Evaluation of Employee Assistance Programs

Michael J. Holosko
Marvin D. Feit
Editors

Evaluation of Employee Assistance Programs

Evaluation of Employee Assistance Programs

Michael J. Holosko
Marvin D. Feit
Editors

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

Evaluation of Employee Assistance Programs has also been published as *Employee Assistance Quarterly*, Volume 3, Numbers 3/4, 1988.

Evaluation of Employee Assistance Programs

CONTENTS

ABOUT THE EDITORS

Michael J. Holosko, PhD, is Associate Professor at University of Windsor School of Social Work at Windsor, Ontario. He has been a consultant to the human services field for the past ten years, and is consulted internationally in the areas of administrative skills training, program evaluation, and stress management. Dr. Holosko currently serves on the Board of Directors of the American Association of Industrial Social Workers. He has served on Boards of Directors for a variety of human services organizations including the Health and Welfare Canada Research Advisory Committee for the past five years.

Marvin D. Feit, PhD, is Associate Professor at Norfolk State University School of Social Work at Norfolk, Virginia. He has given presentations at the local, state and national level on employee systems programs and was the director of a national one week course entitled, "Consultants' Role in Employee Systems Programs." Dr. Feit has published articles on evaluation of employee systems programs and substance abuse. He is author of *The Management and Administration of Drug and Alcohol Programs*, and is co-author with Dr. Michael J. Holosko of *Workbook for Internal Management*.

PREFACE

EAPs:
Assessing How They Work

EAPs have experienced some 40 years of longevity and growth in the United States and Canada. During this time, they have evolved and have been subject to a variety of changes and influences. The field itself is still experiencing some growing pains, and evaluation efforts parallel this growth process. To date, evaluations of EAPs have been largely fragmented, in-house publications, based in industry. The methods and findings used have not been adequately disseminated to those working in this field. As a result, there was a need for a manuscript which brings together the latest developments in the field of evaluating EAPs. The key question germane to any evaluation effort and one at the heart of this manuscript is — do these programs work or not work? The articles included in this text all address this question, and highlight a number of issues related to it.

The purpose of this text is to document issues and concerns, and to bring together in one volume articles centering on developments in evaluating EAPs, as well as illustrating a number of actual case examples. As a result, the text is organized into three main categories. Section one addresses the concept of evaluation in its broadest sense, i.e. determining the "state of the art" of the EAP field. Specifically, articles in this section are directed toward identifying

1

the growth, development, trends and issues, and capture the essence of where we have been, where we are at present, and where we are going. Thus, they serve as a point of departure for the remaining articles in the text as they set the stage for understanding how EAPs have emerged and how they are being evaluated.

Stern's lead article highlights significant changes in our economy affecting the American workplace and the role of EAPs in those changes. His article considers how such changes may influence the development of EAPs and their future, and he provides a societal basis for understanding how EAPs and their evaluations will evolve. McClellan and Miller provide empirical data to substantiate many of the claims made by Stern. They show how EAPs are in transition and how they have responded to changes in the workplace and in the economy. McClellan and Miller make the point that all EAPs have several universal functions which evaluators need to recognize if their evaluations are to be successful. The final article in this section, by Straussner, illustrates that despite the national growth of EAPs, upon examination of survey data in the New York Metropolitan area, it was found that in reality, EAPs serve only a very small proportion of industries, corporations and human service organizations. She further develops a comparison of in-house and contractual EAPs, and highlights issues related to them.

Section two, the context of EAP evaluations, deals with the planning, some models, the rationales, issues to consider, obstacles and organizational realities. The articles in this section clearly illustrate that proceeding to conduct an EAP evaluation without a consideration of such contextual issues is shortsighted.

Holosko identifies some common sense yet essential prerequisites for EAP evaluators to consider prior to the conduct of their evaluations. These prerequisites are discussed within the context of a cooperative planning process between the administrator, EAP coordinator and the EAP evaluator. Taylor et al. enunciate the same point but address it from the perspective of the role social work may play in planning EAP evaluations. This article concludes with a series of process questions which should be addressed prior to the conduct of any EAP evaluation. Battle stresses the same theme and examines a variety of issues to be considered in planning EAP evaluations. He describes a model that EAP evaluators should use in

evaluating their programs. Balgopal and Patchner chip away at the same issue from yet a different perspective. They define specific obstacles, issues and strategies that EAP evaluators need to address prior to conducting their evaluations.

Cole and Teram focus on organizational contexts and the important role they play in EAP evaluations. Cole describes a detailed account of an organizational development model which was used through the EAP in order to evaluate how the organization impacted on employees. Teram makes the case for formative rather than summative evaluation of EAPs by studying the role perceptions of organizational cultures in Israel.

Yamatani offers an evaluation model based on an EAP benefit and cost structure analysis and illustrates how it can be utilized for establishing program accountability and planning purposes. He effectively accomplishes the difficult task of relating cost to units of service. Cayer and Perry provide a practical framework to guide comprehensive evaluations of EAPs, based on five programmatic aspects: effort, program performance, adequacy of performance, efficiency and process evaluation. They see the framework as forming the basis of a strategy for evaluating the success or failure of EAPs. Kim also sees the same need and presents four generalizable types of evaluations to use in an overall evaluative scheme: intervention planning, program monitoring, impact assessment and economic efficiency. In his typology, he illustrates how several evaluation methods, such as needs assessment, cost-benefit analysis, program development, utilization analysis, and so forth, can be used in the evaluative research design.

The third section presents a series of case examples of EAP evaluations. In this section, each of the authors downplays the study's findings and highlights the strategies, methods used, designs, and outcomes of the research. In essence they focus on what worked and how it worked. Thus, we selected articles for this section that were "practitioner friendly," as results of any evaluation tend to be highly idiosyncratic to the respective host organization. Thus, we chose to feature articles here related to what methods were used and what problems were encountered so that other EAP evaluators or practitioners could learn from these examples.

Maiden presents data on a 30 month project conducted by the

U.S.D.H.S. employee counselling service program. He high-lights the cost-effectiveness of the evaluation, the design, and the methodological issues encountered. Wright describes three models of EAP evaluations used by the Family Service Association which were tailored to the specific needs of different organizations. He highlights the uniqueness of EAPs, but also the importance of using straightforward methods to evaluate such programs. He also re-minds us how easy it is to become lost in complexity. Stanley et al. discuss case management from their own organization's experience as they continue to implement and evaluate the approach, while Roberts-Degennaro proposes how to develop and evaluate case management.

Chandler et al. describe how an EAP was established and evalu-ated in a small plant operated by a large distillery in another loca-tion. The article details a chronology of events associated with the EAP and suggests a practical model related to a participatory phi-losophy and simple outcome evaluation. Dicks, after conducting a telephone survey of EAP development in rural North Central Loui-siana, focuses on the salient factors contributing to the limited de-velopment of rural EAPs. Her findings are consistent with expected difficulties in developing EAPs anywhere, but highlight the unique-ness of rural characteristics and how they influence EAP growth, development and evaluation. Finally, Browne applies a system of estimating cost in EAPs and demonstrates the importance of under-standing how cost is determined and the issues surrounding the use of cost estimates.

This text strives for a blend of academic and practical insights into the field of EAP evaluation. The range and diversity of articles reflects EAPs in transition, their growth patterns, evaluation needs, and evaluation methods. EAPs and their evaluations have been shown to be constantly changing and evolving, as much from within the field as in response to the environment. Overall, these articles stand as testimony to the point that successful evaluations depend on not just methodological expertise but a consideration of much broader salient and societal issues.

Michael J. Holosko, PhD
Marvin D. Feit, PhD

SECTION I:
"STATE-OF-THE-ART" OF
THE EAP FIELD

Economic Change and Social Welfare: Implications for Employees' Assistance

Mark J. Stern

Employee assistance has been a growth industry during the past decade. Virtually unknown in 1975, EAPs and other emotional health programs have become one of the many ways that industry is becoming involved in the everyday lives of American workers.

Those actively involved in the employee assistance movement — social workers, alcoholism counselors, and other mental health professionals — have generally viewed these events positively. They have paid attention to the scope of the problems of workers and the nature and structure of helping. At the same time, the movement has been buoyed by an optimistic belief that American business has adopted a new humanistic management philosophy. This new attitude includes an increasing sophistication about the nature of the work motivation, a recognition that mental health problems hurt productivity and profitability, and a recognition of corporate responsibility for a range of human problems which may not have their origins in the workplace.

The optimism and growth of employee assistance contrasts sharply with other trends in social welfare. While EAPs have expanded during the 1980s, public and voluntary social welfare institutions have undergone repeated cuts and retrenchment. The public social insurance programs — old age, survivors, and disability insurance (OASDI) and unemployment insurance in particular — have experienced some cuts, while public assistance programs directed at mothers and the "able-bodied" poor have suffered more severe re-

---

Mark J. Stern, PhD, is affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania.

ductions. The voluntary sector, as well, has faced an uncertain period in which maintaining services, rather than expanding services has become the primary preoccupation. While many of the bleak predictions of the early 1980s have turned out to be false, others have been more accurate.

The contrast between EAPs good news and public welfare's bad news has led many critics to question the motives and results of industry-based social services. They have been portrayed as at least the unwitting tool of big business and at worst an active participant in a conspiracy to impose more thorough social control on workers. EAP professionals have understandably resisted these charges, calling attention to the many benefits that the programs have brought to workers and management alike and invoking a "new era" in which the two sides could work together for their mutual advantage.

This debate has distracted attention from a much more vital task: an understanding of how employee assistance does fit into current trends in the workplace. The political and ethical issues are certainly worthwhile, but do not provide the detailed understanding of the changes of the work force that is necessary for planning and evaluation. Neither caricature — the humanistic corporation or the cynical social controller — provides a solid basis for program or policy analysis.

In this paper I examine the major changes which are now affecting the American workplace and the role of EAPs in those changes. A split image emerges reminiscent of Dickens's opening to *A Tale of Two Cities*: "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times." Because of changes in the structure and organization of the labor force, the American corporate community is indeed becoming more involved in enriching and improving the work lives of many Americans. At the same time, however, for many of the same reasons, corporations are abandoning, displacing, and impoverishing other workers.

This big split in the economy explains the contrast between the sunny optimism of EAP professionals and the grimness that grips the public welfare community. It also suggests that while employee assistance is central to the new American workplace, a wider view of employee assistance's role and future is in order.

In this paper we examine four trends: (1) the impact of technolog-

ical change in the composition of the labor force; (2) changes in management philosophy; (3) the changing position of labor unions in the economy; and (4) the impact of displacement on unemployment, poverty, and inequality. This discussion sets the context for a better understanding of the environment in which employee assistance programs have recently flourished.

TECHNOLOGY AND THE CHANGING COMPOSITION
OF THE LABOR FORCE

Since their discovery, computers and other advanced technologies have been seen as the harbinger of a revolutionization of the workplace, yet it is only in the past decade that the contours of this revolution have become clearer. High technology affects what workers do, the skills and training they need, and the duration and nature of their work lives.

The clearest impact of economic change has been the rise of the service sector. By 1985, nearly three-fourths of all jobs in the economy were service-producing. Moreover, of the 23 million new jobs created in the American economy between 1970 and 1984, fully 22 million were in service industries; at the same time, only 1.3 million new jobs were created in goods-production. While the growth of manufacturing employment — which is more cyclical than service-employment — is likely to increase, the dominance of service employment has become a permanent feature of the economy.[1]

For many years, the growth of the service economy evoked the image of millions of computer programmers going off to the office. Recently, as the reality of service dominance has emerged, it has become clear that this is not true. Rather, the service sector is split quite sharply between well-paying and poorly-paying jobs. For example, by one estimate, of 56 million service-sector jobs in 1985 9 million were in high-paying occupational categories (managers and professional workers) and 20 million in low paying occupations (service workers, clerical workers), leaving less than half of the jobs in "middle-income" job categories (technical, production, and sales workers). By contrast, nearly three-quarters of manufacturing jobs are in the middle-income categories. Thus, the shift to the ser-

vice economy implies a shift from a middle-income society to one dominated by class differences.[2]

The slow growth of manufacturing employment, however, does not suggest that this sector is stagnating. Quite the opposite. While employment in manufacturing hardly increased, the value of consumption goods increased by almost 50% in real terms between 1970 and 1985.[3] The declining importance of manufacturing employment was testimony to the rapid productivity increases in this sector.

The key to the rapid transformation of manufacturing over the past decade has been the impact of technological change. Since the 1950s, Americans have been announcing the coming of automation, but today its impact is finally being felt. The application of computers and robotics is changing the nature of manufacture from design of goods to their delivery. This switch is changing the nature of employment throughout the economy.

The byword for this change is flexibility. The last industrial revolution was based on the assembly line and huge integrated production facilities which turned out the mass-market goods which transformed American life: cars, appliances, and other consumer goods. Supply and demand forces have combined recently to alter this picture. The undifferentiated mass-market goods which used to fuel the economy have saturated the American economy.[4] As a result, the market for manufacturing goods is now more specialized, directed at specific (often foreign) markets. As consumers became more selective, the production run for manufacturing goods was reduced from six or seven years to one or two. As a result, the change in demand required American industry to be more flexible, to be able to switch from product to product cheaply and without huge expense.

The computer revolution met these requirements. The centerpiece of computerization is the industrial robot which actually replaces the production worker, but this is only the most visible of the many ways in which technological innovation alters the modern factory. Computer-assisted design and manufacture (CAD/CAM) have reduced the time it takes to get a good from conception to production and have reduced the needs for mounds of paperwork formerly done by middle-managers. At the same time, the appli-

cation for computers to inventory management has led to the development of just-in-time (JIT) manufacture, through which material bottlenecks and waste have been reduced. The new technologies — combined in computer-integrated manufacturing (CIM) — have allowed manufacturing to become as flexible as the new consumer market demands.

These changes signal the obsolescence of the huge integrated production facility. In its place, the new realities require "flexible specialization": a model based on the flexible, multi-use equipment, skilled workers, and the decentralization of production facilities, linked together through a variety of arrangements.[5] The most complete example of this switch from large, mass-production to decentralized, flexible specialization is the American steel industry. The expansion of the integrated steelworks based on open-hearth technology symbolized the industrialization of American society during the early 20th century, just as its collapse symbolized "deindustrialization." Yet, at the same time that basic steel was stumbling, speciality steel based on electrically-powered, minimills expanded. Between 1970 and 1985, electric furnaces more than doubled their share of domestic steel production. Because of higher productivity, lower wages, product specialization, and geographical specialization, minimills were able to beat the older integrated facilities and to stay ahead of foreign competition.[6]

The rise of flexible specialization has immense implications for the American labor force. The biggest impact is to decrease the number of workers needed. The most affected group in the semiskilled production workers of the old industrial giants. In their place, flexible specialization requires a smaller, more skilled, and more flexible workforce. At the same time, the permanent revolution sparked by high technology means that — just as product lives are reduced, so does the career life of the production workers. In the future, workers will not enter a factory at 18 and leave when they retire. Workers will experience several career shifts — and the resulting life crises — during their working years.

White collar jobs, too, are placed in jeopardy by the new manufacturing technologies. Flexibility calls for a responsiveness that is inconsistent with layers of middle managers that swelled the white collar workforce. Instead, computerization allows the flattening of

management pyramids which in time leads to a reduction in lower skilled white-collar jobs as well. The greater job stability of white collar workers, too, is being eroded, increasing their vulnerability to unemployment, layoffs, and job dislocation.

The current industrial revolution, then, is Janus-faced. On the one hand, it can appear as a disastrous combination of deindustrialization, dislocation, unemployment, and increasing poverty. On the other hand, it produces possibilities for job enrichment, increased skill and diversity, and more humanistic management styles. We need not decide which of these is the real face of the economy, they are both underway.

FLEXIBLE SPECIALIZATION AND THE QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

The new economy presents a host of exciting possibilities. It has implications for the training and skill requirements of economy, for quality of the work lives of employees, and for the philosophy of management toward its workers. It is within this context that EAPs fit most comfortably.

Flexible specialization leads to the replacement of masses of semi-skilled production workers with a smaller number of more trained employees. Yet, what are the skill and training requirements of the new factory system?

One trend is the reemergence of a more craft-like occupational model. In place of the deadening and alienating detailed division of labor that dominated the old factory system, flexibility requires workers who are able to perform more tasks and who have more control over their use of time and resources. In many of the more advanced sectors of the economy, this has led to the abandonment of the narrow job classifications that long dominated industrial organization. For example, the Saturn division — that General Motors is hoping is the automobile of the future — will eliminate many of the job classification and restrictive work rules which were the basis of labor relations in traditional automobile factories. In its place, the Saturn factory will be based on small work teams led by an elected "counselor" and linked to other groups by a work unit advi-

sor.[7] In other countries, the trend toward broader skills and responsibilities has progressed even further.[8]

This shift in skill has obvious implications for the training of workers. In the past, industrial skill referred to competency in a limited number of concrete tasks. As jobs become broader, training must be reoriented from mastering specific tasks to developing *judgment* to make informed decisions about what to do and when to do it. This requires workers to be more thoroughly educated and more motivated to do their jobs well. The system of external supervision which dominated the assembly line can no longer substitute for workers' internal motivation.

These new requirements are illustrated most graphically by Larry Hirschhorn in his study of nuclear power plant workers. He discovered that workers at Three Mile Island were trained not with a focus on judgment and motivation, but on concrete skills and external supervision. As a result, they were unprepared to make the complex judgments that were necessary when faced with a possible meltdown. The recent examples of nuclear plant workers falling asleep on the job suggest that plant management is yet to address the motivational problems it faces.[9]

Worker motivation is the genie that American industrial psychology has tried to capture for the entire century. Taylorism believed that external control and incentives could substitute for the internal motivation, while the human relations school of Elton Mayo and his followers looked to group solidarity and sociability as the essential features of the well-run factory. The most recent addition to this history is the quality-of-work-life (QWL) movement which has flowered in the last ten years.

Quality-of-work-life is a broad term used to cover a variety of strategies for increasing worker involvement in task-related decisions; it breaks with the basis of labor management relations since the New Deal, which stressed the right of management to determine the structure of work. In its most limited form, QWL focuses only on workplace issues: quality circles (discussion groups which examine the organization of the work unit), broader worker-supervisor communications, and the use of worker attitude surveys. In its broader forms, QWL can be linked to broader issues like work re-

structuring, the sharing of business knowledge, employment security, or union involvement in management or training programs.[10]

While QWL is hailed as the solution to the productivity crisis, its realities are a good deal more complex. Each party — management, workers, and (if present) unions — enters a QWL program for different reasons. Companies hope to increase productivity, workers hope to improve their jobs, gain more secure employment, or gain income, and unions hope to use the process to achieve collective achievements for the work force and thereby secure their position. In a recent examination of QWL and labor relations, Kochan, Katz, and McKersie concluded that those programs that were most successful were those which linked shop floor issues with broader concerns; yet, ironically, these programs are most likely in companies with strong unions. Given current trends in unionization, the authors conclude, there are severe limits on how generalized these programs can be.[11]

Participation and flexibility are popular among white collar as well as blue collar workers. The ability to flatten hierarchies has led to a decisive shift from hierarchical organizational structures. Matrix management systems, temporary work groups, and the simulation of independent business initiative (intropreneurship) are possible means to improve the efficiency and competitiveness of white collar workers. As with QWL, these innovations' goals is to increase the involvement of the worker in the purposes of the enterprise.

The fate of QWL and organizational innovation is still very much in question. While there are a number of outstanding examples of their success, the evidence to date is mixed. While the pressures toward cooperation will continue, countervailing pressures to cut costs, maintain discipline over the work force, and maintain strategic flexibility will hamper its growth, particularly among nonunion firms. As high-tech industry matures, it will face greater competition which will increase the pressure to cut costs and adopt less liberal employment policies. In addition, as the supply of high-tech workers increases, the need of companies to retain this scarce resource will decline.[12]

Employees assistance programs fit comfortably into the current

economic environment. As broader social forces encourage management to take a wider view of workers and their motivation and to attempt to retain skilled workers, the provision of a range of social services — ranging from alcoholism counseling, stress management, child care, broader assessment and referral services — will increase. EAPs fit into recent trends in management policy.

Yet, as we have noted, this is only one side of the future of work in America. Before we can draw definitive conclusions about the future position of EAPs, we must examine some more troubling trends in the economy.

THE DECLINE OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION

There is little doubt any longer that America has entered a new economic epoch, one dominated by the service sector and high-tech manufacture. Yet, as with previous economic revolutions, the current transformation is producing many losers. While it is too early to fill in a scorecard, it is clear that literally millions of Americans have become the casualties of post-industrialization.

Some of those who are now suffering are already in the advancing sector. For example, while technological innovation has led to record numbers of business formations, it has led at the same time to an avalanche of business failures and bankruptcies.[13]

Still, the major losers in the current industrial revolution are the old industrial work force. The semi-skilled workers in basic industry and a host of supporting sectors have been forced to undergo the painful dislocation, unemployment, and psychological harm that have accompanied post-industrialization. A combination of technological, economic, and political forces have worked to make this transition more painful that it might have been.

The American industrial working class has had a unique history. Throughout the 20th century, the "American standard of living" has been the envy of the world. Indeed, it was the success of the working class during the postwar period that sparked the belief that the working class had become "middle class." While these claims