

575

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California



Quality of Work Life
1992 Survey

Susan Page Hocevar

February 1993

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Prepared for: Human Resources Office
Naval Air Warfare Center
Aircraft Division
Indianapolis, IN

FedDocs
D 208.14/2
NPS-AS-93-030PR

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, CA

RADM T.A. Mercer
Superintendent

Harrison Shull
Provost

The report was prepared for and funded by the Human Resources Office of the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis.

Reproduction of all or part of this report is authorized.

This report was prepared by:

/

,

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management Budget, Paper Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)		2. REPORT DATE February 1993	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Project Report, February 1993	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Quality of Work Life, 1992 Survey			5. FUNDING NUMBERS N0016393WX30033	
6. AUTHOR(S) Susan Page Hocevar				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAMES(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Department of Systems Management Naval Postgraduate School 555 Dyer Rd. Monterey, CA 93943			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NPS-AS-93-030PR	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Department of Systems Management Naval Postgraduate School 555 Dyer Rd. Monterey, CA 93943			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) This report describes the results of the 1992 survey of Quality of Work Life conducted at the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis. This survey assesses employee (N=402) attitudes regarding such issues as job satisfaction; opportunities for training; management support for cooperation, teamwork, and innovation; rewards and equity; and organizational values. Current results are compared with ratings on comparable items from the survey conducted in 1991. The main issues presented in qualitative comments are also identified.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Attitude survey, Management, Job satisfaction, Morale, Organizational values			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 48	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unlimited	

QUALITY OF WORK LIFE
1992 SURVEY

Susan Page Hocesvar
Department of Administrative Sciences
Naval Postgraduate School
February 7, 1993

This report was prepared for the Human Resource Office of the
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis.

Abstract

This report describes the results of the 1992 survey of Quality of Work Life conducted at the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis. This survey assesses employee (N=402) attitudes regarding such issues as job satisfaction; opportunities for training; management support for cooperation, teamwork, and innovation; rewards and equity; and organizational values. Current results are compared with ratings on comparable items from the survey conducted in 1991. The main issues presented in qualitative comments are also identified.

QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

1992 SURVEY

Background

The Quality of Work Life survey has been administered by the Human Resource Office of the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis since 1988. The purpose of this survey is to assess employee attitudes regarding quality of work life issues including job satisfaction, training, and organizational climate (open communication, participation, cooperation, trust) as well as specific programmatic issues such as parking, smoking, and work schedules. This report describes the results of the most recent administration of the QWL survey conducted in November, 1992. The results from 1992 are compared with those from 1991 to assess changes in employees' attitudes regarding quality of work life issues. In addition, the 1992 survey includes a number of questions that examine employees' attitudes regarding the new structure and new roles resulting from the reorganization of the Center.

Questionnaire

The survey is comprised of 58 fixed response questions, and 3 open-ended questions. A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix A. There are 10 questions that gather demographic data from respondents (e.g., age, grade level, education). Thirty-four questions address quality of work life issues, the majority of which are replications of items used on prior QWL surveys administered at the Center. However, some new items regarding teams and innovation were added to reflect issues identified as

important from the Culture Gap study. All of these questions follow a standard 5-category response format:

22. In general, I am satisfied with my job.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

The response categories were modified in some cases to fit the wording of the question but in all cases (1) represents a low or negative rating and (5) represents a high or positive rating of the focal issue.

Regarding information about the restructuring of the Center, there were 8 questions that asked employees to rate their awareness of Management Team and Associate role responsibilities, and their awareness and support of the Customer Support Team (CST) concept. In addition, question #29 asked about the amount of information employees wanted regarding: strategic purpose of restructuring; reporting relationships; training opportunities; career opportunities; clarification of job responsibilities; and coordination mechanisms with other related work groups.

The survey questions were analyzed to determine scales (i.e., groups of items that reliably reflect an internally consistent theme) to be used for reporting purposes and to aid in

comparisons with future data.¹ The new Key Result Areas are labelled as follows:

- Job Satisfaction
- Training
- Equity and Rewards
- Teams and Cooperation
- Factors Impacting ability to do my job
- Organizational Support for Doing Things Differently
- Organizational Values and Trust

Finally there were three open-ended questions included in the survey. These questions allow employees to openly express concerns or explain their viewpoint in narrative form. Question #28 asked respondents to rate the impact of restructuring on their performance capabilities and the open-ended section asked them to specifically explain the perceived problems (if the impact on productivity was rated negative) and the perceived opportunities (if the impact on productivity was rated positive). The last two questions on the survey asked employees to describe their 3 main concerns regarding quality of work life and an opportunity for open comment on the working environment.

Sample

The QWL survey was distributed to a randomly selected sample of 700 Center employees. A total of 402 surveys were return for

¹ Maintaining the eight "Key Result Areas" (KRAs) used in prior surveys was not deemed possible both because of the substantial changes made in the current survey and the determination that some of the KRAs had low internal consistency reliabilities. The determination of new scale categories was made on the basis of factor analysis results and reliability analyses. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients, indicating internal consistency, are reported with the results for all scales. This statistic can range from zero to one with .70 generally viewed as an "acceptable" level of reliability.

a response rate of 57%. Of this total sample, 9.5% are members of a Competency Center Management Team, 25% are female, 85% are Caucasian, 8% have a physical handicap, and the average age is approximately 40. In terms of education, 26% attended college; an additional 28% have a college degree; and 27% have some graduate coursework. Other relevant demographics are presented in Table 1.

Results

The frequency distributions for responses to all questions on the survey can be found in Appendix A.

Awareness and Information Needed Regarding Restructuring

A number of questions were developed for the 1992 QWL survey to assess employee's awareness of new roles and identify their information needs. To the very basic question,

"16. I know who my Management Team members are"

there were 79 employees (20%) who responded "no." A related set of questions asked employees to rate their awareness of the 5 Competency Center Management Team roles as well as that of Project Leader on a scale where (1)=fully aware to (4)=not at all aware. The mean ratings for each role is given below with the roles best understood listed first:

Survey Item	Role	Mean Rating
53.	Project Leader	2.24
52.	Master Scheduler Associate	2.25
54.	Competency Center Director	2.26
50.	People Development Associate	2.41
51.	Process Improvement Associate	2.66

These means indicate that, on average, employees are not as informed as they would like to be regarding the roles and responsibilities of the Competency Center Management Team members

Table 1
Sample Demographics

1. What type of work do you do?	<u>Percentage</u> ²
(1) Administrative	10%
(2) Clerical/Secretarial & Assistant	7%
(3) Engineer/Scientist	39%
(4) Technical	17%
(5) Wage Grade	20%
2. What is your grade level?	
(1) GS-1 to 5	5%
(2) GS-6 to 12	63%
(3) GS-13 to 15	11%
(4) WG-6 to 11	15%
(5) WG-12 and above	2%
8. Total experience at NAWC Indianapolis?	
(1) 1-3 years	10%
(2) 3-5 years	12%
(3) 5-10 years	34%
(4) 10-20 years	27%
(5) 20-30 years	14%
(6) More than 30 years	4%

² Percentages for each question may not total 100% due to missing data.

and the project leader. They are most informed about the PL, MSA, and CCD and least informed about the PIA³.

As can be seen from the frequencies presented in Appendix A, the number choosing the response category (4)=not at all aware ranges from 57 (for the PDA) to 91 (for the PIA). These frequencies confirm that approximately 20% of those surveyed do not know the individuals on their management team (or their Project Leader) and have no understanding as to their roles.

The third set of questions that provides data on information needs is item 29 which asked employees to rate 6 different types of information according to how much information they felt they wanted or needed to effectively perform their job. The results for this item are presented in Table 2. The overall finding shows a substantial majority of employees reporting that they would either like or need more information in all but one area.

The area in which the largest number of employees (50%) say they need no further information is regarding "strategic purpose of restructuring." However, there are still 50% who either would like further information (39%) or feel they need this information to do their job (11%). "Reporting relationships," "training opportunities," and "career opportunities" are identified as the areas where the largest percentage of employees would like information (response category (2)). While this information is important to individuals, it is less frequently rated as critical to job performance. The two areas with the highest frequency of information needed in order to do the job (category (3)) were

³ The differences between the mean ratings for the PL, MSA, CCD (as a group) and the rating for PDA, and PIA are all significantly different from each other [$2.87 < t < 6.80$, $p < .005$].

Table 2
Ratings of Information Needed

Item	% in each response category ⁴		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Strategic purpose of restructuring to organizational mission	50%	39%	11%
Reporting relationships	33%	49%	18%
Training opportunities	25%	48%	27%
Career opportunities	19%	57%	24%
Clarification of job responsibilities	36%	31%	33%
Coordination mechanisms with other related work groups	24%	42%	34%

⁴ The 3 response choices were:

(1)=I need no further information about this

(2)=I would like more information

(3)=I need more information to do my job

"clarification of job responsibilities" (33%) and "coordination mechanisms with other related work groups" (34%).

Quality of Work Life Attitudes

As described above, the revised QWL survey items concerning quality of work life issues have been grouped into 6 Key Result Areas (KRAs). Each of these will be discussed in turn. The KRAs are comprised of items that can be compared with prior survey results well as items unique to 1992. The data presented in Table 3 show the mean rating for all items for 1992 and where appropriate comparisons are given with the 1991 results. In the following tables, an asterisk (*) is used to indicate that mean ratings for 1991 and 1992 are significantly different.⁵ Frequencies for all survey items can be found in Appendix A.

Job Satisfaction. The four items comprising the KRA of Job Satisfaction have means equal or greater than the midpoint rating of 3.0 on the 1992 survey indicating, overall, positive job satisfaction. The highest ratings are for the meaningfulness of the job--both to NAWC and to the individual employee (3.99 and 3.87, respectively). These items (#24 and #36) represent among the highest attitude ratings in the 1992 survey. The frequencies in Appendix A show greater than 70% of employees agreed with these two questions with more than 35% in the strongly agree category. These two questions show no change as compared with 1991 ratings.

The lowest rating of job satisfaction concerns feelings about "my career at NAWC" (mean = 3.0). This item also shows the

⁵ An independent groups t-test statistical comparison was used with all significant results $p < .01$.

largest decrease in comparison with 1991 (mean = 3.49). A factor contributing to these results could be increasing uncertainty about the future of the Center. As described below, one of the most frequently mentioned concerns in the open-ended comment section was job security in the face of downsizing or possible closure of the Center. The question regarding general satisfaction with one's job while still reflecting a positive rating, shows a statistically significant decrease since 1991 (from 3.64 to 3.36).

Equity and Rewards. This KRA is comprised of 5 items. Two items address issues of fairness in both the merit system and work assignments. And 3 items evaluate the extent to which employees perceive positive contributions, cooperation, and support of other groups as recognized and rewarded. All 5 items have ratings less than 3.0 showing negative ratings. While there is not much variation among the 5 means, the lowest ratings regard fairness in both the merit system (2.52) and the distribution of work assignments (2.56) and the highest rating is for the perception of valuation and reward for support and cooperation with other work groups (2.79 and 2.83, respectively).

Of the two items where comparison with 1991 was possible, only one significant difference was found. The item "NAWC recognizes employee effort and acknowledges positive employee contributions" declined from a mean rating of 2.92 in 1991 to 2.64 in 1992.

Table 3
Mean Ratings for Quality of Work Life Attitudes⁶

	<u>1992</u>	<u>1991</u>
<u>Job Satisfaction</u> (alpha=.81) ⁷		
36. My job is meaningful to NAWC	3.99	4.08
24. The work I do is meaningful to me	3.87	4.02
22. In general, I am satisfied with my job	3.36	3.64*
26. I feel ___ about my career at NAWC (1=very negative; 5=very positive)	3.00	3.49*
 <u>Equity and Rewards</u> (alpha=.76)		
27. When employees are promoted through the merit system, the process is handled fairly	2.52	2.61
14. NAWC recognizes employee effort and acknowledges positive employee contributions	2.64	2.97*
43. At NAWC, cooperation with other work groups is valued and rewarded	2.83	
44. At NAWC, supporting the work of other groups is valued and rewarded.	2.79	
58. At NAWC work is divided and assigned fairly	2.57	
 <u>Training</u> (alpha=.60)		
11. How has your formal school-type training influenced your knowledge, skills and abilities?	4.14	4.16
12. I feel that my informal ojt has been (1=very poor; 5=very good)	3.46	3.58
49. My training experiences at NAWC have developed my skills and encouraged my personal growth and enrichment	3.44	3.55

⁶ All means are based on a scale from (1)=low or negative to (5)=high or positive ratings on the given attribute. An asterisk (*) indicates a statistically significant difference between the 1991 and 1992 means using a t-test comparison and $p < .01$.

⁷ Alpha represents the internal consistency reliability.

Table 3 (cont'd)
Mean Ratings for Quality of Work Life Attitudes

	<u>1992</u>	<u>1991</u>
<u>Teams and Cooperation</u> (alpha=.76)		
21. My working environment [cultures & values] fosters cooperation and teamwork	3.14	3.18
15. NAWC encourages employees to freely interact to accomplish common pursuits	3.04	2.96
38. The NAWC environment stimulates communication and cooperation across organizational units	2.61	2.55
23. NAWC's restructuring fosters teamwork	3.02	
<u>Factors Impacting Ability to Do My Job</u> (alpha=.74)		
46. I have had explained to me NAWC's mission and short-range goals	3.44	3.58
47. I have had explained to me the objectives and responsibilities for my job	3.22	3.82*
25. Do you feel informed of important issues that affect your job (1=no; 5=yes)	2.96	3.22*
13. In doing the daily work required of me, the current work environment makes my job (1=much harder; 5=much easier)	2.48	2.68*
28. To what extent has the restructuring impacted your performance (1=much less productive; 5=much more productive)	2.70	
31. Since the restructuring, my roles & responsibilities are clearly defined	2.44	
32. I understand the CST concept	3.03	
34. I personally support the CST philosophy	3.60	

Table 3 (cont'd)
Mean Ratings for Quality of Work Life Attitudes

	<u>1992</u>	<u>1991</u>
<u>Organizational Support for Doing Things</u>		
<u>Differently (alpha=.75)</u>		
20. My working environment fosters innovation and creativity	2.84	3.03*
42. At NAWC I am encouraged to help others complete their tasks	3.48	
39. My working environment encourages me to share information to help other groups	3.28	
41. My working environment encourages me to try new ways of doing things	3.30	
 <u>Organizational Values and Trust (alpha=.77)</u>		
55. NAWC fosters an environment in which employees are encouraged to make meaningful decisions	2.86	3.02*
48. I am encouraged to participate in the planning and policy making activities here at NAWC	2.30	2.64*
35. NAWC's environment exhibits a high degree of ethics & moral values	2.84	3.12*
37. Management endeavors to be truthful and open to all employees	2.67	2.63
17. My management team ^o is concerned about the physical & emotional well-being of me & my family	2.46	3.27*
33. I believe NAWC Management is committed to the CST concept	3.15	

^o In prior versions of the QWL survey, this question referred to "supervisor" vice "management team."

Training⁹. There are three items that ask employees to evaluate aspects of training opportunities at the Center. The results show no difference between 1991 and 1992 item means. All 3 1992 means show a positive attitude with the rating of the impact of "formal school-type training at NAWC...[on] knowledge, skills and abilities" being the highest (4.14).

Teams and Cooperation. This KRA is comprised of 4 questions that evaluate the employees ratings of NAWC's support for cooperation and teamwork. Three of the items have mean ratings at or slightly above the "neutral" midpoint (3.0). The lowest mean rating (2.61) is found for the item "The NAWC environment stimulates communication and cooperation across organizational units."¹⁰ These results show no significant change in comparison with 1991 for the three comparable items. However, if teamwork and cooperation are goals of the Center, the substantial percentage of "neutral" and "disagree" ratings merits further exploration to determine the source of these employee perceptions. One possible explanation for the percentage not agreeing with these items can be found in the results described in the Equity and Rewards KRA described above. Items there show that approximately 40% of respondents feel that the Center does

⁹ While the internal consistency reliability (alpha) of the scale as a whole is low (.60) due to the limited number of items, it is still possible to examine the individual means. For the purposes of comparison with future administrations of the QWL survey, it is recommended that 1-2 additional items relating to training be added to the survey.

¹⁰ In prior surveys, this item referred to "departments" vice "organizational units."

not value and reward cooperation and support for other work groups (see frequencies in Appendix A, items #43 and #44).

Factors Impacting Ability to Do My Job. The items in this KRA rate the extent to which employees feel informed about factors that influence their ability to do their jobs (e.g., job responsibilities, organizational goals), the impact of the work environment and restructuring on performance, and personal understanding and support for Customer Support Teams. Because half of these items refer to items related to restructuring, only limited comparisons with 1991 are possible.

Among the items in this KRA, the highest rating is for how well-informed employees feel regarding "NAWC's mission and short-range goals" (3.44) which is not significantly different from the rating of this item in 1991. However, there is a small, but significant decline in ratings of being "informed of important issues that affect your job" (from 3.22 in 1991 to 2.96 in 1992).

A more substantial decline from 1991 to 1992 is found regarding how well informed employees feel regarding "the objectives and responsibilities for my job." The mean rating, while still positive (i.e., above the neutral point), dropped from 3.83 to 3.22. This decline could be the result of the recent restructuring of the Center. This conclusion is supported by the rating of 2.44 in response to the question "Since the restructuring, my roles and responsibilities are clearly defined." What is not clear is the difference between the 1992 ratings of the two items specifically focussing on clarity of job responsibilities. The item (#31) that specifically refers to "restructuring" is significantly lower than the parallel item (#47). One possible explanation is that

there are generally negative feelings of uncertainty regarding the restructuring of the Center and this contributed to the low rating on item #31.

The final item that can be compared with 1991 results is "In doing the daily work required of the, the current work environment makes my job (1=much harder; 5=much easier)." Again, there is a decrease since 1991 (from 2.68 to 2.48). This shows that employees felt in 1991 that the "work environment" had a more negative than positive impact on their jobs, and this negative influence has increased slightly.

There are two items unique to 1992 that target Customer Support Teams. The mean rating for employees' personal support of the CST philosophy is the highest in this KRA, and among the highest for the entire survey (3.60). It is interesting to note, however, that the rating for "understanding the CST concept" is 3.03 suggesting that there are many employees who, while they support the concept, do not feel they thoroughly understand it.

Organizational Support for Doing Things Differently. Three of the four items in this KRA were all newly developed for the 1992 survey. These questions all have mean ratings above the neutral midpoint (means range from 3.28 to 3.48). This indicates that a majority of employees feel that NAWC encourages them "to help others complete tasks," "to share information to help other groups," and "to try new ways of doing things." It is important to note, however, that most of the positive responses are in the "slightly agree" rather than the "strongly agree" category. The item rating the work environment's support for innovation and creativity is below the midpoint (2.84) and also shows a small but statistically significant decrease since 1991.

Organizational Values and Trust. The most substantial change when comparing 1991 with 1992 results is for item #17: "My management team is concerned about the physical and emotional well-being of me and my family." The mean rating has decreased from 3.27 to 2.46. In surveys prior to 1992, this question focused on "my supervisor" vice "my management team." The results here suggest that employees feel a substantial loss in feelings of personal security and concern for well-being at this stage of the reorganization. Direct supervisor roles have, for the most part, been removed, and at the time of this survey, the emotional support provided by this role has not been fully replaced by the Competency Center Management Team. An important area for further inquiry is whether the new organizational structure can best provide this kind of support through the Competency Centers, CSTs, project teams, or some combination of these groups.

The only item in this KRA with a positive mean (3.15) is "I believe NAWC management is committed to the CST concept." While the rating is positive, more than 20% disagree and more than 40% have no opinion. The lowest rating (2.30) is given to item #48: "I am encouraged to participate in the planning and policy making activities here at NAWC." This item also received a somewhat negative rating in 1991, but the rating has decreased. A related item (#55) concerning encouragement of employees "to make meaningful decisions" also shows a decrease in 1992 as compared with 1991. While the mean rating for this item is below the midpoint (mean=2.86), employees perceive more organizational support for employee involvement in meaningful decisions than planning and policy making.

The last two items in this KRA rate employees' perceptions of management truthfulness and ethical and moral values exhibited at the Center. The rating for #37 "Management endeavors to be truthful and open to all employees" shows a somewhat negative evaluation (mean=2.67); however this represents no change in comparison with 1991. The rating for item #35 "NAWC's environment exhibits a high degree of ethics and moral values is less negative (mean=2.84) but shows a decrease since 1991.

Effectiveness Indicators

Two items on the survey represent employee perceptions of center effectiveness as defined in terms of "attention to customer needs" (item #19) and "efficiency of work" (item #18). In both cases, the mean ratings are below the midpoint category of "average." The mean rating for attention to customer needs is 2.88 and shows no difference in comparison with the 1991 rating. The frequencies (see Appendix A) show that 34% of respondents rate attention to customer needs as "not very good; attention to customers varies." The mean rating for efficiency of work is 2.30 which shows a small but significant decrease in comparison with the 1991 rating. For this item, 48% rate efficiency as "not very good, efficiency varies" and 18% rate efficiency as very poor.

Special Programs

Four questions on the QWL survey for 1992 focused on specific programs not included in the KRAs above. Only one item allowed comparison with 1991 results. Employee perceptions regarding the provision of "sufficient facilities and resources to support my health and wellness" has declined from a mean of 3.24 in 1991 to 2.96 in 1992. The remaining three items show

neutral to positive ratings. Item #56 asked employees whether "Panel interviews are an improvement over one-on-one interviews in the Merit Promotion process" and received a mean rating of 3.09. More positive support is given for perceptions of fair treatment of minorities under the new merit promotion process (mean=3.35) and the improvement of the quality of work life given the smoking policy (mean=3.53).

Qualitative Comments

The QWL survey has historically provided the option for respondents to provide narrative comments regarding quality of work life issues. This opportunity was again provided in the 1992 survey. In addition, more focused question regarding the impact of the restructuring on performance was also included. The rate of response for qualitative comments on this survey greatly surpassed input typically received. The last page of the survey asked two questions: "In priority, what are the three (3) main quality of work life concerns at NAWC Indianapolis?" and "Please comment on any other aspects of the working environment at NAWC Indianapolis." A total of 263 respondents gave from one to three comments in response to the first question. This represents input from 65% of those completing the survey and the number of comments exceeded 700. The second question generated responses from 157 (39%) of the respondents and more than 150 additional comments.

The extensiveness of these data make an accurate summary difficult. Highlights of these data are presented here. A complete transcription of these comments is available from Paul O'Dell in the Human Resource Office.

OWL Concerns. The most substantial number of concerns related to four primary areas: job security and the future of NAWC, Indianapolis; lack of clarity regarding career opportunities and concerns about promotion fairness; communication and clarity of direction particularly regarding the restructuring; and concerns about leadership and management. Additional comments of notable frequency, but less dominant than those above related to workspace and equipment needs, the smoking policy, training opportunities, and management's support for teamwork and cooperation.

Impact of Restructuring on Performance. A new question was added to the 1992 survey that also provided employees an opportunity to elaborate on their choice in the fixed-response format. Specifically, question #28 asked "To what extent has the restructuring of NAWC Indianapolis impacted your performance capabilities?" As can be seen by the frequencies in Appendix A, 167 employees (42%) chose "much less" or "somewhat less" productive as their response. There were 78 employees (20%) who chose the either the response "somewhat more" or "much more" productive. The survey then asked for those who felt less productive to explain "why and what the problems are." Comments were received by 142 (85%) of the 167 possible. Similarly, those who felt more productive were asked to explain "why and what the opportunities are." In this case, comments were received by 50 (64%) of the 78 possible.

The general themes generated to explain how the restructuring has hurt performance include: lack of role clarity, excessive meetings, too much work as well as too little work, and problems with communication. The general themes

generated to explain how restructuring has benefited performance include: removal of barriers allowing greater coordination, opportunities for self-initiative and innovation, and self-management.

Summary

The results of the 1992 Quality of Work Life Survey reflect generally negative ratings by employees at the Center. Out of the 34 questions that addressed a variety of quality of work life attitudes, more than half had mean ratings that were below the neutral midpoint (3.0) or showed a significant decrease as compared with 1991. Of noteworthy exception are the ratings of agreement regarding: meaningfulness of my job, valuation of training, being informed regarding the Center's mission and goals, Center encouragement of helping others complete their tasks, and employee support for the CST concept. In each of these cases, the mean ratings were significantly above 3.0 and a majority of employees responding to the survey agreed with the statement. However, only one item (#11 impact of formal training on knowledge, skills, and abilities) exceeded a rating of 4.0.

The lowest overall ratings for 1992 or the items that showed the greatest decline as compared with 1991 related to: participation and planning and policy making; management team concern for employee well-being; clarity of employee job responsibilities; Center acknowledgement of employee contributions; fairness of work assignments; ethics and moral values at the Center; general satisfaction; and feelings about their career at NAWC.

It is not possible to definitively attribute the causal factors that are contributing to these results. The Center has

been reorganized and it is reasonable to assume that this explains employees' need for clarity about not only their own job responsibilities, but the roles of newly defined positions. The uncertainty expressed by both item ratings and open-ended comments is not surprising given the research on large scale organizational change. This research argues that the transition stage in changes of this magnitude naturally lead to feelings of loss, distress, and even anger. The changes inherent in the restructuring of the Center, though, are not the only possible explanation for these results. There is significant concern expressed in the open-ended comments regarding the threat from outside the organization in terms of downsizing and even possible closure.

The data here clearly suggest that there needs to be further examination by the Center into factors that are contributing to negative employee attitudes and their capabilities to effectively perform their jobs. The results suggest areas that can be targets for inquiry and can provide a basis for continuing evaluation of the Center's attempts to meet both internal and external customer needs.

APPENDIX A

1992 QUALITY OF WORK LIFE SURVEY

ITEM FREQUENCIES AND MEANS

SECTION I:

N %

1. What type of work do you do?

39	9.9	(1) Administrative (GS-343/345/560/1102/1105/other)
26	6.6	(2) Clerical/Secretarial & Assistant (GS-303/344/561/1106/other)
158	40.1	(3) Engineer/Scientist
69	17.5	(4) Technical (GS-334j/346/other)
81	20.6	(5) Wage Grade (WG, WL, WD, WN, WS)
21	5.3	(6) Other

2. What is your grade level?

19	4.8	(1) GS-1 to 5
253	63.6	(2) GS-6 to 12
44	11.1	(3) GS-13 to 15
—	—	(4) SES
12	3	(5) WG-1 to 5
61	15.3	(6) WG-6 to 11
6	1.5	(7) WG 12 and above
3	.8	(8) Other

3. Are you a member of a Management Team, i.e., People Development Associate (PDA), Process Improvement Associate (PIA), Master Scheduler (MSA), Competency Center Director (CCD)?

38	9.7	(1) Yes
352	90.3	(2) No

4. What is your present work schedule for the 9 hour period?

61	15.4	(1) 0600 to 1530
99	25.1	(2) 0630 to 1600
114	28.9	(3) 0700 to 1630
48	12.2	(4) 0730 to 1700
15	3.8	(5) 0800 to 1730
42	10.6	(6) Other 9 hour period
16	4.1	(7) I do not work on 5-4/9; I work an 8-hour per day shift

5. I am:

298	75.3	(1) Male
98	24.7	(2) Female

6. My age is:

52	13.1	(1) 29 or less
135	33.9	(2) 30-39
116	29.1	(3) 40-49
77	19.3	(4) 50-59
18	4.5	(5) 60 or older

N **%**

7. Highest level of education attained:

5	1.2	(1) Attended high school
74	18.4	(2) Graduate high school
105	26.1	(3) Attended college
111	27.6	(4) College degree (Bachelor's)
73	18.2	(5) Some post-graduate courses
26	6.5	(6) Master's degree
6	1.5	(7) Post-Master's courses
2	.5	(8) Doctoral degree

8. My total experience at NAWC Indianapolis is:

		(1) Less than 1 year
38	9.5	(2) Between 1-3 years
48	11.9	(3) Between 3-5 years
138	34.3	(4) Between 5-10 years
107	26.6	(5) Between 10-20 years
55	13.7	(6) Between 20-30 years
16	4	(7) More than 30 years

9. My ethnic background is:

3	.8	(1) American Indian or Alaskan Native
4	1	(2) Asian or Pacific Islander
31	7.8	(3) Black - Not of Hispanic Origin
3	.8	(4) Hispanic
340	85.2	(5) White - Not of Hispanic Origin
18	4.5	(6) Other/Prefer not to respond

10. I have a physical handicap

30	7.6	(1) Yes
363	92.4	(2) No

SECTION II:

N	%		
		11. How has your formal school-type training at NAWC Indianapolis influenced your knowledge, skills and abilities?	mean = 4.143
6	1.5	(1) Very negatively - waste of time	
9	2.3	(2) Slightly negatively	
66	16.8	(3) No noticeable effect	
153	39	(4) Slightly positively	
158	40.3	(5) Very positively - good investments	
		12. I feel that my informal on-the-job training has been:	mean = 3.456
35	8.7	(1) Very poor	
68	17	(2) Not very good (slightly negative reaction)	
56	14	(3) No opinion/neutral response	
163	40.6	(4) Pretty good (slightly positive reaction)	
79	19.7	(5) Very good	
		13. In doing the daily work required of me, the current work environment makes my job:	mean = 2.484
83	20.8	(1) Much harder to do	
157	39.3	(2) Slightly harder to do	
76	19.0	(3) Has no impact on the job I do	
49	12.3	(4) Slightly easier to do	
34	8.5	(5) Much easier to do	
		14. NAWC Indianapolis recognizes employee effort and acknowledges positive employee contributions.	mean = 2.637
93	23.3	(1) Strongly disagree	
117	29.3	(2) Slightly disagree	
50	12.5	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
120	30.1	(4) Slightly agree	
19	4.8	(5) Strongly agree	
		15. NAWC Indianapolis encourages employees to freely interact to accomplish common pursuits.	mean = 3.040
50	12.5	(1) Strongly disagree	
100	25.1	(2) Slightly disagree	
82	20.6	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
118	29.6	(4) Slightly agree	
49	12.3	(5) Strongly agree	
		16. I know who may Management Team members are, i.e., People Development Associate (PDA), Process Improvement Associate (PIA), Master Scheduler Associate (MSA), Competency Center Director (CCD).	mean = 1.200
316	80	(1) Yes	
79	20	(2) No	

N	%		
		17. My Management Team, is concerned about the physical and emotional well-being of me and my family.	
			mean=2.462
117	29.4	(1) Strongly disagree	
73	18.3	(2) Slightly disagree	
128	32.2	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
67	16.8	(4) Slightly agree	
13	3.3	(5) Strongly agree	
		18. I believe that the efficiency of work (accuracy, timeliness) here at NAWC Indianapolis is:	
			mean=2.300
73	18.4	(1) Very poor	
189	47.6	(2) Not very good; the efficiency varies	
82	20.7	(3) "Average" (no opinion; neutral)	
49	12.3	(4) Pretty good, with generally good efficiency	
4	1.0	(5) Very good/excellent	
		19. I believe that NAWC Indianapolis' attention to customer needs is:	
			mean=2.880
26	6.5	(1) Very poor	
136	34.1	(2) Not very good; the attention to customers varies	
108	27.1	(3) "Average" (no opinion; neutral)	
118	29.6	(4) Pretty good, with generally good attention to customers	
11	2.8	(5) Very good/excellent	
		20. My working environment fosters innovation and creativity.	
			mean=2.845
77	19.3	(1) Strongly disagree	
99	24.8	(2) Slightly disagree	
64	16.0	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
129	32.3	(4) Slightly agree	
31	7.8	(5) Strongly agree	
		21. My working environment cultures and values foster cooperation and teamwork.	
			mean=3.143
50	12.6	(1) Strongly disagree	
91	2.9	(2) Slightly disagree	
63	15.8	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
140	35.2	(4) Slightly agree	
54	13.6	(5) Strongly agree	
		22. In general, I am satisfied with my job,	
			mean=3.363
47	11.8	(1) Strongly disagree	
77	19.3	(2) Slightly disagree	
39	9.8	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
158	39.5	(4) Slightly agree	
79	19.8	(5) Strongly agree	

N	%		
23. NAWC Indianapolis' restructuring fosters teamwork.			mean=3.018
60	15.1	(1) Strongly disagree	
82	20.6	(2) Slightly disagree	
86	21.6	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
131	32.9	(4) Slightly agree	
39	9.8	(5) Strongly agree	
24. The work I do is meaningful to me.			mean=3.873
30	7.5	(1) Strongly disagree	
34	8.5	(2) Slightly disagree	
48	12.0	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
134	33.4	(4) Slightly agree	
155	38.7	(5) Strongly agree	
25. Do you feel informed of important issues that affect your job.			mean=2.958
75	18.7	(1) No - I am rarely informed of important issues	
115	28.7	(2) Not really (slightly negative)	
22	5.5	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
130	32.4	(4) Yes, sometimes (slightly positive)	
59	14.7	(5) Yes - with few exceptions I am kept informed of important issues.	
26. I feel _____ about my career at NAWC Indianapolis.			mean=3.000
59	14.8	(1) Very negative	
106	26.6	(2) Slightly negative	
63	15.8	(3) Neither positive or negative	
118	29.6	(4) Slightly positive	
53	13.3	(5) Very positive	
27. When employees are promoted through the merit system at NAWC Indianapolis, the process is handled fairly.			mean=2.518
98	24.7	(1) Strongly disagree	
90	22.7	(2) Slightly disagree	
130	32.8	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
61	15.4	(4) Slightly agree	
17	4.3	(5) Strongly agree	
28. To what extent has the restructuring of NAWC Indianapolis impacted your performance capabilities.			mean=2.695
42	10.5	(1) I feel I am much less productive	
125	31.3	(2) I feel I am somewhat less productive	
165	41.3	(3) It has no impact on my productivity	
49	12.3	(4) I feel I am somewhat productive	
19	4.8	(5) I feel I am much more productive	

N %

29. We recognize that the restructuring of NAWC Indianapolis may have created uncertainties in the organization. Using the scale below, rate each of the following in terms of how much more information you would like or feel you need to effectively perform your job.

_____ Strategic purpose of restructuring to organizational mission

mean = 1.605

- | | | |
|-----|------|---|
| 187 | 50.3 | 1. I need no further information about this |
| 145 | 39.0 | 2. I would like more information |
| 40 | 10.8 | 3. I need more information to do my job |

_____ Reporting relationships

mean = 1.854

- | | | |
|-----|------|---|
| 119 | 32.8 | 1. I need no further information about this |
| 178 | 49.0 | 2. I would like more information |
| 66 | 18.2 | 3. I need more information to do my job |

_____ Training opportunities

mean = 2.011

- | | | |
|-----|------|---|
| 96 | 25.7 | 1. I need no further information about this |
| 178 | 47.6 | 2. I would like more information |
| 100 | 26.7 | 3. I need more information to do my job |

_____ Career opportunities

mean = 2.042

- | | | |
|-----|------|---|
| 73 | 19.3 | 1. I need no further information about this |
| 216 | 57.1 | 2. I would like more information |
| 89 | 23.5 | 3. I need more information to do my job |

_____ Clarification of job responsibilities

mean = 1.965

- | | | |
|-----|------|---|
| 135 | 36.3 | 1. I need no further information about this |
| 115 | 30.9 | 2. I would like more information |
| 122 | 32.8 | 3. I need more information to do my job |

_____ Coordination mechanisms with other related work groups

mean = 2.103

- | | | |
|-----|------|---|
| 87 | 23.6 | 1. I need no further information about this |
| 157 | 42.5 | 2. I would like more information |
| 125 | 33.9 | 3. I need more information to do my job |

30. My workload has _____ since NAWC Indianapolis' restructuring.

mean = 3.106

- | | | |
|-----|------|-----------------------------|
| 55 | 13.9 | (1) Substantially decreased |
| 60 | 15.1 | (2) Slightly decreased |
| 134 | 33.8 | (3) Has not changed |
| 84 | 21.2 | (4) Slightly increased |
| 64 | 16.1 | (5) Substantially increased |

N	%		
		31. Since the restructuring, my roles and responsibilities are clearly defined.	mean=2.444
98	24.6	(1) Strongly disagree	
118	29.6	(2) Slightly disagree	
111	27.8	(3) Not changed	
52	13.0	(4) Slightly agree	
20	5.0	(5) Strongly agree	
		32. I understand the Customer Service Team (CST) concept.	mean=3.025
67	16.9	(1) Strongly disagree	
81	20.5	(2) Slightly disagree	
81	20.5	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
109	27.5	(4) Slightly agree	
58	14.6	(5) Strongly agree	
		33. I believe that NAWC Indianapolis' Management is committed to the Customer Service Team Concept (CST).	mean=3.145
33	8.4	(1) Strongly disagree	
54	13.7	(2) Slightly disagree	
171	43.5	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
93	23.7	(4) Slightly agree	
42	10.7	(5) Strongly agree	
		34. I personally support the Customer Service Team (CST) philosophy.	mean=3.602
15	3.9	(1) Strongly disagree	
21	5.4	(2) Slightly disagree	
163	41.9	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
95	24.4	(4) Slightly agree	
95	24.4	(5) Strongly agree	
		35. NAWC Indianapolis's environment exhibits a high degree of ethics and moral values.	mean=2.836
64	16.2	(1) Strongly disagree	
96	24.2	(2) Slightly disagree	
110	27.8	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
93	23.5	(4) Slightly agree	
33	8.3	(5) Strongly agree	
		36. My job is meaningful to NAWC Indianapolis.	mean=3.985
19	4.8	(1) Strongly disagree	
28	7.1	(2) Slightly disagree	
49	12.4	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
143	36.2	(4) Slightly agree	
156	39.5	(5) Strongly agree	

N %

37. Management endeavors to be truthful and open to all employees.

mean = 2.668

84	21.2	(1) Strongly disagree
114	28.7	(2) Slightly disagree
81	20.4	(3) No opinion (neutral)
83	21.7	(4) Slightly agree
32	8.1	(5) Strongly agree

38. The NAWC Indianapolis environment stimulates communication and cooperation across organizational units.

mean = 2.607

79	19.9	(1) Strongly disagree
128	32.2	(2) Slightly disagree
75	18.9	(3) No opinion (neutral)
100	25.2	(4) Slightly agree
15	3.8	(5) Strongly agree

39. My working environment encourages me to share information to help other groups,

mean = 3.275

38	9.6	(1) Strongly disagree
75	18.9	(2) Slightly disagree
78	19.7	(3) No opinion (neutral)
150	37.9	(4) Slightly agree
55	13.9	(5) Strongly agree

41. My working environment encourages me to try new ways of doing things.

mean = 3.301

40	10.1	(1) Strongly disagree
73	18.4	(2) Slightly disagree
68	17.2	(3) No opinion (neutral)
158	39.9	(4) Slightly agree
57	14.4	(5) Strongly agree

42. At NAWC Indianapolis, I am encouraged to help others complete their tasks.

mean = 3.478

24	6.1	(1) Strongly disagree
62	15.7	(2) Slightly disagree
81	20.5	(3) No opinion (neutral)
157	39.7	(4) Slightly agree
71	18.0	(5) Strongly agree

N	%		
		43. NAWC Indianapolis, cooperation with other work groups is valued and rewarded.	
			mean=2.833
47	11.9	(1) Strongly disagree	
105	26.5	(2) Slightly disagree	
131	33.1	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
93	23.5	(4) Slightly agree	
20	5.1	(5) Strongly agree	
		44. At NAWC Indianapolis, supporting the work of other groups is valued and rewarded.	
			mean=2.790
51	12.9	(1) Strongly disagree	
105	26.6	(2) Slightly disagree	
132	33.4	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
90	22.8	(4) Slightly agree	
17	4.3	(5) Strongly agree	
		45. NAWC Indianapolis provides sufficient facilities and resources to support my health and wellness.	
			mean=2.962
69	17.5	(1) Strongly disagree	
93	23.5	(2) Slightly disagree	
69	17.5	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
112	28.4	(4) Slightly agree	
52	13.2	(5) Strongly agree	
		46. I have had explained to me NAWC Indianapolis' mission and short-range goals.	
			mean=3.437
38	9.6	(1) Strongly disagree	
63	15.9	(2) Slightly disagree	
51	12.9	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
176	44.4	(4) Slightly agree	
68	17.2	(5) Strongly agree	
		47. I have had explained to me the objectives and responsibilities for my job.	
			mean=3.217
55	13.9	(1) Strongly disagree	
80	20.2	(2) Slightly disagree	
55	13.9	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
138	34.8	(4) Slightly agree	
69	17.4	(5) Strongly agree	

N	%		
		48. I am encouraged to participate in the planning and policy-making activities here at NAWC Indianapolis.	
			mean = 2.300
146	36.8	(1) Strongly disagree	
103	25.9	(2) Slightly disagree	
57	14.4	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
65	16.4	(4) Slightly agree	
26	6.5	(5) Strongly agree	
		49. My training experiences at NAWC Indianapolis have developed my skills and encouraged my personal growth and enrichment.	
			mean = 3.444
48	12.0	(1) Strongly disagree	
56	14.0	(2) Slightly disagree	
46	11.5	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
169	42.4	(4) Slightly agree	
80	20.1	(5) Strongly agree	
		50. I am aware of what my People Development Associate's (PDA's) roles and responsibilities are.	
			mean = 2.405
87	21.8	(1) Yes, I am fully aware	
121	30.3	(2) Somewhat, but I would like more information	
135	33.8	(3) I know who they are, but not how they impact my work or how to use them as a resource	
57	14.3	(4) Not at all	
		51. I am aware of what my Process Improvement Associate's (PIA's) roles and responsibilities are.	
			mean = 2.658
58	14.5	(1) Yes, I am fully aware	
112	28.0	(2) Somewhat, but I would like more information	
139	34.8	(3) I know who they are, but not how they impact my work or how to use them as a resource	
91	22.8	(4) Not at all	
		52. I am aware of what my Master Scheduler Associate's (MSA's) roles and responsibilities are.	
			mean = 2.248
111	27.8	(1) Yes, I am fully aware	
139	34.8	(2) Somewhat, but I would like more information	
90	22.5	(3) I know who they are, but not how they impact my work or how to use them as a resource	
60	15.0	(4) Not at all	
		53. I am aware of what my Project Leader's (PL's), roles and responsibilities are.	
			mean = 2.240
133	34.3	(1) Yes, I am fully aware	
117	30.2	(2) Somewhat, but I would like more information	
50	12.9	(3) I know who they are, but not how they impact my work or how to use them as a resource	
88	22.7	(4) Not at all	

N %

54. I am aware of what my competency Center Director's (CCD's), roles and responsibilities are.

mean = 2.258

102	25.8	(1) Yes, I am fully aware
148	37.4	(2) Somewhat, but I would like more information
88	22.2	(3) I know who they are, but not how they impact my work or how to use them as a resource
28	14.6	(4) Not at all

SECTION III

N	%		
		55. NAWC Indianapolis fosters an environment in which employees are encouraged to make meaningful decisions.	
			mean=2.861
56	14.1	(1) Strongly disagree	
115	29.0	(2) Slightly disagree	
75	18.39	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
130	32.7	(4) Slightly agree	
21	5.3	(5) Strongly agree	
		56. Panel interviews are an improvement over on-on-one interviews in the Merit Promotion process.	
			mean=3.093
40	10.0	(1) Strongly disagree	
38	9.5	(2) Slightly disagree	
206	51.6	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
75	18.8	(4) Slightly agree	
40	10.0	(5) Strongly agree	
		57. Minority groups (Hispanic, Asian Pacific, American Indian, Handicapped, Female, and Black) at NAWC Indianapolis are treated fairly under the new Merit Promotion Program."	
			mean=3.348
31	7.8	(1) Strongly disagree	
26	6.5	(2) Slightly disagree	
201	50.4	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
55	13.8	(4) Slightly agree	
86	21.6	(5) Strongly agree	
		58. At NAWC Indianapolis, work is divided and assigned fairly.	
			mean=2.572
88	22.0	(1) Strongly disagree	
107	26.8	(2) Slightly disagree	
105	26.3	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
88	22.0	(4) Slightly agree	
12	3.0	(5) Strongly agree	
		59. The quality of work life at NAWC Indianapolis has improved since implementation of the smoking policy.	
			mean=3.528
50	12.5	(1) Strongly disagree	
36	9.0	(2) Slightly disagree	
102	25.5	(3) No opinion (neutral)	
77	19.3	(4) Slightly agree	
135	33.8	(5) Strongly agree	

SECTION II:

'92 '91

4.143 4.157

11. How has your formal school-type training at NAWC Indianapolis influenced your knowledge, skills and abilities?

- (1) Very negatively - waste of time
- (2) Slightly negatively
- (3) No noticeable effect
- (4) Slightly positively
- (5) Very positively - good investments

3.456 3.581

12. I feel that my informal on-the-job training has been:

- (1) Very poor
- (2) Not very good (slightly negative reaction)
- (3) No opinion/neutral response
- (4) Pretty good (slightly positive reaction)
- (5) Very good

2.484 2.682

13. In doing the daily work required of me, the current work environment makes my job:

- (1) Much harder to do
- (2) Slightly harder to do
- (3) Has no impact on the job I do
- (4) Slightly easier to do
- (5) Much easier to do

2.637 2.970

14. NAWC Indianapolis recognizes employee effort and acknowledges positive employee contributions.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.040 2.960

15. NAWC Indianapolis encourages employees to freely interact to accomplish common pursuits.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

'92 '91

1.200

16. I know who may Management Team members are, i.e., People Development Associate (PDA), Process Improvement Associate (PIA), Master Scheduler Associate (MSA), Competency Center Director (CCD).

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

2.462 3.272

17. My Management Team, is concerned about the physical and emotional well-being of me and my family.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

2.300 2.460

18. I believe that the efficiency of work (accuracy, timeliness) here at NAWC Indianapolis is:

- (1) Very poor
- (2) Not very good; the efficiency varies
- (3) "Average" (no opinion; neutral)
- (4) Pretty good, with generally good efficiency
- (5) Very good/excellent

2.880 3.004

19. I believe that NAWC Indianapolis' attention to customer needs is:

- (1) Very poor
- (2) Not very good; the attention to customers varies
- (3) "Average" (no opinion; neutral)
- (4) Pretty good, with generally good attention to customers
- (5) Very good/excellent

2.845 3.028

20. My working environment fosters innovation and creativity.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

'92 '91

3.143 3.175

21. My working environment cultures and values foster cooperation and teamwork.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.363 3.644

22. In general, I am satisfied with my job,

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.018

23. NAWC Indianapolis' restructuring fosters teamwork.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.873 4.018

24. The work I do is meaningful to me.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

2.958 3.222

25. Do you feel informed of important issues that affect your job.

- (1) No - I am rarely informed of important issues
- (2) Not really (slightly negative)
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Yes, sometimes (slightly positive)
- (5) Yes - with few exceptions I am kept informed of important issues.

'92 '91

3.000 3.493

26. I feel _____ about my career at NAWC Indianapolis.

- (1) Very negative
- (2) Slightly negative
- (3) Neither positive or negative
- (4) Slightly positive
- (5) Very positive

2.518 2.611

27. When employees are promoted through the merit system at NAWC Indianapolis, the process is handled fairly.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

2.695

28. To what extent has the restructuring of NAWC Indianapolis impacted your performance capabilities.

- (1) I feel I am much less productive
- (2) I feel I am somewhat less productive
- (3) It has no impact on my productivity
- (4) I feel I am somewhat productive
- (5) I feel I am much more productive

29. We recognize that the restructuring of NAWC Indianapolis may have created uncertainties in the organization. Using the scale below, rate each of the following in terms of how much more information you would like or feel you need to effectively perform your job.

1.605

_____ Strategic purpose of restructuring to organizational mission

1. I need no further information about this
2. I would like more information
3. I need more information to do my job

1.854

_____ Reporting relationships

1. I need no further information about this
2. I would like more information
3. I need more information to do my job

2.011

_____ **Training opportunities**

1. I need no further information about this
2. I would like more information
3. I need more information to do my job

2.042

_____ **Career opportunities**

1. I need no further information about this
2. I would like more information
3. I need more information to do my job

1.965

_____ **Clarification of job responsibilities**

1. I need no further information about this
2. I would like more information
3. I need more information to do my job

2.103

_____ **Coordination mechanisms with other related work groups**

1. I need no further information about this
2. I would like more information
3. I need more information to do my job

3.106

30. My workload has _____ since NAWC Indianapolis' restructuring.

- (1) Substantially decreased
- (2) Slightly decreased
- (3) Has not changed
- (4) Slightly increased
- (5) Substantially increased

2.444

31. Since the restructuring, my roles and responsibilities are clearly defined.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) Not changed
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.025

32. I understand the Customer Service Team (CST) concept.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

'92 '91

3.145

33. I believe that NAWC Indianapolis' Management is committed to the Customer Service Team Concept (CST).

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.602

34. I personally support the Customer Service Team (CST) philosophy.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

2.836 3.118

35. NAWC Indianapolis's environment exhibits a high degree of ethics and moral values.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.985 4.077

36. My job is meaningful to NAWC Indianapolis.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

2.668 2.629

37. Management endeavors to be truthful and open to all employees.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

'92 '91

2.607 2.552

38. The NAWC Indianapolis environment stimulates communication and cooperation across organizational units.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.275

39. My working environment encourages me to share information to help other groups,

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.301

41. My working environment encourages me to try new ways of doing things.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.478

42. At NAWC Indianapolis, I am encouraged to help others complete their tasks.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

2.833

43. NAWC Indianapolis, cooperation with other work groups is valued and rewarded.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

'92 '91

2.790

44. At NAWC Indianapolis, supporting the work of other groups is valued and rewarded.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

2.962 3.238

45. NAWC Indianapolis provides sufficient facilities and resources to support my health and wellness.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.437 3.577

46. I have had explained to me NAWC Indianapolis' mission and short-range goals.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.217 3.817

47. I have had explained to me the objectives and responsibilities for my job.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

2.300 2.637

48. I am encouraged to participate in the planning and policy-making activities here at NAWC Indianapolis.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

'92 '91

3.444 3.545

49. My training experiences at NAWC Indianapolis have developed my skills and encouraged my personal growth and enrichment.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

2.405

50. I am aware of what my People Development Associate's (PDA's) roles and responsibilities are.

- (1) Yes, I am fully aware
- (2) Somewhat, but I would like more information
- (3) I know who they are, but not how they impact my work or how to use them as a resource
- (4) Not at all

2.658

51. I am aware of what my Process Improvement Associate's (PIA's) roles and responsibilities are.

- (1) Yes, I am fully aware
- (2) Somewhat, but I would like more information
- (3) I know who they are, but not how they impact my work or how to use them as a resource
- (4) Not at all

2.248

52. I am aware of what my Master Scheduler Associate's (MSA's) roles and responsibilities are.

- (1) Yes, I am fully aware
- (2) Somewhat, but I would like more information
- (3) I know who they are, but not how they impact my work or how to use them as a resource
- (4) Not at all

2.240

53. I am aware of what my Project Leader's (PL's), roles and responsibilities are.

- (1) Yes, I am fully aware
- (2) Somewhat, but I would like more information
- (3) I know who they are, but not how they impact my work or how to use them as a resource
- (4) Not at all

2.258

54. I am aware of what my competency Center Director's (CCD's), roles and responsibilities are.

- (1) Yes, I am fully aware
- (2) Somewhat, but I would like more information
- (3) I know who they are, but not how they impact my work or how to use them as a resource
- (4) Not at all

SECTION III

2.861 3.016

55. NAWC Indianapolis fosters an environment in which employees are encouraged to make meaningful decisions.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.093

56. Panel interviews are an improvement over on-on-one interviews in the Merit Promotion process.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.348

57. Minority groups (Hispanic, Asian Pacific, American Indian, Handicapped, Female, and Black) at NAWC Indianapolis are treated fairly under the new Merit Promotion Program."

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

2.572

58. At NAWC Indianapolis, work is divided and assigned fairly.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3.528

59. The quality of work life at NAWC Indianapolis has improved since implementation of the smoking policy.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Slightly disagree
- (3) No opinion (neutral)
- (4) Slightly agree
- (5) Strongly agree

Distribution List

<u>Agency</u>	<u>No. of copies</u>
Department of Systems Management Library Code AS Naval Postgraduate School 555 Dyer Rd. Monterey, CA 93943	2
Dr. Susan Page Hocesvar, Code AS/Hc Department of Systems Management Naval Postgraduate School 555 Dyer Rd. Monterey, CA 93943	3
Dudley Knox Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5002	2
Library, Center for Naval Analyses 4401 Ford Ave. Alexandria, VA 22302-0268	1

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY



3 2768 00342640 4