MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Notice: Microfilm only

Notice: Microfilm only

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

**MANAGING CHANGE:
A CASE STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF TEAM-BASED ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES**

by:

Dawn L. Miller, B. Comm.

**A Thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the Degree of**

Master of Management Studies

**School of Business
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario**

17 December 1993

**© copyright
1993, Dawn L. Miller**

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-89881-X

Canada

Name _____

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

--	--	--	--

U·M·I

SUBJECT TERM

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0370
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language
General 0679
Ancient 0289
Linguistics 0290
Modern 0291
Literature
General 0401
Classical 0294
Comparative 0295
Medieval 0297
Modern 0298
African 0316
American 0591
Asian 0305
Canadian (English) 0352
Canadian (French) 0355
English 0593
Germanic 0311
Latin American 0312
Middle Eastern 0315
Romance 0313
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion
General 0318
Biblical Studies 0321
Clergy 0319
History of 0320
Philosophy of 0322
Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology
Archaeology 0324
Cultural 0326
Physical 0327
Business Administration
General 0310
Accounting 0272
Banking 0770
Management 0454
Marketing 0338
Canadian Studies 0385
Economics
General 0501
Agricultural 0503
Commerce Business 0505
Finance 0508
History 0509
Labor 0510
Theory 0511
Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science
General 0615
International Law and Relations 0616
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
General 0626
Criminology and Penology 0627
Demography 0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
Individual and Family Studies 0628
Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
Public and Social Welfare 0630
Social Structure and Development 0700
Theory and Methods 0344
Transportation 0709
Urban and Regional Planning 0999
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
General 0473
Agronomy 0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
Animal Pathology 0476
Food Science and Technology 0359
Forestry and Wildlife 0478
Plant Culture 0479
Plant Pathology 0480
Plant Physiology 0817
Range Management 0777
Wood Technology 0746
Biology
General 0306
Anatomy 0287
Biostatistics 0308
Botany 0309
Cell 0379
Ecology 0329
Entomology 0353
Genetics 0369
Limnology 0793
Microbiology 0410
Molecular 0307
Neuroscience 0317
Oceanography 0416
Physiology 0433
Radiation 0821
Veterinary Science 0778
Zoology 0472
Biophysics
General 0786
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geology 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
General 0566
Audiology 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Medicine and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pathology 0571
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiology 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
Chemistry
General 0485
Agricultural 0749
Analytical 0486
Biochemistry 0487
Inorganic 0488
Nuclear 0738
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics 0405
Physics
General 0605
Acoustics 0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0759
Molecular 0509
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463

Applied Sciences

Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0964

Engineering
General 0537
Aerospace 0538
Agricultural 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
Hydraulic 0545
Industrial 0546
Marine 0547
Materials Science 0794
Mechanical 0548
Metallurgy 0743
Mining 0551
Nuclear 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0765
Sanitary and Municipal 0554
System Science 0790
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

The undersigned hereby recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

**"MANAGING CHANGE:
A CASE STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF TEAM-BASED ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES"**

submitted by

Dawn L. Miller, B.Comm.

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Management Studies

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Director, School of Business

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

28 January 1994

ABSTRACT

The implementation of team-based organizational structures is often viewed as a means of improving efficiency and increasing productivity through empowering employees. The arbitrary use of such structural changes can, however, have a detrimental effect on organizations. Friction occurs between organizational structure and culture when the organizational culture is not prepared for the change or when the values of the culture are inconsistent with the values espoused by self-directed teams. This case study examines an organizational unit during and following the implementation of a structural change effort, referred to as the team pilot. In this research, particular emphasis is placed on the interaction of the structural change with the organizational culture of the unit. Factors such as inadequate communication skills, lack of a clear role for the former supervisor, language tensions, lack of job security, and the resistance of the unit culture to the change acted as barriers to the team pilot. This document concludes with recommendations regarding the future implementation of team-based structures.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this research marks the culmination of more than a year of work that has at various times been motivating, frustrating, exciting and sometimes discouraging. Overall, however, it has been a rewarding and valuable learning experience.

I would like to begin by thanking the employees and management of the unit of Supply and Services Canada who served as the focus of this case study. The cooperation and openness of the employees and management contributed to the attainment of rich and valuable data that is central to this research.

At this time I wish to thank the professors of the School of Business for helping to make Carleton an intellectually stimulating and challenging environment for students. Over the past six years, I have had the opportunity to learn and develop academically under your guidance and direction. A special thanks to Professor Ian Lee for recommending the MMS program to me, and to Professor Lorraine Dyke for recommending me to the MMS program, as well as for her continued interest and guidance.

My thesis co-supervisors, Professor David Cray and Professor George Haines Jr. have provided unwavering encouragement to me throughout this process. Their constructive feedback, insightful suggestions, and friendly advice helped to guide me through this research and helped me to stay focused.

I would also like to acknowledge at this time the remaining members of my committee, Professor Moses Kiggundu and Professor Gene Swimmer. Thank you for your helpful suggestions and comments. Gratitude is also extended to Jean Blair for her administrative assistance.

There are many others that deserve recognition for assisting me in this effort: My fellow MMS students for providing an atmosphere of support and for understanding first-hand the ups and downs involved in completing a thesis; Luanne and Julie for assistance in translation; and Kim for some graphical assistance. Finally, thanks to my family and friends who have put up with the late nights and my unconventional schedule.

This research is dedicated to my parents, whose unending love, support and patience have made the achievement of my academic pursuits possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	.vii
LIST OF FIGURES	.vii
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1 Human Relations Theory	4
2.2 Team Structures	8
2.3 Organizational Culture	12
2.4 Change	18
2.5 Structure and Organizational Culture	21
3.0 PS2000: RESTRUCTURING IN THE FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVICE	24
4.0 RESEARCH QUESTION	26
5.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	27
5.1 Unit of Analysis	27
5.2 Data Collection	28
5.2.1 Questionnaires	29

5.2.2	Personal Interviews	31
5.2.3	Archival Data	32
5.2.4	Observations	33
5.3	Unit of Comparison	34
6.0	RESULTS	35
6.1	Overview	35
6.2	Demographic Profile	38
6.3	Process and Context in the Unit	40
6.4	Attitudes Toward Work, Colleagues, and Management	50
6.5	Attitudes Toward the Team Pilot	55
6.6	Unit of comparison	63
7.0	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	70
7.1	Examination of Hypothesis	71
7.2	Is This Really a Team?	73
7.3	Resistance to Change	76
7.4	Cultural Aspects	83
7.5	Culture, Structure, and Change	87
8.0	LIMITATIONS, BENEFITS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH	90
8.1	Limitations of the Research	90
8.2	Benefits of the Research	91
8.3	Directions for Future Research	93

9.0	CONCLUSION: HOW TO PROCEED	94
-----	--------------------------------------	----

SOURCES	98
-------------------	----

APPENDICES:

APPENDIX I: Questionnaire - English and French	103
--	-----

APPENDIX II: Questionnaire Results - Primary Unit	124
---	-----

APPENDIX III: Questionnaire Results - Unit of Comparison	160
--	-----

APPENDIX IV: Interview Schedule	178
---	-----

APPENDIX V: Results of Test for Difference of Means	180
---	-----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Research Timeline	29
Table 2:	Demographic Profile of Primary Unit	39
Table 3:	Reported Service Levels	48
Table 4:	Attitudes Toward Work and Colleagues	52
Table 5:	Attitudes Toward Management	55
Table 6:	Comparison of Aspects of Unit Prior to Team Pilot with Time of Response	59
Table 7:	Reliability Coefficients of Statements Measuring Unit Prior to Team Pilot With Time of Response	60
Table 8:	Top Three Reported Barriers to Success of Team Pilot	62
Table 9:	Demographic Profile of Unit of Comparison	67

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1:	Floorplan of Unit	44
------------------	------------------------------------	-----------

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Organizations are continually faced with the need to increase output while at the same time attempting to make the most of their resources. One method that has gained popularity in recent years is incorporating team structures into the organization. A team-based structure advocates the utilization of groups of individuals, referred to as teams, to work together and coordinate activities in order to attain mutual goals or objectives (Larson and LaFasto, 1989). Team structures are frequently accompanied by encouraging the adoption of the management philosophies of empowerment, participative decision making and teamwork. By altering the structure of an organization through planned change and placing more decision making authority with lower level employees who are encouraged to work as a team, employers hope to reduce the number of management levels required while concurrently increasing the work satisfaction and output of employees.

One organization which has attempted to reduce its hierarchial structure while at the same time empowering lower level employees is the Canadian Federal Public Service. This research examines one such attempt within the Department of Supply and Services. A functional processing unit within the National Capital Regional Services Office began a team pilot project in October 1992. The structure of the unit was altered to form a team, with the manager of the department becoming the 'team expert'. Some of the responsibilities that had belonged to the manager were given to the team.

During this structural change, however, no study or regard was given to the area of the organizational culture. The Federal Public Service is known for having a strong organizational culture and the compatibility of the new structure with this culture was either overlooked, or it was assumed that a cultural shift would follow a change in structure.

This case study examines the team pilot primarily from the perspective of the individual worker and studies the effects of the organizational culture on this change in structure and the interaction between the culture and structure.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review has been designed to provide a developmental and theoretical background into the issues and concepts that form the foundation of this research. The review begins with a look at the development of human relations theories of management, a necessary background to the second element, that of team structures. Included in the team structure discussion are relevant issues relating to teamwork in both North America and Japan.

Organizational culture is also a central concept in this research and is dealt with in the third part of the review. Culture is viewed not only as being organization wide, but in terms of sub-unit cultures existing within an organization. A discussion of the factors that contribute to the formation and continuity of an organizational culture is also included.

The issue of planned change is reviewed beginning with Lewin's change model. The discussion progresses to addressing planned change in relation to organizational culture. This section concludes with an examination of resistance to cultural change and a formula that attempts to explain the magnitude of resistance that an organization may face during an attempt at cultural change.

The final section of the literature review attempts to integrate the theories of organizational structure with organizational culture. This creates the necessary link that draws the previous issues and concepts together.

2.1 Human Relations Theory

Although traces of human relations theory can be found throughout history, human relations as we know of it today arose from the effects of the industrial revolution. Just as this period brought about significant advances in production and technological capabilities, it also marked the beginning of new theories for improving worker satisfaction and performance. Although the importance of the human factor in the workplace had been recognized, the theories of human relations and its four fundamental concepts of mutual interest, individual differences, motivation and human dignity, remained relatively undeveloped until the early 1900s.

F.W. Taylor published *The Principles of Scientific Management* in 1911, in which he drew attention to people in the work situation as important factors in the quest for efficiency in production (Taylor, 1911). Although the goal of his work remained technical efficiency, it eventually led to improved recognition and productivity for industrial workers.

The theories were developed further by the work of Elton Mayo in the 1920s and 1930s. The work of Mayo included a sociological perspective on the issue and promoted the idea that the worker was indeed the most important element in business. He also maintained that no one knew much about the worker (Davis, 1962). A number of trends led to the development of the human relations perspective in businesses following the Second World War.

During the 1950s and 1960s, researchers began conceptualizing and applying understandings of individual psychology to organizational settings. The concept of motivation of workers emerged as a dominant theme. Two of the theorists who significantly contributed to this management philosophy in the post war period were Douglas McGregor and Rensis Likert.

McGregor developed an approach to management which he named Theory Y. He contrasted this with Theory X: management's traditional view of the worker as an economic input that must be controlled and modified to meet the needs of the organization. McGregor's Theory Y was a more flexible and optimistic management philosophy that recognized the untapped potential of workers. This untapped potential, argued McGregor, required only an opportunity to display itself.

The following four dimensions form the foundation of McGregor's Theory Y:

1. Management is responsible for organizing the elements of productive enterprise - money, materials, equipment, people - in the interest of economic ends.
2. People are not by nature passive or resistant to organizational needs. They have become so as a result of experience in organizations.
3. The motivation, the potential for development, the capacity for assuming responsibility, the readiness to direct behaviour toward organizational goals are all present in people. Management does not put them there. It is a responsibility of management to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves.
4. The essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts toward organizational objectives (McGregor, 1960).

The role of management, as outlined in McGregor's philosophy was one of integration. Theory Y did not view control as shifting from management to workers, but rather a matter of aligning the goals of management and workers. McGregor's recommendations included issues related to job enlargement, delegation, decentralization, and worker participation in organizational decision making. McGregor acknowledged that due to ingrained attitudes, habits, and expectations, change in the direction of Theory Y would be slow and would require "extensive modification" of the attitudes of management and workers (McGregor, 1960). McGregor's Theory Y has received a great amount of empirical support and has had a significant and lasting influence on management philosophies.

During the same time period, Rensis Likert developed another theory of management that drew upon many of the same principles as McGregor's Theory Y. Unlike McGregor's theory, Likert's work was based heavily upon behavioural research. Likert's theory refers to a superior work unit as a cooperative social system with four features. This theory draws its name - System 4 - from the use of the following four features:

1. a favourable climate, with lots of mutual confidence and trust among workers and supervisors
2. management attention to multiple motivations of workers
3. highly cohesive and participative work groups
4. the availability of performance feedback for worker self-guidance. (Likert, 1961).

The concept of participative work groups formed an underlying basis for Likert's theory and became an important element of the Human Relations perspective. Participative work groups also spurred the evolution of the Human Relations views of teamwork, which is defined as a "coordinated action by a cooperative small group in regular contact wherein members contribute responsibly and enthusiastically toward task achievement" (Davis, 1962: 419).

The Human Relations school therefore views teamwork as an effective means of task achievement. Teamwork can be viewed in terms of both an organization-wide team, known as an institutional team and a small group of employees within the organization, referred to as an operations team. According to Human Relations

theory, only in small teams can coordinated action between team members occur.

There are six essential elements of an effective operations team which include: 1) a small group, 2) a leader, 3) a common goal, 4) regular interaction, 5) each member responsibly contributing, 6) a team spirit or cooperative attitude, and 7) conscious coordinating (Davis, 1962).

2.2 Team Structures

Some of the first significant research involving group structures and group effectiveness in North America was conducted as part of the Hawthorne Studies. These studies, carried out by Harvard researchers between 1928 and 1930, took place at the Western Electric Company in Hawthorne, Illinois (Northcraft and Neale, 1990). Although one of the primary hypotheses of the study relating working conditions to worker efficiency was rejected, further research into work groups was conducted. It was discovered that one of the most important factors in promoting worker output was developing a sense of group identity and cohesion, essentially becoming part of a 'team'. The researchers involved in the Hawthorne Studies, including Elton Mayo, specified conditions they believed to be important in developing team effectiveness.

The research interest in team effectiveness heightened following World War II with studies that involved group dynamics, group processes and group design (Lewin,

1946; McGregor, 1960; Likert, 1961). In the early 1950s, Eric Trist conducted research on British coal miners. In Trist's research, some of the miners were formed into teams based on an analysis of the technical and social requirements of their jobs. In the mines, employees worked together, helping each other and often trading jobs. Trist discovered clear indications of higher productivity and job satisfaction among those workers who were given more control over their jobs. This research with coal miners also indicated that "organizations with workers who were involved in the operation were better equipped to respond to changing market and political conditions - something that large and rigid organizations found difficult" (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991: 8).

In 1960, Douglas McGregor outlined eleven characteristics that he found to be essential in promoting an effective work team. A year later, Rensis Likert published his research findings and advocated what he referred to as Participative Group management where managers cope with a totality of people under their direction and not just manage individuals one-on-one (Dyer, 1977). Twenty-four characteristics present in effective groups were identified by Likert.

While the theories of participative management were beginning to emerge in North America and Europe, the practices were already in place in Japan. In the mid 1950s the Japanese began to use what was referred to as Quality Circles as a means to promote participation by employees in problem solving and in promoting productivity

improvements. This type of structure was a natural outgrowth of traditional Japanese managerial characteristics of decentralized decision making and the use of small organizational units to promote responsibility (Muchus, 1983).

Quality circles were introduced in North America in the mid 1970s and the use of them has been increasing since (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991). Success by North American firms has been reported in terms of achieving higher levels of quality, employee motivation, satisfaction, commitment and reduction in costs (Northcraft and Neale, 1990). Research has proven, however, that the benefits in these cases were not as plentiful as advocates had claimed. Critics claimed that the use of quality circles and other similar arrangements was North America's attempt to emulate Japanese management practices while overlooking the wide gap that exists between Japanese and North American management philosophies and national cultures. Academics question whether quality circles will be as successful in American companies, which are believed to be more autocratic and individualistic than many of their Japanese counterparts (Muchus, 1983).

Regardless of the debate over the effectiveness of quality circles in North America, there is no doubt that they served an important purpose. "Value was placed on workers' opinions, and recognition was given for work-related input and decisions - with some impressive results. Perhaps more important, the value of teamwork became far more prominent" (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991: 9).

The theories regarding team structures and participative management also led to the development of the concept of semiautonomous work groups. This is a team of employees who are responsible for a series of assigned tasks. This differs from the concept of quality circles due to the fact that the semiautonomous work group is assigned a group of tasks and the group has the responsibility for determining how the work will get done and who will do it. With quality circles, the circles act in an advisory capacity while management retains responsibility for making day-to-day operational decisions. With semiautonomous work groups, management delegates responsibility for day-to-day operational decisions to the work group (Northcraft and Neale, 1990). The use of semiautonomous work groups is among the truest forms of participative decision making.

There are a variety of benefits to an organization from using semiautonomous work groups, including a reduced need for management personnel, supervisors and theoretically, greater satisfaction from employees. Increased productivity of workers is also cited as a benefit associated with this structure (Lawler, 1986). Together, these benefits translate into significant financial savings to organizations which successfully adopt the semiautonomous work group structure.

A management concept that is inherent to semiautonomous work groups and participative decision making is empowerment. Empowerment evolved from the motivation centred theories of the 1950s and 1960s and extends these theories to

include more focus on the development of the worker as an individual in addition to the development of the organization. Empowerment, based on liberating and not controlling human energy, requires major shifts in organizational structures to accommodate the power required to allow individuals to develop to his or her full potential (Vogt and Murrell, 1990).

Empowerment is based upon the assumption that through cooperation, sharing and working together, power within a situation can be increased, not just redistributed (Vogt and Murrell, 1990). The presence of new organizational structures are not sufficient, however, to realize full attainment of empowerment within an organization. Organizations must also be adapted culturally in order to embrace the principles of empowerment.

2.3 Organizational Culture

The concept of organizational culture emerged in the early 1980s and has generated a great deal of research interest. Despite its popularity and recent attention, a common definition for organizational culture is difficult to locate. Each researcher or set of researchers adapts the common elements to suit their individual needs. Culture in its most simplistic form may be defined as 'the way we do things around here'. Conversely, culture has also been defined by Edgar Schein as: "A pattern of

shared basic assumptions, invented, discovered, or developed by a given group, as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid, and, therefore, is to be taught to new members of the group as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" (Schein, 1991: 247). A more satisfactory definition that has been developed for the purposes of this research describes culture as *the commonly held and relatively stable beliefs, attitudes, values, assumptions and artifacts that exist within the organization.*

These shared values are not always obvious and can be expressed by different members of the organization in different ways. By labelling these values as organizational culture, researchers and theorists have drawn attention to a set of organizational realities that had always existed but had been largely unnoticed.

There are a large number of factors that contribute to the formation of a culture within an organization. These stem from both the external and internal environment of the workers and the organization (Davis, 1985). The external environment, such as the industry within which the organization operates is one such factor that provides a basis for the development of culture. Different industries develop different cultural attributes that fit their particular business needs (Gordon, 1985). For example, in an industry of rapid technological change, a culture that supports the values of innovation and efficiency would be expected to exist.

Individuals who do not fit with these values would not be expected to survive within organizations in this industry. Conversely, in an industry that is relatively stable over time, the cultural values developed may reflect support of long employee service to the organization, and little emphasis on innovation or responsibility for individual decision making. Other factors of the external environment which affect the culture of an organization include the social, political, legislative, economic, and technical constraints and demands placed on the organization, as well as the diversity, size and market position of the organization. These factors affect the culture through the strategic and structural systems that the organization adopts (Williams, Dobson, Walters, 1989), which form the broad outlines of an appropriate culture.

Another factor that affects the content of a culture is the pattern of assumptions that founders, leaders, and organizational employees bring with them when they join the organization (Schein, 1983). These assumptions are in turn affected by the experience of the individual within national, ethnic, regional, religious, occupational or professional cultures and communities. Differences in the personal beliefs and values of company founders or leaders during the early years of an organization has been shown to have a lasting effect and to explain some of the differences between organizational cultures (Schein, 1983; Sathe, 1985).

Another source of organizational culture content is the accumulation of experiences that individuals have had. Experience in dealing with the resolution of

basic problems within the organization originating from the external environment and from internal integration is particularly relevant. These prior assumptions and learning experiences combine to form a frame of reference for individuals.

From these examples of factors affecting the content of organizational culture, two important implications for the study of culture can be drawn. First, organizational culture is subject to change. Just as the experiences of the individuals within the organization change and the external and internal environments evolve, so will the culture of the organization adapt and change. Second, it can be implied that change in culture will occur slowly. The culture of an organization by its very nature is resistant to change and the changes in a culture are evolutionary and incremental in nature (Sathe, 1985).

Organizational cultures possess properties that differentiate the cultures of different organizations and determine the strength of the culture itself. The three specific features of culture that determine its strength are thickness, extent of sharing, and clarity of ordering (Sathe, 1985).

A thick culture is one in which there are many shared values between the members of the organization, as opposed to a thin culture, in which there are very few shared values. The second feature, extent of sharing, reflects the degree to which the values are shared by the members of the organization. Organizations that have

cultures that are widely shared by members, such as IBM (Sathe, 1983), are stronger because more people are guided by the shared values. The third feature, clarity of ordering, is an indication of the relative importance of the shared values, in relation to each other. Cultures in which these shared values are clearly ordered are stronger due to the fact that the members of the organization are clear regarding which of the values rank higher than others. In cases of conflicting interests, members have a clear understanding of which values will prevail.

It is important to recognize that each of these factors are independent. An organization can have a thick culture that is not high in clarity of ordering or a culture that is thin, but is widely held by members of the organization.

Organizational subcultures exist among members of smaller units within organizations and are often stronger than the company culture (Sathe, 1985; Williams, Dobson and Walters, 1989). The divisions between possible subcultures within an organization are often along functional lines, such as a subculture within a Research and Development department or within a marketing department. Subcultures can also exist along geographical, professional, or spatial divisions, such as a regional office subculture or any isolated division of a larger organization.

Organizations can have some subcultures that follow the content of the company culture and other subcultures that hold conflicting assumptions to those of the larger

organization. These conflicting assumptions are referred to as countercultures. The formation of these subcultures usually follow two patterns. Formation can take place along functional roles of the organization such as a middle management subculture that pervades different departments. The second pattern that subculture formation may follow is geographic proximity. Under this pattern, workers within a specific area or particular unit of the organization will develop a unique subculture.

Organizational culture can be either an asset or a liability. It is an asset when the culture is aligned with the purposes, objectives and direction of the organization. Culture in this case facilitates understanding, decision making, control and communication within organizations. It can also increase the cooperation and commitment of the members in an organization. This results in a more efficient organization in terms of both time and monetary savings.

Conversely, organizational culture is a liability when the culture does not fit with the needs of the organization. In this case the culture of the organization may cause members to feel and act in ways that interfere or conflict with the requirements or directives of the company. This can be a serious liability due to the fact that the content of organizational cultures are difficult and slow to change.

2.4 Change

Change is a continuing and inevitable part of human existence. There are two types of change, however, that should be distinguished. The first type is unplanned and unanticipated change; the second type is planned change that is deliberate. Planned change is viewed as an ongoing cycle of activities: diagnosis, intervention, evaluation and institutionalization (Cummings and Huse, 1989). Organizations use planned change for a number of reasons. These include: to solve problems in the organization, to adapt to changes in the organizational environment, and to influence the future direction of the organization.

The development efforts implemented within the organization in this research were planned, as opposed to happening unexpectedly. It is planned change, therefore, that will be examined.

One of the early models of planned change was developed by Kurt Lewin in 1951. Lewin's theory was based on the belief that the level of behaviour at any moment in time is the result of two sets of forces - those striving to maintain the status quo and those pushing for change. Lewin referred to the balanced state between the forces as a state of "quasi-stationary equilibrium" (Lewin, 1951). In order to change the balance between the forces, one of the forces must be either increased or decreased, leading to a temporary imbalance. Due to the constant nature

of the two opposing forces, a new equilibrium will be achieved at a different point between the two forces. Lewin categorized this change in equilibrium as a three step process which he referred to as unfreezing, moving and refreezing (Lewin, 1951).

Unfreezing is the process of preparing the organization for change by reducing the forces that are working to maintain the organization in its present state. The second step in Lewin's model is moving. This step is the actual implementation of the planned change. It is during this step that new behaviours, values and attitudes are formed through changes to organizational structures and processes. Once the change has been fully implemented, the final step, refreezing, stabilizes the organization at a new equilibrium state. During this stage, the new behaviours, values, and attitudes are reinforced. Lewin's change model provided the basis for further developments in planned organizational change (Lippett, Watson, Westley, 1958; Kolb and Frohman, 1970).

During the 1980's, a divergent theory based on the process of organization development challenged the traditional problem-focused change models (Cummings and Huse, 1989). Organization development can be defined as "a systemwide application of behavioral science knowledge to the planned development and reinforcement of organizational strategies, structures, and processes for improving an organization's effectiveness" (Cummings and Huse, 1989: 1).

The issue of changing an organization's existing culture has been explored in recent years. Some researchers have advocated the importance of instilling a new corporate culture in order to make organizations more productive and competitive (Peters and Waterman, 1982). The theories of cultural change involve a variety of methods and steps to assist managers in an attempt to manage the cultural change process (Peters and Waterman, 1982; Sathe, 1983; Dyer, 1985).

Research indicates that cultural change in an organization is generally more successful when it is attempted in conjunction with other stages or circumstances in the life of the organization (Sathe, 1983; Schein, 1983; Dyer, 1985; Williams and Patterson, 1985). Some of the circumstances commonly associated with successful cultural change are new leadership, a crisis within the organization, unanticipated recessions, death of a key leader or founder, structural change or times of intense conflict within an organization. These factors succeed in altering the culture by questioning the beliefs, values and attitudes that act to hold a culture in place and contribute to its stability.

Any attempt made to change the culture of an organization will encounter resistance. The degree of cultural resistance, however, is directly proportional to the extent of the change. A radical shift in an organization's culture will experience greater resistance than an incremental change will encounter. This relationship can be represented as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{Resistance to} & & \text{Magnitude of the} & & \text{Strength of the} \\
 \text{culture change} & = & \text{change in the content} & \times & \text{prevailing} \\
 & & \text{of the culture;} & & \text{culture, that} \\
 & & \text{that is, radical versus} & & \text{is, strong} \\
 & & \text{incremental change in} & & \text{versus weak} \\
 & & \text{cultures's content} & & \text{culture} \\
 & & & & \text{(Sathe, 1985)}
 \end{array}$$

2.5 Structure and Organizational Culture

The concept of culture has been expanded in recent years and has included the joint study of culture with other aspects of the organization, such as change, effectiveness, strategy, and structure (Peters and Waterman, 1982; Williams, Dobson and Walters, 1989; Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg and Martin, 1991).

A strong relationship exists between the structure of an organization and the prevailing organizational culture (Williams, Dobson, Walters, 1989; Cummings and Huse, 1989). An organization develops a structure which reflects the cultural as well as the structural needs of the organization. The way in which a company is organized and the way that people operate within that structure can be viewed as an expression of the organization's culture (Gordon, 1985). Many of the traditional Weberian bureaucracies have developed structures based on the requirements and priorities of the organizations. These priorities include reliable service levels with little chance of error, with little or no emphasis placed on the values of innovativeness or individual

decision making. The structure in this type of organization would include well-defined roles and responsibilities set within a hierarchy of authority. Conversely, an organization which values individual initiative and innovativeness will likely have a structure which reflects these values through less bureaucracy, including a greater realm of responsibility and accountability for workers.

Despite the close relationship between the concepts of organizational structure and organizational culture, there has been little research focused on directly linking the two. In 1989, three British researchers reported that "...most of the literature on organizational design treats it as a purely technical matter, a question of adjusting structure to suit prevailing contingencies" (Williams, Dobson, Walters, 1989).

From the lack of research directly relating the two concepts, it may appear that some researchers believe that structure and culture are so closely intertwined that when one factor is altered, the other will automatically adjust itself to the change.

This research will examine the interaction between the concepts of organizational structure and culture while maintaining the position that these two concepts are distinct and do not automatically adjust with a movement of the other. This sentiment has been addressed through the argument that "...many of the ills of organizations stem from imposing an inappropriate structure on a particular culture" (Williams, Dobson, Walters, 1989).

In particular, this research will analyze organizational culture in the period during and following a planned structural change and will attempt to fill an existing gap in the current literature.

3.0 PS2000: RESTRUCTURING IN THE FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVICE

The Canadian federal government announced a massive restructuring program for the federal public service in 1989. This plan, titled PS2000 was intended to renew the public service through a number of reform initiatives. For public servants these include better training, enhanced development and career opportunities, more personal satisfaction, responsibility and authority, increased recognition and better leadership.

Public Service 2000 also emphasizes client service and attempts to simplify government red tape through fewer rules and regulations. "Reliance on excessive controls will be replaced by trust, judgement, initiative and stronger accountability for results" (Government of Canada, 1990). The government also proposes to reduce the number of occupational groups by about two thirds as well as reducing the number of classification levels within each occupational group.

One of the methods of increasing the personal satisfaction, responsibility, authority and skills of public servants that is emphasized in PS2000 is the use of empowerment, employee participation and team building. This type of re-structuring through empowerment is being encouraged within Federal government departments. The use of empowerment is intended to "intensify the commitment of individuals to meet clients' needs, and encourage them to try new ways of achieving work goals"

(Government of Canada, 1990). Furthermore, empowerment within the Canadian Federal Public Service is intended to enhance productivity, elevate morale, create a dynamic working environment, and give managers and employees greater control over and accountability for overall results rather than a narrow compliance with procedural requirements.

The PS2000 framework provides government departments with an overall philosophy espousing the ideals and values of a fully empowered public service. It is up to each department to work toward the attainment of PS2000 objectives.

The restructuring that is being analyzed in this case study was implemented by Supply and Services Canada, in accordance with the PS2000 directive.

4.0 RESEARCH QUESTION

Just as the culture of a nation or region can affect the structure and strategies that an organization pursues, the cultures that exist within the work units of the organization can potentially affect the structure and strategies pursued by the organization. In this research the question to be addressed is: What is the interaction between organizational culture and organizational structure during and following a planned structural change?

The organizational culture in this case is the culture that exists within the functional processing unit, which is the work unit identified. The planned structural change is the team pilot project that was implemented within this work unit in October 1992.

Hypothesis: Under a thick organizational culture, unless effort is made to adapt the organizational culture to complement a structural change, the change will not be successful.

5.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research effort evolved from a request from Supply and Services Canada to aid in identifying the sources of difficulties in a unit that had recently undergone a structural change. The thesis topic emerged directly from this opportunity and was developed simultaneously with the contractual undertaking for the department. The format of this research primarily follows a single case study methodology (Yin, 1989).

5.1 Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis is divided into two levels. The first level is the unit that is being evaluated, which is the team pilot project that was implemented in October 1992 in a functional processing unit of Supply and Services Canada. At the data collection level, however, the unit of analysis is the individual worker within the unit who is experiencing the change.

The mandate of this processing unit is to answer cheque inquiries from client departments and the general public. The largest client department is Revenue Canada Taxation with the primary product being GST refunds. The unit processes cheques that have been returned, authorizes and issues duplicate or replacement cheques, and initiates investigations regarding stolen or fraudulently cashed cheques.

The overall goal of the team pilot, as stated in the Action Plan for the project is "to develop an organizational cell that utilizes the most modern management practices available to support production requirements." A clearer picture is obtained through the expression of the sub-goals:

1. To empower employees through the decentralization of decision making.
2. To develop a team approach based on partnership and trust.

The success of the team pilot, in this evaluation, is measured in terms of the degree to which the goals of the team pilot are achieved, as reported by the individual employees and supervisors.

5.2 Data Collection

Data was collected in the period between 08 January and 13 August 1993 (Table 1). A variety of data collection methods were used, including questionnaires, personal interviews, archival data and personal observations.

Table 1: Research Timeline

Research Timeline	
October 1992	- Team pilot implemented in unit
January 1993	- Observational data collection commenced - Notification of departmental downsizing and impending job losses
February 1993	- First set of questionnaires distributed
April 1993	- Second set of questionnaires distributed
July 1993	- Third set of questionnaires distributed
August 1993	- Unit of comparison data collected - Interviews conducted with individuals in primary unit - Conclusion of data collection

5.2.1 Questionnaires

Three evaluations of the team pilot were conducted in the form of questionnaires that each of the twenty-one members of the department completed (Appendix I). These questionnaires were produced in both English and French, in order to accommodate the first language of each employee. The original questionnaire was written in English and translated into French by Tessier Translations, an in-house service of Supply and Services Canada.

The data collected through the questionnaires included information regarding work satisfaction of the employees, the responsiveness to change in the unit, and the perception of the employees toward the change immediately following the implementation of the pilot compared to the time at which the questionnaire was answered. Background information regarding basic demographic data of the members of the unit was also collected through the questionnaire. This information consists of age category, level of education attained, number of years working both for the federal public service and within the unit and whether the employee has worked outside of the federal public service.

The first of these questionnaires was distributed on February 5 and 12, 1993. Two separate dates were scheduled in order to compensate for those who were absent on the first occasion. The second questionnaires were distributed on April 2 and April 13, 1993. The third and final set of questionnaires were distributed on July 9 and 19, 1993. The second and third sets were as close as possible to the first questionnaire in terms of content and format. Ideally, all three sets of questionnaires would be identical, however, some small adjustments were made to accommodate concerns or suggested improvements made by the employees during the first set of evaluations. The second and third evaluation tested whether attitudes and perceptions had changed over the elapsed period of time. It was not expected that drastic changes in reported commitment level toward the team pilot would have occurred due to the

fact that a long period of adjustment to change is normally required (Sathe, 1983; Dyer, 1985; Cummings and Huse, 1989).

Once the two evaluations using the questionnaires were completed, comparisons were drawn in order to measure changes over time. Correlations were run with some of the data, as well as simple statistics such as difference of mean calculations and frequency distributions.

5.2.2 Personal Interviews

Interviews with each member of the unit took place in the period following the third questionnaire-based evaluation. These individual interviews were held outside of the working unit in order to provide confidentiality. Each interview consisted of both a structured and an unstructured portion (Appendix IV). The structured aspect of the interview provided common cultural factors that are important to individuals and their feelings toward a variety of cultural questions. The unstructured portion of the interview provided employees with an opportunity to voice opinions of the team pilot that either were not expressed in written form, were not known earlier, were not appropriate to be spoken around others in the unit or did not fit with the format of the written questionnaire.

By combining a structured and unstructured format, interviews were able to follow a more individualized route, as opposed to the simple structured interview, and provided a greater variety of data.

These interviews were conducted in the language with which the employee is most comfortable. The use of a translator facilitated interviews in French. It is possible that the presence of an unfamiliar person as a translator may have affected the nature of the intended one-to-one interview. An attempt was made to minimize this potential effect by employing a translator whom the employees would not perceive as threatening and by using the translator only when necessary. The translator was another student who was introduced to the employees during a casual tour of the unit.

5.2.3 Archival Data

A written record of the history and development of the team pilot concept was maintained by the management of the unit. This includes memos between various players, minutes of meetings that dealt with the team pilot, copies of newsletters that were sent to employees of the unit, and the overall goals and sub-goals of the pilot.

This data provided a background and historical account of the pilot. It was necessary to use archival data due to the fact that the evaluation process for this research did not begin until approximately three months after the team pilot was implemented. This data also proved to be useful in obtaining a record of the methods and content of communication between management and the members of the unit in the pre-stages of the pilot.

5.2.4 Observations

One of the most important and interesting methods of collecting data for this research was through observations made while spending time within the unit. Each Friday, beginning on 08 January, 1993, and at other times when deemed necessary or appropriate, time was spent in the unit participating in a variety of activities: casual conversation with the employees, performing some work within the unit, attending meetings, and interactions on lunch breaks. Time was also spent talking to management of the unit and discussing different issues relating to the management of the unit and the team pilot.

The purpose of the observational data was to provide a more holistic appreciation of the unit and to gain an insider's understanding of the issues of concern to the employees in relation to the team pilot. It also served as a means for the

employees to become better acquainted with the researcher and to gain a more trustful perspective than they would acquire toward a complete outsider. This was of particular benefit during the interview process as the employees felt more comfortable expressing their feelings and concerns to a familiar interviewer.

Daily field notes of experiences and conversations within the unit provided a valuable record for research purposes.

5.3 Unit of Comparison

An additional unit within Supply and Services that has attempted a similar organizational change was also studied in order to provide a reference point from which the primary unit could be compared. The same questionnaire was used in both units. In addition to the questionnaire, information was also collected through personal discussions with the managers and some of the employees.

6.0 RESULTS

This section contains highlights of the results of the data collection. Following an overview, a demographic profile of the primary unit is provided. The presentation of results continues with further explanation of the situation of the unit during the data collection period. This includes the process through which the researcher gained an understanding into the operations of the unit and gained the trust of the employees. Attitudes of the employees toward elements such as work, colleagues, management and the team pilot are then presented. The section concludes with the results gained from data collection in the unit of comparison.

6.1 Overview

The results of this research encompass much more than the field notes, transcripts and questionnaire results that make up some of the data collected. This case study encompasses the lives of twenty one individuals who work within the unit that has been studied. In order to most effectively convey the information collected, this section will be presented as a narrative as well as a systematic presentation of results. This story must convey the feelings of the individuals whose lives were affected by this structural change. These feelings include: frustration, fear, anger, bitterness, hope, and betrayal.

It is appropriate at this point, prior to the presentation of results, to be reminded of the three fundamental concepts underlying the objective of this research; structure, organizational culture, and planned change. The interaction between these elements form the basis of the research hypothesis: under a thick organizational culture, unless effort is made to adapt the organizational culture to complement a structural change, the change will not be successful. It is useful, therefore, to examine the following results from the perspective of this hypothesis.

Although employees were reluctant to share their feelings and attitudes at the initial stages of the data collection, trust was established and communication between the researcher and the employees was attained. The establishment of trust played, perhaps, the most significant role in allowing the researcher to collect such data. This trust was built slowly and steadily over a seven month process. The culmination of the research consisted of individual interviews with each of the employees. These interviews were tape recorded and lasted between twenty minutes and one hour.

There are a large number of factors in any type of change process which combine in different variations to create the environment within which the change takes place. There are, however, factors which play a larger role in determining the unique situation that emerges in each change process. In this case, the data collection revealed a multitude of factors that have converged and have affected the change

process. Several factors, such as communication, language, and the role of the supervisor have been found to play a significant role in this situation.

The first of these is communication. The origin of many problems that arose within the unit can be traced to breakdowns within the communication networks as well as lack of communication skills among employees. These include both between employees and between the employees and management. The new team-based structure demands personnel with a higher degree of communicative skills than was previously necessary. Employees were not adequately prepared to assume this role.

The second factor is language. The unit is composed of unilingual English and unilingual French employees as well as those who are bilingual. Language-related problems that existed within the unit prior to the team pilot were compounded by the new structure. Management inadvertently served to complicate the volatile internal environment of the unit by ignoring any language based issues.

The third factor which played a key role in this case study is the role of the supervisor. This role was continually being re-defined throughout the data collection period. This continual re-definition was a source of uncertainty for all three levels of players in the unit; the employees, management and the supervisor. Not only were employees unsure of the boundaries of the new role or responsibilities of the supervisor, but the supervisor was equally unsure of his duties. Management

continually re-examined the responsibilities of the supervisor in an effort to achieve a balance of responsibility that was mutually satisfying to both the team pilot objectives and the supervisor, while at the same time ensuring that the unit functioned effectively.

6.2 Demographic Profile

There were twenty one members of the functional unit being studied in January 1993. Data collected from twenty of the English and French questionnaires gives a demographic profile of the unit (Table 2). The most frequent age category reported by the employees was 30-39. Two employees did not respond to this question. Approximately 80% of the respondents reported either some high school or high school graduate as their highest formal education level. The average length of time worked in the unit was two to five years and the average number of years in the federal public service was reported as fifteen to twenty. Approximately 65% of the workers had never worked full-time outside of the federal public service. For those that had worked full-time outside, the average length of time was 6.2 years.

From this demographic data, an initial profile of the unit can be formed. The unit generally consists of younger employees who have been working for the federal public service most of their working lives. The formal education level is not high,

with only 20% of the employees having any post-secondary education. These demographic figures are an important element in understanding the reactions and interpretations of the employees in response to the team pilot project that was undertaken in the unit.

Table 2: Demographic Profile of Primary Unit

<u>Age</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Percent</u>
20-29	0	-
30-39	9	43%
40-49	7	33%
50-59	2	0%
60-65	0	-
Not Answered	2	10%
<u>Highest Education Level</u>		
some high school	4	20%
high school graduate	12	60%
some college or university	2	10%
college graduate	2	10%
university graduate	0	-
other	0	-
<u>Years in Unit</u>		
less than two	2	10%
two to five	9	45%
five to ten	5	25%
ten to fifteen	2	10%
fifteen to twenty	1	5%
more than twenty	1	5%

(N = 20, February questionnaire data)

6.3 Process and Context in the Unit

Initial reaction toward having a researcher in the unit was mixed. As reported in field notes from the first day in the unit, "Some people seemed genuinely friendly, others appeared sceptical and suspicious of my intentions." This reaction was partially expected. The employees had already been going through a period of change for approximately three months prior to the introduction of an outside researcher. The stable working environment of these twenty one employees had been altered and transformed into an unfamiliar and often confusing configuration that was continually changing. The employees had been told by management that a student from Carleton University would be studying the team pilot within the unit, but were given no other details.

One of the first priorities of the researcher was to prevent any employee of the unit from feeling threatened. An attempt was made to blend as much as possible with the workers and to make them feel comfortable with the presence of the researcher. An opportunity to become acquainted less officially with some of the employees offered itself on the first day of data collection with an offer to join in the 'lunch pool' and share take-out Chinese food at lunchtime. This proved to be an ongoing lunchtime ritual within the unit and was a valuable opportunity to observe some of the socialization aspects and the cultural traits of the unit.

It became apparent early in the data collection process that barriers existed between management and the employees. This was not only in terms of communication and the physical arrangement of work space, but in terms of trust. Many employees of the unit did not trust management and may have viewed the presence of an outsider as being part of a hidden agenda on the part of management.

Employees were generally friendly but seemed reserved in their comments regarding the team pilot. A conversation with an employee on the second day of the data collection provided evidence to this effect. The employee was talking openly and freely with the researcher on a topic which was not related to the unit or to the team pilot. When the topic of conversation turned to the work place and the researcher specifically asked about the employees' perception of the team pilot within the unit, the responses of the employee became noticeably guarded. Field notes of the researcher suggest "Trust does not appear to come easily in this unit. It seems as though the employees do not trust anyone, and especially those who are perceived as working for management."

An attempt was made from the beginning to dispel any feelings that the intention of the researcher was to work on behalf of management. Through casual conversation in the unit with various employees, by asking about their jobs and by showing interest in their individual feelings and attitudes, the employees gradually became more open and trusting of the researcher. One of the most important factors

in getting to know the employees and in gaining their trust was interacting with each employee one-on-one. Taking the time to speak to an employee individually and to be interested in what they had to say, helped in conveying the message that the researcher was genuinely interested in the concerns of the employee. Field notes also show that some employees seemed especially to enjoy explaining their individual jobs and being asked about the importance of their role in the functioning of the office.

Other first impressions of the unit that were recorded included the distinct language barrier that existed between the English speaking and French speaking employees. The employees fell into three categories; those who spoke only English, bilingual employees, and those who spoke only French. The tensions existed primarily between the two unilingual groups. Due to the fact that the researcher only spoke English, a special effort was made from the start to attempt to speak a few words of French each day to the French speaking employees in order to show a genuine effort to communicate. However, the majority of the day to day interactions between the employees and the researcher occurred with either the English speaking or the bilingual employees.

The physical layout of the unit was another factor that made an initial impression [Figure 1]. Six circular formations that each contained four workstations were arranged in the unit. Although the unit was officially one large team at the initial stages of the data collection, there were two distinct sub-units of the team.

These two sub-units acted as separate teams and completed separate functions, but were not spatially distinguishable from each other. It can be noticed in the figure of the floor plan that two sub-units were arranged in a format that did not encourage the development of separate identities or promote team cohesiveness within the individual units.

Figure 1: Floorplan of Unit

An additional factor that became a consideration during the data collection period was an announcement made by management to the workers of the unit. It was announced for the first time that within the next three to four years, fifteen of the twenty-one positions within the unit would be eliminated due to large-scale government restructuring across departments. Clients, which are other government departments, will be taking over much of the work currently performed by the unit. All of the employees were guaranteed positions within the federal public service without a reduction in pay level. The timing of this announcement coincided with the introduction of the researcher into the unit. English and French speaking employees were informed at two separate meetings that were held one hour apart.

The directive concerning the unit reduction had originated at a higher level within and was part of an overall departmental downsizing. Once management was aware of the details of the planned unit reduction, employees were told almost immediately. A group setting was chosen and all employees who work at the affected site were told together in order to reduce the possibility of misleading rumours of the cuts spreading throughout the units. The level of the department that controlled decisions regarding downsizing was independent of the management level that controlled the team pilot.

There is no doubt that this news changed some of the feelings and attitudes that employees had toward the team pilot. It was expected that some employees would admit to having lost some of the enthusiasm or hope that they may have felt toward the structural changes that had occurred in the unit. The following excerpt from field notes approximately two weeks after the announcement confirms this expectation. "I had a chat with two people who I had not really met before....When I asked specifically about the team pilot they said that it had been going along OK until the announcement of the job cuts. Now it seems the attitude is 'What's the use? We'll all be gone in two years. What's the use in learning to work together in a team when the whole team will be disbanded.'" This change in attitude led to the inclusion of a portion of the written questionnaire which asked respondents to indicate their feelings and commitment today as compared to how they felt when the team pilot began. In the event that the commitment level of a respondent had changed, the respondent was asked what made it change.

Two weeks after the announcement of the pending unit cut-backs, the first strong effects that directly affected the team pilot were observed. At a meeting that was intended as a forum to discuss team pilot related issues with management, the team pilot was virtually ignored as a discussion regarding the future of the employees of the unit took place. The topics included the repositioning of workers, the re-training that will be provided and the career counselling that is available. The only team pilot related issue that was raised was management's request for an update on

the training on a new computer system that the team was responsible for conducting. It was discovered that the team had not come up with a training plan or a coordinator and no action had been taken on the matter. It was also announced at this time that all of the overtime budget for the fiscal year had been used and any overtime would have to be taken in time until the end of March. The planning and use of overtime was one of the responsibilities that had been turned over to the team.

An update of service levels for the last few months of 1992 were also revealed at this team meeting. It was reported that during the initial stages of the team pilot, the service levels of the unit remained steady and remarkably high (Table 3). Due to the fact that service levels were high before the team pilot and remained high after the restructuring, some employees expressed the opinion that there was no advantage to the new structure, while others were pleasantly surprised that levels remained high despite an increased amount of tension in the unit. However, later in the data collection period, it was discovered that productivity reports had been altered in order to make problems in the unit appear less serious.

Table 3: Reported Service Levels

<u>Month</u>	<u>Reported Level</u>
September 1992	99.42 %
October 1992*	99.86 %
November 1992	99.90 %
December 1992	99.97 %

* Team pilot began in October

After two weekly visits in the unit, several key observations were recorded. First, it became clear that those who were not in favour of the team pilot were among the most vocal in the unit. This aided in creating an atmosphere within the unit that was tense and often very negative toward the team pilot. It was not until conversations were held with workers on a personal level that positive feelings toward some aspects of the team pilot began to emerge. These more positive attitudes were generally overpowered by the louder negative sentiments that were openly expressed.

Second, the sources of many of the problems in the unit ran far deeper and were more extensive than the team pilot. One such problem was tension between the two language groups. On the surface the problem was teammates who did not cooperate with each other and did not communicate with members of their team who spoke the other language. This situation initially presented itself as a problem relating to the team pilot. This language-based problem, however, existed long before the

team pilot was implemented and is not easily reconciled. A comprehensive and effective solution is beyond the realm of both the team pilot project and this study.

Communication was discovered to be at the centre of other problems that existed within the unit. Some of the examples of communication breakdowns that occurred were between management and the workers of the unit and between team members. The breakdowns between management and the employees occurred in both directions; management did not always communicate effectively to the employees and the employees often did not openly communicate with management.

One example of a communication difficulty that occurred between employees was recalled in a story told to the researcher by a member of the unit. The problem began when one member told a second team member that she was not pulling her weight in the workload of the team. The employee immediately broke into tears and left the office. Within a few minutes about 15 people were yelling and screaming at each other. The person recalling the story questioned how the team was expected to work together when one team member cannot honestly tell another team member how they are doing.

This event served as a reminder of the critical role that communication assumes in a team-based structure. Employees that were never authorized to comment on the work habits of a colleague are suddenly expected to communicate

openly with each other. In this unit, the supervisor played an important role in maintaining civility and ensuring that work was completed on time. Furthermore, the role of the supervisor was not only a functional one but also very much a symbolic role. The supervisor was perceived as 'the parental figure' within the unit and the one to whom problems with a colleague were directed. In response to the question, "If your commitment level [to the team pilot] has changed, what made it change?", the consequences of the diminished role of the supervisor were made apparent. One frustrated employee replied: "I find that there is a lot more talking, more fooling around and less work done than before, less help. Some people don't need a supervisor, some do. There are less and less people helping each other. So why should I do more work, and let the others have fun? I am sorry but it is just like a zoo in here." Another employee wrote: "Certain employees do not accept that we ask them to do certain jobs unless the supervisor asks them." With the role of supervisor greatly diminished and both workers and the supervisor unsure of the boundaries of responsibility within the unit, the importance of communication is paramount.

6.4 Attitudes Toward Work, Colleagues, and Management

In addition to collecting data directly related to the team pilot, an important element of the research was to gain better understanding of the workers' feelings and attitudes toward their work, their colleagues and the management of the unit. As

mentioned, from observation of the work place and informal discussions with employees, it seemed as though employees generally enjoyed their work, but did not enjoy coming to work due to personality conflicts and the strong negative attitudes being expressed daily by co-workers. When specifically asked about their job most appeared more than willing to explain it and how it fit in with the functional role of the unit. Measurable results regarding the attitudes of employees toward their work were obtained from the questionnaire, which included the statement, "I enjoy my work." The responses were measured on a 7-point Likert type scale with the following numeric scale: 1 - Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Somewhat Disagree, 4 - Indifferent, 5 - Somewhat Agree, 6 - Agree, 7 - Strongly Agree. The mean responses for the three time periods remained relatively stable and high with 6.0, 5.3, and 5.6. (See Appendix V for results of test for difference of means). All of these mean responses show that employees generally enjoy their work and fall between somewhat agree and agree (Table 4).

One of the two most common complaints of the employees as recorded by the researcher regarded other workers within the unit. On separate occasions, more than half of the employees in the unit complained of feeling as though they were always being watched by their colleagues. Some felt frustrated that the team mates seemed less concerned about increasing productivity in the unit than about catching a teammate returning late from a break, from lunch, or leaving a few minutes early at the end of the day. The questionnaires attempted to assess the relationship between

workers and their colleagues with three similar statements that were each measured using the 7 point Likert type scale. The first statement, "I feel that my colleagues appreciate my work" remained relatively stable with an general feeling of indifference over the three time periods with mean responses of 4.8, 4.3 and 4.1. The second statement, "I assist and support my work colleagues" also remained stable with employees agreeing to the statement. The mean scores were substantially higher at 6.0, 5.8, and 5.6. The final statement used to measure the relationship between colleagues was "I have confidence in my work colleagues." The mean scores reflect a somewhat low and fluctuating confidence level with mean scores of 4.2, 3.1, and 3.4.

Table 4: Attitudes Toward Work and Colleagues

Statement	Mean Responses		
	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3
I enjoy my work	6.0	5.3	5.6
I feel that my colleagues appreciate my work	4.8	4.3	4.1
I assist and support my work colleagues	6.0	5.8	5.6
i have confidence in my work colleagues	4.2	3.1	3.4

(Scale: 1 - Strongly Disagree, 7 - Strongly Agree)
N = 20

The relations between members of the unit were often volatile. The atmosphere of the unit was very changeable, often in a short period of time. The

field notes indicate the degree of interaction that occurred within the unit on several occasions. After reviewing these notes, a pattern began to emerge. For example, it was observed on several occasions that first thing in the morning, the employees of the unit were generally friendly and cordial to one another. Conversations were on such topics as what the individuals did the previous evening or the news headlines of the morning.

By mid-morning, however, tensions began to arise. The degree of tension appeared to be highly dependent on which employees were present and conversely, which were absent. Absentee rates in the unit during the period in which the data was collected were generally between twenty five and thirty percent. It was also observed that the working atmosphere of the unit was dependent upon who was on holiday at a given time. For example, during one week of the data collection, the mood and atmosphere of the entire unit was noticeably improved over the previous few weeks. It was discovered that several of the team members who were more difficult to get along with were on holidays simultaneously. Tensions often declined at lunchtime, as some employees left the office and others shared the cost of ordering lunch.

During the afternoons, employees seemed to keep very much to themselves; conversations were at a minimum. At this point in the day, many of the employees appeared more concerned about how soon they could leave the office than about

dealing with co-workers. The most noticeable change in the general atmosphere of the unit occurred at about 3:00 pm, when the level of interaction between employees noticeably increased. The following is an excerpt taken from field notes on one such occasion: "...It was interesting to see how the atmosphere began to get noticeably friendlier at about 3 pm. The first set of people left around 3:20 pm and most of the others left at 3:50 pm. I don't think I have ever witnessed an area clear out so quickly. Most people did not even say goodbye to anyone, they just headed to the door."

One of the subgoals of the team pilot, as expressed in the pilot documents, was to create a relationship between employees and management based on partnership and trust. In addition to general observation and conversation with employees, this goal was translated into a statement and presented on the written questionnaire to employees (Table 5). The statement was "The relationship between employees [of the unit] and management is that of a partnership. The results from the three sets of questionnaires yielded mean ratings of 4.0, 2.8, and 2.6. This indicates a relationship in which indifference declined to a point of disagreement with the statement. (See Appendix V for results of test for difference of means).

The issue of the relationship between employees and management was further examined with two other statements, both of which were also measured using the 7 point Likert type scale. The first of these statements was, "I trust management at [the

office] to do what is best for the unit." Mean responses from the three intervals were 3.7, 2.8, and 2.4. The second statement also focused on the issue of trust with "The team pilot has increased the amount of trust between employees of [the unit] and the management of [the office]. Similar declining mean responses were recorded with scores of 3.3, 2.2, and 2.1.

Table 5: Attitudes Toward Management

Statement	Mean Responses		
	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3
The relationship between employees [of the unit] and management is that of a partnership.	4.0	2.8	2.6
I trust management at [the office] to do what is best for the unit.	3.7	2.8	2.4
The team pilot has increased the amount of trust between employees of [the unit] and management of [the office].	3.3	2.2	2.1
(Scale: 1 - Strongly Disagree, 7 - Strongly Agree)			
N = 20			

6.5 Attitudes Toward the Team Pilot

The feelings and attitudes that members of the unit held toward the team pilot were diverse and varied over the time of the data collection. The most consistent

results were in response to a question that asked the employee to rate his or her personal commitment to the team pilot immediately after it began. Across the three time periods, those who reported being either committed with a few reservations or fully committed with no reservations were 80%, 84%, and 83%. No respondents reported being very negative and not in support of the team pilot at all. These figures reflect that many of the employees began the team pilot experience with a positive outlook and were relatively committed to the concept during the early stages. When asked to rate personal commitment to the team pilot today [at the time of the questionnaire], responses were considerably different. Those who reported being fully committed with no reservations or committed with a few reservations declined over the three time periods with results of 75%, 68% and 50%. Although fluctuation over a five month period is normal, in this case, the positive responses to the team pilot continually declined. Negative attitudes toward the team pilot varied between the time periods. Only 10% of the respondents were very negative at the time of the first questionnaire and did not support the team pilot at all. This figure had grown to 26% at the second time period and fell somewhat at the final time period to 17%.

It was expected that when the employees were asked the cause of a change in commitment toward the team pilot between the time immediately after it was introduced and the time of the questionnaire, the most frequent theme would be the announcement of job cuts. The issue of job losses appeared to be the most striking blow to the team pilot, and one that would lead to a definite change in the level of

commitment held by employees. The results were surprising, however, with a wide variety of responses. The following is a sample of some of the reasons given for a change in commitment level: "people's attitude", "management made promises that were never met", "...There are less and less people helping each other. So why should I do more work, and let the others have fun?..".

These results from the questionnaire confirm the observational data collected over the same time period. It was evident that while morale within the unit was relatively stable, indifference toward the team pilot was increasing. The weekly meetings, which were intended for discussing problems or issues relating to the team pilot, became bi-weekly meetings. The issues that were raised during these forums began to stray from team pilot related issues to other workplace matters. In addition, the responsibility of running these meetings was turned over to the former supervisor of the unit. This move gave the former supervisor a much larger role to play in the team pilot, and gave the employees a sense of having a supervisor once again. This reversal of a previous arrangement aided in the growing attitude of indifference held by the employees.

In addition to measuring the commitment level that employees had toward the team pilot, it was important to look at the perceived differences that the team pilot made in the daily operations of the unit. Observational data indicated that employees enjoyed some of the aspects of the new structure, but were generally frustrated with

the team pilot. When asked to name positive aspects of the team pilot, employees responded with items such as increased responsibility and decision making in their job and less management supervision. It was interesting, however, that on several occasions, employees expressed the feeling of having more power to make decisions, but followed up by stating that they saw no change in their day to day job after the implementation of the team pilot. One employee went so far as to say that the team pilot was management's way of paying lip service to the concept of government restructuring and that nothing around the unit would ever change.

The questionnaire contained six statements which compared aspects of the unit prior to the team pilot with the situation at the time of the response (Table 6). In order to verify that the six statements were measuring similar circumstances or attitudes, reliability tests were run. The responses to the six statements were compared within each time period and provided three sets of reliability coefficients. The six statements provided a standardized alpha of .62 in the first time period. The correlation matrix, however, revealed that one statement did not correlate with any of the other five statements. The reliability test was repeated with the remaining five statements and revealed a standardized alpha of .86. This pattern of performing the test with both six and five statements was followed in carrying out reliability tests in the second and third time periods, with similar results (Table 7). (See Appendix V for results of test for difference of means).

Table 6: Comparison of Aspects of Unit Prior to Team Pilot with Time of Response

Statement	Mean Responses		
	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3
The team pilot has made a lot of good changes to [the unit].	3.4	3.2	3.1
I make more decisions about my job today than I did before the team pilot.	4.6	3.4	4.0
In my opinion, [the unit] is a better place to work now than it was before the team pilot.	3.2	2.3	1.9
I prefer things the way they used to be, before the team pilot.	4.2	3.8	4.4
I have more authority over my job than I did before the team pilot.	4.4	4.3	3.1
The team pilot has brought more meaning to my work.	3.8	3.1	2.8
(Scale: 1 - Strongly Disagree, 7 - Strongly Agree)			
N = 20			

The statement "I prefer things the way they used to be, before the team pilot began" did not correlate with the other five. Although this statement draws a comparison between the situation in the unit prior to the team pilot with the situation at the time of the response, it is not surprising that the responses do not correlate. The wording of this statement may draw upon a natural aversion to change more than

it reflects sentiments toward the team pilot in particular. Even if employees rated the team pilot favourably, a preference for doing things the way they were done before the change is not unusual.

Table 7: Reliability Coefficients of Statements Measuring Unit Prior to Team Pilot With Time of Response

	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3
6 Items	.63	.60	.31
5 Items	.86	.86	.64
Statements included: 1, 5, 6, 8*, 10, 12			
* Removed			

One of the statements of the questionnaire was purposely left for the end of the Likert-type scale section. The statement was included in order to measure agreement to a sentiment that had been expressed in the unit by several employees. The statement is "The team pilot is management's way of giving us more work for the same pay." It was left close to the end of the questionnaire in order to prevent the statement from potentially influencing the respondent's attitudes through the remainder of the questions. The responses were encouraging to supporters of the team pilot with mean scores of 4.4, 4.7 and 3.9.

It became apparent early in the data collection process that the team pilot was not working as smoothly as management had hoped it would. Problems and conflicts

of varying degrees were emerging almost daily and minor alterations to the team pilot were undertaken in an effort to promote stability within the unit. Barriers to the success of the team pilot existed, however, both within the unit and in the environment within which the unit functions, and minor alterations were insufficient to adequately address them. Although some of these barriers were observed by the researcher, the questionnaire asked employees to rank the degree to which six factors served as barriers that prevented the team pilot from achieving its full potential. The six factors presented were: lack of direction, English/French language tensions, co-operativeness of co-workers in the unit, management of the office, lack of job security, support from outside. Two additional factors that were added by respondents were lack of training and lack of communication. Employees were asked to rank each of the barriers according to a five-point scale, with 1 as 'not a barrier to success of the team pilot' and 5 as 'a very large barrier to the success of the team pilot' (Table 8).

During the first time period the number one barrier as reported by the employees was lack of job security, with a mean rating of 3.8 out of the scale of 1 to 5. This was understandable and expected under the circumstances that prevailed in the unit. Co-operativeness of co-workers ranked as the second largest barrier with a mean score of 3.6. The third highest barrier was English/French language tensions with a mean score of 3.27.

Table 8: Top Three Reported Barriers to Success of Team Pilot

Period 1:	1.	Lack of job security	3.8
	2.	Co-operativeness of co-workers	3.6
	3.	English/French language tensions	3.2
Period 2:	1.	Co-operativeness of co-workers	4.0
	2.	Lack of job security	4.1
	3.	English/French language tensions	3.8
Period 3:	1.	Co-operativeness of co-workers	3.8
	2.	Management of [the office]	3.5
	3.	Lack of job security	3.4

(1 - not a barrier, 5 - a very large barrier)
Period 1: N=20, Period 2: N=19, Period 3: N=18

The same barriers ranked in the top three during the second measured time period, with a change in ranking of the top two. Co-operativeness of co-workers was seen as a more serious barrier with a mean score of 4.1, followed by lack of job security at 4.0. English/French language tensions remained the third ranked barrier to the team pilot with a mean score of 3.8. All three of these barriers increased in score during the second time period, reflecting a perception of being a more important barrier.

The third time period revealed that co-operativeness of co-workers was still perceived as the most important barrier to the success of the team pilot with a mean score of 3.8. A new barrier, management of the office, entered the top three in the

second position with a mean score of 3.5. The third position was lack of job security with a mean score of 3.5.

6.6 Unit of comparison

Near the completion of the data collection period in the unit, a visit was made to another functional unit within the same government department. This department had embarked on a similar team-based restructuring program approximately ten months prior to the primary team pilot profiled in this study. The restructuring involved approximately 120 employees who were divided into fourteen teams across four functional areas. This one-time visit provided data in the form of interviews with management, casual conversation with employees and the completion of a questionnaire by selected employees of the unit. The questionnaire was identical to that used to collect data in the primary unit of the study.

The first noticeable difference between the primary unit and this unit of comparison was the layout of the office. The entire floor of the building which housed this unit had been remodelled to reflect the team-based structure. Employees were arranged in eight to ten person 'operational teams' which were separated by partitions. Within each of these teams, there were no physical walls or partitions dividing the workspace. Each of these units was identified with signs which clearly

distinguished the teams from one another. Several of the teams also had hand drawn posters and notice boards with names that the team members had come up with. For example, one team used the cartoon character of Garfield as their unofficial mascot and used a drawing of the character on a poster at the entrance to the team area.

In this arrangement, each team had an advisor stationed within the enclosed team area. The four managers responsible for the four functional areas shared an office which was relatively central to the operations. In the event of a problem, employees were encouraged to seek advice or help from any of the managers in the office, not necessarily the manager directly responsible for the particular function.

One year before the restructuring occurred, employees were informed of the plan and the teams were formed. The teams were selected by management according to the level of skills and degree of training possessed by each employee. According to the action plan of the unit, the purpose was to allow time for team building and to build the confidence of employees in regard to the new structure.

Preparation for the restructuring occurred during the one year lead that was allowed and included visits by management and senior employees to several sites across the country where private corporations had successfully implemented a team-based structure. Training was also conducted during the preparation year in an

attempt to provide employees with the capability to interchange duties within a team when necessary.

During this preparation period, the absentee rate remained steady and management reported that employee morale increased. An employee assistance program provided a psychologist to aid employees in solving new work related problems. Upon implementation of the new structure, however, attendance declined and problems emerged both within and between teams. These problems ranged from minor disputes to more serious disciplinary problems and accountability disputes. Due in part to some of these problems, it was decided that responsibilities would be gradually transferred to the teams as the restructuring progressed.

The questionnaires, which were completed by a representative group selected by management yielded some interesting results (Appendix III). The results of the questionnaire in the comparative unit should be viewed with the understanding that the ten individuals had been selected by management and therefore may not be representative of the views held by members of the unit. Where comparisons are drawn between the primary unit and the unit of comparison, the data from the third questionnaire distribution in the primary unit is used. This data from the third time period was used for two reasons. First, it is the furthest from the commencement of the team pilot and therefore most closely resembles the stage of change of the unit of comparison. Second, the data from the third set of questionnaires in the primary unit

was collected within one month of the data collected in the unit of comparison, closer than either the first or second set of questionnaires.

Demographically, the unit of comparison was similar to the primary unit (Table 9). The average age category of respondents in the unit of comparison, or the secondary unit, is 30 - 39 and the highest level of education reported was some high school or high school graduate by 70% of the respondents. Half of the respondents had worked more than ten years in the unit and half had worked less than ten years. Ten to fifteen years was the average length of time spent working in the Federal Public Service. Unlike the primary unit, 60% of the respondents of the secondary unit had worked full time outside of the Federal Public Service, with the average length of time being 10.8 years.

Reported personal commitment to the restructuring in the unit of comparison was considerably higher than that reported in the primary unit. When asked about personal commitment, 80% report being either fully committed, with no reservations, or committed, with a few reservations both immediately after the pilot began and at the time of the questionnaire. This is in contrast to the primary unit where 83% reported the same level of commitment immediately after the team pilot began, but only 50% reported commitment at the time of the questionnaire.

Table 9: Demographic Profile of Unit of Comparison

<u>Age</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Percent</u>
20-29	0	-
30-39	6	60%
40-49	3	30%
50-59	0	0%
60-65	1	10%
Not Answered	0	-
<u>Highest Education Level</u>		
some high school	2	20%
high school graduate	5	50%
some college or university	3	30%
college graduate	0	-
university graduate	0	-
other	0	-
<u>Years in Unit</u>		
less than two	1	10%
two to five	3	30%
five to ten	1	10%
ten to fifteen	1	10%
fifteen to twenty	3	30%
more than twenty	1	10%
(N = 10)		

In part C of the questionnaire, which measures agreement or disagreement using a seven point Likert-type scale, considerable differences in opinion between the primary unit and the unit of comparison were revealed. Out of the fifteen statements measured in this portion of the questionnaire, ten of the statements had mean differences greater than 1.5. Four of these statements had mean differences that exceeded 2.0 and only two statements revealed a mean difference of less than 1.0.

The greatest difference was in response to the statement "I have more authority over my job than I did before the team pilot". The mean in the unit of comparison was very high at 5.8, as compared to the primary unit mean of 3.1. A similar statement "In my opinion, [the unit] is a better place to work now than it was before the team pilot" elicited different opinions with the unit of comparison reporting relative indifference with a mean score of 4.5. The mean score of the primary unit to this statement was much lower at 1.9.

In relation to attitudes and feelings toward management, the employees of the unit of comparison were more positive. The statement "I trust management [of the office] to do what is best for the unit" produced a mean of 4.3 within the unit of comparison and only 2.4 within the primary unit. Similarly, the statement "The team pilot has increased the amount of trust between employees of [the unit] and the management of [the office]" elicited a mean score of 4.2 within the unit of comparison and a relatively low 2.1 within the primary unit. Neither of these statements regarding trust produced particularly high mean scores within the unit of comparison, but were substantially higher than those reported in the primary unit.

One of the most interesting results is in relation to the statement "I enjoy my work". Although it was close, the employees of the primary unit produced a slightly higher mean score of 5.6 as compared to the unit of comparison which produced a mean score of 5.5.

In regard to the final statement, "The team pilot is management's way of giving us more work for the same pay", it would seem probable that the mean score would be higher within the primary unit. This would correspond to the more positive overall responses that the questionnaire elicited from the unit of comparison. Interestingly, however, the primary unit scored a substantially lower mean at 3.9 than did the unit of comparison, whose mean score indicated agreement with the statement at 5.6.

7.0 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The following section provides a discussion of the results which focuses on the effectiveness of the team pilot within the unit. It serves to raise some key concerns and observations regarding this intervention. In particular, the results of the data collection are discussed in a manner which relates the issues of structure, organizational culture and planned change and leads to insights regarding the interaction between these components.

The section begins by addressing the question of the research hypothesis and whether the hypothesis is supported from the data collected. The inability to quantifiably measure the thickness an organizational culture is also discussed.

The discussion continues by examining whether the primary unit that was examined in this case had actually become a team as a result of the team pilot. This involves differentiating between work groups and work teams, as well as defining and exploring the concept and properties of teamwork and empowered teams.

It is evident that a substantial degree of resistance to this change effort was present in the unit. Resistance to change within the unit is discussed and factors which contributed to this resistance are examined.

A focal point of this research is the examination of the culture of the unit studied in regard to the structural change that was undertaken. This is undertaken by first determining the cultural effects that contributed to the development of the team pilot. The interaction between the new structure and the unit culture during and following the planned change is then addressed.

7.1 Examination of Hypothesis

It became evident early in the data collection process that the reality of the situation in the unit was more complex than the research hypothesis had envisioned. This complexity was evident in several aspects of the research such as attempting to quantify the thickness of the organizational culture or seeking to conclusively determine the success of the change effort based upon goals established by the designers of the team pilot.

Evidence collected suggests that a thick unit culture is present. In the literature review of this document, a thick culture was defined as being a culture in which there are many shared values between the members of the organization. Although observational data supported this claim of many shared values between members, no formal method of measuring the extent of this thickness was achieved. An attempt was made to gain a measurement of cultural thickness through the

individual interviews, however, many of the employees were unable to understand the nature of the questions. For example, employees were asked "What are the unwritten rules of the unit that everybody has to follow?" and "Pretend for a minute that all of CIU is one person. How would you describe this person?" Even after further explanations by the interviewer, most of the employees were unable to grasp the abstract nature of the questions. Another property of the unit culture which emerged in this case was the depth to which the observed shared values of the unit were held. This depth, or entrenchment of the unit culture aided in creating an environment in which the culture is highly resistant to change.

The inability to quantify the thickness of the culture emerged during the data collection to be of secondary importance. The extent of other problems in the unit, such as lack of training and communication skills overshadowed the issue of measuring the culture in this case and provided a basis for evaluating the team pilot.

The question of whether the hypothesis is supported can be argued both for and against. Judgement on this issue is dependent primarily upon the criteria used in evaluating whether the unit culture was indeed thick. It has become evident through this research that organizational culture, or unit culture in this case, and the attributes that characterize that culture are much easier to observe than to measure.

7.2 Is This Really a Team?

It is appropriate to begin the discussion section by first establishing whether the restructuring effort that was undertaken in the unit had successfully created an empowered team. Although the restructuring effort was named the "Team Pilot", did a work team really exist? Insight into this question is provided by first examining the properties of work groups and comparing them with the properties of the unit in this case. The second step of the process is defining a work team and differentiating a work team from a work group. Finally, teamwork will be viewed in relation to both a work group and a work team.

"A work group is a set of two or more jobholders who make up some identifiable organizational unit that is considered to be a permanent part of an organization" (Kinlaw, 1991). In addition, work groups typically have a single supervisor and usually do not exceed thirty employees. The distinctive quality of work groups outlined in this approach is that they exist to perform a set of tasks that contributes to make a larger whole. In other words, "work groups cannot be defined quantitatively by the number of their members or leaders. They can best be described functionally by what they produce" (Kinlaw, 1991).

According to this definition of a work group, the unit examined in this research is within the realm of a work group. The unit is an identifiable part of an

organization, follows the norm of less than thirty employees and has one leader.

Although the unit's output is not integrated into a larger whole, the output of individuals is added together and the sum becomes the unit's output.

Having established that the unit is a work group, the properties of a work team will be examined. The main differences between work groups and work teams are qualitative and functional (Kinlaw, 1991).

Qualitatively, work teams may perform the same tasks as work groups, but teams add value that is not present in work groups. Conflicts are resolved quickly and openly in work teams and information is shared more easily. A general cooperative approach is taken to task completion among team members (Larson and LaFasto, 1989; Kinlaw, 1991).

Functional differences between work groups and work teams include that members of work teams not only cooperate in task performance, but also share in traditional management functions and responsibilities. Teams provide organizations with a viable way of increasing empowerment and job ownership that is otherwise unavailable (Wellins, Byham and Wilson, 1991). These include joint planning, team organization, the establishment of performance goals, resource allocation, and the assessment of team goals.

The unit studied in this case possesses some of the attributes of a work team, particularly in the functional operation of the unit. The unit was given some responsibility that had previously belonged to management. The primary differences lie in the qualitative properties of the team. The unit studied in this research has not succeeded in achieving the qualitative aspects of team cooperation and cohesiveness. It can be argued that the functional properties are those which can be imposed upon a unit by a new structure designed by management. For example, employees can be required to take over or share with management functions such as the setting of performance goals or resource allocation. The qualitative aspects of work teams, however, are more difficult to impose on a unit. Work teams are not created overnight. Becoming a self-directed work team is an evolutionary process as employees adapt over time to greater degrees of responsibility, self-direction, and empowerment (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991). Similarly, cooperative attitudes and openness among employees must be developed and encouraged over a period of time. Although the unit in this research possesses some of the characteristics of a work team, the evidence provided through the data collection suggests that it fits more closely to the definition of a work group.

The categorization of the unit in this report as a work group, as opposed to a work team does not imply that there is no teamwork within the unit. Teamwork is a condition that may only last in a group long enough to complete one task, or may be a permanent characteristic of a group. "Teamwork can exist anywhere within an

organization...It includes a multitude of processes that have a single purpose - to transcend the limits of individual jobholders or individual organizational units and achieve more than it is possible for individuals or separate work units to achieve" (Kinlaw, 1991). The difference between a work group and a work team is the degree to which teamwork exists between its members. Within the unit studied in this research teamwork did exist, but not to the degree that the team pilot design had intended.

7.3 Resistance to Change

Change of almost any type has the potential to generate deep resistance in people and organizations which contributes in making change efforts difficult and sometimes impossible to implement (Cummings and Huse, 1989). It is evident from the data collected in this research that substantial resistance to the team pilot existed at both the employee and supervisory level. Although there are many factors which contribute toward creating resistance to change on the part of individuals in the organization, two particular factors played a dominant role in this case; fear of unemployment and fear of loss of status.

Fear of unemployment was no doubt one of the most influential components in this research. This fear is often associated with a potential organizational change

which threatens to eliminate, completely or partially, the functions of an individual or group (Stanley, 1958). In this case, the team pilot itself is not related to the overall departmental downsizing and the eventual elimination of jobs. Due to the unfortunate timing of the announcement of jobs cuts, however, the team pilot became associated with the downsizing in the minds of many of the employees. This fear of unemployment transcends all levels of the organization in this case, with managers and supervisors being affected to the same degree as the employees. Change can arouse anxiety about letting go of the known and moving to an uncertain future as individuals question whether existing skills will be relevant in the future (Cummings and Huse, 1989). The anxiety of an uncertain future is complicated and amplified with the knowledge of impending job losses.

Fear of loss of status takes several forms, such as reduction of a relative hierarchical position, loss of a function or a change in physical location (Stanley, 1958; Cummings and Huse, 1989). In this case, the fear of loss of status was primarily present at the supervisory level, with the supervisor facing a loss in both formal and informal status in the unit. The redistribution of responsibilities resulted in a shift in power and a loss of formal status for the supervisor. Such a redistribution, however, can be very difficult not only for those who lose power, but for those who assume it (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991). The informal status relates to circumstances such as the possibility of a change in physical location, which does not reflect a loss of formal organizational authority but is a perceived loss.

Although the supervisor maintained his corner office in the unit during the data collection period, it was uncertain how long it would continue.

Another factor that contributed to the high degree of resistance to the team pilot was a lack of understanding in regard to the objectives and purpose of the team pilot. This lack of understanding and communication between management, the supervisor and employees translated into less than full support for the team pilot. One of the leading causes of ineffective teams is a lack of understanding of the goal to be achieved and a loss in the belief that the goal embodies a worthwhile or important result (Larson and LaFasto, 1989).

Regardless of the fact that management had the power to unilaterally implement the team pilot without the support of the employees, the full cooperation of the employees is a necessary component of its success. In order to accept the change, it is crucial that all of those affected as a result of change understand the need for change and know what the organization is trying to accomplish (Stanley, 1958; Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991). Due to the fact that management designed the team pilot and initiated this change, it is understandable that management comprehended the need for the restructuring.

It became apparent in this case, however, that the employees did not understand the reasons behind the team pilot. When directly asked why the pilot was

implemented responses such as "I have no idea" and "Good question" were given. This is a major concern due to the fact that management believed that it had communicated the goals and rationale sufficiently. Additionally, the strategy and goals were not clear to the employees of this unit. This uncertainty has contributed to employees reporting that they are not fully committed to the team pilot.

This lack of understanding is another example of the communication breakdowns that occurred between management and the employees. Management believed that the employees had understood why the change was necessary and how the unit would be improved. In reality, employees picked up only portions of the intended message. Mixed messages were also a factor in this communication breakdown as employees were aware of the negative attitude of the former supervisor toward the team pilot. According to the supervisor, he was initially in favour of the change and was a key player in encouraging the selection of this particular unit for the pilot. However, due to the fact that the action plan for the team pilot was continually being adjusted, the supervisor claims that the changes that were implemented held little resemblance to the plan that he had been "sold on". He felt as though he had been used by management in order to gain initial support for the team pilot.

It is unrealistic to assume that commitment to the pilot by all employees would be achieved. The supervisor of the unit, who had endorsed the project initially, was

now seemingly stripped of many of his responsibilities and was openly negative toward it. It is difficult for employees to view the objectives of the change as significant when those in authority, through their behaviour, convey the view that the objectives are relatively unimportant (Larson and LaFasto, 1989).

In addition, prior to the implementation of the team pilot, employees of the unit were used to receiving all unit related information from the supervisor. Employees rarely dealt directly with management. With the new structure, however, the communication network was expected to flow directly between employees and management. Not only did employees have difficulty associating and communicating directly with management, but management was unsure of how to deal directly with employees. Evidence to this effect is provided in this excerpt from field notes:

"When I arrived today, [the supervisor] was leading a meeting in the unit....It occurred to me that the employees seemed to be more comfortable talking to [the supervisor] than they had been when discussing the same issues with [a manager]. It appears as though the employees are more comfortable around [the supervisor] because they perceive him to be "more like them" than like management. There is less of a "power distance" between employees and [the supervisor] than between employees and [management]." This provides an interesting perspective to the issue of eliminating the supervisory level. It also illustrates the importance of taking into account how de-layering will affect the communication network between those above and below the removed layer.

Resistance to the change in this case is also compounded due to the fact that there was no specific means through which an individual can express views openly or promote effective communication in a group setting. This is apparent in the team pilot through two particular observations. First, it appears that the complainers within the department are the ones who make their opinions known. This is unfortunate as it may be these individuals who tend to sway the opinions of those who are indifferent toward the team pilot. The questionnaires showed that there are a number of employees who are committed and believe that the team pilot has some good to offer the unit. The committed team members appear to be the ones that keep their attitudes to themselves. Second, some team members cannot cope with receiving any type of negative feedback from co-workers. This is complicated by the fact that the majority of those providing the negative comments are less than adequate themselves, in terms of communication skills.

Communication is a critical function that is a fundamental element of the team-based structure. Effective communication between individuals and between layers of the organization is a crucial factor. In the former structure, however, effective communication did not play a significant role and was not valued as such. Due to this lack of focus on communication, many of the employees of this unit have not developed the level of communication skills that the new structure demands. For example, some employees do not appear to have the skills that are required to

effectively separate personal and work related issues. Personality differences between employees inhibits the ability of the individuals to cooperate in their work efforts.

Those who are most affected by this change appear to have been largely overlooked in the planning process for the team pilot. The employees themselves were only minimally involved in the planning stages of the team pilot although they were the key ingredient in its operation and central to its potential success. The employees in this unit were reaching out for hope. Due to a combination of lack of job security, hostility among workers in the office and the continual change, many employees perceived the researcher to be the best hope for relief from the daily strain of working in the unit.

A great deal of the resistance to the team pilot might have been avoided if the supervisor and employees had been fully involved in the pilot's development. Involvement in the actual change process has been shown to manifest itself as a heightened sense of ownership in the team concept and to increase the odds for successful implementation (Stanley, 1958; Cummings and Huse, 1989; Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991).

7.4 Cultural Aspects

For the purposes of this research organizational culture has been defined as the commonly held and relatively stable beliefs, attitudes, values, assumptions and artifacts that exist within the organization.

The change effort studied in this case, the team pilot, involved much more than a purely structural change. To this unit, the successful implementation of the team pilot required a monumental shift in the existing unit culture. This shift was represented by changing power structures, a redistribution of responsibilities, new communication patterns as well as a shift in commonly held values and attitudes.

In the previous structure, employees performed their work with no necessary regard for the work habits or performance of colleagues. Problems between employees or unusual work related client cases were dealt with by the unit supervisor. Interaction between employees was minimal, with focus being placed on the actions and performance of individuals.

The transformed unit structure that formed the focal point of the team pilot required entirely new methods of behaviour and new ways of perceiving situations. The work habits and customs that had been learned and ingrained in the habits and work-lives of the employees no longer "fit" with the new environment. For example,

rather than waiting to be told how to handle an unusual inquiry from a client or having to be asked to help a colleague meet a deadline, employees are now expected to discover answers to questions on their own with the aid of colleagues rather than a supervisor. Deadlines are to be considered as team goals, not individual goals and as such, employees are expected to aid one another without prompting. This focus on team rather than individual goals also requires that employees openly communicate with each other on a regular basis. The compensation system was unchanged, however, and no mechanism existed for recognizing team members for team accomplishments. The lack of team performance reward and incentive structures is one of the most commonly reported problems confronting team-based structures (Larson and LaFasto, 1989).

These new ways of thinking and acting are foreign, however, to employees who are accustomed to a rule-based environment where individual accountability was limited. Due to the fact that employees must learn qualitatively different ways of perceiving, thinking, and behaving, the process of learning will be substantial and will involve unlearning many past behaviours (Cummings and Huse, 1989).

It is evident from the data collected that the attitudes, values and beliefs of the employees have not adapted to fit the new team-based environment. Most of the employees in this unit have never worked outside of the current setting and are conditioned and accustomed to the highly bureaucratic focus of the organization.

There are rules and regulations which leave the employee little or no room for individual judgement and tend to limit to a great extent the ability to attain any significant degree of decentralization. The past experiences of the employees also contribute to the difficulty in adjusting to this new responsibility. Employees have learned values and have acquired habits based on what they have seen, heard, and experienced not only in this unit but in other public service units they have worked with. These experience-based attributes are ingrained and have been developed over many years.

During the pre-implementation and early implementation stage of the team pilot, management assumed that employees of this unit would grasp the opportunity to suddenly participate in decision making and to take control of unit responsibilities that had previously been held by the supervisor. When the employees failed to welcome these new responsibilities and team-based concepts, and as problems within the team developed, the reaction of management was to view the team pilot as a failure. The resistance on the part of the employees, however, was a natural reaction to the changes that were taking place around them (Sathe, 1985; Cummings and Huse, 1989).

Sathe quantifies resistance to culture change as being the product of the magnitude of the change in the content of the culture and the strength of the prevailing culture (Sathe, 1985) Evidence collected during the data collection

process supports this formula. Due to the fact that the team concept requires a radical change in the content of the culture, which is thick and entrenched, there exists substantial resistance to the culture change.

An organization's culture develops from its most salient values. In order to overcome resistance to cultural change and to achieve responsible and informed decision making at the lowest levels, everyone must understand the organization's vision and values (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991). A team-based structure represents a major shift in the way an organization operates and in how it values its employees. This type of significant culture change must not be addressed lightly.

The cultural transition that is necessary in this unit in order for a team-based structure to be effective is formidable and will require the full cooperation of all levels of the department. "The team concept means a massive role change not only for team members, but for supervisors and managers who must give up the trappings of formal power and learn to lead through empowerment" (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991). The task of creating a culture of teamwork is crucial, however, in order to ensure that the proper environment exists within a unit and that the values of employees will be supportive of team-based structures.

2 of/de 2

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

7.5 Culture, Structure, and Change

It is evident that during this structural change no study or regard was given to the area of the organizational culture. The compatibility of the new structure with the existing culture of the unit appears to have been either overlooked, or it was assumed that a cultural shift would follow a change in structure.

This lack of focus regarding the issue of unit culture and the important role it plays in facilitating organizational change is, perhaps, the most significant oversight on the part of management. Making no alteration in the physical environment and providing no training in communication skills prior to the team pilot implementation are two noticeable others. The thick and entrenched culture that exists in this unit is resistant to any type of change and without concerted effort will continue to restrict the effectiveness of the team pilot project.

The effort that has been made on the part of management to restructure the unit is testimony of a commitment toward creating an organization which is more effective. A broader perspective must be taken, however, in order to realize a meaningful and long-lasting change in day to day operations. The change effort must be viewed in relation to the environment in which it will be implemented. "The importance of structure is not in its presence or absence, not in having a structure for structure's sake. Rather, the significance of structure lies in identifying the

appropriate structure for the achievement of a specific performance objective" (Larson and LaRusso, 1989: 40).

A team-based structure may not be the most suitable means of achieving business objectives. The most persistent and influential aspect of a team's environment is its values (Kinlaw, 1991). If the values of the environment, however, do not fit the values necessary to support a team-based structure, conflicts such as those that emerged in this case will arise. Teams work only when an organization's culture is ready for them (Wellins, Byham, and Wilson, 1991). Determining the readiness of a culture to accept empowered teams is a necessary step in the change process.

An understanding of the separate elements of organizational culture, structure and the function and management of planned change is not sufficient to deal with the complex problems that arise from cases such as the one profiled in this document. Researchers, consultants and managers alike must understand how these fundamental elements interact with one another. To study and plan the re-structuring of any type of unit or department without considering, for example, the corresponding cultural traits and attributes, is only a partial solution. Long term and effective restructuring of hierarchical organizations requires broad study and consultation. Proceeding in a restructuring effort without proper research has the potential of not only risking what might have been a successful change effort, but can also de-moralize employees and

create an environment in which any future innovative efforts will be viewed unfavourably.

8.0 LIMITATIONS, BENEFITS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The following section begins by providing an overview of some of the limitations regarding the generalizability of the results of this research. It continues with an evaluation of the benefits that are generated from this case study. The section concludes with suggestions from the researcher regarding the directions for future research in this area.

8.1 Limitations of the Research

There are several limitations of this research that may affect the results. First, it can be argued that due to the fact that this is a single case study, the results may not be generalizable. The unit in question, however, is similar in structure and function to an operational unit of many different organizations. The environment is task oriented and the outlook appears to be short term in focus - in terms of the attitude toward benefits and perceived outcomes.

Second, the number of people in the unit is twenty-one. Although this is a relatively small figure, it incorporates the entire unit and is no less valid in terms of this case study than a single unit with a larger number of employees.

The third limitation is language related. The working environment of the unit being studied is both English and French, with approximately fifty percent of the employees coming from each background. It should also be noted that a large proportion of the employees are bilingual, therefore providing a degree of overlap. Due to the fact that the researcher only speaks and understands English, a bias is possible. This is especially relevant in the observational aspects of the data collection, where day to day conversations can be difficult. This was minimized as much as possible by conducting the personal interviews in the language preferred by the employee, with the aid of a translator.

An additional element of concern in this research may be researcher biases toward what is observed. The thesis topic is built around the concept of organizational culture and without realizing it, the bias of the researcher toward this topic may cause an interpretation of findings to suit the selected research topic. Being aware of the potential of this bias is, however, the first step in attempting to control for it.

8.2 Benefits of the Research

The issues that are being faced by the unit in this case study are similar in nature to problems that exist in organizations across a wide variety of industries in

both the private and public sector. Organizations such as the one to be studied in this research are embracing new management concepts such as empowerment as a means of increasing the overall effectiveness and employee productivity. These organizations are concurrently initiating the implementation of new organizational structures to facilitate the power distribution requirements.

It is important to explore the relationship that exists between the elements of these organizations that are being altered in order to maintain and enhance the overall effectiveness and productivity of the organization and to promote the personal development of employees. Without exploration and research into the interaction between organizational elements such as culture, structure and change, the full potential of change efforts will not be realized.

This research will aid students, managers, consultants and researchers in becoming aware of the relationships and interaction between organizational structure and organizational culture. It will also aid in promoting the importance of compatibility between an organization's chosen structure and the organizational culture. By recognizing potential areas of difficulty prior to implementing structural change, proper preparations and training can be developed. This will reduce expensive mistakes both in monetary terms and in terms of employee frustration and potentially reduce the time frame necessary for adjusting to the change.

8.3 Directions for Future Research

Restructuring efforts, such as the one undertaken in this case study, cannot be viewed in isolation. It is crucial that managers and researchers understand how structural changes interact with other elements of the organization, such as the organizational culture. In order to gain a clear understanding of the relationship that exists between organizational culture, structure and planned change, more research is required.

In order to facilitate research into the interaction between these elements, however, more focus should be placed on creating a measure by which to evaluate the strength of organizational culture. By focusing on the development of more quantifiable measures of organizational culture, efforts to develop theories that have the ability to compare organizational elements will be enhanced.

In addition, it would be of benefit to both organizations and to researchers if study into the implementation of change efforts were to begin earlier in the change process. This would allow researchers to collect data from the unit prior to the implementation of the change and to more readily compare this pre-implementation data with the data collected during and following the change.

9.0 CONCLUSION: HOW TO PROCEED

The conclusion of this research takes the form of recommendations that stem from the lessons learned through this case study.

Greater emphasis on pre-implementation. In this case, the team pilot was developed and subsequently implemented without a great deal of preparation in the unit. This resulted in problems that management should have anticipated. By placing more effort and emphasis on the pre-implementation stage of a restructuring effort, management will be in a proactive instead of a reactive position. An important element of this pre-implementation stage is training. This includes training in areas such as communication skills as well as cross-training of team members in all tasks of the team.

Involve those who are affected by the change. The planning stages of a significant change such as the one that occurred in this case should include those who are affected. Although the inclusion of employees in the planning process may not always be feasible, every effort should be made to include representation from each affected level of the organization.

Consider cultural values and strength of existing culture. A structural change should never be considered in isolation. One of the most crucial elements to be taken

into account is the existing culture and the fundamental values that form the basis of the culture. In the event that the underlying cultural values are incongruent with those advocated by team-based structures, efforts must be made to begin the process of aligning the two elements.

Consider organizational environment. In addition to considering the existing culture of the organization, other factors in the organization's internal and external environment should be taken into account. These include: present level of productivity, quality of output, and customer service. Other factors such as the organization's history of accepting changes, the morale of those who will be involved and the impact of events such as layoffs must also be considered. These factors will aid in determining whether a change effort is viable in a particular situation.

Strategic Support. A structural change cannot be undertaken in isolation. A decision to implement a team-based structure should be considered in the context of the long term strategic support that will be in place to guide and maintain the development of the empowered teams. Continued and steadfast commitment to restructuring is a necessary component of its success.

Clarity of Role of Supervisor. The balance of responsibility between the supervisor and the newly empowered team must be clearly defined and understood.

Uncertainty regarding roles and responsibilities leads to frustration and confusion among both the team and the supervisor.

Adapt workspace to reflect new structure. It is important that physical alterations in the workplace coincide with an alteration in the structure. A change in the layout or work area into a more team conducive environment would provide tangible evidence of the otherwise abstract concept of restructuring that takes place in a unit. In the event that the role of the supervisor is reduced or eliminated, the office of the supervisor should be relocated out of the team's immediate area.

Redesign compensation mechanisms. Compensation in the organization traditionally rewards individual employees for the achievement of individual goals. These mechanisms must be brought in line with the values espoused by team-based structures. This involves designing team compensation for the achievement of team goals in order to encourage cooperation between team members.

Regardless of the problems that emerged in this case, the management of this office deserves credit for attempting to improve the efficiency and operations of the unit. The majority of the employees of the unit also deserve praise for attempting to accommodate at least portions of the team pilot. This change effort, as its name implies, was only a pilot and as such was a test case. The lessons learned through this case will not only benefit future team efforts in this department but have

contributed to a greater understanding of how organizational elements such as culture, structure and change interact with each other.

SOURCES

Amburgey, Terry, L., Dawn Kelly, William P. Barnett, "Resetting the Clock: The Dynamics of Organizational Change and Failure", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51-73, (March 1993).

Blake, Robert R., Jane Srygley Mouton, and Anne Adams McCauley, *Change By Design*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., (1989).

Boland, Richard J. and Howard Thomas, *Managing Ambiguity and Change*, John Wiley and Sons, 1988.

Cummings, Thomas G. and Edgar F. Huse, *Organization Development and Change*, St-Paul, Minnesota, West Publishing Company, (1989).

Davis, Keith, *Human Relations At Work*, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., (1962).

Davis, Stanley, "Culture is not Just an Internal Affair", in Kilmann Ralph H, Saxton Mary J, Serpa Roy et al. *Gaining Control of Corporate Culture*, Jossey-Bass, (1985).

Davis, Tim R. V., "Managing Culture at the Bottom", in Kilmann Ralph H, Saxton Mary J, Serpa Roy et al. *Gaining Control of Corporate Culture*, Jossey-Bass, (1985).

Deal, Terrence, E. "Cultural Change: Opportunity, Silent Killer, or Metamorphosis?", in Kilmann Ralph H, Saxton Mary J, Serpa Roy et al. *Gaining Control of Corporate Culture*, Jossey-Bass, (1985).

Denison, Daniel R. *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*, New York, John Wiley and Sons, (1990).

Dyer, William G., *Team Building: Issues and Alternatives*, Addison Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., (1977).

Dyer, W. Gibb Jr., "The Cycle of Cultural Evolution in Organizations", in Kilmann Ralph H, Saxton Mary J, Serpa Roy et al. *Gaining Control of Corporate Culture*, Jossey-Bass, (1985).

Frost, Peter J, Larry F. Moore, Meryl Reis Louis, Craig C. Lundberg and Joanne Martin, *Organizational Culture*, Sage Publications Inc., London, 1985.

Frost, Peter J, Larry F. Moore, Meryl Reis Louis, Craig C. Lundberg and Joanne Martin, *Reframing Organizational Culture*, Sage Publications Inc., London, 1991.

Gordon, George G., "The Relationship of Corporate Culture to Industry Sector and Corporate Performance", in Kilmann Ralph H, Saxton Mary J, Serpa Roy et al. *Gaining Control of Corporate Culture*, Jossey-Bass, (1985).

Government of Canada, *Highlights of the White Paper on Public Service 2000*, December 1990.

Hanna, David P., *Designing Organizations for High Performance*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., (1988).

Hofstede, G. *Culture and Organizations*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, University Press, Cambridge, (1991).

Hofstede, Geert., Bram Neuijen, Denise Daval Ohayv, Geert Sanders, "Measuring Organizational Cultures: A Qualitative and Quantitative Study across Twenty Cases", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 286-316, (June 1990).

Kinlaw, Dennis C., *Developing Superior Work Teams*, Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books, (1991).

Kirkpatrick, Donald, *How to Manage Change Effectively*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Inc, (1985).

Kolb, D. and A. Frohman, "An Organization Development Approach to Consulting", *Sloan Management Review*, 12, 51-65, (1970).

Larson, Carl E., and Frank M. J. LaFasto, *Teamwork*, Newbury Park, California, Sage Publications, (1989).

Lawler, E., *High-Involvement Management*, London, Jossey-Bass Inc, (1986).

Lewin, Kurt, *Field Theory in Social Science*, New York, Harper and Row, (1951).

Likert, Rensis, *New Patterns of Management*, New York, McGraw-Hill, (1961).

Lippett, R., J. Watson, and B. Westley, *The Dynamics of Planned Change*, New York, Harcourt Brace and World, 1958.

McGregor, D. *The Human Side of Enterprise*, New York, McGraw-Hill, (1960).

Martin, Joanne, *Cultures in Organizations: Three Perspectives*, London, Oxford University Press, (1992).

Meyerson, Debra and Joanne Martin, "Cultural Change: An Integration of Three Different Views", *Journal of Management Studies*, 24:6, 623-647, (November 1987).

Mintzberg, Henry, *The Structuring of Organizations*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall Inc, (1979)

Muchus, G. "Employer-Employee Based Quality Circles in Japan: Human Resource Policy Implications for American Firms," *Academy of Management Review*, 255-262, (August 1983).

Northcraft, Gregory B., Margaret A. Neale, *Organizational Behaviour: A Management Perspective*, Orlando, Florida, The Dryden Press, (1990).

Peters, Thomas J., Robert H. Waterman, *In Search of Excellence; Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*, New York, Harper and Row, (1982).

Sathe, Vijay, *Culture and Related Corporate Realities*, Homewood, Illinois, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., (1985).

Sathe, Vijay, "How to Decipher and Change Corporate Culture", in Kilmann Ralph H, Saxton Mary J, Serpa Roy et al. *Gaining Control of Corporate Culture*, Jossey-Bass, (1985).

Sathe, Vijay, "Implications of Corporate Culture: A Manager's Guide to Action", *Organizational Dynamics*, 5-23, (Autumn, 1983).

Schein, Edgar H. "How Culture Forms, Develops, and Changes", in Kilmann Ralph H, Saxton Mary J, Serpa Roy et al. *Gaining Control of Corporate Culture*, Jossey-Bass, (1985).

Schein, Edgar H. "What is Culture?", in Frost, Peter J. et al., *Reframing Organizational Culture*, Newbury Park, California, Sage Publications Inc., (1991).

Schein, Edgar, "The Role of the Founder in Creating Organizational Culture", *Organizational Dynamics*, (Summer, 1983).

Schooman, David F. and Benjamin Schneider, *Facilitating Work Effectiveness*, Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books, (1988).

Seashore, Stanley, Edward E. Lawler, Philip H. Mirvis, Cortlandt Cammann, *Assessing Organizational Change*, New York, John Wiley and Sons, (1983)

Smircich, Linda, Gareth Morgan, "Leadership: The Management of Meaning", *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Volume 18, Number 3, 257-273, (1982).

Stanley, John D., "Group Influence on Technological and Organizational Change", in Davis, Keith, and Scott, William G. *Readings in Human Relations*, New York, McGraw-Hill, (1959).

Taylor, Frederick W., *The Principles of Scientific Management*, New York: Harper and Brothers, (1911)

Vogt, Judith F. and Kenneth L. Murrell, *Empowerment in Organizations*, Pfeiffer and Company, San Diego, (1990).

Wellins, Richard S., William C. Byham, and Jeanne M. Wilson, *Empowered Teams: Creating Self-Directed Work Groups That Improve Quality, Productivity, and Participation*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, (1991).

Williams, Allan, Paul Dobson, and Mike Walters, *Changing Culture: New Organizational Approaches*, London, Institute of Personnel Management, (1989).

Wilkins, Alan L. and Kerry J. Patterson, "You Can't Get There From Here: What Will Make Culture-Change Projects Fail", in Kilmann Ralph H, Saxton Mary J, Serpa Roy et al. *Gaining Control of Corporate Culture*, Jossey-Bass, (1985).

Yin, Robert K., *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Newbury Park, California, Sage Publications Inc., (1989).

APPENDIX I:
QUESTIONNAIRE:
ENGLISH
FRENCH

NOTE: It is once again time for an evaluation of the team pilot in [the unit]. This is your pilot so it is important that you take this opportunity to express what you really feel. Please answer all of the questions with your personal opinions and not the opinions of your co-workers. There are no right or wrong answers and only with your evaluation and feedback can this research be successful.

All responses are completely confidential. Management will NOT be permitted to view the completed questionnaires. After the responses have been collectively recorded, all completed questionnaires will be destroyed.

Thank You for your cooperation.

TEAM PILOT EVALUATION #2

PART A

1. What is your age? 20 - 29 _____
30 - 39 _____
40 - 49 _____
50 - 59 _____
60 - 65 _____
2. Which of the following best describe your highest formal education level?
- some high school _____
high school graduate _____
some college or university _____
college graduate _____
university graduate _____
other (please specify) _____
3. How many years have you worked in [the unit]?
- less than two _____
two to five _____
five to ten _____
ten to fifteen _____
fifteen to twenty _____
more than twenty _____
4. How many years have you worked for the Federal Public Service?
- less than two _____
two to five _____
five to ten _____
ten to fifteen _____
fifteen to twenty _____
more than twenty _____
5. Have you ever worked full-time outside of the Federal Public Service?
- No Yes ==> How many years? _____

PART B

For each question indicate which of the answers best fits how you truly feel.

1. How do you classify changes to your job as a result of the team pilot?

☐ many large changes
☐ a few large changes
☐ a lot of small changes
☐ a few small changes
☐ no change

2. How do you generally feel about your job today, as compared to how you felt about it before the team pilot began?

☐ I feel much worse about my job
☐ I feel a little worse about my job
☐ There is no change in how I feel about my job
☐ I feel a little better about my job
☐ I feel much better about my job

3. How would you rate the productivity of your working environment at [the unit] since the team pilot was implemented?

☐ much more productive
☐ a little more productive
☐ no change
☐ a little less productive
☐ much less productive

4. How would you rate your personal commitment to the team pilot immediately after it began?

☐ I was very negative and did not support the team pilot at all
☐ I was a little negative and did not fully support the team pilot
☐ I was indifferent toward the team pilot
☐ I was committed, but had a few reservations
☐ I was fully committed, with no reservations

5. How would you rate your personal commitment to the team pilot today?

_____ I am fully committed, with no reservations
_____ I am committed, but have a few reservations
_____ I am indifferent toward the team pilot
_____ I am a little negative and do not fully
support the team pilot
_____ I am very negative today and do not support
the team pilot at all

6. If your commitment level has changed, what made it change?

37. Often, when changes take place, there are barriers that prevent it from achieving its full potential

Do you feel that any of the following factors are barriers to the success of the team pilot? Specify the degree to which you believe each of the following are barriers according to the following scale:

- 1 not a barrier to success of the team pilot
- 2 a small barrier not really important to success of the team pilot
- 3 a moderate barrier to success of the team pilot
- 4 an important barrier to success of the team pilot
- 5 a very large barrier to the success of the team pilot

FACTORS	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of direction					
English/French language tensions					
Co-operativeness of co-workers in [the unit]					
Management of [the office]					
Lack of job security					
Support from outside					
Others (please specify)					

PART C

Indicate by circling the appropriate number how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements according to the following scale:

- 1 Strongly Disagree
- 2 Disagree
- 3 Somewhat Disagree
- 4 Indifferent
- 5 Somewhat Agree
- 6 Agree
- 7 Strongly Agree

1. The team pilot has made a lot of good changes to [the unit].

Strongly									Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree	

2. The relationship between employees of [the unit] and management is that of a partnership.

Strongly									Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree	

3. I enjoy my work.

Strongly									Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree	

4. I feel that my colleagues appreciate my work.

Strongly									Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree	

5. I make more decisions about my job today than I did before the team pilot.

Strongly								Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree

6. In my opinion, [the unit] is a better place to work now than it was before the team pilot.

Strongly								Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree

7. I trust management at [the office] to do what is best for the unit.

Strongly								Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree

8. I prefer things the way they used to be, before the team pilot began.

Strongly								Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree

9. I assist and support my work colleagues.

Strongly								Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree

10. I have more authority over my job than I did before the team pilot.

Strongly								Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree

11. More training in team related issues would help me adapt to the team pilot.

Strongly								Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree

12. The team pilot has brought more meaning to my work.

Strongly								Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree

13. I have confidence in my work colleagues.

Strongly								Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree

14. The team pilot has increased the amount of trust between employees of [the unit] and the management at [the office].

Strongly								Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree

15. The team pilot is management's way of giving us more work for the same pay.

Strongly								Strongly
Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Agree

16. In your opinion, why was the team pilot implemented?

17. a) If the team pilot were to begin over again, what would you change?

b) What would you change about the team pilot today?

18. What things are important to you at work?

19. What things are important for your co-workers at work?

20. Any other comments?

NOTE : C'est de nouveau le temps d'évaluer l'équipe pilote de l'unité d'enquête sur chèques. C'est votre équipe pilote, il est donc important de profiter de cette occasion pour dire ce que vous ressentez vraiment. Veuillez répondre à toutes les questions en exprimant vos opinions personnelles et non celles de vos collègues. Il n'y a pas de bonnes ou de mauvaises réponses, et la réussite de cette recherche repose sur votre évaluation et vos commentaires.

Toutes les réponses sont entièrement confidentielles. La direction ne sera PAS autorisée à examiner les questionnaires dûment remplis. Après la notation collective des réponses, on détruira tous les questionnaires dûment remplis.

Nous vous remercions de votre collaboration.

PARTIE B

Pour chaque question, indiquer les réponses qui correspondent le mieux à vos sentiments véritables.

1. Comment classez-vous les changements apportés à votre emploi en raison de l'équipe pilote?
 - ☐ de nombreux changements profonds
 - ☐ quelques changements profonds
 - ☐ beaucoup de légers changements
 - ☐ quelques légers changements
 - ☐ aucun changement

2. En général, quels sont vos sentiments au sujet de votre emploi aujourd'hui, par comparaison à ceux que vous éprouviez avant la création de l'équipe pilote?
 - ☐ J'éprouve des sentiments beaucoup plus négatifs envers mon emploi
 - ☐ J'éprouve des sentiments un peu plus négatifs envers mon emploi
 - ☐ Rien n'a changé quant à mes sentiments envers mon emploi
 - ☐ J'éprouve des sentiments un peu plus positifs envers mon emploi
 - ☐ J'éprouve des sentiments beaucoup plus positifs envers mon emploi

3. Comment évaluez-vous la productivité de votre milieu de travail à [l'unité] depuis la mise en œuvre de l'équipe pilote?
 - ☐ beaucoup plus productif
 - ☐ un peu plus productif
 - ☐ aucun changement
 - ☐ un peu moins productif
 - ☐ beaucoup moins productif

4. Comment évaluez-vous votre engagement personnel envers l'équipe pilote immédiatement après sa création?

_____ J'étais très négatif et je n'ai pas appuyé l'équipe pilote
_____ J'étais légèrement négatif et je n'ai pas pleinement appuyé l'équipe pilote
_____ J'étais indifférent à l'équipe pilote
_____ J'étais engagé mais avec quelques réserves
_____ J'étais pleinement engagé, sans aucune réserve

5. Comment évaluez-vous votre engagement personnel envers l'équipe pilote aujourd'hui?

_____ Je suis pleinement engagé, sans aucune réserve
_____ Je suis engagé, mais avec quelques réserves
_____ Je suis indifférent à l'équipe pilote
_____ Je suis légèrement négatif et n'appuie pas pleinement l'équipe pilote
_____ Aujourd'hui, je suis très négatif et n'accorde aucun appui à l'équipe pilote

6. Si votre degré d'engagement a changé, quel est le motif de ce changement?

7. Souvent, lorsque des changements ont lieu, des obstacles les empêchent de réaliser leurs pleines possibilités.

Estimez-vous que les facteurs suivants constituent des obstacles à la réussite de l'équipe pilote? Précisez dans quelle mesure vous croyez que chacun des facteurs suivants constitue un obstacle selon l'échelle ci-dessous :

- 1 pas un obstacle à la réussite de l'équipe pilote
- 2 un léger obstacle qui n'a pas vraiment d'importance pour la réussite de l'équipe pilote
- 3 un obstacle moyen à la réussite de l'équipe pilote
- 4 un obstacle important à la réussite de l'équipe pilote
- 5 un obstacle très important à la réussite de l'équipe pilote

FACTEURS	1	2	3	4	5
Absence d'orientation					
Tensions linguistiques entre anglophones et francophones					
Coopération des collègues entre eux					
Gestion du [le bureau]					
Absence de sécurité d'emploi					
Appui de l'extérieur					
Autres (veuillez préciser)					

PARTIE C

En encerclant le chiffre approprié, indiquez dans quelle mesure vous êtes d'accord ou en désaccord avec chacun des énoncés suivants, selon l'échelle ci-dessous :

1	Fortement en désaccord
2	En désaccord
3	Plutôt en désaccord
4	Indifférent
5	Plutôt d'accord
6	D'accord
7	Fortement en accord

1. L'équipe pilote a apporté de nombreux changements positifs à [l'unité].

Fortement									Fortement
en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		en accord

2. La relation entre les employés de [l'unité] et la direction constitue un partenariat.

Fortement									Fortement
en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		en accord

3. J'aime mon travail.

Fortement									Fortement
en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		en accord

4. Je sens que mes collègues de travail apprécie mon travail.

Fortement									Fortement
en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		en accord

5. Je prends davantage de décisions relatives à mon travail aujourd'hui que je ne le faisais avant l'équipe pilote.

Fortement								Fortement
en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	en accord

6. Selon moi, [l'unité] est un meilleur milieu de travail maintenant qu'ils ne l'étaient avant l'équipe pilote.

Fortement								Fortement
en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	en accord

7. Je fais confiance à la direction du [le bureau] pour travailler dans le meilleur intérêt de l'unité.

Fortement								Fortement
en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	en accord

8. Je préfère la situation antérieure, avant la création de l'équipe pilote.

Fortement								Fortement
en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	en accord

9. J'aide et supporte mes collègues de travail.

Fortement								Fortement
en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	en accord

10. J'ai plus d'autorité sur mon travail qu'avant la création de l'équipe pilote.

Fortement								Fortement
en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	en accord

11. Une formation accrue sur les questions liées à l'équipe m'aiderait à m'adapter à l'équipe pilote.

Fortement en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fortement en accord
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

12. L'équipe pilote a donné davantage de sens à mon travail.

Fortement en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fortement en accord
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

13. Je fais confiance à mes collègues de travail.

Fortement en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fortement en accord
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

14. L'équipe pilote a accru la confiance entre les employés [l'unité] et la direction du [le bureau].

Fortement en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fortement en accord
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

15. L'équipe pilote est une façon pour la direction de nous donner plus de travail contre le même salaire.

Fortement en désaccord	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fortement en accord
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

16. Selon vous, pourquoi a-t-on mis en œuvre l'équipe pilote?

17. a) Si l'équipe pilote devait repartir à zéro, que changeriez-vous?

b) Qu'est-ce que vous voudriez changer concernant l'équipe pilote aujourd'hui?

18. Selon vous, quels sont les choses importantes à votre travail?

19. Pour vos collègues, quels sont les choses importantes des à leur travail?

20. Autre commentaires?

APPENDIX II:
QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS
PRIMARY UNIT

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS: PRIMARY UNIT

Dates of first evaluation: 05 February 1993
12 February 1993

Number of English Responses: 12

Number of French Responses: 08

Total number of respondents: 20

* At the time of the first evaluation, one member of the unit was not available to complete the questionnaire.

Dates of second evaluation: 02 April 1993
13 April 1993

Number of English Responses: 09

Number of French Responses: 10

Total number of respondents: 19*

* At the time of the second evaluation, one member of the unit had retired and one member of the unit was away on extended leave.

Dates of third evaluation: 09 July 1993
23 July 1993

Number of English Responses: 12

Number of French Responses: 06

Total number of respondents: 18

* At the time of the third evaluation, one additional member was away for an extended period of time due to health reasons.

TEAM PILOT EVALUATION RESULTS

PART A

1. What is your age?

	<u>Feb</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>July</u>
20 - 29	0	0	0
30 - 39	9	10	9
40 - 49	7	7	5
50 - 59	2	1	2
60 - 65	0	0	0
Not answered	2	1	2

2. Which of the following best describe your highest formal education level?

	<u>Feb</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>July</u>
some high school	4	4	5
high school graduate	12	12	11
some college or university	2	1	1
college graduate	2	1	1
university graduate	0	0	0
other (please specify)	0	0	0
not answered	0	1	0

3. How many years have you worked in [the unit]?

	<u>Feb</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>July</u>
less than two	2	0	0
two to five	9	8	10
five to ten	5	4	2
ten to fifteen	2	5	4
fifteen to twenty	1	1	0
more than twenty	1	0	2
not answered	0	1	0

4. How many years have you worked for the Federal Public Service?

	<u>Feb</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>July</u>
less than two	1	0	0
two to five	0	0	0
five to ten	1	1	2
ten to fifteen	2	4	3
fifteen to twenty	8	7	7
more than twenty	8	6	6
not answered	0	1	0

5. Have you ever worked full-time outside of the Federal Public Service?

Feb

No 13 Yes 7 ==> How many years?
2, 2, 2.5, 3, 8, 13, 13

April

No 11 Yes 7 ==> How many years?
2, 2.5, 3, 4, 10, 11, 18

July

No 12 Yes 6 ==> How many years?
2, 2, 10, 12, 13, 15

PART B

For each question indicate which of the answers best fits how you truly feel.

1. How do you classify changes to your job as a result of the team pilot?

	<u>Feb</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>July</u>
many large changes	4	4	4
a few large changes	5	4	1
a lot of small changes	2	3	2
a few small changes	6	5	8
no change	3	3	3

2. How do you generally feel about your job today, as compared to how you felt about it before the team pilot began?

	<u>Feb</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>July</u>
I feel much worse about my job	4	5	4
I feel a little worse about my job	2	3	0
There is no change in how I feel about my job	8	8	12
I feel a little better about my job	5	2	0
I feel much better about my job	1	1	2

3. How would you rate the productivity of your working environment at [the unit] since the team pilot was implemented?

	<u>Feb</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>July</u>
much more productive	4	2	2
a little more productive	6	2	3
no change	5	9	6
a little less productive	2	2	3
much less productive	3	4	4

4. How would you rate your personal commitment to the team pilot immediately after it began?

	<u>Feb</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>July</u>
I was very negative and did not support the team pilot at all	0	0	0
I was a little negative and did not fully support the team pilot	4	0	0
I was indifferent toward the team pilot	0	3	2
I was committed, but had a few reservations	10	10	9
I was fully committed, with no reservations	6	6	6
not answered	0	0	1

5. How would you rate your personal commitment to the team pilot today?

	<u>Feb</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>July</u>
I am fully committed, with no reservations	6	4	4
I am committed, but have a few reservations	9	9	5
I am indifferent toward the team pilot	0	1	4
I am a little negative and do not fully support the team pilot	3	0	2
I am very negative today and do not support the team pilot at all	2	5	3

6. If your commitment level has changed, what made it change?

NOTE: ALL RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES ARE PRESENTED AS DIRECT QUOTATIONS. WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SPELLING CORRECTIONS, ALL GRAMMAR AND VOCABULARY ARE AS THE RESPONDENT ANSWERED.

FEBRUARY RESPONSES:

English

- I find that there is a lot more talking, more fooling around and less work done than before, less help. Some people don't need a supervisor, some do. There is less and less people helping each other. So why should I do more work, and let the other have fun. I am sorry but it is just like a zoo in here.
- I feel there is too much talking going on and some people are not pulling their weight to get the work done. Some people do only what they want to do and leave the rest of the work for the other person.
- People's attitude
- You always end up doing somebody else's job because there is walking around talking all day.
- Management made promises that were never met.
- We are lied to by management.
- We do not have full cooperation from management.
- Some employees do not cooperate fully which is frustrating.
- Attendance is poor.
- Very few support from management.
- Management (particularly at the chief and manager level), but also the small-mindedness of my co-workers.

French

- In what concerns me I have no restrictions but faced with certain attitudes of other employees????
- have promotions, progress in my job
- Acquire more knowledge, take decisions, aptitudes and responsibilities in relation to our work. Learn better. Know our limits. Improve in our everyday work.
- Cuts
- Lack of participation
- It's easier for the younger people
- My change was well done
- There is a lot of negativity within the team. The team members cannot agree on all the changes.
- There is a serious lack of communication and lack of co-operation between certain employees.

APRIL RESPONSES: (NOTE these are direct quotations)**English****- Management / Co-workers**

- I feel there are a few people in the section that are always watching other people and doing too much reporting.
- Because everybody just does what they want. They just walk around talking all the time. Nobody seems to care about anything.
- Co-workers did not respect working hours, there is no control or discipline. It's a shame to say, but adults are worst than kids sometime.

French

- Too much "boss". Each wants his own way.
- The management and the employees
- According to me, certain employees do less because they know other employees will do it. Others simply do their job. The supervisor gets more duties and we get less. The supervisor gives favours to certain employees. He has no judgement.
- Caused by too much abuse by each employee.
Specifically: too much absence
 leaving early
 always the same ones giving 100%
 lack of respect

JULY RESPONSES: (NOTE these are direct quotations)**English**

- Management
- Because there are some people who just sit and talk or look out the windows. And because we're a team everybody has to do the work that person hasn't done all month.
- Some people on the team
- Co-workers do not take their own decision and will not help each other out. They need someone to push them to work at all times.

French

- There was an appearance of change in supervision but after one year nothing has changed.
- The supervisor demonstrates that he wants everything to go as before (he was never in agreement with the project). Certain employees don't accept that we ask them to do certain jobs unless the supervisors ask them.
- Too much abuse of employees.

7. Often, when changes take place, there are barriers that prevent it from achieving its full potential

Do you feel that any of the following factors are barriers to the success of the team pilot? Specify the degree to which you believe each of the following are barriers according to the following scale:

1	not a barrier to success of the team pilot
2	a small barrier not really important to success of the team pilot
3	a moderate barrier to success of the team pilot
4	an important barrier to success of the team pilot
5	a very large barrier to the success of the team pilot

(see next page for complete table)

FACTORS		1	2	3	4	5
Lack of direction	Feb	2	1	7	3	3
	April	2	6	2	2	4
	July	4	2	3	3	5
English/French language tensions	Feb	1	6	3	3	5
	April	0	3	3	4	7
	July	2	4	2	5	5
Co-operativeness of co-workers in [the unit]	Feb	2	2	2	6	6
	April	0	2	3	3	9
	July	1	1	4	5	7
Management of [the office]	Feb	6	2	3	4	3
	April	4	2	2	1	8
	July	0	5	4	3	6
Lack of job security	Feb	0	3	6	0	9
	April	2	1	3	0	12
	July	2	3	3	3	6
Support from outside	Feb	7	0	5	2	4
	Apri.	8	2	2	2	3
	July	4	3	5	1	2
Others (please specify)						
lack of training	(Feb)	0	0	0	0	1
	(April)	0	0	0	1	0
lack of communication (Feb)		0	0	0	1	0

PART C

Indicate by circling the appropriate number how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements according to the following scale:

- 1 Strongly Disagree
- 2 Disagree
- 3 Somewhat Disagree
- 4 Indifferent
- 5 Somewhat Agree
- 6 Agree
- 7 Strongly Agree

1. The team pilot has made a lot of good changes to [the unit].

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	6	1	5	2	1	2	3	Mean = 3.45
<u>April</u>	4	2	6	3	2	1	1	Mean = 3.20
<u>July</u>	6	0	4	5	1	0	2	Mean = 3.17

2. The relationship between employees of [the unit] and management is that of a partnership.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	2	2	5	5	3	0	3	Mean = 3.85
<u>April</u>	7	1	2	7	1	1	0	Mean = 2.80
<u>July</u>	5	5	4	2	1	0	1	Mean = 2.61

3. I enjoy my work.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	0	1	0	2	2	5	10	Mean = 6.0
<u>April</u>	2	0	0	3	1	8	5	Mean = 5.37
<u>July</u>	1	0	0	1	3	9	4	Mean = 5.67

4. I feel that my colleagues appreciate my work.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	2	2	0	4	3	3	6	Mean = 4.85
<u>April</u>	3	2	1	3	2	5	3	Mean = 4.36
<u>July</u>	3	1	2	4	3	2	3	Mean = 4.17

5. I make more decisions about my job today than I did before the team pilot.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	2	1	0	6	5	2	4	Mean = 4.65
<u>April</u>	6	3	0	4	1	3	2	Mean = 3.42
<u>July</u>	4	3	0	4	0	3	4	Mean = 4.0

6. In my opinion, [the unit] is a better place to work now than it was before the team pilot.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	5	4	3	3	1	3	1	Mean = 3.20
<u>April</u>	8	4	3	3	0	0	1	Mean = 2.32
<u>July</u>	10	2	3	3	0	0	0	Mean = 1.94

7. I trust management at [the office] to do what is best for the unit.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	3	2	4	3	5	3	0	Mean = 3.70
<u>April</u>	6	1	4	6	2	0	0	Mean = 2.84
<u>July</u>	7	3	2	5	1	0	0	Mean = 2.44

8. I prefer things the way they used to be, before the team pilot began.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	3	2	2	5	1	3	4	Mean = 4.20
<u>April</u>	5	0	1	7	1	2	3	Mean = 3.89
<u>July</u>	4	1	1	2	2	3	5	Mean = 4.44

9. I assist and support my work colleagues.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	0	0	1	1	5	3	10	Mean = 6.0
<u>April</u>	0	1	0	4	0	4	10	Mean = 5.89
<u>July</u>	1	0	1	2	1	6	7	Mean = 5.67

10. I have more authority over my job than I did before the team pilot.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	1	3	2	5	2	3	4	Mean = 4.45
<u>April</u>	1	4	2	3	3	1	5	Mean = 4.37
<u>July</u>	5	3	2	5	0	2	1	Mean = 3.11

11. More training in team related issues would help me adapt to the team pilot.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	2	2	2	3	0	4	7	Mean = 4.85
<u>April</u>	3	1	2	5	4	0	4	Mean = 4.15
<u>July</u>	4	2	2	4	2	2	2	Mean = 3.67

12. The team pilot has brought more meaning to my work.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	6	1	0	2	7	2	2	Mean = 3.85
<u>April</u>	6	2	2	4	3	1	1	Mean = 3.15
<u>July</u>	6	1	2	8	0	1	0	Mean = 2.89

13. I have confidence in my work colleagues.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	2	2	4	4	1	4	3	Mean = 4.20
<u>April</u>	5	0	4	5	2	1	1	Mean = 3.16
<u>July</u>	3	2	4	4	4	0	1	Mean = 3.44

14. The team pilot has increased the amount of trust between employees of [the unit] and the management at [the office].

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	6	3	0	5	4	0	2	Mean = 3.30
<u>April</u>	9	3	2	4	1	0	0	Mean = 2.21
<u>July</u>	10	2	0	5	1	0	0	Mean = 2.17

15. The team pilot is management's way of giving us more work for the same pay.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response:								
<u>February</u>	4	2	1	1	3	5	4	Mean = 4.40
<u>April</u>	3	2	0	3	4	2	5	Mean = 4.79
<u>July</u>	3	3	1	4	2	2	3	Mean = 3.94

16. In your opinion, why was the team pilot implemented?

FEBRUARY RESPONSES:

English

- Good question
- No idea
- I have no idea.
- To give us more power and feel better of ourself.
- Because this is the way of the 90's.
- To better the working area, leaving the employee to take more responsibility.
- To eliminate management.
- Working as a team and self supervised and doing a good job
- Direct deposit (DDIS) coming in. Get rid of supervisors to save money. Get less employees to do more work for same pay.
- To make show of doing something - pretending to boldly go into the future. To give seemingly incompetent and unqualified managers something to be in charge of.
- To cut on jobs.

French

- Good question.
- Get used to taking decisions for future considerations (job). Lessening of the roles of chief and supervisors.
- Management wants to see if the workers could adopt to working in teams without productivity suffering. In order to try to get the employees to get along better.
- To work better in teams. Improve service to clients. The versatility of employees; see immediate needs.
- Good question.
- In order that employees will take charge of their work.
- To take our responsibilities.
- Give us the chance to take decisions and to be independent in our work. Prepare us for future changes.

16. In your opinion, why was the team pilot implemented?

APRIL RESPONSES:

English

- To get rid of staff.
- Because it is very strong in private industry.
- To give employees more freedom and space to breath.
- Political pressure from above - to give management (and the chosen few) something to do. To give the appearance of planning for the future and implementing change.
- To cut people out of jobs.

French

- Good question.
- In order to give us more responsibility and autonomy without too much supervision.
- To shrink the staff.
- I don't know.
- Communicate better
- Because of the big changes in the future; job cuts and diminishing management.
- No idea.
- To try to get the employees to work in teams, try to better unders and and have a greater sense of communication.
- I'd really like to know.
- To see if workers were capable of taking responsibility. Work together?

16. In your opinion, why was the team pilot implemented?

JULY RESPONSES:

English

- Because management of [the office] was told that they had to - politics.
- To follow the trend of private enterprises.
- To be more independent and self responsible.
- Reduce staff
- Because it is to produce a better working environment.
- To help us work together.
- To give us more work for less pay.
- So that management can cut out on other people functions.
- To give employees more chance to voice their opinion and more freedom - but they (we) are abusing it.

French

- In order that employees can better know and learn to work together
- In order that we will be more autonomous
- Because of a decrease in long term personnel.
- I don't know anymore. Does a team pilot really exist?
- For better production, better service.

17. If the team pilot were to begin over again, what would you change?

FEBRUARY RESPONSES:

English

- Some people still need a supervisor.
- For some people they still need a supervisor.
- Start more slowly eg. leave boss in position to give discipline, don't leave employees to think they have all the power
- Having to ask other people for a day of annual leave.
- Nothing
- Have management not involved.
- Some employees
- Warn loud mouths to restrain.
- The chief
- Have supervisor control the disciplinary actions on employees.

French

- Team unity
- No supervisors in section.
- Insist on still more teamwork.
- As some employees didn't want to participate, I would ask the opinion of employees as to whether they want to work in teams.
- Co-operation
Improved training
How to work better in teams
- The method of approaching employees.
- The team must have more information on the intentions of management and on the way the team must handle itself, takes decisions and the way it handles itself.

- Communication between employees.
- Better preparation.
 - More information.
 - Get off on a better foot.
 - Grow gradually.
 - Abuse by some employees of holidays and sick days.
 - Work preparation.

17. a) If the team pilot were to begin over again, what would you change?

APRIL RESPONSES:

English

- Have management less involved.
- Would change all the watch dogs and reporters.
- Everything
- Some people never grow up enough to be on a team.
- Changes I had recommended were done. Thanks.
- Management (first and foremost) particularly at the Chief and Manager [the office] level. Give some training for our own jobs (from someone who knows what training is and can speak the official language of the person being trained). Support from management (rather than lies and roadblocks).
- Nothing, but change people to other sections.

French

- The section
- The coach must be further from the team physically
- Many too many meetings taking too much time for insignificant things
- Have adult colleagues, not children. Have people who do not pass their time reporting silliness.
- To know whether this is an employee project or not there must be meetings on a regular basis.
- The supervisor must leave the office completely
- Establish base points between employees (ie. lateness, holidays)
- Good information
- Ask the employees their opinions, have consultants explain the role of the team and get rid of negative employees.
- It needs someone to walk the floor (supervisor).

17. a) If the team pilot were to begin over again, what would you change?

JULY RESPONSES:

English

- Take it slowly one step at a time. Not full speed ahead.
- I wouldn't be in the team pilot for [the unit].
- Some people in the work place who constantly want to start trouble for other people.
- Atmosphere
- People to get proper training and to be more responsible in doing a proper job.
- Ask for more discipline among workers.
- The way it was implemented. I would do it gradually.
- Management - particularly at the Chief and manager level.

French

- The atmosphere
- Better preparation at the beginning. Receive good training
- The abuses of certain employees: work hours / holidays / punctuality / trustworthiness.
- That the supervisor is out of the section from the beginning
- Much more information on the functioning of the team.

17. b) What would you change about the team pilot today?

APRIL RESPONSES:

English

- Everything
- I would cancel it, and put them back with a supervisor.
- Nothing.
- Everything - The most important being management, without this one change I view the whole exercise as doomed.
- Change people to other sections.

French

- I think that the coach should take back many of his old responsibilities. Certain CR-04's must work and stay in their offices and not pass hours each day with the coach in his office. The CR-04's must work for and with the team and not with the coach.
- Less listening to the complainers and all that runs through their heads.
- Atmosphere which is at zero.
- Start with other colleagues
- It is impossible to change the situation if the employees cannot learn to work in teams. Changes should be to ask the opinion of the employees to know if they want to work in teams and if workers can adapt.
- Too many people speaking and saying nothing.
- Work a bit more
- Much too much absence.

17. b) What would you change about the team pilot today?

JULY RESPONSES:

English

- Start over taking it one step at a time.
- Some employees
- Try to get people to learn to get along and stop all the pettiness
- Try to help people
- People to be more courteous to each other (something like discipline)
- Management - without that there can be no change for the better
- Nothing; it's too late.

French

- Reallocation of work
- Abuses concerning work hours, holidays and sick days, respect between colleagues
- Receive good training
- Maintain the meetings even though the employees don't want them.
- Find a way to talk to these people.
- Try without the supervisor in the section.
- Change the employees with negative attitudes.

18. What things are important to you at work?**FEBRUARY RESPONSES:****English**

- To make sure that the dead lines are done on time.
- To be able to get my work done and help people when I can.
- To be at ease (impossible at present time).
- Enjoy my work
- Get along with co-workers
- Honesty
- People getting along and helping each other instead of complaining all the time. It's always the same people that don't do anything. This place is like a zoo.
- To co-operate more with my colleagues.
- Getting along with co-workers
- People treating each other as equal shouldn't be any favours, but it is
- Steady job
- Respect
- Recognition
- Having a job
- Competence, consistency, training, atmosphere, money
- For everybody to get along and help one another, but it will never happen.

French

- Like to do my job. Take more pleasure concerning the team pilot.
- In what concerns me, do well with the work I am assigned.
- Achieve the level of service. Give good service to the clients. Satisfy the client.
- Quality, service as fast as possible, reasonable production, adapt to technological changes, etc.
- Communication, training,
- Team spirit
- Good atmosphere
- Productivity
- Be capable to help others
- A positive team spirit. Co-operation with all. It is very important to succeed.

18. What things are important to you at work?**APRIL RESPONSES:****English**

- For everyone to get along and stop all the backstabbing.
- work and work ethics
- A pleasant working atmosphere.
- Communication / Deadlines / Satisfying clients and pensioners
- 1. training, 2. fairness, 3. money, 4. environment, 5. honesty, 6. having the tools to do my job
- To help one another

French

- Job security
- Atmosphere
- Feel good / understand better
- Employee relations (communication) / work production
- Team spirit / positive spirit / help one another
- Give good service to clients.
- I really like to get to the end of the month. Be sure that work is up to date. Can help the client as much as possible (telephone).
- I don't know.

18. What things are important to you at work?**JULY RESPONSES:****English**

- Production
- To do a good job and to do it effectively.
- Each employee give their share of work.
- Nothing. I come in do my day and go home. It's the only way to survive in here.
- job; people
- To make sure my work is up to date and keep my clients happy and try to help them as much as I can. When you have to put in 8 hrs a day at work I feel people should try to be happy and get along with your co-workers.
- Job security
- Production, help one another, getting along well with your co-workers, smile and have fun while doing your work.
- Co-operative of co-workers and trust.

French

- Client satisfaction
- Environment with my colleagues
- Relations between employees is a big asset. Sharing of work.
- Good environment and good atmosphere, team spirit, co-operation of each employee, desire to succeed together to give better service and be happy in our work.
- Be in sync with my colleagues at work.

19. What things are important for your co-workers at work?**FEBRUARY RESPONSES:****English**

- For everyone to work at the pace and level.
- Honesty
- Respect
- To feel like we recognize them and the work they do.
- Getting involved
- Getting a job description
- They wish to boss - and you do whatever they want.
- Security, money
- To have people appreciate what one does for the other and be congratulated by management for work well done more often.

French

- Communication would be appreciated. Respect, work in teams.
- No idea
- Do their work well, adapt to changes, good production, work in teams.
- Team spirit
- I think the same as me (good atmosphere, productivity, capable to help others)
- I have no idea.

19. What things are important for your co-workers at work?

APRIL RESPONSES:

English

- Fun, lunch, and breaks
- Being able to do what ever they want, the majority of them.
- Lunch hour (hours)
- 1. No pressure
2. Little work
3. Money
4. No challenge

French

- Autonomy
- To do what they want.
- I imagine they would be the same as me (atmosphere).
- I don't know what to say because certain employees don't talk about it and others don't want the project.
- I have no idea.
- No idea
- I have no idea.

19. What things are important for your co-workers at work?**JULY RESPONSES:****English**

- I really don't know!!!
- I don't know because they don't want to talk about it. If they would talk about stuff they don't like we could get together and solve a lot of problems.
- Job security
- Work in a peaceful atmosphere but for some it is impossible to stop their continuous insignificant talking.
- To do their job well and don't leave the difficult problems for people who is going to be doing the said job for the next month.

French

- I don't know anymore.
- Change the atmosphere.
- They are only here for the cheque. Their attitude is "me, myself & I". Really too bad.
- The environment with their colleagues.
- That employees can learn to work in teams.

20. Other comments?**APRIL RESPONSES:****English**

- Management is in our way for the success of the team pilot
- Who judges our managers and why do we need six Chiefs?

French

- Discouraging / lots of work to do
- I have no hope for success regarding the team pilot.
- I really like my work, but I would like it better if my colleagues helped me a bit. There are some days when it's not livable, like a zoo (unbelievable). No supervisor works as they are supposed to. Lots of talk, lots of absence, lots of foolishness. It is not everyone who is like this, but is more than the people who were surveyed. I could have a lot more to say.....Thank You.

JULY RESPONSES:**English**

- This team pilot could really work if my co-workers would stop being so negative about everything. Get along with each other and look for the good things or points of their co-workers. In other words attitude, co-operation, willingness to think for themselves.

- I hope that the team pilot will go better after this questionnaire. Team pilot in [the unit] is getting colder every day.

- I feel that a lot of the problems in [the unit] is that there are some people that are very insecure. There are people that watch other people in what they are doing and how long they take for breaks instead of sitting at their desks and doing their work and minding their own business.

- It's always the same people who run things, if you say anything it's still done their way. There are more arguments than ever in here.

- They wanted to try something out but it is not working as well as they think it would. It is just like a zoo in here. Everybody wants to be the boss in here - work if they feel like working, not too often. It is hard to work when you want to meet your dead lines and nobody wants to help. Nobody just don't care anymore. They are too busy watching what their next door neighbour are doing etc...It is just too bad for the people you wants to work.

- Some people are just plain lazy. Some people just talk all day and look through the windows and leave their job for others to do.

French

- I no longer believe in the team pilot.

- This project was very important to me because from day to day I put a lot of myself into my work but with the people here, it's in vain. But what I don't understand is that everyone says the same, but no one does anything. They move in their field of work, but they talk against each other. We formed a social committee of which I was a member. We tried some events but....It's really too bad I am 100% for good relations, fraternity, participation and discussion.....do you have a solution?

APPENDIX III:
QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS
UNIT OF COMPARISON

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS: UNIT OF COMPARISON

Date of evaluation: 04 August 1993

Number of English Responses: 6

Number of French Responses: 4

Total number of respondents: 10

UNIT OF COMPARISON RESULTS

PART A

1. What is your age?

20 - 29	0
30 - 39	6
40 - 49	3
50 - 59	0
60 - 65	1

2. Which of the following best describe your highest formal education level?

some high school	2
high school graduate	5
some college or university	3
college graduate	0
university graduate	0
other (please specify)	0

3. How many years have you worked in [the unit]?

less than two	1
two to five	3
five to ten	1
ten to fifteen	1
fifteen to twenty	3
more than twenty	1

4. How many years have you worked for the Federal Public Service?

less than two	0
two to five	1
five to ten	2
ten to fifteen	1
fifteen to twenty	4
more than twenty	2

5. Have you ever worked full-time outside of the Federal Public Service?

No 4 Yes 6 ==> How many years?

16, 2, 27, 5, 14, 1

Average = 10.8 years

PART B

For each question indicate which of the answers best fits how you truly feel.

1. How do you classify changes to your job as a result of the team pilot?

many large changes	2
a few large changes	5
a lot of small changes	2
a few small changes	1
no change	0

2. How do you generally feel about your job today, as compared to how you felt about it before the team pilot began?

I feel much worse about my job	0
I feel a little worse about my job	2
There is no change in how I feel about my job	3
I feel a little better about my job	3
I feel a much better about my job	2

3. How would you rate the productivity of your working environment at [the unit] since the team pilot was implemented?

much more productive	0
a little more productive	2
no change	5
a little less productive	3
much less productive	0

4. How would you rate your personal commitment to the team pilot immediately after it began?

I was very negative and did not support the team pilot at all	0
I was a little negative and did not fully support the team pilot	1
I was indifferent toward the team pilot	1
I was committed, but had a few reservations	6
I was fully committed, with no reservations	2

5. How would you rate your personal commitment to the team pilot today?

I am fully committed, with no reservations	2
I am committed, but have a few reservations	6
I am indifferent toward the team pilot	2
I am a little negative and do not fully support the team pilot	0
I am very negative today and do not support the team pilot at all	0

6. If your commitment level has changed, what made it change?

Responses: (NOTE these are direct quotations)

English

(no responses)

French

- To learn other jobs within the team. This motivates me to become busier.

- The support of management has decreased.

- With the involvement, positive results, and proccess since March/93, my reservations have been eliminated. In March/93 my language was as follows: "A project like this is good in theory but not in practice." At the beginning I had trouble accepting our errors and things are now going better.

7. Often, when changes take place, there are barriers that prevent it from achieving its full potential

Do you feel that any of the following factors are barriers to the success of the team pilot? Specify the degree to which you believe each of the following are barriers according to the following scale:

- 1 not a barrier to success of the team pilot
- 2 a small barrier not really important to success of the team pilot
- 3 a moderate barrier to success of the team pilot
- 4 an important barrier to success of the team pilot
- 5 a very large barrier to the success of the team pilot

FACTORS	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of direction	0	1	4	1	4
English/French language tensions	0	6	2	1	1
Co-operativeness of co-workers in [the unit]	0	1	1	5	3
Management of [the office]	0	2	4	2	2
Lack of job security	3	2	5	0	0
Support from outside	3	2	2	1	1
Others (please specify)					
Lack of training	0	1	0	1	1
Team members not at equal pay levels	0	0	0	0	1

PART C

Indicate by circling the appropriate number how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements according to the following scale:

1	Strongly Disagree
2	Disagree
3	Somewhat Disagree
4	Indifferent
5	Somewhat Agree
6	Agree
7	Strongly Agree

1. The team pilot has made a lot of good changes to [the unit].

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	0	0	1	2	4	3	0	Mean = 4.9

2. The relationship between employees of [the unit] and management is that of a partnership.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	0	1	4	2	1	1	1	Mean = 4.0

3. I enjoy my work.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	0	0	0	1	4	4	1	Mean = 5.5

4. I feel that my colleagues appreciate my work.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	0	0	1	0	2	6	1	Mean = 5.6

5. I make more decisions about my job today than I did before the team pilot.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	Mean = 5.7

6. In my opinion, [the unit] is a better place to work now than it was before the team pilot.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	1	1	0	3	2	1	2	Mean = 4.5

7. I trust management at [the office] to do what is best for the unit.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	0	1	2	3	2	1	1	Mean = 4.3

8. I prefer things the way they used to be, before the team pilot began.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	3	0	0	3	1	1	0	Mean = 2.6

9. I assist and support my work colleagues.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	Mean = 5.8

10. I have more authority over my job than I did before the team pilot.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	Mean = 5.8

11. More training in team related issues would help me adapt to the team pilot.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	0	0	0	3	0	4	3	Mean = 5.7

12. The team pilot has brought more meaning to my work.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	1	1	0	4	2	2	0	Mean = 4.1

13. I have confidence in my work colleagues.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	0	0	1	0	5	3	1	Mean = 5.3

14. The team pilot has increased the amount of trust between employees of [the unit] and the management at [the office].

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	0	1	2	3	2	2	0	Mean = 4.2

15. The team pilot is management's way of giving us more work for the same pay.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
Response	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	Mean = 5.6

16. In your opinion, why was the team pilot implemented?

Responses:

English

- To give better services to the clients.
- To give more work and responsibilities to employees at same pay.
- This was one way of: getting rid of "deadwood"
 motivating workers
 making management's efforts look good
- To help implement human resource cutbacks.
- Gain the favour of the Canadian public.
- Realize savings in P.Y.s. [Person Years]
- "Building the Future" was implemented to provide better services to our clients (ie. More personal touch).
- To offer better service to our client departments. It was probably expected, also, that individuals would generate better work patterns and strengthen interpersonal relationships by working as a team.

French

- For me it is for us to be more responsible for our work, to ourselves and to the client.
- Improve service to clients. Also create new services.
- To give the opportunity to employees to better know their product and their client and to give better service.
- To better serve the clients, to develop and train employees in several fields, to take decisions there, where they must be taken.

17. a) If the team pilot were to begin over again, what would you change?

Responses:

English

- Nothing
- More gradual implementation and better leadership from management.
- Maybe more time preparing (ie. training)
- The speed at which change was implemented would be slowed dramatically. More quality training, especially in specific jobs and would be offered to all team members.
- Training was definately lacking when the team concept began; therefore I would ensure employees had full knowledge of most duties first. Many employees were scrambling around the first weeks to find out what the sould be doing.
- I would look at better training and preparation prior to being placed into this kind of concept. The transition to this concept happened very fast leaving many employees unprepared and maybe even a little fearful. A lot more reassurance could be given.

French

- Better training.
Wait to implement until after training.
Complete procedures and flowcharts.
Give more coaching.
- Training of employees in the field where each one's tasks can be replaced and where work disappears if there are absences.
- Finish employee training before implementation.
- That all the employees of this team know more than one job before the project starts.

b) What would you change about the team pilot today?

Responses:

English

- I would like to see people with better training.
- Better training for back-up employees.
- There has to be MORE encouragement.
- Take on board extra people to allow for a smoother transition while team members learn new jobs.
- I would reinstate the typing pool (urgent cheque issue) area and keep the work centralized to those employees.

French

- Not much
- Something to get rid of lack of motivation.
- Train monitors.
Clarify roles and responsibilities.
Furnish better work tools.

18. What things are important to you at work?

Responses:

English

- Good communication, support for your decisions.
- That I am able to do a good job with the tools and time provided. That I have someone to turn to to help with problems.
- Co-operation of team members and of all teams.
- Being on the look out for "back stabbers".
- Not knowing for sure to trust management (ie. when it comes to acting assignments and competitions).
- Job satisfaction, feeling useful.
- Not getting overwhelmed by too much work because of lack of manpower.
- Not having to work with inefficient and undependable people.
- Having quality training and readily available job-related information at my disposal.
- My personal opinion is to feel satisfaction from my output and quality of work. To get along well with co-workers and ensure all due dates are met.
- That my interpersonal relationships with fellow employees are good. It is very important to me when my co-ordinator fully understands my position/duties at all times and is always ready to offer suggestions, help, and advise. It is very important that I have a reasonable workload, no more, no less, and that in all fairness the duties within my team are distributed fairly within their levels of functioning.

French

- Enrichment by doing new jobs.
See the progress of employees.
Better motivation.
That I have the ability to be creative, to be innovative and
to use my intelligence.
- To serve our clients well and to have confidence in our
colleagues at work.
- Client service.
Quality of work.
Laughter.
- To help each other as much as possible with the goal of
serving the client.

19. What things are important for your co-workers at work?

Responses:

English

- Teamwork, shared responsibilities.
- A smoothly working operation.
- I think basically to work as a group to maintain levels of service to our clients and ensure all work is shared equally by everyone (rotation of some duties).
- I would think probably the same things I think are important to me are important to them.

French

- Help each other.
- I think they are the same.
- To give good service to our clients.
- Participation, consultation, work well done, client service, responsibility, teamwork, that we can work without direct supervision.

20. Any other comments?**Responses:****English**

- Too much is expected for salary paid, time allotted, and responsibilities given.

- The team concept is a good one. I'm glad I was here from the beginning. I would not want to be starting new in [the office] now. Heavy in the air is a feeling of disorganization and of mistrust. I do appreciate management's efforts to appear more visible and to encourage open communication. I do wonder then, why things are done (and decisions made re. positions) before when we the employees are kept in the dark until much later. Does management intend to do whatever they want to afterall??

- I think basically the team concept is a good idea and can work well but better coordination and reorganization should be implemented in order to further function at its best.

French

- I like working in the team.

APPENDIX IV:
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

PART A) CIU in General

1. What does it take to be considered highly successful in CIU?
2. What type of person is most respected in the unit?
3. What are the unwritten rules of the unit that everybody has to follow?
4. Pretend for a minute that all of CIU is one person. How would you describe this person?

PART B) Team Pilot in CIU

5. What do you think would help the team pilot succeed in CIU?
6. What mistakes do you think were made with the team pilot?
7. What advice would you offer to management before they start another team pilot?
8. What would you say to the employees of a unit that was about to begin a team pilot?
9. Do you have any other comments or suggestions that you would like to make regarding the team pilot in CIU.

APPENDIX V:
TEST FOR DIFFERENCE OF MEANS

TEST FOR DIFFERENCE OF MEANS

	Statement	February Mean	July Mean	ρ Value	Result
1.	The team pilot has made a lot of good changes to [the unit].	3.45	3.17	0.339	n.s.
2.	The relationship between employees of [the unit] and management is that of a partnership.	3.85	2.61	0.016	✓
3.	I enjoy my work.	6.0	5.67	0.234	n.s.
4.	I feel that my colleagues appreciate my work.	4.85	4.17	0.15	n.s.
5.	I make more decisions about my job today than I did before the team pilot.	4.65	4.0	0.174	n.s.
6.	In my opinion, [the unit] is a better place to work now than it was before the team pilot.	3.20	1.94	0.011	✓
7.	I trust management at [the office] to do what is best for the unit.	3.70	2.44	0.009	✓
8.	I prefer things the way they used to be, before the team pilot began.	4.20	4.44	0.370	n.s.
9.	I assist and support my work colleagues.	6.0	5.67	0.243	n.s.
10.	I have more authority over my job than I did before the team pilot.	4.45	3.11	0.019	✓

Statement		February Mean	July Mean	p Value	Result
11.	More training in team related issues would help me adapt to the team pilot.	4.85	3.67	0.049	✓
12.	The team pilot has brought more meaning to my work.	3.85	2.89	0.066	n.s.
13.	I have confidence in my work colleagues.	4.20	3.44	0.105	n.s.
14.	The team pilot has increased the amount of trust between employees of [the unit] and the management at [the office].	3.30	2.17	0.031	✓
15.	The team pilot is management's way of giving us more work for the same pay.	4.40	3.94	0.266	
Attitudes Toward Work and Colleagues (Combines 3,4,9,13)		5.26	4.74	0.160	n.s.
Attitudes Toward Management (Combines 2,7,14)		3.62	2.41	0.015	✓
Comparison of Aspects of Unit Prior to Team Pilot with Time of Response (Combines 1,5,6,10,12)		3.92	3.02	0.072	n.s.
One tailed test $\alpha = .05$ ✓ = Significant, n.s. = Not Significant					

END

20-07-94

FIN