

PN-ABI-688
isn # 72625

FINAL REPORT
ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT ENVIRONMENT:
OTR-0000-I-02-8084-00

June, 1989

Submitted to:

**Sherrie Hailstorks
A.I.D./PFM/PM/PCF/PP
Room 1132, SA-1
Washington, D.C. 20523**

MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL

600 Water Street S.W., NBU 7-7
Washington, D.C. 20024



telephone: (202) 484-7170
telex: 4990821MANSY fax: (202) 488-0754

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
I. METHODOLOGY	1
A. Background	1
B. Preparatory Work	1
C. Sample Selection and Respondent Notification	2
D. Survey Administration	3
E. Data Coding and Analysis	3
II. FINDINGS	4
A. Demographic Characteristics	4
1. Supervisors	4
2. Support Staff	5
B. Satisfaction Level	7
1. Supervisors	7
a. Satisfaction with Support Staff	7
b. Which Supervisors are Most and Least Satisfied?	9
c. Most Liked and Disliked Qualities in Support Staff	11
2. Support Staff	13
a. Satisfaction with their Job	13
b. Which Support Staff are Most and Least Satisfied?	16
c. Things Liked Most and Least about Job	19
d. Most Liked and Disliked Qualities in Supervisors	21
C. Support Staff Training	23
D. Support Staff Attrition	26
E. Suggestions for Changes Needed to Improve Satisfaction and Productivity	28
1. Supervisors	28
2. Support Staff	33

	<u>Page</u>
III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	36
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS	38
A. Program Options	39
B. Training Options	43
C. Recruitment Option	44

ANNEXES

- 1 Support Staff Questionnaire
- 2 Supervisor Questionnaire
- 3 Invitation to Support Staff
- 4 Invitation to Supervisors
- 5 Informational Letter Sent to Managers
- 6 Support Staff Questionnaire Frequency Distributions
- 7 Supervisor Questionnaire Frequency Distributions

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Management Systems International (MSI) was contracted by the Office of Personnel Management, Agency for International Development to conduct a survey of the support staff and supervisors to:

- Determine the reason for the current high rate of turnover among support staff; and
- Measure job satisfaction among the support staff and identify changes needed to improve job satisfaction and productivity.

Meetings were held with the Office of Personnel Management, Equal Opportunity Program officers, the Women's Action Organization, all bureau EMS officers and the American Federation of Government Employees in designing data collection instruments. A random sample of 125 support staff was selected from a list of 474 provided by OPM, stratified according to job series and GS level. Similarly, a random sample of 126 supervisors/managers was drawn from an OPM list of 444 supervisors/managers. Survey participants were invited (under Alan Woods' signature) to attend a one-hour survey session where they were given instructions to complete a written questionnaire. The data was coded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

In general, the data indicates job satisfaction expressed by the support staff and overall supervisors are satisfied with their relationships with support staff. Nonetheless, support staff are not a particularly satisfied group of employees. While slightly over half are "quite satisfied" with their jobs overall, nearly half are either outright dissatisfied or only somewhat satisfied. The bulk of the dissatisfaction is rooted in the areas of lack of advancement potential and salary. Only 13% are satisfied with their advancement potential and only 14% are really satisfied with their salary. While satisfaction is high with the hours they work and with their equipment, only half rated themselves satisfied with their workspace, with other support staff, with other people in the office or with the training opportunities available to them. Half feel the amount of work they are given is unfair and an astounding two out of three feel they are not given challenging assignments. This, despite the fact that half of the supervisors did not think their support staff had the basic skills required to do the job. It is therefore concluded that A.I.D. has a serious morale problem among its support staff.

Support staff job dissatisfaction in most cases did not include (or seem to be the result of) dissatisfaction with supervisors. Three-fourths of the support staff indicated they were quite satisfied with their supervisors and 80 percent rated their relationship as either good or excellent. Three-fourths agreed that they felt comfortable communicating with their supervisor and four out of five felt that their work was appreciated by their supervisor, and that they were treated with respect by their supervisor.

In spite of these findings, there is wide dissatisfaction among supervisors concerning the quality and performance of the support staff. While half of the supervisors are quite satisfied with their support staff the remaining half are either only somewhat satisfied or are dissatisfied. Nearly one out of five supervisors were dissatisfied with their support staff and were specially dissatisfied with the quality and the timeliness of their work. Thirty percent of the supervisors were dissatisfied with the support staff's attendance record, 23 percent were dissatisfied with their punctuality, and 50% of the supervisors thought that their support staff do not have the basic skills required to do the job. Recruitment was another area of great concern; nearly two thirds (64%) indicated they were displeased with the quality of applicants for support positions they had interviewed in the past two years.

It is interesting that the dissatisfaction with the support staff lies in the area of output, skill level, and punctuality and reliability, not personal relationship; 94% rated their relationship with their support staff as good or excellent and over 80 percent said they felt comfortable communicating with their support staff.

This situation in a federal agency -- dissatisfied support staff and disgruntled supervisors -- is not unique to A.I.D.; it is universal within the U.S. government. There is no reason to believe A.I.D.'s problem is worse than any other agency's, nor are its grade levels lower than other agencies. Rather, it would appear that the problem stems primarily from the nature of the Civil Service system, with its strict grade and salary guidelines, promotion procedures and advancement ceilings for support staff. For federal agencies located in Washington, these Civil Service-related constraints are exacerbated by the economic realities of the area, its high cost of living, low unemployment, and the glut of service industries (food and retail in particular) which vie with the federal government for the relatively small pool of less skilled but competent and reliable employees.

Several unique characteristics of A.I.D., however, further exacerbate the problems endemic to the federal government personnel system. The first lies in the fact that many supervisors/managers are Foreign Service officers and have been exposed (and often become accustomed) to quite a different level of Mission support staff while on duty in the field in terms of education, performance, and staff size (the ratio of professional to support staff is lower in the field than in Washington headquarters). Support staff in the Missions is typically drawn from the elite of the foreign nationals in terms of education and competence. Thus, upon return to Washington after field duty, they sometimes experience "culture shock" themselves, which might explain why FS supervisors are less satisfied than GS supervisors with the quality of work, timeliness of work, amount of work accomplished, attendance record, and punctuality of their support staff.

In addition, the educational gap between the typical support staff is unusually wide due to the highly technical or regional expertise required of A.I.D. professionals and the low average level of education of the support staff. Eighty-five percent of the supervisors had at least a B.A. degree and 64 percent had at least a masters degree. Only 10 percent of the support staff had at least a B.A. degree. This has two effects: it

makes it more difficult than in other less technical agencies for support staff to cross the bridge to professional positions without extensive additional formal education, and it makes the interpersonal gaps between supervisors and support staff wider than in an "average" supervisor/support staff relationship.

This study indicated that the problems A.I.D. faces lie in the area of recruitment and performance, rather than in the area of retention. Recommendations for improvement fall into three categories:

- Those that involve major structural/program changes within A.I.D.;
- Those that entail a training component; and
- Those that involve recruitment specifically.

In the area of structural/program changes within A.I.D. the study identifies at least three options. The option of choice would be to institutionalize a two-year internship along the lines of the Peace Corps model, in which college graduates with appropriate office skills would be recruited to come to A.I.D. for the purpose of learning about development as a professional field. They would be paid at a low rate and the recruitment process would specifically address the fact that the work would often be less than challenging, and during these two years they would be expected to provide quality secretarial/clerical services. In return, the interns would be offered some kind of predetermined preferential treatment in securing a professional position within A.I.D. upon satisfactory completion of their internship. In addition, an enrichment program could be designed whereby during the two-year internship the interns would have access to various speakers on development issues (both technical and regional) and other specific opportunities (TDYs for instance).

This is an exciting option and viable within the current confines of the Civil Service system. This kind of program would have the dual advantage of providing a constant flow of well qualified, well motivated professionals to carry out current support functions while not costing the Agency any more in salaries than current support staff.

A second option concerns re-establishing an "upward mobility" program in which support staff receive university training, enabling them to move out of the support field and into a professional position, whether at A.I.D. or elsewhere. The advantages of this option would be twofold: support staff would be provided an opportunity for the professional development it yearns for, and enrollment would provide a strong incentive for participants to stay until their training was completed. The disadvantage of this option is its high cost, and thus the relatively few support staff that would be likely to benefit from it at any one time.

A third option would be to decrease as much as possible the number of secretarial/clerical positions and proportionately increase the number of para-professionals such as administrative operations assistants and program operations assistants with those positions' higher grades and salaries.

In the area of training, recommendations include expanding current supervision courses of supervisor/managers or a new course developed that would incorporate support staff career development and clarification of support staff standards. Another option involves establishing a mandatory entry training program. Underlying this option is the premise that since it is difficult at best to attract and retain quality support staff given current grade and pay levels and advancement regulations and constraints, the next best thing is to train people to A.I.D.'s standards prior to placing them in permanent jobs within A.I.D.

Finally, A.I.D. may want to consider targeting its recruitment to a particular kind of worker, such as homemakers or college students, to whom they could offer particular concessions or flexibility that would make the job appealing to them (i.e. part time or positions tied to the school calendar year). The possible variations on this are endless, depending upon the targeted populations. Limitations on this option include the fact that these groups are already in great demand and have been targeted by many firms/organizations.

I. METHODOLOGY

A. Background

Management Systems International (MSI) was contracted by the Office of Personnel Management, Agency for International Development, to conduct a survey of the support staff and supervisors to:

- determine the reason for the current high rate of turnover among support staff; and
- to measure job satisfaction among the support staff and identify changes needed to improve job satisfaction and productivity.

B. Preparatory Work

Meetings were held with the following organizations/offices/people in order that MSI could receive their input concerning the problem (from the perspective of both the support staff and the supervisors) and their expectations for the survey:

- September 29, 1988 - Marina Fanning (Officer-in-Charge), Bonnie Daniels (Project Director) and Marion Cosmides, all of MSI, met with Sherrie Hailstorks (Project Officer) and Douglas Brandt (Chief Policy Analyst, Office of Personnel Management) to receive a project start-up briefing concerning the problems leading to the initiation of the assessment and their expectations for the contractor.
- October 22, 1988 - Bonnie Daniels and Sherrie Hailstorks met with Dennis Diamond (Director, EOP), Dinah Cohen (EOP), Mildred Beasley, (Senior Classifier, Office of Personnel Management), and Douglas Brandt to receive their input concerning the problem and suggestions for items they thought should be included in the data collection instruments.
- October 24, 1988 - Bonnie Daniels and Sherrie Hailstorks met with Mary Ann Riegelman, Marilyn Zak, and Barbara Turner from the Women's Action Organization (WAO) concerning the background of their interest in having this survey conducted, their perceptions of the problem, and their input concerning what should be included in the data collection instruments.
- October 25, 1988 - Bonnie Daniels and Sherrie Hailstorks met with all bureau EMS officers to brief them about the survey and to obtain input concerning the support staff morale and turnover problem within their bureau. It was decided to meet with EMS officers in three small groups rather than one large group so that interaction could be

maximized. All bureaus were represented at these meetings with the exception of Personnel and Financial Management.

- November 4, 1988 - Bonnie Daniels and Sherrie Hailstorks met with Fern Finley and Helen McKensey of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) to brief them about the upcoming survey and receive their input concerning problems that have come to their attention and what they would like to see come from the survey.

Design of data collection instruments for the support staff and supervisors was on-going during this preparatory phase of the project. Draft questionnaires were provided to the Project Officer, Sherrie Hailstorks, for her comments and so that she could receive suggestions for changes/additions from other A.I.D./OPM staff as appropriate. Several meetings were held with Sherrie Hailstorks to discuss the instruments and to receive her feedback concerning both content and format. In addition, a meeting was held with Dinah Cohen (EOP) to incorporate suggested changes from that office.

After several revisions, the data collection instruments were pretested on Wednesday, November 9, 1988 with approximately ten supervisors and ten members of the support staff. Overall, both questionnaires worked quite well, however, several changes were made in each to modify questions that were confusing or did not elicit the intended information. Final revisions were made to the support staff and supervisor questionnaires (included as Annexes 1 and 2, respectively) and approval to proceed with the data collection was received from the Project Officer, Sherrie Hailstorks.

C. Sample Selection and Respondent Notification

A list of 474 support staff from which the sample was to be selected was provided to MSI by the Office of Personnel Management and included all support staff in the following job series and AOSC: 312, 318, 322, 303.03 and all 303 at GS-5 and below. A random sample of 125 support staff was selected from this list, stratified according to job series and GS level. The selected support staff were sent an invitation (included in this report as Annex 3) under the signature of the A.I.D. Administrator, Alan Woods, to participate in the study by coming to Room 1912 in New State on the afternoon of January 3, 1989 to attend one of two survey sessions. At each survey session, the purpose of the survey was explained by Sherrie Hailstorks, the Project Officer, instructions for completing the questionnaire were given by Bonnie Daniels, the Project Director, and the respondents were given time to complete the questionnaire. In order to minimize the time away from work, each "survey session" was designed to last no more than one hour.

Similarly, a random sample of 126 supervisors/managers was drawn from a list of 444 supervisors/managers provided to MSI by the Office of Personnel Management. The selected supervisors/managers were invited (invitation included as Annex 4 of this report) to one of two survey

sessions in Room 1912, New State, on the morning of January 3, 1989 to complete a questionnaire.

In order to increase the response rate, a letter (included as Annex 5) was sent from the A.I.D. Administrator, Alan Woods, to senior management explaining the purpose of the survey, eliciting their support, and asking them to encourage members of their staff (support and professional) to participate if selected.

D. Survey Administration

On the morning of January 3, 1989, 78 supervisors completed questionnaires (a response rate of 62% of the invitees). In the afternoon, 53 support staff completed questionnaires (a response rate of 42% of the invitees). Snow had been predicted for that afternoon, which may have been responsible for the lower attendance at the afternoon sessions. Thus, it was decided that due to the comparatively low response rate of the support staff (and since the survey primarily focused on their concerns), that invitations would be sent to the non-respondents among the support staff sample asking them to attend a second, follow-up survey session. This follow-up session was held on January 23, 1989, again in Room 1912 of New State; 17 additional support staff attended and completed questionnaires (bringing the response rate up to 56%).

A survey of eleven (20%) of the support staff non-respondents was conducted to determine if there were any unusual participation patterns within that group. Results indicated that reasons for non-response were within a normal, predictable range and included the following:

	First Session	Second Session
On leave (sick or annual)	5	5
Too busy with work responsibilities	2	1
In training		1
Retired	1	1
Didn't receive invitation		1
Forgot	2	1
No longer with A.I.D.	1	1

E. Data Coding and Analysis

A codebook was developed for each of the questionnaires. The data were coded, entered into MSI's computer, and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Appropriate frequency distributions and crosstabulations were run for both data sets (support staff and supervisors). Frequency distributions (the number of people who

responded in a particular way to each question on the questionnaire) for the Support Staff Questionnaire are provided as Annex 6; the frequency distributions for the Supervisor Questionnaire are provided as Annex 7.

II. FINDINGS

A. Demographic Characteristics

1. Supervisors

The typical A.I.D. supervisor/manager is a well-educated, Caucasian, middle-aged male. Of the respondents who chose to indicate their race, sex and age (although these questions were marked "optional" on both questionnaires, all but 4 indicated their sex and age; 7 declined to indicate their race) three-fourths were male, 90 percent were between the ages of 40 and 59, and 87 percent were white (10 percent were black and 3 percent were of Hispanic origin).

DEMOGRAPHICS OF SUPERVISORS

Sex:	Male	76%
Age:	40-59	90%
Race:	White	87%

Not surprising for an agency which requires a high level of technical expertise, supervisors were overall very well educated. Eighty-five percent had at least a B.A. degree; 64 percent had a masters or more advanced degree. Supervisors have had a long tenure with A.I.D. Nearly 80 percent have been with the agency for 10 years or more; half have been with A.I.D. twenty years or more. Approximately one-third of the supervisor respondents were foreign service officers.

LEVEL OF EDUCATION

High School	1%
BA or BS Degree	21%
Master Degree	64%
Other	14%

YEARS WORKING AT A.I.D.

1-4 years	10%
5-9 years	10%
10-19 years	30%
20 or more years	50%

STATUS

FS	33%
GS	62%
AD	4%
Not Ascertained	1%

Supervisors were typically high level employees; 68 percent were compensated at the GS 15 or 16 level and only 4 percent were GS 12s or below.

GRADE

GS 12 or below	4%
GS 13 or 14	28%
GS 15 or 16	68%

Most were seasoned supervisors; only 10 percent had been supervisors for four or fewer years. As befits seasoned supervisors, eighty percent have at some time nominated support staff for a cash award. Slightly over 20 percent had been supervisors in A.I.D./Washington for two years or less.

Three-fourths of the supervisors had received training in how to supervise. Of these, nearly two thirds had taken the Supervisors Role in Personnel Management Course, one-third had taken the Basic Supervisory Skills Workshop, one-third have taken Senior Management Skills Training Course and 17 percent had taken OPM (Office of Personnel Management) or AMA (American Management Association) courses. Almost all said this training was very helpful or somewhat helpful to them.

2. Support Staff

The support staff are demographically quite different from the supervisors. The typical support staff respondent was a black female who was either a high school graduate or had attended a business or secretarial school after high school. Of the respondents who chose to indicate their race, sex and age (all but 7 indicated their sex; all but 8 indicated their age and race), 94 percent were female, 47 percent were middle-aged, between the ages of 40 and 59, (26 percent were under 30 years of age and 19 percent were between 30 and 39 years old), and 61 percent were black (5 percent other minority and 34 percent white).

DEMOGRAPHICS OF SUPPORT STAFF

Sex: Female	94%
Age: 60 or over	8%
40-59	47%
30-39	19%
20-29	26%
Race: Black	61%
White	34%
Other Minority	5%

For slightly over a quarter of the respondents, the highest level of education completed was high school; an additional 44 percent had attended a business or secretarial school. Only 10 percent had a B.A. degree or higher. Eighty-five percent work at A.I.D. full time. Forty percent of

the support staff respondents had supervisors who were foreign service officers.

LEVEL OF EDUCATION

No Degree	1%
High School	27%
AA Degree	7%
Bus or Sec	44%
BA or Higher	10%
Other	11%

As one would expect, the GS grade of the support staff was considerably lower than that of supervisors. One-fourth of the support staff respondents were GS-5s or below; one-fourth were GS-8s or GS-9s; half were GS-6s or GS-7s. The bulk of the support staff respondents fell into two categories: those who were relatively new to A.I.D. and those who have been with A.I.D. for a long time. Although the support staff in general had been with A.I.D. for fewer years than the supervisors, approximately half had been with the agency for ten years or more; one-fourth, however, had been with A.I.D. for two years or less.

Support staff were asked if they attended an orientation when they first started working at A.I.D., over 90 percent of the support staff said they had. Nearly all of those who attended an orientation found it useful; 44% found the orientation very useful and 53% found the orientation to be somewhat useful. When asked why they felt that way, one third found the orientation to be generally informative. The remaining comments were mixed and sometimes contradictory, illustrative of the old adage "One person's rhinestone is another person's diamond." Positive comments included that it was a good refresher, it eased them into the workforce, that it was good that they took it before starting their job, that it was a good way to meet people, and that it taught useful skills. Negative comments included that it covered material they already knew, there should be more information provided about A.I.D., the information they learned was not applicable to their job or too general, the instructors were poor, the orientation came too soon, the orientation came too late, and that it didn't include information on advancement opportunities. Specific comments were:

"I felt that there was not enough information about the function of A.I.D."

"The instruction provided explanations and reasons for doing the work in a given manner; acquainted one with the A.I.D. method."

"As I remember, it was too long, and tried to cover too much material."

"The two-week orientation was very useful because it gave an overview of the Agency and it represented the purposes and goals. It also gave hands-on training for the Wang computer."

In order to learn more about the background of the support staff, they were asked how many years they had worked as support staff prior to coming to work at A.I.D., what they were doing immediately prior to coming to work at A.I.D., and how they learned about their first position with A.I.D.

Support staff came to A.I.D. with varied levels of experience. Although for 17%, their job at A.I.D. was their first job, 27% had previously been in support staff positions 1-4 years, 29% had been in support staff positions 5-9 years, and 19% brought 10-19 years of support staff experience.

YEARS AS SUPPORT STAFF PRIOR TO A.I.D.

First Job at A.I.D.	17%
1-4 years	27%
5-9 years	29%
10-19 years	19%
20 or more years	6%
Not ascertained	2%

Prior to working at A.I.D., the support staff were most likely to have been working for another government agency (30%); 27% were working in the private sector in a support staff position, 14% had been attending school, and 14% had been homemakers.

OCCUPATION PRIOR TO A.I.D.

Another Government agency	30%
Private Sector	27%
Attending School	14%
Homemaker	14%
Other	15%

The support staff first learned about A.I.D. through a variety of mechanisms. Seventeen percent of the support staff had taken the civil service exam and were subsequently contacted by A.I.D.; 29% learned about A.I.D. through a newspaper; 13% learned about A.I.D. through a friend or relative; and 20% learned about A.I.D. through an A.I.D. employee. A few respondents were referred by their school (high school or secretarial school).

B. Satisfaction Level

1. Supervisors

a. Satisfaction with Support Staff

Supervisors were asked to rate (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being not satisfied and 5 being very satisfied) how satisfied they were with their support staff in general as well as with specific aspects of how they do their job including the quality of their work, the timeliness of their

work, the amount of work they accomplish, their attendance record, and their punctuality (getting to work on time, back from lunch on time, etc.). For purposes of this analysis, responses were grouped into three categories: 1s and 2s were combined to form a "dissatisfied" category, 3s remained as the middle, "somewhat satisfied" category, and 4s and 5s were combined to form a "quite satisfied" category. The table below shows the results of this analysis for the group of supervisors:

	Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Quite Satisfied
a. Overall satisfaction	17%	33%	50%
b. Quality of work	19%	33%	47%
c. Timeliness of work	17%	31%	53%
d. Amount of work accomplished	14%	32%	54%
e. Attendance record	30%	19%	51%
f. Punctuality	23%	30%	47%

As another indicator of satisfaction with their support staff, supervisors were asked to rate statements on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being that they disagree strongly and 5 being that they agree strongly. For purposes of analysis, the 1s and 2s were combined to form a general disagree category, the 3s remained as a middle, neither agree nor disagree category, and the 4s and 5s were combined to form a general agree category. The table below provides these statements with the percentage of supervisors that fell into each category.

	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree
a. I feel that my support staff makes an important contribution to the work of this office.	4%	13%	83%
b. My support staff always has a professional appearance and demeanor.	20%	27%	52%
c. I think my support staff has the basic skills required to do the job to my satisfaction.	21%	21%	58%

Overall, only half of the supervisors were quite satisfied overall and with individual aspects of their support staff's performance. Nearly one out of five were generally dissatisfied with their support staff and specifically dissatisfied with the quality and the timeliness of their work. The areas of greatest dissatisfaction, however, were their support staff's attendance record (30%) and punctuality (23%). Only half of the supervisors agreed that his/her support staff has a professional appearance or demeanor. Half also didn't feel their support staff had the basic skills required to do the job to their satisfaction. Nevertheless, 83 percent agreed with the statement, "I feel that my support staff makes an important contribution to the work of this office."

It is interesting to note, however, that satisfaction with performance appears to be distinct from supervisors' perception of their relationship with their support staff. Supervisors responded quite positively when they were asked to rate their overall relationship with their support staff. Thirty-nine percent felt it was excellent, 55 percent felt it was good and only 6 percent rated it as fair or poor. Supporting this, over 80 percent of the supervisors said they felt comfortable communicating with their support staff.

b. Which Supervisors are Most and Least Satisfied?

It was thought that it would be interesting (and relevant in terms of recommendations for changes or improvements) to determine the characteristics of the supervisors who were most and least satisfied with their support staff. Crosstabulations by race and age, usually considered potentially differentiating variables, were not done because of the homogeneity of the group (87 percent white and 90 percent between the ages of 40 and 59). Crosstabulations were run, however, differentiating supervisors by sex, GS/FS, and by number of years they've been a supervisor in Washington. The results are provided below.

	<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>Somewhat Satisfied</u>		<u>Quite Satisfied</u>	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
a. Overall satisfaction	23%	0%	30%	44%	45%	56%
b. Quality of work	23%	6%	36%	33%	41%	61%
c. Timeliness of work	21%	6%	34%	28%	45%	67%
d. Amount of work accomplished	16%	11%	38%	22%	46%	67%
e. Attendance record	34%	22%	20%	22%	46%	56%
f. Punctuality	27%	11%	34%	22%	39%	67%

	<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>Satisfied</u>	
	FS	GS	FS	GS
a. Overall satisfaction	23%	13%	50%	50%
b. Quality of work	15%	20%	39%	52%
c. Timeliness of work	15%	19%	46%	56%
d. Amount of work accomplished	12%	17%	42%	60%
e. Attendance record	42%	21%	42%	58%
f. Punctuality	27%	21%	42%	50%

	<u>Dissatisfied</u>				<u>Quite Satisfied</u>			
	<u>Years Supervisor</u>				<u>Years Supervisor</u>			
	<u>in Washington</u>				<u>in Washington</u>			
	0-2 yrs.	3-5 yrs.	6-9 yrs.	10+ yrs.	0-2 yrs.	3-5 yrs.	6-9 yrs.	10+ yrs.
a. Overall satisfaction	29%	18%	28%	3%	24%	47%	50%	67%
b. Quality of work	29%	12%	36%	10%	24%	53%	50%	57%
c. Timeliness of work	29%	12%	15%	13%	29%	52%	50%	67%
d. Amount of work accomplished	18%	18%	21%	7%	47%	47%	50%	63%
e. Attendance record	29%	35%	36%	23%	35%	35%	57%	67%
f. Punctuality	24%	29%	21%	20%	29%	24%	65%	64%

Across the board, female supervisors tended to be more satisfied than male supervisors. With the exception of overall satisfaction (for which they were even), a higher percentage of GS than FS supervisors tended to be "quite satisfied" with particular aspects of how their support staff does their job. Interestingly, however, it did not follow that FS supervisors were always more dissatisfied with their support staff than GS

supervisors. The percentage of supervisors most dissatisfied with their support staff vacillated from GS to FS depending upon the aspect.

A strong pattern emerges when one looks at the percentage of supervisors who are quite satisfied with their support staff differentiated by number of years they have been a supervisor in A.I.D. Washington. There is a marked increase in satisfaction the longer the person has been a supervisor in Washington. This likely reflects that GS supervisors by definition would have more Washington-based experience as a support staff supervisor. Women, more satisfied as a group than men, are also more likely to be GS than FS. (Over ninety percent of the FS supervisors were male.) Alternatively, it may reflect the mellowing that comes with age, the development of more realistic expectations the longer one is in Washington, or a fact that with seniority or longevity comes a more highly skilled support staff or a learning of the "system", including how to obtain and retain good support staff. Not surprising, supervisors who have been supervisors for 10 or more years in Washington are also less likely to be dissatisfied with their support staff than supervisors with less Washington supervisory experience.

c. Most Liked and Disliked Qualities in Support Staff

In order to determine the qualities in support staff that supervisors value the most and dislike the most, supervisors were asked to complete the following statements: "The best thing about my support staff is..." and "The thing that frustrates me the most about my support staff is...". For each respondent, up to three "mentions" (item that they like or dislike about their support staff) were coded for each question, thus the total number of "mentions" exceed the number of respondents. The table below lists the qualities by at least 10 percent of the supervisors as being the best thing about their support staff, with those mentioned most frequently listed first.

Best Thing About Support Staff	Mentions
Competence	56
Positive Personality Traits	28
Dependability	15

Not surprisingly, the supervisors value the same qualities in their support staff that any employer would value in a good employee. Some variation of the quality of competence was mentioned by nearly three-fourths of the supervisors as the best thing about their support staff. This quality was expressed in a variety of ways: "hardworking," "self-motivated," "knows agency procedures," "follow-up," "timeliness of work," "good technical skills," "adaptability," or productivity under adverse conditions such as low pay, a time crunch, or a high vacancy rate which

increased their workload. The second most frequently mentioned thing supervisors like about their support staff fell into the category of positive personality traits: "friendliness," "positive attitude," "nice," "good interpersonal relations." The third most frequently mentioned plus was dependability or reliability, the presence of the "work ethic."

The table below lists the things mentioned by at least 10 percent of the supervisors that most frequently frustrate them about their support staff, with those mentioned most frequently listed first:

Thing That Frustrates Me Most	Mentions
Bad Attitude	31
Punctuality/Excessive Absenteeism	12
Spend Too Much Time on Personal Things	10
Poor Basic Skills	9
My Inability to Reward Them	9

Nearly half of the supervisors were most frustrated by that illusive quality, the "bad attitude." This category encompassed such comments as "not caring," "low interest," "little commitment," "lack of pride in work," "lack of initiative," "failure to take responsibility for the final product," "don't read typing assignments for meaning," "no proofreading." As one supervisor said, "In general, frustration occurs with their value system -- a day's work for a day's pay -- taking interest and being responsible for doing good work."

The second most frequently mentioned item (mentioned by twelve respondents) that frustrates supervisors is poor punctuality/excessive absenteeism. This category also included tardiness, a feeling that leave was used as quickly as it was earned, and absenteeism without prior notice. Support staff were asked for what reasons they were usually late or absent (excluding personal illness or vacation). Traffic/transportation problems and weather problems were the worst offenders, each blamed by half the respondents, sick children were mentioned by 23 percent and child care problems by only 10 percent of the respondents. (Availability of child care is a major problem for fewer than 10 percent of the support staff.) Spending too much time on personal items such as personal phone calls or talking to fellow employees was frustrating to ten of the supervisors. Nine supervisors commented on the low level of basic skills that their support staff had (English, math, meaning of table headings, etc.).

Other things that frustrated supervisors included the feeling that the support staff do not see themselves as professionals ("Don't see their job as a career."), mentioned by seven supervisors, and that it seemed like the good workers left while the bad remained (mentioned by six supervisors). One supervisor commented:

"The main problem actually is a low salary/reward system. A.I.D. serves as a training ground. Good support staff leave. Mediocre and poor staff often stay on."

Said another,

"That the good secretaries and clerical staff leave for better promotion opportunities elsewhere, while the less talented or productive tend to stay."

In fact, one supervisor suggested the institutionalization of this phenomenon:

"Our office should recognize that the best staff won't stay due to pay restrictions. We should make more efforts to attract top, but junior people who need experience and are willing to work for a negotiated, but fixed period of time, 1-3 years, where we get the best of their skills but they ultimately can move on without guilt. For several years we have, in fact, served as a "training ground" for less than adequate clerk typists. Why not officially recognize it and put it to good use?"

While this question gave many supervisors an opportunity to vent their frustrations with some aspect of the behavior of their support staff, it is significant that for nine of the supervisors their biggest frustration was their inability to reward good work or increase the challenge of their support staff job due to the limitation on grade levels or salary. As one supervisor said, "my inability to recognize their contributions through larger cash awards and/or promotions."

2. Support Staff

a. Satisfaction with their job

Support staff were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all satisfied and 5 being very satisfied, how they felt about their current position in A.I.D. in general as well as how satisfied they were with specific aspects of their job. For purposes of analysis, 1s and 2s were grouped together to form a "dissatisfied" category, 3s remained as a "somewhat satisfied" category and 4s and 5s were grouped together as a "quite satisfied" category. The results are provided below.

	Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Quite Satisfied
a. Overall satisfaction with job	13%	30%	57%
b. Opportunities to be promoted	74%	13%	13%
c. The equipment I have to work with	13%	17%	70%
d. My workspace	30%	17%	53%
e. My supervisor	13%	10%	76%
f. Other support staff I work with	14%	35%	51%
g. Other people in my office that I work for	4%	37%	58%
h. The salary I make	49%	37%	14%
i. Training opportunities	20%	26%	54%
j. The hours that I work	8%	10%	81%

Other aspects of job satisfaction were measured in a question that asked the support staff to rate statements on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being that they disagree strongly and 5 being that they agree strongly. For purposes of the analysis, 1s and 2s were combined to form a "disagree" category, 3s remained as a neither disagree nor agree category, and 4s and 5s were combined to form an "agree" category. The table below provides the results of this analysis:

	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree
a. I am given challenging assignments	37%	21%	41%
b. The amount of work I am given is fair	20%	27%	53%
c. I make an important contribution to my office	7%	16%	77%
d. My work is appreciated by my supervisors	10%	11%	79%
e. I am comfortable communicating with my supervisor	16%	9%	75%
f. There is ample advancement potential for me at A.I.D.	61%	21%	17%
g. A.I.D. is a prestigious government agency	21%	29%	50%
h. My workspace is too noisy	54%	16%	30%
i. When my supervisor tells me something in my work is not satisfactory, he/she also tells me specific ways to improve what I'm doing	19%	25%	56%
j. I am treated with respect by my supervisor	10%	9%	81%

Over half of the support staff were quite satisfied with their job overall. Thirty percent fell into the middle, somewhat satisfied category; only 13 percent were not satisfied.

The single area of greatest dissatisfaction for the support staff was the lack of opportunities for promotion or career advancement. Seventy-five percent of the respondents indicated that they were not satisfied with advancement opportunities; only 13 percent were quite satisfied. Reinforcing this, only 17 percent agreed with the statement, "There is ample advancement potential for me at A.I.D." Closely related and ranking second in terms of dissatisfaction, half of the respondents were not satisfied with the salary that they make; only 14 percent were quite satisfied.

Other areas of dissatisfaction included the kind and amount of work they were given. Only 41 percent felt they were given challenging assignments and only half felt the amount of work they're given is fair. Nearly one-third felt their workspace was too noisy. Half of the respondents agreed that A.I.D. is a prestigious government agency.

Areas of greatest satisfaction were with the equipment that they work with (70 percent were quite satisfied), the hours that they work (only 8 percent were dissatisfied), and the people in their office that they work

with (only 4 percent were dissatisfied). Seventy-five percent felt they make an important contribution to their office.

AREAS OF GREATEST SATISFACTION

Office equipment	70%
Hours work	81%
People work with	56%

Overall, the support staff has positive feelings about their supervisors. Three-fourths of the support staff indicated they were quite satisfied with their supervisor. As another indicator of satisfaction with their supervisor, when asked to rate their relationship with their current supervisor, over four-fifths of the support staff rated that relationship as either excellent or good. Three-fourths agreed that they felt comfortable communicating with their supervisor and four out of five felt their work was appreciated by their supervisor and that they were treated with respect by their supervisor. Only half, however, said that when something in their work was not satisfactory that their supervisor tells them specific ways to improve what they're doing.

SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISOR

Quite Satisfied with Supervisor	75%
Good/Excellent Relation with Supervisor	80%
Feel Comfortable Communicating with Supervisor	75%
Feel my Work is Appreciated	79%
Feel I am Treated with Respect	81%
Am Told How to Improve	50%

b. Which support staff are most and least satisfied?

As with the supervisors, an attempt was made to determine the characteristics of the support staff who were most and least satisfied with their jobs. Crosstabulations were run differentiating the satisfaction level of the support staff by race and grade. (There was not a substantial difference in the distribution among grades between Caucasians (C) and Blacks (B)). The table below provides the results of the analysis of satisfaction level by race.

	<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>Satisfied</u>	
	C	B	C	B
a. Overall satisfaction with job	0%	18%	86%	45%
b. Opportunities to be promoted	67%	74%	14%	16%
c. The equipment I have to work with	24%	8%	57%	74%
d. My workspace	38%	21%	52%	63%
e. My supervisor	0%	16%	100%	67%
f. Other support staff I work with	14%	16%	52%	45%
g. Other people in my office that I work for	0%	3%	70%	57%
h. The salary I make	25%	61%	24%	13%
i. Training opportunities	29%	16%	67%	58%
j. The hours that I work	14%	5%	86%	79%

Blacks are less likely to be satisfied overall with their jobs than Caucasians; no Caucasians were dissatisfied overall with their job. The percentage of support staff most dissatisfied with a specific aspect of their job vacillated from Black to Caucasian, with Blacks being slightly more dissatisfied with promotion opportunities, other support staff they work with and other people in their office they work for, and Caucasians being slightly more dissatisfied with their equipment, their workspace, training opportunities and the hours that they work. Dissatisfaction with promotion opportunities was extremely high regardless of race (67% of Caucasians and 74% of Blacks).

One area of great differentiation was in the ratings of supervisors. All of the Caucasians, but only two-thirds of the Blacks, were quite satisfied with their supervisors. Further, as shown in the tables below, only 5 percent of the Caucasians compared with 26 percent of the Blacks felt their relationship with their supervisor was fair or poor. Caucasians were substantially more likely to feel comfortable communicating with the supervisors and slightly more likely to feel they are treated with respect by their supervisor.

RELATIONSHIP WITH CURRENT SUPERVISOR

	Caucasian	Black
Excellent	91%	45%
Good	5%	29%
Fair	5%	18%
Poor	0%	8%

	<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Agree</u>	
	C	B	C	B
a. I feel comfortable communicating with my supervisor	5%	21%	90%	68%
b. I am treated with respect by my supervisor	5%	11%	91%	79%

A second area of great differentiation was with satisfaction with salary. Blacks (61%) were much more likely to be dissatisfied than Caucasians (25%), particularly interesting since, as shown in the table below, there is not a substantial difference in distribution among grade levels by race. As also shown below, however, although there are few support staff at any grade levels who are quite satisfied with their salary, dissatisfaction increases as grade level decreases.

	Caucasian	Black
GS 2-4	14%	13%
GS 5-6	33%	45%
GS 7-9	52%	42%

SALARY I MAKE

	GS 2-4	GS 5-6	GS 7-9
Dissatisfied	63%	55%	39%
Somewhat Satisfied	25%	29%	48%
Quite Satisfied	13%	16%	13%

Not surprisingly overall job satisfaction is also related to grade level, as may be seen in the table below; GS7-9s are more than three times as likely to be satisfied with their jobs as GS2-4s.

OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH JOB

	GS 2-4	GS 5-6	GS 7-9
Dissatisfied	40%	18%	13%
Somewhat Satisfied	40%	53%	19%
Quite Satisfied	20%	29%	69%

c. Things liked most and least about job

Overall job satisfaction may be thought of as the combination and relative weighting of the positive aspects of a job and the negative aspects of a job. Increasing overall job satisfaction therefore should be a function of increasing the positive aspects and decreasing the negative aspects of the job. Thus the support staff was asked to complete the following statements: "The thing I like most about my job is..." and "The thing I like least about my job is..." Up to three mentions were coded for each respondent. The table below lists the things they like most about their job that were mentioned by at least 10 percent (7) of the respondents.

Thing I Like Most About My Job	Number of Mentions
The people I work with	23
General kind of work I do	19
Responsibility, working independently	18
Being challenged, learning	15
Diversity, variety of duties	8
Hours I work	7

The table below provides the things that they like least about their job that were mentioned by at least 10 percent (7) of the respondents.

Thing I Like Least About My Job	Number of Mentions
No promotion potential	15
Too much work	15
Boring, dull	13
Money, poorly compensated	8
Poor office environment	8

On the positive side, the human factor, liking the people they work with, was the most frequently mentioned thing the support staff liked about their jobs. This was expressed in a variety of ways: "My supervisor's temperament," "we work as a team," "respect of people I work with," "get along well with other support staff," "get along well with my supervisor." As one respondent said,

"My supervisor and the officers. They don't treat me like a lower grade worker. They treat me like a professional."

In fact, satisfaction with colleagues can sometimes outweigh advancement desires and keep a person in a particular job/office:

"I would like to advance to a more administrative position but the Agency training is not geared for this type of advancement at my level. I am basically happy with my position because I work with intelligent, caring people. In some respects this "comfort climate" probably keeps me from looking at other positions."

"I really enjoy my job, the work environment, the people, and my supervisors. Although my position is strictly a GS-5, I will stay cause I'm happy there."

It's not surprising then, that the converse, a poor office environment, was frequently mentioned as what they like least about their job. Included in the category of poor office environment were such complaints as: "tension," "personality problems," "moody, temperamental co-workers," "unkind professionals," "gossip." As one respondent said,

"Negative, downbeat attitudes. Superiority, elitism, inconsideration. People like to give rank and file secretaries a hard time anytime they feel like it on anything."

Other positive aspects of their job mentioned by about one-fourth of the respondents included general comments about liking the nature of their job (meeting people, helping others, that it is interesting, its

international nature), liking to work unsupervised and feeling responsible ("freedom to make decisions," "not hovered over," "have the confidence of my supervisors," "being trusted to carry out responsibilities"), and being challenged and learning new things. The diversity and variety of their duties and hours they work were also mentioned by 10 percent of the respondents as things they liked most about their jobs.

Negative aspects were headed by the lack of promotion potential ("lack of opportunity for advancement," "dead-end job," "standstill job") and too much work ("inequitable distribution of work," "doing duties beyond job description for which I'm not compensated," "taking on responsibilities not my own," "responsibilities added without conferring with me"), both in the context of others not "pulling their weight" and because of being short-staffed due to many or long term vacancies in support staff positions. A dislike of boring or routine responsibilities ("busy work," "need to be challenged"), including not having enough to do or not being given enough responsibility, was mentioned by nearly twenty percent of the respondents. Eight respondents mentioned some aspect of pay as the thing they liked least about their job. This included not being able to get a raise, feeling like they're not compensated for their time and effort, or receiving no overtime pay.

d. Most liked and disliked qualities in supervisors

To determine what qualities they like and dislike in their immediate supervisor, the support staff was asked to complete the following statements: "The thing I like most about my supervisor..." and "The thing I like least about my supervisor..." Again, up to three mentions for each question were coded for each respondent. The table below provides the positive qualities mentioned by at least 10 percent of the respondents.

Thing I Like Most About My Supervisor	Number of Mentions
Good personality traits	34
Good communication	19
Respect, confidence	15
Professional traits	12

table below lists the negative qualities mentioned by at least 10 percent of the respondents.

Thing I Like Least About My Supervisor	Number of Mentions
Avoids confrontation	9
Poor personality traits	8
Poor planning, procrastination	7

The "human factor," personality, was important to the support staff, just as it was to the supervisors. Half of the respondents mentioned a positive personality trait ("thoughtful," "pleasant," "sense of humor," "easy-going," "nice," "caring," "patient," "understanding," "down-to-earth") as the thing they liked most about their supervisor. Conversely, poor personality traits ("phoney," "unkind," "aloof," "inflexible," "discusses co-workers with each other") were mentioned by nine of the support staff as what they liked least about their supervisor.

Good communication ("willing to listen," "open door policy") and respect/confidence ("allows me to work independently," "trust in me," "doesn't constantly check on me," "doesn't look over my shoulder,") were mentioned by approximately one-fourth of the support staff as positive attributes in a supervisor. Twelve of the respondents mentioned professional traits that they respected ("a hard worker," "intelligent," "good credentials," "has formal training") as the thing they liked most about their supervisor.

Respondents were effusive about supervisors that personified many of these qualities:

"He is respectful, always willing to listen and discuss and be helpful. He believes in what he is doing, enjoys it and this is reflected in a positive attitude toward his staff."

"That she is pleasant, has a great sense of humor, tells me what I'm doing wrong, compliments me for a job well done, gives me my lead, respects my feelir She's great."

"Bright, considerate, well-organized, hard worker, informative and most important makes one feel like part of the team."

"She helps out in any way possible. She helps me correct my mistakes. She treats me like she does everyone else."

Nine respondents complained that their supervisor was too easy going and avoids confrontation. This was expressed in a variety of ways ("doesn't exercise authority enough," "doesn't see lazy staff members," "poor leadership skills," "lack of courage to take action against poor employees") but the common theme was an unwillingness or discomfort with taking a position or stand with personnel.

"When reprimands are in order, he doesn't want to get involved because of a possible grievance."

"He and other professionals are hesitant to correct lower-grade support staff when they are not performing properly."

"The lack of courage to take action against employees whose performance is less than satisfactory. Trying to avoid management decisions rather than facing them directly."

Poor planning was another area which was mentioned by 10 percent of the support staff as an area of contention and included complaints of procrastination (then expecting subordinates to accomplish "whatever") or putting off necessary work until just before the end of the day. Other irksome things mentioned included not keeping them informed about office matters, poor "stress" or "under pressure" behavior, and not encouraging them to advance.

C. Support Staff Training

Over 90% of the support staff surveyed had attended workshops, seminars, or training programs offered by A.I.D.; one third had taken one or two courses, one third had taken three to five courses and one third had taken six or more courses. Of the support staff who received some form of training, 44% indicated that it had improved their work performance "a great deal" and another 41% indicated that their training had improved their work performance "somewhat."

Two out of five of the support staff surveyed had at sometime been denied training that they requested. When asked why they had been denied training, lack of office coverage was mentioned by one third of the respondents; training class cancellations were mentioned by only 8% of the respondents. Other reasons for denial were varied and included comments such as that a supervisor would not let them take training that was not directly related to their job, that the training was being given outside of the Washington area, that they were ineligible because they were not the right grade, and that the class was full.

The support staff were asked if they felt A.I.D. offers enough training opportunities for support staff personnel. The distribution was even; half felt that A.I.D. did and half felt A.I.D. did not offer enough training opportunities. The support staff feels the gap in the current A.I.D. curriculum is in the area of courses which will help them to advance, not in the area of courses which will help them to do their

current job better. When asked what training should be available, one third responded that their grade makes them ineligible for the training they want to take. One member of the support staff commented:

"Training for support staff is clearly defined to keep us in that position."

Another one-third desired training that had to do with some aspect of career advancement, such as career ladder training, college courses, or a course comparable to the Career Management for Women Course provided for higher grades (Although there is currently such a course, it is only one day in length rather than one week).

"Regarding upward mobility - Career development for women in A.I.D. is offered to GS-9's and above. It should be offered to all interested parties or have a comparable program for GS-8's and below."

Other single responses reflected individual interests including accounting, speed reading, office equipment, computers and basic English.

Likewise, supervisors were asked if A.I.D. offers enough training opportunities for support staff personnel. Nearly one third of the supervisors felt A.I.D. didn't, but their recommendations for the type of classes to add were different from the support staff's. When asked what training should be available, one third cited basic education (math, English, communication skills).

"Because of low salary we don't get professional secretaries even applying, consequently we need to have a more basic entering secretarial preparation course."

Other suggested courses included an introduction to A.I.D. (purpose, geography of where countries are, etc.), office procedures, technical skills, and an upward mobility training program. Supervisors also suggested:

"opportunity to fill in for secretaries on home leave at USAID Missions.

"Training in collaborative work habits, team-building, and communications, i.e., beyond the "basic skills" courses."

The support staff were asked to rate their satisfaction with training opportunities on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being not satisfied and 5 being very satisfied). For the purposes of this analysis, responses were grouped into three categories: 1s and 2s were combined to form a "dissatisfied" category, 3s remained a "neither agree nor disagree" category, and 4s and 5s were combined to form a "quite satisfied" category. Over half of the respondents indicated that they were quite satisfied with training opportunities. Twenty percent were not satisfied.

TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

Quite Satisfied	54%
Neither	26%
Not Satisfied	20%

Other training-related opinions were ascertained in a question that asked support staff to rate statements on a scale of 5, with 1 being that they disagree strongly and 5 being that they agree strongly. As before, responses were grouped into three categories: 1s and 2s were combined to form a "disagree" category, 3s remained a "neither agree nor disagree" category, and 4s and 5s were combined to form a "agree" category. The results are provided below.

	Agree	Disagree
a. My work requires more technical knowledge than I have.	11%	70%
b. I feel comfortable asking my supervisor if I can take a training course.	79%	13%
c. I have the basic skills I need to do this job to the satisfaction of my supervisor.	94%	1%
d. My supervisor is supportive when I want to take training courses	71%	10%

Nearly all of the support staff felt they had the basic skills they needed to do their job to the satisfaction of their supervisor. Only 11 percent agreed that their work requires more technical knowledge than they have. Four out of five felt comfortable asking their supervisor if they could take a training course and approximately 70% felt their supervisor was supportive when they wanted to take a training course.

It is interesting to compare the responses of the support staff and the supervisory staff when asked identical questions concerning training. The comparisons are shown below.

	<u>Support Staff</u>		<u>Supervisors</u>	
	<u>Yes/ Agree</u>	<u>No/ Disagree</u>	<u>Yes/ Agree</u>	<u>No/ Disagree</u>
a. Does A.I.D. offer enough training for support staff?	50%	47%	69%	31%
b. The support staff has the basic skills necessary to do their job.	94%	1%	58%	22%
c. Supervisory staff are supportive when support staff wants to take training.	71%	10%	100%	0%

The support staff was less satisfied than the supervisors with the array of courses available to support staff. This again likely reflects the support staff's desire for courses which allow them upward growth as opposed to horizontal enrichment or foundation skills. Supervisors rated their support staff's basic skills considerably lower than the support staff themselves did. Although support staff rated supervisors fairly high on supporting them when they want to take training (almost 75% agreed that supervisors were supportive), supervisors unanimously rated themselves as supportive.

D. Support Staff Attrition

A high rate of turnover among the support staff has been a problem at A.I.D. Thus, to obtain a projection of future attrition rates and the reason for it, the support staff were asked if they thought they would be working for A.I.D. in one year and if not, why. Approximately two thirds indicated that they would be working for A.I.D. one year from now. Of the one third who indicated they would leave A.I.D. within the year, reasons for departure included promotion opportunity or increased salary 75% of the time; retirement, health problems and to get more education were other reasons mentioned for leaving. Asked where they will be working, 30% indicated they would be working for another government agency, 25% indicated they would move into the private sector, and approximately 13% indicated they would not be in the work force.

Support staff were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being not very important and 5 being very important) the reasons they knew that other support staff had left A.I.D. in the past year. For the purposes of this analysis, responses were grouped into three categories: 1s and 2s were combined to form a "not important" category, 3s remained a "neither important nor unimportant" category, and 4s and 5s were combined to form an "important" category. The table below provides the percentage of respondents in each category for each reason listed.

	Not Important	Neither Important or Unimportant	Importan
a. Wanted to make more money.	0%	3%	97%
b. Change in family circumstances.	46%	30%	25%
c. Dissatisfaction with supervisor.	17%	17%	65%
d. Wanted to work for another government agency.	35%	19%	45%
e. Wanted to leave the government and work in the private sector.	23%	15%	63%
f. Wanted more opportunities for training.	49%	18%	33%
g. Wanted more opportunities for advancement.	2%	5%	94%

According to the respondents, a desire to make more money and wanting more opportunities for advancement were the most important factors in the decision to leave for nearly all the support staff that had left in the past year. Dissatisfaction with supervisor and wanting to leave the government to work in the private sector were factors cited for two-thirds of the departees; wanting to work for another government agency was a factor for 45%. Wanting more opportunities for training was mentioned in conjunction with only one-third; change in family circumstances was a factor for one-fourth.

Respondents were also asked where they expected to be in five years. Only one respondent thought that he/she would be in a government support staff position at the same GS level; 31% expected to be in a government support staff position at a higher GS level. Over 34% expected to be in the government in a professional position; only 6% expected to be in the private sector in a professional position. Approximately 11% indicated they would no longer be in the work force. One individual indicated that he/she would be in the private sector in a support staff position; others thought they would be doing a combination of things such as going to school and working part-time.

WHERE EXPECTED TO BE IN 5 YEARS

Government - Support - Same GS	1%
Government - Support - Higher GS	31%
Government - Professional	34%
Private Sector - Support	1%
Private Sector - Professional	6%
Not in Work Force	11%
Other	16%

Nearly two-thirds of the supervisory staff surveyed anticipated some support staff turnover in the next year. Since one support staff usually serves several professionals, there is probably no real disparity between the supervisor's and support staff's anticipated rate of turnover. Of those who expected support staff turnover, 35% cited career advancement, 17% cited general unhappiness, and 13% mentioned wanting more money as the reason for leaving. Comments included:

"More pay. More opportunity. Better organized work place..."

"Low morale. Limited opportunities for advancement. Burn out."

"Overall unhappiness with work conditions - feeling that contributions are not appreciated and seeing higher pay and benefits."

"Feelings of dead-end in opportunity; jobs easier or more interesting in State; un-met expectations for perks, e.g., wish to have TDY's abroad occasionally, either not permitted or not given opportunity."

"Lack of advancement opportunities, low salary."

E. Suggestions for Changes Needed to Improve Satisfaction and Productivity

1. Supervisors

Supervisors were asked to respond to the question: "What improvements do you feel are needed to increase your support staff's productivity and/or your satisfaction with your support staff?" Up to four "mentions" were coded for each respondent. The table below provides the suggestions given by 10% (8) or more of the respondents.

Improvements or Changes Needed	No. of Mentions
Better pay, upgrading support positions	31
More training -- all kinds	22
Better recruiting	19
Increase advancement opportunities	15
Training for supervisors	14
Increased Staff	14
Better attitude, work ethic	13
Need Incentives	10
Better equipment	9

Thirty-one of the supervisors advocated better pay or upgrading support positions to pay better as a means of increasing their support staff's productivity and thus their satisfaction with the support staff. Fifteen mentioned a closely related suggestion, increased advancement opportunities and an additional ten mentioned the need for incentives, a genuine linking of performance and rewards. The underlying feeling in these three suggestions was that it was difficult to attract and retain quality support staff given current grade and pay levels and advancement regulations and constraints.

"We're not competitive in salaries for competent people. We therefore end up with less skilled, less motivated people who treat full-time responsibilities as part-time commitments, who are professionally and personally immature, and looking for every way to get a pay check with minimum work."

"Salaries should be increased. There should be many more salary steps so that an employee can receive pay increases over a longer career term without leaving the support staff."

"My support staff would view their position on my staff as a career with long term potential rather than a job, if the grade structure was higher. They are now forced to seek employment elsewhere as soon as they are eligible even though they like working in my office."

"It has to be made possible to promote without losing support personnel. Supervisors have a disincentive to promote good ones."

Improving recruiting procedures (including higher standards and better screening) was suggested by approximately one-fourth of the supervisors. This mirrors the feeling elicited elsewhere in the

questionnaire when supervisors were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being disagree strongly and 5 being agree strongly, how they felt about the following statement: "I am pleased with the quality of the applicants for support positions that I have interviewed in the last two years." Ones and 2s were combined to form a "disagree" category, 3s remained as a "neither agree nor disagree" category, and 4s and 5s were combined to form an "agree" category. Dissatisfaction was the norm; sixty-four percent of the respondents who answered the question disagreed with the statement and only 11 percent agreed with it.

"I am pleased with the quality of the applicants for support positions that I have interviewed in the last two years."

Disagree	64%
Neither	24%
Agree	11%

Many of these areas of discontent, better pay/upgrading support positions, better recruiting, increased advancement opportunities and need for incentives are, of course, inter-related:

"Losing good support staff because of lack of promotion potential in the job has been very disruptive. Also, candidates for replacements have often been poor. I've often had vacancies for months waiting for applicants."

"Until A.I.D. can raise starting salaries and then recruit people who are already fairly well trained and motivated, I don't believe that the quality of our entering support staff will improve. Once untrained people are in, it's hard to upgrade skills, particularly since the demands on them are high."

Training for the support staff was suggested by twenty-two of the supervisors. Most suggested training in general, however, some specified training in basic English and math skills (As one supervisor said, "High school education [skills] so they know the difference between 'countries' and country's, know the countries of Africa, and know the logic of labels in a table or graph."), typing and other technical skills, or in basic office procedures including manners. Said one supervisor,

"Seems we're in a perpetual "in, up and out" process -
- with need for basic skills, motivations and sense of responsibility in newcomers so the "thru process" will work and keep offices working."

Another suggested:

"A.I.D. should establish a training program for local high school or college students for clerical entry and a phased upward mobility career development which would elevate proven/bright performers to sub-professional and professional levels. Others, who satisfy clerical demands - showing less potential should be given other incentive packages and clear guidance that their advancement upward would be limited."

Fourteen of the respondents (18%) felt that training of supervisors in supervisory-related skills was needed. Suggestions included training supervisors in the following areas: standard expectations for support staff; communications; how to set work standards and hold support staff accountable; developing support staff professionally; and how to train support staff. One supervisor suggested "a good day's sensitivity course by senior or junior support staff on how they see things -- A.I.D. managers, hopes for promotion, things that irritate, appreciation. Incorporate into supervisor's course." There is a lack of clarity about support staff standards that makes the process of supervising difficult for some supervisors. For instance:

"Either I need to know through systematic consultation with Agency management or the Agency needs to provide a clearer definition of support staff standards/expectations to help us all communicate on a more objective basis."

"Supervisors need more training in how to communicate across cultures, how to set work standards and hold secretaries accountable for them."

More/closer oversight of support staff supervisors by their supervisors to make certain they are supervising correctly and optimally was also suggested:

"I think much of the problem with support staff stems from the supervisors, and that this requires attention on a regular basis by people outside the office if the situation is to improve. Otherwise there will be other matters that seem more important or at least pressing in the sense of time constraints that take a supervisor's attention away from the best attention to support staff. Supervisors in general, I believe, prefer not to have to deal with support staff problems and therefore let awkward situations go too long unattended."

"Supervisors need to be rated specifically on how they supervise and develop support staff."

"Top management needs to show the same interest in support staff as it does for professional staff."

"I see the major task as moving supervisors to develop their coaching roles with secretaries, which means treating them less impersonally and taking time to hear them and work with them."

Thirteen respondents mentioned that presence of a better attitude or work ethic would increase their satisfaction with their support staff, not surprising since this was the most frequently mentioned thing that frustrated supervisors about their support staff. This category included suggestions such as taking responsibility for doing a good job, better attendance and punctuality, and increased motivation.

The need for more support staff or a lower support staff to professional ratio was mentioned by fourteen of the supervisors. Nine of the supervisors felt that better equipment (printers, terminals, etc.) would improve support staff productivity. Other suggestions included removing poor workers, integrating the support staff more into the work and goals of the office, and treating the support staff more professionally, including giving them more respect and appreciation.

Nine supervisors expressed frustration with their inability to really manage (including rewarding and penalizing) their support staff. Several suggested allowing managers to implement low cost reward systems such as days off, small cash bonuses, thereby directly rewarding support staff without a lot of bureaucratic processing. Other suggestions included:

"Give supervisors greater influence in determining promotions (often tied to grade level of position which may or may not reflect the importance of incumbent's contribution to overall office efforts)."

"In the D.C. area market the Federal Government can no longer compete for top-notch support staff. Salary differences and lock-step inflexibility of grade structure are too constraining. It would help a lot if managers could manage -- set pay, advance, penalize poor performance, without a year of paperwork and agony. The problem is more basic than more training or attempts to make support staff feel they're a part of the team, though these are not bad things to do. The ratio of support to professional staff is too low. If managers could manage with money rather than "slots" this would change very quickly. Contracting out for temporary services or special workload requirements is very badly needed as the best short-term amelioration of the problem."

2. Support Staff

The support staff was asked: "What changes or improvements do you feel are needed to increase your satisfaction with your job?" and "What changes or improvements do you feel are needed to increase your productivity?" Up to four "mentions" were coded for the question concerning job satisfaction and up to three "mentions" were coded for the question concerning productivity. The suggestions given by the support staff concerning improvements or changes needed to increase job satisfaction and productivity are provided in the tables below.

Changes Needed to Increase Job Satisfaction	No. of Mentions
Increased advancement opportunities	30
More respect, appreciation	17
Better morale, communication	16
More money	13
More challenge, responsibility	13
More training	11
More equitable workload distribution	9
Better workspace	8

Changes Needed to Increase Productivity	No. of Mentions
More training	10
Better equipment	10
More equitable workload distribution	7
Better morale, communication	7

Nearly half of the support staff reiterated yet again their desire for increased advancement opportunities. This category included complaints about the grading of jobs (that the grading scale should be changed, that there should be individual desk audits to upgrade positions, that a particular job is graded too low), that they want to advance to a higher level position (professional, administrative, career ladder position), and general comments concerning the lack of upward mobility opportunities. Closely related (actually interchangeable for many) was the desire for more money, mentioned by 13 respondents. Comments included:

"Since the Women's Revolution" it is degrading to be a secretary, particularly in the federal government, and salaries confirm it. At the same time, I don't understand why the 'market place' doesn't change the problem. With other things, when there is short supply and high demand, the price goes up. P.S. I never miss an opportunity to tell any young, smart woman that she would be a fool to take a secretarial job in the government."

"Problems not only lie in the office, but when trying to leave. All merit promotion interviews are not true vacancies. The support staff is a professional job and should be treated as such. Potential should be recognized and effort should be put forth to let that person enhance his/her self."

"A better upward mobility program is needed for the secretarial field."

"My job allows me growth opportunities. However, the grade level does not. My duties are forever increasing and room for grade advancement is at a standstill."

The second most frequently mentioned change that would increase job satisfaction was greater respect and appreciation from the people they work for. Comments from these 17 respondents included such specifics as a desire for recognition of their value, that they would like to be treated more professionally, that they would like to be treated with the same respect that professional staff members receive, and a wish to be spoken to in a "civilized" way.

"Everyone should be given respect regardless of position held and not looked down on because of grade level."

"...maybe if I felt like I wasn't just being thrown work as if I were less than they and accepting it because I have no choice at the time."

"Secretaries are treated as second-class citizens who were put in with the toilets. We are not treated with respect and are considered too stupid to be anything more than a secretary. It is almost impossible to get into another field. The only way to advance is to know someone who is in a senior position who does not have an ego problem of his own and is willing to give credit where credit is due."

"Recognition of me as a human being with intelligence."

Hand in hand with the desire for greater respect and appreciation, sixteen respondents felt that a better environment or improvement of morale within the office would increase their satisfaction with their job. This category included better communication within the office and generally a more comfortable interaction between management and support staff.

"Eliminate secretarial positions. They are people to heap scorn on, look down on, deplore, take out irritability on, blame."

"...When people start treating support staff as professionals and not like they are hired help, this will be a better place to work."

"The supervisor needs training in human relations -- how to let his/her employee know what they do is appreciated; if an employee expresses a concern or offers a suggestion, the supervisor should be tactful and not make the employee feel that his/her opinion is not being considered."

Nearly twenty percent desired more responsibility and challenges in their job, including fewer "busy work" tasks.

Training was mentioned by eleven respondents in the context of increasing job satisfaction and by ten in the context of increasing productivity. Many requested training in general but others specified training that would help them to better understand procedures (the completion of travel-related documents was frequently mentioned as being difficult).

Complaints arose again (from 9 respondents in the context of increasing job satisfaction and from 7 in the context of increasing productivity) concerning an equitable workload distribution, both in terms of even distribution of work among existing support staff and the need for additional staff. One respondent vented her frustration:

"A.I.D. must hire more qualified support staff. [I] do not feel I can recommend the agency to friends because of morale problem created by inadequate, unmotivated clerical personnel - leaving good workers to do their work. (This has happened consistently in office I am in. Several really good secretaries have left for this reason. They felt they were carrying the entire load while less was expected of other employees.)"

Eight respondents said a better (quieter, larger, warmer, not so dull) workplace would increase their satisfaction with their job. Ten support staff mentioned better equipment as an improvement that would increase their productivity. As one respondent said, "The equipment I have to deal with is inferior and always breaking down (Wang printer, Wang work station, Xerox machine, typewriter) and this interferes with efficient

completion of assignments in a timely manner and greatly adds to stress and frustration to the staff, both secretarial and other."

Other items mentioned included an incentive program to recognize and reward good work, different hours ("My main concern is my hours and being able to take advantage of my car pool. I arrive early (8:00 a.m.) but cannot leave until 5:30 p.m. so that I must use public transportation which is very difficult for me."), and fairness from their supervisors (such as accurate PERS). One respondent, reacting to the reality that today many professionals draft their correspondence reports on word processors, suggested that since this is the case they should learn to do it properly. "Due to the increase of managers and supervisors using word processors to finalize letters, reports, etc. they should be required to take A.I.D. correspondence courses, especially for format."

III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

While there is certainly good news in the data, both in terms of job satisfaction expressed by the support staff and the satisfaction of the supervisors with their relationships with the support staff, the data shows nonetheless that the support staff is not a particularly satisfied group of employees. While slightly over half are "quite satisfied" with their jobs overall, nearly half are either outright dissatisfied or only somewhat satisfied. The bulk of the dissatisfaction is rooted in the areas of lack of advancement potential and salary. Only 13% are satisfied with their advancement potential and only 14% are really satisfied with their salary. While satisfaction is high with the hours that they work and with their equipment, only half rated themselves satisfied with their workspace, with other support staff, with other people in the office or with the training opportunities available to them. Half feel the amount of work they are given is unfair and an astounding two out of three feel they are not given challenging assignments. This, despite the fact that half of the supervisors did not think their support staff had the basic skills required to do the job. It is therefore concluded that A.I.D. has a serious morale problem among its support staff.

However, support staff job dissatisfaction in most cases did not include (or seem to be the result of) dissatisfaction with supervisors. Three-fourths of the support staff indicated they were quite satisfied with their supervisors and 80 percent rated their relationship as either good or excellent. Three-fourths agreed that they felt comfortable communicating with their supervisor and four out of five felt that their work was appreciated by their supervisor, and that they were treated with respect by their supervisor.

Notwithstanding, as noted above, there is wide dissatisfaction among supervisors concerning the quality and performance of the support staff. While half of the supervisors are quite satisfied with their support staff; the remaining half are either only somewhat satisfied or are dissatisfied. Nearly one out of five supervisors were dissatisfied with their support staff and were specifically dissatisfied with the quality and the timeliness of their work. Thirty percent of the supervisors were

dissatisfied with their support staff's attendance record, 23 percent were dissatisfied with their punctuality, and 50% of the supervisors didn't think their support staff had the basic skills required to do the job. Recruitment was another area of great concern; nearly two thirds (64%) indicated they were displeased with the quality of applicants for support positions they had interviewed in the past two years.

It is interesting that the dissatisfaction with the support staff lies in the area of output, skill level, and punctuality and reliability, not personal relationship; 94% rated their relationship with their support staff as good or excellent and over 80 percent said they felt comfortable communicating with their support staff.

This situation in a federal agency, dissatisfied support staff and disgruntled supervisors, is not unique to A.I.D.; it is universal within the U.S. government. There is no reason to believe A.I.D.'s problem is worse than any other agency's, nor are its grade levels lower than other agencies. Rather, it would appear that the problem stems primarily from the nature of the Civil Service system, with its strict grade and salary guidelines, promotion procedures and advancement ceilings for support staff. For federal agencies located in Washington, these Civil Service-related constraints are exacerbated by the economic realities of the area, its high cost of living, low unemployment, and the glut of service industries (food and retail in particular) which vie with the federal government for the relatively small pool of less skilled but competent and reliable employees.

Several unique characteristics of A.I.D., however, further exacerbate the problems endemic to the federal government personnel system. The first lies in the fact that many supervisors/managers are Foreign Service officers and have been exposed (and often become accustomed) to quite a different level of Mission support staff while on duty in the field in terms of education, performance, and staff size (the ratio of professionals to support staff is lower in the field than in Washington headquarters). Support staff in the Missions is typically drawn from the elite of the foreign nationals in terms of education and competence. Thus, upon return to Washington after field duty, they sometimes experience "culture shock" themselves, which might explain why FS supervisors are less satisfied than GS supervisors with the quality of work, timeliness of work, amount of work accomplished, attendance record, and punctuality of their support staff.

In addition, the educational gap between the typical supervisor and typical support staff is unusually wide due to the highly technical or regional expertise required of A.I.D. professionals and the low average level of education of the support staff. Eighty-five percent of the supervisors had at least a B.A. degree and 64 percent had at least a masters degree. Only 10 percent of the support staff had at least a B.A. degree. This has two effects: it makes it more difficult than in other less technical agencies for support staff to cross the bridge to professional positions without extensive additional formal education, and it makes the interpersonal gap between supervisors and support staff wider than in an "average" supervisor/support staff relationship.

This interpersonal gap between supervisors and support staff is stark and it is likely that some of the frustrations on both sides are caused by that difference alone. The typical A.I.D. supervisor/manager is a well-educated, Caucasian, middle-aged male, while the typical A.I.D. support staff is a young, black female who is either a high school graduate or has attended a business or secretarial school after high school.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

On January 10, 1989, Alan Woods, the A.I.D. Administrator, issued a general notice to all A.I.D. staff concerning "Excellence." In this notice he outlined high expectations for the Agency in the next four years: "I would like A.I.D. to be known as the best-managed Agency of its size in the U.S. Government." Mr. Woods goes on to recognize that excellence at the top alone is not sufficient to make a difference; excellence must pervade all levels:

"The same principles apply whether you manage projects, administer part of our financial system, deal with new applicants and payroll, or keep us stocked with pens and pencils. Excellence comes from knowing your broad objectives, defining tasks clearly, developing appropriate timetables for getting things done -- and holding yourself to the highest quality standards as you do your work."

It is in the spirit of Alan Wood's call for "new management goals at every level" that we make our recommendations. All management relies upon support staff, and if there is a lack of excellence and satisfaction at this level, it affects an agency directly or indirectly at all levels. The A.I.D. Office of Personnel has within its role and mandate the opportunity to be a key player, at the forefront in helping the Agency achieve a new level of excellence through the implementation of some of the recommendations outlined in this report.

This study indicates that the problems A.I.D. faces lie in the areas of recruitment and performance, rather than in the area of retention. Attrition is not by definition a negative; it only becomes a negative when replacement is difficult and/or the quality/quantity of output is reduced as a result. Thus, if attrition is treated as a given (and retention, we feel, of quality support staff will always be problematic at best unless drastic, sweeping changes are made in the Civil Service system as a whole regarding grade levels and salaries), it is in the best interest of all concerned to proceed to establish policies and programs which build upon this reality in a positive way.

The nature of our primary recommendations are, therefore, structural rather than interpersonal, as we feel that the solutions to A.I.D.'s support staff problem lie in changing the way the recruitment and retention of the support staff is approached, rather than in rectifying the interpersonal relationship (which is basically good) between the supervisors and support staff. Our recommendations fall into three major categories:

- those that involve major structural/program changes within A.I.D. (Program Options);
- those that entail a training component (Training Options); and
- one that involves recruitment specifically (Recruitment Option).

These recommendations are grounded in the findings and conclusions of this study, as outlined in the table on the following pages.

We would like to make it clear at the outset that, in our opinion, the Training and Recruitment Options outlined, although certainly not a bad idea, do not tackle the largest portion of the support staff problem at A.I.D., and thus we mention the Program Options first.

A. Program Options

Program Option 1. Our "option of choice" would be to institutionalize a two year internship along the lines of the Peace Corps model, in which college graduates with appropriate typing/word processing skills would be recruited to come to A.I.D. for the purpose of learning about development as a professional field. "Second tier" applicants to the I.D.I. program, those that have applicable skills but are not quite strong or experienced enough to be selected for the program, could also be informed of and considered for this program. They would be paid at a low rate (for instance, GS 4 for year 1 and GS 5 for year 2), the recruitment process would specifically address the fact that the work would often be less than challenging, and it would be made clear to them that during these two years they would be expected to provide quality secretarial/clerical services. In return, these interns would be offered some kind of predetermined preferential treatment in securing a professional position (either GS or FS) within A.I.D. upon satisfactory completion of their internship. In addition, an enrichment program could be designed whereby during the two year internship the interns would have access to various speakers on development issues (both technical and regional) and other specific opportunities (TDYs for instance).

This is an exciting option and viable within the current confines of the Civil Service system. This kind of program would have the dual advantage of providing a constant flow of well qualified, well motivated professionals to carry out current support functions while not costing the Agency any more in salaries than current support staff.

The participants in an internship program like this could be supervised by a permanent cadre of senior support staff such as the para-professionals (administrative operations assistants and program operations assistants) recommended in Program Option 3. This would serve the dual purpose of providing continued employment for senior, quality support staff as well as providing much needed continuity and a repository for "agency history" which is important to the smooth running of any organization.

<u>FINDINGS</u>	<u>CONCLUSIONS</u>	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
<p>Only half of the supervisors are very satisfied with their support staff.</p> <p>Half of the supervisors didn't feel the support staff had the basic skills required to do the job.</p> <p>64% of the supervisors were not pleased with the quality of applicants for support positions they had interviewed in the past two years.</p>	<p>If pay and advancement opportunities cannot be significantly increased given the confines of the Civil Service system, support functions could be provided by well-qualified staff motivated to provide quality work for a different reason, albeit on a shorter term, "revolving door" basis.</p>	<p>A. Program Options</p> <p>Create a two year internship program in which college graduates with appropriate typing/word processing skills would be recruited to provide quality support services in exchange for learning about development as a professional field.</p>
<p>Half of the support staff feels A.I.D. does not offer enough training opportunities, particularly in areas which will help them to advance.</p> <p>Increased advancement opportunities were mentioned by 43% of the support staff as a change needed to increase job satisfaction.</p>	<p>Support staff should be provided the opportunity for the professional development it wants. Enrollment in such a program would provide a strong incentive for participants to remain in their job and perform satisfactorily while in training.</p>	<p>Re-establish an "upward mobility" program in which support staff could receive university training which would enable them to move out of the support field and into a professional position.</p>
<p>Only 13% of the support staff are very satisfied with their advancement potential.</p> <p>Only 14% of the support staff are very satisfied with their salary.</p> <p>GS 7-9s are more than three times as likely to be satisfied with their jobs as GS 2-4s.</p>	<p>Much of the support staff dissatisfaction is rooted in the areas of lack of advancement potential and salary.</p> <p>Dissatisfaction among lower GS levels is substantially higher than among higher GS levels.</p>	<p>Continue the review of secretarial/clerical positions in order to, as appropriate, substantially decrease the need for lower GS level (GS2-4s) secretarial/clerical positions and increase as needed the number of para-professionals such as administrative operations assistants and program operations assistants.</p>

<u>FINDINGS</u>	<u>CONCLUSIONS</u>	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
<p>Half of the supervisors didn't feel the support staff had the basic skills required to do the job.</p> <p>64% of the support staff were not pleased with the quality of applicants for support positions they had interviewed in the past two years.</p>	<p>If it is difficult to attract quality support staff given current grade and pay levels and advancement regulations and constraints, the next best thing is to train people to A.I.D.'s standards prior to placing them in permanent jobs within A.I.D.</p>	<p>B. Training Options</p> <p>Establish a mandatory entry training program for support staff.</p>
<p>21% of the support staff respondents indicated a need for greater respect and appreciation from the people they work with.</p> <p>20% of the support staff felt a better environment or improvement of morale within the office was a needed change.</p> <p>13% of the support staff mentioned they were dissatisfied with their supervisor's unwillingness or discomfort with taking a position or stand with personnel.</p>	<p>Although in general the relationship between support staff and supervisors is satisfactory, further training of supervisors concerning their supervisory techniques and responsibilities could increase support staff satisfaction with their supervisors even further.</p>	<p>Expand current supervision courses for supervisor/managers or develop a new course to include proper treatment of support staff, support staff career development, presentations on "how it feels to be on the support staff and clarification of support staff standards including enforcement procedures.</p>
<p>64% of the supervisors were not pleased with the quality of applicants for support positions which they had interviewed in the past two years.</p>	<p>Recruitment efforts should attempt to target a relatively untapped segment of the pool of potentially available support staff.</p>	<p>C. Recruitment Option</p> <p>Target recruitment to a particular kind of worker (i.e. homemakers) to whom A.I.D. could offer particular concessions or flexibility that would make the job appealing to them.</p>

Program Option 2. Re-establish an "upward mobility" program in which support staff receives university training, enabling them to move out of the support field and into a professional position, whether at A.I.D. or elsewhere. The advantages of this option would be twofold: support staff would be provided an opportunity for the professional development it yearns for, and enrollment would provide a strong incentive for participants to stay until their training was completed. The disadvantage of this option is its high cost, and thus the relatively few support staff that would be likely to benefit from it at any one time.

Program Option 3. Support staff and supervisors agreed that the most needed improvement or change to increase satisfaction within and with the support staff was better pay and the upgrading of support positions. The supervisors feel frustrated with the quality of the support staff they can recruit and retain within the current pay scale, and the support staff simply wants more pay.

Given the proliferation of personal computers in the workplace, lower level secretarial positions per se are becoming less and less necessary. The tasks that often remain for the support staff require higher level skills such as recordkeeping/coordination/administrative/final production functions. The data showed clearly that job satisfaction is directly related to grade level; GS 7-9s are more than three times as likely to be "quite satisfied" with their jobs as GS 2-4s (69% versus 20%). Only 13 percent of the GS 7-9s rated themselves as dissatisfied with their job. Thus, one option would be to continue to review the need for secretarial/clerical positions within A.I.D. in order to decrease as much as possible those positions and proportionately increase the number of para-professionals such as administrative operations assistants and program operations assistants with those positions' higher grades and salaries.

This option would also help to close the "culture" gap between the supervisors and support staff by raising the caliber of applicants that could be attracted. Put somewhat harshly, as in most other areas of consumerism, "you get what you pay for." The supervisors/managers expect and desire professional performance/behavior from the support staff who, in fact, currently are neither trained nor paid to be professionals. As a corollary, quantity is certainly not better than quality, and fewer well-trained, well-paid individuals can accomplish more than a larger number of disgruntled, poorly trained individuals. With the implementation of this option, it would be reasonable to expect a dramatic improvement in overall support staff morale and supervisor satisfaction.

B. Training Options

Training Option 1. Although lack of promotion opportunities and low salary were the greatest sources of dissatisfaction among the support staff, 21% of the support staff respondents indicated a need for greater respect and appreciation from the people they work for, and 20% felt that a better environment or improvement of morale within the office was a needed change and would increase their satisfaction with their job. To address this need, current supervision courses for supervisor/managers

could be expanded, or a new course could be developed that would incorporate the following:

- Appropriate treatment of support staff, including showing respect and appreciation and giving feedback, positive and negative.
- Support staff career development, including learning the options for a support staff career path and being encouraged to encourage their support staff to "be all that they can be."
- Bring in representatives of the support staff to "tell how it feels."
- Clarification of support staff standards including enforcement procedures. (This by definition would mean that A.I.D. management would need to develop and support specific standards and guidelines and stand ready to administratively support supervisors who enforce them. As a corollary, we would also recommend that supervisors be held strictly accountable for the enforcement of these standards so that unsatisfactory support staff are purged quickly and early.)

Training Option 2. The establishment of a mandatory entry training program is recommended as another option to deal with the problems A.I.D. currently has recruiting quality support staff. Underlying this option is the premise that since it is difficult at best to attract and retain quality support staff given current grade and pay levels and advancement regulations and constraints, the next best thing is to train people to A.I.D.'s standards prior to placing them in permanent jobs within A.I.D.

Candidates would be hired directly out of high school into this six month to one year program, during which time, in addition to receiving training, they would provide report production services for the Agency. Candidates would start their training at a low level, but be able to rise to higher grades swiftly given superior performance. In order for it to work -- and to work is defined as graduating support staff who have good office procedure and equipment skills as well as a proven commitment to quality and reliability -- graduation standards would have to be uniformly high (with no special case waivers). Trainers would have to rigorously adhere to strict standards and a comprehensive curriculum. Further, we would recommend that as one feature of the quality control monitoring system, trainers be held accountable for the quality of the support staff graduated from the program.

A by-product of the training program would be that it would serve as a "job shop" of sorts, responsible for production of documents for participating offices. This role would help the training program offset its cost.

C. Recruitment Option

Recruitment Option 1. A.I.D. may want to consider targeting its recruitment to a particular kind of worker, such as homemakers or college students, to who they could offer particular concessions or flexibility that would make the job appealing to them. For instance, women with young children could be allowed to work part time (so they would not have to leave home until after their children did and could return home by the time school buses arrived), they could be offered a position (part or full time) that was tied to the school year calendar so that when their children were out of school they could be home with them, or they could work part time three or four days a week with one or two complete days off. The possible variations on this are endless, depending upon the targeted population. Limitations on this option include the fact that these groups are already in great demand and have been targeted by many firms/organizations, many of which are located in easier-to-commute-to locations such as the new commercial/retail hubs of the suburbs.

* * * * *

In commissioning this study, the A.I.D. Office of Personnel has taken a necessary first step towards improving the management of the support staff of the Agency. In implementing the recommendations outlined, A.I.D. can make an important contribution to address a management problem that has recurringly plagued not only A.I.D., but many Government agencies, a contribution that can place A.I.D. in the words of Allen Woods, truly at the forefront, as the "best-managed Agency of its size in the U.S. Government."

ANNEX 1

SUPPORT STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

45

Respondent # _____

A.I.D. ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

SUPPORT STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle the number that corresponds to the appropriate response for each question or write your answers on the lines provided. It is important that you answer all of the questions.

1. When did you start working at A.I.D.?

_____ (month) _____ (year)

2. Do you work:

(1) Part time

(2) Full time

3. Current GS grade and step.

_____ (grade) _____ (step)

4. GS grade and step when you started working at A.I.D.:

_____ (grade) _____ (step)

5. Is your supervisor:

(1) GS

(2) FS

(3) AD

6. Highest level of education attained:

- (1) Less than high school graduate
- (2) High school graduate
- (3) Business or secretarial school/training beyond high school
- (4) A.A. degree
- (5) B.A./B.S. degree
- (6) Masters degree or higher
- (7) Other SPECIFY _____

7. How many years of work experience have you had?

8. Prior to coming to work at A.I.D., how many years had you worked in support staff positions?

9. Immediately prior to coming to work at A.I.D. were you:

- (1) Working for another government agency
- (2) Working in the private sector in a support staff position
- (3) Working in the private sector in a non-support staff position (such as for a retailer or food establishment)
- (4) Attending school
- (5) Other... SPECIFY _____

10. How did you learn about A.I.D. and the position you first held at A.I.D.?

11. Would you rate your overall relationship with your current supervisor as excellent, good, fair or poor?

(1) Excellent

(2) Good

(3) Fair

(4) Poor

12. Did you attend an orientation when you first started working at A.I.D.?

(1) Yes (ANSWER Q. 12A)

(2) No (GO TO Q. 13)

12A. (IF YES) Would you say the orientation that you received when you started to work at A.I.D. was very useful, somewhat useful, or not at all useful?

(1) Very useful

(2) Somewhat useful

(3) Not at all useful

12B. Why do you feel that way?

13. Since you have been working in A.I.D., have you received any training - that is, attended any workshops, seminars, or training programs offered by A.I.D.?

(1) Yes (ANSWER Q. 13A)

(2) No (GO TO Q. 14)

13A. (IF YES) What training have you received?

13B. In general, would you say that this training improved your work performance a great deal, somewhat, or not at all?

- (1) A great deal
- (2) Somewhat
- (3) Not at all

14. Do you feel that A.I.D. offers enough training opportunities for support staff personnel?

- (1) Yes (GO TO Q. 15)
- (2) No (ANSWER Q. 14A)

14A. (IF NO) What kind of training do you feel should be available that is not already offered?

15. Have you ever been denied training that you requested?

- (1) Yes (ANSWER Q. 15A)
- (2) No (GO TO Q. 16)

15A. (IF YES) For what reason(s) were you were denied the training?

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
(a) Lack of office coverage	(1)	(2)
(b) Training class cancelled by training office/vendor	(1)	(2)
(c) Other... SPECIFY _____	(1)	(2)

16. We are interested in how satisfied you are in your current position in A.I.D. in general as well as how satisfied you are with specific aspects of your job. For each of the items listed below, please rate it on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all satisfied and 5 being very satisfied:

	Not satisfied		Very satisfied		
a. Overall satisfaction with job	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
b. Opportunities to be promoted	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
c. The equipment I have to work with (typewriter, word processor, etc.)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
d. My workspace	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
e. My supervisor	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
f. The other support staff I come into contact with	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
g. The other people in my office that I work for besides my direct supervisor	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
h. The salary I make	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
i. Training opportunities	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
j. The hours that I work	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

17. Please rate each of the statements listed below on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being that you disagree strongly and 5 being that you agree strongly:

	Disagree Strongly		Agree Strongly		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
a. I am given challenging assignments.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
b. The amount of work I am given is fair.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
c. I make an important contribution to my office.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
d. My work is appreciated by my supervisors.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
e. I am comfortable communicating with my supervisor.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
f. There is ample advancement potential for me in A.I.D.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
g. My work requires more technical knowledge than I have.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
h. The availability of child care is a major problem for me.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
i. I feel comfortable asking my supervisor if I can take a training course.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
j. I have the basic skills I need to do this job to the satisfaction of my supervisor.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
k. A.I.D. is a prestigious government agency.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
l. My workspace is too noisy.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

	<u>Disagree</u>			<u>Agree</u>	
	<u>Strongly</u>			<u>Strongly</u>	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
m. When my supervisor tells me something in my work is not satisfactory, he/she also tells me specific ways to improve what I'm doing.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
n. My supervisor is supportive when I want to take training courses.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
o. I am treated with respect by my supervisor.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

18. When I am late or absent from work, for reasons other than personal illness or vacation, it is usually because of:

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
(a) Traffic/transportation problems	(1)	(2)
(b) Weather problems	(1)	(2)
(c) Sick children	(1)	(2)
(d) Child care problems (babysitter sick, unavailable, etc.)	(1)	(2)
(e) Other.. SPECIFY _____	(1)	(2)

19. What changes or improvements do you feel are needed to increase your satisfaction with your job?

20. What changes or improvements do you feel are needed to increase your productivity?

21. Do you think you will be working for A.I.D. one year from now?

(1) Yes (GO TO Q. 22)

(2) No (ANSWER Q. 21A)

21A. (IF NO) Why will you leave A.I.D.?

21B. Where will you be working?

(1) Another government agency

(2) Private sector

(3) Not in the work force

(4) Other... SPECIFY _____

53

22. People leave jobs for a wide variety of reasons. For the support staff that you know that have left A.I.D. in the past year, please rate on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being not very important and 5 being very important, how important each of the following reasons was in their decision to leave:

	Not very important			Very important	
a. Wanted to make more money	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
b. Change in family circumstances	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
c. Dissatisfaction with supervisor	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
d. Wanted to work for another government agency	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
e. Wanted to leave the government and work in the private sector	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
f. Wanted more opportunities for training	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
g. Wanted more opportunities for advancement	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
h. Other... SPECIFY _____	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

23. In five years do you expect to be: (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY.)

- (1) In a government support staff position at the same GS level
- (2) In a government support staff position at a higher GS level
- (3) In the government in a professional position
- (4) In the private sector in a support staff position
- (5) In the private sector in a professional position
- (6) Not in the work force
- (7) Other... SPECIFY _____

24. The thing I like most about my job is. . .

25. The thing I like least about my job is.

26. The thing I like most about my supervisor is. . .

27. The thing I like least about my supervisor is. . .

28. Please use this space to make any other comments concerning any aspect of your job that you are satisfied or dissatisfied with, including any suggestions for changes or improvements in your job or the office in which you work.

OPTIONAL:

29. Sex:-

- (1) Male
- (2) Female

30. Age:

- (1) Under 20
- (2) 20-24
- (3) 25-29
- (4) 30-39
- (5) 40-49
- (6) 50-59
- (7) 60 or over

31. Race:

- (1) Caucasian
- (2) Black
- (3) Asian
- (4) Hispanic origin
- (5) Other SPECIFY _____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.

ANNEX 2

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Respondent # _____

A.I.D. ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle the number that corresponds to the appropriate response for each question or write your answers on the lines provided. It is important that you answer all of the questions.

1. Highest level of education attained:

- (1) Less than high school graduate
- (2) High school graduate
- (3) Business or secretarial school/training beyond high school
- (4) A.A. degree
- (5) B.A./B.S. degree
- (6) Masters degree or higher
- (7) Other SPECIFY _____

2. When did you start working at A.I.D.?

_____ (month) _____ (year)

3. Are you:

- (1) FS
- (2) GS
- (3) AD

3A. Current FS or GS grade and step: _____ (grade) _____ (step)

4. Since you have been with A.I.D., how many years have you spent in the field - that is, outside of the Washington, D.C. office -- not including TDYs?

_____ years

5. What is the largest number of employees you have ever supervised in any job you have ever had?

6. How many clerk typists do you currently supervise?

7. How many secretaries do you currently supervise?

8. How many years have you been a supervisor?

9. How many years have you been a supervisor in A.I.D./Washington?

10. Would you rate your overall relationship with your support staff as excellent, good, fair or poor?

(1) Excellent

(2) Good

(3) Fair

(4) Poor

11. Since you have been working in A.I.D., have you received any training in how to supervise employees - that is, attended any workshops, seminars, or training programs offered by A.I.D. in this area?

(1) Yes (ANSWER Q. 11A)

(2) No (GO TO Q. 12)

11A. (IF YES) What training have you received? (CIRCLE ALL COURSES TAKEN.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
(a) Supervisors Role in Personnel Management	(1)	(2)
(b) Basic Supervisory Skills Workshop	(1)	(2)
(c) Senior Management Training	(1)	(2)
(d) OPM or AMA courses	(1)	(2)
(e) Other... SPECIFY _____	(1)	(2)

11B. Overall, did you find this training very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not at all helpful?

(1) Very helpful

(2) Somewhat helpful

(3) Not at all helpful

12. We are interested in how satisfied you are with your support staff in general as well as with specific aspects of how they do their job. For each of the items listed below, please rate it on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all satisfied and 5 being very satisfied:

	Not satisfied			Very satisfied	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
a. Overall satisfaction with support staff	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
b. Overall quality of support staff's work	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
c. Overall timeliness of support staff's work	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
d. The amount of work my support staff accomplishes	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
e. My support staff's attendance record	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
f. My support staff's punctuality - getting to work on time, back from lunch on time, etc.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

13. Do you expect some turnover in your support staff in the next year?

(1) Yes (ANSWER Q. 13A)

(2) No (GO TO Q. 14)

13A. (IF YES) For what reason do you feel that person/those people will leave A.I.D.?

14. For each of the statements listed below, please rate it on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being that you disagree strongly and 5 being that you agree strongly:

	Disagree Strongly			Agree Strongly	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
a. I feel that my support staff makes an important contribution to the work in this office.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
b. I feel the tasks that I give my support staff are challenging.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
c. I think that my support staff feels appreciated by me and the other people in our office.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
d. I feel responsible for the professional development of my support staff.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
e. My support staff always has a professional appearance and demeanor.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
f. Support staff should be included in staff meetings so they have a better idea about what is going on in the office.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
g. I feel very comfortable communicating with my support staff.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
h. I think my support staff has the basic skills required to do the job to my satisfaction.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
i. When I tell someone on my support staff that something in his/her work is not satisfactory, I also tell him/her specific ways to improve it.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

62

18. The best thing about my support staff is. . .

19. The thing that frustrates me the most about my support staff is. . .

20. We are interested in what you feel would improve the productivity of your support staff - the amount of work she/he is able to do in a given period of time and the quality of that work. For each of the following items, please indicate if you think it would improve your support staff's productivity a lot, somewhat, or not at all.

	<u>A lot</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at all</u>
a. A better relationship with myself and others in the office.	(1)	(2)	(3)
b. More training in basic skills	(1)	(2)	(3)
c. Better/different equipment	(1)	(2)	(3)
d. The possibility of job sharing or doing the job part time	(1)	(2)	(3)
e. Day care assistance	(1)	(2)	(3)
f. Opportunities for advancement	(1)	(2)	(3)
g. A better/different work space	(1)	(2)	(3)

65

21. Please use this space to make any other comments concerning any aspect of your support staff that you are satisfied or dissatisfied with, including any suggestions for changes or improvements.

OPTIONAL:

22. Sex:

- (1) Male
- (2) Female

23. Age:

- (1) Under 20
- (2) 20-24
- (3) 25-29
- (4) 30-39
- (5) 40-49
- (6) 50-59
- (7) 60 or over

24. Race:

- (1) Caucasian
- (2) Black
- (3) Asian
- (4) Hispanic origin
- (5) Other SPECIFY _____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.

ANNEX 3

INVITATION TO SUPPORT STAFF

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D C 20523

THE ADMINISTRATOR

December 15, 1988

Dear Colleague:

The Office of Personnel Management has contracted with Management Systems International (MSI), a management consulting firm, to determine if there are any morale or productivity concerns within the A.I.D. support staff. In order to accomplish this, MSI will conduct a survey of the support staff and supervisors to measure job satisfaction and to identify changes needed to improve job satisfaction and productivity.

A random sample of approximately 20 percent of all support staff was drawn, and those individuals are being asked to participate in this study. You have been selected to represent your colleagues in this survey.

We invite you to come to Room 1912 in the Department of State at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 3, 1989, to give us your opinion on these issues. A representative from MSI will be there to distribute and explain the survey to you, and you will be given time to complete the questionnaire. The entire process will take about one hour.

If you cannot attend this survey session, please contact Sherrie Hailstorks, PFM/PM/PCF, at 663-1444 as soon as possible.

We look forward to receiving your input on these important issues. The only way for A.I.D. management to know how you feel so that improvements can be made is for you to come and express your opinions.

All responses to the survey will be confidential; A.I.D. will see the results only in the aggregate and in no case will specific comments or opinions be attributed to an individual.

We look forward to seeing you and thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,



Alan Woods

ANNEX 4

INVITATION TO SUPERVISORS

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D C 20523

THE ADMINISTRATOR

December 15, 1988

Dear Colleague:

The Office of Personnel Management has contracted with Management Systems International (MSI), a management consulting firm, to determine the reason for the current high rate of turnover among support staff and determine if there are any morale or productivity concerns within the A.I.D. support staff. In order to accomplish this, MSI will conduct a survey of the support staff and supervisors to measure job satisfaction and to identify changes needed to improve job satisfaction and productivity.

A random sample of approximately 25 percent of support staff supervisors was drawn, and those individuals are being asked to participate in this study. You have been selected to represent your colleagues in this survey.

We invite you to come to Room 1912 in the Department of State at 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 3, 1989, to give us your opinion on these issues. A representative from MSI will be there to distribute and explain the survey to you, and you will be given time to complete the questionnaire. The entire process will take one hour or less.

If you cannot attend this survey session, please contact Sherrie Hailstorks, PFM/PM/PCF, at 663-1444 as soon as possible.

We look forward to receiving your input on these important issues. The only way for A.I.D. management to know how you feel so that improvements can be made is for you to come and express your opinions.

All responses to the survey will be confidential; A.I.D. will see the results only in the aggregate and in no case will specific comments or opinions be attributed to an individual.

We look forward to seeing you and thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,



Alan Woods

ANNEX 5

INFORMATIONAL LETTER SENT TO MANAGERS

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON D C 20523

December 15, 1988

Dear Colleague:

The Office of Personnel Management has contracted with Management Systems International (MSI), a management consulting firm, to determine the reason for the current high rate of turnover among support staff and determine if there are any morale or productivity concerns within the A.I.D. support staff. In order to accomplish this, MSI will conduct a survey of the support staff and supervisors to measure job satisfaction and to identify changes needed to improve job satisfaction and productivity.

A random sample of approximately 20 percent of the support staff was drawn, which is proportionately representative of all the support staff within A.I.D., based on job series and GS level. Likewise, a random sample of approximately 25 percent of support staff supervisors was drawn.

The selected support staff and supervisors have been asked to attend a one hour session on Tuesday, January 3, 1989, in order to complete a questionnaire. It is imperative for the success of this survey that we have the commitment of A.I.D. managers and supervisors, both in encouraging their support staff, if selected, to participate in the study and to participate themselves, if they are selected.

This is an important issue for our agency. Thus, I am hopeful that you will assist with this survey by announcing it at staff meetings and strongly encouraging people on your staff to participate.

Support staff and supervisors should be assured that all responses to the survey will be confidential; A.I.D. will see the results only in the aggregate and in no case will specific comments or opinions be attributed to an individual.

Thank you in advance for your support in encouraging cooperation with this survey.

Sincerely,


Alan Woods

13

ANNEX 6

**SUPPORT STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS**

Q1 WHEN START WORKING AT AID

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1-2 YEARS	1	18	25.7	25.7	25.7
3-4 YEARS	2	8	11.4	11.4	37.1
5-9 YEARS	3	7	10.0	10.0	47.1
10-19 YEARS	4	28	40.0	40.0	87.1
20 OR MORE YEARS	5	8	11.4	11.4	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.371 Median 4.000 Mode 4.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q2 WORK FULL TIME OR PART TIME

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
PART TIME	1	11	15.7	15.7	15.7
FULL TIME	2	59	84.3	84.3	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.843 Median 2.000 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q3 CURRENT GS GRADE AND STEP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
	3	2	2.9	2.9	4.3
	4	5	7.1	7.1	11.4
	5	10	14.3	14.3	25.7
	6	21	30.0	30.0	55.7
	7	12	17.1	17.1	72.9
NOT ASCERTAINED	8	13	18.6	18.6	91.4
	9	6	8.6	8.6	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	6.371	Median	6.000	Mode	6.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q4 GS GRADE AND STEP WHEN STARTED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2	7	10.0	10.0	10.0
	3	11	15.7	15.7	25.7
	4	27	38.6	38.6	64.3
	5	15	21.4	21.4	85.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	6	9	12.9	12.9	98.6
	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.186	Median	4.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q5 SUPERVISOR IS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
GS	1	31	44.3	44.3	44.3
FS	2	28	40.0	40.0	84.3
AD	3	11	15.7	15.7	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.714	Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q6 HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT HIGH SCHOOL GRAD	1	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD	2	19	27.1	27.1	28.6
BUS OR SEC SCHOOL	3	31	44.3	44.3	72.9
AA DEGREE	4	5	7.1	7.1	80.0
BA OR BS DEGREE	5	5	7.1	7.1	87.1
MASTER DEGREE OR MOR	6	2	2.9	2.9	90.0
OTHER	7	7	10.0	10.0	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.400	Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

11

Q7 YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1-4 YEARS	1	7	10.0	10.0	10.0
5-9 YEARS	2	8	11.4	11.4	21.4
10-19 YEARS	3	26	37.1	37.1	58.6
20 OR MORE YEARS	4	28	40.0	40.0	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.457 Median 3.000 Mode 4.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q8 YEARS AS SUPPORT STAFF PRIOR TO AID

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE	0	12	17.1	17.1	17.1
1-4 YEARS	1	19	27.1	27.1	44.3
5-9 YEARS	2	20	28.6	28.6	72.9
10-19 YEARS	3	13	18.6	18.6	91.4
20 OR MORE YEARS	4	4	5.7	5.7	97.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	2	2.9	2.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.457 Median 2.000 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q9 WHAT DOING PRIOR TO COMING TO AID

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ANOTHER GOVT AGENCY	1	21	30.0	30.0	30.0
PRIVATE SECTOR SUPP	2	19	27.1	27.1	57.1
PRIVATE SEC-NON SUPP	3	5	7.1	7.1	64.3
ATTENDING SCHOOL	4	10	14.3	14.3	78.6
HOMEMAKER	5	10	14.3	14.3	92.9
COMBINATION OF THING	6	1	1.4	1.4	94.3
OTHER	8	3	4.3	4.3	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.900	Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q10 HOW LEARNED ABOUT AID

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CIVIL SERVICE EXAM-0	1	12	17.1	17.1	17.1
NEWSPAPER AD	2	20	28.6	28.6	45.7
SCHOOL REFERRAL	3	4	5.7	5.7	51.4
COMMERCE DEPT JOB FA	4	1	1.4	1.4	52.9
RELATIVE-GENERAL	5	2	2.9	2.9	55.7
FRIEND-GENERAL	6	9	12.9	12.9	68.6
AID EMPLOYEE	7	14	20.0	20.0	88.6
OTHER	8	8	11.4	11.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.200	Median	3.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q11 RELATIONSHIP WITH CURRENT SUPERVISOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	42	60.0	60.0	60.0
GOOD	2	15	21.4	21.4	81.4
FAIR	3	8	11.4	11.4	92.9
POOR	4	5	7.1	7.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.657	Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q12A HOW USEFUL WAS ORIENTATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	6	8.6	8.6	8.6
VERY USEFUL	1	28	40.0	40.0	48.6
SOMEWHAT USEFUL	2	34	48.6	48.6	97.1
NOT AT ALL USEFUL	3	2	2.9	2.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.457	Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q12BMEN1 WHY DO YOU FEEL THAT WAY-MEN1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	6	8.6	8.6	8.6
GENERALLY INFORMATIV	1	21	30.0	30.0	38.6
GOOD REFRESHER	2	1	1.4	1.4	40.0
EASED INTO WORKFORCE	3	1	1.4	1.4	41.4
TOOK BEFORE STARTED	4	1	1.4	1.4	42.9
GOOD WAY TO MEET FOL	5	2	2.9	2.9	45.7
TAUGHT USEFUL SKILLS	6	1	1.4	1.4	47.1
TOO RUSHED	21	2	2.9	2.9	50.0
NOT TOLD ADVANCE OPP	22	1	1.4	1.4	51.4
KNEW MATERIAL	23	2	2.9	2.9	54.3
MORE INFO RE AID	24	1	1.4	1.4	55.7
INFO NOT APPLICABLE	25	3	4.3	4.3	60.0
INFO TOO GENERAL	26	6	8.6	8.6	68.6
INFO DIDNT HELP ME	27	1	1.4	1.4	70.0
POOR INSTRUCTORS	28	1	1.4	1.4	71.4
NOT ENOUGH INFO	29	1	1.4	1.4	72.9
COVERED TOO MUCH	30	6	8.6	8.6	81.4
ORIENTATION TOO SOON	31	3	4.3	4.3	85.7
ORIENTATION TOO LATE	32	4	5.7	5.7	91.4
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	6	8.6	8.6	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 21.286 Median 21.500 Mode 1.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0
Q12BMEN2 WHY DO YOU FEEL THAT WAY-MEN2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	6	8.6	8.6	8.6
EASED INTO WORKFORCE	3	1	1.4	1.4	10.0
TAUGHT USEFUL SKILLS	6	2	2.9	2.9	12.9
NOT TOLD ADVANCE OPP	22	2	2.9	2.9	15.7
MORE INFO RE AID	24	1	1.4	1.4	17.1
INFO TOO GENERAL	26	1	1.4	1.4	18.6
POOR INSTRUCTORS	28	1	1.4	1.4	20.0
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	56	80.0	80.0	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 81.157 Median 99.000 Mode 99.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q12Q QUOTABLE QUOTE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	4	5.7	5.7	5.7
NO	2	66	94.3	94.3	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.943	Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q13 HAVE YOU RECEIVED ANY TRAINING AT AID

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	64	91.4	91.4	91.4
NO	2	5	7.1	7.1	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.186	Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

82

Q13A NUMBER OF TRAINING COURSES TAKEN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	5	7.1	7.1	7.1
	1	14	20.0	20.0	27.1
	2	7	10.0	10.0	37.1
	3	12	17.1	17.1	54.3
	4	4	5.7	5.7	60.0
	5	4	5.7	5.7	65.7
	6	3	4.3	4.3	70.0
	7	1	1.4	1.4	71.4
	8	1	1.4	1.4	72.9
	9	1	1.4	1.4	74.3
MULTIPLE-6 OR MORE	97	17	24.3	24.3	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 27.000 Median 3.000 Mode 97.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q13B TRAINING IMPROVED WORK PERFORMANCE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	5	7.1	7.1	7.1
A GREAT DEAL	1	31	44.3	44.3	51.4
SOMEWHAT	2	29	41.4	41.4	92.9
NOT AT ALL	3	2	2.9	2.9	95.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	3	4.3	4.3	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.743 Median 1.000 Mode 1.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q14A WHAT TRAINING SHOULD BE AVAILABLE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	14	48.6	48.6	48.6
CAREER LADDER TRNG	1	4	5.7	5.7	54.3
GRADE MAKES INELIGIB	2	11	15.7	15.7	70.0
LANGUAGE TRAINING	3	1	1.4	1.4	71.4
CMWW FOR LOWER GRADE	4	4	5.7	5.7	77.1
COLLEGE COURSES	5	2	2.9	2.9	80.0
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	6	1	1.4	1.4	81.4
AID BIG PICTURE	7	1	1.4	1.4	82.9
SPEED READING	8	1	1.4	1.4	84.3
ACCOUNTING	9	1	1.4	1.4	85.7
NEW EMPLOYEE TRNG	10	1	1.4	1.4	87.1
ON THE JOB TRNG	12	1	1.4	1.4	88.6
COMPUTERS	13	1	1.4	1.4	90.0
BASIC ENGLISH	14	1	1.4	1.4	91.4
CLASSES ARE FULL	15	1	1.4	1.4	92.9
COURSES TOO LONG	20	1	1.4	1.4	94.3
OTHER	98	1	1.4	1.4	95.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	3	4.3	4.3	100.0

TOTAL 70 100.0 100.0

Mean 8.057 Median 1.000 Mode .000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q14Q QUOTABLE QUOTE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	9	12.9	12.9	12.9
	2	61	87.1	87.1	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.871 Median 2.000 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q15 HAVE YOU EVER BEEN DENIED TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	29	41.4	41.4	41.4
NO	2	41	58.6	58.6	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.586	Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q15AA LACK OF OFFICE COVERAGE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	41	58.6	58.6	58.6
YES	1	13	18.6	18.6	77.1
NO	2	16	22.9	22.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	.643	Median	.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q15AB TRAINING CLASS CANCELLED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	41	58.6	58.6	58.6
YES	1	3	4.3	4.3	62.9
NO	2	26	37.1	37.1	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	.786	Median	.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q15AC OTHER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	41	58.6	58.6	58.6
YES	1	16	22.9	22.9	81.4
NO	2	13	18.6	18.6	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	600	Median	.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q16A OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH JOB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	3	4.3	4.3	4.3
	2	6	8.6	8.6	12.9
	3	21	30.0	30.0	42.9
VERY SATISFIED	4	27	38.6	38.6	81.4
	5	13	18.6	18.6	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.586	Median	4.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

86

Q16B OPPORTUNITIES TO BE PROMOTED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	34	48.6	48.6	48.6
	2	18	25.7	25.7	74.3
	3	9	12.9	12.9	87.1
	4	3	4.3	4.3	91.4
VERY SATISFIED	5	6	8.6	8.6	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.986	Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q16C EQUIPMENT I HAVE TO WORK WITH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	6	8.6	8.6	8.6
	2	3	4.3	4.3	12.9
	3	12	17.1	17.1	30.0
VERY SATISFIED	4	22	31.4	31.4	61.4
	5	27	38.6	38.6	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.871	Median	4.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

81

Q16D MY WORKSPACE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	12	17.1	17.1	17.1
	2	9	12.9	12.9	30.0
	3	12	17.1	17.1	47.1
VERY SATISFIED	4	19	27.1	27.1	74.3
	5	18	25.7	25.7	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.314	Median	4.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q16E MY SUPERVISOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	6	8.6	8.6	8.6
	2	3	4.3	4.3	12.9
	3	7	10.0	10.0	22.9
VERY SATISFIED	4	21	30.0	30.0	52.9
	5	31	44.3	44.3	97.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	2	2.9	2.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.143	Median	4.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

98

Q16F OTHER SUPPORT STAFF I WORK WITH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	2	2.9	2.9	2.9
	2	8	11.4	11.4	14.3
	3	24	34.3	34.3	48.6
	4	23	32.9	32.9	81.4
VERY SATISFIED	5	12	17.1	17.1	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.586	Median	4.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q16G OTHER PEOPLE IN MY OFFICE I WORK FOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	2	2.9	2.9	2.9
	2	1	1.4	1.4	4.3
	3	25	35.7	35.7	40.0
	4	22	31.4	31.4	71.4
VERY SATISFIED	5	17	24.3	24.3	95.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	3	4.3	4.3	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.986	Median	4.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

89

Q16H THE SALARY I MAKE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	21	30.0	30.0	30.0
	2	13	18.6	18.6	48.6
	3	26	37.1	37.1	85.7
VERY SATISFIED	4	8	11.4	11.4	97.1
	5	2	2.9	2.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.386 Median 3.000 Mode 3.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q16I TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	7	10.0	10.0	10.0
	2	7	10.0	10.0	20.0
	3	18	25.7	25.7	45.7
VERY SATISFIED	4	26	37.1	37.1	82.9
	5	12	17.1	17.1	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.414 Median 4.000 Mode 4.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q16J THE HOURS THAT I WORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	4	5.7	5.7	5.7
	2	2	2.9	2.9	8.6
	3	7	10.0	10.0	18.6
VERY SATISFIED	4	18	25.7	25.7	44.3
	5	39	55.7	55.7	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.229	Median	5.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q17A I AM GIVEN CHALLENGING ASSIGNMENTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	14	20.0	20.0	20.0
	2	12	17.1	17.1	37.1
	3	15	21.4	21.4	58.6
AGREE STRONGLY	4	12	17.1	17.1	75.7
	5	17	24.3	24.3	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.086	Median	3.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q17B THE AMOUNT OF WORK I AM GIVEN IS FAIR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	8	11.4	11.4	11.4
	2	6	8.6	8.6	20.0
	3	19	27.1	27.1	47.1
AGREE STRONGLY	4	20	28.6	28.6	75.7
	5	17	24.3	24.3	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.457	Median	4.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q17C I MAKE AN IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	2	2.9	2.9	2.9
	2	3	4.3	4.3	7.1
	3	11	15.7	15.7	22.9
AGREE STRONGLY	4	17	24.3	24.3	47.1
	5	37	52.9	52.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.200	Median	5.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q17D MY WORK IS APPRECIATED BY SUPERVISORS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	3	4.3	4.3	4.3
	2	4	5.7	5.7	10.0
	3	8	11.4	11.4	21.4
AGREE STRONGLY	4	26	37.1	37.1	58.6
	5	29	41.4	41.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.057 Median 4.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q17E COMFORTABLE COMMUNICATING WITH SUPERVISOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	5	7.1	7.1	7.1
	2	6	8.6	8.6	15.7
	3	6	8.6	8.6	24.3
AGREE STRONGLY	4	16	22.9	22.9	47.1
	5	37	52.9	52.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.057 Median 5.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q17F THERE IS AMPLE ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	24	34.3	34.3	34.3
	2	18	25.7	25.7	60.0
	3	15	21.4	21.4	81.4
	4	9	12.9	12.9	94.3
AGREE STRONGLY	5	3	4.3	4.3	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.357	Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q17G WORK REQUIRES MORE TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	33	47.1	47.1	47.1
	2	16	22.9	22.9	70.0
	3	12	17.1	17.1	87.1
	4	7	10.0	10.0	97.1
AGREE STRONGLY	5	1	1.4	1.4	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.043	Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q17H AVAILABILITY OF CHILD CARE IS A PROBLEM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	46	65.7	65.7	65.7
	2	4	5.7	5.7	71.4
	3	4	5.7	5.7	77.1
	4	2	2.9	2.9	80.0
AGREE STRONGLY	5	4	5.7	5.7	85.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	10	14.3	14.3	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.629 Median 1.000 Mode 1.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q17I FEEL COMFORTABLE ASKING FOR TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	4	5.7	5.7	5.7
	2	5	7.1	7.1	12.9
	3	6	8.6	8.6	21.4
	4	12	17.1	17.1	38.6
AGREE STRONGLY	5	43	61.4	61.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.214 Median 5.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q17J I HAVE THE BASIC SKILLS I NEED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
	3	3	4.3	4.3	5.7
AGREE STRONGLY	4	18	25.7	25.7	31.4
	5	48	68.6	68.6	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.614	Median	5.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q17K AID IS A PRESTIGIOUS GOVERNMENT AGENCY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	6	8.6	8.6	8.6
	2	8	11.4	11.4	20.0
	3	20	28.6	28.6	48.6
	4	19	27.1	27.1	75.7
AGREE STRONGLY	5	15	21.4	21.4	97.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	2	2.9	2.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.586	Median	4.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

96

Q17L MY WORKSPACE IS TOO NOISY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	28	40.0	40.0	40.0
	2	10	14.3	14.3	54.3
	3	11	15.7	15.7	70.0
	4	12	17.1	17.1	87.1
AGREE STRONGLY	5	9	12.9	12.9	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.486 Median 2.000 Mode 1.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q17M IF NOT SATISFACTORY AM TOLD HOW TO IMPRO

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	8	11.4	11.4	11.4
	2	4	5.7	5.7	17.1
	3	16	22.9	22.9	40.0
	4	14	20.0	20.0	60.0
AGREE STRONGLY	5	22	31.4	31.4	91.4
	9	6	8.6	8.6	100.0
NOT ASCERTAINED					
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.057 Median 4.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

97

Q17N SUPERVISOR IS SUPPORTIVE ABOUT TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
	2	6	8.6	8.6	10.0
	3	11	15.7	15.7	25.7
	4	12	17.1	17.1	42.9
AGREE STRONGLY	5	38	54.3	54.3	97.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	2	2.9	2.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.314	Median	5.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q17O I AM TREATED WITH RESPECT BY SUPERVISOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	4	5.7	5.7	5.7
	2	3	4.3	4.3	10.0
	3	6	8.6	8.6	18.6
	4	13	18.6	18.6	37.1
AGREE STRONGLY	5	44	62.9	62.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.286	Median	5.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

CF

Q18A LATE - TRAFFIC OR TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	36	51.4	51.4	51.4
NO	2	34	48.6	48.6	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.486	Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q18B LATE - WEATHER PROBLEMS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	35	50.0	50.0	50.0
NO	2	35	50.0	50.0	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.500	Median	1.500	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q18C LATE - SICK CHILDREN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	16	22.9	22.9	22.9
NO	2	53	75.7	75.7	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.871	Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

99

Q18D LATE - CHILD CARE PROBLEMS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	7	10.0	10.0	10.0
NO	2	62	88.6	88.6	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.000	Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q18E LATE - OTHER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SICK RELATIVES	1	2	2.9	2.9	2.9
FATIGUE-OVERSLEEP	2	2	2.9	2.9	5.7
HOUSEHOLD EMERG	3	2	2.9	2.9	8.6
TEACHER CONFERENCE	4	1	1.4	1.4	10.0
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	63	90.0	90.0	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	8.329	Median	9.000	Mode	9.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

187

Q19MEN1 CHANGES NEEDED TO INCREASE SAT-MEN1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE-ENJOY MY JOB	0	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
MORE MONEY	1	8	11.4	11.4	12.9
ADVANCEMENT OPP	2	22	31.4	31.4	44.3
MORE CHALLENGE-RESP	3	7	10.0	10.0	54.3
MORE TRAINING	4	6	8.6	8.6	62.9
INCENTIVE PROGRAM	5	1	1.4	1.4	64.3
BETTER WORKSPACE	6	2	2.9	2.9	67.1
WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTIO	7	6	8.6	8.6	75.7
MORE RESPECT-APPREC	8	3	4.3	4.3	80.0
BETTER EQUIPMENT	9	1	1.4	1.4	81.4
FLEXITIME-HOURS	10	1	1.4	1.4	82.9
BETTER MORALE-COMM	11	8	11.4	11.4	94.3
FAIRNESS-FAIR PERS	13	1	1.4	1.4	95.7
OTHER	98	2	2.9	2.9	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	8.500	Median	3.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

101

Q19MEN2 CHANGES NEEDED TO INCREASE SAT-MEN2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MORE MONEY	1	3	4.3	4.3	4.3
ADVANCEMENT OPP	2	6	8.6	8.6	12.9
MORE CHALLENGE-RESP	3	5	7.1	7.1	20.0
MORE TRAINING	4	2	2.9	2.9	22.9
INCENTIVE PROGRAM	5	2	2.9	2.9	25.7
BETTER WORKSPACE	6	4	5.7	5.7	31.4
WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTIO	7	3	4.3	4.3	35.7
MORE RESPECT-APPREC	8	8	11.4	11.4	47.1
BETTER EQUIPMENT	9	2	2.9	2.9	50.0
BETTER MORALE-COMM	11	6	8.6	8.6	58.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	29	41.4	41.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	44.457	Median	10.000	Mode	99.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

102

Q19MEN3 CHANGES NEEDED TO INCREASE SAT-MEN3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MORE MONEY	1	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
ADVANCEMENT OPP	2	1	1.4	1.4	2.9
MORE CHALLENGE-RESP	3	1	1.4	1.4	4.3
MORE TRAINING	4	2	2.9	2.9	7.1
INCENTIVE PROGRAM	5	3	4.3	4.3	11.4
BETTER WORKSPACE	6	1	1.4	1.4	12.9
MORE RESPECT-APPREC	8	4	5.7	5.7	18.6
BETTER EQUIPMENT	9	1	1.4	1.4	20.0
FLEXITIME-HOURS	10	1	1.4	1.4	21.4
BETTER MORALE-COMM	11	2	2.9	2.9	24.3
FAIRNESS-FAIR PERS	13	1	1.4	1.4	25.7
INSTALL OFF PRAC	15	1	1.4	1.4	27.1
OTHER	98	1	1.4	1.4	28.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	50	71.4	71.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	74.057	Median	99.000	Mode	99.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q19MEN4 CHANGES NEEDED TO INCREASE SAT-MEN4

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MORE MONEY	1	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
ADVANCEMENT OPP	2	1	1.4	1.4	2.9
MORE TRAINING	4	1	1.4	1.4	4.3
BETTER WORKSPACE	6	1	1.4	1.4	5.7
MORE RESPECT-APPREC	8	2	2.9	2.9	8.6
OTHER	98	1	1.4	1.4	10.0
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	63	90.0	90.0	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	90.914	Median	99.000	Mode	99.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

103

Q20MEN1 CHANGES NEEDED TO INCREASE PROD-MEN1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE-AM PRODUCTIVE	0	13	18.6	18.6	18.6
MORE MONEY	1	1	1.4	1.4	20.0
ADVANCEMENT OPP	2	4	5.7	5.7	25.7
MORE CHALLENGE-RESP	3	2	2.9	2.9	28.6
MORE TRAINING	4	6	8.6	8.6	37.1
BETTER WORKSPACE	6	5	7.1	7.1	44.3
WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTIO	7	6	8.6	8.6	52.9
MORE RESPECT-APPREC	8	1	1.4	1.4	54.3
BETTER EQUIPMENT	9	7	10.0	10.0	64.3
FLEXITIME-HOURS	10	1	1.4	1.4	65.7
BETTER MORALE-COMM	11	6	8.6	8.6	74.3
EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION	12	1	1.4	1.4	75.7
SUFFICIENT TIMEFRAME	13	2	2.9	2.9	78.6
MORE WORK-NOT BUSY	14	1	1.4	1.4	80.0
LESS TEACHING SUP ST	15	1	1.4	1.4	81.4
ME-MORE ENTHUSIASTIC	16	1	1.4	1.4	82.9
STREAMLINE PROCED	17	1	1.4	1.4	84.3
HOPE COMP SYS WILL	18	1	1.4	1.4	85.7
PHONE-INTERRUPTIONS	19	1	1.4	1.4	87.1
COLLEGE EDUC	21	1	1.4	1.4	88.6
OTHER	98	1	1.4	1.4	90.0
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	7	10.0	10.0	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	17.243	Median	7.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q20MEN2 CHANGES NEEDED TO INCREASE PROD-MEN2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ADVANCEMENT OPP	2	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
MORE TRAINING	4	3	4.3	4.3	5.7
MORE RESPECT-APPREC	8	1	1.4	1.4	7.1
BETTER EQUIPMENT	9	3	4.3	4.3	11.4
FLEXITIME-HOURS	10	1	1.4	1.4	12.9
BETTER MORALE-COMM	11	1	1.4	1.4	14.3
EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION	12	1	1.4	1.4	15.7
SUFFICIENT TIMEFRAME	13	1	1.4	1.4	17.1
PHONE-INTERRUPTIONS	19	2	2.9	2.9	20.0
TRN MGRS CORRES FORM	20	1	1.4	1.4	21.4
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	55	78.6	78.6	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 79.971 Median 99.000 Mode 99.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q20MEN3 CHANGES NEEDED TO INCREASE PROD-MEN3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MORE TRAINING	4	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
BETTER WORKSPACE	6	1	1.4	1.4	2.9
WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTIO	7	1	1.4	1.4	4.3
SUFFICIENT TIMEFRAME	13	1	1.4	1.4	5.7
STREAMLINE PROCED	17	1	1.4	1.4	7.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	92	1	1.4	1.4	8.6
	99	64	91.4	91.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 92.500 Median 99.000 Mode 99.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

105

Q21 WILL BE WORKING FOR AID IN ONE YEAR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	45	64.3	64.3	64.3
NO	2	23	32.9	32.9	97.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	2	2.9	2.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.557	Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q21A WHY WILL YOU LEAVE AID

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	47	67.1	67.1	67.1
PROMOTN OPPORTUNITY	1	13	18.6	18.6	85.7
RETIREMENT-HEALTH	2	2	2.9	2.9	88.6
MORE MONEY-SALARY	3	4	5.7	5.7	94.3
MORE EDUCATION	7	1	1.4	1.4	95.7
OTHER	8	1	1.4	1.4	97.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	2	2.9	2.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	.886	Median	.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q21B WHERE WILL YOU BE WORKING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	47	67.1	67.1	67.1
OTHER GOVT AGENCY	1	7	10.0	10.0	77.1
PRIVATE SECTOR	2	6	8.6	8.6	85.7
NOT IN WORK FORCE	3	3	4.3	4.3	90.0
OTHER	4	6	8.6	8.6	98.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	.871	Median	.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q22A LEAVE - WANTED TO MAKE MORE MONEY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	3	2	2.9	2.9	2.9
	4	5	7.1	7.1	10.0
VERY IMPORTANT	5	59	84.3	84.3	94.3
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	4	5.7	5.7	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	5.100	Median	5.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q22B LEAVE - CHANGE IN FAMILY CIRCUMSTANCES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT VERY IMPORTANT	1	18	25.7	25.7	25.7
	2	10	14.3	14.3	40.0
	3	18	25.7	25.7	65.7
VERY IMPORTANT	4	6	8.6	8.6	74.3
	5	9	12.9	12.9	87.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	9	12.9	12.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.457	Median	3.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q22C LEAVE - DISSATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT VERY IMPORTANT	1	3	4.3	4.3	4.3
	2	8	11.4	11.4	15.7
	3	11	15.7	15.7	31.4
	4	9	12.9	12.9	44.3
VERY IMPORTANT	5	32	45.7	45.7	90.0
	9	7	10.0	10.0	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.443	Median	5.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q22D LEAVE - ANOTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT VERY IMPORTANT	1	12	17.1	17.1	17.1
	2	10	14.3	14.3	31.4
	3	12	17.1	17.1	48.6
	4	11	15.7	15.7	64.3
VERY IMPORTANT	5	17	24.3	24.3	88.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	8	11.4	11.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.843 Median 4.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q22E LEAVE - WANTED TO WORK IN PRIVATE SECTOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT VERY IMPORTANT	1	9	12.9	12.9	12.9
	2	5	7.1	7.1	20.0
	3	9	12.9	12.9	32.9
	4	16	22.9	22.9	55.7
VERY IMPORTANT	5	23	32.9	32.9	88.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	8	11.4	11.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.243 Median 4.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

109

Q22F LEAVE - WANTED MORE TRAINING OPPORTUNITI

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT VERY IMPORTANT	1	24	34.3	34.3	34.3
	2	6	8.6	8.6	42.9
	3	11	15.7	15.7	58.6
	4	5	7.1	7.1	65.7
VERY IMPORTANT	5	15	21.4	21.4	87.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	9	12.9	12.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.500	Median	3.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q22G LEAVE - WANTED ADVANCEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY IMPORTANT	2	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
	3	3	4.3	4.3	5.7
	4	5	7.1	7.1	12.9
	5	55	78.6	78.6	91.4
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	6	8.6	8.6	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	5.143	Median	5.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

110

Q22H LEAVE - OTHER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT VERY IMPORTANT	1	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
	4	1	1.4	1.4	2.9
VERY IMPORTANT	5	9	12.9	12.9	15.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	59	84.3	84.3	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 8.300 Median 9.000 Mode 9.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q23 WHERE EXPECT TO BE IN FIVE YEARS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
GOVT-SUPP-SAME GS	1	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
GOVT-SUPP-HIGHER GS	2	22	31.4	31.4	32.9
GOVT-PROFESSIONAL	3	24	34.3	34.3	67.1
PRIV SECTOR-SUPPORT	4	1	1.4	1.4	68.6
PRIV SECTOR-PROF	5	4	5.7	5.7	74.3
NOT IN WORK FORCE	6	8	11.4	11.4	85.7
OTHER	7	10	14.3	14.3	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.700 Median 3.000 Mode 3.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

111

Q24MEN1 THING I LIKE MOST ABOUT MY JOB-MEN1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOTHING	0	2	2.9	2.9	2.9
RESPONSIBILITY-TRUST	1	14	20.0	20.0	22.9
LIKE PEOPLE-TEAM	2	23	32.9	32.9	55.7
HOURS I WORK	3	4	5.7	5.7	61.4
JOB IN GENERAL-WORK	4	10	14.3	14.3	75.7
TRNG OPPORTUNITIES	5	1	1.4	1.4	77.1
NICE WORKSPACE	6	1	1.4	1.4	78.6
DIVERSITY-VARIETY	7	7	10.0	10.0	88.6
CHALLENGE-LEARNING	8	4	5.7	5.7	94.3
BENEFITS	9	1	1.4	1.4	95.7
BEING APPRECIATED	11	1	1.4	1.4	97.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	2	2.9	2.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 6.029 Median 2.000 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q24MEN2 THING I LIKE MOST ABOUT MY JOB-MEN2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RESPONSIBILITY-TRUST	1	3	4.3	4.3	4.3
LIKE PEOPLE-TEAM	2	4	5.7	5.7	10.0
HOURS I WORK	3	2	2.9	2.9	12.9
JOB IN GENERAL-WORK	4	8	11.4	11.4	24.3
TRNG OPPORTUNITIES	5	1	1.4	1.4	25.7
NICE WORKSPACE	6	3	4.3	4.3	30.0
DIVERSITY-VARIETY	7	1	1.4	1.4	31.4
CHALLENGE-LEARNING	8	9	12.9	12.9	44.3
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	39	55.7	55.7	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 57.314 Median 99.000 Mode 99.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q24MEN3 THING I LIKE MOST ABOUT MY JOB-MEN3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RESPONSIBILITY-TRUST	1	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
HOURS I WORK	3	1	1.4	1.4	2.9
JOB IN GENERAL-WORK	4	1	1.4	1.4	4.3
TRNG OPPORTUNITIES	5	1	1.4	1.4	5.7
CHALLENGE-LEARNING	8	2	2.9	2.9	8.6
BENEFITS	9	1	1.4	1.4	10.0
GOOD EQUIPMENT	10	1	1.4	1.4	11.4
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	62	88.6	88.6	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	88.371	Median	99.000	Mode	99.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q25MEN1 THING I LIKE LEAST ABOUT MY JOB-MEN1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOTHING-LIKE JOB	0	2	2.9	2.9	2.9
NO PROMOTN POTENTIAL	1	15	21.4	21.4	24.3
BORING-DULL	2	10	14.3	14.3	38.6
HOURS-NO FLEXITIME	3	2	2.9	2.9	41.4
TOO MUCH WORK	4	9	12.9	12.9	54.3
MONEY-NO INCENTIVE	5	3	4.3	4.3	58.6
MY SUPERVISOR	6	1	1.4	1.4	60.0
MY WORKSPACE	7	2	2.9	2.9	62.9
POOR OFFICE ENVIRON	8	6	8.6	8.6	71.4
TRNG OTHER SEC	9	2	2.9	2.9	74.3
POOR QUALITY STAFF	10	2	2.9	2.9	77.1
POOR EQUIPMENT	11	1	1.4	1.4	78.6
ANSWERING PHONE	12	2	2.9	2.9	81.4
OTHER	98	9	12.9	12.9	94.3
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	4	5.7	5.7	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	21.586	Median	4.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q25MEN2 THING I LIKE LEAST ABOUT MY JOB-MEN2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
BORING-DULL	2	3	4.3	4.3	4.3
HOURS-NO FLEXTIME	3	1	1.4	1.4	5.7
TOO MUCH WORK	4	5	7.1	7.1	12.9
MONEY-NO INCENTIVE	5	5	7.1	7.1	20.0
MY SUPERVISOR	6	1	1.4	1.4	21.4
MY WORKSPACE	7	2	2.9	2.9	24.3
POOR QUALITY STAFF	10	1	1.4	1.4	25.7
ANSWERING PHONE	12	1	1.4	1.4	27.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	51	72.9	72.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	73.500	Median	99.000	Mode	99.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

Q25MEN3 THING I LIKE LEAST ABOUT MY JOB-MEN3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
TOO MUCH WORK	4	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
POOR OFFICE ENVIRON	8	2	2.9	2.9	4.3
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	67	95.7	95.7	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	95.043	Median	99.000	Mode	99.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

114

Q26MEN1 THING LIKE MOST ABOUT SUPERVISOR-MEN1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOTHING	0	4	5.7	5.7	5.7
RESPECT-INDEPENDENT	1	10	14.3	14.3	20.0
GOOD COMMUNICATION	2	11	15.7	15.7	35.7
GD PERSONALITY TRAIT	3	26	37.1	37.1	72.9
PROFESSIONAL TRAITS	4	8	11.4	11.4	84.3
CHALLENGE-RESPONSIBL	6	1	1.4	1.4	85.7
FAIRNESS	8	4	5.7	5.7	91.4
SUPPORT-ENCOURAGE	9	2	2.9	2.9	94.3
FEEDBACK	10	1	1.4	1.4	95.7
ALLOWS ME TRAINING	11	1	1.4	1.4	97.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	2	2.9	2.9	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 5.957 Median 3.000 Mode 3.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q26MEN2 THING LIKE MOST ABOUT SUPERVISOR-MEN2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RESPECT-INDEPENDENT	1	4	5.7	5.7	5.7
GOOD COMMUNICATION	2	6	8.6	8.6	14.3
GD PERSONALITY TRAIT	3	6	8.6	8.6	22.9
PROFESSIONAL TRAITS	4	3	4.3	4.3	27.1
APPRECIATION-PRAISE	5	2	2.9	2.9	30.0
CHALLENGE-RESPONSIBL	6	2	2.9	2.9	32.9
CLEAR ASSIGNMENTS	7	1	1.4	1.4	34.3
FAIRNESS	8	2	2.9	2.9	37.1
SUPPORT-ENCOURAGE	9	3	4.3	4.3	41.4
FEEDBACK	10	4	5.7	5.7	47.1
ALLOWS ME TRAINING	11	2	2.9	2.9	50.0
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	35	50.0	50.0	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 52.071 Median 55.000 Mode 99.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

115

Q26MEN3 THING LIKE MOST ABOUT SUPERVISOR-MEN3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RESPECT-INDEPENDENT	1	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
GOOD COMMUNICATION	2	2	2.9	2.9	4.3
GD PERSONALITY TRAIT	3	2	2.9	2.9	7.1
PROFESSIONAL TRAITS	4	1	1.4	1.4	8.6
APPRECIATION-PRAISE	5	2	2.9	2.9	11.4
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	62	88.6	88.6	100.0

TOTAL 70 100.0 100.0

Mean 88.043 Median 99.000 Mode 99.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q27MEN1 THING LIKE LEAST ABOUT SUPERVISOR-MEN1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOTHING-NO PROBLEMS	0	18	25.7	25.7	25.7
DOESNT KEEP INFORMD	1	5	7.1	7.1	32.9
DSNT ENCOURAGE ADVAN	2	5	7.1	7.1	40.0
POOR PLANNING-PROCR	3	6	8.6	8.6	48.6
DSNT SUPPT HIGHER PA	4	2	2.9	2.9	51.4
AVOIDS CONFRONTATION	5	8	11.4	11.4	62.9
NO FEEDBACK	6	2	2.9	2.9	65.7
LOOKS OVER SHOULDER	7	1	1.4	1.4	67.1
POOR PERSONALITY	8	5	7.1	7.1	74.3
DSNT GIVE RESPONSIB	9	3	4.3	4.3	78.6
POLITICALLY MOTIVATE	10	1	1.4	1.4	80.0
STRESS-PRESSURE BEHA	11	3	4.3	4.3	84.3
DOESNT APPRECIATE	14	3	4.3	4.3	88.6
DSNT SUPPORT TRNG	16	1	1.4	1.4	90.0
DSNT UNDERST CHILDR	17	1	1.4	1.4	91.4
OTHER	98	2	2.9	2.9	94.3
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	4	5.7	5.7	100.0

TOTAL 70 100.0 100.0

Mean 12.529 Median 4.000 Mode .000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

1/6

Q27MEN2 THING LIKE LEAST ABOUT SUPERVISOR-MEN2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DSNT ENCOURAGE ADVAN	2	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
NO FEEDBACK	6	1	1.4	1.4	2.9
POOR PERSONALITY	8	3	4.3	4.3	7.1
STRESS-PRESSURE BEHA	11	2	2.9	2.9	10.0
PERS PROBS TO OFFICE	12	1	1.4	1.4	11.4
NEEDS SUPERVIS TNG	15	2	2.9	2.9	14.3
DSNT SUPPORT TRNG	16	1	1.4	1.4	15.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	59	84.3	84.3	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 85.043 Median 99.000 Mode 99.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q27MEN3 THING LIKE LEAST ABOUT SUPERVISOR-MEN3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
POOR PLANNING-PROCR	3	1	1.4	1.4	1.4
AVOIDS CONFRONTATION	5	1	1.4	1.4	2.9
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	68	97.1	97.1	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 96.286 Median 99.000 Mode 99.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q29 SEX

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MALE	1	4	5.7	5.7	5.7
FEMALE	2	59	84.3	84.3	90.0
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	7	10.0	10.0	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.643 Median 2.000 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

Q30 AGE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
UNDER 20	1	2	2.9	2.9	2.9
20-24	2	7	10.0	10.0	12.9
25-29	3	7	10.0	10.0	22.9
30-39	4	12	17.1	17.1	40.0
40-49	5	16	22.9	22.9	62.9
50-59	6	13	18.6	18.6	81.4
60 OR OVER	7	5	7.1	7.1	88.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	8	11.4	11.4	100.0
TOTAL		70	100.0	100.0	

Mean 5.000 Median 5.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 0

118

Q31 RACE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CAUCASIAN	1	21	30.0	30.0	30.0
BLACK	2	38	54.3	54.3	84.3
ASIAN	3	1	1.4	1.4	85.7
HISPANIC ORIGIN	4	1	1.4	1.4	87.1
OTHER	5	1	1.4	1.4	88.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	8	11.4	11.4	100.0
	TOTAL	70	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.586	Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	0		

119

ANNEX 7

**SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS**

Q1 HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Value Label	Value	Frequenc	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD	2	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
BUS OR SEC SCHOOL	3	5	6.4	6.4	7.7
AA DEGREE	4	2	2.6	2.6	10.3
BA OR BS DEGREE	5	17	21.8	21.8	32.1
MASTER DEGREE OR MOR	6	50	64.1	64.1	96.2
OTHER	7	3	3.8	3.8	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 5.526 Median 6.000 Mode 6.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q2 YEAR START WORKING AT AID

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1-4 YEARS	1	8	10.3	10.3	10.3
5-9 YEARS	2	8	10.3	10.3	20.5
10-19 YEARS	3	24	30.8	30.8	51.3
20 OR MORE YEARS	4	38	48.7	48.7	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.179 Median 3.000 Mode 4.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q3 ARE YOU FS GS OR AD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
FS	1	26	33.3	33.3	33.3
GS	2	48	61.5	61.5	94.9
AD	3	3	3.8	3.8	98.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.795 Median 2.000 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q3A CURRENT GRADE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	8	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
	9	1	1.3	1.3	2.6
	12	1	1.3	1.3	3.8
	13	8	10.3	10.3	14.1
	14	14	17.9	17.9	32.1
	15	22	28.2	28.2	60.3
	16	31	39.7	39.7	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 14.808 Median 15.000 Mode 16.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q4 YEARS SPENT IN FIELD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE	0	46	59.0	59.0	59.0
1-4 YEARS	1	6	7.7	7.7	66.7
5-9 YEARS	2	6	7.7	7.7	74.4
10-14 YEARS	3	13	16.7	16.7	91.0
15 OR MORE YEARS	4	7	9.0	9.0	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.090	Median	.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q5 LARGEST NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES SUPERVISED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0-4 EMPLOYEES	1	6	7.7	7.7	7.7
5-9 EMPLOYEES	2	18	23.1	23.1	30.8
10-19 EMPLOYEES	3	21	26.9	26.9	57.7
20 THRU 49 EMPLOYEES	4	17	21.8	21.8	79.5
50 OR MORE EMPLOYEES	5	16	20.5	20.5	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.244	Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q6 CLERK TYPISTS CURRENTLY SUPERVISE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	36	46.2	46.2	46.2
	1	26	33.3	33.3	79.5
	2	13	16.7	16.7	96.2
	3	1	1.3	1.3	97.4
	4	1	1.3	1.3	98.7
	5	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
	TOTAL	78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	.821	Median	1.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q7 SECRETARIES CURRENTLY SUPERVISE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	16	20.5	20.5	20.5
	1	49	62.8	62.8	83.3
	2	9	11.5	11.5	94.9
	3	2	2.6	2.6	97.4
	4	1	1.3	1.3	98.7
	5	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
	TOTAL	78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.051	Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

124

Q8 YEARS BEEN A SUPERVISOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1-4 YEARS	1	8	10.3	10.3	10.3
5-9 YEARS	2	19	24.4	24.4	34.6
10-19 YEARS	3	34	43.6	43.6	78.2
20 OR MORE YEARS	4	17	21.8	21.8	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.769	Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q9 YEARS BEEN SUPERVISOR IN AID-WASHINGTON

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0-2 YEARS	1	17	21.8	21.8	21.8
3-5 YEARS	2	17	21.8	21.8	43.6
6-9 YEARS	3	14	17.9	17.9	61.5
10 OR MORE YEARS	4	30	38.5	38.5	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.731	Median	3.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

125

Q10 OVERALL RELATIONSHIP WITH SUPPORT STAFF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	30	38.5	38.5	38.5
GOOD	2	43	55.1	55.1	93.6
FAIR	3	4	5.1	5.1	98.7
POOR	4	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.692	Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q11 RECEIVED TRAINING IN HOW TO SUPERVISE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	59	75.6	75.6	75.6
NO	2	19	24.4	24.4	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.244	Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

-126

Q11AA SUPERVISORS ROLE IN PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	19	24.4	24.4	24.4
YES	1	37	47.4	47.4	71.8
NO	2	22	28.2	28.2	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.038	Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q11AB BASIC SUPERVISORY SKILLS WORKSHOP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	19	24.4	24.4	24.4
YES	1	19	24.4	24.4	48.7
NO	2	40	51.3	51.3	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.269	Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q11AC SENIOR MANAGEMENT TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	19	24.4	24.4	24.4
YES	1	20	25.6	25.6	50.0
NO	2	38	48.7	48.7	98.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.346 Median 1.500 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q11AD OPM OR AMA COURSES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	19	24.4	24.4	24.4
YES	1	10	12.8	12.8	37.2
NO	2	48	61.5	61.5	98.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.474 Median 2.000 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

128

Q11AE OTHER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	19	24.4	24.4	24.4
YES	1	13	16.7	16.7	41.0
NO	2	45	57.7	57.7	98.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.436 Median 2.000 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q11B HOW HELPFUL WAS THIS TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	19	24.4	24.4	24.4
VERY HELPFUL	1	27	34.6	34.6	59.0
SOMEWHAT HELPFUL	2	30	38.5	38.5	97.4
NOT AT ALL HELPFUL	3	2	2.6	2.6	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.192 Median 1.000 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q12A OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH SUPPORT STAFF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
	2	12	15.4	15.4	16.7
	3	26	33.3	33.3	50.0
VERY SATISFIED	4	28	35.9	35.9	85.9
	5	11	14.1	14.1	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.462	Median	3.500	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q12B OVERALL QUALITY OF SUPPORT STAFF WORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
	2	14	17.9	17.9	19.2
	3	26	33.3	33.3	52.6
VERY SATISFIED	4	27	34.6	34.6	87.2
	5	10	12.8	12.8	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.397	Median	3.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

130

Q12C TIMELINESS OF SUPPORT STAFF WORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	2	2.6	2.6	2.6
	2	11	14.1	14.1	16.7
	3	24	30.8	30.8	47.4
VERY SATISFIED	4	25	32.1	32.1	79.5
	5	16	20.5	20.5	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.538	Median	4.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q12D AMOUNT OF WORK ACCOMPLISHED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
	2	10	12.8	12.8	14.1
	3	25	32.1	32.1	46.2
VERY SATISFIED	4	26	33.3	33.3	79.5
	5	16	20.5	20.5	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.590	Median	4.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q12E SUPPORT STAFF ATTENDANCE RECORD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
	2	22	28.2	28.2	29.5
	3	15	19.2	19.2	48.7
VERY SATISFIED	4	17	21.8	21.8	70.5
	5	23	29.5	29.5	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.500 Median 4.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q12F SUPPORT STAFF PUNCTUALITY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT SATISFIED	1	4	5.1	5.1	5.1
	2	14	17.9	17.9	23.1
	3	23	29.5	29.5	52.6
VERY SATISFIED	4	15	19.2	19.2	71.8
	5	22	28.2	28.2	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.474 Median 3.000 Mode 3.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

013 EXPECT TURNOVER IN NEXT YEAR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	48	61.5	61.5	61.5
NO	2	30	38.5	38.5	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.385	Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q13A WHY WILL THEY LEAVE AID

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CAREER ADVANCEMENT	1	17	21.8	35.4	35.4
PROMOTION IN AID	2	3	3.8	6.3	41.7
RETIREMENT	3	3	3.8	6.3	47.9
MORE MONEY	4	6	7.7	12.5	60.4
WANTS PT WORK	5	1	1.3	2.1	62.5
GEN UNHAPPY-MULTIPLE	6	8	10.3	16.7	79.2
REMOVING EMP	7	2	2.6	4.2	83.3
OTHER	8	8	10.3	16.7	100.0
	.	30	38.5	MISSING	
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.896	Median	4.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	48	Missing Cases	30		

Q14A SUPPORT STAFF MAKES IMP CONTRIBUTION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
	2	2	2.6	2.6	3.8
	3	10	12.8	12.8	16.7
AGREE STRONGLY	4	23	29.5	29.5	46.2
	5	42	53.8	53.8	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.321	Median	5.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q14B TASKS I GIVE SUPP STAFF ARE CHALLENGING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE STRONGLY	2	10	12.8	13.0	13.0
	3	27	34.6	35.1	48.1
	4	31	39.7	40.3	88.3
	5	9	11.5	11.7	100.0
	.	1	1.3	MISSING	
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.506	Median	4.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	77	Missing Cases	1		

134

Q14C SUPPORT STAFF FEELS APPRECIATED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2	4	5.1	5.1	5.1
	3	27	34.6	34.6	39.7
AGREE STRONGLY	4	38	48.7	48.7	88.5
	5	9	11.5	11.5	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.667	Median	4.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q14D RESPONSIBLE FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2	3	3.8	3.8	3.8
	3	2	2.6	2.6	6.4
AGREE STRONGLY	4	36	46.2	46.2	52.6
	5	37	47.4	47.4	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.372	Median	4.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q14E SUPP STAFF HAS A PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	3	3.8	3.8	3.8
	2	13	16.7	16.7	20.5
	3	21	26.9	26.9	47.4
AGREE STRONGLY	4	20	25.6	25.6	73.1
	5	21	26.9	26.9	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.551	Median	4.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q14F SUPP STAFF INCLUDED IN STAFF MEETINGS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
	2	2	2.6	2.6	3.8
	3	14	17.9	17.9	21.8
AGREE STRONGLY	4	22	28.2	28.2	50.0
	5	39	50.0	50.0	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.231	Median	4.500	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

136

Q14G COMFORTABLE COMMUNICATING WITH SUPP STF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2	3	3.8	3.8	3.8
	3	10	12.8	12.8	16.7
AGREE STRONGLY	4	32	41.0	41.0	57.7
	5	33	42.3	42.3	100.0
	TOTAL	78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.218 Median 4.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q14H SUPPORT STAFF HAS BASIC SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	3	3.8	3.8	3.8
	2	14	17.9	17.9	21.8
	3	16	20.5	20.5	42.3
AGREE STRONGLY	4	23	29.5	29.5	71.8
	5	22	28.2	28.2	100.0
	TOTAL	78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.603 Median 4.000 Mode 4.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

137

Q14I IF NOT SATISFACTORY TELL HOW TO IMPROVE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
	3	7	9.0	9.0	10.3
AGREE STRONGLY	4	33	42.3	42.3	52.6
	5	37	47.4	47.4	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.359 Median 4.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q14J SUPPORTIVE WHEN WANT TO TAKE TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	4	17	21.8	21.8	21.8
AGREE STRONGLY	5	61	78.2	78.2	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.782 Median 5.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

138

Q14K PLEASSED WITH QUALITY OF APPLICANTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISAGREE STRONGLY	1	18	23.1	25.7	25.7
	2	27	34.6	38.6	64.3
	3	17	21.8	24.3	88.6
AGREE STRONGLY	4	5	6.4	7.1	95.7
	5	3	3.8	4.3	100.0
	.	8	10.3	MISSING	
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.257	Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	70	Missing Cases	8		

Q15 AID OFFER ENOUGH TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	54	69.2	69.2	69.2
NO	2	24	30.8	30.8	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.308	Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q15AMEN1 WHAT TRAINING SHOULD BE AVAILABLE-MEN 1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	54	69.2	69.2	69.2
BASIC EDUCATION	1	8	10.3	10.3	79.5
OFFICE PROCEDURES	2	4	5.1	5.1	84.6
TECHNICAL SKILLS	3	3	3.8	3.8	88.5
INTRO TO AID AND GOV	5	2	2.6	2.6	91.0
PROF UPWARD MOBILITY	7	1	1.3	1.3	92.3
OTHER	8	6	7.7	7.7	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.154	Median	.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q15AMEN2 WHAT TRAINING SHOULD BE AVAILABLE-MEN 2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	54	69.2	69.2	69.2
OFFICE PROCEDURES	2	4	5.1	5.1	74.4
TECHNICAL SKILLS	3	3	3.8	3.8	78.2
CAREER ADVANCEMENT	4	2	2.6	2.6	80.8
INTRO TO AID AND GOV	5	2	2.6	2.6	83.3
OTHER	8	1	1.3	1.3	84.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	12	15.4	15.4	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.936	Median	.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

140

Q15AMEN3 WHAT TRAINING SHOULD BE AVAILABLE-MEN 3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT APPLICABLE	0	54	69.2	69.2	69.2
OFFICE PROCEDURES	2	1	1.3	1.3	70.5
INTRO TO AID AND GOV	5	1	1.3	1.3	71.8
FURTHER FORMAL ED	6	1	1.3	1.3	73.1
OTHER	8	4	5.1	5.1	78.2
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	17	21.8	21.8	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.538	Median	.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q16 NOMINATED SUPPORT STAFF FOR CASH AWARD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	63	80.8	80.8	80.8
NO	2	15	19.2	19.2	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.192	Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

141

Q17MEN1 IMPROVEMENTS OR CHANGES NEEDED-MEN 1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO IMPROVEMENTS	0	2	2.6	2.6	2.6
BETTER PAY-UPGRADE	1	14	17.9	17.9	20.5
BETTER RECRUITING	2	6	7.7	7.7	28.2
BETTER EQUIPMENT	3	6	7.7	7.7	35.9
REMOVE POOR WORKERS	4	2	2.6	2.6	38.5
PROMOTION OPP	5	6	7.7	7.7	46.2
MANAGER REWARDS	6	2	2.6	2.6	48.7
INCENTIVES	7	1	1.3	1.3	50.0
MORE TRAINING-GEN	0	4	5.1	5.1	55.1
TRNG-BASIC EDUC	1	3	3.8	3.8	59.0
TRNG-TECHNICAL	12	1	1.3	1.3	60.3
TRNG-OFFICE PROC	13	1	1.3	1.3	61.5
SUPERVISOR TRNG-RESP	20	7	9.0	9.0	70.5
INVOLVE SUPP STAFF	21	2	2.6	2.6	73.1
BETTER COORDINATION	31	1	1.3	1.3	74.4
MORE STAFF	32	7	9.0	9.0	83.3
WORK ETHIC-ATTITUDE	40	9	11.5	11.5	94.9
RESPECT/THANK SUPP S	50	1	1.3	1.3	96.2
CHANGING ROLE OF SEC	60	1	1.3	1.3	97.4
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	2	2.6	2.6	100.0

TOTAL	78	100.0	100.0
-------	----	-------	-------

Mean 16.718 Median 8.500 Mode 1.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

142

Q17MEN2 IMPROVEMENTS OR CHANGES NEEDED-MEN 2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
BETTER PAY-UPGRADE	1	12	15.4	15.4	15.4
BETTER RECRUITING	2	8	10.3	10.3	25.6
BETTER EQUIPMENT	3	2	2.6	2.6	28.2
PROMOTION OPP	5	3	3.8	3.8	32.1
MANAGER REWARDS	6	1	1.3	1.3	33.3
INCENTIVES	7	7	9.0	9.0	42.3
MORE TRAINING-GEN	10	7	9.0	9.0	51.3
TRNG-OFFICE PROC	13	1	1.3	1.3	52.6
SUPERVISOR TRNG-RESP	20	2	2.6	2.6	55.1
INVOLVE SUPP STAFF	21	2	2.6	2.6	57.7
USE TEMP-TYPING POOL	30	1	1.3	1.3	59.0
MORE STAFF	32	2	2.6	2.6	61.5
MORE PROG OP ASSTS	34	1	1.3	1.3	62.8
WORK ETHIC-ATTITUDE	40	2	2.6	2.6	65.4
RESPECT/THANK SUPP S	50	1	1.3	1.3	66.7
CHANGING ROLE OF SEC	60	2	2.6	2.6	69.2
OTHER	98	1	1.3	1.3	70.5
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	23	29.5	29.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 38.744 Median 10.000 Mode 99.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

143

Q17MEN3 IMPROVEMENTS OR CHANGES NEEDED-MEN 3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
BETTER PAY-UPGRADE	1	3	3.8	3.8	3.8
BETTER RECRUITING	2	3	3.8	3.8	7.7
REMOVE POOR WORKERS	4	1	1.3	1.3	9.0
PROMOTION OPP	5	4	5.1	5.1	14.1
INCENTIVES	7	2	2.6	2.6	16.7
EQUAL DIST WORK	8	1	1.3	1.3	17.9
MORE TRAINING-GEN	10	2	2.6	2.6	20.5
SUPERVISOR TRNG-RESP	20	5	6.4	6.4	26.9
USE TEMP-TYPING POOL	30	1	1.3	1.3	28.2
BETTER COORDINATION	31	1	1.3	1.3	29.5
MORE STAFF	32	3	3.8	3.8	33.3
MORE PROG OP ASSTS	34	1	1.3	1.3	34.6
WORK ETHIC-ATTITUDE	40	1	1.3	1.3	35.9
RESPECT/THANK SUPP S	50	2	2.6	2.6	38.5
OTHER	98	2	2.6	2.6	41.0
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	46	59.0	59.0	100.0
	TOTAL	78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	67.385	Median	99.000	Mode	99.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

144

Q17MEN4 IMPROVEMENTS OR CHANGES NEEDED-MEN 4

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
BETTER PAY-UPGRADE	1	2	2.6	2.6	2.6
BETTER RECRUITING	2	2	2.6	2.6	5.1
BETTER EQUIPMENT	3	1	1.3	1.3	6.4
PROMOTION OPP	5	2	2.6	2.6	9.0
MORE TRAINING-GEN	10	1	1.3	1.3	10.3
TRNG-BASIC EDUC	11	1	1.3	1.3	11.5
TRNG-TECHNICAL	12	1	1.3	1.3	12.8
INVOLVE SUPP STAFF	21	1	1.3	1.3	14.1
BETTER COORDINATION	31	1	1.3	1.3	15.4
MORE STAFF	32	2	2.6	2.6	17.9
WORK ETHIC-ATTITUDE	40	1	1.3	1.3	19.2
RESPECT/THANK SUPP S	50	1	1.3	1.3	20.5
OTHER	98	1	1.3	1.3	21.8
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	61	78.2	78.2	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	81.987	Median	99.000	Mode	99.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q17MEN5 IMPROVEMENTS OR CHANGES NEEDED-MEN 5

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
BETTER RECRUITING	2	3	3.8	3.8	3.8
BETTER EQUIPMENT	3	1	1.3	1.3	5.1
TRNG-TECHNICAL	12	1	1.3	1.3	6.4
SUPERVISOR TRNG-RESP	20	1	1.3	1.3	7.7
RESPECT/THANK SUPP S	50	1	1.3	1.3	9.0
CHANGING ROLE OF SEC	60	1	1.3	1.3	10.3
OTHER	98	2	2.6	2.6	12.8
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	68	87.2	87.2	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	90.756	Median	99.000	Mode	99.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

145

Q18MEN1 BEST THING ABOUT MY SUPPORT STAFF-MEN 1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
COMPETENCE	1	53	67.9	67.9	67.9
DEPENDABILITY	2	6	7.7	7.7	75.6
FRIENDLINESS	3	15	19.2	19.2	94.9
INC RESPONSIBILITY	4	1	1.3	1.3	96.2
NOTHING GOOD	7	1	1.3	1.3	97.4
OTHER	8	1	1.3	1.3	98.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.769 Median 1.000 Mode 1.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q18MEN2 BEST THING ABOUT MY SUPPORT STAFF-MEN 2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
COMPETENCE	1	3	3.8	3.8	3.8
DEPENDABILITY	2	9	11.5	11.5	15.4
FRIENDLINESS	3	11	14.1	14.1	29.5
INC RESPONSIBILITY	4	1	1.3	1.3	30.8
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	54	69.2	69.2	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 6.974 Median 9.000 Mode 9.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

146

Q18MEN3 BEST THING ABOUT MY SUPPORT STAFF-MEN 3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
FRIENDLINESS	3	2	2.6	2.6	2.6
INC RESPONSIBILITY	4	2	2.6	2.6	5.1
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	74	94.9	94.9	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	8.718	Median	9.000	Mode	9.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q19MEN1 THE THING THAT FRUSTRATES ME MOST-MEN 1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NA-NOT FRUSTRATED	0	5	6.4	6.4	6.4
BAD ATTITUDE	1	26	33.3	33.3	39.7
PUNCTUALITY-ABSENT	2	9	11.5	11.5	51.3
POOR TECH SKILLS	3	1	1.3	1.3	52.6
POOR BASIC SKILLS	4	3	3.8	3.8	56.4
GOOD LEAVE-BAD STAY	5	3	3.8	3.8	60.3
TOO MUCH TIME PERSON	6	4	5.1	5.1	65.4
DONT SEE AS PROF	8	3	3.8	3.8	69.2
POOR SKILLS-GEN	9	1	1.3	1.3	70.5
INABILITY TO REWARD	20	8	10.3	10.3	80.8
OFTEN OVERWORKED	21	3	3.8	3.8	84.6
SLOW-MISS DEADLINES	22	1	1.3	1.3	85.9
OTHER	98	7	9.0	9.0	94.9
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	4	5.1	5.1	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	18.692	Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

147

Q19MEN2 THE THING THAT FRUSTRATES ME MOST-MEN 2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
BAD ATTITUDE	1	4	5.1	5.1	5.1
PUNCTUALITY-ABSENT	2	2	2.6	2.6	7.7
POOR BASIC SKILLS	4	6	7.7	7.7	15.4
GOOD LEAVE-BAD STAY	5	3	3.8	3.8	19.2
TOO MUCH TIME PERSON	6	5	6.4	6.4	25.6
DONT SEE AS PROF	8	2	2.6	2.6	28.2
INABILITY TO REWARD	20	1	1.3	1.3	29.5
OFTEN OVERWORKED	21	2	2.6	2.6	32.1
SLOW-MISS DEADLINES	22	1	1.3	1.3	33.3
OTHER	98	1	1.3	1.3	34.6
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	51	65.4	65.4	100.0

TOTAL 78 100.0 100.0

Mean 68.256 Median 99.000 Mode 99.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q19MEN3 THE THING THAT FRUSTRATES ME MOST-MEN 3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
BAD ATTITUDE	1	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
PUNCTUALITY-ABSENT	2	1	1.3	1.3	2.6
TOO MUCH TIME PERSON	6	1	1.3	1.3	3.8
DONT SEE AS PROF	8	2	2.6	2.6	6.4
OTHER	98	2	2.6	2.6	9.0
NOT ASCERTAINED	99	71	91.0	91.0	100.0

TOTAL 78 100.0 100.0

Mean 92.949 Median 99.000 Mode 99.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

148

Q20A BETTER RELATIONSHIP WITH ME AND OTHERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A LOT	1	11	14.1	14.1	14.1
SOMEWHAT	2	36	46.2	46.2	60.3
NOT AT ALL	3	28	35.9	35.9	96.2
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	3	3.8	3.8	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.487	Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q20B MORE TRAINING IN BASIC SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A LOT	1	16	20.5	20.5	20.5
SOMEWHAT	2	47	60.3	60.3	80.8
NOT AT ALL	3	13	16.7	16.7	97.4
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	2	2.6	2.6	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.141	Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	78	Missing Cases	0		

Q20C BETTER OR DIFFERENT EQUIPMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A LOT	1	21	26.9	26.9	26.9
SOMEWHAT	2	28	35.9	35.9	62.8
NOT AT ALL	3	26	33.3	33.3	96.2
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	3	3.8	3.8	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.333 Median 2.000 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q20D POSSIBILITY OF JOB SHARING OR PART TIME

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A LOT	1	4	5.1	5.1	5.1
SOMEWHAT	2	23	29.5	29.5	34.6
NOT AT ALL	3	48	61.5	61.5	96.2
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	3	3.8	3.8	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.833 Median 3.000 Mode 3.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q20E DAY CARE ASSISTANCE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A LOT	1	17	21.8	21.8	21.8
SOMEWHAT	2	19	24.4	24.4	46.2
NOT AT ALL	3	40	51.3	51.3	97.4
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	2	2.6	2.6	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.474 Median 3.000 Mode 3.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q20F OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADVANCEMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A LOT	1	47	60.3	60.3	60.3
SOMEWHAT	2	25	32.1	32.1	92.3
NOT AT ALL	3	5	6.4	6.4	98.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.551 Median 1.000 Mode 1.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

151

Q20G A BETTER OR DIFFERENT WORK SPACE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A LOT	1	16	20.5	20.5	20.5
SOMEWHAT	2	30	38.5	38.5	59.0
NOT AT ALL	3	30	38.5	38.5	97.4
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	2	2.6	2.6	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.359 Median 2.000 Mode 2.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q22 SEX

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MALE	1	56	71.8	71.8	71.8
FEMALE	2	18	23.1	23.1	94.9
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	4	5.1	5.1	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.641 Median 1.000 Mode 1.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q23 AGE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
30-39	4	6	7.7	7.7	7.7
40-49	5	39	50.0	50.0	57.7
50-59	6	28	35.9	35.9	93.6
60 OR OVER	7	1	1.3	1.3	94.9
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	4	5.1	5.1	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 5.513 Median 5.000 Mode 5.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0

Q24 RACE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CAUCASIAN	1	62	79.5	79.5	79.5
BLACK	2	7	9.0	9.0	88.5
HISPANIC ORIGIN	4	2	2.6	2.6	91.0
NOT ASCERTAINED	9	7	9.0	9.0	100.0
TOTAL		78	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.885 Median 1.000 Mode 1.000

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 0