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ABSTRACT

The present study examined the effects of a participatory program evaluation on the job satisfaction of staff in a skills training program for visible minority women. A review of the literature indicated that human services staff frequently suffer from job dissatisfaction, especially in the Interpersonal areas of co-worker relations, supervision, and participation in decision-making (Buffum & Konick, 1982; Cherniss & Egnatios, 1978; Frank, Cosey, Angevine & Cardone, 1985). Preliminary meetings with the staff confirmed the existence of dissatisfaction in these areas. With the collaboration of staff, organizational processes were examined and enhanced: goals and objectives were clarified, data were collected and analyzed, performance review forms were redesigned, new instruments were designed, and the evaluation report was written. Direct interventions, in the form of team-building workshops, focused on improving the program in terms of staff relations. As well, the process itself, with maximal staff participation, was designed to increase staff members' participation in decision-making. Changes in staff job satisfaction were monitored through an initial Job Satisfaction Questionnaire and mid-point and final interviews. As hypothesized, staff expressed initial dissatisfaction, primarily in the Interpersonal area.
Rather than reducing dissatisfaction, participation in the evaluation process led staff to discuss perceived problems more openly, resulting in several staff resignations. Program participants' outcome levels and evaluations of the program were used as measures of organizational effectiveness and changes in staff attitudes. Although aware of staff problems, successive participant groups' task performance improved, consistent with the evaluation initiated program changes. The implications of these results for the participatory evaluation model are discussed.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project, long in reaching fruition, could not have been completed without the help of several people.

First, I would like to thank the chairperson of my committee, Dr. Shelagh Towson, for her guidance, her encouragement and her patience during sometimes difficult times. Her insight and input were invaluable.

Second, sincere thanks are extended to Dr. Durhane Wong-Rieger who guided me through murky waters yet still gave me the chance to find my own way. Her contributions went far beyond what was required of a committee member.

Third, I would like to express my gratitude to the late Dr. Gerald Erickson who contributed greatly with his helpful feedback and insights.

Finally, I would like to thank the staff and Board of ACHIEVE whose cooperation throughout the research project went beyond the call of duty.
# CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ........................................................................... i

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ..................................................... iii

LIST OF TABLES .................................................................. vi

LIST OF FIGURES ................................................................ vii

Chapter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. INTRODUCTION ..........................................................</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Models of Program Evaluation .......................................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Program Evaluation and Job Satisfaction ....</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses ...................................................................</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. METHOD ..........................................................</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description ...................................................</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design ..........................................................</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure ...................................................................</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background ...................................................................</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Staff Procedure .............................................</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview ....................................................................</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Interventions ...........................................</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Dependent Measures ...........................................</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Questionnaire .....................................</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Interviews .......................................................</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Procedure ...............................................</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview ....................................................................</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Dependent Measures ....................................</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Outcomes ..................................................</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Evaluations ..............................................</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Interviews ...............................................</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. RESULTS ..........................................................</th>
<th>61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Analyses ...................................................</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Dependent Measures ...........................................</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Questionnaire .....................................</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Related Factors ..................................................</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic (Content) ......................................................</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic (Context) .....................................................</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Factors ..................................................</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker Relations ...................................................</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision .............................................................</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decision-Making ...................................</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary .....................................................................</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mid-Point Individual Staff Interviews... 79
  Program Staff...................................... 79
  Project Manager.................................. 83
Final Interviews.................................... 85
Participant Dependent Measures.............. 93
Participant Outcomes............................ 94
Participant Evaluations of the
  Program........................................... 104
Participant Interviews.......................... 111
Summary of Participant Dependent
  Measures.......................................... 112

IV DISCUSSION........................................ 116

  General Discussion and Limitations
  of the Study.................................... 116
  Conclusions and Suggestions for
  Further Studies.................................. 134

REFERENCES........................................ 136

Appendix

A. Application Form Initially used by ACHIEVE........ 145
B. Revised Application Form.............................. 150
C. Job Satisfaction Questionnaire....................... 158
D. Futuring Workshop.................................. 164
E. Job Descriptions Workshop............................ 167
F. Initial Staff Interview Format....................... 172
G. Initial Format For Follow-Up Staff Interviews.... 173
H. Revised Format for Follow-up/Exit Interviews...... 175
I. Participant Evaluation Form........................... 177
J. Participant Interview Questions...................... 183
K. Participant Comments.................................. 184

Vita Autoris........................................... 188
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation Process, Steps, Objectives and Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JSQ Task-Related Factor Ratings: Intrinsic (Content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JSQ Task-Related Factor Ratings: Extrinsic (Context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JSQ Interpersonal Factor Ratings: Co-Worker Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JSQ Interpersonal Factor Ratings: Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JSQ Interpersonal Factor Ratings: Participation in Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Responses to Final Interview Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mean Technical Skills Outcome Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Percentage of Participants Who Excel in Technical Skill Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mean Transitional Skills Outcome Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mean Small Business Component Outcome Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Participants' Mean Ratings of Staff Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Participants' Mean Ratings of Appropriateness of Amount of Staff Time Spent in Each Skill Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Participants' Mean Ratings of Usefulness of Instruction in Each Skill Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGURES</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Participatory Program Evaluation, Staff Job Satisfaction, and Participants' Outcome Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACHIEVE Staff: Data Collection and Intervention Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ACHIEVE Participants: Data Collection Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The research described in the present paper involves an assessment of the impact of a participatory program evaluation on the job satisfaction of staff members in an employment skills training program for visible minority women. The choice of a participatory model of program evaluation and the focus on job satisfaction as a critical variable were dictated by both theoretical considerations and specific program characteristics. The following discussion begins with a survey and critique of various program evaluation models. The second section of the introduction includes a model of job satisfaction, a brief review of relevant research, and arguments suggesting the utility of a participatory program evaluation model in increasing job satisfaction. In the third section of the introduction, relevant research questions and hypotheses are proposed.

Models of Program Evaluation

Program evaluation is defined by Rossi and Freeman (1982) as "a systematic application of social research procedures to make a reliable and valid assessment of
the conceptualization, design, implementation, and utility of a social program" (p. 19). While this definition is consistent with that used by most program evaluators (e.g., Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1978; Pancer, 1985; Posavac & Carey, 1985; Rutman, 1977; Rutman & Nowbray, 1983), their interpretation of its component parts differs significantly, depending on whether the program evaluation is summative or formative and whether the program evaluators are advocates of "research/truth" or "practice/action" program evaluation models (Hudson, 1988).

Summative evaluations answer the question of whether a program should be started, continued, discontinued, or chosen from a number of alternatives (Posavac & Carey, 1985). A summative evaluation describes the program and produces a statement outlining whether the program has achieved its goals, had unanticipated outcomes, and possibly how it compares to other alternatives. Regardless of whether the program is "young" or "old," the focus is on outcomes, with little or no regard for processes (Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1978).

The summative approach has been criticized on various grounds. First, governmental regulations may require the evaluation of a program before it has been completely developed and refined (Weiss, 1972b). A
related problem is that necessary information may not be available for the evaluation (Posavac & Carey, 1985). Third, summative evaluations tend to treat programs as undifferentiated wholes and program components may not be examined separately (Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1978). Fourth, numerous studies (e.g., Stevenson, Longabaugh & McNeill, 1979; Weiss, 1972b) have found that recommendations based on summative evaluation data are seldom used.

The focus of formative or "process" evaluations is on the means or processes used to fulfill program goals. Formative evaluations focus on program components in an attempt to improve services or outcomes and make the program more effective and efficient (Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1978). The program is not regarded as final or set, so evaluators can try out variations of different methods and measures. Because the formative evaluation model is more flexible than the summative evaluation model, it has more potential for utilization (Davis & Salasin, 1975). Evaluation findings can also feed back into the program.

The specific form the summative and formative models take is strongly influenced by the extent to which the program evaluator is research/truth or practice/action-oriented. Program evaluation is a relatively new area. Although some program evaluations
were conducted as early as the late 1890's, these efforts were sporadic and certainly not of the calibre required today (Rutman, 1980). It was not until the 1970's, as a result of the economic crisis and declining funds for service programs, that there began a quest for more constructive and useful evaluations (Dubois, 1981).

The earliest systematic program evaluations followed the research/truth model of evaluation which dominated until the mid seventies (Patton, 1981, 1982). This model was long touted as the "ideal" way of conducting studies and is still the model of choice for some researchers (e.g., Campbell, 1979; Rossi & Freeman, 1982; Boruch & Cordray, 1982). Using methods developed for laboratory-based, experimental social science research, program evaluators committed to the "truth" criterion see their role as that of objective scientists. The assumption is that a good evaluation is one which fulfills rigorous methodological criteria. What happens after the data are collected "is somebody else's concern" (Hudson, 1988, p. 115). In the hands of research/truth evaluators, both formative and summative program evaluations tend to reflect a strong commitment to experimental methodology based on the hypotheticoductive model, with an emphasis on randomization, experimental control and quantitative modes of analysis. The explicit assumption is that if the traditional
experimental method is strictly adhered to, then the evaluation will necessarily be both valid and informative and therefore its results will inevitably be utilized (Patton, 1981, 1982).

Perhaps in a laboratory setting this would indeed be the case. In the real world, however, effects usually have multiple sources. The hypothetico-deductive model typically treats program outcomes simply as estimates of treatment effects, as though inputs and outputs are unidimensional. In fact, this is seldom the case (Britan, 1981; McLaughlin, 1985). Further, in the real world of program evaluation, nature does not stick to the script. Planned treatments go awry, and surprises lead the investigator down new paths. Questions posed to get the inquiry underway prove to be far less interesting than the questions that emerge as observations are made and puzzled over. Not infrequently, questions arising out of the observations prove to be more important in the long run than the facts that the study was designed to pin down (Cronbach, 1982, p. x).

It has been argued that the experimental method is actually counterproductive, since it requires holding the program constant, rather than facilitating its continual improvement (Guba & Stufflebeam, 1988, cited in Weiss, 1970). Furthermore, it requires having the program run full cycle, so that the eventual information provided by the evaluation may be too late to have any real impact. Finally, the need to establish experi-
ments and control conditions can create an artificial program. Fulfillment of the experimental goal, demonstration of statistically significant effects, requires that "all sources of variance be controlled and that specific program or policy effects be estimated against the clamor and complexity of the institutional setting" (McLaughlin, 1985, p. 105).

A further criticism of the truth-oriented approach to formative and summative evaluations is that, even when the experimental method is not rigidly adhered to, the evaluator as experiemnter assumes almost total control of the evaluation. Although program stakeholders may be consulted at the outset of the evaluation and kept informed of its progress, they are in no sense regarded as colleagues or active contributors to the research process. Rather, the evaluator, in an effort to maintain "scientific objectivity," remains as detached as possible from program stakeholders (Patton, 1982).

These criticisms of the philosophical and methodological bases of the research/truth evaluation model evolved in large part as a result of increasing evidence that recommendations based on this model were not being utilized (e.g., Patton, 1977; Stevenson, Longabaugh & McNeill, 1979; Weiss, 1973). This disheartening finding led to the development of the
practice/action model of evaluation with a primary focus on utility. Evaluators who subscribe to the practice/action paradigm mold the evaluation to meet the needs of the program and become active change agents. By virtue of their activist position, they believe that what happens to the evaluation findings is a critical concern, and every effort is taken to ensure that their recommendations are adopted. The guiding question is: How might the evaluation process be carried out to maximize the likelihood that the findings will be used (Patton, 1981)? Thus, whether the action-oriented researcher chooses a formative or summative evaluation model, the emphasis is on the utility of the evaluation to the stakeholders rather than the discovery of theoretical truth.

This emphasis on practical utility is reflected in the definition of the evaluator's role and the choice of research design and methodology. In contrast to their research/truth colleagues, practice/action evaluators define themselves as advisors/facilitators, actively soliciting the participation of program staff and other stakeholders at all steps in the evaluation process. Instead of bursting on to the scene, gathering appropriate data, feeding it back occasionally, but retaining control of the direction of the evaluation, practice/action evaluators work closely with program
stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. The actual extent of stakeholder participation may vary depending on whether the evaluation is essentially formative or summative, but the underlying premise is that the greater the degree of staff and stakeholder involvement the more they will claim ownership of the evaluation, and the greater the perceived relevance and eventual utilization of the findings (e.g., Dawson & D'Amico, 1985).

The level of stakeholder participation dictated by the action-oriented approach may be described in terms of a summative, formative, participatory continuum. At one end of the continuum, if the primary purpose of the evaluation is summative, stakeholders are asked to identify what they hope to gain from the evaluation; the evaluator then ensures that these goals are addressed. If the evaluation is formative, staff members may help with instrument development, data collection and/or interpretation of the results.

In line with the activist orientation of the practice/action evaluator, evaluations at the participatory end of the continuum go beyond stakeholder input into various aspects of the evaluation, to involve both evaluator and staff in interventions designed to modify the program itself. Evaluators opting for this participatory evaluation approach consciously assume the
roles of advocates and change agents. The distinguishing characteristic of participatory evaluation is that evaluators act neither as objective experimenters nor as relatively passive data collectors. Rather, evaluators purposely intervene in the program and actively solicit the participation of stakeholders in dealing with problems as they become evident or before they become critical.

Dawson and D'Amico's (1985) formative evaluation of two similar school improvement programs is a good example of the benefits to be gained from the "participation" aspect of the action-oriented approach. In their evaluation, aimed at documenting the use of the two programs in the schools, program staff participated directly as interviewers of teachers, one staff member became a coevaluator, and all participated in informal, interactive feedback activities. Dawson and D'Amico contend that this level of staff participation led to program improvement. Because of staff involvement, the information provided by the evaluation was more timely, communication improved, and the staff were more receptive to evaluation findings.

The action-oriented evaluator's focus on utility rather than "truth" is also reflected in the choice of research design and methodology. Because the emphasis is on maximizing the utility of the evaluation,
practice/action evaluators must be situationally responsive. Ultimately, the utilization of evaluation findings and recommendations rests in the hands of program stakeholders, and past evidence indicates that they are not moved to action by methodological rigour alone (Patton, 1981).

In keeping with the notion of situational responsiveness, action-oriented evaluators make use of both quantitative and qualitative data (Reichardt & Cook, 1979; Saxe & Fine, 1979). Quantitative data provide invaluable information but qualitative data may play a critical role in understanding processes and providing contexts (Filstead, 1979). Also, the collection of information about the program via different data sources increases the level of confidence in conclusions reached (Filstead, 1979).

The manner in which qualitative data can enhance evaluations is illustrated by a study on the impact of moving child wards of state residential child care institutions to other less institutional placements (Bush & Gordon, 1978). The evaluators found that open ended interviews with clients shed light on sometimes conflicting agency records. For example, agency records in one instance indicated that a mother had set fire to her apartment. Open ended interviews with the child revealed that, on a particularly cold day, when the...
landlord had consistently refused to fix the furnace, the mother had lit a fire in a wastebasket to keep warm. In research, it is quite common to obtain unexpected results. With qualitative data providing a context, it is much easier to make sense of it.

Love and Hagarty’s (1985) evaluation of a welfare reform program, designed to assist sole support mothers in gaining financial independence through employment, is another example of the action-oriented model. The evaluators combined quantitative and qualitative methods in their evaluation. They claim that the active participation of the project manager, staff, social service administrators, and government decision-makers enabled all evaluation participants to develop a clear consensus on both policy and operations information needs at various levels of government and the major indicators of program outcome. Through the use of interviews to form developmental profiles, the evaluators were able to investigate sensitive issues. Furthermore, they state: “the importance of the client feedback process should not be underestimated. Without client interview data, the major perceived benefit [of the program] may have gone unnoticed” (p. 110). This benefit was the strengthened client self-esteem and confidence gained from the counseling by program staff, a change that was necessary
to move towards financial independence.

The action-oriented model of evaluation has gained increasing credibility as a result of documented proof of its successes (e.g., Bush & Gordon, 1978; Dawson & D'Amico, 1985; Love & Hagarty, 1985; Pancer, 1985a; Patton, 1981, 1982). Even Campbell, long the major proponent of the experimental method as the best approach to program evaluation, has modified his views. Although not placing the experimental and action-oriented program evaluation methods on an equal footing, he recognizes that at times the latter is the most appropriate approach (Campbell, 1979). This change in the program evaluation climate is reflected in the revised standards of evaluation provided by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) which call for utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy, in that order (Posavac & Carey, 1985).

Participatory Program Evaluation and Job Satisfaction

The impetus for the present study, an examination of the effects of a participatory evaluation on staff job satisfaction, came from two main sources. First, numerous authors have pointed out that workers in the human services frequently suffer from poor morale and disillusionment with their jobs (e.g., Barber, 1986; Beck, 1987; Cherniss, 1980; Farber, 1983; Jayarante &
Chess, 1984; LaRocco, & Jones, 1978; McNeely, 1988). Yet, though the potential of participatory evaluation for organizational development has been documented (e.g., Bickel, 1986; Wholey, Abramson & Bellavita, 1986), organizational development has typically focused on improved organizational performance with no explicit consideration of staff job satisfaction as a dependent variable.

Second, Rappoport (1977) has outlined a strategy for organizational change aimed at improving the "effectiveness" of the organization. Effectiveness is defined as including both the personal satisfaction of members of the organization and the accomplishment of the organization's formal goals. Rappaport's (1977) strategies for organizational change in fact are the tenets for the action-oriented participatory program evaluator, who intervenes directly in a program to deal with problem areas. According to Rappaport, the applied behavioural scientist selects a technique that will respond to or create a 'felt need' for change among the members of an organization, facilitate change in the process by which decisions are made, and most importantly, involve the client group in planning and implementing change. Methods include interviews, group confrontation meetings, the development of intergroup competition, problem-solving conferences, and diagnosis of managerial problems. (Rappoport, 1977, p. 174)

A framework for conceptualizing the determinants of
Job satisfaction has been proposed by Oskamp (1984), based largely on earlier frameworks suggested by Locke (1976) and Grunenberg (1979). According to this framework, factors affecting job satisfaction can be grouped into two main areas: intrinsic factors, pertaining to the work itself, and extrinsic factors, pertaining to the physical and human context in which the work is performed.

As indicated in Figure 1, intrinsic factors include task identity, or "the feeling of responsibility and pride that results from doing an entire piece of work rather than only a small part of it" (Werther, Davis, Schwind, Das & Miner, 1985, p. 571), task significance, or "knowing that the work one does is important to others" (Werther et al., 1985, p. 571), and job autonomy, or "having control over one's work" (Werther et al., 1985, p. 552).

The second group of job satisfaction determinants includes extrinsic or context factors, divided into two categories -- working conditions and interpersonal factors. Working conditions refer to such issues as pay, in particular relative to one's cohort (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969); job security (Smith et al., 1989); role ambiguity (e.g., unclear job duties, vague criteria for obtaining raises/promotions) (Oskamp, 1984; House & Rizzo, 1972); organizational structure
Determinants of Job Satisfaction

**Intrinsic (Content)**
- Task-Related
  - Task Identity
  - Task Significance
  - Job Autonomy

**Extrinsic (Context)**
- Task-Related
  - Working Conditions
  - Interpersonal
    - Pay
    - Co-worker Relations
    - Job Security
    - Supervision
    - Role Ambiguity
    - Participation in Decision-Making
    - Organizational Structure
    - Physical Working Conditions
    - Environmental Factors

Figure 1. A modified version of Oskamp's (1984) determinants of job satisfaction.
(hierarchical versus "flat" organizations) (Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1975); physical working conditions (e.g., lighting, temperature, appropriate tools and equipment) (Locke, 1976); and environmental factors (e.g., location of the organization) (Bass & Bass, 1978).

Three interpersonal context factors also play a role in determining job satisfaction. Adams and Slocum (1971) identified the importance of co-worker relations; job satisfaction was positively influenced by popularity with other workers and work group cohesiveness. Cherniss (1980) found that absence of collegiality was a possible source of burnout which is the end result of intense job dissatisfaction. Pincus (1986) found that employees' perceptions of organizational communication were directly related to job satisfaction (and job performance). Organizational communication consisted not only of co-worker communication but communication with subordinates and supervisors as well. Supervision has also been identified as a determinant of job satisfaction; ideal supervisors are typically those who are "Considerate" (Vroom, 1964) and "Employee-centered" (Likert, 1961). Both of these terms have similarly been defined as: friendly, personally interested, praising, and active listeners (Locke, 1976). Pincus (1986) pointed out the "vital importance of employee-immediate supervisor communication on job satisfaction" (p. 413).
In fact, he stated that supervisor-subordinate communication was the most critical factor in the subordinate's job satisfaction. The third critical factor in Oskamp's model is participation in decision-making. Oskamp (1984) reports that participation in decisions relevant to one's own job situation appears to be more important than participation in more general organizational and administrative decision-making. Cherniss and Egnaticos (1978) point out that lack of participation in decision-making is associated with general dissatisfaction with work. A growing body of literature outlines how job satisfaction can be enhanced through participation in decision making (e.g., Frank, Coey, Angevine & Cardone, 1985; McNeely, 1983; Spector, 1986). These findings have been replicated in small community-based programs (Cherniss & Egnaticos, 1978, Frank et al., 1985). In fact, Cherniss and Egnaticos (1978) have pointed out the positive correlation between participation in making work-related decisions, job satisfaction, communication, satisfaction with supervisors and co-workers, skill utilization, and goal setting. Satisfaction with salary and promotions was not associated with the general participation factor. Similarly, Frank et al. (1985) uncovered two intriguing findings; staff input into decisions relevant to their provision of services was the best predictor of
satisfaction with client service job aspects, and involvement in administrative decisions best predicted satisfaction with monetary or status reward aspects of the job.

A review of the literature (e.g., Buffum & Konick, 1982; Cherniss & Egnatic, 1978; Frank et al., 1985; Leiter, 1988; McNeely, 1983; Pincus, 1980; Spector, 1986; Ursprung, 1986; Wiggins & Moody, 1983), suggests that in human service organizations, interpersonal context factors (co-worker relations, supervision, participation in decision-making) are more important determinants of job satisfaction than some of the other variables listed in Figure 1 and may actually mediate these other variables. From this perspective, Oskamp's model might be conceptualized more usefully as incorporating Task-Related and Interpersonal rather than Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factor categories. Both the Intrinsic-Content Factors and the Extrinsic-Context Working Conditions Factors are in essence "task-related." These factors can be seen as quite distinct from the Extrinsic Context Interpersonal Factors. From the program evaluation perspective, it is precisely in the area of Interpersonal Factors that a participatory evaluation could be expected to have the most direct and immediate impact. Although staff may express dissatisfaction in Task-Related areas (e.g., with the
location of the organization, the amount of job
autonomy, the organizational structure, their pay), many
of these areas are beyond an evaluator's control.
Recommendations can be made to those individuals who are
in control so that changes may be made, but the
evaluator does not have real power to bring about change
in these areas. For example, evaluators may point out
to those in charge that staff are dissatisfied with an
organization's location but they cannot unilaterally
change it. There may be valid reasons behind the choice
of locations that are crucial to the organization but
not important to the staff. Regardless of final reports
or conclusions, however, the very process of a
participatory evaluation could affect Interpersonal
Factors. The nature of participatory evaluations is
such that staff work together toward a common goal. By
involving staff in planning and implementing change, one
can facilitate change in the decision-making process.
This kind of co-operative interdependence has resulted
in improved intragroup relations in other contexts
(e.g., Aronson, Sikes, Blaney, & Snapp, 1978).

Furthermore, a participatory program evaluation is
designed to troubleshoot for problem areas, so that
direct interventions can be implemented to deal with
identified weaknesses in co-worker relations. For
example, program staff can participate in workshops
directed at enhancing group cohesiveness. These workshops can cover the range from confrontation to problem-solving meetings. Hostilities and misunderstandings can be worked out through the facilitative capacity of the evaluator. The evaluator can also serve as a mediator between staff and supervisor to bring to light and deal with weaknesses in supervision. Further, by the very nature of the close interactions among all staff members (and evaluators), the work team can be strengthened.

Since participation in decision-making is one of the defining characteristics of action-oriented program evaluation, it could be argued that active staff participation in program evaluation should enhance their morale. Further, the enhancement should be greatest with a formative, rather than a summative approach, when staff members take part in decision making at all stages and have the opportunity to see their decisions being implemented. As well, workshops focusing on the importance of collaboration and participative decision-making can be held with all stakeholders to point out the benefits of participative management. Workshops focussed on the differences between ideal and actual input can also be a tool in enhancing participation in decision-making.

If participation in the program evaluation process
increases levels of staff job satisfaction, what implications does this increased satisfaction have for the program as a whole? The assumption that worker satisfaction leads to increased productivity provided the initial impetus for research aimed at identifying the determinants of job satisfaction. Surprisingly, however, evidence for a link between job satisfaction and productivity is equivocal. Although positive relationships have been found between high satisfaction and performance (e.g., Spector, 1986), they usually are not large (Werther et al., 1985). Some researchers have postulated that, in fact, the relationship is in a direction opposite to that predicted, with high productivity leading to high satisfaction (e.g., Porter & Lawler, 1968).

It should be noted, however, that although job satisfaction has been extensively studied (4,783 articles had been published by 1985; Spector, 1985), human services organizations have been largely ignored. In fact, Dehlinger and Perlman (1978) reported that only about 20 studies had examined job satisfaction in relation to performance and outcomes in human service contexts. Although this number has increased somewhat since their review, the primary focus has been on turnover and absenteeism as opposed to actual job performance, measured through participant evaluations.
and outcomes. Barber (1986) stated, "it is interesting that relatively little has been written about the work environment of human service workers" (p. 25). As well, no systematic model of determinants of job satisfaction has been developed specifically for human service organizations. The assumption may be that the determinants must be similar to that of product producing industries. In fact, however, "the work flow and technology are very different [in business and industrial settings] from that found in community mental health and other human service settings" (Cherniss & Egnatios, p. 172). If the product of an organization is people, rather than inanimate objects, staff job satisfaction may indeed play a more direct role in productivity than seems to be the case in industrial organizations. This expectation is supported by some documentation that higher levels of employee job satisfaction are associated with better job performance (Cherniss & Egnatios, 1978; Pincus, 1980; Spector, 1986; Wiggins & Moody, 1983) and improved client outcomes (Buffum & Konick, 1982; Schwartz & Will, 1981). In Spector's (1986) study, employees who believed that they had comparatively high levels of control at work, due to high levels of participation in decision-making, were found to perform better, to be less likely to express thoughts of quitting, and to be less likely to actually
do so.

If job satisfaction is enhanced through participation in the evaluation process, then it could be predicted that staff work performance would improve and clients would both perceive the change and show improvements in their own performance, the productivity component of a human service agency. Figure 2 illustrates the possible relationship between the program evaluation, the staff and the participants.

The program evaluation may have a direct impact on participant outcomes, as a result of clarified program goals, improved instrumentation, and tightened methods and procedures. As Figure 2 indicates, participants may also be affected indirectly, as a result of improved staff job satisfaction leading to changes on specific behavioural indices.
Figure 2. Participatory program evaluation, staff job satisfaction, and participant outcome levels.
Hypotheses

In the following hypotheses, the acronym ACHIEVE refers to the skills training program which is the focus of the proposed participatory evaluation research.

Past research (e.g., Cherniss, 1980) has identified job dissatisfaction as a major problem in human service agencies. Further, according to the literature, interpersonal context factors play a major role in job dissatisfaction. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

H1 Prior to their participation in the program evaluation:

A: ACHIEVE staff will express a considerable degree of job dissatisfaction.

B: ACHIEVE staff dissatisfaction will be primarily in the area of Interpersonal Factors (Co-worker relations, Supervision, Participation in decision-making).

Action-oriented participatory program evaluation is theoretically designed to increase decision making participation. Furthermore, group meetings and workshops aimed at enhancing co-worker relations and supervision can be an integral part of an interventionary participatory evaluation. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

H2: Participation in a participatory program evaluation will lead to significant increases in ACHIEVE staff job satisfaction, especially in the areas of co-worker relations, supervision and participation in decision-making.

Although the decision making in which ACHIEVE staff will be involved may focus on the program evaluation itself,
Job satisfaction should generalize to the program as a whole, as the proposed changes are implemented. Given some evidence that increased staff job satisfaction in human service agencies leads to better performance (e.g., Spector, 1986), and given that the products of human service agencies are people, capable of observing changes in staff behaviour, the third hypothesis is that:

H3: ACHIEVE program participants will perceive improvements in staff attitudes over the course of the participatory evaluation.

Finally, some evidence exists (e.g., Buffum & Konick, 1982) for a positive relationship in human service agencies between increased job satisfaction and improved client/participant outcomes. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis is that:

H4: ACHIEVE program participant outcomes will improve over the course of the participatory evaluation.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

In a study involving "orthodox" experimental research, topics discussed in the methods section usually include subjects, research design, procedure, dependent measures and planned statistical analyses. However, the present study involves a case study of the effects of a participatory program evaluation on one aspect of the program being evaluated. Therefore, the following discussion, although paralleling the standard format, does differ somewhat. The first section, analogous to the "Subjects" section of a more traditional proposal, describes the program being evaluated in terms of both its structure and its personnel. The second section deals with the quasi-experimental research design of the case study. The procedure section includes background information regarding the overall program evaluation as well as descriptions of procedures and qualitative and quantitative dependent measures specific to the case study which is the focus of the research.
Program Description

ACHIEVE is the pseudonym chosen for a skills training program designed to prepare visible minority women, both Canadian born and immigrants, for entry level clerical positions, leading to full time, long term employment.

ACHIEVE is an initiative of the Women in the Workforce Sub-Committee of the Mayor’s Committee on Employment Opportunities/Services to the Unemployed. It first opened its doors in February, 1987, and is funded in large part by the Job Entry Program of the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission. The rest of its costs are off-set by the small business component of the program, an integrated office services business in which program participants serve as employees.

The program has a four tiered organizational structure. Although on paper this organization appears to be "flat," in fact this is not the case. A definite power and authority differential exists between levels, but given the small size of the organization it is not a typical hierarchy. The Board of Directors holds ultimate authority and is the policy-making body of the program. The fifteen Directors serve in a voluntary capacity and do not receive remuneration. Board members serve as advisors to the program, and through their work on subcommittees (finance, personnel, services, and
public relations), Board members research and investigate issues. They then report their findings to the Board for policy and decision making. Members bring a variety of areas of expertise to the Board including experience in training and education, finance, law, human resources, human service management, and business.

The next organizational level is filled by the project manager, hired in February, 1987. Although program staff are supposedly equal in status, the project manager actually occupies a higher rank, in terms of responsibility, than the other staff. The program staff report to the manager who in turn reports to the Board of Directors. Her other duties are financial management of the project, supervision of the staff, performance appraisals of staff and marketing of the project to the community.

The five core program staff, at the next organizational level, include the technical trainer, the transitional skills counselor, the business manager, a placement officer, and a part time administrative assistant. The technical trainer has the responsibility of teaching business math, word processing, computerized accounting, and typing. The transitional skills counselor's domain encompasses the teaching of business English, office procedures, business communications, and life skills (self esteem, proper grooming, stress
management, punctuality, business work norms, career planning, job search skills, family management, goal definition, and assertiveness). Many of these skills are enforced in the everyday routine of the program and do not remain the transitional skills counselor's sole responsibility. The business manager is responsible for developing and maintaining the small business component of the program. This involves promoting the business to the community, getting work for the participants, teaching applied skills, and maintaining statistics on the business and participants' performance.

The placement officer, responsible for finding off-site placements for the participants, was only hired mid-way through the evaluation, after the majority of interventions, and she left well before its completion. She has not been replaced, to date. As a result, she was not included as a subject in the study.

Although the administrative assistant is also supposedly part of the core, her position is slightly lower in the hierarchy, since she is a part-time employee and serves a primarily clerical function (reception, payroll, office accounting, coaching participants, inventory, purchasing of supplies, maintenance of equipment, and support to staff). For almost the entire duration of the evaluation process, the staff, including the project manager were without a
contract.

The fourth level in the organizational structure consists of the program participants. In the time period encompassed by the program evaluation, 47 visible minority women, in eight groups, have completed part or all of the forty week program. The first group, consisting of eight participants, entered the program in April, 1987, and graduated in January, 1988. The second group, consisting of four participants, was accepted in June, 1987, and graduated in March, 1988. A third group, consisting of eight participants, entered the program in early November, 1987, and graduated in June, 1988, and a fourth group, consisting of five participants, followed shortly thereafter, beginning in late November, 1987, and graduating in late June. A fifth group of seven participants was accepted in February, 1988, and graduated in August, 1988, and a sixth group of seven participants, which began in late May, 1988, was to graduate in late December, but had the program extended until January, 1989. The seventh group of six participants began in early June and is expected to finish in early February, 1989. The eighth group of five participants began in mid August and is expected to finish in April, 1989.

All program participants are admitted on the basis of a written application and an intake interview which
indicate that they fulfill certain preset criteria (e.g., they are visible minority women, they are severely employment disadvantaged, they are functional at a grade ten level). Program participants receive technical training (word processing, business math, typing, and computerized accounting), transitional skills training (business English, office procedures, business communication, life skills: self esteem, proper grooming, stress management, punctuality, business work norms, career planning, job search skills, family management, goal definition, assertiveness). Again, many of the transitional skills are not taught directly, but are incorporated into the fibre of the program. As well, depending on the needs of various participant groups, different life skill areas may be stressed. Participants have the opportunity to apply what they have learned by working for a small business component of the program (e.g., word processing is practiced on resumes brought in to the small business). Participants also have a short-term field placement in a local business before they begin their final search for long term employment.

Research Design

The research design is best described as a quasi-experimental "Patched-Up Design" (Campbell & Stanley,
Due to the constraints associated with field research, the initial design is often inadequate. The patch-up approach adds specific features to control for sources of invalidity. "The result is often an inelegant accumulation of precautionary checks, which lacks the intrinsic symmetry of the 'true' experimental designs, but nonetheless approaches experimentation" (Campbell & Stanley, 1963, p. 57).

As indicated in Figure 3, the direct effects of the evaluation on ACHIEVE staff were studied with a one group time series design. They were measured at several points in the interventionary process by both qualitative and quantitative methods. The planned sequence of dependent measures and interventions for program staff was as follows: Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ), two workshops designed to enhance staff communication, individual interviews, group discussion of the preliminary evaluation report findings, presentation of the revised and final report, re-administration of the JSQ and finally, a second set of individual interviews. As is frequently the case with field research, however, unanticipated events led to changes in this procedure. Figure 3 also indicates the points at which the actual procedure differed from the planned procedure. These changes will be discussed in more detail in the procedure section.
### Planned:

**1988**  
Jan  Feb  Mar  Apr  May  Jun  Jul  Aug  Sep  Oct  Nov  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>JSQ</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>JSQ2</th>
<th>i2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>Pres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actual:

**1988**  
Jan  Feb  Mar  Apr  May  Jun  Jul  Aug  Sep  Oct  Nov  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>JSQ</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>JSQ2</th>
<th>i2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Feed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JSQ**  Job Satisfaction Questionnaire  
**W1**  First Workshop  
**W2**  Second Workshop  
**i**  Interview  
**JSQ2**  Retest on Job Satisfaction Questionnaire  
**Feed**  Feedback of Evaluation Report  
**Pres**  Presentation of Final Evaluation Report  
**i2**  Follow-up Interviews  
**a**  Resignation of Administrative Assistant  
**b**  Resignation of Business Manager  
**c**  Resignation of Transitional Skills Trainer

---

**Figure 3.** ACHIEVE staff: Data collection and intervention points.
As Figure 4 indicates, the indirect effects of the evaluation process on ACHIEVE participants were measured through an analysis of their perceptions and outcomes, assessed with a recurrent institutional cycle design. This design lends itself particularly well to "opportunistically exploiting features" of a setting (Campbell & Stanley, 1963, p. 57). Since it combines cross sectional and longitudinal approaches, it allows several comparisons. Although typically this design allows comparisons within one group across time, across groups at one point in time, and of group differences at the same time within their exposure to the program, but at different points in time, it was only this last comparison that was feasible, due to the incompleteness of the original monitoring system. Thus comparisons were made across groups with respect to the effects of various lengths of exposure (none, partial, total) to the evaluation-influenced staff on participant perceptions and performance.

Procedure

Background

In October, 1987, the Board of Directors asked one of the Board members, an applied social psychologist at the University of Windsor, to conduct an evaluation of the program. She employed the author of the present paper as the student evaluator member of this two-
1987
Apr May Jun Jul //Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar //Aug Sep Oct Nov

1988

Group 1

\[ \text{IN} \quad x \quad \text{OUT} \quad x \quad \text{pe} \quad x \quad \text{PE} \]

Group 2

\[ \text{IN} \quad x \quad \text{OUT} \quad x \quad \text{pe} \quad x \quad \text{PE} \]

Group 3

\[ \text{IN} \quad x \quad \text{OUT} \quad x \quad \text{pe} \quad x \quad \text{PE} \]

Group 4

\[ \text{IN} \quad x \quad \text{OUT} \quad x \quad \text{pe} \quad x \quad \text{PE} \]

Group 5

\[ \text{IN} \quad x \quad \text{OUT} \quad x \quad \text{pe} \quad x \quad \text{PE} \]

Group 6

\[ \text{IN} \quad I \quad \text{OUT} \quad x \quad x \quad x \quad \text{PE} \]

Group 7

\[ \text{IN} \quad I \quad \text{OUT} \quad x \quad x \quad x \quad x \quad \text{PE} \]

Group 8

\[ \text{IN} \quad I \quad \text{OUT} \quad x \quad x \quad x \quad \text{PE} \]

IN Intake Data Collected
OUT Outcome Data Collected
pe Participants complete original Program Evaluation Form
PE Participants complete revised Program Evaluation Form
I Interviews with sample participants

Figure 4. ACHIEVE Participants: Data collection points.
person evaluation team. The purpose of the evaluation, as conceptualized by the Board, was to determine whether the program was fulfilling its mandate of preparing visible minority women for procuring and maintaining long term employment. Two specific goals were articulated. The first was to examine, retrospectively, the process and outcomes of ACHIEVE relative to its mandate; the second was to develop data-gathering systems which would allow for on-going monitoring and periodic evaluations of the program. The evaluation process had several anticipated outcomes. First, stakeholders, including the funding agency, would be given the opportunity to re-examine the original mission, goals and objectives of the program with a year of experience behind them. Second, adjustments could be made to re-align program activities with program goals. Third, data-gathering systems would be in place to allow on-going monitoring of the program. Fourth, with the use of the information system, service delivery could be rendered more efficient and effective. Finally, the impact of program participation on clients could be assessed. The objectives and rationale of each step in the evaluation process are listed in Table 1.

As the program evaluation was initially conceptualized, the staff and project manager would be integrally involved in the process of assessing how the
Table 1.

Evaluation Process, Steps, Objectives and Rationale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Observation of sample intake interviews</td>
<td>to obtain a global picture of the functioning of ACHIEVE; to see what selection criteria were used in practice; to see if intake process needed improvement, to track the process an individual is exposed to in ACHIEVE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Examine the forms and methods currently used at ACHIEVE to determine what information is being gathered about clients, staff and programs, at intake, during the program and at termination.</td>
<td>to establish a baseline data set of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Set up research questions to be answered by evaluation.</td>
<td>to ensure that all necessary information is gathered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Examine the compiled information and determine what research questions can be answered and what information is missing.</td>
<td>to critically examine the usefulness of the information currently being gathered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consult with staff to see what additional information they would like to have.</td>
<td>to ensure that staff needs were addressed and that they perceived the relevance of the system for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Set up computerized data system using LOTUS 123 spreadsheet.</td>
<td>to centralize and make the data accessible to staff; to increase efficiency of recording and retrieval of information; to permit on-going evaluation, comparisons across groups, and comparison of outcomes relative to intakes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
7. Enter all available data into system for groups 1 and 2. to see where staff may be encountering problems with existing data collecting instruments.

8. Develop forms and instruments to gather missing data; revise inefficient instruments. to ensure that all important information was available to allow ongoing monitoring; to allow easy transference of information to computer file.

9. Staff meetings to clarify goals. to improve record-keeping; to tighten curricula; to express the importance of assessing participants on outcomes derived from the each objective.

10. Enter data for intakes 3 and 4. (still on old forms) to see if record-keeping was consistent with that for intake 1 and 2.

11. Administration of the JSQ. to confirm suspicions of staff dissatisfaction and interpersonal problems.

12. Futuring Workshop to examine individual and group goals; to promote collaboration.

13. Workshop: Generation of Job Descriptions, discussion of leadership styles and decision-making. to compare self-generated to other generated job descriptions; to highlight differences in decision-making capacity, to promote team building.

14. Individual interviews to provide an opportunity for individual input, to examine effects of interventions to date.

15. Enter data for intakes 5 and 6. to continue data keeping until staff could take it over. (Table Continues)
16. Group discussion of preliminary evaluation report to provide an opportunity for staff to clarify any ambiguities; to give staff a chance to see their ideas in the report; to allow them to hear report first hand; to increase the sense of ownership of report.

17. Interview participants to serve as an index of staff changes; to give participants a chance for verbal input.

18. Participants who had not completed a revised evaluation form were sent one. to see whether participants were aware of staff problems; to see if staff problems were associated with changes in progressive groups' evaluation of the program.

19. Enter data for intake 7 to keep data system up to date.

20. Final Staff Interviews to determine post-facto reasons for resignations.

21. Participant evaluations to serve as another check for effects of staff attitudes on participants.
program had deviated from the proposal and where it could be tightened up. The student evaluator met with ACHIEVE staff in October, 1987, and observed some intake interviews both to familiarize herself with the process and the workings of the organization and to see what selection criteria were actually being used. Intake interviews were conducted for all possible program candidates to determine their eligibility and to acquire greater familiarity with each candidate's situation than could be gleaned from a written application alone. These interviews were conducted by any two people chosen from: the project manager, the transitional skills counselor and the business manager. Of the six staff members, these three had English as a first language.

Several issues complicated and slowed down the evaluation process. First, the existing record keeping system, consisting of a file on each program participant, was too cumbersome for efficient information retrieval. Second, not all the information from the intake interviews was systematically recorded in a useful manner. Third, examination of program participant files revealed that neither application nor intake forms included all the information necessary to fully answer questions concerning program impact. (See Appendix A for initial application form.) For example, the application form did not include questions about
education since arrival in Canada or participants' perceptions of barriers to their employment. The intake forms did not include questions about intake levels. For example, initial levels of competency in mathematics and English were of interest to ensure eligibility, yet they were not recorded immediately to intake forms. Intake levels were recorded elsewhere in the file and the disorganization led to occasional unmarked tests. The lack of routine prevented efficient use of information; instead of simply using these scores to ascertain basic competency levels, they could be used to monitor progress. Including intake levels on the intake form itself would routinize the marking step and promote more efficient use of information.

In a subsequent meeting with program staff, the two program evaluators explained that a necessary first step in the program evaluation was the creation of a computerized data keeping system. It was explained that all the necessary information was not being collected and as well, a computerized system would increase the efficiency of information retrieval. Therefore, ACHIEVE staff were asked to put together a list of the information they wished to include in the computerized system. The student evaluator added other information that should be included in the records. The relevant information available in past records was abstracted and
a computerized record keeping system was set up, using a spread sheet format with Lotus 123 software.

On the basis of these lists, and with continuing input from the staff, the program evaluators developed instruments to allow easy recording of demographic and intake data from that point on (Appendix B). The intention was for the staff eventually to take over the computerized record keeping system to allow continual monitoring, easy access to files, and to facilitate an ongoing evaluative process.

In the course of gathering these initial data and setting up the information system, it became clear that one of the reasons for the lack of adequate participant records was the lack of clarity of staff goals and objectives. Therefore, the next step in the participatory evaluation process consisted of a series of meetings between the evaluators and staff members, intended to help the staff clarify their goals and objectives. Two observations emerged from these meetings. First, the program thus far seemed to be functioning relatively well. Although it was agreed that the objectives of the separate program components had to be formulated in a measurable fashion, ACHIEVE graduates had been placed successfully in various kinds of work settings and current program participants seemed to be learning what they were supposed to learn.
If a lack of formal objectives had been the only problem identified, an action-oriented formative program evaluation model would have sufficed. However, these initial meetings with staff revealed a second, potentially more serious problem in the area of job satisfaction. In discussions with staff, two themes cropped up repeatedly, a feeling of "unconnectedness with the Board," and a "lack of openness among the staff members." It became apparent that these themes could be categorized in terms of the three Interpersonal Factors Oskamp (1984) had identified as critical to job satisfaction: co-worker relations, supervision, and participation in decision making.

At least two alternative strategies were possible at this point. One option would have been to continue working on the "task" part of the program and to stress to the Board in the final evaluation report that there were problems in certain job satisfaction areas. A second option was to actively intervene, in the manner described by Rappaport (1977), working with the staff to improve their morale and overall organizational effectiveness. It was decided to pursue the latter approach, and to use a highly participatory program evaluation model, with the deliberate interventions it dictates.
Program Staff Procedure

Overview

As indicated in Figure 3, the planned sequence of dependent measures and interventions for program staff was as follows: Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ), two workshops designed to enhance staff communication, individual interviews, group discussion of the preliminary evaluation report findings, presentation of the revised and final report, readministration of the JSQ, and finally, a second set of individual interviews.

However, due to unforeseen circumstances, the planned process had to be modified. The initial administration of the JSQ, the workshops, and the first set of individual interviews took place as planned. Shortly after the interviews, however, the administrative assistant left for a full time position elsewhere, leaving the project manager and three of the four original staff members. After the presentation of the preliminary evaluation report and before the intended presentation of the final/revised report, a larger disruption occurred. The business manager called a staff-Board meeting at which she stated that she did not feel she had the respect of the project manager. Since she was no longer able to work under these conditions, she was resigning from her position, effective immediately. Her action served as a catalyst
for the transitional skills counselor who also tendered her resignation. Shortly after this open meeting, the Board of Directors held a series of closed meetings, culminating in their decision to ask for the project manager's resignation. Although the project manager refused to resign until she had found another position, it seemed rather pointless to readminister the JSQ to the one staff member remaining from the original group. Therefore, the second administration of the JSQ was eliminated. However, the decision was made to proceed with in depth staff interviews, revised to reflect the dramatic changes which had occurred (Appendix H). As well, the presentation of the final evaluation report to the staff was no longer considered to be an intervention, since only one staff member of the original group still remained. The final evaluation report was presented to the Board in the presence of the project manager and the newly hired transitional skills counselor.

Experimental Interventions

The first experimental intervention consisted of a workshop on "futuring" held with the staff in late February, 1988, approximately two weeks after the administration of the JSQ. In this futuring workshop, staff members created scenarios of what they hoped the program would look like at various points in the future
and if and where they saw themselves fitting in. Both individual and group goals were examined. Collaboration was required to produce a "wish list" of where the group wished the organization to be ideally in the future. They were encouraged to be as fanciful as desired. Within this context leadership styles were discussed. Workshops of this nature can serve as indicators of both incompatible and cohesive goals among staff members and lack of organizational-staff fit. As well, team building is enhanced through the required collaboration (Francis & Young, 1978). (See Appendix D for a more detailed description of workshop content.)

The second experimental intervention, held with the staff in mid March, 1988, consisted of a workshop on building job descriptions. At this workshop, staff members generated their own job descriptions and indicated how their own jobs fit into the organization. (See Appendix E for a description of the workshop.) This workshop dealt with three problem areas. First, it addressed interpersonal communication problems by enabling staff members to compare self generated job descriptions with those generated by their co-workers. This was achieved by having all staff members identify the behaviours and responsibilities associated with doing their jobs and the skills and aptitudes necessary to perform. Other staff members were encouraged to
amend others' job descriptions where they perceived errors. The group work necessitated by the workshop further enhanced team building, presumably strengthening interpersonal bonds (Francis & Young, 1979). The second issue addressed by the workshops also centred around communication, but this time between the Board and staff. Staff members felt the Board was unaware of the complexities of the situation. This process permitted staff to point out where necessity had forced deviations from the proposal and what was required of them in practice. The premise was that those carrying out the work know best what their duties are and are in the best position to point them out. The third issue addressed by the workshop was that by generating job descriptions, comparisons could be made between actual and ideal amounts of input into decision making and direction of the program. Because the project manager was also present at the workshop she could be alerted to areas of dissatisfaction.

The third and final experimental intervention consisted of a meeting held in early October, approximately six months after the administration of the individual staff interviews. At this meeting, the student evaluator outlined the preliminary evaluation findings. This process was intended as an input session by the staff, an opportunity for them to clarify any
ambiguities or misrepresentations they saw, and a chance for them to see the fruits of their labour and the successes of the recommendations that had been implemented.

**Staff Dependent Measures**

**Job Satisfaction Questionnaire.** The first dependent measure, completed by the staff in early February, 1988, consisted of a questionnaire tapping job satisfaction (Appendix C). It was administered in order to determine the extent and source of the job dissatisfaction expressed in the initial meetings. The Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ) is a combination of Spector’s (1985) 18-item Job Satisfaction Survey, four questions from the Team Review Questionnaire (Francis & Young, 1979), and five evaluator-generated questions aimed at tapping specific aspects of the ACHIEVE program. Questions tapping both Task-Related and Interpersonal job satisfaction factors are included in the questionnaire. Task-Related Factors (see Figure 1) are tapped by several of Spector’s subscales. Spector’s Operation Procedures (e.g., "I have too much paperwork") and Nature of Work (e.g., "I like doing the things I do at work") question categories correspond to Oskamp’s Intrinsic Task-Related Factor category, as do the four self-assessment questions specific to the present evaluation setting (e.g., "I provide timely and useful
feedback to the clients"). Spector's Pay (e.g., "I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think of what they pay me"), Promotion (e.g., "There is really too little chance for promotion on my job") and Benefits (e.g., "I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive") question/categories correspond to Oskamp's Extrinsic Task-Related Factor categories Pay and parts of Role Ambiguity; Spector's Co-worker Relations (e.g., "I like the people I work with"), questions and the questions taken from the Team Review Questionnaire (e.g., "Members of the work group are not really committed to the success of the group") correspond to Oskamp's Co-Worker Relations Interpersonal Factor. Spector's Supervision questions (e.g., "My supervisor feels too little interest in the feelings of the subordinate"), and some of his Contingent Rewards questions (e.g., "When I do a good job I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.") correspond to Oskamp's Supervisory Interpersonal Factor. Finally, Spector's Communication questions (e.g., "I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization"), correspond to Oskamp's Participation in Decision-Making Interpersonal Factor.

Staff Interviews. The initial semi-structured interview administered to the staff, in early April, 1988
(Appendix F) included five key questions: "What is your perception of how well the organization is working?", "How well do you think the organization is achieving its goals?", "What are the strengths and weaknesses of the organization?", Can you think of any changes or improvements that need to be made?", "What do you see as the interpersonal strengths and weaknesses of the organization?". To prevent leading respondents, the questions did not directly address Interpersonal Factors. It was of interest to see whether interpersonal problems previously articulated at meetings and in the JSQ would be mentioned spontaneously. The format was such that the interview could move in the direction most appropriate to each staff person. For example, a major problem identified at earlier meetings with staff was perceived lack of input to the Board. The question: "What are the weaknesses of the organization?" was included to see if staff members would continue to generate similar responses. If other types of responses were given, the interview could easily move in that direction. These interviews gave staff members the opportunity to express their personal views confidentially, to elaborate on their questionnaire responses, to ask questions, and to comment on the evaluative process to date. As well, they served as a posttest measure for the first set of
interventions. Finally, the interview protocols were used to clarify ambiguities in the JSQ and provided a context in which to view the quantitative data.

The second and final set of interviews, administered in late October, 1988, was initially intended to assess changes in attitudes throughout the evaluation (Appendix G). However, in light of the staff resignations, the interview protocol was revised to allow a post-facto determination of what had led to these resignations and the disintegration of the work group (Appendix H). Although some of the questions included in the planned version of the questionnaire were retained (e.g., "How do you feel communication is among staff members? Has this changed over the last 6 months?") other questions assessed staff perceptions of the crisis directly (e.g., "What do you think led up to some of the staff members quitting?").

**Participant Procedure**

**Overview**

Program participants were an important part of the study for two reasons. First, it will be recalled that, according to the original parameters of the evaluation, participant performance outcomes were a primary means for determining program effectiveness. For the purpose of this study, it was also useful to examine this
information as an indirect measure of the relationship between staff satisfaction and participant performance. Second, since the products of human service organizations are people, it was believed that it would be useful to determine directly how aware participants were of staff problems. All participants were thus assessed on two measures: outcome levels of work performance and detailed personal evaluations of the program. As well, a sample of participants were interviewed as a complement to written evaluation and outcome information.

**Participant Dependent Measures**

**Participant Outcomes.** With the help of the evaluators, the staff developed clear criteria by which to measure participant progress. For example, by assessing participants' typing skills before their exposure to instruction, their progress toward an objective goal could be recorded. In this manner, their final proficiency level could be compared both to their intake score and to an objective score. Unfortunately, intake scores were not available for the groups that already were in or had finished the program. As a result, outcome scores alone are reported in the present study. All participants' outcome levels were recorded on technical skills (word processing, business math, computerized accounting, and typing), some transitional skills, (business communications, job search skills,
business English, some office procedures) and on some
performance criteria in the small business component
(sense of closure, quality of work, ability to work
independently, cooperativeness, and overall
dependability).

There were several problems associated with the
assessment of outcome levels in the transitional skills
area. First, there was a staffing change mid-way
through the second group's progress in the program.
Although some office procedures, business
communications, and business English were still taught
in a similar fashion, the focus on some of the life
skills changed. For example, the first and second
groups had stress management taught as a separate area
while later groups learned it in the context of the
program.

Second, the groups that had thus far passed through
the program had not been assessed on some life skills
(e.g., stress management, family management,
assertiveness, self-esteem, grooming, punctuality,
business work norms, career planning and goal
definition). Although these skills were an integral
part of the program, they were not always taught
separately and were not any one person's sole domain of
responsibility. Also, these skills were not readily
testable. Although a critical incident type of
assessment might have been possible, both evaluators and staff agreed that it would not provide much valuable information. Therefore, it was agreed by the evaluators that it was not as crucial to assess participants on some of these skills, as long as it was documented that they had been taught (grooming, family management, business work norms, goal definition, career planning).

However, it was pointed out that it would be desirable to assess participants on some of the other transitional skills. Although the transitional skills counselor had intended that assertiveness and self-esteem be measured, outcome levels on these skills were not initially recorded, because she found it too subjective a task. In informal meetings with the transitional skills counselor and again in the preliminary evaluation report presentation, the student evaluator demonstrated the use of behavioural checklists to measure these qualities and strongly recommended their use with future groups. As well, it was suggested that, where tests were available, they be used in a test-retest fashion to monitor changes, for example, in self-confidence and self-esteem. The replacement transitional skills counselor did intend to use these tests.

In addition, the evaluators pointed out that some of the previous ways of measuring outcomes were
unnecessarily subjective (e.g., filing skills were assessed through the transitional skills counselor's recollections of past performance; the student evaluator pointed out the advantages of using an in-basket filing task where they could be assessed directly).

Third, the transitional skills counselor resigned before completing final assessments for group 5. Although she had explained to her replacement the standards she used in the assessments, the replacement could not complete assessments of group 5 since she had never seen them. However, where possible (i.e., where she was familiar with their skill areas) she was capable of assessing groups 6 and 7. It should be noted that group 7 had not completed the program in its entirety and so they had not been fully trained in job search skills, reception duties, and did not have as much experience in the small business component. Therefore, they were at a slight disadvantage in terms of outcomes.

There is also a problem related to participants' outcome levels in the small business. As discussed above, the small business had several objectives. One objective was to offset program costs but although statistics were gathered, they did not provide much information about participants. Second, the small business component was to provide an applied setting for participants to practice skills learned in the other
components. As a result, it was documented, in much the same way as with some of the transitional skills, that each participant had a certain number of "jobs," but these were not formally evaluated. As a result, the only available data reflecting participants' outcome levels in the small business component are with respect to participants' general approach to work.

Unfortunately, the business manager had left prior to completing these evaluations for groups 5, 6, and 7, and evaluations of groups 3 and 4 were not complete. The technical trainer, who was replacing her in the applied component temporarily, was able to complete them for groups 6 and 7. However, she was not familiar with either group 3's, 4's or 5's performance in the business setting and could not assess them.

The first two groups of participants had finished most of the program before the evaluation had begun, the second two groups were in the program during the evaluation and the third two groups began the program after some of the recommended changes were in place. The fourth two groups, close to program completion, were also of interest, since they had been most exposed to staff tension. Therefore, a comparison of outcomes both across groups and relative to an objective measure, could provide some information as to the effects that staff job satisfaction had on the participants' work.
performance. It should be remembered that, as indicated in Figure 2, improved participant outcomes could be attributed directly to the program evaluation (e.g., clarified goals, etc.) rather than to improved staff job satisfaction per se. Therefore, it was important to assess outcomes in conjunction with participants' views of staff attitudes and performance. One feature of the "patched-up design" is the "inclusion of precautionary checks" to compensate for lack of experimental control. In the present study, checks came in two forms: participant evaluations and interviews.

Participant Evaluations. Participants completed in-depth program evaluations indicating their perceptions of both the program and various aspects of staff performance (Appendix I). Groups 1 and 2 (pre-intervention) had already completed evaluations of the program at the time of their program completion. However, these original forms were sketchy. New forms were designed and administered to these participants several months after they had finished the program. The new forms were then compared to the old forms to ensure consistency, where possible. Groups 3 and 4 (mid-intervention) completed the new evaluations approximately two months after both completion of the old version and their respective program completions. Group 5 participants (post1 intervention), who completed the program
on schedule, also completed the evaluation subsequent to program completion. However, group 6 members, who had their program extended due to the staff problems, completed the evaluation just short of program completion. Evaluations by groups 7 and 8 (post2 intervention) were included, although they were one and three months short of graduation respectively, since they had been in the program during the height of staff tension.

These evaluations focused on specific program components and staff behaviours. Participants were asked to rate the availability of staff for individual help in each of the skill areas, the appropriateness of the amount of time spent on various skills, and the usefulness of instruction in all skill areas. In addition, there were several open ended questions (e.g., What did you like and/or dislike about the atmosphere at ACHIEVE?). These evaluations were compared across groups. Because the groups were staggered in terms of exposure to the program and the evaluation process, it was believed the participants' evaluations of the program would be a good indicator of the evaluation effects. Participant evaluations were a precautionary check because, via their evaluations one could estimate whether the timing of perceived staff attitude or performance changes corresponded to specific evaluator interventions, and whether there was a correspondence
with changes in their outcome data. In short, were the participants aware of staff moods and did these affect their outcome levels? Thus, the evaluations compensated for lack of intake level data against which to monitor progress.

**Participant Interviews.** A second check was introduced in the form of an unplanned addition to the planned procedure, an interview of several of the participants from groups 6, 7, and 8. Relevant questions were taken from the final staff interviews. (See Appendix J for participant interview format). These interviews proved a valuable addition, since they permitted the interviewer to ask for clarifications to clear up ambiguities. For example, when participants said the atmosphere at work was co-operative, did that include staff? Or, when it was claimed that there was less tension now, it could be asked what "now" referred to. As well, since English was not the first language of most participants, it proved easier for them to explain their feelings verbally rather than in writing. Finally, their interviews could be used in the same way as the written evaluations, to see if any improved outcome levels were associated with perceived changes in staff. Although not all participants were interviewed, these responses can be seen as representative of the last three groups.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS

Statistical Analyses

Although both quantitative and qualitative data were collected, the small number of subjects involved dictated reliance on descriptive rather than inferential statistics. Where possible, relative frequencies are compared and discussed. In the case of interview data, response frequency analysis was based on content analysis of staff and participant responses.

Staff Dependent Measures

Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

It will be recalled that the JSQ included questions in two broad categories: Task-Related Factors and Interpersonal Factors (co-worker relations, supervision, participation in decision making). The results of this questionnaire provide evidence relevant to suspicions raised in early group meetings and the first hypothesis tested in the present study that staff would express some degree of job dissatisfaction and that this dissatisfaction would be particularly pronounced in the Interpersonal domain.
**Task-Related Factors**

Task-Related Factors are discussed in two categories. The Intrinsic (Content) category includes Self-Assessment of Performance, and Spector's (1985) Nature of Work and Operation Procedures subscales (Table 2). The Extrinsic (Context) category, includes Spector's (1985) Pay, Benefits, and Promotions subscales (Table 3).

**Intrinsic (Content).** Staff members' responses to questions assessing their perception of their own performance are presented in Table 2. Perhaps not too surprisingly, all the staff perceived their own performance in a favourable light, agreeing that they provided timely and useful feedback to participants (M=5.00), reviewed and monitored participant progress on a regular basis (M=5.25), set realistic goals for the participants (M=5.25) and used appropriate and properly modified techniques for teaching (M=5.00). The project manager agreed very much that she provided timely and useful feedback and monitored participant progress regularly. She did not respond to the other two items, presumably because she did not consider these activities part of her job.

Spector's (1985) five Nature of Work items tap Oskamp's Task Significance dimension and serve as
Table 2

JSQ Task-Related Factor Ratings: Intrinsic (Content)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Staff 1</th>
<th>Staff 2</th>
<th>Staff 3</th>
<th>Staff 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Assessment of Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Realistic Goals For Participants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Timely and Useful Feedback</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review/Monitor Participant Progress</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Appropriate Teaching Techniques</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Job*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Appreciated by Others*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable Job</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Pride in Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operation Procedures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Too Much Work*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Too Much Paperwork*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Tape Not a Problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules Not Hindering*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items reversed in direction and coding from questionnaire.

Staff: 1=Technical Trainer; 2=Business Manager; 3=Transitional Skills Counselor; 4=Administrative Assistant

Scale: 1=disagree very much; 6=agree very much
general indices of satisfaction with one's job. With the exception of one item, "Work is Appreciated by Others," ratings were as positive as they had been for the self-referential items. All staff, and also the project manager, agreed that their jobs were both meaningful (staff $M=5.25$) and enjoyable (staff $M=5.25$), and that they liked (staff $M=5.75$) and felt pride in (staff $M=5.50$) their work. However, neither the project manager nor two of the staff members believed their work was appreciated by others. Although the project manager and the transitional skills counselor disagreed only slightly that their work was appreciated, the administrative assistant expressed a very strong perception of non-appreciation. Two aspects of this deviation from the generally positive tone of responses to the other items should be noted. First, conceptually, this item touches on the interpersonal component of job satisfaction. Second, it will be recalled that the administrative assistant was the first to resign.

With regard to specific operating procedures, the staff as a whole was somewhat less happy, members believing to varying degrees that they did have too much work, both generally ($M=3.00$) and in terms of paperwork ($M=2.50$). It is interesting to note that the project manager and the transitional skills counselor agreed
more strongly than the others that they had too much work and the administrative assistant disagreed slightly. However, with the exception of the transitional skills counselor, who did not respond, staff agreed moderately that rules did not get in the way of doing a good job (M=4.33). When asked about red tape, the project manager, administrative assistant and transitional skills counselor agreed that red tape was a problem, but the business manager and technical trainer believed that it was not. The more positive response of the administrative assistant to the work load item is interesting, given her negative perceptions regarding the lack of appreciation associated with her work. The project manager was more positive than most of her staff, except that she also believed that she had too much work.

In conjunction, the global evaluation items indicate that the project manager and the transitional skills counselor, who believed more strongly than the others that they had too much work, also believed more strongly that they were not appreciated by others and, although they claimed to like their work, it was to a slightly lesser extent than the rest of the staff.

Extrinsic (Context). Table 3 lists the items referring
Table 3

JSQ Task-Related Factor Ratings: Extrinsic (Context)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Staff 1</th>
<th>Staff 2</th>
<th>Staff 3</th>
<th>Staff 4</th>
<th>Staff M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Pay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnoughRaise*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciated re Pay*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough Rewards*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Chances for Salary Increase</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Benefits*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparable Benefits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Benefits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Necessary Benefits Available*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample Chance for Promotion on My Job*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Workers Have Fair Chance for Promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Ahead as Fast Here as Elsewhere</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with My Chances for Promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff: 1=Technical Trainer; 2=Business manager; 3=Transitional Skills Counselor; 4=Administrative Assistant
Scale: 1=disagree very much; 6=agree very much

*Items reversed in direction and coding from questionnaire.
to pay, benefits, and promotion. Examination of staff responses reveals the same split between the two "camps" of co-workers noted on the Intrinsic item dealing with the extent to which one's work is appreciated by others. Those workers who showed previous indications of dissatisfaction on this item continued to do so. Examination of Table 3 indicates that the administrative assistant and transitional skills counselor responded negatively to ten and twelve of the thirteen items, respectively. These responses are in contrast to the four and five negative responses to the thirteen items endorsed by the technical trainer and business manager, respectively. Both the technical trainer and business manager responded positively to all five items dealing with pay, and to three of the four items dealing with promotion. Both the transitional skills counselor and the administrative assistant responded negatively to three of the five questions pertaining to pay and to three of the four promotion-related questions. On the remaining three items, one of these staff members, but never both, responded more positively. There was one curious finding with regard to promotions. The administrative assistant and transitional skills counselor disagreed that there were ample or satisfactory chances for promotion on their own jobs or that people, in general, got ahead as fast as in other organizations,
while the technical trainer and business manager agreed with each of these statements. However, when asked whether good workers generally stood a fair chance for promotion, the administrative assistant reversed her position and agreed moderately, the transitional skills counselor modified her position and disagreed slightly less strongly, and the business manager reversed hers and disagreed strongly. Taken together, these responses may indicate a belief that favouritism exists within the organization. Although the business manager and, to a lesser extent, the technical trainer do not believe it affects their jobs, the others are more inclined to believe that generally workers stand a fair chance of promotion while they themselves do not.

In terms of benefits, the staff were more united in their dissatisfaction, agreeing that benefits were not satisfactory, comparable, or equitable, and that all necessary benefits were not available. The administrative assistant did agree slightly that benefits were equitable, but her response was only a slight deviation from the negative norm.

The responses of the project manager reflect both positive and negative perceptions. Of the ten items she responded to, she answered six negatively. She was relatively negative regarding pay and promotions. Although she agreed that there were enough rewards and
satisfactory chances for salary increases, she was aligned with the administrative assistant in the belief that pay was unfair. She agreed with the transitional skills counselor that there were not enough raises available, and she, along with both the transitional skills counselor and the administrative assistant, did not feel appreciated regarding pay. Her responses to promotion items were curious. Although she was strongly dissatisfied with her chances for promotion, the project manager did not respond to the item asking whether there were ample chances for promotion on her job. Similarly, although she disagreed that good workers stood a fair chance for promotion, she did not answer whether she believed people got ahead as fast at ACHIEVE as elsewhere.

The project manager was reasonably content with benefits. She strongly agreed that they were comparable to other places and equitable although she disagreed slightly that they were satisfactory.

**Interpersonal Factors**

It will be recalled that the results of the literature review suggested that Interpersonal Factors may be more important determinants of job satisfaction within human service organizations than more task-related factors. As well, it was within this area that
a participatory program evaluation was expected to have the largest effect. The second part of the first hypothesis predicted that staff at ACHIEVE would express greatest dissatisfaction in this area.

**Co-Worker Relations.** An examination of staff responses regarding their relations with their co-workers (Table 4) indicates a slight variation on the two camp pattern noted on the task-related items. The administrative assistant was more negative than any other staff member on seven of the eight items and tied with the transitional skills counselor for most negative response on the eighth item ("Not too much bickering and fighting"). Her former "ally," the transitional skills counselor, was positive on five of the eight items but also negative on the three items that dealt with communication.

Except for the administrative assistant, staff liked and enjoyed each other (M=5.0). On both questions, the administrative assistant rated her co-workers markedly less favourably than did the others, disagreeing moderately that she "liked" and "enjoyed" their company.

Examination of work related items, dealing with ability and dedication of co-workers, reveals a similar pattern in that, with the exception of the
Table 4

**JSQ Interpersonal Factor Ratings: Co-Worker Relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like Co-Workers</td>
<td>5 5 5 5 2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy Co-Workers</td>
<td>5 4 6 5 2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent Co-Workers*</td>
<td>5 5 6 5 3</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers Committed to Group Success*</td>
<td>5 3 6 8 2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesive Co-Worker Objectives*</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 5 2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers Don't Restrain Remarks to Avoid Conflict*</td>
<td>5 3 4 2 1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank and Open Co-Workers*</td>
<td>6 5 3 3 2</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Too Much Bickering and Fighting*</td>
<td>3 5 4 2 2</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff: 1=Technical Trainer; 2=Business Manager; 3=Transitional Skills Counselor; 4=Administrative Assistant

Scale: 1=disagree very much; 6=agree very much

*Items reversed in direction and coding from questionnaire.
administrative assistant, staff members agreed moderately that co-workers were competent and committed to group success, and had non-conflicting objectives.

The remaining three items in Table 4 can be conceptualized as dealing with communication. In contrast to other Interpersonal Factor items, these items tended to be more negatively rated. In other words, it would appear that, although from a task perspective staff members generally perceived each other to be good at their jobs, they did not feel unified on a personal level.

Consistent with the "two camp" pattern noted earlier, the transitional skills counselor and administrative assistant consistently gave the most negative ratings, agreeing both that co-workers restrain critical remarks to avoid conflict and that there was too much bickering and fighting at work and disagreeing that co-workers were frank and open. Although the technical trainer and the business manager gave more favourable ratings, the business manager's ratings were only marginally more favourable. In fact, she too disagreed that co-workers were frank and open, and only disagreed slightly that co-workers restrained critical remarks, and that there was too much bickering and fighting.

The responses point out an interesting
contradiction. Although the transitional skills counselor and the administrative assistant believed that there was too much fighting at work, they also believed that people restrained their remarks and were not frank and open. Similarly, although the business manager disagreed that staff were frank and open, she also disagreed that there was any restraint of critical remarks. These responses may simply reflect globally negative perceptions of staff communication. The restraint of remarks item may have been interpreted differently, depending on whether the respondent believed restraint to be a positive action, such as avoiding pettiness or a negative action, such as not communicating effectively and hiding one's beliefs.

Of note, on two of the three items concerned with communication, the project manager responded more favourably than did the other staff members. There was some ambiguity in the items in the area of co-worker relations. From the project manager's perspective the work group included herself. However, it is unclear by the wording of the questions whether the other staff members also included the project manager as a co-worker and whether communication deficits may, in fact, be directed toward her, as opposed to the other co-workers. For example, when staff members claim that co-workers were not frank and open, it is not clear whether
that referred to supervisory or nonsupervisory communications.

**Supervision.** Table 5 presents the seven items concerned with supervision. For the staff, two items considered supervision from a task perspective, with regard to ability and competence, and five items considered supervision from a person perspective. The project manager was generally rated more favourably, from the task, than from the person perspective. In general, there was moderate agreement that she was competent ($M=5.0$), and there was slight agreement ($M=4.3$) that she provided good explanations of work assignments. In this second instance, however, the transitional skills counselor and the administrative assistant again were aligned in their slight disagreement.

The more negatively rated person aspect of supervision reveals again a particularly pronounced pattern of the transitional skills counselor and the administrative assistant versus the technical trainer and the business manager. In almost every instance, the transitional skills counselor and the administrative assistant rated the project manager less favourably. They disagreed that they received either appropriate rewards or the recognition they deserved, and they
Table 5

JSQ Interpersonal Factor Ratings: Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Staff 1</th>
<th>Staff 2</th>
<th>Staff 3</th>
<th>Staff 4</th>
<th>( \text{Staff M} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Explanation of Work Assignments*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Rewards For Efforts*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive Recognition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Fair to Me*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Interested in Workers' Feelings*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff: 1=Technical Trainer; 2=Business Manager; 3=Transitional Skills Counselor; 4=Administrative Assistant

Scale: 1=disagree very much; 6=agree very much

*Items reversed in direction and coding from questionnaire.
disagreed that she was interested in subordinates' feelings. Although the administrative assistant continued to disagree both that the project manager was fair and that she liked her, the transitional skills counselor agreed that the project manager was fair, and did not respond in the second instance. Also of note, the business manager only agreed slightly that she liked the project manager and disagreed that she received deserved recognition. In short, the only staff member to give consistently high ratings to the project manager was the technical trainer.

It is not clear from the project manager's responses whether she was referring to the Board of Directors as her supervisors, or whether she was evaluating herself as a supervisor. Her responses do suggest that she was answering in terms of her supervisors rather than herself. Although the project manager agreed slightly that she liked her supervisors, she was generally harsh in her evaluation. She did not believe that she received deserved recognition, that her efforts were appropriately rewarded, that the supervisors were fair, and that they were interested in workers' feelings. She did agree, however, that work assignments were well explained.

Participation in Decision-Making. Table 6 lists
Table 6

JSQ Interpersonal Factor Ratings: Participation in Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Staff 1</th>
<th>Staff 2</th>
<th>Staff 3</th>
<th>Staff 4</th>
<th>Staff M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear Goals*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Organizational Decisions *</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff: 1=Technical Trainer; 2=Business Manager; 3=Transitional Skills Counselor; 4=Administrative Assistant

Scale: 1=disagree very much; 6=agree very much

*Items reversed in direction and coding from questionnaire.
staff responses to the three items concerned with staff participation in decision-making. For all three items a clear pattern emerged. None of the staff believed that communications were good (M=2.67). On the other two items, the usual split among the staff is once again evident. The transitional skills counselor and the administrative assistant disagreed that goals were clear or that they were aware of organizational decisions, while the technical trainer and the business manager agreed, at least moderately, with both these statements.

Conversely, the project manager perceived decision making to be an open, group process, as evidenced by her consistent favourable ratings. According to the project manager, communications within the organization were good, organizational goals were well clarified and determined by all, and all had high awareness of organizational decisions.

Summary

Based on the results of the JSQ, support is provided for the hypothesis that ACHIEVE staff would express job dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction does not appear to stem from poor self assessments of ability nor from more global task-related areas. The common themes that weave through the areas of dissatisfaction expressed in the questionnaire are feelings of being
unappreciated and poor communication. As well, a second area of dissatisfaction was revealed; benefits were negatively evaluated by all staff, excluding the project manager. Dissatisfaction was more pronounced with some staff members; on numerous items, the transitional skills counselor and the administrative assistant responded more negatively than did the other staff members.

**Mid-Point Individual Staff Interviews**

**Program Staff**

When the responses of the staff were content analyzed, the bulk of the responses were classified as reflecting **Interpersonal Factors**. However, there was dissatisfaction expressed in other areas as well. There was some mention of a need for additional benefits, and with regard to environmental factors there was mention of the negative impact of the building in which the program was located until January, 1988. These areas of dissatisfaction, however, were minor in comparison with the strong messages of discontent expressed in interpersonal areas.

As far as co-worker relations were concerned, primary and secondary messages were expressed. The primary message was a need for improved communication. This need was stated in several different ways. The
technical trainer believed that "more frankness was needed" and that "bad moods affect others." (These statements are interesting in that on the JSQ the technical trainer agreed moderately that staff were frank and open, and disagreed moderately that there was too much bickering and fighting at work.) The administrative assistant stated that "there [was] a need for improved communication," for "more unity," and that "problems were not brought out into the open." She stated that she believed there was a "breach of confidence" among the staff members. The business manager believed there was "interpersonal conflict," "weaknesses in communication," and "insincere communication." She also expressed her feeling that "concerns were not addressed." These very strong feelings had not been evident in her JSQ responses in this area which vacillated between slight agreement and slight disagreement, essentially a neutral point. The transitional skills counselor stated that "struggles within the staff prevent effectiveness." This belief was mirrored by her comments that there was a "bad atmosphere at work," that people "restrain their critical remarks" and that "complaints never reach the manager."

Despite the negative comments about communication, the secondary theme, expressed directly by two staff
members, was a belief in the dedication and effort of co-workers. The administrative assistant stated that "all staff put forth a strong work related effort." This sentiment was not communicated in her JSQ responses, where she disagreed moderately that co-workers were committed to the success of the program. The business manager stated that "work-wise the program is good, even if personality-wise there are some problems." Similar feelings of pride in the program were presented in a less direct manner. The technical trainer, despite her negative ratings of co-worker commitment on the JSQ, stated that "the program [was] always improving towards objectives," the administrative assistant believed that "the program [was] reaching its objectives," and the business manager stated that the staff had "taken a vague mandate and made a good program."

Comments made in the area of supervision similarly reflected perceived weaknesses in communication both with the Board and with the immediate supervisor, the project manager. The staff mentioned feelings of: "being unconnected with the Board," "needing more feedback" (the technical trainer), "mistrust of the Board," and "needing more exposure to the Board" (the administrative assistant), "receiving inappropriate feedback from the Board" (the business manager), "being
treated as though [she] was incompetent" and "not getting deserved recognition" (transitional skills counselor).

There were also some negative comments directed at the project manager. The business manager claimed that the project manager gave inappropriate feedback, in terms of time and format, and that she "was too abrasive." This discontent had not been particularly evident on the JSQ. The transitional skills counselor stated that there was "a power struggle with the manager," that there was "favouritism by the manager," that she "felt like she was under a dictatorship," that her "criticisms and complaints were not addressed" and that "issues were discussed with others before they reached her." She also stated that the manager was constantly changing her mind.

Comments by some of the staff are indicative of perceptions that decision-making was a nonparticipative process. The administrative assistant stated that "she felt ill-advised of changes," the transitional skills counselor believed that "things fluctuate daily" and "rules and procedures change too much." Both the business manager and the technical trainer alluded to weaknesses in communication, but neither one made direct reference to participation in decision-making.

Interview responses were generally more negative
with respect to Interpersonal Factors than were JSQ responses. The technical trainer's comments were much more negative in interpersonal communication areas in the interviews. However, the administrative assistant tended, in the interview, to be more positive with evaluations of co-worker dedication. Two explanations were possible, at this point. Either the interviews were tapping areas that the JSQ had glossed over, allowing more room for explanation, or the workshops and evaluation process were bringing issues into the open that had been causing tension but had not been verbalized.

Project Manager

Because of her unique position as a link between the staff and the Board, the project manager's responses were considered separately from those of the rest of the staff. In fact, analysis of her responses indicate that she expressed problems both with respect to her supervisors (the Board) and to her subordinates (the staff).

With respect to the Board, responses reflected feelings of being unappreciated and her worth being unrecognized. This dissatisfaction was communicated in a number of ways. In terms of Intrinsic Task-Related Factors, the project manager stated that she "feels like
[she has] lots of responsibility and no authority". In terms of Extrinsic Task-Related Factors (Pay), the same message was relayed by her feelings of being underpaid, of not "receiving appropriate monetary compensation" and, as well, of not having necessary job security. Her feelings of being disrespected were more strongly expressed in terms of Interpersonal Factors. She identified problems both with the Board structure and personnel.

As far as the Board and her supervision were concerned, she stated: "the complexity of my job is not recognized by the Board. They do not realize that I am forced to wear many hats, and they certainly do not pay me accordingly". Harsher feeling were expressed in the statement: "the Board is more of a hindrance -- uninterested Board members should leave and make room for new blood." These statements were followed by comments that the Board sent mixed messages and that its function was unclear to her.

In terms of her subordinates, her comments also revealed interpersonal dissatisfaction. She felt powerless as a supervisor but in fact, the perceptions of her subordinates, discussed previously, were that she wielded too much power. She made specific reference to the fact that she was given no authority to fire anyone, even if she felt it was well deserved. This gave her a
feeling of "having her hands tied." Other more specific comments were made with regard to subordinates. She expressed strong dislike for one subordinate and claimed this individual was "subversive." This same individual was believed to be incompetent, for "not following a set curriculum" and for "bringing her private matters to work." Generally speaking the project manager stated that "every once in awhile people aren't frank and open with each other." Contrary to her response on the JSQ, she stated that she felt she had to work extra hard to make up for "others' incompetencies." At the same time, however, she stated that "for the most part the workers enjoy each other's company," that "they respect each others' abilities," that they "pull on each others' expertise," that even though there were "different staff goals, they [were] still compatible" and that "with the exception of one individual [she has] confidence in them all."

When the project manager was asked about participation in decision making within the organization she stated: "the group makes all the decisions together, but I pull rank when it is necessary".

**Final Interviews**

To reiterate, although the final set of interviews may be conceptualized as a posttest measure of change,
they may also be considered as another step in clarifying the picture of what happened at ACHIEVE leading up to the final confrontational meeting and the disintegration of the staff. It should be pointed out again that when the follow-up interviews actually took place, only two of the original staff -- the project manager and the technical trainer -- were still a part of ACHIEVE. Because the administrative assistant had left well before the confrontation she was not contacted. However, the transitional skills counselor and the business manager both agreed to be interviewed. Despite numerous attempts, the transitional skills counselor continually cancelled scheduled interview times. As a result, final interviews were carried out for three staff members. For the business manager, the follow-up interview served as an exit interview.

Representative responses for all interview questions are included in Table 7. Again, they are divided into staff and project manager responses to underscore differences in their perceptions. Staff members and the project manager were all asked to describe what they believed had led to the disintegration of the staff. Although the project manager was aware of building tensions, she expressed no awareness that she, according to the other staff members, was at the root of the tension. Staff members claimed that
Table 7
Responses to Final Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What led to staff leaving ACHIEVE?</td>
<td>Lack of respect from project manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No decision-making power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottled up tensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterize the atmosphere at work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For staff, bad for participants good</td>
<td>Atmosphere of double messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension has been building up for awhile</td>
<td>(impatience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to bring in a consultant</td>
<td>Unprofessional: project manager yells at us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and participants in front of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project manager takes out moods on everybody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most significant changes at ACHIEVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive: move and staff changes</td>
<td>Personnel changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier now in 2nd year</td>
<td>Curriculum well tuned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor staff members I can't fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterize staff-Board communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get knee-jerk reaction to negative events</td>
<td>Don't have much communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't get treated with respect by some of</td>
<td>project manager was our link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Board</td>
<td>Board is reactionary, we hear from them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am given no authority</td>
<td>when something happens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input into direction of program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All staff have tremendous input</td>
<td>Have a lot of group meetings, but project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whoever teaches component is in charge</td>
<td>manager dominates them all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board does not respect my opinion,</td>
<td>In my teaching I can decide, in all else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doesn't give me the tools I need</td>
<td>I am stifled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project manager did not implement anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>she did not want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My hands were tied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
Project manager

Feel that worth at work is recognized?

- Only Board respect is grudging
- They don’t address my concerns

Changing expectations of you?

- Board always had unreal expectations
- All of Board members want different things from ACHIEVE

Co-Worker Relations?

- All co-workers seem to get along, but it is hard to know
- I don’t want to be "friends" with co-workers, it’s not my management style
- With participants, cannot be buddies, cannot leave yourself open to charges of favouritism

Were people frank/open?

- Those who are secure are open
- They don’t address complaints properly, they complain to each other

Fighting at work?

- Some, group dynamics are not clear

Cohesive group?

- Always common objectives, not always agreement on how to get there
- Board wants egalitarian, not possible if you need

Staff

- By participants and core staff, yes, with respect to project manager no, she has to have her stamp of approval on all

- Only in relation to what is needed

- Better relationship between all core than any one with project manager
- Intention to be cohesive, but now distrust
- Co-workers have good relationship with each other and participants
- Project manager does not like it when we get close to participants or when we talk behind closed doors

- Co-workers were open, but not with project manager
- No, not frank/open, even under pressure
- No one wants to tell project manager

- Only fighting was with project manager, usually she pulls you into her office

- Yes, except for Board/staff differences
- Despite personal differences all staff want program to be a success (Table continues)
Project Manager

decision-making.

Communication?
- Seemed good/ we had team meetings
- Some staff did do things without my knowledge; I don’t like this

Staff
-On project related issues it’s good, on personnel issues it’s poor
- I don’t know what others do in their areas.
- With project manager bad communication, she doesn’t really listen to what you have to say
- With staff other than project manager I am comfortable

Supervision?
- I need help in delegating
- I need more patience
- I have to learn how to be patient with incompetent people
- My own supervision is poor

- She complains she has too much work, but she wants to be in charge of everything
- Very moody
- Good at task things, bad at personnel
- Oppressive with regards to anything she has an idea about

Participation in Decision-Making?
- We have team meetings
- Decisions have to be made, if wait for group they’ll never be made

- In my area, I decide, everything else goes through project manager
- We only participate on foregone conclusions

Most satisfying aspect of job?
- Successes of placements

- Pro-women
- Contributing to society
- Participants

Least satisfying aspect of job?
- Lack of authority
- Reverse discrimination
- Poor treatment by Board

- Tension from project manager
- Lack of professional respect from project manager

Anything preventing good work?
- Incompetent staff

- Project manager: yells and then expects us to go back to class
- Apathy based on numerous attempts to expand and being stifled
they received no respect, they had no decision-making power, and that there were bottled up tensions. The business manager stated explicitly that had it not been for the lack of respect from the project manager and her own feelings of being stifled she would not have left. Interestingly, on the JSQ, only one item, "receive appropriate recognition," provided any clue to the business manager's feelings. Her negative feelings became more apparent in the first set of interviews.

Although project manager and staff alike characterized the atmosphere at ACHIEVE as tension filled, the project manager believed that the participants were unaware of the tension. Contrary to her view, the other staff made explicit reference to the fact that the project manager took her moods out on everybody, not only the staff, and in fact, often reprimanded the staff in front of the participants.

Staff and the project manager saw both staffing changes and honing of the program as significant changes at ACHIEVE, but did not make mention of any improved communication per se. As well, from a task perspective, all staff at ACHIEVE were perceived by both the staff and the project manager to have common goals.

Both staff members and the project manager mentioned that the Board was "reactionary" and only heard from when something negative happened.
Furthermore, one staff member mentioned that all communications passed through the project manager. The project manager also expressed her view that she was not treated with respect by the Board and that she was given no authority. Ironically, these are the same comments that the staff members made with regard to the project manager. They felt as though they had no authority, and they found her oppressive with respect to anything she had an idea about. The business manager claimed to feel that her hands were tied.

Respondents were questioned regarding the amount of input they had into the program and how much they believed they participated in decision making. The project manager claimed that all staff had tremendous input, particularly with regard to their components. However, she added that the Board did not give her the necessary tools or final authority to do a good job and that Board members did not respect her opinion. She stated that decisions were made by the team but then added that if she waited for the group, decisions would never be made. In contrast, the staff stated that a lot of team meetings were held but that the project manager dominated them all. This perception had not surfaced until this point. They agreed that they had input into their particular components, but in all other areas they stated they were stifled. The most telling comment was
the business manager's that "participation was always on foregone conclusions."

The project manager claimed she had only "grudging respect from the Board." Similarly, the staff members stated that they got no respect from the project manager, only from each other or from the participants.

The project manager claimed that she had a professional managerial style which by its nature inhibited becoming friends with co-workers and participants; the staff interpreted her behaviour otherwise. They perceived the project manager to be unapproachable. They claimed that the project manager did not like it when they were close with the participants or with each other -- it made her nervous. Both the project manager and the staff were in agreement that co-workers were friendlier among themselves than with her. The project manager claimed that any communication problems stemmed from people's insecurities and lack of knowledge of how to address concerns appropriately. She stated that people chose to complain among themselves instead of taking appropriate action. The staff, however, stated that the project manager was unapproachable and punitive and for that reason the complaints did not reach her. The staff similarly saw all fighting at work to be with the project manager and took issue with her way of
reprimanding; the project manager blamed dysfunctional group dynamics.

Perhaps most telling, when queried as to the least satisfying aspects of the job—and whether anything was preventing them from being effective, the staff had similar responses. In both instances, tension emanating from the project manager was reported, and the belief that this tension made it difficult to return to teaching when one had been significantly unsettled.

The final picture that emerges of the staff at ACHIEVE differs from earlier pictures primarily in the intensity of complaints in the interpersonal context area. Although there was mention of the program improving from a task perspective, the interpersonal schism among the staff appeared only to have widened. There was ample evidence that, in fact, it was interpersonal factors that contributed most to dissatisfaction. However, these complaints were not resolved through the evaluation process, and the hypothesis that participation in the evaluation process would improve staff satisfaction in the interpersonal area was not supported.

Participant Dependent Measures

Participants were assessed on their outcome levels, comprehensive personal evaluations of the program, and sample interviews.
Participant Outcomes

It will be recalled that the participant outcomes were to serve a dual purpose. First, they were a primary means for determining program effectiveness. Second, they provided an indirect measure of the relationship between staff satisfaction and participant performance. It was hypothesized that participants' outcome levels would improve as a result of improved staff morale. In light of the decline in staff morale, it is of interest to see if there was a similar decline in participants' outcome levels.

The seven participant cohorts were divided into four groups, according to when they were in the program relative to the interventionary period. The interventionary period is considered the time frame between the initial staff meetings and the presentation of the preliminary evaluation report. The two cohorts in the pre-intervention group completed the program before the onset of the evaluation process. The two cohorts in the mid-intervention group began the program almost simultaneously with the beginning of the evaluation process. The two cohorts in first post-intervention group (post-1) began the program after the workshops and after some of the changes were in place. The one cohort in the second post-intervention group (post-2) began the program three months and two months
prior to the staff resignations and were in the program throughout the staff's most tense time period.

As Table 8 indicates, in the technical skills area, participants' outcomes generally increased from pre-intervention to the second post-intervention group (post-2). However, these increases were not consistent over time. Using the Bonferonni procedure to control the error factor in multiple comparisons (Myers, 1979), only three of the fifteen possible contrasts reached significance. In three of the five skill areas, outcomes decreased from pre- to mid-intervention groups. However, only one of these decreases, math, reached significance, \( t(22) = 3.86, \ p < .01 \). Typing, one of the two areas that showed increases in outcome levels from pre- to mid-intervention, had not been taught to the earlier groups, thus accounting for the large jump, \( t(19) = 7.19, \ p < .001 \). Also of note, in four of the five skill areas, there were decreases in outcome levels from mid- to post-intervention (post-1). The exception was math, which showed a non-significant tendency to increase, \( t(22) = 2.64, \ p < .10 \).

The trend of decreasing outcome levels in these technical skill areas coincides with the technical trainer's increased interpersonal dissatisfaction. In fact, the two cohorts in the post-1 group were progressing through the program when hostilities were
Table 8

**Mean Technical Skills Outcome Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Skill</th>
<th>Pre Groups 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Mid Groups 3 &amp; 4</th>
<th>Post-1 Groups 5 &amp; 6</th>
<th>Post-2 Group 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>72.08</td>
<td>83.48</td>
<td>91.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing</td>
<td>23.84a</td>
<td>44.10</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Processing</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotus 123</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.73a</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.90b</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** Outcome levels are based on the following measures. Math: percentage scored on a test; typing: words typed per minute; word processing: 3 point scale (1=basic, 2=good, 3=advanced); Lotus 123: 3 point scale (1=data entry on pre-set spreadsheet and prints, 2=solves simple business problems, manipulates data, uses graphics, 3=forecasts and solves business problems in spreadsheets, graphics and data management fields); accounting: 3 point scale (1=major assistance needed, 2=little assistance needed, 3= no assistance needed). Typewriters were purchased after group 2 was almost finished the program.

a Means based on 11 participants.
b Means based on 10 participants.
brewing beneath the surface. Interestingly, when staff hostilities were finally voiced, the outcome levels of the last group (post-2) improved beyond all post-1 outcome levels, and in four of the five cases, beyond pre-intervention group levels. This finding suggests two possibilities. First, it may be that unexpressed interpersonal problems translated into poorer performance on the part of the technical trainer. Thus, when dissatisfaction was finally voiced, outcome levels increased. The second possibility is that participants' outcome levels ultimately improved as a result of the improved task-related areas of the program (clarified objectives, better instrumentation, improved curricula), regardless of the technical trainer's interpersonal staff dissatisfaction. The relative plausibility of these two explanations can be determined to a certain extent by participant perceptions, which will be discussed subsequently.

It was also important to determine what percentage of participants was reaching the objectives set by program staff. In terms of technical skills, by the time they had completed the program, almost all participants had reached an adequate level of functioning in all areas. Perhaps more interesting, however, is the percentage of participants who exceed an adequate level and excel in various skill areas. Table
### Table 9

**Percentage of Participants Who Excel in Technical Skill Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post-1</th>
<th>Post-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups 5 &amp; 6 - Group 7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Processing</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotus 123</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** To be considered above adequate a math score must exceed 75%, a typing score must exceed 50 words per minute, word processing scores and Lotus 123 scores must be at least a "2" on their respective three point scales, and accounting must be a "3" on its three point scale.

*Pre-intervention groups did not have typing instruction.*
9 lists the skill areas and the percentage of participants from each group that exceed an adequate competency level. Excluding typing, since the pre-intervention groups had no typing instruction, in three of four cases, percentages of high performing participants in the pre- and post-2-intervention groups were higher than the mid- and post-1-intervention groups. In four of five cases, post-2 intervention groups had the largest percentage of high performers. This finding further suggests that the two middle groups (mid- and post-1-intervention), who were in the program during the decline of the technical trainer's interpersonal satisfaction, may have borne the brunt of it and shown less outstanding performances.

Participants' outcome levels were also gathered for some transitional skills (see Table 10). Even with missing data, outcome levels in this area form a completely different pattern than do those of the technical skills area. Although none of the differences between means was significant, there is a trend of increases in outcome levels across groups. In fact, there is only one exception; there was a decrease in competency with the telephone from mid- to post-1-intervention groups.

Interestingly, the transitional skills counselor was dissatisfied from the onset, and did not have the
same increase in dissatisfaction as the technical
trainer. This difference may account for the lack of
comparable decreases in outcome levels across the middle
groups. The consistent increases may be attributable to
improvements in the transitional skills area, from a
task perspective. This area was originally the weakest,
from a task perspective, and likely gained the most in
terms of these kinds of changes (e.g., revised forms,
clearer objectives, less subjective measures). This
possibility can be verified, in part, via participants'
perceptions.

The transitional skills counselor also rated the
participants with respect to how they compared to the
typical clerical employee. In almost all areas, across
groups, all participants were assessed as capable of
functioning adequately in the workplace. The only less
than adequate ratings were for the pre-intervention
groups, in which one participant had problems with all
written language skills (i.e., business communication,
business English). One other participant was assessed
as having difficulties with telephone skills, although
her written skills were adequate. Unlike the technical
skills, the transitional skills did not yield notable
differences across groups, in the percentage of
participants who were rated as excellent.

The objectives of the small business component of
Table 10

Mean Transitional Skills Outcome Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitional Skill</th>
<th>Pre Groups 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Mid Groups 3 &amp; 4</th>
<th>Post-1 Groups 5 &amp; 6</th>
<th>Post-2 Group 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Communication</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Search Skills</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.12b</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Skills</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.13b</td>
<td>4.00d</td>
<td>5.00e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception Duties</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.79b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Materials</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Transitional skills are scored on a 5 point scale:

1=unsatisfactory; 5=excellent.

a  One participant missing from original group.
b  Two participants missing from original group.
c  No data available for group 5
d  Statistics based on 4 participants
e  Statistics based on 3 participants
the program were that all participants be exposed to a variety of applied experiences. These tasks, however, are not graded for two reasons. First, the skills used in this area are usually assessed elsewhere. Second, since work is for paying customers, it is always repeated until it is adequate. However, the business manager did assess the participants on general approach to work characteristics (see Table 11).

Using the same five-point scale as was used for transitional skills, the business manager rated the participants on five "skill" areas. As with transitional skills, there is a trend of increases over time, although mean differences are not significant. Again, a possible explanation is that despite growing interpersonal dissatisfaction, the improvements in task areas of the small business component led to increased outcome levels over time.

The business manager used the same standard as the transitional skills counselor to determine adequacy of competence. Those participants who scored below a "3" on the five point scale were perceived as functioning below a level necessary for the work place. For the pre-intervention group, the only area that posed problems was ability to function independently. Two participants were perceived as inadequate in this area. No participants were inadequate in any of the areas for
Table 11

**Mean Small Business Component Outcome Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Business</th>
<th>Pre Groups 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Mid Groups 3 &amp; 4</th>
<th>Post-1 Groups 5 &amp; 6</th>
<th>Post-2 Group 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=11a</td>
<td>N=11a</td>
<td>N=12c</td>
<td>N=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.80b</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperativeness</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.20b</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Performance in small business is scored on a 5 point scale, 1=Unsatisfactory; 5=Excellent.

a. One participant missing from the original group.

b. Two participants missing from the original group.

c. Data not available for group 5.
post-1 and post-2 intervention groups, and in the three areas where data were available for the mid-intervention groups. No consistent pattern emerged with respect to the percentage of participants, across groups, that achieved excellent proficiency in the various applied skills.

Participant Evaluation of the Program

The third hypothesis in the present study was that by nature of their close interactions with the staff, participants should be attuned to improvements in staff morale by virtue of improved staff performance. Conversely, in light of the change of events, the participants could equally easily provide testimony as to the disintegration of the work group and any decrement in staff performance.

Table 12 includes means of participant ratings of program staff, in terms of their accessibility. Only the three staff who were involved daily with participants, and who were in charge of a skill area, were included in the ratings, to parallel the outcome assessments completed by these staff members.

As Table 12 indicates, there was an initial increase in perceived accessibility of staff both during the interventionary period and in two cases, even more improvement following the interventionary period.
Table 12 -

Participants’ Mean Ratings of Staff Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre Groups 1 &amp; 2 N=5</th>
<th>Mid Groups 3 &amp; 4 N=5</th>
<th>Post-1 Groups 5 &amp; 6 N=8</th>
<th>Post-2 Groups 7 &amp; 8 N=9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Trainer</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Skills Counselor</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Pre=Pre-Intervention Groups 1 & 2; Mid=Mid-Intervention Groups 3 & 4; Post-1=Post-Intervention Groups 5 & 6; Post-2=Post-Intervention Groups 7 & 8 (have not completed program). Technical Trainer’s Areas include business math, typing, word processing, and business applications. Transitional Skills Counselor’s Areas include telephone skills, reception duties, job search skills, business correspondence, business English, stress management, professional grooming, assertiveness training and career planning. Business Manager’s Areas include small business component (on-site placement where participants practice skills on work from outside the program.)

a Items are scored on scale where 0=not available; 3=excellent.
However, in each skill area the perceived accessibility ratings decreased for those groups (7 & 8) that began the program following the interventions, but at the height of staff tensions. This finding suggests that there may have been an initial improvement in staff morale/satisfaction that dissipated.

Similarly, there was a drop in ratings from the first post-intervention groups (post-1) to the second post-intervention groups (post-2), with regard to participants' perceptions of the amount of time spent in skill areas. More important, as Table 13 indicates, in each instance the amount of time spent in a skill area was rated lower by the second post-intervention groups (post-2) than by the pre-intervention groups. Participants were thus noticing negative changes that corresponded to increasing staff dissatisfaction.

However, it must be kept in mind that these last two groups (7 & 8) had not finished the program at the time of the evaluation. The trends in the ratings are quite interesting: the technical trainer peaked in ratings at mid intervention, but then continued to decline, the transitional skills counselor initially declined in ratings, peaked dramatically following interventions, and then dropped below pre-intervention level, and the business manager initially plateaued in ratings, but then continued to decline. What may be more telling is
Table 13
Participants' Mean Ratings of Appropriateness of Amount of Staff Time Spent in Each Skill Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre Groups 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Mid Groups 3 &amp; 4</th>
<th>Post-1 Groups 5 &amp; 6</th>
<th>Post-2 Groups 7 &amp; 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>N=9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Technical Trainer | 1.75 | 1.85 | 1.75 | 1.60 |

| Transitional Skills Counselor | 1.62 | 1.56 | 2.16 | 1.60 |

| Business Manager | 1.80 | 1.80 | 1.60 | 1.44 |

Note. Pre = Pre-Intervention; Mid = Mid-Intervention; Post-1 = First Post-Intervention groups; Post-2 = Second Post-Intervention groups (have not completed program). Technical Trainer Areas include business math, typing, word processing, and business applications. Transitional Skills Counselor Areas include telephone skills, reception duties, job search skills, business correspondence, business English, stress management, professional grooming, assertiveness training and career planning. Business Manager's Areas: small business component (on-site placement where participants practice skills on work from outside the program).

a Items are scored on scale where 0=none, 3=too much
the change from mid- to post-intervention. Although the perceived appropriateness of the amount of time decreased for the technical trainer's and business manager's skill areas, there was a marked, positive increase in the ratings of the appropriateness of time spent in the transitional skills area. One possible interpretation of this finding may be that the transitional skills counselor initially benefited most from the interventions. However, as her level of dissatisfaction rose, the benefits were lost.

Participants' perceptions of the usefulness of instruction are included in Table 14. In each skill area, there was an increase in ratings from pre- to post-intervention. The highest rating for instruction in the technical skills area and the transitional skills area came from the post-intervention groups. For the business manager, however, the peak was at mid-intervention. This finding can be understood in light of the business manager's own explanation that as time went on she became apathetic. The technical trainer continued to improve, the transitional skills counselor peaked following the interventions, then deteriorated slightly for the last groups, and the business manager peaked mid-intervention and deteriorated subsequently. These findings are particularly interesting in view of the pattern of resignations. Participants' perceptions
Table 14
Participants' Mean Ratings of Usefulness of Instruction in
Each Skill Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre Groups 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Mid Groups 3 &amp; 4</th>
<th>Post-1 Groups 5 &amp; 6</th>
<th>Post-2 Groups 7 &amp; 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>N=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Trainer</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Pre = Pre-Intervention; Mid = Mid-Intervention; Post-1 = First Post-Intervention groups; Post-2 = Second Post-Intervention groups (have not completed program). Technical Trainer Area include business math, typing, word processing, and business applications. Transitional Skills Counselor Area include telephone skills, reception duties, job search skills, business correspondence, business English, stress management, professional grooming, assertiveness training and career planning. Business Manager’s Area includes small business component. (On-site placement where participants practice skills on work from outside the program.)

*Items are scored on a scale where 0 = none given; 4 = excellent.*
of the technical trainer, who was most happy throughout the evaluation, improved. However, perceptions of the business manager, who was most unhappy at the time period subsequent to the workshops (mid- to post-1-intervention) and by her own admission apathetic, declined from mid-intervention onward. Her resignation occurred during this time period. The transitional skills counselor, who peaked in participants' ratings at post-intervention (post-1), improved, perhaps in hopes of change, but eventually gave up and quit.

The open ended comments of the participants are perhaps most revealing (Appendix K). All comments from the pre-intervention groups indicated that they found the atmosphere to be "friendly" and "like a family". In the mid-intervention groups, however, there were two comments of discontent: "teachers should treat all participants the same, with respect" and "trainers treat us like we are mentally disabled." Post-1-intervention group comments again indicated a friendly atmosphere (e.g., "staff is enthusiastic") but from the most recent two groups, five of the seven comments provided were negative, stressing favouritism (e.g., "Instructors should try not to show favouritism") and intolerance (e.g., "Sometimes we were made to feel stupid").

Similar, differences were again evident on the open-ended comments questions. For the pre- and mid-
intervention groups no negative comments were generated. For the post-1-intervention groups only one individual commented negatively, but directed the comment at one staff member in particular, the replacement for the previous administrative assistant. For the last two groups (post-2), however, three of the four comments were strongly negative, pointing out lack of patience on the part of the staff. In short, these comments provide ample evidence for the hypothesis that participants are quite attuned to the morale of the staff and that staff dissatisfaction was reflected, somewhat, in their performance. Yet these factors did not have consistent effects on participant performance measures.

**Participant Interviews**

Further evidence for participant awareness of staff interpersonal problems comes from the interviews with a sample of two participants from each of the post-intervention groups. The sample was not planned; it was comprised of an informal group who approached the student evaluator while on a field trip outside the program setting. The comments centered around the theme that though the curriculum at ACHIEVE was good, this fact was overshadowed by the perceived tension. Participants stated that they "were intimidated by the project manager" and that they felt there was
"discrimination within ACHIEVE." They noticed a change since the meeting where members had resigned and believed that the project manager "does not respect the staff or participants." Further, they stated that participants who were currently on placement did not want to come back because of the tension.

Summary of Participant Dependent Measures

It was hypothesized that participants were in a position to perceive improvements in staff attitude and performance. Obviously, because staff attitudes did not improve, participants could not perceive improvements. However, there is evidence that participants perceived negative changes.

The technical trainer was most satisfied based on pre-intervention ratings, and continued to be more satisfied than the others, even though her level of satisfaction declined slightly over time. Correspondingly, the usefulness of her instruction was rated more highly by all groups at all points in time. As well, it increased consistently over time. While it can be argued that comparison of usefulness of different skill areas is not appropriate, the increase in the usefulness ratings is telling. Similarly, the technical trainer was perceived as more accessible than the other staff, and her ratings improved up till the first post-
intervention group and then declined only slightly. This decline is understandable in light of the fact that towards the end, the technical trainer ended up covering for other missing personnel and was over-extended.

Based on the cumulative data in the technical skills area, there are some interesting findings. From pre- to post-1-intervention groups the technical skills trainer's job dissatisfaction increased, and correspondingly, participants' outcome levels mostly decreased. As well, more open-ended evaluation comments and interview responses also became increasingly negative. Yet, ratings of appropriateness of time stayed the same, and ratings of her accessibility and usefulness of instruction increased. This finding implies that participants' performance may reflect staff dissatisfaction, and participants were aware of staff dissatisfaction, but the structured part of the evaluations did not seem to tap this. For the last groups, performance was highest, yet comments indicate an awareness of staff interpersonal problems. One possible explanation for this contradiction is that outcome levels were determined after the evaluations were completed by these groups, and quite likely there was a change in atmosphere subsequent to the resignations. Thus, post-2 intervention groups' comments are likely more reflective of the context in
which outcome levels were based for post-1 intervention
groups.

The transitional skills counselor who, of the three
teaching staff, had all along been most dissatisfied,
improved in all ratings up till post-1 groups. (It
should be noted that she was not the transitional
counselor for most of the pre-intervention groups’s
training. There was an earlier transitional skills
counselor who left well before the onset of the
evaluation.) Presumably, her dissatisfaction must have
increased around this time, for her to tender her
resignation. Yet, there is some evidence that outcome
levels continued to increase past this point, despite
the decline in all ratings. This pattern is difficult
to interpret. However, bearing in mind that this area
was weakest prior to the evaluation-initiated changes,
some portion of the increase in outcomes is likely due
to task-related improvements. Thus, even after her
satisfaction deteriorated to the extent that she
resigned, participant groups were still benefitting from
the task related changes, so that outcome levels still
increased. It is possible that they would have
increased to a greater extent, had the program improved
from a person as well as a task perspective.

Another possibility is that the transitional skills
counselor initially was very hopeful that the
interventionary process would bring about positive changes, thus her performance improved, but when major structural changes did not occur, her performance deteriorated. This deterioration did not cause a decline in participants' outcome levels, because of the task-related changes discussed above, yet it did cause the drop in ratings of her performance. There is tentatively greater support for this second possibility because of the corresponding drop in ratings.

The business manager who, by her own admission, became apathetic over time, overall deteriorated in ratings of the usefulness of her instruction, her accessibility, and the appropriateness of the amount of time spent teaching in her area. Interestingly, however, she was rated highest on all criteria for the mid-intervention groups. It will be recalled that on the JSQ, the business manager expressed some dissatisfaction, but it did not become pronounced until after the interventionary period. Thus, her relatively high satisfaction coincided with reasonably high participant outcome levels and highest ratings. When her dissatisfaction was greatest, participants' ratings of her also declined. Again, the continued increase in outcomes is likely attributable to improvements in task-related areas.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

General Discussion and Limitations of the Study

As Cronbach (1982) said

"nature does not stick to the script. Planned treatments go awry, and surprises lead the investigator down new paths. Questions posed to get the inquiry underway prove to be far less interesting than the questions that emerge as observations are made and puzzled over. Not infrequently, questions arising out of the observations prove to be more important in the long run than the facts that the study was designed to pin down (p. x)."

In the present case study, the "question arising out of the observations" is: What led to the disintegration of the work group and what implications do these findings have for the participatory evaluation approach? This question forms the basis for the following discussion.

It is necessary to trace the evaluation process to see what hypotheses were supported and to determine where
and why there were deviations from the expected occurrences.

Consistent with past findings that staff job dissatisfaction is frequent in human service organizations and largely determined by Interpersonal Factors (e.g., Buffum & Konick, 1982; Cherniss & Egnatics, 1978; Frank et al., 1985; Leiter, 1988; McNeely, 1983; Pincus, 1980; Spector, 1986; Ursprung, 1986; Wiggins & Moody, 1983), results of the administration of the JSQ support the hypotheses that staff in ACHIEVE were dissatisfied, and that this dissatisfaction was primarily in, though not limited to, the Interpersonal domain.

Several points need to be noted, however. First, although in the present study some staff dissatisfaction was expressed in more concrete areas such as benefits and promotions, there are limits to possible evaluator interventions in these areas. Small organizations frequently have problems implementing benefit packages, due to cost, and there are certainly limitations on promotional opportunities. It may be that in these circumstances, as with ACHIEVE, where smooth daily functioning requires interactions on the part of all the staff, special measures have to be taken to enhance Interpersonal Factors to compensate for less desirable and less changeable areas.
Second, as subsequent data confirm, these concrete areas may have been worthy of complaint but it was really problems in the Interpersonal area that led to future drastic action and despite limited possibilities in the more concrete areas, interventions can address Interpersonal Factors.

Third, the results of the JSQ indicate that at pre-intervention there were two staff members who were particularly unhappy, the administrative assistant and the transitional skills counselor. Despite negative responses, the administrative assistant and the transitional skills counselor claimed to like what they did and to believe that they did it well. Frank et al. (1985) found that input into decision-making about provision of services was related to satisfaction with client service aspects. In fact, the only input the ACHIEVE staff had was with their own program areas. As well, Frank et al. found input into administrative decisions to be correlated with satisfaction about monetary status and rewards. Both the transitional skills counselor and the administrative assistant were dissatisfied with pay, benefits, and promotions and claimed to be unaware of organizational decisions. Cherniss and Egnatios (1978) claim that work-related decisions should be correlated with satisfying communication and supervision, and general job
satisfaction, and this certainly does not appear to be the case.

Although the project manager was only slightly more satisfied than the transitional skills counselor and the administrative assistant, the business manager and the technical trainer seemed much more content. In fact, though the administrative assistant and transitional skills counselor expressed dissatisfaction almost completely across all non-self referential items, the business manager and the technical trainer were generally positive. The exceptions to positive responses are few but telling. These exceptions paint a picture of workers who felt overworked and, at least in the case of the business manager, unrecognized. As well, both had complaints with respect to communication, with both co-workers and the project manager.

Although in retrospect the administrative assistant's resignation can be understood, it remains to be examined why her job satisfaction did not improve over the course of the evaluation. More confusing, despite the relatively positive responses of the business manager, she was the second person to resign. This paradoxical finding also needs to be more closely examined.

The mid-point interviews elicited almost exclusively Interpersonal Factor responses. Although
this phenomenon supports the hypothesis that staff dissatisfaction was primarily with Interpersonal Factors, it also is indicative that the workshops did not have the desired effect. In fact, complaints and dissatisfaction were intensified. Prior to the interventions, dissatisfaction with communication had been mentioned, but not emphasized with respect to the project manager. The business manager, who previously was relatively positive, commented on her lack of input, and the problems associated with poor supervision. Similarly, the other staff members were negative regarding Interpersonal Factors. While the project manager was the pivot in most of the staff concerns, she, in turn, focused much of her dissatisfaction on her supervisors, the Board of Directors.

There are at least three possibilities for why the workshops did not have the predicted effect of improving staff job satisfaction in Interpersonal areas. First, it is likely that in the group meetings staff members were not completely open with the extent and pervasiveness of their dissatisfaction, due to the presence of the project manager. Thus, although there was a veneer of group decision-making, it was really the project manager who dominated everything.

Unfortunately, it is only retrospectively that this possibility becomes evident. In fact, it was pointed
out by several of the staff members that these group workshops were reflective of the manner in which all meetings were held and decisions made. Because problems were not confronted they could not be dealt with effectively.

The second possibility is in line with Rappaport's (1977) thinking. That is, the workshop and interview techniques may have "responded to a need" for some and "created a felt need" for change in other members (p. 174). The administrative assistant, transitional skills counselor and project manager, who were most negative on the JSQ, did not appear markedly more so in the mid-point interviews. In fact, the administrative assistant was slightly more positive. The business manager and the technical trainer, who were originally most positive, became more closely aligned with the other two staff members. In short, the workshops may have raised the consciousness of some group members -- a positive first step in the change process. Some support for this possibility lies in the improved participant ratings of the business manager and technical trainer around this time period. However, there was no opportunity to follow through with true organizational changes before the resignations.

Related to this second possibility is a third possibility why the workshops did not have the desired
effect. Because the program was ongoing, the staff were still responsible for their components. As a result, any time they put into the evaluation process took away from the program. Therefore, meetings had to be spread out over a longer period of time than was desirable. This problem was compounded by the equally busy schedules of the evaluators. If, in fact, consciousness was raised, changes should have followed shortly after. Unfortunately, there were long gaps in time.

Had it been more obvious that the majority of problems stemmed from the project manager the situation could have been avoided or ameliorated. Discussions and exercises on leadership could have been the major focus of the workshop, instead of one issue among many. Action could have been taken to eliminate power differentials in the workshop context, by making the project manager dependent on others for help, more strongly in the vein of Aronson et al. (1978), than was the case. Aronson et al. used a jigsaw puzzle method to overcome competition and hostility in the classroom; each child alone had only a fragment of a solution to the "puzzle" so that complete resolution required group cooperation. Similarly, at the very least, the futuring workshop could have been modified so that instead of each staff member drawing separate illustrations of their ideal future, a group poster
could have been designed where cooperation would have been required even just in the sharing of markers and poster space. Because the power differential was not acknowledged officially, and staff were not open initially, these inherent problems were not obvious until after the fact.

More individual interviews before the workshops might have shed more light on the situation. Then initial meetings could have been held without the project manager to initiate the communication process, with all possible threats removed. A more opportune moment to bring in the project manager might have been after the communication process had begun. However, given the nature of the project manager's supervisory style, it is unlikely that she would have supported an endeavour of which she was not a part. This lack of support might have complicated matters more.

The final interviews serve as testimony to the worsened situation interpersonally and its impact on job satisfaction. From the initial administration of the JSQ to the final interviews, there had been several positive task-related changes. First, there was the move from a relatively unsatisfactory location and premises to one that was markedly superior. Second, for the majority of the evaluation process, staff were without a contract. Before the final interviews,
however, all staff, including the project manager, had new contracts. Third, between the mid-point and final interviews, all staff received a pay increase and the technical trainer was promoted to assistant director. As well, objectives were clarified, new instruments were designed, curricula honed, and processes tightened. Although some program improvement can be attributed to experience alone, most of it can be attributed to the evaluation process, and this is confirmed by informal staff comments and interview responses.

Yet, given all these positive task-related changes, staff job satisfaction decreased to the extent that there were three resignations. With the task-related areas improving and job satisfaction decreasing, evidence is provided for the greater importance of Interpersonal Factors for staff job satisfaction in human service organizations, particularly in small organizations. In fact, in the final interviews, no negative mention was made of task-related areas and some members commented positively. It was only at this point that staff were truly open and a clear picture emerged.

Some definite patterns emerged from the final interviews. The technical trainer, consistently more positive on the JSQ, and still comparatively more positive in the mid-point interviews also admitted that up till this point she had been favoured by the project
manager. As well, she had the greatest control over her area and received the only promotion and recognition.

The business manager, who was at first reasonably satisfied, by the time of the mid-point interviews was less so. In fact, she was the second person to quit, after the admittedly dissatisfied administrative assistant. Her final interview comments emphasize a growing realization of her lack of input and control, even in her own area. In fact, she explicitly stated that her pay was satisfactory, she liked the program and she never would have quit had it not been for the project manager. Interestingly, the business manager brought up the incident of the technical trainer's extra raise and promotion. She stated that although the promotion should have been considered as a success for the group, and something to be proud of, it was kept quiet, and the technical trainer was robbed of deserved recognition. She felt that not telling the other staff members made the process seem underhanded and created hostility instead of pride. She felt this was symbolic of all decisions that were made; staff members were advised long after the fact.

The transitional skills counselor, who was quite negative on the JSQ and mid-point interviews, also quit before the final interviews. Although she could not be reached for an interview, her informal comments reflect
the common pattern. The transitional skills counselor was very aware that she was disliked by the project manager. She felt that she received no recognition or respect from him and was unjustly criticized at every turn.

The project manager similarly felt tension at the time of the final interviews but was not aware that she was the root of most problems. Interestingly, her complaints also centred around lack of input and power, in her case, however, with respect to the Board rather than staff.

Spector (1986) noted that those who participate to a great extent in decision-making are less likely to quit. As evidenced by the three staff resignations, this, in fact, is borne out by what happened at ACHIEVE. The administrative assistant, the first person to resign, was dissatisfied in almost every area. The business manager who, at the end, felt least control of her job, was most dissatisfied with her component. The transitional skills counselor also was not particularly satisfied in any area, but her resignation coincided with increasingly more negative interpersonal complaints. In fact, the only person who did not quit, the technical trainer, was the only one who felt she had complete control of her own job, and did not make particular mention of lack of input into general
decision making.

Pincus (1986) also pointed out the importance of the immediate supervisor-subordinate relationship for job satisfaction. Again, the transitional skills counselor was admittedly disliked by the supervisor, the business manager, at the end, claimed she received no respect from the supervisor, and the administrative assistant was kept ill-advised of much of what transpired at ACHIEVE. In fact, these are the three staff members who resigned. The favourite of the supervisor was the one who stayed on, even though the supervisor was asked to leave.

Pincus (1986) documented the importance of employee-top management relationships on the employee's job satisfaction. Perception of open communication is correlated with greater satisfaction. In the present study, there were some strong comments about lack of awareness of Board decisions and lack of feedback, particularly positive. Because the staff members resigned before the final report was presented, they did not have the opportunity to see their direct input into the Board. It would be advisable for Board members to visit the program more often and to encourage staff to attend the open Board meetings.

All the staff interactions with the Board passed through an intermediary -- the project manager. At the
beginning, there were more negative comments directed toward the Board than toward the project manager. However, as the problems with the project manager began to surface, she became the focus of complaints and some staff members believed she did not represent their interests to the Board. Furthermore, they were forced to believe the project manager's version of Board transactions and did not doubt its accuracy until the other complaints emerged. Whether the initial complaints were truly directed at the Board or the project manager is unclear.

Finally, there is documentation of the importance of co-worker communication (Pincus, 1986). Although the JSQ clearly documented the transitional skill counselor's and the administrative assistant's dissatisfaction in this area, the business manager's negativism did not become critical until after the mid-point interviews, and the project manager did not really have co-workers at her level; all her relationships were supervisor-subordinate. By the time of the final interview, co-worker directed hostilities were prevalent, and became a secondary focus, next to supervisory complaints.

It is interesting that the largest area of complaints at the earliest group meetings indicated dissatisfaction with the Board. Other areas were less
of a focal point. Then, it became evident that
complaints toward the Board masked the larger problem of
poor supervisor-subordinate relationships. Once these
complaints were voiced they became the focal point.
This time they concealed the deteriorating relationships
with the rest of the staff. It was only at the very end
that the full extent of interpersonal problems became
evident.

Unfortunately, participation in the evaluation
process did not lead to improved satisfaction.
The results do bring to bear other considerations,
however. First, the project manager and the staff
appeared to have conflicting ideas of how best the
organization should run. The staff believed that
ideally the organization should have leaned towards a
human relations administrative model (personalized
relationships, collegiality of decision-making,
internalization of the organizations' goals), while the
project manager adhered largely to a rationalistic model
(decisions from the top [herself], hierarchical,
impersonal relationships) (McNeely, 1983). These
differences in style are particularly evident with
regard to final interview responses. For instance,
while the project manager perceived herself to be
"professional," the staff perceived her to be
"unapproachable" and "impersonal." While the project
manager saw top-down decision-making to be necessary, the staff resented their lack of input. Furthermore, the staff, particularly the transitional skills counselor, found the project manager’s attempts to routinize and standardize somewhat inappropriate, given changing market demands and differences in intake groups. As McNeely (1983) points out, hierarchical decision-making is likely to create feelings of powerlessness expressed in poor job satisfaction and frequently leading to burnout. In an organization of this nature, where continual interactions are essential, it is necessary to have faith in one’s co-workers (or subordinates), to allow them to do their job, and to get along with them. Perhaps it would be advisable then to have staff involved in the hiring process.

The second important consideration centres around how much information about an organization can be gained from observation of outcomes alone, in a summative manner. The present study is a case in point. If the focus had been only on objectives, the program would have been seen to be functioning well. With a formative evaluation, the program from a task perspective may have improved, as well. However, particularly in a small organization, such as ACHIEVE, ignoring the person perspective can be a fatal flaw. It was particularly crucial for ACHIEVE since the multi-cultural aspect of
the program exacerbated communication problems. If there are subterranean problems that are not confronted and dealt with effectively, the entire program may be in jeopardy. It was fortunate, in the present case, that the staff members liked and were committed to the program enough not to sabotage its efforts and continued to help out.

Given that staff dissatisfaction increased, the implications this increase had for the participants can now be considered. Obviously, participants could not perceive improved staff attitudes. However, if one redefines the hypothesis as the ability of participants to sense any changes in attitudes, support is again provided. Participants were very aware of staff problems and this awareness was particularly evident in open-ended comments and interview responses. It did not come across as clearly in the more structured ratings.

This finding has tremendous implications for programs of this nature and underlines the distinction between job satisfaction and job performance in industrial and human service settings. While workers on a production line merely have to attach parts, the staff at ACHIEVE are forced to interact with demanding clients continuously.

Because staff job satisfaction did not improve, the final hypothesis, that participant outcome levels would
improve as a result of improved staff morale, could not be supported. Again, the hypothesis can be reworded to be nondirectional. Participants' outcome levels would either improve as a result of improved staff job satisfaction or deteriorate as a result of increased staff job dissatisfaction. The alternate possibility is that participants' outcome levels will improve independent of staff satisfaction. There is support for this nondirectional prediction; however, it is not a simple relationship. Based on the data, outcome levels do reflect staff dissatisfaction, but the task-related area of the program play a role as well. It was found that improvements in the program, from a task perspective (e.g., clarification of objectives, strengthening of curricula, improved scoring systems), regardless of the staff perspective, were associated with improved outcome levels.

An interesting parallel is set up between job satisfaction and job performance with staff and with participants. It was found that participants' outcome levels were not always directly reflective of their Interpersonal job satisfaction (based on interview and evaluation data). A portion of their outcome levels can be directly attributed to Task-Related changes in the program, so that even when they were aware of a tense atmosphere at work, their outcome levels sometimes still
improved.

It is ironic that what some individuals would label as the limitations of the study were, at the same time, advantages. Specifically, as is the case with field research, many of the "research/truth" characteristics were impossible (and undesirable) to implement. For instance, the scientist as detached observer was unfeasible. However, it was because the student-evaluator was able to blend into the program and acquaint herself with the inner workings that many of the observations and conclusions were possible, because much more was taking place beneath the surface than a detached observer could have noticed. As well, the good relationship that developed between the staff and the student-evaluator enabled her to pursue the study, even after staff had resigned.

Furthermore, the value of the qualitative data cannot be stressed enough. Although the quantitative data, for both participants and staff, did provide clues, it was really the qualitative information that provided answers. It is recommended that qualitative data should form an integral part of studies of this nature.

Finally, although the applied nature of the research limited control and obviously could not prevent staff resignations, it also led down alternative paths
that proved more interesting. While the "research/truth" approach would have ended with staff resignations, the flexibility inherent in the "action/oriented" approach permitted new discoveries.

Conclusions and Suggestions For Further Studies

Several interesting findings provide ground for further research. First, the technical trainer showed an increase in all ratings from pre- to post-intervention participant groups. In fact, even when her dissatisfaction was greatest she received high ratings, higher than all other staff. This finding may indicate that generally technical skills are viewed as more important than the other types of skills. This area is worthy of investigation. Future studies could examine whether this observation holds true for different participant groups, or whether there are different needs. For example, do Native women need the same emphasis on transitional skills as immigrant women do?

Second, the possibilities for the use of program evaluation as a tool for organizational development have been discussed. The present study provides further support. Although staff job satisfaction did not increase, it was likely due to the limitations of the present study. It would be worthwhile to use the same approach as the present study, but eliminating the long
time gaps, and providing a more intensive workshop period. As well, it would be desirable to have other stakeholders, particularly Board members, involved in the process. It would be of interest to have the participants more directly involved in the evaluation process to better explore the impact of involvement on their satisfaction.

Finally, it would be of interest to compare the process of change within a small, semi-hierarchical organization, such as ACHIEVE, with one where participative management is practiced. Differences in approach to and benefits gained from the evaluation process could then be examined.
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Appendix A

Application Form initially used by ACHIEVE
APPLICATION FOR TRAINING:

Family Name: ___________________________ Given Names: ___________________________

Address: ________________________________________________________________

City: ___________________________ Postal Code: ___________________________

Telephone Number: ______________ Languages Spoken: ___________________________

Date of Arrival in Canada: Month _______ Year _____________

EDUCATION:

Elementary/Secondary

In which country were you educated? ___________________________

How many years did you spend in school (NOT including college or university)? _______ What year did you finish school? _______

College or University

Did you attend college or university in your country? ( ) yes ( ) No

Degree completed? ( ) Yes ( ) No Years attended: From ___ To ___

subject Studied: ____________________________________________________________

Technical Training

Did you receive any technical training (e.g. at a technical institute, business school, or other special school) in your home country? ( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, please supply details below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>Course Length</th>
<th>Full-or Part Time</th>
<th>Course Completed?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDUCATION: CANADA

English Training

Have you studied English as a Second Language? ( ) Yes ( ) No
If yes, please supply details below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of school</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Course length</th>
<th>Full-or-part time</th>
<th>Hours per week</th>
<th>Level completed</th>
<th>Date compl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Courses

Have you taken any other courses (e.g. high school, technical or business courses, upgrading) in Canada? ( ) Yes ( ) No
If yes, please supply details below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of school</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Name of course</th>
<th>Course length</th>
<th>F/P-time</th>
<th>Hrs./week</th>
<th>Level completed</th>
<th>Date compl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please detail below any other training you have had in Canada or any volunteer work you have done that you think would make your application more successful.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
WORK EXPERIENCE: CANADA

Please list the jobs you have held in Canada, beginning with the most recent job. In each case, describe in as much detail as possible the responsibilities of your job.

1. Name of Company: ___________________________ City: __________
   Name of Job: ___________________________ Full-time () Part-time()
   Hours per Week: ___ Period of Employment: From ___ To ___
   Responsibilities: ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   Reason for Leaving: ________________________________________

2. Name of Company: ___________________________ City: __________
   Name of Job: ___________________________ Full-time () Part-time()
   Hours per Week: ___ Period of Employment: From ___ To ___
   Responsibilities: ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   Reason for Leaving: ________________________________________

3. Name of Company: ___________________________ City: __________
   Name of Job: ___________________________ Full-time () Part-time()
   Hours per Week: ___ Period of Employment: From ___ To ___
   Responsibilities: ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   Reason for Leaving: ________________________________________
WORK EXPERIENCE: COUNTRY OF ORIGIN (IF APPLICABLE)

Did you work before you came to Canada? ( ) Yes ( ) No

Please list the jobs you held, beginning with the last one.

1. Name of Job: ______________________________________________________
   Type of Business: _________________________________________________
   Period of Employment: From ___________ To ___________
   Responsibilities: _________________________________________________

2. Name of Job: ______________________________________________________
   Type of Business: _________________________________________________
   Period of Employment: From ___________ To ___________
   Responsibilities: _________________________________________________

Did you use English in any of the jobs you had before coming to Canada? ( ) Yes ( ) No. In which jobs? __________________________

********************************************

On a separate sheet of paper, write a letter, not more than one page in length, addressed to WEST, explaining why we should select you for training in this project.

********************************************

DECLARATION

I have been unemployed since (day) __________ (month) __________ (year) ___________.
I certify that the information in this application is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.

Date ____________________
Sign ____________________
Appendix B

Revised Application Form
ACHIEVE
APPLICATION FORM

Last Name________________________ First Name________________________
Address__________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
City ____________________________ Postal Code _______________________

Telephone:________________________

How long have you been in Canada?____________________________________

What languages do you speak?

__ first language ____________________ __ second language ____________

Did you speak English before coming to Canada?__________________________

How did you hear about ACHIEVE?

__ 1. Canadian Employment Center
__ 2. Women's Immigrant Center
__ 3. Unemployed Help Center
__ 4. Advertisement
__ 5. South Asian Center
__ 6. Chinese Community Center
__ 7. City of Windsor Social Services
__ 8. Third World Resource Center
__ 9. Friend
__ 10. Other (Please specify________________________________________)

* * * * *

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

In which country did you start school?__________________________________

What level of school did you complete in that country?

__ 1. Less than Grade 10
__ 2. Grade 10 - Grade 11
__ 3. Grade 12 - Grade 13
__ 4. Community College
__ 5. University
__ 6. Vocational/ Technical/ Trade
__ 7. Other (PLEASE SPECIFY_______________________________________)

Have you gone to school in Canada?___________________________________

What level of school did you complete in Canada?
1. Less than Grade 10
2. Grade 10 - Grade 11
3. Grade 12 - Grade 13
4. Community College
5. University
6. Vocational/Technical/Trade
7. Other (PLEASE SPECIFY)

If you had special skills training in your home country, (for example, word processing, bookkeeping, nursing, etc) beginning with the most recent, supply details below:

1. What was the type of course? 
How long was the course? 
Was the course full time or part time? 
Did you complete the course? 
What was the date of completion?

2. What was the type of course? 
How long was the course? 
Was the course full time or part time? 
Did you complete the course? 
What was the date of completion?

3. What was the type of course? 
How long was the course? 
Was the course full time or part time? 
Did you complete the course? 
What was the date of completion?

If you had special skills training in Canada, specify where.
1. Futures
2. Business College (Specify Name__________)
3. Community College (Specify Name__________)
4. Program like ACHIEVE (Specify Name__________)
5. Other (Specify__________)
What skills did you learn in your special training?

1. Computers
2. Typing
3. Bookkeeping
4. Phone/Receptionist
5. Filing
6. Other (Specify__________________________)

Have you studied English as a second language in Canada?
Yes___ No___

If yes, beginning with the most recent, supply details below:

1. What is the name of the school?_________________________________________
   What city is the school in?_____________________________________________
   How long was the course?______________________________________________
   How many hours per week was the course?______________________________
   What level did you complete?__________________________________________
   On what date did you complete the course?_______________________________

2. What is the name of the school?_______________________________________
   What city is the school in?____________________________________________
   How long was the course?______________________________________________
   How many hours per week was the course?______________________________
   What level did you complete?__________________________________________
   On what date did you complete the course?_______________________________

3. What is the name of the school?_______________________________________
   What city is the school in?____________________________________________
   How long was the course?______________________________________________
   How many hours per week was the course?______________________________
   What level did you complete?__________________________________________
   On what date did you complete the course?_______________________________
Do you have other training or skills that you think would be useful in a job?


WORK EXPERIENCE IN YOUR HOME COUNTRY

Did you ever work in your home country? Yes___ No___

If yes, please list the jobs you held, beginning with the most recent.

1. Job Title_____________________________________
   Type of Business_________________________________
   Was this Full time or Part time________________________
   Period of Employment: From____________________ to____________________
   Responsibilities_________________________________
   Did you use English on the job?____________________

2. Job Title_____________________________________
   Type of Business_________________________________
   Was this Full time or Part-time________________________
   Period of Employment: From____________________ to____________________
   Responsibilities_________________________________
   Did you use English on the job?____________________
3. Job Title

Type of Business

Was this Full time or Part time

Period of Employment: From_______ to_______

Responsibilities

__________________________________________

Did you use English on the job?

4. Job Title

Type of Business

Was this Full time or Part time

Period of Employment: From_______ to_______

Responsibilities

__________________________________________

Did you use English on the job?

* * * * * WORK EXPERIENCE IN CANADA * * * * *

Please list the jobs you have held in Canada, beginning with the most recent.

1. Name of Company____________________ City_______

Job title____________________ Full time( ) Part time ( )

Hours per week_______ Period of employment: (From_______

to_______)

Responsibilities

__________________________________________

Reason for leaving

__________________________________________
2. Name of Company __________________________ City __________________
   Job title ___________________________ Full time() Part time()
   Hours per week _____ Period of employment: From __________
   to __________.
   Responsibilities __________________________________________
   Reason for leaving _________________________________________

3. Name of Company __________________________ City __________________
   Job title ___________________________ Full time() Part time()
   Hours per week _____ Period of employment: From __________
   to __________.
   Responsibilities __________________________________________
   Reason for leaving _________________________________________

4. Name of Company __________________________ City __________________
   Job title ___________________________ Full time() Part time()
   Hours per week _____ Period of employment: From __________
   to __________.
   Responsibilities __________________________________________
   Reason for leaving _________________________________________

5. Name of Company __________________________ City __________________
   Job title ___________________________ Full time() Part time()
   Hours per week _____ Period of employment: From __________
to ____________________________

Responsibilities ____________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

Reason for leaving ____________________________________________

* * * * * * *

How many months have you been employed full time in the last 5 years? ______________

If you have been unemployed since coming to Canada, or have not had the kinds of jobs that you would like to have, indicate the reasons why you think this is so. Check off ALL that apply.

___ 1. no transportation
___ 2. no telephone
___ 3. not enough confidence
___ 4. no child care
___ 5. no money for appropriate clothes
___ 6. don’t have necessary job skills
___ 7. don’t have adequate education
___ 8. don’t know how to find a job
___ 9. there is no future in the areas where I have skills
___10. no work experience
___11. no work experience in Canada
___12. my English is not good enough
___13. I am a member of a minority group

DECLARATION:

I have been unemployed since (day)____ (month)____ (year)____

I certify that the information in this application is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.

Date___________________________________

Sign___________________________________
Appendix C

Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

Interpersonal Context Factors

Co-worker Relations = 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 24, 33, 42
Supervision = 11, 13, 20, 29, 38, 40, 44
Participation in Decision-Making = 17, 26, 34

Working Conditions Context Factors

Pay = 9, 18, 27, 31, 36
Benefits = 12, 21, 30, 37
Promotion = 10, 19, 28, 41

Intrinsic Content Factors

Nature of Work = 16, 22, 25, 35, 43
Self Assessment of Performance = 1, 2, 3, 4
Operation Procedures = 14, 23, 32, 39
ACHIEVE
Staff Questionnaire

Below you will find a series of questions relating to your job and your work environment. In evaluating a program it is necessary to consider every aspect of it, including the attitudes of those administering the services. Please rest assured that the responses will remain completely confidential.

Instructions: Please indicate how accurately the statements below describe your current work group (program staff and manager) using the following six-point scale:

1  2  3  4  5  6
disagree  disagree  disagree  agree  agree  agree
very much  moderately  slightly  moderately  very much

1. I set realistic and appropriate goals and objectives for my clients.
   1  2  3  4  5  6

2. I provide timely and useful feedback to the clients.
   1  2  3  4  5  6

3. I monitor and review client progress on a regular basis.
   1  2  3  4  5  6

4. I use appropriate training/teaching methods and modify them to fit the needs of each client.
   1  2  3  4  5  6

5. People in the work group often are not really frank and open with each other.
   1  2  3  4  5  6

6. Members of the work group are not really committed to the success of the group.
   1  2  3  4  5  6

7. The objectives of some individual members of the group do not gel with those of other members.
   1  2  3  4  5  6

8. Members often restrain their critical remarks to avoid "rocking the boat".
   1  2  3  4  5  6
9. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.
   1  2  3  4  5  6
10. There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.
    1  2  3  4  5  6
11. My supervisor is quite competent in doing her job.
    1  2  3  4  5  6
12. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.
    1  2  3  4  5  6
13. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.
    1  2  3  4  5  6
14. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.
    1  2  3  4  5  6
15. I like the people I work with.
    1  2  3  4  5  6
16. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.
    1  2  3  4  5  6
17. Communications seem good within the organization.
    1  2  3  4  5  6
18. Raises are too few and far between.
    1  2  3  4  5  6
19. Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.
    1  2  3  4  5  6
SCALE

1  2  3  4  5  6
Disagree  Disagree  Disagree  Agree  Agree  Agree
Very much  Moderately  Slightly  Slightly  Moderately  Very much

20. My supervisor is unfair to me.
1  2  3  4  5  6

21. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.
1  2  3  4  5  6

22. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.
1  2  3  4  5  6

23. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.
1  2  3  4  5  6

24. I find that I have to work harder at my job than I should because of the incompetence of people I work with.
1  2  3  4  5  6

25. I like doing the things I do at work.
1  2  3  4  5  6

26. The goals of the organization are not clear to me.
1  2  3  4  5  6

27. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think of what they pay me.
1  2  3  4  5  6

28. People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.
1  2  3  4  5  6

29. My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of the subordinate.
1  2  3  4  5  6

30. The benefit package we have is equitable.
1  2  3  4  5  6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. There are few rewards for those who work here.  
1  2  3  4  5  6

32. I have too much to do at work.  
1  2  3  4  5  6

33. I enjoy my co-workers.  
1  2  3  4  5  6

34. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.  
1  2  3  4  5  6

35. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.  
1  2  3  4  5  6

36. I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.  
1  2  3  4  5  6

37. There are benefits we do not have which we should have.  
1  2  3  4  5  6

38. I like my supervisor.  
1  2  3  4  5  6

39. I have too much paperwork.  
1  2  3  4  5  6

40. I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.  
1  2  3  4  5  6

41. I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.  
1  2  3  4  5  6

42. There is too much bickering and fighting at work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. My job is enjoyable.

44. Work assignments are often not fully explained.

* * * * * * *

Please feel free to include any comments that you feel are relevant.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix D

Futuring Workshop

Feb. 29, 1988

The five core staff and the two evaluators took part in the workshop.

1/ The staff were asked to consider generally "how the organization fits into the needs of the staff." They were asked to individually list their ideal, but realistic, goals for the future, by responding to the question: "What do you see yourself doing one year from now?"

2/ Staff members were then asked to draw a picture of "your ideal future."

3/ Staff then each individually presented their individual lists and pictures.

4/ The focus then turned to group goals. A two column chart was set up on a flip chart; one column was labelled "Prouds" and the other was labelled "Sorries." The staff members were encouraged to freely call out additions to the list. The prouds were meant to reflect anything that the program/organization, as a whole, had achieved that the staff were proud of. Conversely, the sorries reflected perceived mistakes, weaknesses, or wishes to have done something differently.

Prouds and Sorries

Prouds

- From scratch to organization
- Focus with women
- Good reputation throughout Ont.
- VMW as role model in office
- Flexible - taken mandate to fit needs
- Only project for VMW in Windsor
- Giving chance to develop
- Increased self esteem, personal growth, not subservient to family
- All fighters
- When chips down, band together

Sorries

- Didn't move sooner
- Don't get contact & feedback from Board
- Problems not solved internally but externally.
- Don't have more knowledge to deal Psychologically with clients
- Not enough time away from clients
- When contact with Board no feedback
- Increased understanding of others
- Women solving problems physically and mentally
- Greater awareness of what was taken for granted
- Creating jobs for city
- Giving women chance they wouldn't get otherwise
- Pilot program into workable stage
- Survival

- Board has impression of incompetent staff
- Feel like under magnifying glass: faults are scrutinized not positively (by community, public/private sector, Board)
- Not addressing criticisms usefully/assertively
- Learned behaviour in organization - not to cross lines.
- Constant negative reinforcement for speaking out not for trying.

5/ The staff were asked to express what they hoped to have addressed by the evaluation: their goals and objectives.

1. Area in which need help - ideas for changing
2. Positive reinforcement - focus on accomplishments
3. Clarify mandate of Board - relationship with Board
4. What does staff want from Board
5. Clarify level of authority of of program director
6. Board meetings and presence of members.
7. Comparison with other job development projects.
8. Future directions - Board as a whole vs Individuals

6/ The final step involved the staff, working together, to develop a "wish list." The question posed was: "What do you think the program should/could be like one year from now, if everything worked out? Think in terms of relationships, atmosphere, and the program."

Wish List

1. - A multi-level/streamlined
   - steady growth/sameness
   - streamline good idea/as a group though
2. - Consistency
3. - Breathing time
4. - One group at a time/not staggered intake
5. - Same schedule all the time
6. - more teachers
7. - more business
8. - more positive reinforcements
9. - more use by participants of skills
10. - less institutionalized discrimination
11. - more harmony on all levels
12. - less personal involvement with participants
13. - co-workers support each other
14. - better benefits.
15. - project to pay OHIP for married.

Throughout these basic steps, open discussion was encouraged. Although the workshop procedure was set up ahead of time, it was left loosely enough structured to permit straying from the steps when the occasion warranted it. For example, when concerns were expressed by the staff, these were focused on.
Appendix E

Job Descriptions Workshop

Outline of Workshop on Self Generated Job Descriptions held March 15, 1988

1/ The first step involved having the staff individually respond to the question: "Given what you know about your work, what would be your job description?" A flip chart was created with four headings: Skills/Aptitudes, Responsibilities, Behaviours, and Purpose of the job.

2/ After the staff had individually generated their job descriptions, they read them aloud. The other staff members were asked to express their views. The lists were shortened to the key components.

JOB DESCRIPTIONS - SELF DERIVED

I Business Manager:

Skills and Aptitudes:
- self starter
- marketing
- business background
- teaching ability (training, coaching)
- flexibility
  (team member, organized)

Responsibilities:
- business component - developing, maintaining
- teaching/training of applied skills
- evaluating performance in business component
- coordinating with the rest of organization

Behaviours:
- getting work for trainees/maintaining flow of work
- supervising trainees' business work
- promoting business to outside
- maintaining statistics on business and performance
- reporting to manager on regular basis
- screening/selecting new applicants
  (- bookkeeping class)
Purpose of job:
- Providing applied opportunities for academic skills and training.

Technical Trainer:

Skills and aptitudes:
- technical expertise with computers, business math, and bookkeeping
- teaching ability and experience
- curriculum development
- time management
- motivation

Responsibilities:
- teaching technical skills
- maintaining technical equipment
- keeping up to date on technical needs of market, software, skills
- providing technical assistance in business component
- backing-up business manager

Behaviours:
- teaching group and individuals
- developing curriculum, weekly, monthly
- reporting to program manager regularly
- screening/selection of new applicants
- keeping equipment in working order
- inventory control
- evaluating trainees/giving feedback

Purpose of Job:
- Preparing trainees with modern, updated, marketable skills for entry level positions.

III Transitional Skills Counselor (Trainer?)

Skills and aptitudes:
- skills and knowledge in variety of teaching styles/approaches
- counseling of groups/individuals
- cultural understanding
- previous work experience, especially in office setting
- professional attitude
- curriculum development
- interviewing, testing, evaluating of trainees
- business English and office skills
Responsibilities:
- teaching transitional skills (self esteem, how to dress, punctuality, business work norms, family management, personal goals/goal definition, assertiveness)
- counseling
- interviewing of applicants
- evaluation of participants
- (*teaching office procedures, business communications)
- (*placements, job search)

Behaviours:
- teaching life skills, Labour Law, business communications, office procedures (memos, letters, business English photocopy, receptionist skills)
- developing curriculum
- providing group and individual guidance
- screening applicants, interviewing, assessing
- (*supervising job search)
- (*following-up placement)

Purpose of job:
- To prepare trainees for entry level positions in Canadian workforce.

IV Project Manager

Skills and Aptitudes:
- creative, innovative, self directive
- effective written, verbal communication
- knowledge of marketing strategies
- ability to counsel (participants and staff)
- management experience - diversified
- ability to access alternate sources of funding
- ability to project/envision direction of ACHIEVE

Responsibilities:
- financial management of whole project
- supervision of staff
- staff performance (monitoring/appraisal)
- marketing project to community
- establishing niche in Windsor for ACHIEVE
- (*hiring/firing)
- liaison and reporting to/from Board

Behaviours:
- reporting to Board of Directors/funding sources
- liaison with community
- *trouble-shooting with staff and participants
- screening/selecting applicants
setting up working structure
- counseling of participants
- reviewing monthly curriculum reports
- being available for advice and suggestions
- conducting regular staff meetings/informal meetings
- taking minutes at Board meetings

Purpose:
To provide direction, coordination, reinterpretation of the mandate/overall supervision, integration of staff and services.

V Administrative Assistant/Bookkeeper

Skills and Aptitudes:
- secretarial
- bookkeeping
- office procedures/receptionist

Responsibilities:
- reception
- payroll
- office accounting
- coaching participants
- providing support to staff
- inventory supplies/maintenance

Behaviours:
- answering phones
- typing, accounts payable, payroll
- ledger - trial balance
- inventory, purchasing
- mail

3/ The final step of the evaluation involved having the staff volunteer their views of the structure and relationships of the program, in terms of an analogy.

1. Raising a child: from ideal, adapt to reality
   - staff is group of parents
   - many sides of single parent (mother)

2. Family:
   - loyal to itself, arguments
   - band against outside
- good friends
- fighting for betterment
- respect for each other's intelligence

3. 5 strangers rowing together in a boat.
Appendix F

Initial Staff Interview Format

Staff are given back Job Satisfaction Questionnaires and asked if there are any comments or clarifications needed. They are then told "This is intended as a chance for you to voice your opinions. I am going to ask you some pretty broad and general questions".

1) What is your perception of how well the organization is working?

2) How well do you think the organization is achieving its goals/objectives?

3) What are the strengths/weaknesses of the organization?

4) Can you think of any changes or improvements that need to be made?

5) What do you see as the interpersonal strengths and weaknesses of the organization?
Appendix G

Initial Format For Follow-up Staff Interviews

Introductory Comments:

A few months ago I gave you a questionnaire to fill out about your feelings on a number of subjects relevant to the program. You later had the chance to elaborate on the questionnaire and to express other concerns you might have had. What I would like to do is take sometime and see how you feel now about various aspects of the program. Let me begin with some very general questions.

1) What do you find most/least satisfying about your job?

2) Did you have feel the same way 6 months ago? 1 year ago?

3) How do you feel communication is among the staff members? 6 months ago?

4) How would you characterize the atmosphere at work?

5) What do you see as the most meaningful/significant changes that the program has undergone in the last 6 months?

6) What kind of communication is there between the Board and the staff members? Does this differ at all from how it was 6 months ago?

7) How much input do you have into the direction of the program? Has this changed at all in the last 6 months? In the last year?

8) Do you feel as though your worth at work is recognized?
9) Do you feel that what is expected of you has changed at all over time?
Appendix H

Format for Follow-up/Exit Interviews Revised

1. Describe what you think led up to some of the staff members leaving ACHIEVE. (For individuals who themselves have left ask them to further elaborate on their personal reasons. What were the largest contributing factors, e.g. coworker problems poor pay...)

2. How would you characterize the atmosphere at work?

3. What do you see as the most meaningful/significant changes that the program has undergone in the last 6 months?

4. What kind of communication is there between the Board and the staff members? Does this differ at all from how it was 6 months ago?

5. How much input do you have into the direction of the program? Has this changed at all in the last 6 months? In the last year?

6. Do you feel as though your worth at work is recognized?

7. Do you feel that what is expected of you has changed at all over time?

8. What do/did you think of the relationship of the co-workers at ACHIEVE?
   a. Did you find that people were frank and open? Has this changed at all over time?
   b. Did you find that there was fighting at work?
   c. Did you feel that it was a cohesive group with common objectives?
   d. What was the communication like? Did you feel like you were ill advised of changes?
9. How did you feel about your supervision? Too involved/uninterested/fair/ consistent?

10. If you had to hire all new staff at ACHIEVE, what would be the sorts of things you would look for? How does that differ from what there was?

11. Do you feel that you participated in decision making? Have you noticed any changes over the last 6 months in your level of participation? What do you attribute these changes to?

12. Did/do you find your pay to be satisfactory?

13. What is it about your job that made it most satisfying to you?

14. What is it about your job that made it least satisfying to you?

15. Do you feel that there is anything preventing you from doing the best you can at your job?

Comments:
Appendix I

Participant Evaluation Form
ACHIEVE
Program Evaluation

As you know, ACHIEVE is a relatively new program and is always trying to improve. Since you are a graduate of ACHIEVE your comments and suggestions will help the ACHIEVE staff make the program even better for future groups. Your name is not included anywhere. Please answer as honestly as possible. If you are not sure of an answer make your best guess. Do not skip any items. It would also be appreciated if you would add your personal comments.

Put an "x" in the right spot:

1) WERE YOU BORN IN CANADA? yes___ no___
2) IS ENGLISH YOUR FIRST LANGUAGE? yes___ no___

For the following questions, put an x in the space that best shows how you feel.

I/ Rate the amount of time spent on the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>too little</th>
<th>right amount</th>
<th>too much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Business Math</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Typing</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Word Processing</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Business Applications</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Telephone Skills</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Reception Skills</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Business Correspondence</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(book reviews, memos, letters, envelopes, order forms)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Written Job Search Skills</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(resume, applications)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Oral Job Search Skills</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(interview techniques)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Business English</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None Given</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Small Business</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simple word processing</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complex word processing</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reception duties</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bookkeeping</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Stress Management</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Professional Grooming</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Assertiveness Training</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Career Planning</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Guest Speakers</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Field Trips</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Homework</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Testing</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II/ How useful was the instruction you received in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None Given</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Business Math</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Typing</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Word Processing</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Business Applications</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Telephone Skills</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Reception Skills</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Business Correspondence (book reviews, memos, letters, envelopes, order forms)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Written Job Search Skills (resume, applications)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oral Job Search Skills (interview techniques)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Professional Grooming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Assertiveness Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Career Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III/ Rate the availability of staff for individual help (either with the skill or with personal problems) for the following skill areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Not available</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Business Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Typing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Word Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Business Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Telephone Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reception Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Business Correspondence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(book reviews, memos, letters, envelopes, order forms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Written Job Search Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(resume, applications)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oral Job Search Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(interview techniques)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Professional Grooming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14) Assertiveness Training ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
15) Career Planning ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

Did you feel that you were adequately prepared for your job placement? Please be specific.

Which area of training did you like the most? Why?

Which area of training did you like the least? Why?

How do you feel the training methods could be improved?
What did you like and/or dislike about the atmosphere at ACHIEVE?


Would you recommend ACHIEVE to a friend? Why or why not?


Do you have any other comments you would like to make?


Thank you very much for the time you took to fill out this evaluation. By knowing what our graduates think and how well prepared they are for their jobs, we can make ACHIEVE even better.
Appendix J

Participant Interview Questions

1. How would you characterize the atmosphere at ACHIEVE?

2. What did you think of the relationship of the co-workers at ACHIEVE?

3. What was your relationship like with the staff?

4. Did you find that there was fighting at ACHIEVE?

5. Do you feel as though your worth at work is recognized?

6. How did you feel about your supervision?
Appendix K

Participant Comments

Groups 1 & 2

Groups 3 & 4

Groups 5 & 6

Groups 7 & 8

Were you adequately prepared for your job placement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Working for program</th>
<th>More typing</th>
<th>Not in every area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, it's my fault</td>
<td>Didn't have one</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More assertiveness training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need applied practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need more computer work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What did you like most?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word processing</th>
<th>Bookkeeping</th>
<th>Reception</th>
<th>Bookkeeping computer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math, bookkeeping, English</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>Interview training</td>
<td>Typing, filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Typing, reception filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Bookkeeping word processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Word processing</td>
<td>Computer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-small business

-computer

-word processing

-computer
What did you like least?

- nothing
- computer
- nothing
- bookkeeping
- nothing

- transitional
- transitional
- accounting
- bookkeeping
- nothing

- typing
- reception
- math
- typing
- reception

- dictaphone
- -
- -
- bookkeeping
typing
typing

How could training be improved?

- Typing
- teacher's
- more tests

- need more
- stressed
- handouts

- English
- more tests

- typing
- stressed
- handouts

- more practice
- -
- -
- -

- better teachers
- prepared
- patience
- more patience
- patience
- more patience

- make trans-
- need staff
- typing speed
- confidence
- better staff-

- -ional skills
- discussions
- more time
- student commun-

- meaningful
- steady schedule
- small business
- ication

- -
- -
- -

- more experience.
- -
- -

- need equal opportu-

- more practice
- -
- -

- -
- -

- -
- need qualified teachers
- teachers
assertiveness  student communication

What did you like/dislike about atmosphere?

-liked all  -built self confidence  -favouritism
- teachers should treat all participants the same, with respect
- first tension now family

-get respect

-like cooperation organization

-enthusiastic

-friendly

-some attitude problems

-get respect

-treated unfairly

-liked

-trainers treat us like we are mentally disabled

-stressful

-cooperative

-dislike meetings

-favouritism

-one bad staff

Would you recommend ACHIEVE?

-yes

-some attitude problems

-get respect

-treated unfairly

-committees

-stressful

-cooperative

-dislike meetings

-favouritism

-one bad staff
Comments

-good program      -good luck      -more patience
-none             -no

-enjoyed         -typing needs improvement

-need more assertiveness  -good program      -no

-assertiveness      -one bad staff
                 -treat us like kids
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