



## IX. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND LABOR-MANAGEMENT TRAINING SERVICES - PART F OF THE SURVEY

The FLRA offers alternative dispute resolution programs and labor-management training to assist labor and management develop collaborative relationships and to provide dispute resolution services in pending unfair labor practice, representation, negotiability, and arbitration cases. FLRA programs and services include training programs, intervention and facilitation services. Respondents were asked to indicate the types of services in which they participated in 1996 and 1997. Respondents could indicate participation in training, assistance and intervention services offered by ADR. Participants were, then, asked to assess ADR before and after services were provided.

The top three programs in which respondents participated were: training on interest-based negotiation and problem-solving techniques or alternative dispute resolution systems and design (43%); training on the rights and duties of employees, unions and management under the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute [Statutory training] (40%); and assistance in building effective working relationships (28%). Table 45 describes the services that the respondents participated in. They are self-explanatory.

Asked about their labor-management relationship before receiving ADR services, of 467 respondents, 62% of respondents believed it was uncooperative, while 13% believed it was neither cooperative nor uncooperative, and 25% believed it to be cooperative. This varied by program participated in. Of 200 agency respondents, 51% believed it to be uncooperative; of 218 union respondents, 71% believed it to be uncooperative; and of 28 individual respondents, 75% believed it to be uncooperative. See Table 46.

A series of questions related to the effectiveness of the services rendered. As a result of ADR services, 34% of respondents who answered the question believed the parties have developed a more cooperative relationship and 38% believe the parties are working together to resolve disputes. 45% of respondents believe that as a result of these services, the agency has involved labor in decisions that previously were not subject to negotiations. These data are further broken-out as follows. See Table 47.

Of 454 respondents, 34% agreed with the statement, “as a result of the FLRA’s alternative dispute resolution services the parties have developed a more cooperative relationship (for example, entered into a partnership agreement),” 27% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 39% disagreed.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>In reviewing the responses to the questions of program effectiveness in this set, the reader may notice that the responses, for the most part, are rather evenly spread across the categories of agreed, neither agreed nor disagreed, and disagreed. Also, there are large percentages of respondents who answered neither agreed nor disagreed. As mentioned earlier, such a distribution of responses may indicate that the persons responding to the questions are not sure of their answers. It may be that it is difficult for the respondents who are working through their various labor-management issues to appreciate change for good or bad in a relative short time frame. Therefore other criteria may need to be studied to measure these outcomes.



TABLE 45  
PARTICIPATION IN ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND  
LABOR-MANAGEMENT TRAINING SERVICES

F1. The following types of services are offered through the FLRA's alternative dispute resolution programs. Mark the programs in which you participated in 1996 and/or 1997.

	<u>Training on Rights and Duties</u>	<u>Training on Interest Based Negotiations</u>	<u>Assistance in Building Effective Working Relationship</u>	<u>Intervention Services</u>	<u>Assistance in Identifying Representation Issues</u>	<u>Training and Assistance</u>
<b>All Respondents</b>	295	317	209	124	53	66
<b>Role Represented Before FLRA</b>						
Agency	115	128	83	55	12	12
Union	149	150	103	54	34	45
Individual	15	17	10	0	3	5
Other	1	4	1	0	0	0

TABLE 46  
STATUS OF RELATIONSHIP BEFORE USING FLRA ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE  
RESOLUTION AND LABOR-MANAGEMENT TRAINING SERVICES

F2. How would you characterize your labor-management relationship before you received any of the FLRA's alternative dispute resolution services?

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Very/Generally Uncooperative</u>	<u>Neither Cooperative nor Uncooperative</u>	<u>Generally/Very Cooperative</u>
<b>All Respondents</b>	467	62%	13%	25%
<b>Role Represented Before FLRA</b>				
Agency	200	51%	12%	37%
Union	218	71%	15%	14%
Individual	28	75%	11%	14%
Other	5	40%	0%	60%



TABLE 47  
EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SERVICE(S) RECEIVED

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
<b>F3.1 As a result of the FLRA’s alternative dispute resolution services: the parties have developed a more cooperative relationship (for example, entered into a partnership agreement).</b>				
<b>All Respondents</b>	454	34%	27%	39%
<b>Role Represented before FLRA</b>				
Agency	195	35%	32%	33%
Union	208	30%	27%	43%
Individual	29	38%	14%	48%
Other	5	60%	0%	40%
<b>F3.2 As a result of the FLRA’s alternative dispute resolution services: the parties are working together to resolve disputes.</b>				
<b>All Respondents</b>	461	38%	24%	38%
<b>Role Represented before FLRA</b>				
Agency	195	43%	27%	30%
Union	214	34%	22%	44%
Individual	30	30%	23%	47%
Other	5	60%	20%	20%



TABLE 47 Continued  
EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SERVICE(S) RECEIVED

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
<b>F3.3 As a result of the FLRA’s alternative dispute resolution services: the agency has involved labor in decisions that previously were not subject to negotiations.</b>				
<b>All Respondents</b>	455	45%	18%	37%
<b>Role Represented before FLRA</b>				
Agency	191	60%	23%	17%
Union	213	32%	13%	55%
Individual	28	39%	22%	39%
Other	6	34%	33%	33%
<b>F3.4a The service has: assisted the parties in understanding and complying with the requirements of the Statute and Executive Order 12871.</b>				
<b>All Respondents</b>	453	50%	21%	29%
<b>Role Represented before FLRA</b>				
Agency	189	63%	24%	13%
Union	212	40%	22%	38%
Individual	29	38%	10%	52%
Other	6	67%	0%	33%



TABLE 47 Continued  
EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SERVICE(S) RECEIVED

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
<b>F3.4b The service has: assisted the parties in developing consensual problem-solving skills.</b>				
<b>All Respondents</b>	447	41%	28%	31%
<b>Role Represented before FLRA</b>				
Agency	189	49%	30%	21%
Union	207	34%	29%	37%
Individual	28	43%	7%	50%
Other	5	60%	0%	40%
<b>F3.4c The service has: reduced the parties' reliance on adversarial methods of dispute resolution.</b>				
<b>All Respondents</b>	451	32%	25%	43%
<b>Role Represented before FLRA</b>				
Agency	189	35%	31%	34%
Union	209	29%	23%	48%
Individual	29	31%	10%	59%
Other	7	57%	14%	29%



TABLE 47 Continued  
EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SERVICE(S) RECEIVED

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
<b>F3.4d The service has: enabled the parties to concentrate on accomplishing their mission and improving their effectiveness.</b>				
<b>All Respondents</b>	446	28%	30%	42%
<b>Role Represented before FLRA</b>				
Agency	184	31%	32%	37%
Union	210	24%	30%	46%
Individual	29	31%	17%	52%
Other	6	34%	33%	33%
<b>F3.4e The service has: saved time, money and resources.</b>				
<b>All Respondents</b>	440	32%	26%	42%
<b>Role Represented before FLRA</b>				
Agency	185	33%	30%	37%
Union	202	30%	26%	44%
Individual	29	28%	17%	55%
Other	6	67%	17%	33%

Of 461 respondents, 38% agreed with the statement, “as a result of the FLRA’s alternative dispute resolution services the parties are working together to resolve disputes,” 24% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 38% disagreed. However, of 195 agency respondents, 43% agreed, of 214 union respondents, 34% agreed, and of 30 individual respondents, 30% agreed.

Of 455 respondents, 45% agreed with the statement, “as a result of the FLRA’s alternative dispute resolution services the agency has involved labor in decisions that previously were not subject to negotiations,” 18% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 37% disagreed. There were differences in the response based on individual participation in a program. There also were differences in responses based on role represented before the FLRA. For the 191 agency respondents, 60% agreed, for the 213 union respondents, 32% agreed, and for the 28 individual respondents, 39% agreed. Of 453 respondents, 50% agreed with the statement, “the service has assisted the parties in understanding and complying with the requirements of the Statute and Executive Order 12871,” 21% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 29% disagreed. There were differences in responses based on the program participated in. Of 189 agency respondents, 63% agreed; of 212 union respondents, 40% agreed; and of 29 individual respondents, 38% agreed.

Of 447 respondents, 41% agreed with the statement, “the service has assisted the parties in developing consensual problem-solving skills,” 28% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 31%



disagreed. There were differences in responses based on the program participated in. Of 189 agency respondents, 49% agreed, of 207 union respondents, 34% agreed; and of 28 individual respondents, 43% agreed. Of 451 respondents, 32% agreed with the statement, “the service has reduced the parties’ reliance on adversarial methods of dispute resolution,” 25% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 43% disagreed. Of 446 respondents, 28% agreed with the statement, “the service has enabled the parties to concentrate on accomplishing their mission and improving their effectiveness,” 30% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 42% disagreed. There were differences depending upon the program participate in. Of 184 agency respondents, 31% agreed, of 210 union respondents, 24% agreed; of 29 individual respondents, 31% agreed. Finally, of 440 respondents, 32% agreed with the statement, “the service has saved time, money and resources,” 26% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 42% disagreed.

Since receiving services, although 68% of respondents reported that there was short-term improvement in labor-management relations, 32% said there was long-term improvements. Indeed, only 18% of respondents said they would use the services again. These data are disappointing. This appears to be an area that FLRA will want to carefully study and decide upon remedial efforts to improve the perception of the program. The use of focus groups and supplemental surveys may help in designing these changes. See Table 49.

*Comments. F5. Please add any comments about the FLRA’s alternative dispute resolution and labor-management training services. (These are examples only. They do not represent a systematic representation of the comments. See Appendix B for the complete set of comments.) (1) Good. (2) No enforcement. (3) Need more in-depth training. (4) Did not realize they were available. (5) Would like to put more personnel through the partnership training. (6) Very good program. Make sure it is maintained and participation encouraged. (7) The reason there has been no improvement has nothing to do with your services. (8) Intervention succeeded because of the enthusiasm and commitment of CADR staff. (9) Not offered locally.*



TABLE 48  
EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SERVICE(S) RECEIVED

**F4. Since I received FLRA alternative dispute resolution services, labor-management relations have improved:\***

	<u>Significantly</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Improved Short-term</u>	<u>Improved Long-term</u>
<b>All Respondents</b> (Base = 419)	44 10%	188 45%	187 45%	91 68%	42 32%
<b>Role Represented Before FLRA</b>					
Agency (Base = 182)	16 9%	98 54%	68 37%	41 67%	20 33%
Union (Base = 194)	22 11%	79 41%	93 48%	42 69%	19 31%
Individual (Base = 27)	32 11%	7 26%	17 63%	4 67%	2 33%
Other (Base = 3)	0 0%	1 33%	2 67%	0 0%	0 0%

\* As of 1996, there were 890 respondents who indicated attending a ADR session or training.



TABLE 49  
EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SERVICE(S) RECEIVED

---

<b>F5</b>	<b>I would use the services again. (Alternative dispute resolution services.)</b>		
	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
<b>All Respondents</b>	451	80 18%	371 82%
<b>Role Represented before FLRA</b>			
Agency	195	28 14%	167 86%
Union	205	33 16%	172 84%
Individual	29	12 41%	17 59%
Other	5	1 20%	4 80%

---