasons are: 1) the accountability of the public sector which does not allow them the freedom of the private sector. With perhaps one group or one person being accountable there leaves little room for the participative style of QWL. 2) the performance measurement of the public sector is less defined than in the private sector. Judgment of changes in profitability are much easier than judgment of changes in effectiveness. 3) the democratic system as it stands today does not allow the public sector the participation in decision making and thus puts restrictions on many QWL programs. 4) the public sector has a weaker union in comparison to the private sector and this inequity does not allow a combined front in the area of QWL. All of these reasons are contributing factors in keeping QWL out of the public arena as we now see QWL in the private sector. However, there is action in this area and the public sector is beginning to recognize the need for QWL in their arena.

There are some recommended concepts and actions which are the key to successfully initiating QWL efforts in any arena. They are:

- QWL efforts can not be viewed as short term quick fix programs and should not be undertaken lightly

- Organizations must develop new definitions of 'how we work in the organization' when initiating QWL efforts
QWL improvement efforts require the willing participation and involvement of all levels of the organization.

QWL improvement efforts require the commitment of organization leaders.

QWL improvement efforts enable organizations to communicate and integrate their strategic goals into the day to day operations of the agency/business.

QWL improvement efforts represent new approaches and processes in most organizations. These processes are never static and require constant attentiveness and responsiveness to developments as they occur.

There are many ways to initiate a QWL program or process and any agency or organization should do some research before attempting to initiate a new program.

This research leads to a new philosophy in the area of management. Human relations would appear to be a common sense way of managing but we find it is a difficult way to manage in some cases. The idea of QWL and participative management is a movement toward this new philosophy.
General Foods' Chairman Clarence Francis expressed this philosophy well:

"You can buy a man's time, you can buy a man's physical presence at a given place; you can even buy a measured number of skilled muscular motions per hour or day. But you cannot buy enthusiasm; you cannot buy initiative; you cannot buy loyalty; you cannot buy the devotion of hearts, minds and souls. You have to earn these things . . . It is ironic that Americans - the most advanced people technically, mechanically, and industrially - should have waited until a comparatively recent period to inquire into the most promising single source of productivity: namely, the human will to work. It is hopeful on the other hand, that the search is now under way."22
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INTRODUCTION

Reason for Research

Are you familiar with the concept of QWL?

Brief Description - QWL is a concept or idea which believes the employee's satisfaction in his/her job does influence the ultimate objective of the organization. The purpose of a QWL program would then be to create a framework and an atmosphere which not only recognizes the value of employee satisfaction, but actively seeks it.

Is there any aspect of your environment or routine which you think approaches a QWL function? (ex: team meeting, joint problem solving.)

BELIEF IN PARTICIPATION

Do you believe you should participate in the management of your area and your job?

Should you have any input into the following:

When the work day ends or begins

Selection of supervisors

Who should join your group
Who should be dismissed for poor performance/attendance

Who should be promoted

Fair days work

Level of quality of work

Methods and procedures

ACTUAL PARTICIPATION

Do you actually participate in any of these areas?

Who joins your group

Who should be dismissed/promoted

Methods and procedures

Who should do what job

How often do you participate in policy decisions (weekly, daily?)

TEAM CONCEPT

Does your job give you a feeling of working on a team?

Is your job important to others?

Do you ever feel alone or isolated in your job?

Does your supervisor have group meetings?

How often?

COMMUNICATION
Would you rate the communication of your organization overall as good, fair or poor?

Your specific group?

Are you able to talk to your manager openly and at all times? (Is your staff able to talk to you openly without fear and at all times?

CONFLICT

Do you feel you and management are working toward the same goals?

Is management aware of your work environment?

Is QWL in any way a conflict between you and your supervisor?

If a QWL program were suggested by you would it be accepted by management? by others in the organization? by others in your work group?

GENERAL QUESTIONS

Have you ever worked in another agency either public or private?

Did either of these organizations have any type of QWL program?

If you have team meetings, who chairs these meetings?

Do you feel a QWL program would be feasible for your organization?

In your own words, please describe what QWL means to you.
### Key Elements of QWL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Team Building meetings  
      | regularly                                                             |
| 2    | Joint Decision Making on problems                                      |
| 3    | Training Programs  
      | classroom                                                             
      | offsite                                                               
      | on-the-job                                                            |
| 4    | Joint decision making on policy and procedure                          |
| 5    | Group meetings                                                         |
| 6    | Problem solving sessions on quality                                    |
| 7    | Open communication                                                     |
| 8    | Open door policy on conditions of employment                           |
| 9    | Questions by management on employee interests                          |
| 10   | Questions by management on employee morale                             |
| 11   | Commendation/recognition program                                       |
| 12   | Offsite get togethers                                                  |
| 13   | Programs to improve the employee's health                              |
| 14   | Outside activities for employees sponsored by co                       |
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