

W

**VOLUME II: SURVEY DATA REPORT  
LEADERSHIP AND WORK EXPERIENCES**

**Washington State Ferries  
Workforce Management Analysis**

**Volume II  
January 2021**

## WSF SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS NARRATIVE

---

The employee survey not only provided qualitative and quantitative analysis regarding the Legislative Directive but went further in depth regarding the overall employee experience. Many of the recommendations below are a result of that analysis. The narrative to follow shows insights into the use of overtime and the affects to employees, the importance of leadership development, career commitment, supervisory and organizational relationships, and employee voice within organizational culture.

### Overtime

**Recommendations:** It is important to manage the risks of burnout due to overtime. One way to do this is to reduce the amount of overtime; and when that is not possible, it is important to attend to \*how\* overtime is incurred. Giving employees more \*choice\* in whether and how much overtime they work is a critical way to reduce burnout. In the end-of-survey comments, for instance, there was quite a bit of variation in positive/negative reactions to overtime. Some people wanted it desperately; others felt that they were overworked and had to work overtime because they had no other choice. The variation in employees' experience of overtime indicates that it is worth examining the processes involved in how overtime is allocated across individuals – and to the extent personal choice is honored, overtime is less likely to result in burnout. In addition, scheduling more breaks during overtime or bringing in workers for additional days rather than extending their shifts may help with fatigue management.

### Training and Development

**Recommendations:** It is important to manage the risks of burnout due to overtime. One way to do this is to reduce the amount of overtime; and when that is not possible, it is important to attend to \*how\* overtime is incurred. Giving employees more \*choice\* in whether and how much overtime they work is a critical way to reduce burnout. In the end-of-survey comments, for instance, there was quite a bit of variation in positive/negative reactions to overtime. Some people wanted it desperately; others felt that they were overworked and had to work overtime because they had no other choice. The variation in employees' experience of overtime indicates that it is worth examining the processes involved in how overtime is allocated across individuals – and to the extent personal choice is honored, overtime is less likely to result in burnout. In addition, scheduling more breaks during overtime or bringing in workers for additional days rather than extending their shifts may help with fatigue management.

**Recommendations:** The gaps in training effectiveness across organizations, positions, and demographic groups suggests that there is room from improvement in terms of increasing the quality of the training experience. One recommendation is to be judicious on the format of training. In the end-of-survey comments, several individual mentioned that they felt in-person training was more effective than online training. While there are certainly constraints associated with what can be done in person given COVID-19, it is still worth thinking about what material is best delivered in-person (or in virtual platforms that allow for interaction and engagement) versus in a passive manner such as through online videos. In general, skills that involve physical action or depend on personal interaction are best done in person.

The employee survey not only provided qualitative and quantitative analysis regarding the Legislative Directive, but went further in depth regarding the overall employee experience. Many of the recommendations below are a result of that analysis. The narrative to follow shows insights into the use of overtime and the affects to employees, the importance of leadership development, career commitment, supervisory and organizational relationships, and employee voice within organizational culture.

## Overtime

**Recommendations:** It is important to manage the risks of burnout due to overtime. One way to do this is to reduce the amount of overtime; and when that is not possible, it is important to attend to \*how\* overtime is incurred. Giving employees more \*choice\* in whether and how much overtime they work is a critical way to reduce burnout. In the end-of-survey comments, for instance, there was quite a bit of variation in positive/negative reactions to overtime. Some people wanted it desperately; others felt that they were overworked and had to work overtime because they had no other choice. The variation in employees' experience of overtime indicates that it is worth examining the processes involved in how overtime is allocated across individuals – and to the extent personal choice is honored, overtime is less likely to result in burnout. In addition, scheduling more breaks during overtime or bringing in workers for additional days rather than extending their shifts may help with fatigue management.

## Training and Development

**Recommendations:** It is important to manage the risks of burnout due to overtime. One way to do this is to reduce the amount of overtime; and when that is not possible, it is important to attend to \*how\* overtime is incurred. Giving employees more \*choice\* in whether and how much overtime they work is a critical way to reduce burnout. In the end-of-survey comments, for instance, there was quite a bit of variation in positive/negative reactions to overtime. Some people wanted it desperately; others felt that they were overworked and had to work overtime because they had no other choice. The variation in employees' experience of overtime indicates that it is worth examining the processes involved in how overtime is allocated across individuals – and to the extent personal choice is honored, overtime is less likely to result in burnout. In addition, scheduling more breaks during overtime or bringing in workers for additional days rather than extending their shifts may help with fatigue management.

**Recommendations:** The gaps in training effectiveness across organizations, positions, and demographic groups suggests that there is room from improvement in terms of increasing the quality of the training experience. One recommendation is to be judicious on the format of training. In the end-of-survey comments, several individual mentioned that they felt in-person training was more effective than online training. While there are certainly constraints associated with what can be done in person given COVID-19, it is still worth thinking about what material is best delivered in-person (or in virtual platforms that allow for interaction and engagement) versus in a passive manner such as through online videos. In general, skills that involve physical action or depend on personal interaction are best done in person.

A second recommendation is to capture information on the effectiveness of trainings. The fact that we could not access this information except through conducting our own survey suggests that there is an opportunity to learn, from user feedback, whether trainings have been effective. In other words, if you want to know if your training and development program is working, you need to measure it. Simple ways to do this might involve administering a test before and after the training, or having users apply the newly trained skills to a specific work task as part of the training. Asking users whether the training addressed key skill gaps or concerns is another important criterion for effectiveness.

A related and third recommendation is to customize learning paths. The reality is that everyone comes to a training experience at different levels of familiarity and proficiency with the material. Instead of insisting on a uniform path, doing the research to understand what mid- and long-term skills are needed and then involving supervisors in crafting individualized learning paths for employees based on where they offer two benefits. First, employees are more likely to focus their attention on the skills that they personally need. Second, employees feel their supervisors are invested in their growth and development, which in turn increases their motivation to develop themselves. Third, ask employees what they need. Several end-of-survey comments contained suggestions from employees on training needs that are not currently addressed. By designing training content based on feedback from employees who are encountering work-related challenges on a day-to-day basis, you can increase training effectiveness simply by giving employees what they need to get better at their jobs.

## Leadership Development

**Recommendations:** Based on the information we collected during the project; it appears that WSF does not currently have a leadership development program for supervisors. This is an important omission. Supervisors have tremendous influence over the experience of their employees as well as their development. As indicated in the end-of-survey comments, the quality of supervision ranges from non-existent (i.e., laissez-faire leadership) to micro-managing to supportive, participative, and empowering. Clearly, promoting individuals exclusively based on their technical qualifications is paramount – but ensuring that those individuals are also prepared to supervise well is just as important. Providing leadership training for supervisors is a keyway to accomplish this.

The survey analyses indicate that an empowering leadership style is important for both engaging employees in their work as well as increasing their career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Empowering leadership involves the supervisor inviting input from employees in making decisions that affect them; communicating the purpose and intent behind organizational policies/initiatives; and coaching employees in their development. Training leaders to be more empowering will result in more engaged employees who take ownership of the work they do and who will focus on advancing in the organization. It is important to point out that numerous supervisors, in their end-of-survey responses, commented that this leadership style is not well-suited to the command-and-control context of many organizations within WSF. However, the data is very clear that when leaders *do* exhibit empowering leadership, positive outcomes followed. Thus, in addition to helping supervisors gain awareness of what empowering

leadership entails, it is also important to dispel the myth that empowering leadership does not belong at WSF. It does and it can make a difference.

Empowering leadership training should involve not only teaching the principles of empowerment, but also require a behavioral training component where supervisors have the opportunity to practice empowering leadership behaviors in real-life learning situations and exercise. Empowering leadership training should also involve feedback for supervisors in the eyes of their employees. As our survey analyses indicate, supervisors tend to over-inflate their empowering leadership compared to the experiences reported by their employees. Regularly assessing how supervisors are doing on this metric offers an important reality check for how supervisors are progressing in their leadership development.

## Career Commitment

**Recommendations:** The gaps in career commitment, motivation, and efficacy among certain groups require further investigation. Do these gaps exist due to perceptions of inequity in accessing advancement opportunities? Or bias with respect to who is promoted? The results of the survey provide some insights to these questions, particularly in Section IV below. However, the broader recommendation here is that, in addition to the anonymous engagement survey that is administered each year (but due to anonymity, offers limited information about where gaps in engagement exist), it may be worth administering WSF's own survey on career engagement and further asking respondents to offer some indication of their demographic, positional, and organizational group. Including open-ended questions around why they responded the way they did would also be helpful. In the end-of-survey comments, several employees indicated that they were not particularly interested in career development because they were close to retirement; several employees also indicated that they used to care about career development, but genuinely did not see many promotion opportunities; lastly, several employees decried the promotion process as largely political as opposed to merit based. Getting to the bottom as to *\*why\** these gaps exist is essential in determining how much these gaps are driven by personal choices (as in the case of the near-retirees) versus an inequitable experience that needs addressing.

## Talent Identification and Hiring

**Recommendations:** Given that the recruiting and hiring experience matters for employees' career commitment, motivation, and efficacy, here are some steps that may improve that experience.

First, add more detail to your job postings. When job postings contain more detail (e.g., including the day-to-day activities of the position, or describing what the career trajectory looks like for this position), you are better able to attract and retain candidates that are highly qualified and a good fit for the job.

Second, involve more individuals in the hiring process. Ideally, it is best to include those the new hire will interact with most often on the job, as those individuals have a clear idea of what the job entails and whether the candidate is a good fit. Several end-of-survey comments indicated that employees felt the hiring process (particularly hiring supervisors) needed greater transparency.

Giving employees a voice in this process not only increases the likelihood that high quality candidates are hired, but also shows that you value your current employees and their opinion as to who they work with.

Third, compose a more rigorous set of interview questions. One of the end-of-survey comments indicated that they were only asked a handful of tangential questions during the recruiting process. This indicates that there is room for improvement in how candidates are interviewed and tested. Interview questions should assess fit both in terms of technical skills but also behavioral fit. Does this person act and react to challenging situations in a way that would be considered desirable? Several end-of-survey comments indicated that a particularly challenging aspect of deck jobs is interacting with rude customers. Working such a scenario into the interview process for customer-facing jobs seems beneficial not only in terms of assessing behavioral fit but also in giving the candidate a realistic preview of what they might encounter on the job.

Fourth, ensure that the process is fair. Every candidate needs to go through the same interview experience and evaluation. This is the only way to ensure hiring decisions are made based on merit as opposed to something idiosyncratic. Notably, the majority of survey respondents were recruited to WSF through friend/acquaintances/family. This makes it doubly important to ensure that the interview process is consistent, regardless of personal connection. Otherwise, hires may be perceived to be influenced by nepotism. (In fact, this was a genuine concern raised in the end-of-survey comments.) To reduce bias or favoritism, consider using a structured set of interview questions with a structured rubric for scoring answers, as well as using a scorecard that accounts for education, experience, certifications, and training in a consistent manner across candidates.

**Recommendations:** Given that employee's learning orientation and intrinsic motivation matters for employees' career commitment, motivation, and efficacy, it may be worth including assessments of learning orientation and intrinsic motivation in the selection process.

Beyond test scores, interview questions can also be devised to capture an employee's learning orientation and intrinsic motivation. For instance, a question like "Describe a time when you took a new job that required a much different set of skills from what you had. How did you go about acquiring the needed skills?" or "Tell me about a time when you volunteered for an assignment to expand your knowledge and skills" can indicate the strength of an employee's learning orientation.

To capture intrinsic motivation, you might ask "How would you define success for your career? At the end of your work life, what must have been present for you to feel as if you had a successful career?" or "In your experience, what draws forth your discretionary energy and effort, that willingness each person has, to go the extra mile, push harder, spend more time, do whatever it takes to get the job done?" If the responses to these questions tend to focus around monetary or extrinsic rewards, as opposed to intrinsic motivation factors such as enjoyable work or seeking to make a positive impact, you might be concerned that the candidate is more extrinsically rather than intrinsically motivated.

**Recommendations:** Fortunately, there are a number of actions that can be taken to directly increase the job characteristics of jobs.

First, consider job rotation. This reduces the likelihood that employees will be bored of what they are doing, since they will not be stuck with the same job for years on end. They will also gain a bigger glimpse of the work that is being done by the organization more broadly, instead of being focused solely on their tiny slice of the work.

Second, vary assigned work by combining tasks. Requiring a variety of skills and talents prevents work from being monotonous and repetitive. By combining different tasks in a job, you enhance task identity and task significance.

Third, delegate tasks to the lowest possible level. When tasks are delegated to the lowest level, this encourages job autonomy even for the frontline employee, which in turn creates a deeper sense of responsibility and ownership of employees for the outcomes of their work.

Fourth, connect employees with the customers or end users. This helps employees know firsthand what end users think or feel about the output of their work. This feedback mechanism is one of the most impactful ways to increase task significance, since employees can see the impact of their own on others.

There are also a number of ways to increase person-job fit.

First, make sure you are hiring the right person for the job. This involves assessing a candidate's suitability for a job, not only with respect to technical skills and knowledge levels and abilities, but also in terms of personality and passions. In fact, prior research has shown that when employee's feel that their job utilizes their unique strengths and taps into their personal passions, they experience greater person-job fit and engagement.

Second, assess person-job fit regularly. Just because you brought in someone who fit the job at one point in time does not mean they still fit the job at a later point in time. In other words, initial fit can give way to misfit over time. Monitoring levels of person-job fit on a regular basis can alert the supervisor as well as employee to the need to make adjustments that enable better fit.

Third, take action to increase fit. Adjustments might include shifting certain tasks to the forefront that align better with the employee's strengths and passions; or misfit related to technical skills and abilities might indicate the need for additional training.

**Recommendations:** Increasing inclusion is a big topic in today's organizations. And WSF is no exception. Generally speaking, when employees feel safe to be themselves and are appreciated for their unique attributes, they experience higher inclusion; in contrast, when employees don't feel like they can be themselves and must hide or mask core parts of themselves because they feel unsure, unsafe, or invisible, they experience lower inclusion. Several actions can be taken to increase inclusion.

First, embrace the difference between inclusion and diversity. Many organizations value diversity (i.e., bringing in people who are different from each other along any set of attributes) but do not consider inclusion as the means by which diversity translates into superior performance. In other words, if those who are most different also feel the least safe to express their unique ideas or work contributions, the organization will not benefit from their presence. In sum, start by championing both diversity and inclusion, as opposed to diversity alone.

Second, hire a more diverse workforce, with particular attention to a diverse leadership team. Leaders and the identities they portray speaks volumes about how welcoming your organization is toward individuals of diverse backgrounds; and when employees see their own identities represented at the highest levels of leadership, they infer from that whether it is safe to be themselves.

Third, ensure that every voice is heard, regardless of age, gender, race, religion, etc. Employees need to feel free to express themselves based on their unique perspectives; and they also need to know that it is precisely because of those unique perspectives that they bring value to the organization. Fourth, ensure that company policies and workspaces are inclusive. That includes strengthening anti-discriminatory policies, particularly with respect to hiring and promotions, as well as ensuring that people feel like they can bring their whole selves to the workspace they occupy.

Lastly, be sure to regularly take the pulse of different demographic groups, whether based on gender, generation, ethnicity, geography, or otherwise. As this survey has shown, the experience of working at WSF and particularly with respect to career commitment, motivation, and efficacy can be vastly different by group. Having an indication of where each group stands and tracking progress over time is an essential step towards including all employees' experiences, not just the majority's.

## **Supervisory Relationships**

**Recommendations:** In an earlier section, we provided recommendations on how to improve empowering leadership among supervisors through leadership training. Here, we focus on recommendations on how supervisors can increase leader-member exchange with their employees.

First, take stock of which employees you have a strong relationship with (i.e., the employees who are trusted, are hard workers, are loyal) and which employees you have weak relationships. The latter may be those who have less far-reaching career goals, less competence, and you may deem them as less trustworthy. These are also the individuals who you are less likely to consider

for promotions or challenging assignments. Stop and ask yourself – why do you not trust these individuals? Why have these individuals fallen out of favor? Do you let that distrust influence how you relate to them? Do you subconsciously withhold opportunities that might help them grow and succeed?

Second, re-establish the relationship. It is important to make an effort to re-establish the relationship, and that is on you, the supervisor. Meet each member one-on-one and take time to find out if they're happy with their job, what their career goals are, and how you can make their work experience more positive. You may learn that they want to be challenged; you may learn that they need more training. No matter what, you will learn something that will improve this individual's morale and hopefully lead to changes that increase this individual's effectiveness on the job. Touching base on a regularly basis is important for increasing the quality of the relationship.

As an employee noted in the end-of-survey comments, "I just wish for a mentor to see my potential and value, and help me/teach me skills that I could use for the benefit of this company, my coworkers, and myself. Although I love what I do, advancement is exciting and a good path to take, but I do not know how to do this, who to talk to, who would take an interest in me. Those things are roadblocks. and it's frustrating." By training supervisors to "lead" through relationships and mentoring as opposed to simply "supervising," you can move the needle in creating a more positive and motivating workforce development experience for all employees.

## Employee Voice and Relationships

**Recommendations:** As noted above, employees are more likely to voice when they supervisors are acting on their ideas, when they feel that it is a safe environment for speaking up, and that their voice is supported, regardless of whether it is enacted. Supervisors can take several actions in foster a voice culture along these lines.

First, you can act on ideas. Not all ideas can be acted upon; and not all ideas should be acted upon. Sometimes ideas are not feasible or may not necessarily have positive impact. However, recognize that the better ideas you *can* act on, the more you reinforce that speaking up is welcome, appreciated, and not futile. Sometimes this means being willing to try something, recognizing that experimenting is the most straightforward path to learning to do something better. Most importantly, be consistent in how you evaluate ideas and make decisions on which ideas to act on. As long as the process is seen as fair and merit-based, people will continue to speak up, even if their ideas aren't acted on, because they have faith in the system and they see that there is a positive voice culture.

Second, make it safe. It goes without saying that no matter the quality of ideas employees brings to you, always appreciate the value of voice. Celebrate it. Make sure you affirm the act publicly. Unless you explicitly do so, employees will assume that you prefer to stick with the status quo and any suggestions for improvement are unwelcome. As the leader, you can make it more safe for employees to speak up by inviting their suggestions and input on key decisions; or presenting problems with the status quo to the group and seeking their suggestions on how to improve

things. You can acknowledge your own limitations on a given issue and the need for others to chime in, in order to advance group goals.

Third, support voice. Acting on people's ideas obviously sends a strong signal that you support their suggestions, concerns, and opinions. So, showing that you support people's ideas is even more critical when you don't act on their ideas. Ways you can do this is to support their voice through encouragement, providing feedback on how their ideas can improve, and providing tangible support as they continue to develop their ideas. By doing these things, employees know their ideas matter; and that you are invested (as a coach, not just decision-maker) in helping shape their ideas to be as valuable of a contribution as possible.

## Relationship with WSF

**Recommendations:** As noted above, how satisfied and commitment employees are to WSF matter for their career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Therefore, any actions that WSF can take to improve the experience of employees will be beneficial here. Broadly speaking, organizational commitment is driven by the sense of connection they feel toward their organization. If they understand the goals of the organization and they feel aligned with those goals, they also experience person-organization fit. Here are some steps to increase that connection and alignment.

First, be clear about company objectives. What is WSF's positive contribution to society? How does WSF's goals link to that overarching purpose? How does each individual employee's work goals link to WSF's goals? Creating a clear line of connection between the work each individual accomplishes in advancing meaningful, WSF-level goals sends a powerful message that what we do here matters.

Second, be an energizing employer. Employees gain energy from their work when there is a good match between employees and their work; when employees' development is encouraged and supported; when employees' concerns and frustrations are heard and acted upon; and when employees feel that they are treated with dignity and respect. The end-of-survey responses indicated a number of employees were frustrated with how vulnerable they felt working on the vessels during COVID-19. This is a peak opportunity for WSF to acknowledge the courage and sacrifice of its frontline employees, show appreciation, and also to take action to protect the health of its employees at all costs.

Third, help people fit in. Previously, we provided recommendations on how to increase inclusion. Fitting in and creating a sense of belonging, however, is not simply a matter of diversity and inclusion. One recommendation along these lines is to create positive, shared experiences among employees, as doing so reinforces a feeling of belonging and fitting in. Personal meetings as well as company-wide events can accomplish this. Involving employees in company-wide decisions also accomplishes this.

## Career Support

**Recommendations:** Fortunately, the career support satisfaction items provide fairly clear guidance as to the actions that can be taken.

First, ensure that there is clear information on career advancement to employees of different occupational paths. Information should not only chart out the path to advancement, but also the technical and social and other competencies that are needed to advance, and where/how those competencies can be acquired. Transparency in terms of how promotion decisions are made (criteria and who are involved) as well as timeline should also be clarified. The goal here is for all employees to be equipped with sufficient information so that anyone who wants to advance knows how to approach the process, and there are no surprises in the advancement process.

Second, ensure that opportunities to access developmental assignments and experiences are available and equitably distributed. A clear pathway is of no use if not everyone can access the experiences that enable them to build the competencies they need to advance. A system should be created where employees are made aware of any developmental assignments and opportunities that arise and then can apply for those assignments and opportunities. Related, clear criteria in terms of who receives those developmental assignments and opportunities are also needed, to ensure a fair and equitable process of accessing these opportunities.

Third, ensure that supervisors are mentoring employees in their career development. This is touched upon in an earlier recommendation related to empowering leadership and leader-member exchange; but in the absence of formal performance reviews, it is even more important for supervisors take the time to meet one-on-one with their employees to discuss their work experiences, needs/concerns, as well as career goals. Train supervisors to do this through leadership training and make it a part of their job/responsibilities.

## WSF SURVEY RESULTS

---

In October 2020, we launched the “Leadership and Work Experiences Survey” to all deck, engine, terminal, and Eagle Harbor employees. There were two versions of the survey – an employee version targeting non-supervisory staff, and a supervisor version. The surveys covered extensive ground including questions about work motivation, job characteristics, voice culture, work-group experiences, supervisor leadership style, overall satisfaction and commitment to WSF, career commitment and motivation, reasons for overtime, recruitment and hiring experiences, and training effectiveness. Survey responses were confidential but not anonymous. When completing the survey, employees and supervisors were asked to locate their names on an employee roster and provide a unique survey ID. This survey ID enabled the UW team to link their responses to the survey to individual-level data from HR and dispatch.

### **I. Survey Distribution and Collection**

Given the constraints of COVID-19 and the unique work conditions of different organizations within WSF, original plans to promote and solicit participation in the survey in person were not possible. After much consultation with WSF leadership and the support of key stakeholders, we ultimately distributed 54 boxes of individualized envelopes and surveys to 10 different vessels and terminal locations. In total, 1530 surveys were printed and distributed (678 deck, 334 engine, 406 terminals, and 112 Eagle Harbor). Online versions of the survey were also available and accessible via a link and QR code. The survey was promoted as a UW and WSF collaboration via a flyer, which also stated the objectives of the survey. The survey was also promoted via Quick Notice by WSF leadership. Participants were instructed to return their survey responses via a Business Reply Envelope to a UW address, where a member of the UW team processed and scanned and inputted the returned surveys. The UW team offered \$25 gift cards to 37 randomly selected participants as a token of appreciation for completing the survey. In total, the survey was in active circulation among WSF employees between September 23 and October 20, 2020.

### **II. Survey Response Rate & Representativeness**

In total, 249 employees responded to the employee version of the survey, and 108 supervisors responded to the supervisor version of the survey. The breakdown of the responses by organization are presented below.

## **Description of the Survey**

In October 2020, we launched the “Leadership and Work Experiences Survey” to all deck, engine, terminal, and Eagle Harbor employees. There were two versions of the survey – an employee version targeting non-supervisory staff, and a supervisor version. The surveys covered extensive ground including questions about work motivation, job characteristics, voice culture, work-group experiences, supervisor leadership style, overall satisfaction and commitment to WSF, career commitment and motivation, reasons for overtime, recruitment and hiring experiences, and training effectiveness. Survey responses were confidential but not anonymous. When completing the survey, employees and supervisors were asked to locate their names on an employee roster and provide a unique survey ID. This survey ID enabled the UW team to link their responses to the survey to individual-level data from HR and dispatch.

### **I. Survey Distribution and Collection**

Given the constraints of COVID-19 and the unique work conditions of different organizations within WSF, original plans to promote and solicit participation in the survey in person were not possible. After much consultation with WSF leadership and the support of key stakeholders, we ultimately distributed 54 boxes of individualized envelopes and surveys to 10 different vessels and terminal locations. In total, 1530 surveys were printed and distributed (678 deck, 334 engine, 406 terminals, and 112 Eagle Harbor). Online versions of the survey were also available and accessible via a link and QR code. The survey was promoted as a UW and WSF collaboration via a flyer, which also stated the objectives of the survey. The survey was also promoted via Quick Notice by WSF leadership. Participants were instructed to return their survey responses via a Business Reply Envelope to a UW address, where a member of the UW team processed and scanned and inputted the returned surveys. The UW team offered \$25 gift cards to 37 randomly selected participants as a token of appreciation for completing the survey. In total, the survey was in active circulation among WSF employees between September 23 and October 20, 2020.

### **II. Survey Response Rate & Representativeness**

In total, 249 employees responded to the employee version of the survey, and 108 supervisors responded to the supervisor version of the survey. The breakdown of the responses by organization are presented below.

**A. Breakdown by organization.**

Title: Employee survey responses broken down by organization.

	Frequency	Percentage
Eagle Harbor	30	12.7%
Terminals	107	45.1%
Deck	72	30.4%
Engine	28	11.8%

Employee survey responses broken down by organization reveal that the majority of respondents came from Terminals (45.1%) then Deck (30.4%). Note that the total reported here is 237 rather than 249 as 16 individuals responded to the survey but declined to self-identify a survey ID.

Title: Supervisor survey responses broken down by organization.

	Frequency	Percentage
Eagle Harbor	19	18.8%
Terminals	15	14.9%
Deck	46	45.5%
Engine	21	20.8%

Supervisor survey responses broken down by organization reveal that the majority of respondents came from Deck (45.5%) then Engine (20.8%) and Eagle Harbor (18.8%). Note that the total reported here is 101 rather than 108 as 7 individuals responded to the survey items but declined to self-identify a survey ID.

Title: Overall response rate by organization.

	Surveys Distributed	Surveys Returned	Response Rate
Eagle Harbor	112	49	43.8%
Terminals	406	122	30.0%
Deck	678	118	17.4%
Engine	334	49	14.7%

Taking into consideration the number of surveys that were distributed to each organization and the number of surveys that were returned, the response rate was highest for Eagle Harbor (43.8%), followed by Terminals (30.0%), Deck (17.4%), and Engine (14.7%).

Title: Overall response rate by organization compared to percentage of total active employees by organization.

	Percentage of Total Survey Responses	Percentage of Total Active Employees
Eagle Harbor	14.5%	6.7%
Terminals	36.1%	22.5%
Deck	34.9%	43.7%
Engine	14.5%	27.1%

When comparing the percentage of total survey responses from a particular organizational group to the percentage of total active employees from those same groups, we can see that Eagle Harbor and Terminals had slightly higher representation in the survey responses, while Deck and Engine had slightly lower representation in the survey responses. Generally, however, the survey responses were representative of those respective groups.

## B. Breakdown by demographic group (gender, race, age, tenure, and years of service).

Title: Employee survey responses broken down by gender.

Sex Assigned at Birth	Frequency	Percentage
Male	156	67%
Female	77	33%

Employee survey responses broken down by gender reveal that the majority of respondents were male (67%). Note that the total reported here is 233 rather than 249 as 16 individuals declined to self-identify a survey ID.

Title: Supervisor survey responses broken down by gender.

Sex Assigned at Birth	Frequency	Percentage
Male	90	89.1%
Female	11	10.9%

Supervisor survey responses broken down by gender reveal that the majority of respondents were male (89.1%). Note that the total reported here is 101 rather than 108 as 7 individuals declined to self-identify a survey ID.

The percentages of male and female survey responses across the employee and supervisor surveys were very comparable to the gender breakdown of active employees: male (78.5%), female (21.5%).

Title: Employee survey responses broken down by race.

Race/Ethnicity Group	Frequency	Percentage
White/Caucasian	103	92.8%
Non-White	8	7.2%

Employee survey responses broken down by gender reveal that the majority of respondents were White/Caucasian (67%). Note that the total reported here is 111 rather than 249 as 16 individuals declined to self-identify a survey ID and an additional 122 had missing data on race in the HR database.

Title: Supervisor survey responses broken down by race.

Race/Ethnicity Group	Frequency	Percentage
White/Caucasian	74	88.1%
Non-White	10	11.9%

Supervisor survey responses broken down by gender reveal that the majority of respondents were White/Caucasian (88.1%). Note that the total reported here is 84 rather than 108 as 7 individuals declined to self-identify a survey ID and an additional 17 had missing data on race in the HR database.

The percentages of white and non-white survey respondents across the employee and supervisor surveys were very comparable to the racial breakdown of active employees: white (89.3%), non-white (10.7%).

Title: Employee survey responses broken down by age group.

Years of Age	Frequency	Percentage
20-29	19	8.2%
30-39	35	15.0%
40-49	43	18.5%
50-59	66	28.3%
60-69	66	28.3%
70-	4	1.7%

Employee survey responses broken down by age group reveal that the majority of respondents were between 50-59 years of age (28.3%) and 60-69 years of age (28.3%). Note that the total reported here is 233 rather than 249 as 16 individuals declined to self-identify a survey ID.

Title: Supervisor survey responses broken down by age group.

Years of Age	Frequency	Percentage
20-29	2	2.0%
30-39	11	10.9%
40-49	20	19.8%
50-59	43	42.6%
60-69	23	22.8%
70-	2	2.0%

Supervisor survey responses broken down by age group reveal that the majority of respondents were between 50-59 years of age (42.6%), followed by 60-69 years of age (22.8%). Note that the total reported here is 101 rather than 108 as 7 individuals declined to self-identify a survey ID.

The percentages of age groups among respondents across the employee and supervisor surveys were very comparable to the age group breakdown of active employees: 20-29 (9.3%), 30-39 (17.4%), 40-49 (19.2%), 50-59 (27.4%), 60-69 (22.3%), 70- (1.7%).

Title: Employee survey responses broken down by tenure (years of service).

Years of Service	Frequency	Percentage
0-5	95	40.8%
6-10	48	20.6%
11-15	32	13.7%
16-20	12	5.2%
21-25	18	7.7%
26-30	17	7.3%
31-	11	4.7%

Employee survey responses broken down by tenure reveal that the majority of respondents were between 0-5 years of service (40.8%), followed by 6-10 years of service (20.6%). Note that the total reported here is 233 rather than 249 as 16 individuals declined to self-identify a survey ID.

Title: Supervisor survey responses broken down by tenure (years of service).

Years of Service	Frequency	Percentage
0-5	8	7.9%
6-10	13	12.9%
11-15	13	12.9%
16-20	12	11.9%
21-25	23	22.8%
26-30	9	8.9%
31-35	11	10.9%
36-40	7	6.9%
41-	5	5.0%

Supervisor survey responses broken down by tenure reveal that the majority of respondents were between 21-25 years of service (22.8%). Note that the total reported here is 101 rather than 108 as 7 individuals declined to self-identify a survey ID.

The percentages among respondents' tenure across the employee and supervisor surveys were very comparable to the tenure breakdown of active employees: 0-5 (33.0%), 6-10 (18.3%), 11-15 (14.4%), 16-20 (7.8%), 21-25 (12.2%), 26-30 (7.6%), 31-35 (3.2%), 36- (3.5%).

### C. Breakdown by contract type, position title, and field office location.

Title: Employee survey responses broken down by employee's status with the State of WA (contract type).

Contract Type	Frequency	Percentage
Non-Permanent	65	27.4%
Permanent	172	72.6%

Employee survey responses broken down by contract type reveal that the majority of respondents were under permanent contract (72.6%).

Title: Supervisor survey responses broken down by supervisor's status with the State of WA (contract type).

Contract Type	Frequency	Percentage
Non-Permanent	12	11.9%
Permanent	89	88.1%

Supervisor survey responses broken down by contract type reveal that the majority of respondents were under permanent contract (88.1%). The percentages among respondents' contract type across the employee and

supervisor surveys were very comparable to the contract type breakdown of active employees: permanent (72.3%), non-permanent (27.7%).

Title: Employee survey responses broken down by position title group.

Deck Position Titles	Frequency	Percentage
ABLE SEAMAN	39	54.2%
OS	30	41.7%
RELIEF AB + ON-CALL DECK	3	4.2%

Employee survey responses broken down by position title reveal that the majority of Deck respondents were Able Seaman (54.2%) and OS (41.7%). The percentages among Deck employees' position titles were very comparable to the position title breakdown of active employees in these three positions: able seaman (52.2%), OS (39.2%), and Relief AB + On-Call Deck (8.5%).

Engine Position Titles	Frequency	Percentage
ASST ENGINEER	10	35.7%
OILER	16	57.1%
RELIEF AE	1	3.6%

Employee survey responses broken down by position title reveal that the majority of Engine respondents were Oilers (57.1%) and Asst Engineers (35.7%). The percentages among Engine employees' position titles were very comparable to the position title breakdown of active employees in these three positions: Oilers (70.7%), ASST ENGINEER (27.0%), Relief AE (2.3%).

Terminals Position Titles	Frequency	Percentage
TERM ATTD/WATCH	42	39.3%
ON-CALL TERMINAL	33	30.8%
TICKET SELLER/A	27	25.2%
RELIEF SELLER/A	5	4.7%

Employee survey responses broken down by position title reveal that the majority of Terminals respondents were Terminal Attendants (39.3%), followed by On-Call Terminal employees (30.8%), and Ticket Sellers (25.2%). The percentages among Terminal employees' position titles were very comparable to the position title breakdown of active employees in these four positions: Terminal Attendants (34.4%), On-Call Terminal employees (28.5%), Ticket Sellers (32.2%), and Relief Sellers (4.9%).

Eagle Harbor Position Titles	Frequency	Percentage
BOILERMAKER	3	10.0%
ELECTRICIAN	8	26.7%
MACHINIST	4	13.3%
SHIPWRIGHT JOURNEY	5	16.7%
SHOREGANG	5	16.7%
OTHER	5	16.7%

Employee survey responses broken down by position title reveal that the majority of Eagle Harbor respondents came from the Electrician group (26.7%), followed by Shipwright Journey (16.7%) and Shoregang (16.7%). The Other category contained several position titles (i.e., Insulation, Pipefitter, and Sheetmetal Worker) where there were less than three respondents per title. The percentages among Eagle Harbor employees' position titles were very comparable to the position title breakdown of active employees in these positions: Boilermaker (9.0%), Electrician (16.7%), Machinist (18.0%), Shipwright Journey (11.5%), Shoregang (16.7%), and Other (inclusive of Insulation, Pipefitter, and Sheetmetal Worker) (28.2%).

Title: Supervisor survey responses broken down by position title group.

Deck Position Titles	Frequency	Percentage
MASTER + STAFF MASTER	21	48.8%
CHIEF MATE + SECOND MATE	19	44.2%
RELIEF MASTER + RELIEF CM	3	7.0%

Supervisor survey responses broken down by position title reveal that the majority of Deck respondents were Masters (48.8%) and Chief Mates (44.2%). The percentages among Deck supervisors' position titles were very comparable to the position title breakdown of active employees in these three positions: Masters (32.3%), Chief Mates (45.3%), and Reliefs (22.3%).

Engine Position Titles	Frequency	Percentage
CHIEF ENGINEER	11	52.4%
STAFF CHIEF + ALT STAFF CHIEF + RELIEF CHIEF	10	47.6%

Supervisor survey responses broken down by position title reveal that the majority of Engine respondents were Chief Engineers (52.4%). The percentages among Engine supervisors' position titles were very comparable to the position title breakdown of active employees in these two positions: Chief Engineer (46.4%) and Staff and Relief Chiefs (53.6%).

Terminals Position Titles	Frequency	Percentage
TERMINAL SUPERVISOR	12	80.0%
Relief Supervisor	3	20.0%

Supervisor survey responses broken down by position title reveal that the majority of Terminals respondents were Terminal Supervisors (80.0%). The percentages among Terminal supervisors' position titles were very comparable to the position title breakdown of active employees in these two positions: Terminal supervisors (85.3%) and Relief supervisors (14.7%).

Eagle Harbor Position Titles	Frequency	Percentage
FORE PERSONS	8	42.2%
LEAD PERSONS	9	47.4%

Supervisor survey responses broken down by position title reveal that the majority of Eagle Harbor respondents came from lead persons (47.4%) and fore persons (42.2%). The percentages among Eagle Harbor supervisors' position titles were very comparable to the position title breakdown of active employees in these two positions: Fore (37.9%) and Lead (62.1%).

Title: Employee survey responses broken down by employee's field office location.

Field Office Location	Frequency	Percentage
ANACORTES	15	6.3%
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND	51	21.5%
BREMERTON	14	5.9%
CLINTON	3	1.3%
COUPEVILLE	5	2.1%
EDMONDS	17	7.2%
KINGSTON	9	3.8%
MUKILTEO	20	8.4%
PORT ORCHARD	3	1.3%
PORT TOWNSEND	6	2.5%
SEATTLE	83	35.0%
TACOMA	9	3.8%
VASHON	2	0.8%

Employee survey responses broken down by field office location reveal that the majority of respondents came from Seattle (35.0%), followed by Bainbridge Island (21.5%). Note that this field is "not maintained by HR" and so this breakdown may not be up to date.

Title: Supervisor survey responses broken down by employee's field office location.

Field Office Location	Frequency	Percentage
ANACORTES	8	7.9%
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND	24	23.8%
BREMERTON	6	5.9%
CLINTON	4	4.0%
MUKILTEO	11	10.9%
SEATTLE	40	39.6%
OTHER	11	10.9%

Supervisor survey responses breakdown by field office location reveals that the majority of respondents came from Seattle (39.6%), followed by Bainbridge Island (23.8%). Note that this field is “not maintained by HR” and so this breakdown may not be up to date. The percentages among employee and supervisor respondents' field office locations were very comparable to the field office breakdown of active employees: Seattle (50.5%) and Bainbridge (14.0%).

Conclusion. Although the overall response rate was low, the responses that we received were highly representative of the workforce at WSF across numerous categories. This lends substantial confidence that the findings from the survey are meaningful and representative of the average employee's experience at WSF.

## Employee Survey Data on Turnover Intentions

Although the nothing in the survey data speaks to the number of vacancies or the causes of vacancies, the employee survey did capture turnover intentions among certain groups (work area, job class, demographic group), which might provide some helpful information in forecasting vacancies in the near future.

Turnover intentions were captured by the following three statements:

1. I am thinking about leaving this organization.
2. I intend to look for a new job.
3. I don't plan to be in this organization for much longer.

Response scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

### I. Overall Turnover Intentions

Title: Turnover intentions across all employee survey respondents.

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Turnover intentions	2.49	1.65

Turnover intentions were relatively low, with the mean falling between mostly disagree and slightly disagree with statements related to turnover.

### II. Analysis of Turnover Intentions by Group

#### A. Breakdown by organization.

Title: Turnover intentions broken down by organization.

	Number of Valid Responses	Mean	Standard Deviation
Eagle Harbor	30	2.97	1.42
Terminals	104	2.27	1.53
Deck	72	2.42	1.59
Engine	28	2.45	1.73

Employee survey responses broken down by organization reveal that the average employee across organizations held mostly low turnover intentions. However, the mean of turnover intentions among Eagle Harbor (2.97) was higher than other organizations.

## B. Breakdown by demographic group (gender, race, age, tenure, and years of service).

Title: Turnover intentions broken down by gender.

Sex Assigned at Birth	Number of Valid Responses	Mean	Standard Deviation
Male	153	2.50	1.66
Female	77	2.48	1.63

Employee survey responses broken down by gender reveal that turnover intentions were similarly low for male and female employees.

Title: Turnover intentions broken down by race.

Race/Ethnicity Group	Number of Valid Responses	Mean	Standard Deviation
White/Caucasian	103	2.60	1.61
Non-White	8	2.46	1.67

Employee survey responses broken down by race reveal that turnover intentions were similarly low for white and non-white employees.

Title: Turnover intentions broken down by age group.

Years of Age	Number of Valid Responses	Mean	Standard Deviation
20-29	19	3.16	1.87
30-39	35	2.45	1.71
40-49	41	2.62	1.89
50-59	66	2.08	1.41
60-69	65	2.58	1.54
70-	4	4.55	0.51

Employee survey responses broken down by age group reveal that turnover intentions vary by group. Whereas turnover intentions were relatively low for those between 30 and 69 years of age, turnover intentions were higher among the 20-29 years of age group and highest among the 70+ age group.

Title: Turnover intentions broken down by tenure (years of service).

Years of Service	Number of Valid Responses	Mean	Standard Deviation
0-5	95	2.15	1.38
6-10	48	2.27	1.28
11-15	32	3.17	1.61
16-20	12	1.80	1.54
21-25	18	3.08	1.46
26-30	17	2.18	1.46
31-	11	3.95	1.64

Employee survey responses broken down by tenure reveal that turnover intentions vary by group, with the 31+ YOS group exhibiting the highest turnover intentions, followed by the 11-15 YOS group, followed by the 21-25 YOS group. The group exhibiting the lowest turnover intentions is the 16-20 YOS group.

### C. Breakdown by contract type, position title, and field office location.

Title: Turnover intentions broken down by employee's status with the State of WA (contract type).

Contract Type	Number of Valid Responses	Mean	Standard Deviation
Non-Permanent	63	1.91	1.22
Permanent	171	2.67	1.73

Employee survey responses broken down by contract type reveal that permanent employees exhibited higher turnover intentions than non-permanent employees.

Title: Turnover intentions broken down by position title group.

Deck Position Titles	Number of Valid Responses	Mean	Standard Deviation
ABLE SEAMAN	39	2.22	1.68
OS	30	2.71	1.51

Within deck, employee survey responses broken down by the most represented position titles reveal that OS respondents exhibited higher turnover intentions than Able Seaman respondents.

Engine Position Titles	Number of Valid Responses	Mean	Standard Deviation
ASST ENGINEER	10	2.93	2.07
OILER	16	2.27	1.58

Within engine, employee survey responses broken down by the most represented position titles reveal that Asst Engineers exhibited higher turnover intentions than Oiler respondents.

Terminals Position Titles	Number of Valid Responses	Mean	Standard Deviation
TERM ATTD/WATCH	42	2.32	1.66
TICKET SELLER/A	27	2.94	1.62
ON-CALL TERMINAL	33	1.56	1.01

Within terminals, employee survey responses broken down by the most represented position titles reveal that Ticket Seller respondents exhibited higher turnover intentions than Terminal Attendant respondents. On-Call Terminal respondents exhibited the lowest levels of turnover intentions.

Eagle Harbor Position Titles	Number of Valid Responses	Mean	Standard Deviation
ELECTRICIAN	8	4.67	1.94
MACHINIST	4	3.25	2.33
SHIPWRIGHT JOURNEY	5	2.73	1.30
SHOREGANG	5	2.40	1.52

Within Eagle Harbor, employee survey responses broken down by the most represented position titles reveal that Electrician respondents exhibited the highest turnover intentions, followed by Machinist respondents.

Title: Turnover intentions broken down by employee's field office location.

Field Office Location	Number of Valid Responses	Mean	Standard Deviation
ANACORTES	15	2.00	1.48
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND	51	2.86	1.76
BREMERTON	14	2.62	1.82
EDMONDS	17	3.35	1.56
KINGSTON	9	2.41	1.27

MUKILTEO	20	1.93	1.21
SEATTLE	83	2.41	1.73

Employee survey responses broken down by the most represented field office locations reveal that Edmonds respondents exhibited the highest turnover intentions, whereas Mukilteo and Anacortes exhibited the lowest.

Conclusion: Turnover intentions were generally low across different segments of survey respondents. However, two groups reported particularly high levels of turnover intentions (scoring above 4.0 on a scale of 1-7), which may help with forecasting the types of roles that may likely have vacancies in the near future. They include employees at Eagle Harbor (in particular, the Electrician group) and employees in the 70+ years of age group.

(3) *An analysis of current strategies for filling vacancies, including the use of overtime, relief staff, on-call staff, hiring of additional or new employees, and a comparison of these strategies to determine which may be more cost-effective*

## Employee Survey Data on Reasons for Overtime

Although nothing in the survey data speaks to the financial cost of different strategies for filling vacancies, the survey can provide some insights into the most common reasons for overtime among particular organizational groups. This information could help clarify why overtime is being used and shed light on its appropriateness as a strategy for filling certain types of vacancies.

Reasons for overtime were as follows:

1. I worked overtime because my supervisor wanted me to.
2. I worked overtime because my colleagues were on annual leave.
3. I worked overtime because my colleagues were on sick leave.
4. I worked overtime because my colleagues were on leave without pay (LWOP).
5. I worked overtime because an unexpected event happened to my colleagues or to the fleet.
6. I worked overtime because of seasonal demand.

Response scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

### I. Overall reasons for overtime

Title: Reasons for overtime across all employee survey respondents.

Reason	Mean	Standard Deviation
... because my supervisor wanted me to.	3.77	1.97
... because my colleagues were on annual leave.	3.87	1.80
... because my colleagues were on sick leave.	4.27	1.82
... because my colleagues were on leave without pay.	3.72	1.71
... because an unexpected event happened to my colleagues or to the fleet.	4.67	1.80
... because of seasonal demand.	4.54	1.82

Among all employee survey respondents, the top three commonly cited reasons for working overtime were because of an unexpected event, seasonal demand, and colleagues being on sick leave.

## II. Analysis of Reasons for overtime

### A. Breakdown by organization

Title: Reasons for overtime for deck employees.

Reason	Mean	Standard Deviation
... because my supervisor wanted me to.	2.56	1.68
... because my colleagues were on annual leave.	3.62	2.00
... because my colleagues were on sick leave.	4.10	1.97
... because my colleagues were on leave without pay.	3.68	1.83
... because an unexpected event happened to my colleagues or to the fleet.	4.16	1.98
... because of seasonal demand.	4.78	1.80

Among deck respondents, the top three commonly cited reasons for working overtime was because of seasonal demand, because of an unexpected event, and because colleagues were on sick leave.

Title: Reasons for overtime for engine employees.

Reason	Mean	Standard Deviation
... because my supervisor wanted me to.	2.92	1.72
... because my colleagues were on annual leave.	3.62	1.77
... because my colleagues were on sick leave.	4.08	1.98
... because my colleagues were on leave without pay.	3.00	1.81
... because an unexpected event happened to my colleagues or to the fleet.	4.62	1.79
... because of seasonal demand.	3.69	1.87

Among engine respondents, the top two commonly cited reasons for working overtime was because of an unexpected event and because colleagues were on sick leave.

Title: Reasons for overtime for terminal employees.

Reason	Mean	Standard Deviation
... because my supervisor wanted me to.	4.70	1.59
... because my colleagues were on annual leave.	4.14	1.73
... because my colleagues were on sick leave.	4.69	1.69
... because my colleagues were on leave without pay.	4.05	1.50

... because an unexpected event happened to my colleagues or to the fleet.	5.14	1.54
... because of seasonal demand.	4.69	1.72

Among terminal respondents, the top cited reason for working overtime was because of an unexpected event.

Title: Reasons for overtime for Eagle Harbor employees.

Reason	Mean	Standard Deviation
... because my supervisor wanted me to.	3.93	2.07
... because my colleagues were on annual leave.	3.44	1.60
... because my colleagues were on sick leave.	3.33	1.52
... because my colleagues were on leave without pay.	3.15	1.51
... because an unexpected event happened to my colleagues or to the fleet.	4.04	1.95
... because of seasonal demand.	3.72	1.76

Among Eagle Harbor respondents, the top cited reason for working overtime was because of an unexpected event.

**Summary:** Across the four organizations, working overtime because of an unexpected event was cited as the most common reason, suggesting that overtime as a strategy is likely used when an unpredictable need arises. On the other hand, there were pockets of more predictable reasons for overtime for each group. Deck and terminal respondents reported working overtime due to seasonal demand; to the extent seasonal demand can be forecasted, overtime might be replaceable with the use of temporary, seasonal workers. In addition, engine respondents reported working overtime due to coworker sick leave – which, if it were possible to forecast likely number of sick leave hours and when people tended to take sick leave based on prior years’ records – might lead to more precise usage of overtime versus other strategies for filling vacancies.

**B. Qualitative reasons for overtime**

Title: Qualitative reasons for overtime across all employee survey respondents.

\$ dollars
(I do not work OT)
As closer, if a vessel runs late on the last run of the night, I must OT
Because I like big paychecks
Because it pays more
Because my supervisor made a mistake by not having enough coverage in scheduling.

because terminal employee walked off the dock in the middle of her shift - had to share her shift with another
Because we don't get paid enough
Built in!
covid
CoVid
Covid
covid 19 coverage for colleagues on medical leave
covid leave
Crew member coverage. I don't know why the crew member didn't work that day
did get enough
extra income
Extra pay/comp time
Forced overtime due to lack of available staffing, as well as an effort to cut costs.
Greed
heavy traffic
held over due to heavy traffic supervisor NOT scheduling enough staff
Hold over against my choice, due to lack of available crew *not fun and not worth it* no ability to plan being home at a certain time.
Hold over, dispatch is bad at their job
I don't ask why I'm working OT
I quit working OT because of the way and how of the dispatch process
I want to make as much \$ as possible
I will be engaged in a project and desire to finish; I keep going as progress is more important to me.
I work OT for home projects/extra. OT has a specific purpose in my life.
I worked overtime because of management incompetence to oversee the job there doing and felt I owed it to my community to step up and do something that needed to be done to keep things going!
I worked overtime to comp for longer vacations.
I'm on a boat & it arrived late on a daily basis
it was needed
late boats
late boats
Late boats/off schedule poor scheduling of boats/boat moves
money
My overtime was voluntary
need money
need the overtime money
No coverage for certain shifts due to illness or seasonal changes
no relief.
not enough family time
Not paid enough in the first place

overtime built in schedule
pandemic
poor scheduling
poppa needs a brand-new bag
short crew
So passengers could get from point a to point b
the most frequent reason is because it is not a choice, you work until the boat returns to a terminal regardless of time, if the worker opposite is late you have to stay until someone else can cover.
To advance my career at W.S.F
To make some extra money
vessel off schedule or weather
when it's offered and convenient
Worked O/T due to my skills
Worked OT because my spouse is unemployed due to COVID-19
You are prohibited from leaving boat without proper relief.

**III. Consequences of burnout due to overtime**

One of the hidden costs of overtime is burnout due to employees working a full work week, plus additional overtime hours. To the extent burnout is high, overtime can be considered not only costly from a financial standpoint, but costly also from a human sustainability standpoint.

Burnout was captured by the following items:

1. My overtime work makes me feel mentally exhausted.
2. My overtime work makes me feel physically exhausted.

Response scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

**A. Overall level of burnout due to overtime**

Title: Overall level of burnout due to overtime

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Burnout due to overtime	3.66	1.75

The risk of burnout due to overtime is moderate, with the mean level response being between slightly disagree and neither agree nor disagree.

**B. Burnout due to overtime by organization**

Title: Burnout due to overtime by organization

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Deck	3.83	1.84
Engine	2.96	1.77
Terminals	3.84	1.82
Eagle Harbor	3.43	1.44

Across the four organizations, working overtime seems to pose the most risk of burnout for deck and terminal respondents.

Summary. While it is important to consider overtime as a workforce management strategy, particularly in addressing vacancies, it is also important to consider its cost in terms of burnout on current employees, particularly Deck and Terminal employees.

(4) An inventory of mandatory training and certification requirement as compared to training provided currently to state ferry employees
--

## Employee Survey Data on Current Training Provided

Nothing in the survey speaks to mandatory and certification requirements. However, the survey does provide an estimation of how frequently employees attended mandatory versus voluntary trainings. It also inquired into the barriers to attending voluntary trainings, which might yield some qualitative insights for how to make voluntary training more accessible to all. Lastly, it provided perceived training effectiveness, broken down by group.

Mandatory training frequency:

1. How often do you attend mandatory trainings?

Voluntary training frequency:

1. How often do you attend voluntary trainings?

Response scale: 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = occasionally, 4 = sometimes, 5 = frequently, 6 = usually, 7 = all the time)

Perceived training effectiveness:

1. The training is useful for my job.
2. The training is useful for my personal development.
3. The training merits a good overall rating.

Response scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

### I. Overall levels of training frequency.

Title: Overall levels of mandatory and voluntary training frequency.

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Mandatory training frequency.	5.19	1.98
Voluntary training frequency.	3.49	2.02

The frequency of attending mandatory training is significantly higher than the frequency of voluntary training.

## II. Training frequency analyses by group.

### A. Breakdown by organization.

Title: Levels of mandatory and voluntary training frequency across organizations.

	Mandatory training frequency		Voluntary training frequency	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Deck	5.90	1.66	3.47	2.14
Engine	4.52	2.19	3.78	1.55
Terminals	4.77	2.09	3.62	2.04
Eagle Harbor	5.48	1.74	3.14	2.00

Overall, frequency of mandatory trainings is higher than voluntary trainings. Mandatory trainings are most frequent for Deck employees, followed by Eagle Harbor. Voluntary trainings are most frequent for Engine and Terminals.

### B. Breakdown by demographic group (gender, race, age, tenure, and years of service).

Title: Levels of mandatory and voluntary training frequency broken down by gender.

	Mandatory training frequency		Voluntary training frequency	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Sex Assigned at Birth				
Male	5.19	1.94	3.47	1.87
Female	5.20	2.15	3.57	2.24

Overall, frequency of mandatory or voluntary trainings did not differ by gender.

Title: Levels of mandatory and voluntary training frequency broken down by race.

	Mandatory training frequency		Voluntary training frequency	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Race/Ethnicity Group				
Non-White	4.63	2.00	3.00	2.00
White/Caucasian	5.33	2.03	3.55	2.06

Overall, frequency of mandatory and voluntary trainings was lower for non-white employees than white employees.

Title: Levels of mandatory and voluntary training frequency broken down by age group.

Years of Age	Mandatory training frequency		Voluntary training frequency	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
20-29	4.47	2.24	3.00	1.62
30-39	5.24	1.90	3.55	1.84
40-49	5.10	2.02	3.63	2.06
50-59	5.45	2.01	3.58	2.02
60-69	5.16	1.99	3.54	2.14
70-	4.33	2.52	1.67	1.15

Overall, frequency of mandatory and voluntary trainings was similar across age groups, with somewhat less voluntary training among the 70- years of age group.

Title: Levels of mandatory and voluntary training frequency broken down by years of service.

Years of Service	Mandatory training frequency		Voluntary training frequency	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
0-5	5.17	1.97	3.53	1.87
6-10	4.98	2.11	3.18	1.89
11-15	6.00	1.70	4.41	2.08
16-20	5.50	1.98	4.17	2.12
21-25	4.89	2.13	3.26	2.33
26-30	5.06	2.05	2.82	2.13
31-	4.27	2.24	2.73	1.62

Overall, there appears to be an increase in training frequency between 11-20 years of service.

**C. Breakdown by contract type.**

Title: Levels of mandatory and voluntary training frequency broken down by employee’s status with the State of WA (contract type).

Contract Type	Mandatory training frequency		Voluntary training frequency	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Non-Permanent	4.95	1.92	3.76	1.89
Permanent	5.26	2.03	3.45	2.05

Overall, there appears to be comparable levels of training frequency across permanent and non-permanent employees.

Summary: Overall, mandatory training frequency was higher than voluntary training frequency; however, this difference varied by organization and position type. It is noteworthy that while training frequency did not differ substantively by gender, non-white respondents and respondents falling in the higher age and years of service groups reported less mandatory and voluntary training frequency compared to their counterparts. These gaps may be concerning to the extent it creates inequitable opportunities for development among employees of certain demographic groups.

**D. Qualitative reasons for what have prevented participation in voluntary trainings.**

Title: Qualitative reasons for what has prevented participation in voluntary trainings.

? We do not have any
Access
All of our "training" is mandatory 1 on 1 training videos. No discussions etc. Just info on computer. We aren't offered any (voluntary) trainings - like emergency 1st aid, defusing situations.
Already full
Already had the knowledge
Already working when it happens
always held on days I am working
always participated
amount of hours worked + time off
another obligation conflict
Ask for it and not gave it.
Availability for training, and flexibility to attend the training (restricted by the job)

availability
Availability (lack of)
Availability of voluntary trainings, and work schedules
awareness
being on duty already
budget cuts
Budget cuts
budget, limits on # of students, seniority
Can't get the time off
Can't think of any voluntary training offered
car deck and passenger patrols
Childcare
classes cancelled /not enough offered
Computer connectivity
Conflicting work schedules- not getting approval or support from 2901.
covid
covid-19 concerns
Do we have those?
don't have it
don't really hear of any
Don't remember many offerings of voluntary training.
Emergent jobs
family & time
family obligations
Family/kid/covid
felt it was not related to my scope of work
FMLA
funding
grandchildren and dating life!
had to work
Have not been offered many
I am not interested in six sigma
I can't think of any voluntary offered
I will do it only during paid working hours
if work jobs needed to be compled asap
illness
I'm still pretty new
information for voluntary trainings
injury
interest
interest in the subject
Internet connections + work schedules.
internet training not available

It's not offered here
I've done online training videos
I've never been asked
I've never missed a mandatory training
job
Lack of desire to do so.
lack of information on upcoming training or opportunities- lack of opportunities
voluntary training.
lack of interest
Lack of interest in the material
lack of interest or need
lack of knowing about classes
lack of opportunity
Lack of training available
life
life
life outside work
Life// I've had a number of physical setbacks/surgeries
little offered or relevant to my job (terminal attendant)
location
location
me
my family
N/A
NA
NA
Never been offered
Never had it's always mandatory
never heard of any
never seen any
no
no
no notification
no offered
no such thing!
no time
no training offered
non interest

none
none
None are offered anymore due to no funding
none available
none available/ work schedules
none have been offered to me
none offered
none were available
not approved by management
not asked
not available in the past
Not being allowed to due to limited class size + not enough training budget
Not being chosen.
Not being paid would prevent me although I don't remember any voluntary meetings being offered.
Not enough time for sitting at the desk or in front of PC.
not enough time to get job coverage
Not getting paid for my time
not many available
Not many of them
not offered
not scheduled for my work hours
Not sure
Nothing
Nothing, I have not been offered very many opportunities for voluntary trainings.
Often by work and/or overtime
on call work
Opportunity
other engagements

other interests
other personal obligations
Pay wasn't offered
personal commitments
Personal issues
Prior engagements
Rising daughter
rule 31.01
schedule
schedule
schedule conflicts
schedule issues
scheduled workday
scheduling
The lack of voluntary trainings
There are none
There are none that I know of
there are voluntary trainings?
There has been no training
there isn't any- terminal side
There were none
There were none
They don't do them any longer
they rarely ask
This job already takes a lot of our time. Time is an issue. on the job training works best??
time
Time and Access
Time away from home
time constraints
time off with family
time on job
Time with family/pay/lack of job advertisement
Time! Don't have time to do my work and develop myself
time, always working
Time, expense, travel, value

Time.
Time/life/necessity for i
Time/online + I'm working
Timing
timing
Timing
Training in my off hours/OT
unaware of them
vacation
Value of my personal time
we don't have any!
We don't have any.
We don't have voluntary training.
We have drills on the boat, but have stopped all extra training outside of what is on the ferry.
We have no training
we have none
work
work and family/new baby
work hours
workload
Work schedule
work schedule
Work schedule
Work schedule coverage
Work Shift hours
work/family
work/life balance
Work?

**III. Overall levels of perceived training effectiveness.**

Title: Overall levels of perceived training effectiveness.

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Training effectiveness	5.14	1.37

Overall levels of perceived training effectiveness were high, with the mean response falling between slightly agree and mostly agree.

**A. Breakdown by organization.**

Title: Perceived training effectiveness across organizations.

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Deck	5.25	1.38
Engine	5.14	1.64
Terminals	5.23	1.28
Eagle Harbor	4.73	1.33

Overall, perceived training effectiveness is comparable across organizations, with effectiveness being lowest for Eagle Harbor employees.

**B. Breakdown by demographic group (gender, race, age, tenure, and years of service).**

Title: Perceived training effectiveness broken down by gender.

Sex Assigned at Birth	Mean	Standard Deviation
Male	5.15	1.33
Female	5.12	1.42

Overall, perceived training effectiveness is comparable across gender.

Title: Perceived training effectiveness broken down by race.

Race/Ethnicity Group	Mean	Standard Deviation
Non-White	4.14	1.62
White/Caucasian	5.23	1.29

Overall, perceived training effectiveness was significantly lower for non-white employees compared to white employees.

Title: Perceived training effectiveness broken down by age group.

Years of Age	Mean	Standard Deviation
20-29	4.68	1.70
30-39	5.18	1.50
40-49	5.03	1.35
50-59	5.39	1.24
60-69	5.03	1.32
70-	5.44	1.39

Overall, perceived training effectiveness was comparable across age groups, though effectiveness was lowest among the 20-29 years of age group.

Title: Perceived training effectiveness broken down by years of service.

Years of Service	Mean	Standard Deviation
0-5	5.21	1.36
6-10	5.08	1.41
11-15	5.38	1.06
16-20	5.21	1.75
21-25	4.96	1.96
26-30	4.94	1.11
31-	4.73	0.79

Overall, perceived training effectiveness was comparable across YOS groups, though effectiveness declined as YOS increased, with the lowest effectiveness reported among those with 31+ YOS.

### C. Breakdown by contract type.

Title: Perceived training effectiveness broken down by employee's status with the State of WA (contract type).

Contract Type	Mean	Standard Deviation
Non-Permanent	5.70	1.03
Permanent	4.95	1.41

Overall, perceived training effectiveness was lower for permanent employees compared to non-permanent employees.

Summary: Overall, perceived training effectiveness was high across groups; however, this difference varied by organization and position type. Eagle Harbor

respondents appeared to perceive the lowest training effectiveness, while non-permanent employee respondents perceived the highest. It is noteworthy that while training effectiveness did not differ substantively by gender, non-white respondents and respondents falling in the lowest age and highest years of service groups reported lower training effectiveness compared to their counterparts. These gaps may be concerning to the extent it creates inequitable opportunities for development among employees of certain demographic groups.

#### **IV. Leadership training needs.**

In analyzing some of the key facilitators and barriers to workforce development (per Objective #6 below), the results revealed that leadership – in particular, empowering leadership, leader-member exchange, and supervisor career support – played an important role in enhancing employees’ career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Interestingly, in the employee survey, the average level of empowering leadership across all respondents was 5.01. In contrast, in the supervisor survey in which supervisors rated themselves on empowering leadership, the average level of empowering leadership was 5.90. This is a significant gap, indicating that the average supervisor believes they are more empowering than the average employee perceives they are. This also points to a need for leadership training among supervisors.

(6) An analysis of barriers to implementing changes in workforce management or innovative approaches to workforce development
---

## Employee Survey Data on Facilitators and Barriers to Workforce Development

The survey provides an understanding of the psychological facilitators/deterrents to workforce development. To the extent employees experience higher career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy, the more favorable their readiness to respond to and benefit from workforce development initiatives. In contrast, knowing where there are gaps can help direct attention in terms of increasing readiness for workforce development.

Career commitment was captured by the following items:

1. My line of work/career field is an important part of who I am.
2. This line of work/career field has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
3. I have created a plan for my development in this line of work/career field.
4. I have a strategy for achieving my goals in this line of work/career field.

Career motivation was captured by the following items:

1. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I advance my career.
2. Advancing my career will make my work more interesting.
3. Better pay or other rewards are likely to result from advancing my career.
4. Advancing my career increases my chances of promotion and other tangible rewards.

Career efficacy was captured by the following items:

1. I believe I can succeed at advancing my career.
2. I am confident that I can effectively advance my career.

Response scale: (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

Below are the breakdown of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy by group.

### **I. Overall levels of career support satisfaction, commitment, motivation, and efficacy.**

Title: Overall levels of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy.

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Career commitment.	5.01	1.31
Career motivation.	5.24	1.24
Career efficacy.	4.99	1.68

Overall, the mean responses indicated slightly agree or mostly agree in terms of their commitment and motivation to advance their careers. However, the mean response indicated neither agree nor disagree and slightly agree in terms of their efficacy for career advancement. This indicates that overall, respondents were committed and willing to advance their careers, but they were slightly less confident that they would be able to do so successfully at WSF.

## II. Analyses of career support satisfaction, commitment, motivation, and efficacy by group.

### A. Breakdown by organization.

Title: Levels of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy by organization.

	Career Commitment		Career Motivation		Career Efficacy	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Deck	5.06	1.44	5.38	1.16	5.17	1.63
Engine	5.16	1.35	5.31	1.46	5.22	1.77
Terminals	4.90	1.33	5.24	1.20	4.91	1.72
Eagle Harbor	4.96	0.95	4.77	1.16	4.48	1.53

Overall, career commitment, motivation, and efficacy were comparable across organizations, though Eagle Harbor trails in all but one category.

### B. Breakdown by demographic group (gender, race, age, tenure, and years of service).

Title: Levels of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy by gender.

Sex Assigned at Birth	Career Commitment		Career Motivation		Career Efficacy	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Male	5.04	1.30	5.22	1.24	4.94	1.69
Female	4.83	1.35	5.19	1.16	4.97	1.68

Overall, career commitment, motivation, and efficacy were comparable across gender groups, though slightly lower among female employees.

Title: Levels of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy by race.

Race/Ethnicity Group	Career Commitment		Career Motivation		Career Efficacy	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Non-White	4.97	0.80	5.19	1.34	4.75	2.38
White/Caucasian	4.99	1.28	5.02	1.16	4.58	1.66

Overall, career commitment, motivation, and efficacy were comparable across race groups.

Title: Levels of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy by age group.

Years of Age	Career Commitment		Career Motivation		Career Efficacy	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
20-29	4.36	1.40	5.25	1.22	5.50	1.55
30-39	5.56	1.29	5.81	1.22	5.81	1.42
40-49	4.97	1.03	5.00	1.18	4.79	1.65
50-59	5.05	1.31	5.34	1.25	4.99	1.78
60-69	4.82	1.39	4.93	1.11	4.45	1.62
70-	3.83	0.95	5.00	1.15	4.33	0.58

Overall, career commitment, motivation, and efficacy varied across age groups, with a general trend of being highest among the 30-39 years of age group, and lowest for the 70- years of age group.

Title: Levels of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy by years of service.

Years of Service	Career Commitment		Career Motivation		Career Efficacy	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
0-5	4.99	1.35	5.42	1.26	5.35	1.57
6-10	5.07	1.23	5.41	0.97	5.11	1.57
11-15	4.97	1.19	4.87	1.06	4.83	1.23
16-20	5.44	1.41	5.60	0.93	4.92	2.12
21-25	4.95	1.37	4.86	1.28	4.55	1.85
26-30	4.53	1.31	4.97	1.45	3.85	1.87
31-	4.55	1.58	4.27	1.35	3.73	2.00

Overall, career commitment, motivation, and efficacy varied across YOS, with a general trend of being highest among the 16-20 YOS group, and lowest for

the 31- YOS group. It is also worth noting that career efficacy tended to be highest for those with the least YOS and trended downward as YOS increased.

### C. Breakdown by contract type.

Title: Levels of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy by employee's status with the State of WA (contract type).

Contract Type	Career Commitment		Career Motivation		Career Efficacy	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Non-Permanent	5.30	1.24	5.67	1.03	5.61	1.38
Permanent	4.88	1.33	5.08	1.25	4.74	1.72

Overall, career commitment, motivation, and efficacy were higher for non-permanent compared to permanent employees.

Summary. Overall, career commitment, motivation, and efficacy were comparable across groups, though slightly lower for Eagle Harbor employees, female employees, and quite a bit lower for employees in higher age groups and years of service as well as permanent employees.

### III. Analyses of Antecedents of Career Commitment, Motivation, and Efficacy

Given that employees experiencing higher career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy are likely more ready in responding to and benefiting from workforce development initiatives, it is helpful to consider the various factors that can shape these experiences. In the section below, we examine 8 different groups of factors that plausibly shape career commitment, motivation, and efficacy.

#### A. Who and how you hire

In this section, we consider how, above and beyond demographic differences (e.g., age, gender, race) and position-based differences (e.g., contract status, organization), the factors below shape career commitment, motivation, and efficacy:

- i) Employee's education and prior work experience (in years)
- ii) Employee's satisfaction with the recruiting and hiring process

Theoretically, employees with higher education and lengthier work experience represent more qualified candidates, who in turn may be more motivated and committed to advancing their career at WSF. Additionally, employees who had a

more satisfying recruitment and hiring experience are more likely presented with a more positive and accurate preview of the job, the work environment, and career development opportunities. More satisfying recruitment and hiring experiences, thus, may result in higher quality employees who are motivated to advance their careers.

Items below are indicative of a more satisfying recruiting and hiring experience:

1. My recruiter was professional and knowledgeable.
2. My recruiter explained the details of the job to me.
3. Overall, I was satisfied with the recruiting process.
4. The hiring process was challenging and interesting.
5. The job role was presented to me in a consistent way during the hiring process.
6. Overall, I was satisfied with the hiring process.

Response scale: (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

Title: Regression results comparing recruitment and selection factors and their impact on career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy

Factor	Variance Explained in Career Commitment	Variance Explained in Career Motivation	Variance Explained in Career Efficacy
Demographic differences	1.5%	5.5%	2.8%
Position-based differences	1.4%	5.5%	6.8%
Employee's education and prior work experience	3.2%	0.6%	0.6%
Employee's satisfaction with the recruiting and hiring process	8.4%	7.5%	4.9%

**Note:** The values featured under “variance explained” indicate how important a given factor is in shaping a particular outcome (in this case, career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy). The larger the variance explained, the more important the factor.

**Interpretation:** The results indicate that for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy, the dominant factor is employee's satisfaction with the recruiting and hiring process. In comparison, demographic differences explained some variance in career motivation, but not as much in career commitment and career efficacy. Position-based differences played a role in shaping career motivation and career efficacy, but less so for career commitment. Employee's education and prior work

experience played a small role for career commitment but had a negligible effect on career motivation and career efficacy.

Summary: The data suggests that how you hire generally matters more for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy than who you hire.

## **B. Individual differences in work motivation**

In this section, we consider how, above and beyond demographic differences (e.g., age, gender, race) and position-based differences (e.g., contract status, organization), the factors below shape career commitment, motivation, and efficacy:

- i) Employee's learning orientation
- ii) Employee's intrinsic motivation
- iii) Employee's extrinsic motivation

Employee's learning orientation reflects the extent an individual's work motivation is driven by the desire to learn and gain mastery of new skills. Employee's intrinsic motivation reflects the extent an individual's work motivation is driven by their enjoyment of the work itself. Employee's extrinsic motivation reflects the extent an individual's work motivation is driven by the monetary rewards of the job.

Theoretically, employees who are more learning oriented and more intrinsically and extrinsically motivated are also more likely to seek out and act on career development opportunities.

Items below are indicative of a learning orientation:

1. I am willing to select a challenging work assignment that I can learn a lot from.
2. I often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge.
3. I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks at work where I'll learn new skills.

Items below are indicative of intrinsic motivation:

1. I do this job because I enjoy this work very much.
2. I do this job because I have fun doing my job.

Items below are indicative of extrinsic motivation:

1. I do this job because it affords me a certain standard of living.
2. I do this job for the paycheck.

Response scale: (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

Title: Regression results comparing individual differences in motivation and their impact on career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy

Factor	Variance Explained in Career Commitment	Variance Explained in Career Motivation	Variance Explained in Career Efficacy
Demographic differences	0.1%	3.4%	2.5%
Position-based differences	3.1%	6.1%	8.4%
Employee's learning orientation	6.1%	14.1%	9.1%
Employee's intrinsic motivation	24.6%	9.6%	5.1%
Employee's extrinsic motivation	2.4%	3.1%	2.7%

**Note:** The values featured under “variance explained” indicate how important a given factor is in shaping a particular outcome (in this case, career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy). The larger the variance explained, the more important the factor.

**Interpretation:** The results indicate that, beyond the effects of demographic and position-based differences, individual differences in motivation matter a great deal for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Career commitment is most influenced by employee's intrinsic motivation, indicating that individuals who are motivated by the work itself are most likely to experience career commitment. In contrast, career motivation and career efficacy are most influenced by employee's learning orientation, indicating that individuals who are motivated to learn and gain mastery of new skills are also most motivated and confident in their ability to advance their career. Interestingly, extrinsic motivation did not play as large of a role in career commitment, motivation, or efficacy.

**Summary:** The data suggests that employee's motivation matters for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. When employees have higher learning orientation and intrinsic motivation, they feel more committed, motivated, and efficacious in advancing their careers.

### C. Design of work

In this section, we consider how, above and beyond demographic differences (e.g., age, gender, race) and position-based differences (e.g., contract status,

organization), the factors below shape career commitment, motivation, and efficacy:

- i) Employee's job characteristics
- ii) Employee's person-job fit

Job characteristics refer to features of jobs that are associated with higher levels of intrinsic work motivation, satisfaction, performance, and lower levels of absenteeism and turnover. These features include skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. The idea is that when jobs are designed with a greater degree of these characteristics, the work is more engaging. Below is a summary of what each of these characteristics refer to:

**Skill Variety:** The degree to which a job requires various activities, requiring the worker to develop a variety of skills and talents. Jobholders can experience more meaningfulness in jobs that require several different skills and abilities than when the jobs are elementary and routine.

**Task Identity:** The degree to which the job requires the jobholders to identify and complete a workpiece with a visible outcome. Workers experience more meaningfulness in a job when they are involved in the entire process rather than just being responsible for a part of the work.

**Task Significance:** The degree to which the job affects other people's lives. The influence can be either in the immediate organization or in the external environment. Employees feel more meaningfulness in a job that substantially improves either psychological or physical well-being of others than a job that has limited effect on anyone else.

**Job Autonomy:** The degree to which the job provides the employee with significant freedom, independence, and discretion to plan out the work and determine the procedures in the job. For jobs with a high level of autonomy, the outcomes of the work depend on the workers' own efforts, initiatives, and decisions, rather than on the instructions from a manager or a manual of job procedures. In such cases, the jobholders experience greater personal responsibility for their own successes and failures at work.

**Feedback:** The degree to which the worker has knowledge of results. This is clear, specific, detailed, actionable information about the effectiveness of his or her job performance. When workers receive clear, actionable information about their work performance, they have better overall knowledge of the effect of their work activities, and what specific actions they need to take (if any) to improve their productivity.

Person-job fit is defined as the compatibility between individuals and the job or tasks that they perform at work. This definition includes compatibility based on employee needs and job supplies available to meet those needs, as well as job

demands and employee abilities to meet those demands. When person-job fit is higher, job satisfaction, organizational attraction, organizational commitment, and satisfaction with coworkers and supervisors are also higher.

Theoretically, employees whose work involves more job characteristics and employees who experience higher person-job fit are more engaged with the work, which in turn may increase their desire and motivation for career development.

Items below are indicative of job characteristics, broken down by facets:

Skill variety:

1. This job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.
2. This job is not simple and repetitive.

Task identity:

3. This job is arranged so I can do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.
4. This job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin.

Task significance:

5. This job is one where a lot of other people can be affected by how well the work gets done.
6. This job itself is very significant and important in the broader scheme of things.

Job autonomy:

7. This job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.
8. This job gives me a chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.

Feedback:

9. Just doing the work required by this job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.
10. After I finish a job, I know whether I performed well.

Items below are indicative of person-job fit:

1. My knowledge, skills, and abilities “match” or fit the requirements of the job.
2. My job is a good match for me.
3. My job enables me to do the kind of work I want to do.

Response scale: (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

Title: Regression results comparing design of work and their impact on career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy

Factor	Variance Explained in Career Commitment	Variance Explained in Career Motivation	Variance Explained in Career Efficacy
Demographic differences	0.1%	3.4%	2.4%
Position-based differences	2.7%	6.1%	7.9%
Job characteristics	18.5%	10.5%	10.5%
Person-job fit	16.1%	12.0%	4.0%

**Note:** The values featured under “variance explained” indicate how important a given factor is in shaping a particular outcome (in this case, career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy). The larger the variance explained, the more important the factor.

**Interpretation:** The results indicate that, beyond the effects of demographic and position-based differences, work design matters a great deal for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Job characteristics was highly influential for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Moreover, supplementary analyses indicated that the effect of job characteristics on career commitment and motivation were largely driven by the facets of task significance and job autonomy, whereas the effect of job characteristics on career efficacy was largely driven by the facet of job autonomy. Person-job fit was also highly influential, particularly for career commitment and motivation. It was less critical in influencing career efficacy.

**Summary:** The data suggests that employee’s work design matters for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Employees who reported higher levels of job characteristics – particularly task significance and job autonomy – as well as person-job fit were more committed, motivated, and efficacious in advancing their careers.

#### **D. Workgroup experiences**

In this section, we consider how, above and beyond demographic differences (e.g., age, gender, race) and position-based differences (e.g., contract status, organization), the factors below shape career commitment, motivation, and efficacy:

- i) Employee’s inclusion
- ii) Quality of coworkers

Inclusion refers to the experience of feeling a sense of belonging and being uniquely valued within one’s workgroup. Likewise, working with coworkers

who are knowledgeable, reliable, and motivated to advance in the organization can play an important role in shaping employee's own attitudes toward career advancement.

Theoretically, employees who feel greater inclusion in their workgroup and work with higher quality coworkers may experience a higher desire and motivation for career development.

Items below are indicative of inclusion:

1. My work group gives me the feeling that I belong.
2. My work group treats me as an insider.
3. My work group allows me to be authentic.
4. My work group allows me to be who I am.

Items below are indicative of quality of coworkers:

1. My coworkers who I come in contact with at work are reliable.
2. My coworkers who I come in contact with at work are knowledgeable.
3. My coworkers who I come in contact with at work are focused on getting promoted.

Response scale: (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

Title: Regression results comparing workgroup experiences and their impact on career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy

Factor	Variance Explained in Career Commitment	Variance Explained in Career Motivation	Variance Explained in Career Efficacy
Demographic differences	0.1%	3.4%	2.4%
Position-based differences	2.7%	6.1%	7.9%
Inclusion	16.4%	12.9%	4.2%
Quality of coworkers	6.8%	7.1%	5.6%

**Note:** The values featured under “variance explained” indicate how important a given factor is in shaping a particular outcome (in this case, career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy). The larger the variance explained, the more important the factor.

**Interpretation:** The results indicate that, beyond the effects of demographic and position-based differences, workgroup experiences matter a great deal for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Inclusion was highly influential for career

commitment and career motivation. Quality of coworkers was also influential for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy, though less so than inclusion. Supplementary analyses also indicated that the effect of coworkers on career commitment, motivation, and efficacy were largely driven by coworker's motivation to advance in the organization.

Summary: The data suggests that employee's workgroup experiences matter for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Employees who reported higher levels of inclusion in their workgroup as well as having coworkers who were motivated to advance in the organization were themselves more committed, motivated, and efficacious in advancing their careers.

## **E. Supervisory experiences**

In this section, we consider how, above and beyond demographic differences (e.g., age, gender, race) and position-based differences (e.g., contract status, organization), the factors below shape career commitment, motivation, and efficacy:

- i) Empowering leadership
- ii) Leader-member exchange

Empowering leadership refers to a leadership style in which supervisors encourage employees' input during decision-making, supervisors coach employees to facilitate their mastery of work-relevant skills and capabilities, and supervisors keep employees well-informed of company-wide information and how it relates to their work. Empowering leadership is known to be an effective style of leadership for motivating employees' ownership and engagement as well as professional development.

Leader-member exchange refers to the quality of relationship between an employee and his/her supervisor. A high-quality relationship is defined by mutual respect for competence, trust in character, and benevolence toward each other. Higher quality leader-member relationships are known to increase engagement, satisfaction, organizational commitment, as well as lower turnover.

Theoretically, employees who report having supervisors that are more empowering and with whom they have a higher quality relationship may experience a higher desire and motivation for career development.

Items below are indicative of empowering leadership:

1. My direct supervisor encourages work group members to express ideas/suggestions.
2. My direct supervisor uses my work group's suggestions to make decisions that affect us.

3. My direct supervisor explains how my work group fits into the company.
4. My direct supervisor explains the purpose of company policies to my work group.
5. My direct supervisor helps my work group see where we need more training.
6. My direct supervisor teaches work group members to solve problems on their own.

Items below are indicative of leader-member exchange:

1. My supervisor understands my problems and needs.
2. My supervisor recognizes my potential.
3. My supervisor would use his or her influence to help me solve problems in my work
4. My supervisor is someone I can count on to help me out, even if it is at his/her own expense.
5. My supervisor has enough confidence in me that he/she would defend and justify my decisions even if I were not present.
6. I usually know where I stand with my supervisor.
7. I have an excellent working relationship with my supervisor.

Response scale: (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

Title: Regression results comparing supervisory experiences and their impact on career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy

Factor	Variance Explained in Career Commitment	Variance Explained in Career Motivation	Variance Explained in Career Efficacy
Demographic differences	0.2%	2.7%	2.4%
Position-based differences	2.7%	6.0%	8.0%
Empowering leadership	14.7%	18.8%	10.6%
Leader-member exchange	13.4%	17.4%	10.2%

**Note:** The values featured under “variance explained” indicate how important a given factor is in shaping a particular outcome (in this case, career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy). The larger the variance explained, the more important the factor.

**Interpretation:** The results indicate that, beyond the effects of demographic and position-based differences, supervisory experiences matter a great deal for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Empowering leadership was highly influential for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Supplementary analyses indicated that the effect of empowering leadership on career commitment was

largely driven by the leader's informing behaviors, whereas the effect of empowering leadership on career motivation was largely driven by the leader's participative decision-making behaviors. Leader-member exchange was also highly influential for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy, and overall, was very comparable in its effect to empowering leadership.

Summary: The data suggests that employee's supervisory experiences matter for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Employees who reported that their supervisors exhibited higher levels of empowering leadership and leader-member exchange were more committed, motivated, and efficacious in advancing their careers.

## **F. Voice culture**

In this section, we consider how, above and beyond demographic differences (e.g., age, gender, race) and position-based differences (e.g., contract status, organization), the factors below shape career commitment, motivation, and efficacy:

- i) Voice and silence
- ii) Voice enactment and valuation

Employee voice refers to the extent employees speak up with ideas, suggestions, concerns, and other work-related opinions on ways to improve the way work is done. Employee voice is an important way in which employees' knowledge, skills, and capabilities can be engaged to enhance performance. It is also an important way to engage employees, as employees who exercise voice experience greater ownership over their work and the performance of their work group. The opposite of employee voice is employee silence, which describes the intentional holding back of ideas, suggestions, concerns, or other work-related opinions, out of fear that those opinions will not be welcome or out of cynicism that those opinions will not result in actual change. Employee silence is predictive of turnover.

Voice enactment and valuation refers to how employees' ideas, suggestions, concerns, and other work-related opinions are received by one's supervisor and fellow coworkers. Voice enactment is high when employees' ideas are incorporated into the strategy and work-related actions of the team. Voice valuation is high when employees feel that their ideas, suggestions, concerns, and other work-related opinions are valued, appreciated, and make a positive difference in the team.

Theoretically, employees who report having higher voice, voice enactment, and voice valuation (as well as lower silence) may experience higher commitment and ownership in the organization, which in turn may contribute to a higher desire and motivation for career development.

Items below are indicative of voice:

1. I suggested new ideas which are beneficial to the team.
2. I raised suggestions to improve the team’s working procedure.
3. I voiced constructive suggestions that help the team reach its goals.
4. I spoke out against undesirable behaviors that would hamper job performance.
5. I spoke up about problems that might cause serious loss to the team.
6. I pointed out problems when they appeared in the team.

Items below are indicative of silence:

1. Although I had ideas for improving work processes, I did not speak up to my supervisor.
2. I said nothing to my supervisor about potential work problems I noticed in the team.

Items below are indicative of voice enactment:

1. My ideas for change were incorporated into the team’s work.
2. My suggestions for improvement were acted upon by the team.
3. My concerns about work-related problems resulted in a change in the way my team accomplishes its work.

Items below are indicative of voice valuation:

1. I feel that my work-related ideas are valued here.
2. I feel that my work-related ideas are appreciated here.
3. I feel that my work-related ideas make a positive difference here.

Response scale: (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

Title: Regression results comparing voice culture and its impact on career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy

Factor	Variance Explained in Career Commitment	Variance Explained in Career Motivation	Variance Explained in Career Efficacy
Demographic differences	0.2%	3.2%	2.2%
Position-based differences	2.7%	5.9%	7.9%
Voice	19.6%	8.7%	5.6%
Silence	4.1%	1.2%	0.2%

Voice enactment	5.5%	4.3%	1.1%
Voice valuation	1.2%	11.7%	5.4%

**Note:** The values featured under “variance explained” indicate how important a given factor is in shaping a particular outcome (in this case, career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy). The larger the variance explained, the more important the factor.

**Interpretation:** The results indicate that, beyond the effects of demographic and position-based differences, voice culture matters of a great deal for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Voice – that is, the extent employees spoke up with ideas, suggestions, concerns, and opinions about how to improve the work – was most influential on career commitment, and less so for career motivation and career efficacy. In contrast, voice valuation was particularly influential on career motivation. Silence appeared to have a small, detrimental effect on career commitment. Voice enactment had a small, positive effect on career commitment and career motivation.

**Summary:** The data suggests that voice culture matters for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Employees who reported high levels of voice and voice valuation were more committed, motivated, and efficacious in advancing their careers. Supplemental analyses further indicate that employees are more likely to exhibit voice when they feel that their voice is enacted; they are less likely to be silent when they feel that it is a safe environment for them to speak up; and they feel their voice is valued when their voice is enacted and when their supervisor creates a culture that is supportive of voice.

## **G. Relationship with WSF**

In this section, we consider how, above and beyond demographic differences (e.g., age, gender, race) and position-based differences (e.g., contract status, organization), the factors below shape career commitment, motivation, and efficacy:

- i) Overall satisfaction
- ii) Person-organization fit
- iii) Organizational commitment

Overall satisfaction refers to the level of contentment employees feel about various aspects of their work experience at WSF, including: work-life balance, persons in their work group, their supervisor, their job, the organization as a whole, their pay, their progress in the organization, and their chances for getting ahead in the organization.

Person-organization fit refers to the level of compatibility between an employee and the organization. It describes the congruence of an employee's beliefs and values with the mission and values of the organization.

Organizational commitment describes an employee's psychological attachment to the organization they work for. Their attachment can be affective (i.e., the employee wants to stay at their organization because they identify with it), continuance (i.e., the employee stays at their organization because they have a lack of work alternatives or their salary and fringe benefits will not transfer), or normative (i.e., the employee stays at their organization because they feel a sense of guilt for leaving) in nature.

Theoretically, employees who report a stronger positive relationship with WSF – as evidenced by higher overall satisfaction, person-organizational fit, and organizational commitment (particularly the affective kind)– should have a higher desire and motivation for career development within WSF.

Items below are indicative of overall satisfaction:

1. All in all, I am satisfied with the balance between my work and personal or family life.
2. All in all, I am satisfied with the persons in my work group.
3. All in all, I am satisfied with my supervisor.
4. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.
5. All in all, I am satisfied with this organization, compared to most.
6. Considering my skills and the effort I put into my work, I am satisfied with my pay.
7. I am satisfied with the progress I have made in this organization up to now.
8. I am satisfied with my chances for getting ahead in this organization in the future.

Items below are indicative of person-organization fit:

1. My values “match” or fit this organization.
2. My values match those of the current employees in this organization.
3. The values and “personality” of this organization reflect my own values and personality.

Items below are indicative of organizational commitment:

Affective commitment:

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

Normative commitment:

3. I continue to work for this organization because I believe the loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.
4. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.

Continuance commitment:

5. It would be very hard to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
6. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.

Response scale: (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

Title: Regression results comparing employees' relationship with WSF and its impact on career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy

Factor	Variance Explained in Career Commitment	Variance Explained in Career Motivation	Variance Explained in Career Efficacy
Demographic differences	0.1%	3.2%	2.5%
Position-based differences	2.7%	5.7%	8.1%
Overall satisfaction	35.0%	33.3%	40.6%
Person-organization fit	24.3%	27.2%	19.1%
Organizational commitment	34.7%	27.1%	19.4%

**Note:** The values featured under “variance explained” indicate how important a given factor is in shaping a particular outcome (in this case, career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy). The larger the variance explained, the more important the factor.

**Interpretation:** The results indicate that, beyond the effects of demographic and position-based differences, an employee's relationship with WSF matters a great deal for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Overall satisfaction emerged as one of the most powerful influencers of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Supplementary analyses further showed that while overall satisfaction influenced all three outcomes, progression satisfaction was most positively related to career commitment, pay satisfaction was most positively related to career motivation, and organizational satisfaction, progression satisfaction, and advancement satisfaction were most positively related to career efficacy. Organizational commitment was also a powerful influencer of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Supplementary analyses revealed that having an emotional commitment to the organization as well as an obligation to stay were most positively related to career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Notably,

commitment to the organization out of necessity was not related to any of the career outcomes. Lastly, person-organization fit was a positive influencer of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy, though it appeared to be somewhat less of an influencer compared to overall satisfaction and organizational commitment.

**Summary:** The data suggests that overall satisfaction, organizational commitment, and person-organization fit matter for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Employees who reported high levels of overall satisfaction, organizational commitment, and person-organization fit were more committed, motivated, and efficacious in advancing their careers.

## H. Career support

In this section, we consider how, above and beyond demographic differences (e.g., age, gender, race) and position-based differences (e.g., contract status, organization), the factors below shape career commitment, motivation, and efficacy:

- i) Career information satisfaction
- ii) Career opportunity satisfaction
- iii) Career access satisfaction
- iv) Career supervisor support satisfaction

Career support has many facets, of which we capture four. Career information satisfaction reflects employees' level of contentment with the availability of information on career prospects and preparing for senior level jobs at WSF. Career opportunity satisfaction reflects employees' level of contentment with the availability of opportunities to advance their careers. Career access satisfaction reflects employees' level of contentment with their access to meaningful developmental assignments and managers who can act as coaches. Career supervisor satisfaction reflects employees' level of contentment with the level of mentoring they receive from their supervisors to support their development in the organization.

Theoretically, employees who report greater satisfaction with the career support they receive should have a higher desire and motivation for career development within WSF.

Items below are indicative of career support satisfaction:

Career information satisfaction:

1. I am satisfied with the availability of information regarding career prospects at WSF.
2. I am satisfied with the availability of information on preparing for senior level jobs.

Career opportunity satisfaction:

3. I am satisfied with the availability of opportunities to advance my career.
4. I am satisfied with my access to opportunities for advancement.

Career access satisfaction:

5. I am satisfied with my access to meaningful developmental assignment.
6. I am satisfied with my access to managers who can act as coaches.

Career supervisor support satisfaction:

7. I am satisfied with the discussions I have with my supervisor regarding subsequent job opportunities.
8. I am satisfied that I have powerful managers in the organization to support my development.
9. I am satisfied that I have a senior manager as a mentor.

Response scale: (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = mostly disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = mostly agree, 7 = strongly agree)

Title: Regression results comparing facets of career support satisfaction and their impact on career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy

Factor	Variance Explained in Career Commitment	Variance Explained in Career Motivation	Variance Explained in Career Efficacy
Demographic differences	0.1%	3.4%	2.4%
Position-based differences	2.7%	6.1%	7.9%
Career support satisfaction	24.6%	27.7%	31.3%

**Note:** The values featured under “variance explained” indicate how important a given factor is in shaping a particular outcome (in this case, career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy). The larger the variance explained, the more important the factor.

**Interpretation:** The results indicate that, beyond the effects of demographic and position-based differences, career support satisfaction matters a great deal for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Supplementary analyses indicate that of all the facets of career support, career information support satisfaction was particularly important in shaping career commitment, while career opportunity support satisfaction was particularly important in shaping career motivation and career efficacy.

**Summary:** The data suggests that career support satisfaction matter for career commitment, motivation, and efficacy. Employees who reported high levels of

career support satisfaction – particularly the information and opportunity facets – were more committed, motivated, and efficacious in advancing their careers.

#### IV. Overall summary of key antecedents

Below is a visual depiction of the most impactful factors contributing to career commitment, career motivation, and career efficacy.

Figure 1. Summary of key factors shaping workforce development readiness.



This summary suggests that moving the needle in terms of career commitment, motivation, and efficacy requires a multi-faceted approach. Bringing in employees who are learning oriented and intrinsically motivated about the work; designing jobs to be more engaging through increasing job characteristics like skill variety, task identity, task significance, job autonomy, and feedback; increasing person-job fit by putting the right people in the right jobs; enhancing a sense of inclusion for all employees; encouraging leaders to engage in empowering leadership behaviors and increasing leader-member exchange by investing in their relationships with their employees; enabling employees to have a voice in sharing their work-related ideas, suggestions, and concerns; increasing employees' satisfaction with various aspects of their experience at WSF; ensuring that employees feel personally aligned with the organization's mission and values and feel committed to the organization; and lastly, supporting employees in their career development by ensuring availability of information on advancement, access to developmental opportunities, and career

coaching from supervisors – all of these actions can explain in total 68% of the variance in employees' career commitment, motivation, and efficacy, and in turn, increase their readiness to capitalize on workforce development interventions.

#### **V. Key antecedents broken down by group**

A helpful starting point is to focus on a handful of key antecedents and take stock of where there may be current gaps in these antecedents across groups within WSF.

Factor	Means by Organizational Group				Means by Gender		Means by Race		Means by Contract Type	
	Deck	Engine	Terminals	Eagle Harbor	Male	Female	Non-White	White	Non-permanent contract	Permanent contract
Employee's intrinsic motivation	5.16	5.02	5.84	5.38	5.44	5.49	5.28	5.48	5.94	5.31
Job characteristics	4.74	5.25	4.92	4.76	4.93	4.71	4.91	4.84	5.00	4.83
Inclusion	5.75	6.06	5.74	5.42	5.79	5.57	5.92	5.63	5.92	5.66
Empowering leadership	5.37	5.74	4.65	4.95	5.22	4.59	3.67	4.99	5.23	4.93
Leader-member exchange	5.87	6.27	5.21	5.08	5.66	5.14	4.84	5.48	5.67	5.43
Voice	4.03	4.36	3.82	4.61	4.18	3.89	4.21	3.97	3.73	4.17
Overall satisfaction	5.43	5.32	5.34	4.79	5.28	5.27	5.38	5.17	5.71	5.13
Person-organization fit	4.34	4.11	5.09	4.73	4.73	4.60	5.14	4.51	5.11	4.56
Career support satisfaction	4.65	4.61	4.25	3.55	4.32	4.24	3.27	4.21	4.83	4.12

**Gap analysis by organization.** There is a significant difference by organization in several categories. Intrinsic motivation, while highest among Terminal employees, is lower among Eagle Harbor and Deck employees, and lowest among Engine employees. Job characteristics, while highest among Engine employees, were lower for employees of other organizations. Empowering leadership, while highest among Engine employees, was lower for Deck and Eagle Harbor employees, and particularly low for Terminal employees. Leader-member exchange was highest among Engine employees, and lowest for Eagle Harbor employees. Voice was particularly low among Deck and Terminal employees. Overall satisfaction was particularly low for Eagle Harbor employees. Career support satisfaction was particularly low for Eagle Harbor employees, across all types of career support types.

**Gap analysis by gender.** There is a significant difference in the experience of males and females with respect to leadership. Compared to male employees, female employees reported experiencing lower levels of empowering leadership and leadership member-exchange from their supervisors. Female employees also reported lower levels of voice than male employees. Supplementary analyses reveal that female employees reported feeling less safe to speak up (mean = 4.91), compared to male employees (mean = 5.67); female employees also felt that their voice was less supported by leadership (mean = 4.65), compared to male employees (mean = 5.16). Lastly, although overall levels of career support satisfaction were similar for male and female employees, a careful look at specific types of career support satisfaction reveals that female employees perceived significantly lower access to meaningful developmental assignments and managers who can act as coaches (mean = 4.07), compared to male employees (mean = 4.47).

**Gap analysis by race.** There is a significant difference in the experience of white and non-whites with respect to leadership. Compared to white employees, non-white employees reported experiencing lower levels of empowering leadership. Non-white employees also reported lower levels of career support satisfaction. A careful look at specific types of career support satisfaction reveals that non-white employees perceived significantly lower availability of information on advancement (mean = 3.44) compared to white employees (mean = 4.39). Additionally, non-white employees reported lower access to meaningful developmental assignments and managers who can act as coaches (mean = 3.31), compared to male employees (mean = 4.25).

**Gap analysis by contract type.** There is a significant difference by contract type in several categories. Compared to permanent employees, non-permanent employees reported higher intrinsic motivation, overall satisfaction, person-organization fit, and career support satisfaction. In contrast, permanent employees reported higher voice.

(7) *Findings and recommendations* regarding recruitment methods and needs, strategies on how to recruit and conduct outreach to under-represented communities throughout the state, management of overtime and leave usage, ratio of management employees to line employees compared to industry and public sector standard and adequacy of training budget to meet workforce development needs

## Employee Survey Data on Recruitment Sources

The survey provides an understanding of the how efficacious certain recruitment sources are in terms of a) producing hires, b) creating a positive recruiting and hiring experience, and b) reaching under-represented demographic communities.

### A. Overall representation of recruitment sources

Title: Comparing recruitment sources in producing hires

Recruiting source	Frequency of hires	Percent represented
Friends/acquaintances/family	104	48.1%
Online job sites	49	22.7%
Job/career fairs	4	1.9%
Employee referral	40	18.5%
Newspaper advertising	15	6.9%
Employment agencies	4	1.9%

The vast majority of respondents were recruited into WSF through friends/acquaintances/family. To a lesser extent, respondents were recruited into WSF through online job sites and employee referrals. The lowest recruitment methods in terms of yield were job/career fairs and employment agencies.

### B. Overall experience by recruiting source

Title: Comparing satisfaction and number of days to receive offer by recruiting source

Recruiting source	Mean Recruiting Satisfaction	Mean Hiring Satisfaction	Number of Days to Receive Offer
Friends/acquaintances/family	5.00	4.93	174
Online job sites	5.46	5.13	148
Job/career fairs	4.33	3.42	214
Employee referral	4.95	4.95	112
Newspaper advertising	5.10	4.95	121
Employment agencies	3.92	4.17	315

Respondents who were recruited through online job sites appeared to have the most positive experience, as evidenced by higher satisfaction ratings as well as low number of days to receiving an offer. Newspaper advertising and employee referral are second in terms of experience, with newspaper

advertising scoring high in recruiting satisfaction, and employee referrals scoring well in terms of low number of days to receiving an offer. Friend/acquaintances/family also offered relatively high recruiting and hiring satisfaction but a higher number of days to receiving an offer. The least positive experience appears to be with job/career fairs and employment agencies, which scored low in recruiting and hiring satisfaction, and also were associated with the greatest number of days to receiving an offer.

Summary: The data suggests that the most common recruiting sources – i.e., through friends/acquaintances/family, online job sites, and employee referral – tend to also offer the most positive experiences. The least common recruiting sources – i.e., job/career fairs and employment agencies – appear to offer the least positive experiences.

**C. Efficacy of recruitment sources by demographic group**

Title: Comparing percentages of male and female respondents by recruitment source

Recruiting source	% of Males	% of Females
Friends/acquaintances/family	43.5%	56.5%
Online job sites	25.2%	18.8%
Job/career fairs	3.1%	0.0%
Employee referral	18.3%	17.4%
Newspaper advertising	8.4%	4.3%
Employment agencies	1.5%	2.9%

The vast percentage of female respondents were recruited to WSF through friends/acquaintances/family. This percentage is higher than the percentage of male respondents who were recruited to WSF through friends/acquaintances/family. Compared to male respondents, female respondents were also less likely to be recruited through online job sites, newspaper advertising, and job/career fairs. Female respondents were similar to male respondents in their likelihood of being recruited through employee referral.

Title: Comparing percentages of non-white and white respondents by recruitment source

Recruiting source	% of Non-whites	% of Whites
Friends/acquaintances/family	85.7%	59.3%
Online job sites	0.0%	12.1%
Job/career fairs	0.0%	1.1%
Employee referral	0.0%	13.2%
Newspaper advertising	0.0%	14.3%
Employment agencies	14.3%	0.0%

The vast percentage of non-white respondents were recruited to WSF through friends/acquaintances/family. This percentage is higher than the percentage of white respondents who were recruited to WSF through friends/acquaintances/family. There is also a small percentage of non-white respondents who were recruited to WSF through employment agencies.

Title: Comparing percentages of respondents by age group and recruitment source

Recruiting source	20-29 years of age	30-39 years of age	40-49 years of age	50-59 years of age	60-69 years of age	70+ years of age
Friends/acquaintances/family	56.3%	38.2%	58.8%	43.4%	50.0%	0.0%
Online job sites	25.0%	41.2%	5.9%	13.2%	31.7%	0.0%
Job/career fairs	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Employee referral	12.5%	11.8%	20.6%	28.3%	13.3%	0.0%
Newspaper advertising	0.0%	5.9%	2.9%	13.2%	3.3%	100.0%
Employment agencies	6.3%	2.9%	0.0%	1.9%	1.7%	0.0%

The vast percentage of respondents in the 20-29 years of age group were recruited through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by online job sites, and then employee referral. The vast percentage of respondents in the 30-39 years of age group were recruited through online job sites, followed by friends/acquaintances/family, and then employee referral. The vast percentage of respondents in the 40-49 years of age group were recruited through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by employee referral, then job/career fairs. The vast percentage of respondents in the 50-59 years of age group were recruited through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by employee referral, then online job sites and newspaper advertising. The vast percentage of respondents in the 60-69 years of age group were recruited through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by online job sites, then employee referral. Finally, the vast percentage of respondents in the 70+ years of age group were recruited through newspaper advertising.

Title: Comparing percentages of respondents by education level and recruitment source

Recruiting source	% of High School Degree N = 98	% of Technical Degree N = 27	% of Associate's Degree N = 41	% of Bachelor's Degree N = 34	% of Master's Degree N = 3
Friends/acquaintances/family	49.0%	70.4%	43.9%	35.3%	0.0%
Online job sites	19.4%	7.4%	26.8%	38.2%	33.3%
Job/career fairs	2.0%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	33.3%
Employee referral	19.4%	7.4%	24.4%	17.6%	0.0%
Newspaper advertising	8.2%	14.8%	2.4%	5.9%	0.0%
Employment agencies	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	33.3%

The vast percentage of respondents with high school degrees were recruited through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by online job sites and employee referral. The vast percentage of respondents with technical degrees were recruited through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by newspaper advertising. The vast percentage of respondents with associate degrees were recruited through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by online job sites and employee referral. The majority of respondents with bachelor's degrees were recruited through online job sites and friends/acquaintances/family, followed by employee referral. The majority of respondents with master's degrees were recruited through online job sites, job/career fairs, and employment agencies.

Title: Comparing years of experience at time of hiring by recruitment source

Recruiting source	Mean years of work experience
Friends/acquaintances/family	16.8
Online job sites	23.5
Job/career fairs	18.3
Employee referral	19.0
Newspaper advertising	19.4
Employment agencies	14.0

The mean years of work experience was highest among respondents recruited through online job sites (23.5 years), followed by newspaper advertising (19.4 years), employee referral (19.0 years), and job/career fairs (18.3 years); in comparison, respondents recruited through

friends/acquaintances/family had a lower mean of work experience (16.8 years), and employment agencies had the lowest (14.0 years).

**D. Efficacy of recruitment sources by job type**

Title: Comparing percentages of employees by organization group and recruitment source

Recruiting source	% of Deck	% of Engine	% of Terminals	% of Eagle Harbor
Friends/acquaintances/family	47.1%	77.3%	38.5%	52.2%
Online job sites	26.5%	4.5%	29.7%	8.7%
Job/career fairs	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	8.7%
Employee referral	16.2%	18.2%	18.7%	26.1%
Newspaper advertising	5.9%	0.0%	9.9%	4.3%
Employment agencies	1.5%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%

The vast percentage of Deck respondents were recruited to WSF through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by online job sites, then employee referral. The vast percentage of Engine respondents were recruited to WSF through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by employee referral. The majority percentage of Terminal respondents were recruited to WSF through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by online job sites, then employee referral. The vast percentage of Eagle Harbor respondents were recruited to WSF through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by employee referral.

Title: Comparing percentages of non-permanent and permanent employees by recruitment source

Recruiting source	% of Non-permanent	% of Permanent
Friends/acquaintances/family	24.1%	55.3%
Online job sites	44.4%	16.0%
Job/career fairs	1.9%	2.0%
Employee referral	22.2%	17.3%
Newspaper advertising	1.9%	8.7%
Employment agencies	5.6%	0.7%

The vast percentage of non-permanent employee respondents were recruited to WSF through online job sites followed by friends/acquaintances/family and employee referral. In comparison, the vast percentage of permanent employee respondents were recruited to WSF

through friends/acquaintances/family, followed by employee referral and online job sites.

Summary. It appears that recruiting through friends/acquaintances/family and online job sites are particularly important when it comes to hiring female, non-white, and younger employees. Online job sites appear to have an advantage in terms of hiring employees with higher education credentials and more years of experience.

**E. Qualitative comments on other recruitment sources**

Title: Other recruitment sources aside from those listed above.

Built 7 ferries and love to be a part of operations. Hope to work in engineering.
Callins
Commuting over the vessel
craigslist posting
email from governmentjobs.com
Facebook
fellow sailors
Flyer that was on a ferry
Galley Work
I don't remember applying
I like the Puget sound
I myself was interested in working for W.F.S
IBU
IBU job call
MEBA Union member
met carpenter foreman
My mother worked here
on a walk
On channel 4 (KOMO)
Posted on vessel
Radio add on Kiro or Radio show
Schedule a hire through DSHS division of vocational rehabilitation
Seattle Maritime Academy
self-research
Sent by Union to interview opening
T.V.
Union

union
union
Union dispatcher
Union Hall
union referral
union visit to hall
Washington State job listing on the WA website
worked in D.O.T
Worked in gallery
WSDOT website
WSF Website

## End of Survey Qualitative Comments, Sorted by Theme

### Theme: Advancement

There are opportunities for advancement, I just haven't taken advantage of them, doesn't seem like a lot of support for this.
Not all employees are mentored or encouraged to move up within WSF system or take special projects. Opportunity within WSF is not disseminated well within the system.
no interested in overtime or advancement. have 18 months till retirement
Many people love this job but are stuck in low end positions.
If you're not "liked" or too knowledgeable, you won't get promoted.
I joined WSF deck dept. as a second career. My goals and advancement objectives have been met. I am 4 years away from retirement and do not anticipate advancing my career at this point.
My answers here reflect being rejected four times applying for a supervisor position. At that time the existing supervisors selected the members for their "club". Even now there is little chance for advancement.
Availability of job advancement is a joke. Within the terminal the hierarchy goes: On-call -> permanent traffic-> permanent seller. Any "opportunities" beyond that are generally based upon favoritism, now many hoops you will jump through to get referrals, and then based upon interview scores and then your skill set.
Advancement is all favoritism and political not based on your merit.
Officers are great. Their skillset is rare and valuable. They are really underpaid. That and the difficulty of advancing to that level probably has to do with why there is a shortage of them. Even though they have a lot of responsibility and are paid too little the master of what they do inspires me to try and reach that level. If it was easier to take time off work to meet the requirements of the licensing more people would try. Especially when it comes to certain pilotage trips. Employees should always be able to take time off work to get those done.
My low marks regarding prospects for advancement in my career is simply due to the fact that advancement is seniority-based, not merit based (mostly), and the seniority list is long and young. It's not because the employer prevents advancement.
I just wish for a mentor to see my potential and value and help me/teach me skills that I could use for the benefit of this company, my coworkers, and myself. Although I love what I do, advancement is exciting and a good path to take, but I do not know how to do this, who to talk to, who would take an interest in me. Those things are roadblocks. and it's frustrating.
I am a terminal attendant and am older, so I'm no longer interested in advancement. In my earlier years I was but found upper management really didn't give me opportunity back then. I feel in recent years it's improved. I see younger co-workers advancing sooner than before. Thank you

Things at WSF rarely change for the good. For a while we had a CEO that cared but she retired. Her replacement could care less about frontline workers and managers she promotes with rare exception.

**Theme: Training**

Online training not as effective as in person training.
Training has been pretty much nonexistent.
Classroom is the best training. Computer OK but not as good as classroom.
We need yearly training/Fire school. I haven't been to fire trainings in over 5 years. We need that training to do our job.
I believe we should be able to use LMS in a wider variety of scope to develop more skills.
Customer services training for all but especially those directing customers. There is too much yelling and anger at people that make mistakes because they do not know our rules such as tourists!
I would appreciate more safety/1st responder training. We often are in situations where it would be beneficial to know 1st and the operation of the AED.
Terminal employees should receive first aid and CPR training. Plus, some have training with the use of the AED.
Most training has been online and seems less effective to classroom settings. I don't believe we have any voluntary training.
Training has improved the readiness of the fleet as a whole.
not enough specific training to keep up on current + updated technology + systems.
I have never been a part of an organization that stressed training as much as W.S.F. I am extremely satisfied with the training process. Training and overtime are necessary to advance in this field. It would be an absolute mistake to get rid of either.
Poor trade specific trainings.
Use Calhoun/MEBA training more!
WSF used to have training classes about 15-25 people from different docks and job classes. All together for 8 hours at least 1 time a year. It was done in a casual manner and opened doors for discussion on procedures, changes, topics of training. All discussed. Amongst us all. Gave more understanding of training topics. And actually, I looked forward to them every year. We haven't had any of these training classes for about 5 yrs. The new "DOT" time new payroll class should have not been on-line. Needs to be taught in person. Along with other issues this COVID year.
WSF training videos are outdated and repetitive. Required state training is not specific or relevant to WSF. It feels like WSF is an afterthought when it comes to communications from WSDOT. Typical occasional surveys and annual training are clearly designed for people who work in offices and don't seem at all relevant for those working the fleet at WSF.

I believe training and OT are two things WSF should continue. I also believe agents should be taking more education as well. I believe an employee retention class would be very beneficial for all agents to take along with HR. I also believe agents should not show favoritism with other personal - I see it way too much.

**Theme: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**

I have been working this job in 33 years. Honestly, When I started the job, I had a tough time with the company (because I am a minority). But after that, I have seen the company has been changing a lot. The reason I still working here (I did very good job for company). All the peoples treated me bad was gone. I'm glad I work for the company that long and it is almost time to retire now.

I am concerned with bigotry exhibited by coworkers towards persons of color in workplace (not towards me)

I have a great respect for the upper management of this organization, and I think they know what they are doing. However, some of my co-workers including a few supervisors that I have worked with on a daily basis are very closed-minded and authoritative towards their juniors or subordinates or anyone from another culture.

**Theme: Voice culture, proactivity, & initiative**

Nearly every negative answer I gave was directly related to the fact that this is a union job, and a state job. I feel that if I/when I worked in the private sector my initiative and input were not only valued, they got me promoted. Initiative here @WSF gets you laughed at, even ridiculed.

Often feel employees with a good work ethic are overlooked. Job is pretty cut and dry. Either you show up on time, do the work in an efficient manner or you don't. Coworkers are going to be affected by others work ethic but often times things go unnoticed. If you bring something to a supervision's attention you are told nothing can be done or you are viewed as a tattletale.

Creative thought is not encouraged. We are just cogs in the State wheel.

Personally, I need to learn a lot more before suggesting any changes. If I notice an unsafe situation, I would feel confident that an appropriate response would follow.

For the moment, the ON CALL supervisors are the ones who are the most supportive, helpful and receptive to input ideas from us. Even if our immediate supervisors do accept our input, the Regional Supervisors and Operation Supervisors are generally dismissive of the ideas and none of our ideas may be implemented if Seattle doesn't approve.

When a regular employee is asked to make a decision for their supervisor or their supervisor acts upon an idea to fix a situation, the supervisor gets all the credit, not the employee who proposed the solution of made the decision the supervisor wouldn't.

<p>WSF has quite a few employees that have great minds and ideas. Perhaps A program that encourages developing ideas into a tangible form could be beneficial to WSF.</p>
<p>I am fortunate to be on a good watch, with a good chief, and an excellent staff chief. I feel like I and my ideas are respected and that I am part of a team that looks out for each other and cares about the quality of work done, and the individual responsibility that goes into that process.</p>
<p>Communication in this organization is terrible. For example, when a vessel has a major breakdown, or a very challenging problem, the steps to remedy or repair that issue are not widely shared. Even when requested. As front-line workers we seem to have ZERO input with the port engineers office + little to no communications with them other than reprimands. This organization would be much more functional + operate better at less cost if we could implement an incident response communication that gets shared either fleet wide or at least vessel class wide.</p>
<p>Some of my co-workers I've observed over the last year and half in this organization are very lazy at work and they deliberately don't do their job due to a lack of supervising or channels to report the truth about their quality of work.</p>
<p>I have tried to make improvements. Crew that has been here longer always discourage me. They always say that nothing will change. I was very enthusiastic when I first started.</p>

**Theme: COVID-19**

<p>Working for ferries during Covid has been extremely stressful and it's bullshit that so many people "worked" from home for full pay and benefits.</p>
<p>I've been a frontline worker all during the pandemic I feel like those of us that keep these boats running should be recognized.</p>
<p>I am an essential worker; wish I was treated like one.</p>
<p>I enjoy my job but feel that I am very expendable. During the recent covid-19 the state and WSF went to great lengths to make the passengers to feel at ease while traveling, through safety and cleaning practices. As far as myself and my co-workers, we and I felt unsafe and extremely expendable. Most of the moves WSF made were "CYA" moves, and the feeling my employer didn't care about me was abundantly clear.</p>
<p>I am bothered by the fact that we are required to wear masks. I am an auto seller AND there are no suggestions to customers to wear masks until they are at my booth. We ALL need to wear them. It is state law if 6' cannot be maintained. Why not have large signs at Pier 48 as they head to auto booths as well as large signs as they approach my auto booth? I happily wear a mask to protect myself but would like WSF to enforce/support making customers wear as well.</p>
<p>With Covid-19 health scare I rarely see WSF management, Coast Guard, or Homeland Security. While I work on our boats they hide and work from home. Safer than me.</p>

**Theme: Coworkers**

<p>So many coworkers not in a position of responsibility use the words “don't” and “can't” way too much.</p>
<p>plenty of good employees here but often affected by the bad ones and the mood goes way down.</p>
<p>Most of my coworkers are great and usually know their jobs.</p>
<p>New employees seem to be worse each year – very entitled and unwilling to take instructions. Disrespect permeates the system between vessel and dock – new employees/senior employees, supervisors and employees, upper management and employees.</p>
<p>They think that senior or supervisor knows better than juniors or their subordinates, and they are always right about everything which sometimes gets the new members of the group cornered and bullied, even get them in trouble instead of leading or coaching them by being a role model or mentor with the longer experience with the organization. This small group of people talks bad about the organization in front of other co-workers or even in front of the public we are serving and gossip about others instead of following through on the duties they are supposed to do during the shift. Some of my co-workers I’ve observed over the last year and half in this organization are very lazy at work and they deliberately don’t do their job due to a lack of supervising or channels to report the truth about their quality of work. It’s sad to see some people milking the system over and over by slacking at work and getting in no trouble. I really like what I do and the organization over all but my biggest challenge at work is fighting against this kind of toxic company inner culture deeply rooted in some places.</p>
<p>On the vessel, I think crews work well together and there is a lot of O.J.T. (on the job training) that occurs.</p>

**Theme: Supervisors & Quality of Leadership**

<p>My direct supervisor isn't free to make certain changes without getting approval from his/her boss (port captain).</p>
<p>My supervisor is an excellent leader. He has all of the best qualities like: making a person feel like he respects you + your ideas. He actually makes you feel like you’re part of the system. (you count.) Other docks: Coleman, Bremerton, Southworth Bainbridge make you feel like a body is all they need. If you weren't "in the agents pocket" then you weren't recognized as a worthy employee and were treated without respect.</p>
<p>As far as supervisors go... this dock’s supervisors are more interested in hanging out and chatting with the policeman we have. They also have obvious “pet” employees to the point I’ve heard others say “go ask so and so...” knowing it’s the only way to get the desired outcome. It’s very hard to need help and want to ask the agent. I honestly don’t even try. For reasons unknown to me, there’s an agent who talks down to me and is very curt with all</p>

<p>responses. Honestly, I don't get change(d?) or go upstairs at all when her car is here. I don't feel like I'm in trouble before I get to the principal's office!</p>
<p>Also, it would be nice to have access to chain of command. Meaning, having more of a free day open door policy. That way ?'s can get answered.</p>
<p>Supervisors are helpful if it benefits them. They lose our paperwork, neglect to call us as needed and will write people up for stupid crap. My Supers here now are cool. I'd quit if I had to go to Fauntleroy dock, because that Super isn't nice.</p>
<p>A fair number of supervisors treat WSF personnel as if they were children, some supervisors have control issues, some supervisors give "orders" not allowing input. Decisions are made without our input i.e. change of work conditions. Some of those making decisions have little or no experience working on the docks in traffic or selling positions and do not understand current working conditions.</p>
<p>Management/supervisors are varied, and some are knowledgeable and supportive, some are the exact opposite.</p>
<p>I think these questions assume that our supervisors that we work with on a daily basis have power. Apart from immediate issues that come up that must be dealt with the white shirt crew has very little power to impact change in WSF. There's a disconnect with leadership and our daily work. The only things that seem to make a big difference in our daily job is if we are late or a serious accident happens.</p>
<p>It's very dysfunctional and cannot seem to improve internal communication. I've had (and have) supervisors who don't want to supervise, who have bullied me and have said some incredibly inappropriate things. Too many people within WSF view their positions as "power" and not as part of a team. I've been called into a "meeting" because my direct supervisor's ex-wife saw me upset at another co-worker. I wasn't allowed to speak. I stood up for myself with a different supervisor and he would stand off at a distance and stare at me. I'm looking forward to retiring. This place is nuts!</p>
<p>There are too many immediate supervisors. Most do very little. Supervisors make 2x what I do and do the same work the employees do. They need to be replaced by a "LEAD" position. The state would save a LOT of money and the job would still run the same. Our current supervisor doesn't ever check in with her staff, paperwork piles up, supplies aren't getting ordered. The covid box is never checked and has had a non-working thermometer for a couple weeks now! Why pay the supervisors to NOT supervise. She should be replaced by a "Lead" attendant.</p>
<p>My supervisor(s) are knowledgeable and dedicated to success.</p>
<p>Super good leadership on Mukilteo A watch. Crew morale is HIGH!!</p>
<p>Also all the supervisors at Coleman dock are great. Everyone will work with you instead of against you.</p>
<p>On my watch I have 3 supervisors. One of my supervisors has not been with us since 1/2020. This means that I have a new supervisor almost everyday and you never know what you will get until the start of your day. Sometimes the</p>

events on another watch carries over to ours and not in a positive way. Their is NO consistency at WSF.
Our relationships with officers are more being part of a team than it is a typical employee/supervisor relationship. Our adversaries are actually the management staff, not our working deck officers.
All my supervisors do for a seller is give/make change and approve/disapprove a day off.

**Theme: Work Time, Pay, Schedule, and Overtime Concerns**

My biggest complaint against this agency is that it does not seem to value my time. Deadheads to start work should be minimized or at least spoken about by those who have the power to change schedules. Secondly, being held over on a watch to cover crewing requirements for the next watch should be a last resort. We have no option in this overtime. If no one wants overtime, then it should be the last option and dispatch should keep trying to fill the job until the last possible moment. Our lives, our time is important. Thank you for listening.
Deadheading to work (not being paid for time you must spend on a ferry traveling) really sucks.
10-day watches need to go and create more 10 hr. days. Deadheading sucks
The only thing I wish I could change are the scheduler and the amount of travel and time we do to get to and from work. The schedules are not great for families.
I think we need better pay 35.00 hourly- minimum.
with threats of budget cuts all I have to say is your welcome for working OT, because you needed me.
WSF upper management doesn't seem to care about any of its employees. Extra shifts were put in place secretly and employees forced to work them.
Currently, this job, this year has been rough. We do not have enough bodies to be able to fill positions so almost everyone who has been working at the terminal in Anacortes has had no option but to work overtime or abandon their posts to go and fill positions which we have had enough people to fill.
I do wish the employer and union were more competitive on our wages compared to deep sea employees in the same roles.
Work-life balance does not exist, it is unhealthy; lack of adequate rest is an issue not only for myself but others as well. Time between shifts is not adequate especially for new on call + part time employees. Rotating weekends could be a solution for work life balance issues (family time). Bidding process is too complicated and often you work with a commute time in excess of 2 hours or more and a dock not in your locale- but you have to do this in order to vie for a permanent position. Lots of problems with bidding.
How other's can hold permanent job status at a farther away terminal and work at a closer terminal to "bump" other workers to work farther away from their "dream dock". No pay for on-call workers who have to work + train at

docks that are over 1 hour away from their homes. No "regional" hiring options! North-South-East-West; sides.
We have complicated schedules and pay scales and the employer 'scratches' our pay, often incorrectly, which can be frustrating with how regularly your paycheck does not match the pay submitted (and performed).
Overtime questions do not reflect that deckhands can be held over if no relief and there is no choice in the matter;

**Theme: Positivity towards working at WSF**

Overall WSF is my career.
I love my job.
I'm a new employee- started 6 months ago. Thought I would have a seasonal job "for the summer." Turns out, it's a great place and great fit for me! Probably be here till I retire!
I just started working for the ferries this year, but so far, I'm loving it and have big plans for my career here. I really like the workplace culture, there is a lot of support and encouragement. It's also dynamic. The tasks don't change much but interacting with public keeps things interesting and requires a lot of soft skills. I work at a terminal now, but I am going to transfer to Deck and work my way up to Captain.
I come here to safely transport passengers and I am blessed to work with adults that effectively communicate their needs/wants/desires without having to delicately tiptoe around a hurt feeling because someone is special.
WSF is a great place to work
I love working for WSF.
I love my job, it's easy @ my dock.
Despite our imperfections... I really do like my job @ WSF. Co-workers are pretty awesome as well.
I love my jobs. I love the service I perform for the community. Would I recommend the job- not so much.
I love what I do and some of the great people I work with – as well as the schedule. And I stay because I retire in less than 10 years – but still want the job, WSF could be so much more
Working with Washington State Ferries has been a very good experience.
Overall, I'm very happy to be working with WS Ferries. The personnel I've encountered seem highly qualified and motivated. It's encouraging to be a part of the team.
I feel WSF has such good opportunity for growth within the company. I feel very blessed to have this job. Especially through this pandemic. We are lucky.
My experience with WSF has been a good one so far. The job has it's quirks but the more time and effort you put in does pay off. I am seeing the benefits after only 6 months on. Overall, the experience has been more positive than negative.
Upside of WA State Ferries: Decent wages and benefits, Flexible schedules, free passage via vessels, etc.

All in All, it's been a good career!
I've enjoyed my WSF career and do it again. I am now just looking forward to my last few years, pass on my knowledge and retire.

**Theme: Negativity towards working at WSF**

WSF has been crumbling for a long time and now with, covid it is worse. years ago this was a great coveted job, but now it's not ideal
Communication is lacking as a whole. No frontline employee support. Employee moral is low.
I am only here for the money and benefits. Other than that it's a mindless job.
The first year with WSF was excruciating. Excessive days (over 30) with no calls; some employment followed by a 5 month involuntary lay off. We were told it would be hard. They didn't say we would starve.
A work culture stuck in the 80s and a bunch of old coworkers simply existing just to receive a paycheck AFTER HIDING FOR 8 HOURS. There are some good people here, but this place is filled with those who take advantage of the staff.
Downside of WSF Terminal side, inadequate training for general job preparedness leading to a continuous cycle of problems not addressed properly or at all. These problems have lead to down and lost time worked, damaged infrastructure impacting services, lack of personal accountability to those under performing with an unfavorable reflection on the organization. Those employees going above and beyond, see little if any acknowledgement.
Things never change for the better here
There is a lack of accountability at our organization, we have well defined roles and jobs on the vessels and almost no performance review measures to make sure everyone is doing what they're suppose to while on duty. Rules in both our contract and company policy seem to be applied only when convenient for managers in our upper tier and little is done to improve the disparity between the procedures and what the expectations are.

**Theme: Limitations of the survey**

This survey is difficult to answer all questions - due to this being a government organization with a set budget. Our roles/ positions in the vessel are clearly defined.
Q 46- How am I suppose to know if I am being judged? Am I suppose to vaguely make determinations based on perceived facial tics and movements? Am I to be sensitive to every nuance of how I am being looked at? Q 53- Bias. Is my supervisor being biased if he never seems to accept my suggestions? Is he being biased if he accepts all of my suggestions? What judgmental basis am I suppose to be on the look-out for? Questions such as these lead me to believe that you think I come to work to ensure my feeling isn't hurt.
We have 5 different supervisors here and all are different. Very hard to answer these questions as different people have different relationships with each one.
This survey is very generic and doesn't always fit a maritime situation in my humble opinion.

<p>This survey is more in tuned to a corporate structure. Working on the ferries is a different type of occupation. Interaction between officers and crew follow a more military structure.</p>
<p>Overall a good survey but I think some of the questions were maybe too general/random to almost not applicable. For us (crew) we have many rules/regulations issued outside of WSF (ascg...) that people on the dock or office are not required to follow. Therefore work schedule/overtime/training all these are different in the way we approach them.</p>
<p>The prepared survey lack fundamental understanding of how the maritime industry as a whole operates. Once more, there are specific requirements placed on us by USCG that makes a lot of these questions irrelevant. The money spent here could be better utilized to better process suggestions from the fleet.</p>
<p>Some of the "test" questions did not apply to my current position.</p>
<p>I believe the survey is ill suited for the WSF. The questions are vague at best and aimed towards corporate jobs, and my be able to work for vessels.</p>
<p>Also, we have many supervisors, not just one specifically from the list. I chose the one I felt the least support from. The supervisor in question was kind of useless without being able to identify each one.</p>
<p>I'm not sure this survey really pertains to the maritime industry. Our job is based solely on seniority, not merit. Our hours are fixed, rigid, rigid, and not in our control. OT is based on accepting work for the day with no pressure to accept. The only OT we can't control is when our boat is late. Thank you!! Hope this helps</p>
<p>Ours is a very procedural workplace/routine so there is not a lot of room for creativity or "ideas" regarding day-to-day operations/labor. Just mentioning this for reference/perspective.</p>
<p>I didn't feel these questions relate to my job as an auto seller</p>
<p>The survey is does not fit into capturing the nature of our job on the deck side.</p>

**Theme: Recruiting, selection, & promotions**

<p>There are numerous family "trees" within the Ferry System i.e., father, mother, children, cousins (-&gt; friend of families) etc. leading toward certain attitudes not necessarily positive.</p>
<p>Selecting officials select persons like themselves which perpetuates a certain supervisor/administrator.</p>
<p>In my position, everything is based on seniority. During my interview, I was asked a total of 5 questions, asked a few of my own and at the end stated/questioned- my entire seniority placement was based on a math test and this interview. I questioned- with my past work experience- why I was placed on the third class- towards the bottom at that.</p>
<p>There is no rhyme or reason for hiring supervisors – it appears that if you are new, lack knowledge/experience, you get in.</p>
<p>People have been rehired after being caught stealing- after making threats to others.</p>

I was hired in 1993. I was so proud! I saw the potential for WSF to shine. 27 years later and I'm still waiting.
more transparency for the supervisor selection process. maybe outside source to help with selection process...
The use of outside hires or "Academy grads" to fill officer spots instead of helping and promoting loyal "hawspiper" employees is very disheartening.
When I was hired the recruiter was not good at communicating.
WSF has a problem with upper management being heavy with people without outside maritime experience. They hire a lot of ex USCG members that makes it a conflict of interest on operating a vessel honestly. Oilers hired through MEBA are not interviewed or vetted for skills and thus we get the lowest quality of people within the fleet. WSF values seniority over merit
I am disillusioned by the quality of some of the people that get hired. It seems that if you are a terminal transfer or from the galley, you're "in". I've seen a higher proportion of this group of employees treat customers terribly. I wish I could participate in the hiring process. I have a background that I am proud of and I know I could positively contribute.
No real leadership in management above the foreman level. There is a lot of incompetence due to upper management pre-selecting who they want to fill a role prior to interviews.
On recruitment and hiring, I think that the current people recruiting have no expertise in vessel work and mislead new employees when they are hired;

**Theme: Other**

Consistent officers are key to having a well-adjusted and productive crew. Extend temp their job when they go out on medical, daily dispatch of officer is not good.
The ability to get people supplies to complete our job. When asked for the proper supplies we are told they are not in the system and make do. Or buy them yourself (i.e., proper deck gloves in 2XL sizes)
Most employees are content to smile and be friendly with customers, too often with rude, selfish comments in return.
I'm drowning in work and we need help. Two regular workers and 4 supervisors who don't work in the field. Other employees died or were promoted out. Hire more people!
I believe management is oblivious to what happens in my workplace. I believe they don't have their hand on the pulse.
Management knowingly breaks laws about dissemination of private health information and when called out attempts to perform disciplinary action. Washington State gave 40 million dollars to "undocumented immigrants for COVID19 relief" while making it's WSF HR employees demand a cut in salary. WSF management has been cutting hull maintenance on older ferries causing hulls to be unfit for continued use in an effort to condemn the old boats and get funding for new boats. New boats have been designed with a high

concentration of electronics that have a commercial lifespan of 3 years and no thought is given for the long-term continued maintenance of the boats. The organization is grossly mismanaged. An organizational audit should be performed.

Upper management doesn't care about its employee's at all we are merely steppingstones to be used at will to advance their careers.

**Consulting & Business Development Center  
Michael G. Foster School of Business  
University of Washington**

**[FOSTER.UW.EDU/CONSULT](http://FOSTER.UW.EDU/CONSULT)**