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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Nature of the Problem

During the past two decades, much concern regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of public organizations has been expressed in academic literature (McHugh, O’Brien, & Ramondt, 2001; Shalala, 1998). In addition, the importance of human factors within public organizations has been stressed (Carnevale, 2003; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003; Kобрak, 1992). Traditional bureaucracy has been cited as a source of difficulties with both the performance (technical) aspects (Gore, 1993) and the human (social) aspects (Ehin, 2000) of public organizations. Hierarchical management style, involving a predominantly top-down approach, is a key aspect of the traditional bureaucratic organization.

Public mental health agencies (PMHAs) are an area of public service in which apparently no scientific studies have been published regarding the effects of management style on organizational climate and organizational performance. PMHAs support local communities by providing a safety net of services for noninsured and underinsured persons with substance abuse problems, developmental disabilities, and mental illness.

In July of 2004, The Detroit Free Press and Detroit News together published a front-page series of articles that claimed there were severe management problems in
the state's public mental health system (Krupa & Brooks, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c). Inefficiency and instances of inadequate services were reported. In this series of articles, no clear differentiation was made between factors operating at the state level of government and factors operating within the local PMHAs.

Lacking scientific studies that specifically address dynamics within and between levels of government in the mental health system, it is not possible to ascertain the nature, source, extent, and means of remediation of problems within the system. This dissertation addresses one factor that may significantly impact the performance of the public mental health system: the dynamics of management style within the local PMHA. Through an in-depth study of the effects of management style on organizational climate and organizational performance in one PMHA, knowledge was sought that may be useful in improving the working conditions, organizational efficiency, and organizational effectiveness of PMHAs.

It is not suggested here that improvement in management style is a complete solution to problems in PMHAs or the larger public mental health system. However, improvement in management style may lead to organizations that are more unified, and therefore better able to find workable answers to multiple, complex problems. Areas important to organizational functioning that are not addressed in this study include hierarchical structure (the number of levels and definition of functions for each level) and mechanisms of accountability operating between hierarchical levels within an agency and between levels of government. Also, the beneficial effects for the organization of a diverse workforce and integrative conflict resolution processes
also have been outside the scope of this study. However, the “evolved” management style supported by this study would seem to be compatible with progress in these areas.

As noted above, hierarchical management is believed by many to be a primary source of difficulties in large public organizations. Some believe that hierarchical, top-down management does not support efficient and effective performance because: (a) management energy and focus are lost through unnecessary and counterproductive directing and controlling employees rather than devoted to coordinating and improving the organization as a system, and (b) employee input is lost due to their nonparticipation in monitoring and planning regarding the processes and systems in which they are directly involved.

With regard to organizational climate, hierarchical, top-down management is believed by some to be unconducive to a psychological work environment supportive of high organizational performance because: (a) underlying assumptions about employees upon which hierarchical management is based are negative, (b) competition rather than cooperation is fostered, (c) trust is weakened, and (d) distrust, fear, and conflict are engendered.

It is important to distinguish hierarchical organizational structure from hierarchical management style. Hierarchical structure, which on paper is depicted by lines and boxes, refers to levels of administrative authority necessary to facilitate productivity and maintain accountability in large organizations. Accountability and the
addition of value over and above the work done by subordinates are the objectives of managerial hierarchies (Jaques, 1990).

Hierarchical management style, as defined for this study, refers to a set of attitudes and practices that may or may not be present within hierarchical organizational structure. Hierarchical management style is defined as consisting of negative assumptions about the motivation and capacity of employees, dysfunctional retaining of power within the hierarchy, inflexible use of rules, and excessive focus on directing and controlling employees. All large organizations will necessarily have a hierarchical structure to some extent.

In contrast to hierarchical management style, which is believed to result in unintended negative consequences in both organizational climate and organizational performance, this study proposes an evolved management style. Evolved management style is defined here as part of strong administrative capacity and includes positive assumptions about employees, appropriate participation and empowerment of employees, flexibility in use of rules, and focus on improving the system of productivity. An evolved management style emanates from and builds on the strengths of traditional organizational structure and practices. Table 1 shows the key elements of hierarchical management style in comparison with evolved management style.

Hierarchical management style is distinct from hierarchical structure, which is needed to unite and coordinate agency activities and to address critical situations. Clearly, there are times when top-down directives are necessary and when inadequacies at the level of the individual organizational member must be addressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchical Management Style</th>
<th>Evolved Management Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ Holds limiting assumptions regarding employees' intelligence and capacity to be self-motivated; relies on extrinsic motivators (external rewards and punishments).</td>
<td>♦ Holds positive assumptions regarding employees’ intelligence and capacity to be self-motivated; fosters and relies on intrinsic talents and motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Retains power with management via command and control methods (dictating what to do and how to do it).</td>
<td>♦ Fosters empowerment of employees through appropriate job autonomy, flexibility in how tasks are completed, and participation of employees in the monitoring and improvement of the systems in which they work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Treats all employees the same via extensive and inflexible rules.</td>
<td>♦ Differentiates the majority of employees from the small proportion whose behavior warrants close supervision; uses fewer and more flexible rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Focuses on controlling the behavior of employees as the key to productivity.</td>
<td>♦ Focuses on improvement of the system within which employees work as the key to productivity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by P. Meserve in 2002.

Hierarchical management style, as distinct from the authority structure of the agency, refers to assumptions and practices which are pervasive in day-to-day management of an organization. These practices communicate a negative view of employees, and are
incompatible with empowerment of employees and management of the organization from a systems perspective.

An evolved management style, based on understanding of both human and technical factors, is better able to integrate the human and technical domains. Because of a more complete understanding and integration of human and technical factors, an evolved management style is better able to use authority effectively to maintain a supportive work environment and to fulfill the organization's mission. Figure 1 illustrates the importance of positive assumptions regarding employees for achievement of the public organization's mission and for cohesion in society.

Research Intent

The problem in public service organizations addressed by this dissertation is a hierarchical management style that may result in: (a) lack of a strong, unified culture to support organizational members in fulfilling the organization's mission; (b) lack of a system of productivity which provides employees what is needed for optimal service delivery; and (c) lack of effective integration between the human and technical aspects of organizations.

Because organizational culture by definition includes shared basic assumptions, and the presence of shared basic assumptions cannot be assumed, this dissertation studied organizational climate, a concept closely related to organizational culture. Organizational climate is used in this study to refer to the psychological work environment.
A public mental health agency (PMHA) in the American Midwest served as the host agency for an organizational survey. An extensive literature review and the researcher's 26 years of professional work experience in public service organizations guided the design of the organizational questionnaire. Although the study was conducted at a PMHA and findings therefore will be most relevant to PMHAs, some
of the findings may be generalized to other kinds of public service agencies, such as schools, welfare agencies, and public health organizations.

The research questions of this dissertation were:

1. What is the nature of the relationship between management style and organizational climate in a public mental health agency?

2. What is the nature of the relationship between management style and organizational performance in a public mental health agency?

3. What is the nature of the relationship between organizational climate and organizational performance in a public mental health agency?

Significance

While some elements of hierarchical management and its effects on organizations have been studied in public service organizations, few studies, if any, have been specifically designed for a PMHA. This study will help to fill this gap in the literature.

Management style is a factor internal to the organization and a factor over which local managers have control. This is in contrast with factors such as funding and accountability mechanisms by oversight agencies, which at this time are largely beyond the influence of the local organization. However, increased empowerment of PMHAs through better management practices may contribute to local agencies having a greater role in the improvement of funding and oversight practices within the mental health system.
This study was intended to increase knowledge regarding the relationship between management style, organizational climate, and organizational performance within a public mental health agency. This knowledge may encourage managers to adopt nonhierarchical management practices. Nonhierarchical practices, such as strategies to increase interpersonal trust and to increase employee participation in process improvement, may result in benefits for the organization and its stakeholders. Possible benefits for the organization of nonhierarchical management include, for example, increased income through streamlined billing of insurance carriers and improvement in the quality and accessibility of information needed for service provision and documentation.

Organizational stakeholders may benefit from this study as follows: (a) clients of the organization may receive improved services; (b) families of clients and the community may be strengthened as clients with mental health needs are assisted to increasingly become assets to others, rather than liabilities; (c) organizational members may experience a less stressful, healthier work environment and increased opportunities for self actualization; (d) families of organizational members and the community may benefit from the improved health and vitality of organizational members; (e) citizen trust regarding governmental services may be increased, providing support for a more cohesive society and a lessening of a tendency toward cynicism regarding government; and (f) taxpayers may benefit from increased efficiency in service provision.
Contributions of this study to ongoing research include the following:

(a) additional knowledge regarding organizational variables that are current subjects of study in academic literature, (b) a "snapshot" of key organizational factors within one mental health agency which may serve as a basis for further research at that agency, (c) a research design that may become a basis for comparison between organizations, and (d) a survey instrument that may be modified to provide an integral assessment of different types of organizations.

In summary, this study may have a positive impact on organizational research, policy, and practice affecting the vitality and success of PMHAs, their organizational stakeholders, and their communities, as well as other kinds of public organizations. The audience for this dissertation includes organizational members of public service agencies, policy makers, and researchers of public organizations. This study should be of particular relevance to those concerned with the effects of management style on organizational climate and organizational performance within public mental health agencies.

The remainder of this dissertation is divided into four chapters. Chapter II summarizes conceptual and empirical literature related to the research questions; Ken Wilber's "four quadrants" is presented as a basis for the development of an integral organizational theory and the work of theorists is reviewed in relation to integration of human and technical aspects within organizations. Chapter III includes the proposed Integral Organizational Model based on the work of Wilber, definitions of key and component variables, and operationalization of variables in the questionnaire.
that was used in a survey a public mental health agency. Chapter IV presents the findings of the research. Chapter V includes a summary and discussion of findings, limitations of the study, recommendations for organizations similar to the agency surveyed, and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Difficulties have been identified in both the human and technical realms within public organizations. The key argument of this dissertation is thus that an integral approach to the study and management of public organizations is necessary to bring together the human and technical sides of organizations. The human side encompasses individual and collective subjective human experience, including assumptions, identifications, commitments, and feelings. The technical side includes empirically based information related to human behavior and organizational structure, processes, and systems. For this study, an integral approach to organizational theory and practice is defined as a way of understanding and managing organizations so that the human and the technical sides of organizations reinforce and support each other.

The literature review conducted for this study is addressed in this chapter in the following sections: (a) Ken Wilber’s theory, which provides the basis for the integral organizational model proposed in this study, is summarized; (b) An overview of historical and current organizational theory with regard to the inclusion of the human side is provided; (c) The work of W. Edwards Deming is summarized and discussed as a turning point in the application of a balanced human/technical approach in large organizations; (d) Barry Johnson’s “Polarity Management” is discussed as a
useful technique for achieving balance between seeming opposites in organizational management; and (e) Literature related to the variables of the study is reviewed.

The Integral Theory of Ken Wilber

Ken Wilber (1997) has developed a theory that integrates interior, subjective perspectives ("I" and "We") with exterior, objective perspectives ("It," singular and plural). A simple version of Wilber's "four quadrants" may be seen in Figure 2.

Wilber's "four quadrants" has relevance for application to human organizations as a means to unify, in theory and in practice, the subjective (human) and objective (technical) aspects of organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTIVE/ INTERIOR</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE/ INTERIOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I&quot; Perspective</td>
<td>&quot;It&quot; Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 1 (Q 1)</td>
<td>(singular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We&quot; Perspective</td>
<td>&quot;It&quot; Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 2 (Q 2)</td>
<td>(plural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quadrant 3 (Q 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 2. Wilber's "Four Quadrants."
In Figure 2 the reader will note that in Wilber’s model, interior or subjective perspectives are shown in the quadrants on the left side of the typology and exterior or objective perspectives are shown in quadrants on the right side. Singular perspectives are indicated in the upper two quadrants and collective perspectives in the lower two. As shown in Figure 2, starting at the upper left and going counterclockwise, Quadrant 1 represents the subjective, first person singular or “I” perspective; Quadrant 2 represents the subjective, first person plural or “We” perspective; Quadrant 3 represents the objective, third person plural or “It” perspective; and Quadrant 4 represents the objective, third person singular “It” perspective.

The holon, a term coined by Koestler (1967, p. 48), is the conceptual building block of Wilber’s “four quadrants.” The “four quadrants” is a way of considering a holon, or whole/part, from four perspectives. A holon may be perceived from the inside as a whole, individual entity (Quadrant 1); from the inside as part of a collective of entities like itself (Quadrant 2); from the outside as part of a collective of entities (Quadrant 3); or from the outside as a whole, individual entity (Quadrant 4).

In addition to being part of a collective of like entities, the holon or whole-part may also be seen as a link in an evolutionary chain. The holon, while whole in itself, is simultaneously part of a more complex whole, which in turn is part of a yet more complex whole, and so on. In the opposite direction, each holon is composed of parts which are whole in themselves while being composed of yet simpler constructs. This progression goes on infinitely in both directions, involving less complex holons,
or whole/parts, in one direction as well as increasingly complex holons or whole/parts in the other direction.

The progression of holons along a continuum of complexity is sometimes referred to as nesting, in which simpler holons are seen as nesting within more complex holons which in turn are encompassed by yet more complex holons (Wilber, 2000, p. 40). An example of nesting is the progression from molecule to cell, from cell to organ, from organ to human being, from human being to the family, and so on. Development or evolution of holons does not involve the destruction of holons at a simpler stage of development, rather, the simpler holon becomes part of a more complex and evolved entity. The more complex holon transcends and includes the simpler holon (Wilber, 1995, pp. 51–52).

Given the progression of holons along an infinite continuum of increasing simplicity in one direction and increasing complexity in the other, consideration of any holon from the unified perspective of the four quadrants may be thought of as a kind of snapshot of a point of connectedness that ultimately includes everything, both interior or subjective, and exterior or objective.

The concept of the holon has implications for organizations because each individual organizational member, administrative work unit, and committee is a whole that is simultaneously part of larger systems within the organization. Furthermore, an individual organizational member is part of a family, a community, and possibly other community organizations. Likewise, an organization is itself a holon, a complete entity, as well as part of systems of organizations. A local public mental health agency...
is part of the larger mental health system as well as part of a community of local human service organizations—including welfare departments; schools; and a wide range of public, private, and not-for-profit service agencies.

According to Wilber's integral theory, knowledge contained within a given quadrant, which involves one perspective of the holon, is not complete unless it incorporates or allows for the other perspectives of the holon. According to an integral approach, each perspective of a holon, or each quadrant, is equally valid and necessary for optimal understanding (Wilber, 1997, p. 12). Thus, "I" and "We" components, with their inner, subjective realities are as important as "It" realities. When the subjective (I/We) and objective (It singular and plural) perspectives are recognized, understood, and appropriately balanced, integral wholeness is supported.

Because of the interrelatedness of the four quadrants—based on the oneness of the four perspectives of a holon—a change in one quadrant will affect all quadrants. This has obvious implications for organizations, which may be viewed from both human and technical perspectives as well as from individual (micro) and collective (macro) perspectives. The proposed Integral Organizational Model (Figure 4) will be discussed at the beginning of Chapter III: Methodology.

Organizational Theory and the Inclusion of Human Factors

Organizational theorists have recognized from the beginning, at least to some extent, the existence and importance of the human component in organizations. However, the primary focus in theory, as in practice, has generally been on the
structural and technical. The literature indicates that on a theoretical level, attention to human considerations is increasing. However, putting new ideas into practice is difficult. A brief overview of organizational theory in relation to the inclusion of human factors is given in this section.

Max Weber provided an early, in-depth analysis of bureaucracy. Weber described bureaucracy as a form of domination based on legal-rational authority, in contrast with authority based on charisma or tradition. Weber saw fundamental conflict between human and technical values in bureaucracies. Although Weber admired the rationality and efficiency of bureaucratic organizations, he also associated bureaucracy with an oppressive routine that limits freedom and favors the “crippled personality” of the specialist. Weber believed that the specialist necessarily lacked the capacity to understand the organization as a whole. Weber saw a return to small-scale organizations as the only way to avoid the dysfunctional consequences of bureaucratic organizations, but this would deprive society of bureaucracy’s benefits (Fry, 1989, pp. 30–34).

As noted in Chapter I, many continue to see bureaucracy as problematic. Much current innovation in the management of public organizations involves attempts to retain the strengths of bureaucracy while reducing or eliminating problems associated with bureaucracy.

Most traditional organizational theorists primarily address structural and technical issues. While some classical and neoclassical theorists gave some attention to human factors, for example Fayol’s (1949) *esprit de corps* (p. 40) and Barnard’s
(1938) attention to the importance of faith and integrity (p. 259), most early organizational theorists (e.g., Gulick, 1937; Taylor, 1947) have been primarily concerned with objective, technical factors. Taylor (1947) developed a methodology termed “Scientific Management” that was designed to maximize efficiency by determining the one best way to perform any task. Management was responsible for determining, generally by means of time and motion studies, the most efficient procedures. Managers planned every detail of a day’s work. Gulick (1937) summarized the work of the executive with the acronym POSDCORB, which stands for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting.

The human relations school of organizational theory attempted to bring consideration of human factors into organizational management. An early and leading proponent of the human relations school, Follett (1942) kept the inner world of the individual worker in mind as she considered organizational dynamics. She saw authority as existing in the rightness of a course of action and not within person or position (pp. 50–70).

Follett (1942) suggests that conflict be viewed as neither good or bad, but as an expression of difference. Conflict or difference occurs naturally in human situations and may be used creatively as a vehicle for integration. The three main ways of dealing with conflict or difference are domination, compromise, and integration. While compromise is more constructive than domination, compromise deals with what already exists and therefore is not essentially creative. Compromise involves a degree of loss for some or all parties because alternatives are assumed to be mutually
exclusive. While conflict as continued unintegrated difference is pathological, difference is not itself pathological. Follett suggests that it is not necessary to fear or avoid conflict. Conflict as the appearing and focusing of difference may be a sign of health, “a prophecy of progress.” While Follett notes that integration is not possible in all situations, she suggests that it is better to be alive to the opportunities for progress through integration than to habitually fight and compromise (Follett, 1942, pp. 30–49).

The Hawthorne Studies provided the first empirical evidence that subjective, human factors influence productive behavior in the workplace. These studies provided a basis for the development of the human relations school of organizational theory (Fry, 1989, pp. 136–142). The Hawthorne Studies refer to a series of experiments conducted by Mayo and Roethlisberger of the Harvard Business School from 1927 to 1932. While the purpose of the research was to measure the effects of variation in physical factors such as lighting and length of the work day, the unexpected discovery was that social factors, such as attention to workers’ concerns by the researchers, even when steps were not taken to address the concerns, had a stronger influence on productivity than did the physical factors. Based on these studies, Roethlisberger (1941) concluded, “A human problem to be brought to a human solution requires human data and human tools” (p. 9). He noted, “Too many of us are more interested in getting our words legally straight than in getting our situations humanly straight,” and that the Hawthorne Studies seemed to be “a beginning on the road back to sanity in employee relations” (p. 26).
Although the human relations school encouraged increased consideration of human dynamics in organizations, this movement did not succeed in fundamentally shifting management attention away from an almost exclusive concern with controlling performance.

Following World War II, W. Edwards Deming worked as an organizational consultant in Japan, helping that country to rebuild. Deming taught an approach that was integral, blending concern and knowledge regarding both human and technical factors. Deming's work will be discussed in detail in the next section. He is mentioned at this point because his work strongly influenced development of the organizational culture school of organizational theory.

The organizational culture school, which began in the 1980s, brought increased attention to human concerns. Schein (1992) defines organizational culture as

A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it resolved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to these problems. (p. 12)

It can be seen that this definition is completely in terms of subjective human experience, and that the basis of culture is shared assumptions.

Organizational culture as a component of organizations continues to be a subject of research. While culture types are operationally defined for empirical research, the term organizational culture is often used in a general and nonscientific way to refer to the human side of organizations. Schein (1992) has stated that in
organizations “the dynamic processes of culture creation and management are the essence of leadership and make one realize that leadership and culture are two sides of the same coin” (p. 1).

Within the 1990s, a body of management literature began to develop based on the new sciences, including quantum theory and complexity theory (Morcol & Dennard, 2000; Wheatley & Kellner-Rogers, 1996). New science paradigms involve integration of human values with a nonmechanistic view of the objective or empirical side of the organization.

In addition to New Science approaches, several other current schools of thought regarding organizational change encourage integration of human factors with the traditional agenda of organizational management. These include Organizational Development (French & Bell, 1999; Kobrak, 1993) and Organizational Transformation (Adams, 1996), two schools of organizational theory and practice that take a comprehensive approach. Total Quality Management (TQM), which is based largely on the work of Deming, also supports an integral approach if implemented in accordance with Deming’s Principles.

There have been widespread attempts to implement TQM in public settings. Any TQM intervention is often assumed to follow Deming’s model, but TQM has frequently not been implemented in a way that integrates the human and technical aspects of organizations as recommended by Deming. For these reasons, the results of implementation of TQM to date will be reviewed following the next section, which discusses the management principles of Deming.
The Management Theory of W. Edwards Deming

Before discussing Deming's management theory, it should be noted that Deming's model is not synonymous with Total Quality Management (TQM). TQM refers to management systems which are based in part on Deming's principles but which do not necessarily include all of Deming's principles in practice. For example, an organization may promote listening to the voice of the customer and use statistical process control and yet continue to manage in a top-down manner, giving insufficient attention to what Deming referred to as "the problems of people." Deming did not use the term *Total Quality Management* in relation to his work.

Deming was a statistician who became an organizational consultant and theorist later in life. American business was not interested in Deming's approach until after he successfully helped Japan rebuild after World War II, and the American economy was losing its competitive edge. Deming presented his theory as suitable for business, government, and education.

The work of W. Edwards Deming may be seen as a turning point in the evolution of management theory and practice. That Deming's approach is integral is seen in the fact that it has inspired reform movements involving both management of culture and management of technical aspects of performance. On the culture side, Shafritz and Ott (2001) state that "Although the organizational culture reform movements have taken different shapes, jargon, and directions in the 1980s and 1990s, the origin of all of them can be traced back to Dr. W. Edwards Deming's 1950 invited trip to Japan" (p. 426). On the performance side, Deming's use of statistics in
combination with systems theory continues to spawn models for improvement in organizational performance. Examples of statistical/systems models and tools stemming from Deming’s principles include Lean Enterprise, Six Sigma, and Statistical Process Control (SPC).

Deming’s work is compatible with Wilber’s “four quadrants,” and to the adaptation of Wilber’s “four quadrants” to organizations, because he successfully integrates human and technical factors in both theory and practice. Deming’s fundamental respect and concern for human beings permeates all his work. While Wilber’s integral theory provides a relational context for all fields, Deming’s work is specific to the management of organizations. Wilber’s “four quadrants” provide a framework into which Deming’s’ model and other models—complete or partial—may be placed.

Deming’s theory grew out of his experience as an organizational consultant after World War II. His theory was first stated in his Fourteen Points for Management (1982), which he developed and modified over time. Later, Deming summarized the principles underlying the Fourteen Points as a System of Profound Knowledge (1994). Deming’s System of Profound Knowledge and Fourteen Points for Management indicate sensitivity to and inclusion of all four quadrants of the proposed Integral Organizational Model, involving individual and collective perspectives regarding technical and human phenomena.

The four parts of the System of Profound Knowledge are as follows:
(1) Appreciation for a System (appreciation of an instance of applied systems theory);
(2) Knowledge about Variation (a statistical measure, this indicates whether an occurrence—either positive or negative—is a function of the system, or is the result of a special cause operating outside of the system); (3) Theory of Knowledge (relates to the ability to predict outcomes by testing theories regarding organizational processes and systems); and (4) Psychology (the mental, emotional, and motivational aspects of human beings at work) (Deming, 1994, pp. 92–115).

Deming’s Fourteen Points for Management are summarized in Figure 3, based on his elaboration of these points as “principles for transformation” (1982, Chapter 2). The researcher has underlined the central concept of each point and has italicized phrases that relate to human worth, values, or concerns. Clarifying statements by the researcher are in parentheses. Regarding leadership, which is a key aspect of the Fourteen Points, Deming states, “The aim of leadership is not merely to find and record the failures of men, but to remove the causes of failure: to help people do a better job with less effort” (Deming, 1982, p. 248).

That Deming’s theory is integral is shown in Figure 4. This Venn diagram indicates the intersection of the human side and technical sides of organizations. The diagram is intended to show that Deming’s System of Profound Knowledge addresses both the human and technical sides of organization. All 14 points contribute to an approach to management that combines human and technical dynamics. Of the 14 points, 12 explicitly include human factors and only 2 (Points 3 and 5) relate only to technical factors.
1. Create constancy of purpose for improvement of product and service, with the aim to become competitive and to stay in business, and to provide jobs.

2. Adopt the new philosophy. Adopt a new way of thinking in order to survive in an environment of rapid change and intense competition.

3. Cease dependence on mass inspection. Quality comes from improvement in productive process, not inspection. Eliminate the need for inspection on a mass basis by building quality into the product in the first place. (Inspection is costly, and involves an expectation that errors will be made and must be caught.)

4. End the practice of awarding business on the basis of price tag. In addition to price - quality, service and a long-term relationship of loyalty and trust with the supplier to support long-range improvement must be considered.

5. Improve constantly and forever the system of production and service, to improve quality and productivity and constantly decrease costs. Quality must be built in at the design stage, and this must be the intent of management.

6. Institute training. Two central needs which training must address are a) the need to understand variation within a system and b) the need to understand how to remove barriers to the worker’s ability to carry out their work with satisfaction.

7. Institute leadership. Supervision of management is in need of overhaul, as well as supervision of production workers. Leaders must be empowered and directed to inform upper management about problems in the system that need to be corrected.

8. Drive out fear. Security is necessary for a person to perform his or her best. Fear causes many problems, including meeting numerical quotas at the expense of quality, and resistance to new knowledge because it might suggest failure within current or past contexts.

9. Break down barriers between staff areas. (This is another way of saying, get rid of silos, or free-standing hierarchical divisions which compete with each other to optimize division functioning, but which do not work together for the success of the whole organization.)

10. Eliminate slogans, exhortations, and targets for the work force. These practices create adversarial relationships, as the bulk of the causes of low quality and low productivity belong to the system and thus lie beyond the power of the work force. (The error here is the assumption that worker effort is the problem.)

11. (a and b) Eliminate numerical quotas for the work force and numerical goals for management. Focus on quantity causes many problems with quality, because people will meet (or appear to meet) numerical quotas or goals to protect their individual jobs, although this may mean waste of time and defective work. Also, quotas create productivity ceilings which could be surpassed if the system were improved.

12. (a and b) Remove barriers that rob people of pride of workmanship. The right to do good work, to be proud of one’s work, is a birthright. But defects in the system prevent workers from doing a good job. Managers also are handicapped by the system.

13. Encourage education and self-improvement for everyone. There is no shortage of good people; shortage exists in high levels of knowledge. Competitive position will have its roots in knowledge.

14. Put everybody in the company to work to accomplish the transformation. The transformation is everybody’s job.

Figure 3. Deming’s Fourteen Points for Management.
Complete application of Deming's model, implementing the spirit as well as the letter of this humane and knowledge-based approach to management, constitutes a fundamental shift in perspective. Approaches prior to Deming were primarily mechanistic—the organization was a machine to be operated by management. Deming's System of Profound Knowledge implicitly embodies a concept of the organization as a living system, a fundamentally human entity. Because of the
essentially human quality of an organization, it must be managed with sensitivity and respect, based on an understanding of psychology.

Deming's theory of management involves a new paradigm that is radical in its view and approach, particularly regarding the human aspects of organizational dynamics. The Deming model has rarely been implemented in its entirety due to lack of understanding of its principles and inability to sustain long-term commitment to the changes involved.

In reference to "Deming's TQM," that is, Total Quality Management implemented true to the spirit and letter of Deming's model, White and Wolf (1995) state:

We have been watching new approaches to management "come down the pike" for almost three decades. [Deming's] TQM is different ... the culture of public-sector organizations must be shifted away from blame and control to one of support for positive action. [Deming's] TQM does this. The present culture created by ill-conceived management strategies ... that assume if the worker can be tweaked a little more here and there, they will work harder and things will improve. (pp. 223-224)

Regarding appropriateness of Deming's TQM for public organizations, White and Wolf (1995) state:

TQM is compatible with public service. Most public service activities consist of routines, steps in processes. As such, public service work is easily amenable to description and improvement via TQM analytic techniques. The focus on improvement can be a powerful releaser of energy, and there is in the public sector a great pool of potential energy that lies latent because of disillusionment ... (p. 225)
Total Quality Management

Total Quality Management (TQM) is based primarily on the work of W. Edwards Deming, Philip Crosby, and Joseph Juran. Total Quality Management is not a copyrighted technique; it may be presented, taught, and used in a variety of ways. Elements of TQM may be implemented on a piecemeal basis, or in a more comprehensive approach.

Nicholas Henry (2004), a leading scholar of public administration, defines TQM as

a philosophy of administration, a set of principles, and a series of quantitative techniques that are designed to continuously improve and, if necessary, transform the processes of the organization from top to bottom so that customers are fully satisfied with the organization’s products, performance, procedures, and people. (p. 202)

The reader will note that this definition, which appears in a current textbook of public administration, highlights the enhancement of performance through use of quantitative techniques and the importance of customer satisfaction, but it does not explicitly include the necessity of a supportive organizational culture. This definition does not acknowledge the importance of the human dimension of organizations.

Robert Bacal and Associates (2004) describe TQM in comparison with traditional management as follows: (a) customer driven versus company-driven, (b) long-term versus short-term orientation, (c) data driven versus opinion driven, (d) elimination of waste versus tolerance of waste, (e) continuous improvement versus fire fighting, (f) prevention versus inspection, (g) cross functional teams versus fortress departments, (h) high employee participation versus top-down hierarchy,
(i) problem solving versus blame, (j) systems thinking versus isolation, and (k) leadership versus management. Three of these comparisons, #8, #9, and #11, directly relate to the human side of organizations. With regard to #11, the authors state, "Traditional organizations tend to see people as objects to be managed; told what to do, disciplined, tracked, etc. TQM organizations exhibit more confidence in staff and more trust, and more is expected of them, not less” (Bacal et al., 2004).

Henry (2004) reports that a third of U.S. factories, offices, and stores have at least some quality and productivity initiatives in place, 68% of federal government offices used TQM methods to improve services, and 36 states are involved in some type of TQM initiative (pp. 202–203). Regarding the impact of TQM on performance, the results of empirical testing are inconclusive (Henry, 2004, pp. 204–205). Boyne and Walker (2002, p. 111) and Poister and Harris (1997, p. 294) note that there is a need for empirical studies of the relationship between TQM and performance in public organizations.

**Barry Johnson’s Polarity Management Model**

Johnson's (1996) “Polarity Management Model and Set of Principles” facilitates understanding relationships between potentially integral factors operating in organizations. Johnson’s model differentiates a problem to be solved from a polarity to be managed. A problem to solve has a solution that can be considered an end point in a process, while a polarity to manage is not “solved.” It is ongoing. A problem to solve can stand alone; it does not have the necessary opposite that is required for the
solution to work over an extended period of time. In contrast, polarities to manage require a shift in emphasis between opposites, neither of which can stand alone. A problem involves “either/or” thinking. A polarity is a matter of “both/and” thinking (p. 82). Examples of problems to be solved within organizations are decisions about software acquisitions or whether to change office locations. Examples of polarities to be balanced are structure versus flexibility, continuity versus change, differentiation versus integration, and individual versus team.

In the following sections, literature will be reviewed with regard to the three key variables of the current study—management style, organizational climate, and organizational performance. Many facets of management style and organizational climate involve polarities to be balanced, while performance indicators tend to involve “continuum problems,” which in the language of TQM would be stated in terms of continuous quality improvement. The challenge with a continuum problem is technical—how to move from lesser quality to greater quality. A continuum problem does not involve balancing mutually interdependent polar opposites, such as administrative hierarchy and empowerment.

Management Style

In this study, the terms management style and management theory are used in the same way as Deming, who used “management style” when referring to patterns of management assumptions and behavior occurring in practice (1994, pp. 22, 49, 123) and “management theory” when referring to a written system of management
principles (1982, p. 19). In the literature, management style is not consistently defined. From an integral perspective, management style may be defined as consisting of both human and technical characteristics. For example, subjective/interior characteristics are assumptions and focus while objective factors are distribution of power and use of rules. Management style is composed of managerial assumptions and practices. Management style refers to the prevailing attitudes regarding people and situations as well as managerial practices regularly used in the workplace.

Examples of managing polarities within management style include balancing the need for clear structure and policies and the need for flexibility, and the need for balancing generally positive assumptions about people with healthy distrust, backed up by a system of accountability that includes all organizational members.

Assumptions About Human Beings

Managers’ assumptions about employees are considered by many to be a key determinant of managerial practices.

McGregor (2001) described two approaches to management which he labeled “Theory X” and “Theory Y.” Theory X assumes that “the average man wants to work as little as possible, lacks ambition, dislikes responsibility, prefers to be led, is inherently self-centered, indifferent to organizational needs ... and therefore must be controlled ... (his) activities directed.” In contrast, Theory Y assumes that People are not by nature passive or resistant to organizational needs. They have become so as a result of experience in organizations ... The motivation, the potential for development, the capacity for assuming responsibility, the readiness to direct behavior toward organizational goals are all present in
people ... It is a responsibility of management to make it possible for people
to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves.
(McGregor, 2001, pp. 179–183)

Jenkins and Coens' (2000) contrast of conventional and "healthy people"
assumptions regarding people at work is similar to Douglas McGregor's comparison
of "Theory X" and "Theory Y" approaches to management. The conventional
approach includes the assumptions that people do not like to work, cannot be trusted,
and care little about the quality of their work. Further, this conventional approach
assumes that problems with productivity are caused primarily by the mistakes or
carelessness of individual workers, that extrinsic rewards and internal competition
improve performance, and that people act in their own self-interest and not to serve
the greater good. Jenkins and Coens contrast these conventional assumptions with
more positive assumptions about people, which are consistent with the work of
Deming. "Healthy people" assumptions include the following: that people enjoy work,
want to be productive, and can be trusted to do what is right. Similarly, difficulties
with productivity and quality are assumed to arise mostly from the system in which
the work is done, not from deficient motivation. Positive assumptions about people
provide a basis for management practices that allow for choice, collaboration, and
meaningful involvement by employees, which in turn supports productivity (Jenkins &
Coens, 2000, module 21.1).

Support for positive assumptions about people at work may be found in the
writings of psychologist Eric Fromm (1947), who sees human beings as potentially
self-motivated to be productive. Fromm writes, "Productiveness is an attitude which
every human being is capable of unless he is mentally or emotionally crippled” (p. 85).

Fromm notes that the productivity of people is not limited to material production, but that the “productive orientation of personality refers to a fundamental attitude, a mode of relatedness in all realms of human experience. It covers mental, emotional and sensory responses to others, to oneself, and to things” (p. 84).

Regarding Theory X and Theory Y, in 1965, Abraham Maslow wrote, “There is empirical evidence to support Theory Y for most Americans citizens and to disconfirm Theory X for most American citizens. It can almost be called fact “X” and fact “Y” (1998, p. 180). Regarding the necessity for “enlightened management policies,” Maslow states:

The better the society grows, the better the politics, the better the education … the less suitable will the people be for Theory X management … for [enlightened management] they will work well; for authoritarian hierarchical management they will work badly and will be rebellious and hostile. This should show up … in terms of production, quality, identification with managers, etc. (pp. 292–293)

With regard to the last part of this quotation, while dysfunctional reactivity to a “Theory X” approach may prevail in some work situations, it has been the researcher’s observation that in public service organizations, employees’ motivation to be productive and their concern for the well-being of service recipients generally prevail even when hierarchical management assumptions and practices are present. However, such management practices would seem to limit what otherwise could be accomplished.
Orientation Towards Control

The dimension of control in organizational management is directly related to assumptions regarding employees. Management practices will be very different when employees are respected and trusted as innately motivated and productive than when they are not. While hierarchical management approaches tend to be based on command and control, the current literature indicates support for empowerment and participation instead of command and control. Some of these studies will be described below.

Lepore and Cohen (1999) address control as a key issue in organizational management. They write:

The need for which the hierarchical model protects is the need for control. If we find another way of controlling the system that does not require adopting the hierarchical model, there will no longer be valid reasons for continuing to manage organizations hierarchically. (p. 94)

Lepore and Cohen go on to say that it is impossible to think of complex organizations as being under effective control with a hierarchical model (Lepore & Cohen, 1999, p. 94).

Empirical studies which indicate support for empowerment include Carson, Carson, Roe, Birkenmeier, and Phillips (1999); Goodman, Zammuto, and Gifford (2001); Koberg, Boss, Senjem, and Goodman (1999); and Niehoff, Moorman, Blakely, and Fuller (2001). Empirical studies which indicate support for participative management include Julness (2001) and Kim (2002).
The following are some current studies that indicate relationships between empowerment, an indicator of management style, and other indicators of the key variables of this dissertation—management style, organizational climate, and organizational performance.

Koberg et al. (1999) found that perceptions of empowerment (an indicator of management style) were associated with increased performance as well as with decreased propensity to leave the organization (p. 71). The study involved a survey of 612 technically skilled employees at a large, private, general hospital in a major Western metropolitan area (Koberg et al., 1999, p. 75).

Niehoff et al. (2001) found that empowerment has an indirect effect on loyalty (job commitment) through the job enrichment created by empowerment (p. 93). In this study, 203 employees, representing approximately two thirds of this federal agency’s employees, were administered a questionnaire (Niehoff et al., 2001, p. 98).

Carson et al. (1999) explored the relationship between empowerment, commitment, and intention to withdraw among a random sample of members of a medical library association working directly with library patrons. As predicted, the ordering of reported intent to leave the organization were (from greatest intent to leave to least intent to leave): (1) uncommitted to job or career, (2) committed to career only, (3) committed to job only, and (4) committed to both job and career (pp. 1–6). As commitment to job or career increased, intent to leave the job decreased.
Use of Rules

It is a common criticism of bureaucracies that they are made cumbersome and nonresponsive through excessive and inflexible rules (Bozeman, 2000). At the same time, it is generally agreed that organizations need rules that are appropriate to the situation. As Luton (2000) states, “Rules are obviously essential to bureaucratic organizations, creating the basis for stability, continuity, equity, and many other valued attributes” (p. 3). However, “errors of tightness” may occur when rules are too strict for their contexts, with the result that action is constrained by “procedures, hierarchical rules and other paraphernalia of bureaucracy.” At the other extreme, “errors of looseness” occur when structures are too fuzzy, resulting in inefficient (or risky) decisions (Butler, Price, Coates, & Pike, 1998). However, complex situations that may involve risk are not necessarily best handled by tight rules. The more managers consider a situation risk prone, the more they try to control that situation by issuing formal rules and procedures that may decrease the controllability of the situation (Bax, 2000, p. 19).

Organizational Perspective

In this study, one indication of management style is the extent that managers focus on the behavior of individuals as the key to productivity versus focusing on improvement of the system in which individuals work as the key to productivity. Although this distinction is a common theme in organizational literature, no study was found in which this concept is an indicator. In this study, the concept is used as a
component variable termed *level of focus* and is referred to as a hierarchical perspective versus a systems perspective. A hierarchical perspective may be described as tending to focus on directing and controlling the behavior of those supervised rather than tending to work with employees to improve the system.

Support for a systems perspective as opposed to a hierarchical perspective seems to be universal in the current literature (e.g., DeLeon & DeLeon, 2002). Organizational consultants as well as researchers view the organization as a system. However, as acknowledged in the literature, most organizations continue to operate hierarchically (Caiden, 1999; Farrell & Morris, 1999; Sikula, 2001).

The four aspects of management style listed above—assumptions about human beings, orientation towards control, use of rules (extent of differentiation between situations), and organizational perspective—are related in that the latter three serve to enact managers' assumptions regarding employees. It is an hypothesis of this dissertation that management style as an independent variable impacts organizational climate and organizational performance as dependent variables.

*Hewlett Packard*

Hewlett Packard is an example of a large organization that has successfully used an approach to management that integrates human and technical factors. Starting in a rented one-car garage in 1939, the company grew to 83,200 employees and 42 billion dollars in revenue in 1999. Leaders at Hewlett Packard support a democratic culture that fosters creativity and encourages employee participation in decision...
making. Individualism is balanced with teamwork. Three of the five statements that capture the foundation of the “HP Way” are, “We have trust and respect for individuals,” “We focus on a high level of achievement and contribution,” and “We encourage flexibility and innovation” (Fulmer, Gibbs, & Goldsmith, 1999, pp. 21–23).

At Hewlett Packard, activities are guided by a comprehensive system of objectives that are communicated as goals, not assignments. Dave Packard recalls, “I kept getting back to one concept. If we could simply get everyone to agree on what our objectives were and to understand what we were trying to do ... they would move along in a common direction” (Fulmer et al., 1999, p. 22). At Hewlett Packard, managers make sure that directions are clearly stated and effectively communicated and then expect its employees to find their own best ways to accomplish those directions (Fulmer et al., 1999, p. 23).

Organizational Climate

The concept organizational climate is used instead of organizational culture because organizational culture assumes shared basic assumptions (Schein, 1992), and shared basic assumptions do not necessarily exist. Because lack of shared basic assumptions or a unified culture may be a source of problems in organizations, another term was needed, hence organizational climate.

Ott (1989) observed that the term organizational climate is used in various ways and lacks a precise and consistently accepted definition. Ott defines organizational climate as “an amalgamation of feeling tones, or a transient
organizational mood" (p. 47). Burke (1994) defines organizational climate as people's perceptions and attitudes about an organization—whether it is friendly or unfriendly, hard working or easy going, etc.

This dissertation will use part of the definition of organizational climate, which is used by Schein (1992). This definition, which Schein notes is used by other authors, is "the feeling that is conveyed in a group by the physical layout and the way in which members of the organization interact with each other, with customers, or with other outsiders" (Schein, 1992, p. 9). The part of this definition that will be explored in this study is "the feeling that is conveyed in a group by ... the way in which members of the organization interact with each other."

Climate is important in organizations for several reasons. First, as part of the psychological work environment of human beings, a climate may be benevolent and health-promoting or it may engender dysfunctional conflict, fear, and stress to the extent that exposure to the working environment becomes a factor operating against health and happiness. A stressful, negative organizational climate affects not only the individual exposed to the work environment; family members dependent on the health and vitality of the organizational member also may suffer. Studies that address the consequences of excess stress at work will be discussed below in the subsection on stress.

Organizational climate is also important because of its influence on performance, often in combination with other factors. A hospital study comparing the incidence of needlestick injuries indicated work units that clearly had uniformly poor
working climates (whether assessed by nurse burnout, surveys or institutional reports) and less staffing also had more injuries and near misses (Clarke, Sloane, & Aiken, 2002, p. 1115). Pemberton and Davidhizar (1998) note it is important for managers of health care organizations to address the organizational climate after a reduction in the workforce (RIF). They state, “Failure to effectively address the fear, anxiety, anger, blame and uncertainty that permeate an organization following a RIF will often result in diminished organizational performance over a period of time” (p. 13). It has been suggested that focus on improving organizational climate be used as an approach for improving children’s service systems in New York (Glisson, Charles, Hemmelgam, & Anthony, 1998, p. 401).

A third reason why organizational climate is important is that a supportive climate appears to be a necessary condition for successful organizational change initiatives. A study in Florida of four smaller-sized municipal governments indicated a strong relationship between positive organizational climate and successful process reengineering (Daly, 2002, p. 198). Schein (1992) notes the extent of difficulty in learning is often underestimated by managers. Managers tend to expect human beings to remain rational during change; consequently, they fail “to recognize how difficult, anxiety provoking, painful and time consuming new learning can be” (p. 281).

Lindley (1984) considered climate sufficiently important that he suggested a definition of human resources based on organizational climate. His states, “Human resource management can be defined as providing an organizational climate that will motivate employees to reach their maximum potential of effectiveness” (p. 501).
Trust

There is a growing literature on the importance of trust in organizational functioning. Nyhan (2000), based on a literature review of more than 100 books and articles, has proposed a trust-based paradigm for public sector management. The model proposes that participation in decision making, feedback from as well as to employees, and empowerment of employees lead to increased interpersonal trust, which in turn leads to increased organizational commitment and productivity in the public sector (p. 87).

Shaw's book, *Trust in the Balance—Building Successful Organizations on Results, Integrity and Concern* (1997) is one of the first attempts to write about trust in a business setting and to offer pragmatic advice for managing trust (Osterloh, 1999, p. 94). Shaw refers to factors that must be present in an organization for a high level of trust to result as "trust imperatives." The three "trust imperatives" discussed by Shaw are: (1) results, or people's successful performance in meeting their obligations and commitments; (2) integrity, or communicating honestly and behaving consistently with one's words; and (3) concern, or demonstrating through behavior an understanding of the needs of others and willingness to act in consideration of these needs (Shaw, 1997, pp. 30–33).

Respect

Intuitively, it seems that interpersonal respect between organizational members would be important in an organization. As noted above in the discussion of
Hewlett Packard, respect and trust are a key part of the “HP Way.” Unlike interpersonal trust, which has been tested in numerous studies, the literature review has not indicated a study addressing the factor of interpersonal respect in organizations.

During her 25 years of professional experience in public service organizations, the researcher observed that the operation of respect and trust seem to be distinct. This can be seen in the case of a mental health professional who was not included in a meeting of administrators who were to discuss the type of services to be made available to a service recipient with whom he had worked for several years. This mental health professional commented that he believed he was excluded not due to lack of trust, but because of lack of respect. In his words, he was not “high enough up on the totem pole.” This occurrence has implications for working relationships and the completeness of information available to those making administrative decisions.

**Fear**

“Drive out fear” is the eighth point in Deming’s Fourteen Points for Management. Ryan and Oestreich (1998) have outlined many problems associated with fear at work and have described fear in the workplace primarily in terms of not speaking up about work-related concerns due to fear of repercussions (p. xviii). Fear is a block to effective communication and problem solving and is destructive to working relationships. While an extensive search of electronic databases did not indicate fear as an organization variable currently being studied, reviews were
published in peer-reviewed journals regarding Ryan and Ostreich's work on fear and communication in the workplace. At this time, rather than being a subject of academic research, fear seems to be more a focus of some organizational consultants, such as Ryan and Oestreich, and Simmons (1999), who wrote *A Safe Place for Dangerous Truths*.

*Stress*

Organizations cannot maintain vitality and productivity when members of the organization are distressed and dysfunctional to varying degrees. Two of the guiding principles of preventive stress management are especially relevant to managers interested in creating healthy work environments: Principle 1—Individual and organizational health are interdependent; and Principle 2—Leaders have a responsibility for individual and organizational health (Whittington, Paulus, & Quick, 2003, pp. 482–483).

Based on increasing research evidence, there can be little dispute that stress has a dysfunctional impact on both individual and organizational outcomes. Links have been identified between stress and the incidence of coronary heart disease, mental breakdown, poor health behaviors, job dissatisfaction, accidents, family problems and certain forms of cancer (Cooper & Cartwright, 1994).

Curry (2003) states that lost productivity through stress-related absence and reduced performance, as well as organizational members absent from their jobs to deal with grievances and disciplinary procedures, is more costly than increasing the
level of respect and care shown to people within organizations. Stress affects people mentally, physically, and behaviorally, and it affects their ability to focus on their work and do a good job (Curry, 2003).

Participatory management has been recommended as a means for reducing stress. A study of probation personnel in a Southern state revealed that employee perceptions of participation in workplace decision making were an important variable in relation to job satisfaction and its influence on organizational and physical symptoms of stress (Slate, Wells, & Johnson, 2003, p. 519).

Stress research in organizations has traditionally focused on the effects of social relationships on stress. These studies have convincingly documented the positive effects of social supports in relieving the symptoms of stress (Schabracq 2003, pp. 47–48). A study investigating variables that may be predictive of intentions to leave a job involved a survey of 173 retail salespeople. It was found that emotional support from supervisors and self-esteem mediated the impact of stressors on stress reactions, job satisfaction, commitment to the organization and intention to quit. Based on this study, the researchers suggested managers actively monitor workloads and the relationships between supervisors and subordinates in order to reduce and manage stress. It was also suggested that managers monitor both the extrinsic and intrinsic sources of job satisfaction available to employees (Firth, Mellor, Moore, & Loquet, 2004, p. 170).
Commitment and Intent to Leave

In the literature, commitment and intent to leave are closely-related indicators (Carson et al., 1999; Goodman et al., 2001; Niehoff et al., 2001; Somers & Birnbaum, 2000). One study linked employee empowerment with decreased propensity to leave the organization and increased productivity (Koberg et al., 1999).

Organizational Performance

Performance in support of productivity is the primary internal concern of management in all types of organizations. This is so because performance, in comparison with other factors within the organization, relates most directly to achievement of objectives and survival.

The literature review has not indicated a consistent definition of organizational performance. Organizational performance is frequently not defined and when the concept is used, it is described or used differently according to the context. Often it is stated in the literature that performance is difficult to define and to measure (Stainer, 1999). For this study, organizational performance in terms of mission accomplishment refers to activities that are intended to add value to the lives of individuals and families who receive mental health services and to the communities in which service recipients live.

Scholtes, Joiner, and Streibel (2003) operationally define performance with the acronym SIPOC. SIPOC describes the sequence of events in productive organizational activity. Step 1: S—a supplier provides I—input; Step 2: an
organization acts upon the input by means of P, a productive process, thereby generating O, output; Step 3: C—customers receive the product (or service) and provide feedback. SIPOC is a process that happens throughout an organization, involving internal as well as external customers. Outputs are generally quantifiable.

In a comprehensive view of performance by public agencies, the concept of outcome or impact must be added to the sequence of activity described by SIPOC. Mikesell (1995) discusses outcomes in comparison with outputs, noting that outcomes relate to mission fulfillment and refer to the final results, or impact, of the agency's operation (p. 186). Outcomes are important to the performance of public human service agencies, which have missions that go beyond the production of goods and services. The mission includes improvement in the health, safety, productivity, and quality of life for individuals, families, and communities. In considering the performance of PMHAs, it is important to consider both outputs and outcomes. Outcomes, or impacts, are generally harder to measure than outputs.

**Information and Knowledge**

As indicated by the acronym SIPOC, value is added (productivity occurs) by the action of a process upon an input, which results in output. In public mental health agencies, information is a primary input utilized in the provision of many of the agency's services. Managers, professionals, paraprofessionals, and support staff need accessible, clear, accurate, and relevant information in order to do their jobs well. Therefore, information quality would be expected to be a good indicator of
performance. The literature review did not indicate a study in which information quality was studied as a performance indicator in organizations.

Deming (1994) differentiates knowledge from information in the following way. If a statement is based on theory and predicts future outcomes, it is knowledge; if a statement is not based on theory and does not predict future outcomes, it is information (pp. 102, 104). Deming's distinction between knowledge and information is relevant to this study. Based on Deming's definitions, in the day-to-day operation of public mental health agencies, information is a primary input to the productive processes. Knowledge relates to understanding, based on a theory of the steps and factors in a process whereby value is added. The theory referred to generally is not formal and scientific; rather, it is an adequate, practical understanding of how factors interact to either facilitate or obstruct generation of value within a given context.

Efficiency

In organizational literature, public organizations are often described as inefficient, although the basis for the determination and process of inefficiency are not included. Rossi and Freeman (1993) note that while the idea of judging the utility of social programs in terms of their efficiency (in business terms of profitability) has gained widespread acceptance; the matter of how to accurately measure efficiency of social programs remains an area of considerable controversy. Efficiency is easier to assess in the private sector, where it is based on profit (p. 365).
Rossi and Freeman (1993) define an efficiency evaluation for public programs as an analyses of costs (as inputs) of programs in comparison to either their benefits or their effectiveness (as outputs) (p. 2). Studies of perceptions of efficiency by organizational members of public agencies as a measure of efficiency were not found. However, a study by Gelade and Gilbert (2003) in the area of retail banking indicated a significant correlation between organizational climate, as measured by employees' perceptions of operational and management practices, and efficiency as calculated by data envelope analysis (DEA), a technique for evaluating the relative efficiencies of organizations that consume multiple inputs and produce multiple outputs (p. 482).

An examination of possible links between Total Quality Management and financial performance in the private sector indicated that Quality award-winning companies generally had better financial performance than their peers both before and after winning an award (York & Miree, 2004, p. 291).

Summary

This literature review indicated many are searching for ways to improve the management, organizational climate, and organizational performance of public agencies within a seemingly universal consensus that traditional bureaucratic approaches are no longer adequate. The concept that guided this literature review was the belief that an integral approach to organizational management is needed. In an integral approach, both human and technical domains are adequately understood and managed in relation to each other.
The integral theory of Ken Wilber was reviewed. Wilber’s "four quadrants" provides a framework within which to consider organizational theories and techniques. Deming's System of Profound Knowledge and Fourteen Points for Managers was discussed as an integral theory for organizations, although it has seldom if ever been implemented in its entirety in large public organizations. The literature provides support for use of a Deming type of management style in public organizations. Johnson's "polarity management" was discussed as relevant to integral management as a technique for balancing apparent management opposites—such as maintaining necessary hierarchical structure and empowering employees.

A review of formal organizational theory, which began in the early 20th century, indicates a cumulative development of insights and practices. While the focus generally has been on the technical and mechanistic, there has always been some concern with human factors, if only intermittently or in the background. The Human Relations School of organizational theory during the 1920s and 1930s and the Organizational Culture School that began in the 1980s brought increased interest to the human side of organizations.

Current organizational literature is increasingly addressing human concerns as vital to organizational survival and success. Organizational Development, Organizational Transformation, Deming's Total Quality Management, and organizational approaches based on the New Sciences all involve efforts to address and integrate human factors into organizational management.
The literature indicates that a manager's assumptions regarding employees is a key element determining management practices. The literature review showed increasing interest in variables such as trust and organizational commitment, which are aspects of the human dimension of organizations. Trust is emerging as a key human variable in organizations, with links to performance.

Commitment and intent to leave are human indicators that may be links between trust and performance. That is, trust may lead to increased organizational commitment and decreased turnover of staff, thereby supporting organizational performance. In the literature, a systems view of organizations is replacing a hierarchical view, but application of a systems perspective to organizational human resource and service delivery practices is slow in coming.

The literature suggests that organizational performance is hard to measure. Deming has noted that the use of numerical work goals as a means to motivate and measure performance is counterproductive.

While the literature review has shown increased interest in the human factors operating in public organizations, traditional hierarchical practices continue on a widespread basis in public organizations, with their associated human and performance difficulties.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This research project is an inquiry into the relationship between human and technical factors in public organizations. A proposed Integral Organizational Model based on Wilber’s “four quadrants” provides a context for the literature review. The literature review provided information for creation of an organizational questionnaire designed to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the nature of the relationship between management style and organizational climate in a public mental health agency?

2. What is the nature of the relationship between management style and organizational performance in a public mental health agency?

3. What is the nature of the relationship between organizational climate and organizational performance in a public mental health agency?

Following a discussion of the proposed Integral Organizational Model, the major part of this chapter is concerned with the definition and operationalization of terms used in the survey. Questions used in the survey are included. The pilot study of the questionnaire, the reliability and validity of the questionnaire, subject selection, and the public mental health agency surveyed are discussed. At the end of the chapter, hypothesized relationships between the key variables are reviewed.
Integral Organizational Model

For this study, an integral approach to organizational theory and practice is defined as a way of understanding and managing organizations so that the human and the technical sides of an organization reinforce and support each other. It is suggested here that an integral organizational model meet five criteria: (1) It must acknowledge the existence of the human side of organizations as equal in reality to the technical side, (2) It must acknowledge the human side of organizations as equal in significance to the technical side, (3) It must conceptually support increased understanding of the relationship between human and technical factors in organizations, (4) It must be general in order to be adaptable to an organization at its level of development, and (5) It must facilitate the ongoing development of an organization in the direction of increased integration between human and technical factors.

The proposed Integral Organizational Model (Figure 5) is an adaptation of Wilber’s (1997) “four quadrants,” which was discussed in Chapter II. The Integral Organizational Model provides a picture of the relationship between human (Wilber’s subjective or interior) and technical (Wilber’s objective or exterior) factors that operate within an organization. Both human and technical elements are shown from individual and collective perspectives.

The human side of the Integral Organizational Model corresponds to the subjective, interior side of Wilber’s “four quadrants,” and refers to how we actually experience our own consciousness. The technical side of the Integral Organizational
Model corresponds to the objective, exterior side of Wilber's "four quadrants," which refers to a matter-based, empirical description of an occurrence or entity in the world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Side</th>
<th>Technical Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjective/Interior</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objective/Exterior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I&quot; Perspective:</td>
<td>&quot;He/She&quot; or &quot;It&quot; Perspective:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective experience of</td>
<td>(Singular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an organizational member.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes identifications,</td>
<td>or attribute of an organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values, work relationships,</td>
<td>member, structure or process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feelings, and commitments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 1</td>
<td>Quadrant 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We&quot; Perspective:</td>
<td>&quot;They&quot; or &quot;It&quot; Perspective:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared experience of</td>
<td>(Plural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes identifications,</td>
<td>patterns or attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values, work relationships,</td>
<td>in organizational members,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feelings, and commitments.</td>
<td>structures or systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 2</td>
<td>Quadrant 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 5. Adaptation of Wilber's (1997) "Four Quadrants" for the Proposed Integral Organizational Model to Be Used in This Study.

The holon, or whole/part (Koestler, 1967), is the building block of the Integral Organizational Model, just as it is in Wilber's "four quadrants." In an organization, an individual human being may be seen as a holon—whole in himself or herself while simultaneously part of the organization. In turn, the organization is whole in itself and is simultaneously part of systems of organizations, which are parts of yet larger
systems of organizations. Work units and increasingly larger administrative units within an organization may also be seen as a progression of holons, becoming larger and more complex in one direction while becoming smaller in the other direction. The “four quadrants” and the Integral Organizational Model are ways of looking at a holon from four perspectives.

Like the individual human being, a process of service delivery or a subclimate of an administrative division may be seen as whole in itself while simultaneously part of increasingly complex systems of service delivery and organizational climates. Because of the possibility of ever increasing and decreasing levels of complexity and integration in progressions of holons, the concept allows for fragmenting and disintegrative processes as well as for development and evolution (Wilber, 1995, pp. 61-62).

In the Integral Organizational Model, the organization is seen as a collective of human beings. In all instances of productivity, the interior reality of organizational members is present and active. Human beings can never become machines, or simply part of a technical process. Human and technical perspectives or content are aspects of every instance of productivity.

In keeping with Wilber’s inclusive theory, each quadrant is equally valid and necessary for complete understanding. And because the quadrants represent four perspectives of the same reality, a change in any one quadrant will affect the other three quadrants.
Starting at the upper left and going around the quadrants, Quadrant 1 represents the subjective experience of an individual organizational member, the "I" perspective; Quadrant 2 represents the collective subjective experience of a group of organizational members, the "We" perspective; Quadrant 3 represents the collective, objective, third person perspective of structures, systems, and human behaviors—the "They" or "It" (plural) perspective; and Quadrant 4 represents the exterior perspective of individual instances of structure, process, and human behavior—the "He," "She" or "It" (singular) perspective.

As Figure 5 shows, Quadrant 1 includes the values, feelings, and working relationships of individual organizational members; Quadrant 2 includes characteristics of the organizational culture or climate, which involves shared experience such as norms for handling conflict and levels of stress and trust; Quadrant 3 includes empirically known information, at a collective level, regarding behavior or attributes of organizational members, structures, or processes; and Quadrant 4 includes empirically known information regarding an instance of a single attribute or behavior of an organizational member, structure, or process.

Quadrant 3 and Quadrant 4 may require additional explanation to be clear. Examples of Quadrant 3, the technical, collective perspective, include the number of citations received by a given work unit in a review, the number of days of medical leave used annually by organizational members, or the topics covered in management training. Examples of Quadrant 4, the individual, technical perspective, include
timeliness of work completion by an individual, policy regarding a particular subject, steps in a process of service delivery, or the funding of a particular program.

In the adaptation of the “four quadrants” for organizations, “He,” “She,” and “They” perspectives have been included as part of the “It” singular and “It” plural quadrants. In human consciousness, human beings may be thought of and treated as objects. As viewed from the outside, a person or group of persons may be considered an “It” to be acted upon rather than part of a “We.” The pronouns “He,” “She,” and “They” are introduced into the adaptation of the “four quadrants” for use as an Integral Organizational Model. Use of “He,” “She,” and “They” are an expansion of the word “It,” as used by Wilber.

The work of Deming is closely related to the proposed Integral Organizational Model. Although Deming did not speak of his work as “integral,” his System of Profound Knowledge (1994) and Fourteen Points for Managers (1982) seamlessly blend principles related to management of both human and technical factors. Deming’s work is referenced throughout this dissertation, and was foundational to the operationalization of all three key variables.

The theories of Wilber and Deming are complementary as follows: (a) Wilber’s model is global, all-inclusive, and encompasses all systems of knowledge while Deming’s model is specific to human organizations; (b) Wilber’s model articulates that the interior/subjective realm is equal in reality to the exterior/objective realm, and that these two domains are interconnected at all points, while in Deming’s model the interconnectedness of human and technical factors is implicit; (c) Wilber’s
theory is deductive and purely conceptual while Deming's theory is inductive, based on generalizations from his experience with organizations.

Johnson's (1996) Polarity Management model, which relates to the management of polar opposites, is relevant to the work of Wilber, Deming, and the proposed Integral Organizational Model. The central concept of Johnson's model is that a polarity to be managed is fundamentally different from a problem to be solved and that this distinction is key to effective management. Both Wilber and Deming implicitly incorporate understanding of polar relationships in their theories.

Many of the concepts explored in the organizational survey designed for this study represent polarities to be balanced. The four component variables of Management Style are: View of Employees, Distribution of Power, Use of Rules, and Focus (managing the organization as a system vs. managing employees). The six component variables of Organizational Climate are: Interpersonal Trust, Interpersonal Respect, Fear to Communicate Regarding Work-related Issues, Commitment to the Organization, Intent to Leave the Organization, and Work-related Stress. The three component variables of Organizational Performance are: Information Quality, Efficiency, and Service Quality.

In the following sections, the key variables will be discussed in terms of the component variables of which they are comprised and the survey questions used to operationalize the component variables.
Management Style

*Management style* is a term that is sometimes used in the literature but which is generally not defined. In the few instances in which the term is defined, the definitions vary. Management style, however, is chosen as the management variable for this integral study because it may be defined to include both human and technical elements. In this study, the terms *management style* and *management theory* are used in the same way as Deming, who uses *management style* when referring to patterns of management assumptions and behavior occurring in practice (1994, pp. 22, 49, 123) and *management theory* when referring to a written system of management principles (1982, p. 19).

Management style is conceived as occurring on a continuum from fragmenting to unifying. The underlying difference between Hierarchical and Evolved Management Styles is the set of assumptions regarding employees that guides managerial decisions and behavior. In Hierarchical Management Style, the prevailing assumption, enacted in policy and practice, is that employees need extrinsic motivators and external control. In Evolved Management Style, the prevailing assumption is that employees have inherent capacities for intrinsic motivation and responsible self-regulation. All component variables of management style used in this study are based on underlying assumptions about employees. The significance of assumptions about employees for organizational success is shown in Figure 1, in Chapter I.

As the name suggests, Evolved Management Style has grown from and is built upon traditional management style. Evolved Management Style does not eliminate the
need for administrative structure and authority, but it does promote an organizational climate based on respect and trust and a productivity system in which employees are empowered and actively involved in ongoing monitoring and improvement.

For the purpose of this study, Management Style was operationally defined as consisting of the following component variables: (a) View of the Employee, (b) Distribution of Power, (c) Use of Rules, and (d) Systems Focus versus Focus at the Individual Employee Level. “View of the Employee” means the extent to which employees are viewed as inherently predisposed toward intrinsic motivation. “Distribution of Power” means: (a) the extent to which employees are allowed to make decisions in the fulfilling of the requirements of their job, and (b) the extent to which employees are involved in decisions regarding the ongoing improvement of the system of production in which they work. “Use of Rules” means the extent to which rules are enforced inflexibly, without differentiation between employees or circumstances. “Systems Focus versus Focus at the Individual Employee Level” means the extent to which the attention of management is directed toward ongoing improvement of the service and support systems versus managing the behavior of employees.

In this study, characteristics of Management Style which are considered disintegrative are as follows: (a) viewing the majority of employees as needing external motivation and close direction and supervision, (b) generally retaining power with management through command and control methods, (c) treating all employees and situations the same by enforcing rules with little flexibility, and (d) focusing more
on controlling the behavior of employees than on improving the system in which the employees work. In this study, these four characteristics comprise Hierarchical Management Style.

For this study, characteristics of Management Style which are considered integrative are as follows: (a) viewing the majority of employees as intrinsically motivated and capable of thinking and problem solving; (b) fostering empowerment and involvement of employees by allowing flexibility and discretion to be used in fulfilling job responsibilities and by involving employees in the ongoing development of the system of productivity in which they work; (c) differentiating motivated, capable employees from the small proportion of employees needing close training, monitoring, or discipline; and (d) focusing more on improvement of the system in which employees work than on managing the behavior of individual employees. In this study, integrative management style is termed Evolved Management Style.

The four component variables of Management Style, like all component variables in the questionnaire designed for this study, were measured on a 6-point forced-choice Likert Scale ranging from Fragmenting or Disintegrative to Unifying or Integrative. Each component variable was explored by one or more questions for which answers were recorded on an integral scale from 1 to 6. This integral scale, which was developed for the study, was used to record answers ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree” and from “Very Low” to “Very High.” The lower the number, the more disintegrative or fragmenting was the response. The higher the number, the more integrative or unifying was the response. Based on the
content of the question, some questions were reverse-scored, that is, the higher the number, the more fragmenting the response and the lower the number, the more unifying the response.

Survey Questions on View of the Employee, defined as the extent to which employees are viewed as intrinsically motivated and inherently capable:

IN MY PRIMARY WORK ENVIRONMENT, GENERALLY...
1) Manager(s) recognize and rely on employees desire to do a good job.
2) Manager(s) view employees as competent.
5) Manager(s) rely on external rewards and punishments (examples: ratings on employee evaluations), threats of disciplinary action) to influence employee behavior.
35) My immediate supervisor (coordinator, supervisor, or director) encourages my growth (through training or taking on new assignments) as a member of this organization.
36) In the last eight workdays, my immediate supervisor—coordinator, supervisor, manager (not residential home manager or senior), or director—has recognized me or given me positive feedback for doing good work.

For Questions 1, 2, 5, and 36, the relationship of these questions to the component variable View of Employee is evident. Question 35 assumes that employees are viewed as at least potentially capable and self-motivated or their growth as organizational members would not be encouraged.

Survey Questions on Distribution of Power, defined as the extent to which employees are allowed to make decisions in the fulfilling of the requirements of their jobs and are involved in decisions regarding improvement in systems of production.

IN MY PRIMARY WORK ENVIRONMENT, GENERALLY...
3) Employees have the authority they need to make decisions involved in carrying out the responsibilities of their jobs.
4) Manager(s) involve employees in the ongoing improvement of the service or support system in which they work.
6) Managers use “command and control” (give orders and force compliance) as their leading style of supervision.
Survey Questions on Use of Rules, defined as the extent to which rules are enforced inflexibly, without differentiation between employees or circumstances.

IN MY PRIMARY WORK ENVIRONMENT, GENERALLY...
8) Manager(s) provide more supervision for employees who need help, training, or monitoring.
9) Manager(s) support but do not overly supervise experienced, capable employees.
16) Manager(s) apply rules regardless of the circumstances.

Survey Questions on Systems Focus versus Focus at the Individual Employee Level, defined as the extent to which the attention of management is directed toward ongoing improvement of systems of productivity versus managing the behavior of employees as individual workers.

IN MY PRIMARY WORK ENVIRONMENT, GENERALLY...
10) Manager(s) focus on the performance of individual employees.
11) Manager(s) focus on the performance of the service and support systems.
14) Managers overly monitor how employees use their time.
15) Manager(s) give enough attention to improvement of service and support systems.

Organizational Climate

This dissertation focuses on one dimension of the definition of organizational climate, which is used by Schein (1992). This definition, which Schein notes is used by other authors, is “the feeling that is conveyed in a group by the physical layout and the way in which members of the organization interact with each other, with customers, or with other outsiders (Schein, 1992, p. 9). The part of this definition studied in this dissertation is “the feeling that is conveyed in a group by … the way in which members of the organization interact with each other.”

Organizational climate was operationally defined here as consisting of interpersonal respect, interpersonal trust, work-related stress, fear to communicate.
regarding some work-related issues, commitment, and intent to leave the organization. The choice of these component variables for organizational climate, and the appropriateness of the questions designed to measure each component variable, seem evident in most cases. For this dissertation, Organizational Climate is a human side variable operationally defined through the six component variables, all of which indicate human side factors.

For this study, characteristics of Organizational Climate which are considered disintegrative are as follows: (a) low interpersonal respect, (b) low interpersonal trust, (c) high work-related stress, (d) fear blocking communication regarding some organizational issues, (e) low commitment to the organization, and (f) high intent to leave the organization.

For this study, characteristics of Organizational Climate which are considered integrative are as follows: (a) high interpersonal respect, (b) high interpersonal trust, (c) low work-related stress, (d) communication not blocked by fear of repercussions, (e) high commitment to the organization, and (f) low intent to leave the organization.

Survey Questions on interpersonal respect.

IN MY PRIMARY WORK ENVIRONMENT, GENERALLY ...
24) The level of respect between manager(s) and employees is:
25) The level of respect among employees is:

Survey Questions on interpersonal trust.

IN MY PRIMARY WORK ENVIRONMENT, GENERALLY ...
26) The level of trust between manager(s) and employees is:
27) The level of trust among employees is:
Survey Questions on fear.

IN MY PRIMARY WORK ENVIRONMENT, GENERALLY ...
33) Employees sometimes do not speak up regarding problems they are experiencing at work due to fear of negative or punitive responses toward them by manager(s).
34) Employees sometimes do not speak up regarding concerns for consumers due to fear of counter productive responses by manager(s).

Survey Questions on commitment.

REGARDING MYSELF ...
28) I am committed to this organization, (name of agency).
31) I am committed to the population(s) served by (name of agency).

Survey Questions on intent to leave.

REGARDING MYSELF ...
29) I would like to leave (name of agency), but have not taken steps to do this.
30) I am actively seeking employment outside of (name of agency).
38) If I were to voluntarily leave (this agency) within the next year, it would be due to the following reasons: First, check all that apply; second, RANK the items that you checked, starting with #1 as the main reason for wanting to leave.

- Possibility of losing my job due to layoffs (I would be seeking more job security)
- Retirement
- Return to School
- High work load (number of cases or tasks assigned)
- Excessive paperwork
- Lack of support (regarding my efforts to do my job) from my managers(s)
- Difficulty balancing work and home/family responsibilities
- Relationship problems with my coworker(s)
- Relationship problems with my immediate supervisor
- Relationship problems with person(s) that I supervise
- Disorganization or confusion (includes lack of information) within my primary work environment
- Inadequate services to consumers by people in my primary work environment
- Better opportunity to advance in another organization
- Better income and/or benefit package in another organization
- Need to move out of the area for reasons unrelated to my job
- I have no reason to leave (this agency).
Survey Questions on work-related stress.

REGARDING MYSELF ...
32) Work-related stress is a serious problem for me.

Stress was further explored with the following checklist question. Question 37 was also used as the basis for controlling for a budget crisis at the time of the survey. Individuals who indicated high stress due to the possibility of being bumped or laid off were removed from the analysis of the relationship between variables.

37) Within my primary work environment, I experience stress caused by the following factor(s): First, check all that apply; second, RANK the items that you checked, starting with #1 as the main source of work-related stress.

- Severity and urgency of consumer needs
- High work load (number of cases or tasks assigned)
- Excessive paperwork
- Lack of support (regarding my efforts to do my job) from my supervisor(s)
- Difficulty balancing work and home/family responsibilities
- Relationship problems with my co-worker(s)
- Relationship problems with my immediate supervisor
- Relationship problems with person(s) that I supervise
- Disorganization or confusion (includes lack of information)
- Inadequate services to consumers by people in my primary work environment
- Possibility of being bumped or laid off
- I experience no significant work-related stress

Organizational Performance

The literature review has not indicated a consistent definition of the concept organizational performance. Performance is frequently not defined and when the concept is used, it is described or used differently according to the context. Often it is stated in the literature that performance is difficult to define and to measure.
For this dissertation, organizational performance was operationally defined based on the acronym SIPOC, used by Scholtes, Joiner, and Streibel (2003, pp. 4–5). SIPOC describes the sequence of events in organizational activity that is meant to result in the generation of value. Step 1: S—a supplier provides I—input; Step 2: an organization acts upon the input by means of P, a productive process, thereby generating O, output; Step 3: C, customers receive the product and provide feedback. SIPOC is a process that happens throughout an organization, involving internal as well as external customers.

An organization has many productive processes. An output from one productive process may become an input for another productive process. Outputs are generally quantifiable.

For this study, an additional concept, outcome, was added to SIPOC. Mikesell (1995, p. 186) discusses outcomes in comparison with outputs, noting that outcomes relate to mission fulfillment or impact, and refer to the end results of the agency’s operation. Outcome is different from output, which refers to immediate effects of a productive process. Outcomes may or may not be quantifiable and may be intended or unintended, positive or negative.

Input, process, and outcome component variables were used as indicators of performance. Input component variables measure input to productive processes, process component variables measure productive processes, and outcome component variables measure outcomes that demonstrate success or failure in mission fulfillment. In this study, there were one input component variable—information quality; one
process component variable—efficiency; and one outcome component variable—employee perception of service quality, as stated in the organization’s mission statement. The agency mission statement is in terms of outcomes, or final results for service recipients, their families, and the community.

Survey Questions on quality of information available to employees.

IN MY PRIMARY WORK ENVIRONMENT, GENERALLY ...

7) Employees know what is expected of them by manager(s).
17) Employees have the detailed information they need to do a good job. (e.g., location of needed forms, steps required to access and document specific consumer services.)
18) The difference between the role of the immediate supervisor and the role of the employee is both clear and helpful.
19) Person Centered Planning information is adequate. (Leave blank if not applicable.)
20) Clinical information is adequate. (Leave blank if not applicable.)
21) PMHA policies, including job descriptions, provide clear guidance regarding employees’ responsibilities.
22) PMHA policies are adequately communicated to employees.

Survey Questions on efficiency.

IN MY PRIMARY WORK ENVIRONMENT, GENERALLY ...

12) Work is effectively planned and coordinated for the best results for consumers.
13) Work is accomplished without waste of time and/or money.

Efficiency in the context of this study refers to effective productivity without waste. Given limited resources and high need for mental health services, both managers and employees would agree that it is important to be as efficiently productive as possible. The difference with regard to efficiency between the
hierarchical and evolved management styles is the manner in which efficiency is encouraged. While the hierarchical style relies more on a structure of rewards and punishment, the evolved management style engages employees' inherent motivation to be productive without waste. While achievement resulting from hierarchical controls may, in some cases, seem to be efficient in the short term, it is theorized that in the long term, efficiency will be eroded by the hierarchical assumptions and practices described in this dissertation. This is expected due to the loss of time and energy in manager-employee conflicts and loss of focus, communication, and cooperation regarding improvements in the system.

*Survey Question on service quality.*

IN MY PRIMARY WORK ENVIRONMENT, GENERALLY ...

25) My primary work unit is successful in contributing to this agency's mission to (exact wording of the agency’s mission).

Question 25 measures organizational members’ perceptions of work unit success in fulfilling the organization’s mission. This is a measure of the final results, outcome, or impact of the agency’s performance.

**Demographic Data**

Demographic questions, which are listed below, were carefully considered for possible effects on participants' assurance of anonymity. Because the survey was organization-wide and the job categories were broad, it was believed that commonly-requested demographic data would not threaten the participants' sense of anonymity. Due to the low proportions of minorities in the agency, a request for specific
information regarding racial/ethnic background was not included. However, a general minority category was used. This protects individuals from fear of identification based on a racial or ethnic categorization in combination with other demographic data, but still provides potentially valuable information.

In the first demographic question, all positions which involve supervision of organizational members are combined into one category. These are combined because the survey is addressing supervisory assumptions and behavior, not organizational position, in relation to component variables of organizational climate and organizational performance. Also, due to the small number of positions in some supervisory categories, participants might fear identification.

The demographic questions from the organizational questionnaire are listed immediately below.

1) Job Category—Check One:
   Coordinator, Supervisor, Manager, or Director 
   Support Staff 
   Professional Staff (includes Seniors and Home Managers) 
   Direct Care and Paraprofessional Staff 

2) Age Category:
   18 to 25 Yrs
   31 to 35 Yrs
   41 to 45 Yrs
   51 Yrs and over
   26 to 30 Yrs
   36 to 40 Yrs
   46 to 50 Yrs

3) Years Worked at (PMHA's name):
   0 to 5 Yrs
   6 to 10 Yrs
   11 to 15 Yrs
   16 to 20 Yrs
   21 Yrs and over

4) Gender:
   Female
   Male

5) Racial or Ethnic Minority Group:
   Yes, I am a member of a racial or ethnic minority group
   No, I am not a member of a racial or ethnic minority group

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Pilot of the Research Instrument

Two mental health service contract agencies participated in a pilot study of the questionnaire. This was done under the supervision of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board of Western Michigan University. A total of 12 participants—three individuals from each of the four job categories—completed the questionnaire and answered questions regarding clarity of the survey format and survey questions.

The objectives of the pilot study were: (a) to assure that instructions for completing the questionnaire were clear, (b) to assure that the questionnaire format was easy to read and complete, (c) to assure that the meaning of the questions was clear to all groups of participants, and (d) to estimate how long it would take to complete the questionnaire. Needed revisions were minimal and involved change in the wording of several questions for improved clarity. Also, some changes in the grouping and order of questions were made to make the form easier to read and complete. These changes were made in the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The revised questionnaire was used at the host public mental health agency. To protect the anonymity of the host agency, the name of the agency has been removed from the form.

Reliability and Validity of the Research Instrument

It is not a requirement of exploratory studies that a research instrument be formally tested for reliability and validity. A limited pilot study of the questionnaire is
generally considered adequate. Pilot testing was completed for this study, as discussed above.

Unless there are existing, proven instruments that measure the same concepts as operationalized for a given study, and in this case no such instruments exist, the validity of the research instrument is based on the literature review, the research design, and the conceptual content of the survey questions.

Following data collection, preliminary internal reliability testing was performed, based on data from the survey respondents. Internal reliability means the extent to which research questions statistically (as opposed to conceptually) are shown to be measuring the same thing. The researcher performed a preliminary Cronbach's coefficient alpha test of all questions that explored the relationship between the key variables of the study. Cronbach’s alpha is the standard test used to measure internal reliability. Results indicated a high degree of internal reliability for the questionnaire.

The Cronbach’s alpha scores are as follows: (a) for all 36 Integral Scale questions, the alpha score was .9364; (b) for all Management Style Questions (#1 through #11 and #14 through #16), the alpha score was .8639; (c) for all Organizational Climate Questions (#24 through #34), the alpha score was .8397; and (d) for all Organizational Performance Questions (#7, #12, #13, and #17 through #23), the alpha score was .8894. Possible scores on the Cronbach’s alpha range from 0 to 1. Nunnally (1978) recommends a minimum alpha score of .7 as an indication of
internal reliability. Thus, the above scores indicate internal reliability for the three key variables.

Consistent with the conceptual content of the questions, Cronbach's alpha statistical testing indicated the following: (a) that the 36 questions using the Integral Scale collectively measured the same concept, "organizational integralness"; (b) that the 15 Management Style Questions collectively measured the same concept, "integralness of management style"; (c) that the 11 Organizational Climate Questions collectively measured the same concept, "integralness of organizational climate"; and (d) that the 10 Organizational Performance Questions collectively measured the same concept, "integralness of organizational performance."

Subject Selection

A sampling process was not used. All organizational members of the Public Mental Health Agency were invited to participate. There were about 700 permanent employees in this organization. All permanent organizational members, including executives, middle managers, and employees, were included. Employees consist of professionals and nonprofessionals. Professionals are from a wide range of disciplines, including social work, psychology, psychiatry, nursing, speech therapy, and occupational therapy. Nonprofessionals are comprised of two broad groups: (a) support workers (clerical, security, and building repair and maintenance staff); and (b) direct care staff and paraprofessional staff, who are included together in the same job category. Both direct care and paraprofessional staff have at least a high school
level of education, but job tasks vary slightly. Both work under the supervision of a professional. Direct care staff is agency employees who provide hourly care and supervision to handicapped individuals. Paraprofessional staff is agency employees who provide specific assistance to handicapped individuals, including assistance in transportation, shopping, housekeeping, finding and keeping employment, budgeting, and accessing medical care.

Managers at all levels, executives as well as supervisors of line employees, are included in the category of “manager.” For the survey, a manager is defined as an organizational member who has administrative authority to supervise other organizational members.

Mental Health Agency Survey

The organization chosen for the study is a public mental health agency (PMHA) in the American Midwest with about 700 permanent employees. The organization will remain anonymous.

This PMHA was expected to be a good host agency for this study because it was likely to have a range of management styles in use throughout the organization. Although this PMHA has a predominantly traditional authority structure, it has begun to incorporate some of the thinking associated with empowerment of employees within a systems perspective. Some executives and managers have received training in the Deming management model and other new approaches, regularly attend presentations on organizational change, and express interest in moving towards
increased employee involvement. Because this PMHA has moved somewhat towards more participatory management approaches, but has not required the use of these approaches, elements of both "hierarchical" and "evolved" management style, as the terms are used in this dissertation, were expected to be present in the organization. The survey results indicated that this was the case.

Hypotheses

Based upon an extensive literature review and 20 years of experience as a professional within a public mental system, the following relationships, expressed as hypotheses, were expected:

*Hypothesis 1:* In a public mental health agency, an evolved management style will be positively associated with a unifying or integrative organizational climate.

*Hypothesis 2:* In a public mental health agency, an evolved management style will be positively associated with unifying or integrative organizational performance.

*Hypothesis 3:* In a public mental health agency, a hierarchical management style will be positively associated with fragmenting or disintegrative organizational climate.

*Hypothesis 4:* In a public mental health agency, a hierarchical management style will be positively associated with disintegrative organizational performance.

Figure 6 shows the hypothesized relationships between these variables. Management Style is shown as the independent variable impacting both organizational climate and organizational performance. Hierarchical Management Style is shown as
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE
(a) Integrative
(b) Disintegrative
(Dependent Variable)

MANAGEMENT STYLE
(a) Evolved
(b) Hierarchical
(Independent Variable)

Indicators:
- Interpersonal respect Q2
- Interpersonal trust Q2
- Fear to communicate Q2
- Commitment Q1
- Intent to leave Q1
- Stress Q1

Indicators:
- View of employee Q2
- Distribution of power Q3
- Use of rules Q3
- Level of focus Q2

Indicators:
- Information quality Q3
- Efficiency Q3
- Service quality Q3

Direct influence of Independent Variable
Indirect influence of Independent Variable

"Q" represents quadrant designation

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE
(a) Integrative
(b) Disintegrative
(Dependent Variable)

Figure 6. Hypothesized Relationships Between Management Style, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Performance in a Public Mental Health Agency. (Developed by Meserve in 2003)
leading to disintegrative climate and disintegrative performance, while an Evolved Management Style is shown as leading to integrative organizational climate and integrative organizational performance. Figure 6 also shows the secondary mutual influence between organizational climate and organizational performance, with integrative climate mutually supportive with integrative performance and disintegrative climate mutually interactive with disintegrative performance.

The four component variables of management style, six component variables of organizational climate and four component variables of organizational performance are also indicated. Quadrant designation is shown after each component variable. For example, view of employee is a Q2, subjective/collective component variable; interpersonal respect is a Q2, subjective/collective component variable; organizational commitment is a Q1, subjective/individual component variable, and information quality is a Q3, objective/collective component variable. There were no Q4, objective/individual data collected by this survey.

For the design and implementation of the organizational survey, the work of Dillman (2000) was used as a reference.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Survey Implementation

All permanent organizational members were mailed a questionnaire, consent document, and stamped return envelope. The mailing went to individuals' homes via the U.S. Postal Service. Permanent organizational members included all executives, managers and supervisors, support staff, professionals, paraprofessionals, and direct care staff for a total of 645 individuals. Four envelopes were returned by the postal service due to incorrect address. The returned envelopes were taken to the PMHA (Public Mental Health Agency) where they were delivered to the individuals' work sites through interoffice mail.

To protect the privacy of organizational members, the researcher did not have access to the survey mailing list. Arrangements were made for an established, secure mailing service to send the mailing to organizational members at their homes. This printing and mailing company has been in business for 64 years and frequently does mailings for local and state government agencies. The company has a strictly enforced confidentiality policy and never retains mailing lists after a job was finished.

Reasons for mailing the questionnaire to the homes of organizational members were: (a) the researcher would not have access to the mailing list; (b) the survey was separated from PMHA management, which reinforced the fact that participation in
the research was voluntary; and (c) the response rate was expected be higher if the survey was sent to homes rather than to work sites because of high paperwork demands at work and the consequent possibility that the mailing would be quickly discarded due to time limitations. The Human Subjects Institutional Review Board of Western Michigan University and the Human Subjects Review Committee of the PMHA approved use of this printing and mailing company.

The mailing went out on a Friday and was delivered to the homes of many organizational members on Saturday. On Monday morning, a number of employees expressed anger because the mailing went to their homes. They felt that provision of their names and addresses to an outside entity was a violation of their privacy, and consequently were angry with the researcher and agency management for this perceived breach of privacy. Several individuals said that they therefore might not participate in the survey.

The two reminders were distributed at approximately 1-week intervals following the mailing of the questionnaires. Because the questionnaires were not coded, they were printed on Capital Bond paper to prevent copying the questionnaire and returning more than one completed form. Capital Bond paper shows a readily evident watermark when copied. After the first reminder, two individuals called the researcher to report that they had not received a questionnaire. Replacement questionnaires, with consent document and return envelope, were sent to these individuals through the PMHA's interoffice mail system. All questionnaires were returned in the stamped, addressed envelope that had been provided.
Complete anonymity for all organizational members was maintained, in keeping with the research design. The consent document made clear that the study was anonymous at all levels—individual, administrative unit, and for the organization as a whole. To provide additional reassurance regarding anonymity for individuals, questionnaires were not coded. Survey instructions to participants included not putting their name anywhere on the form and permission to leave questions blank. Categories used for demographic questions were broad to lessen the fear of identification based on demographic data.

Questionnaires were returned to the Lansing Study Center of Western Michigan University. All questionnaires were returned within a 9-week period. Of the 251 completed forms that were returned, 240 were received within 1 month following the initial mailing and an additional 11 forms were received during the next 5 weeks. Each returned questionnaire was immediately assigned a number. The numbering was consecutive. When entering the data, the questionnaire number was recorded first, followed by the responses given on that questionnaire. Numbering of return questionnaires assured that the responses were entered only once and were not duplicated by mistake into the data set.

Of the 645 questionnaires that were sent out, 251 completed forms were returned for a response rate of 38.9%. Data from the questionnaires were entered into the statistical software program SPSS. An assistant (a college honor student) entered the data as it was read aloud by the researcher. The Statistics Laboratory of Western Michigan University provided a consultant to assist in the statistical analysis of the
data. Two statistical techniques were completed. Canonical correlation analysis was used to explore the relationship between the key variables, controlling for the effect of stress due to impending layoffs, and a comparison of mean scores by job categories was completed for each of the 13 component variables. Two checklist questions, the first addressing work-related stress and the second addressing possible reasons for leaving the agency, provided information regarding the concerns, priorities, and intentions of organizational members.

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

1. In a public mental health agency, what is the nature of the relationship between management style and organizational climate?

2. In a public mental health agency, what is the nature of the relationship between management style and organizational performance?

3. In a public mental health agency, what is the nature of the relationship between organizational climate and organizational performance?

Hypotheses

The hypotheses explored in this study were as follows:

1. In a public mental health agency, on a continuum from Disintegrative to Integrative, as management style (independent variable) becomes more integrative, organizational climate (dependent variable) becomes more integrative.
2. In a public mental health agency, on a continuum from disintegrative to integrative, as management style (independent variable) becomes more integrative, organizational performance (dependent variable) becomes more integrative.

3. In a public mental health agency, on a continuum from disintegrative to integrative, as organizational climate (mediating variable) becomes more integrative, organizational performance (dependent variable) becomes more integrative.

4. In a public mental health agency, on a continuum from disintegrative to integrative, as organizational performance (mediating variable) becomes more integrative, organizational climate (dependent variable) becomes more integrative.

Controlling for Budget Situation

At the time that the survey was implemented, the agency was experiencing a budget crisis caused by poor economic conditions across the state and country. Layoffs were anticipated, which had the potential to increase tension between managers and employees. In addition to the possibility of being laid off, there was the possibility of being bumped out of one’s current position by an employee with more seniority. To control for possibly increased negativity towards managers due to decreased job security, respondents reporting high stress due to the possibility of being bumped or laid off in the coming year were eliminated from the analysis of the relationship between the key variables. “High stress” as a control for influence of the budget crisis is defined as a respondent’s ranking stress due to the possibility of being bumped or laid off during the coming year as his or her #1, #2, or #3 source of work-
related stress (See Table 8, page 92). The original sample of 251 respondents will be referred to as the “Total Sample.” The sample of 181 respondents, from which respondents were removed who reported high stress due to the possibility of being bumped or laid off, will be referred to as the “Control Sample.” It should be noted that in the “Control Sample,” an additional five questionnaires were eliminated in which respondents answered some questions by checking in between categories. In the “Total Sample,” no questionnaires were eliminated. For questionnaires in which some questions were answered in between the categories, these few responses were entered as missing data and the rest of the information was retained.

Possibility of Bias in the Sample

Participation in this survey was voluntary. The people who completed the questionnaires for this survey were self-selected. All permanent organizational members were sent a questionnaire with an explanation of the survey and an assurance of anonymity. Because the responses of the sample group (the people who participated in the survey by completing and returning a questionnaire) are generalized for the population of all permanent employees of the organization, it is important that the sample be representative of the entire population. This survey was about management style and its effects; therefore, it was important that attitudes towards management on the part of survey respondents not be different from attitudes towards management on the part of the entire population of organizational members of that agency. While it is not possible to eliminate the possibility of bias in
a survey sample, it is important to review factors that may have contributed to bias in a particular direction. Considerations related to possible bias in this sample are as follows:

- Some employees contacted agency management and expressed anger toward agency management or the researcher because the survey had been sent to their homes. Some employees informed managers that they might not participate in the survey because of this perceived breach of privacy. Possible introduction of bias into the sample because of this reaction may be viewed in two ways. On one hand, it may have increased negativity toward management at the time the questionnaire was completed. On the other hand, it may have decreased the number of people in the sample with a tendency toward negative views of management, as some of these individuals may have opted out of participation. The researcher, whose name, e-mail address, and phone number were included in the initial mailing and on both reminders, received no inquiries or complaints regarding the mailing. As discussed under “Implementation of the Survey,” privacy of organizational members was protected in accordance with the human subjects review committees of both the PMHA and Western Michigan University.

- Requirement of participation in a survey does not necessarily improve survey accuracy, as people in this circumstance may not be motivated to carefully read and respond to the questions. Because participation in the
survey was voluntary and confidential, and because the questionnaires were carefully completed (evidenced by logical consistency of responses, neatness, and completeness), there is reason to believe that respondents were self-motivated to accurately report their experience and perceptions regarding the research questions.

- A place for comments was not provided on the form because this could detract from responses within the structure of the survey design. However, a few respondents wrote brief comments in the margins. These few comments were equally divided between positive and negative experiences with managers. Comments were neatly written and professional.

Based on the above considerations of factors relevant to possible bias in this study, in addition to the use of the “Control Sample” that eliminated respondents reporting high stress regarding the possibility of being bumped or laid off, there is no reason to believe that the self-selected sample of organizational members used in this study was significantly biased either for or against management.

Demographic Questions

Analysis of demographic questions was based on the “Control Sample,” which had an n of 181. Demographic information gathered by this survey describes the population surveyed in terms of five characteristics: job category, gender, minority status, age, and years worked at the agency. The study involved permanent
employees, both part-time and full-time. Probational, temporary, and contractual employees were not included in the study.

Job category information is shown in Table 2. This table shows the number (frequency) of survey respondents in each category and the percentage of survey respondents in each category. It can be seen that professionals comprise over half of all respondents.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Category</th>
<th>Respondents Frequency</th>
<th>Respondents Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional/ Direct Care</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>181</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Control Sample excludes the 65 respondents who indicated a high level of stress regarding the possibility of being bumped or laid off.

Table 3 shows that among survey respondents, which included only permanent employees, women comprised 71.3% while men comprised 23.8% of respondents.
Table 3

Gender—Based on the “Control Sample”a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The Control Sample excludes the 65 respondents who indicated a high level of stress regarding the possibility of being bumped or laid off.

Table 4 shows that for the survey sample, there was a high predominance of nonminorities, as well as a relatively high percentage (7.7%) of missing data for the Racial/Ethnic question. Several of the individuals who did not provide this information wrote comments to the effect, “Why does this information matter?”

Frequencies and percentages regarding age of organizational members are shown in Table 5. The age category with the highest number of respondents was “51+ years,” and this group comprised 33.1% of respondents. It can also be seen that people of age 41 and over comprised 75.1% of respondents. This indicates a generally older group, having proportionately more cumulative work and life experience.

Table 6 shows that the number of respondents indicating each category of number of years worked is about 20% of respondents. This indicates that among...
### Table 4
Ethnic/Minority Information—Based on the “Control Sample”\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic/Minority Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonminority</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The Control Sample excludes the 65 respondents who indicated a high level of stress regarding the possibility of being bumped or laid off.

### Table 5
Age of Respondents—Based on the “Control Sample”\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18–25 Yrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–30 Yrs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–35 Yrs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–40 Yrs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–45 Yrs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–50 Yrs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Yrs &amp; Over</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The Control Sample excludes the 65 respondents who indicated a high level of stress regarding the possibility of being bumped or laid off.
survey respondents, years worked at the agency tend to be evenly distributed among the five age categories.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Worked</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–5 Yrs</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 Yrs</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15 Yrs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–20 Yrs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Yrs &amp; Over</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a The Control Sample excludes the 65 respondents who indicated a high level of stress regarding the possibility of being bumped or laid off.

Checklist Questions

Two checklist questions, one addressing sources of work-related stress (Question 37) and one addressing possible reasons for leaving the agency (Question 38), were included in the questionnaire. For the checklist questions, the “Total Sample” (251 respondents) was used. It should be noted that work-related stress and intent to leave the organization were also addressed in Likert scale questions, with
Question 32 addressing stress and Questions 29 and 30 addressing intent to leave. All Likert scale questions were used to explore the correlation between key variables, using the “Control Sample” of 181 respondents. The two checklist questions were not used to explore correlation between the variables.

While the questionnaire was being developed, there was no effort to categorize checklist question options. The effort was to be comprehensive in the provision of options for each question. However, during data analysis it was noticed that options provided fell roughly into five categories: (1) no significant work-related stress (or reason to leave the agency); (2) job security, income, and opportunity to advance; (3) work performance issues, and (4) work relationship issues. For Question 38, which addressed reasons to leave the organization, there is a fifth category, “Other reason to leave the agency.” Other reasons to leave include retirement, return to school, and need to move out of the area for reasons unrelated to the respondent’s job.

Work-Related Stress

Question 37, which addressed sources of work-related stress, was the first of two checklist questions. This question read, “Within my primary work environment, I experience stress caused by the following factor(s).” Participants were asked to check all options that applied and to rank the options checked, with #1 as the respondent’s primary source of work-related stress. Each of the 12 options is included in one of the four categories: (1) Income/Security, (2) Performance, (3) Relationship, and (4) No
Significant Stress. The 12 options with category designation and the total number of times each was checked may be seen in Table 7.

Table 7
Question 37: Sources of Work-Related Stress—Total Number of People Who Checked Each Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Category</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Severity and urgency of consumer needs</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>High work load (number of cases or tasks assigned)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Excessive paperwork</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Possibility of being bumped or laid off</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Disorganization or confusion (includes lack of information)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Lack of support (re: my efforts to do my job) from my manager(s)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Inadequate services to consumers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Difficulty balancing work and home/family responsibilities</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my coworker(s)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my immediate supervisor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with person(s) that I supervise</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Significant Stress</td>
<td>I experience no significant work-related stress.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 251 people who completed the questionnaire, 30 (12.0%) reported that they experienced no significant stress at work. The one “Income/Security” source of stress, “Possibility of being bumped or laid off,” is near the top of the list of options that were rated by respondents as their #1 source of work-related stress (Table 9).

With the exception of the “Income/Security” issue of possibly being bumped or laid off, “Performance” issues (e.g., “severity and urgency of consumer needs,” “excessive paperwork,” and “high work load”) were checked most frequently and ranked highest as sources of stress. In comparison, “Relationship” issues, although significant, were reported less frequently and ranked less high than the performance issues. This same overall result can be seen in the three tables that summarize the data from Question 37 (Tables 7, 8, & 9).

Of the three categories of relationship problems at work—problems with immediate supervisor, problems with coworkers, and problems with persons supervised—the most difficulty was reported with coworkers. Table 10 indicates that managers reported the least amount of stress caused by relationship problems with coworkers while support staff reported the highest amount of stress caused by relationship problems with coworkers. Regarding relationship problems between managers and employees, 7.4% of managers reported stress resulting from relationships with persons that they supervise while 15% of employees reported stress caused by relationship problems with their immediate supervisor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Category</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Severity and urgency of consumer needs</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>High work load (number of cases or tasks assigned)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Excessive paperwork</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Possibility of being bumped or laid off</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Disorganization or confusion (includes lack of information)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Lack of support (re: my efforts to do my job) from my manager(s)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Inadequate services to consumers</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my coworker(s)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Difficulty balancing work and home/family responsibilities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my immediate supervisor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with person(s) that I supervise</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Question 37: Sources of Work-Related Stress—Number of Times an Option Was Ranked as the #1 Source of Stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Category</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Severity and urgency of consumer needs</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Possibility of being bumped or laid off</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Excessive paperwork</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>High work load (number of cases or tasks assigned)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Disorganization or confusion (includes lack of information)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my coworker(s)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Inadequate services to consumers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Difficulty balancing work and home/family responsibilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Lack of support (re: my efforts to do my job) from my manager(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships At Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my immediate supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships At Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with person(s) that I supervise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

“Relationship Problems with Coworkers”—Data from Question 37, Stress Checklist Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Category</th>
<th>Frequency of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency of Reported Stress</th>
<th>Percentage With Coworker Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Care</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons to Leave the Organization

Question 38, which identified and ranked possible reasons for leaving the PMHA, was the second of two checklist questions. Question 38 read, “If I were to voluntarily leave (this agency) within the next year, it would be due to the following reasons …” Respondents were provided 16 options, with the instruction to check all that applied and to rank the options checked, with #1 as the main reason for possibly leaving. Options regarding reason to leave may be grouped into five categories: (1) “No Reason,” (2) “Income/Security,” (3) “Performance-Related,” (4) “Relationship,” and (5) “Other.”

The three “Income/Security” options involved better income and/or benefits, possibility of being laid off (“I would be seeking more job security”), and better opportunity to advance in another organization. The five “Performance-Related”
options were lack of support from managers, disorganization or confusion (including lack of information), high work load, excessive paperwork, and inadequate services to consumers. The three "Relationship" options were relationship problems with immediate supervisor, relationship problems with coworkers, and relationship problems with supervisees. "Other" reasons for possibly leaving the agency were retirement, return to school, difficulty balancing work and family, and need to move out of the area for reasons "unrelated to my job."

Tables 11, 12, and 13 show frequencies of responses for the 251 people who returned the questionnaire. Of the 251 respondents, 181 people (72.1%) checked at least one reason for leaving and 70 people (27.9%) indicated "No Reason" to leave the organization. For the respondents who indicated at least one reason to leave the organization, the average (mean) number of options checked was 3.7.

Tables 11, 12, and 13 provide three views of the data for Question 38. Table 11 shows the total number of times each of the options was checked. For example, in Table 11 it can be seen that of 251 respondents, 101 people, or 40.2% of respondents, indicated that the possibility of losing their job was a possible reason for leaving the agency. Table 12 shows the number of times each option was ranked as the #1, #2, or #3 source of stress. Looking again at the same option, 71 individuals, or 28.3% of respondents, indicated that the possibility of losing their job was ranked #1, #2, or #3 as a reason for leaving the agency. Table 13 shows the number of times each option was checked as #1. It can be seen in Table 13 that 47 people, or 18.7%
Table 11

Question 38: Reasons for Leaving the Agency—Total Number of People Who Checked Each Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Category</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Better income or benefits package in another organization</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Possibility of losing my job due to layoffs</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Better opportunity to advance in another organization</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Lack of support (re: my efforts to do my job) from my manager(s)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Disorganization or confusion (includes lack of information)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>High workload (number of cases or tasks assigned)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Excessive paperwork</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Return to school</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Inadequate services to consumers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Difficulty balancing work and home/family responsibilities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my immediate supervisor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Need to move out of the area for reasons unrelated to my job</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my coworker(s)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with person(s) that I supervise</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reason to leave</td>
<td>I have no reason to leave (this agency).</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 12
Question 38: Reasons for Leaving the Agency—Number of Times an Option Was Ranked as #1, #2, or #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Category</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Better income or benefits package in another organization</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Possibility of losing my job due to layoffs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Better opportunity to advance in another organization</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>High workload (number of cases or tasks assigned)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Lack of support (re: my efforts to do my job) from my manager(s)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Disorganization or confusion (includes lack of information)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Return to school</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Excessive paperwork</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Need to move out of the area for reasons unrelated to my job</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Inadequate services to consumers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Difficulty balancing work and home/family responsibilities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my immediate supervisor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my coworker(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships at Work</td>
<td>Relationship problems with person(s) that I supervise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Question 38: Possible Reasons for Leaving the Agency—
Number of Times an Option Was Ranked #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Category</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Possibility of losing my job due to layoffs</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Better income or benefits package in another organization</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/Security</td>
<td>Better opportunity to advance in another organization</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Return to school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>High workload (number of cases or tasks assigned)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Lack of support (re: my efforts to do my job) from my manager(s)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Inadequate services to consumers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Need to move out of the area for reasons unrelated to my job</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Difficulty balancing work and home/family responsibilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my immediate supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Excessive paperwork</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Disorganization or confusion (includes lack of information)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Relationship problems with person(s) I supervise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Relationship problems with my coworker(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of respondents, indicated that possibility of losing their job would be the #1 reason for them to leave.

All three tables indicate that in general, Income/Security issues were the top reasons for possibly leaving the agency, Performance-related issues were second, Other Reasons were third, and Relationship problems at work were last.

Table 11 indicates that "better income and/or benefits package" was checked most frequently (108) of all options. Table 12 shows essentially the same results, including the same top three Performance issues: high work load, lack of support (re: my efforts to do my job) from my manager(s), and disorganization or confusion (includes lack of information). Table 13 shows that the #1 possible reason for leaving the agency was "possibility of losing one's job due to layoffs," followed by "better income and/or benefits package."

Integral Scale Questions

With the exceptions of the five demographic questions and the two checklist questions, all questions required answers on a 6-category Likert scale, ranging from fragmenting or disintegrative at one end of the scale to unifying or integrative at the other end of the scale. Categories ranged from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" or from "Very Low" to "Very High." The scale was "forced-choice," meaning that the respondent was required to choose between some degree of "agreeing" or "disagreeing" with a statement, or some degree of assessment of "high" or "low" regarding a statement. The options "neither agree nor disagree" and "neither
high nor low” were not provided. Categories provided for the Integral Scale questions may be seen in Figure 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Slightly Low</td>
<td>Slightly High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Categories for the Integral Scale Questions.

Data from the 36 Likert scale questions were analyzed to determine the relationships among the key variables—Management Style, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Performance—and to determine if there were significant differences in response rates between the four broad job categories—managers, support staff, professionals, and paraprofessionals/direct care staff. Data were collected at the organizational level and analyzed for the organization as a whole with reference to the respondent’s “primary work environment.” Because the survey was designed to be anonymous for all organizational members, data were not collected at the administrative unit level as analysis of this data might have revealed the identities of some managers.

Comparison of Job Categories

To determine possible similarities and differences in responses between job categories, a second statistical technique was used to compare mean responses for the 13 component variables. The “Control Sample,” which excluded respondents reporting high stress due to the possibility of being bumped or laid off, was used in
this analysis. The six pair-wise comparisons of job categories were for: (1) Managers and Professionals, (2) Managers and Support Staff, (3) Managers and Paraprofessional/Direct Care Staff, (4) Professionals and Support Staff, (5) Professionals and Paraprofessional/Direct Care Staff, and (6) Support Staff and Paraprofessional/Direct Care Staff.

Management Style was composed of four component variables: View of the Employee, Distribution of Power, Rule Orientation, and Level of Focus.

Organizational Climate was composed of six component variables: Respect, Trust, Commitment, Intent to Leave, Fear, and Stress. Organizational Performance was composed of three component variables: Information Quality, Efficiency, and Service Quality. The findings of this pairs comparison are listed below and may also be seen in Table 14.

• Professionals and Support Staff had no significant differences in their response rates for any of the component variables.

• Managers and Support Staff had two significant differences: Intent to Leave and Rule Orientation.

• Professionals and Paraprofessionals/Direct Care Staff had three significant differences: View of Employees, Respect, and Rule Orientation.

• Support Staff and Paraprofessional/Direct Care Staff had four significant differences: View of Employees, Rule Orientation, Efficiency, and Service Quality.
Table 14

Comparison of Responses by Job Category—Significant Differences in Mean Responses for Component Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Management Style Indicators</th>
<th>Organizational Climate Indicators</th>
<th>Organizational Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>View</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager and Support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Direct Care</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and Direct Care</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Professionals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Direct Care</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 'X' indicates significant differences in mean responses.
• Managers and Professionals had six significant differences: Distribution of Power, Intent to Leave, Rule Orientation, Efficiency, Information Quality, and Service Quality.

• Managers and Paraprofessional/Direct Care Staff had eight significant differences: View of Employees, Distribution of Power, Respect, Rule Orientation, Intent to Leave, Information Quality, Service Quality and Efficiency.

**Canonical Correlation Analysis in This Study**

Determination of the direction of influence in this organizational survey is based on understanding the concepts involved. In this study, it is assumed that Management Style is the independent variable and that Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance are dependent variables. Further, it is assumed that the mutual influence between Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance is that of mediating the primary influence of Management Style. Of the three key variables—Management Style, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Performance—Management Style is assumed to be the one independent variable because management, by definition, has the responsibility and authority to create and maintain the systems of productivity and to establish human resource policies and practices of an organization.

Canonical correlation analysis was chosen as the primary statistical method for this study because this method can assess the relative influence of component
variables and because it is appropriate for an exploratory study involving multiple
dependent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The three key variables of this
study—Management Style, Organizational Climate, and Organizational
Performance—are operationally defined in terms of multiple component variables. To
review, the component variables of Management Style are: (a) View of Employees,
(b) Distribution of Power, (c) Use of Rules, and (d) Level of Focus. The component
variables of Organizational Climate are: (a) Interpersonal Respect, (b) Interpersonal
Trust, (c) Commitment, (d) Intent to Leave, (e) Stress, and (f) Fear to Communicate.
The component variables of Organizational Performance are: (a) Information Quality,
(b) Efficiency, and (c) Service Quality.

In canonical correlation analysis, *variate* refers to a version of a key variable
defined in terms of relative weightings or loadings of the component variables. For
this study, multiple variate pairs were analyzed regarding possible relationships
between key variables. The results of the three canonical correlation analyses that
were done for this study—the analysis of Management Style and Organizational
Climate, the analysis of Management Style and Organizational Performance, and the
analysis of Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance—are given in
Tables 15 through 20.

*Canonical Correlation Analysis of Management Style and Organizational Climate*

Tables 15 and 16 summarize the results of the correlation analysis between
Management Style and Organizational Climate. Table 15 shows the relative loadings
or weightings of the component variables of the variate pairs. Table 16 shows the correlation between the two variates and the proportion of variation in the component variables that is explained by the two variates. Among several canonical variate pairs\(^1\) there is only one significant pair, at the 5% level of significance \((F=8.58, p < 0.0001)\). This implies that there is only one combination of component variables that could explain the relationship between Management Style and Organizational Climate.

Table 15
Loadings of the Management Style and Organizational Climate Variate Pair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical Variate</th>
<th>Component Variables</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Style</strong> (Management Variate)</td>
<td>View of Employee</td>
<td>0.9266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of Power</td>
<td>0.9221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Rules</td>
<td>0.7874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Focus</td>
<td>0.7636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Climate</strong> (Climate Variate)</td>
<td>Interpersonal Respect</td>
<td>0.9347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>0.8401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear to Communicate</td>
<td>0.7697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intent to Leave</td>
<td>0.4456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.4060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>0.3853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Please see Appendix D, which shows all possible variate pairs.
Table 15 shows the canonical loadings of the identified variate pair. For the Management variate, the component variable “View of Employee” has the highest correlation (0.9266) to the Management variate, followed by “Distribution of Power” (0.9221). Although less strong predictors of the Management variate, “Rules” (0.7874) and “Focus” (0.7636) also were significantly correlated with the Management Variate.

For the Organizational Climate variate, the component variable “Interpersonal Respect” has the highest correlation (0.9347) to the Climate variate followed by “Interpersonal Trust” (0.8401) and “Fear to Communicate” (0.7697). Although less strong predictors of the Climate variate, “Intent to Leave” (0.4456), “Commitment” (0.4060), and “Stress” (0.3853) also were significantly correlated with the Climate variate.

Table 16 shows that all of the component variables of Management Style are apparently more highly correlated (0.7643) to the Management variate than the component variables of Organizational Climate (0.4378) are to the Climate variates. The Management variate accounts for 76.43% of the variation in Management Style, while it could explain 27.12% of the variation in Organizational Climate. On the other hand, the Climate variate has the highest correlation with the subscale “Interpersonal Respect” (0.9347), followed by “Interpersonal Trust” (0.8401). This Climate variate accounts for 43.78% of the variation in perceptions within Organizational Climate, while it could explain 27.12% of the variation in Management Style. This canonical variate pair has a correlation of 0.7871, which indicates a moderately high
relationship between Management Style (a variate in which “View of Employee” and “Distribution of Power” have higher loadings than “Use of Rules” and “Level of Focus”) and Organizational Climate (a variate in which “Interpersonal Respect” and “Interpersonal Trust” have the highest loadings among the six component variables of Organizational Climate, while “Fear to Communicate” has a relatively lower loading and “Commitment,” “Intent to Leave,” and “Stress” have the lowest loadings.

Table 16

Canonical Correlation Between the Management Style Variate and the Organizational Climate Variate and the Proportion of Variation in the Component Variables Explained by the Variates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variate Pair</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Proportion of Variation in the Component Variables Explained by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Their Own Canonical Variate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Style Variate</td>
<td>0.7871</td>
<td>0.7643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate Variate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canonical Correlation Analysis of Management Style and Organizational Performance

Tables 17 and 18 summarize the results of the correlation analysis between Management Style and Organizational Performance. Table 17 shows the loadings or weightings of the component variables of each of the variate pairs. Table 18 shows
the correlation between the two variates and the proportion of variation in the two sets of component variables that is explained by the two variates. Following each table is a description of the analysis.

For Management Style and Organizational Performance, among several canonical variate pairs, there is only one significant pair, at the 5% level of significance ($F = 13.43, p < 0.0001$). This implies that there is only one reliable combination of component variables that could explain the relationship between Management Style and Organizational Performance.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Set</th>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Canonical Variate and Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Style</strong></td>
<td>View of Employee</td>
<td>0.8557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Management Variate)</td>
<td>Distribution of Power</td>
<td>0.9596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Rules</td>
<td>0.7479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Focus</td>
<td>0.8282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Performance</strong></td>
<td>Information Quality</td>
<td>0.9011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Performance Variate)</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>0.8826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td>0.7459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows the canonical loadings of the variate pair for Management Style and Organizational Performance. It can be seen that within the Management variate, the component variable “Distribution of Power” has the highest correlation (0.9596) to the Management variate, followed by “View of Employee” (0.8557).
Although less strong predictors of the Management variate, "Rules" (0.7479) and "Focus" (0.8282) also were significantly correlated with the Management variate. Among the three component variables of the Performance variate, "Information Quality" (0.9011) and "Efficiency" (0.8826) were the strongest predictors of the Performance variate while "Service Quality" (0.7459) was a somewhat weaker predictor of the Performance variate.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical Variate Pair</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Proportion of the Subscales Variance explained by Their:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Own Canonical Variate</td>
<td>Opposite Canonical Variate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Style Variate</td>
<td>0.7236</td>
<td>0.7564</td>
<td>0.3961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Performance Variate</td>
<td>0.7035</td>
<td>0.7035</td>
<td>0.3683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 shows that collectively, all of the component variables of Management Style are more highly correlated (0.7564) to the Management variate than the component variables of Organizational Performance (0.7035) are to the Performance variate. The Management variate accounts for 75.64% of the variation in Management Style, while it could explain 36.83% of the variation in Organizational Performance.
Performance. The Performance variate accounts for 70.35% of the variation in Organizational Performance, while it could explain 39.61% of the variation in Management Style. This canonical variate pair has a correlation of 0.7236, which indicates a moderately high relationship between Management Style (a variate in which "View of Employee" and "Distribution of Power" have higher loadings than "Use of Rules" and "Level of Focus") and Organizational Performance (a variate in which "Information Quality" and "Efficiency" have the highest weightings among the three component variables while "Service Quality" has a relatively lower weighting).

Canonical Correlation Analysis of Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance

Tables 19 and 20 summarize the results of the correlation analysis between Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance. Table 19 shows the loadings or weightings of the component variables of each of the variate pairs. Table 20 shows the correlation between the two variates and the proportion of variation in the two sets of component variables that is explained by the two variates. Following each table is a description of the analysis. For Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance, among several canonical variate pairs, there is only one significant pair, at the 5% level of significance ($F = 9.78, p < 0.0001$). This implies that there is only one reliable combination of component variables that could explain the relationship between Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance.
Table 19

Loadings of the Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance Variate Pair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Set</th>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Canonical Variate and Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Climate</strong></td>
<td>Interpersonal Respect</td>
<td>0.9210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>0.8813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear to Communicate</td>
<td>0.7263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.4584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intent to Leave</td>
<td>0.5191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>0.4923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Performance</strong></td>
<td>Information Quality</td>
<td>0.9438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>0.8305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td>0.7176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 shows the canonical loadings of the variate pair for Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance that was found to be significant at the 5% level of significance ($F = 9.78, p < .0001$). It can be seen that within the Climate variate, the component variable "Interpersonal Respect" has the highest correlation (0.9210) to the Climate variate, followed by "Interpersonal Trust" (0.8813). Although less strong predictors of the Climate variate, "Fear" (0.7263), "Intent to Leave" (0.5191), "Stress" (0.4923), and "Commitment" (0.4584) also were significantly correlated with the Climate variate. Among the three component variables of the Performance variate, "Information Quality" (0.9438) and "Efficiency" (0.8305) were the strongest predictors of the Performance variate while "Service
Although significant, was a relatively weaker predictor of the Performance variate.

Table 20

Canonical Correlation Between the Organizational Climate Variate and the Organizational Performance Variate and the Proportion of Variation in the Component Variables Explained by the Variates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical Variate Pair</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Proportion of the Subscales Variance explained by Their:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Own Canonical Variate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate Variate</td>
<td>0.7323</td>
<td>0.4692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Performance Variate</td>
<td>0.6650</td>
<td>0.3566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 shows that collectively, all of the component variables of Performance are more highly correlated (0.6650) to the Performance variate than the component variables of Organizational Climate (0.4692) are to the Climate variate. The Performance variate accounts for 66.5% of the variation in Performance, while it could explain 25.16% of the variation in Organizational Climate. The Climate variate accounts for 46.92% of the variation in Organizational Climate, while it could explain 35.66% of the variation in Organizational Performance. This canonical variate pair has a correlation of 0.7323, which indicates a moderately high relationship between Organizational Performance (a variate in which “Information Quality” and
“Efficiency” have higher loadings than “Service Quality”) and Organizational Climate (a variate in which “Interpersonal Respect” and “Interpersonal Trust” have the highest loadings among the six component variables of Organizational Climate, while “Fear to Communicate” has a somewhat lower loading and “Commitment,” “Intent to Leave,” and “Stress” have the lowest loadings).

Summary

Demographically, the population surveyed was predominantly professional, female, nonminority, 41 years of age or older, and with years worked at the PMHA approximately evenly distributed between 0 to 21+ years.

For all respondents, the top three sources of work-related stress were: (1) “Severity and urgency of consumer needs,” (2) “Possibility of being bumped or laid off,” and (3) “Excessive paperwork.” Regarding possible reasons for leaving the agency, the three top reasons were: (1) “Possibility of losing my job due to layoffs (I would be seeking more job security),” (2) “Better income or benefits package in another organization,” and (3) “Retirement.”

Comparison of mean scores indicated significant differences between job categories for some component variables. For example, managers and professionals had significant differences in their mean responses for six component variables, including “Distribution of Power” and “Information Quality.” In comparison with professionals, managers tended to believe that information quality was higher and that more power was exercised outside of the hierarchy.
Canonical correlation analysis was the technique used to statistically explore the research questions, which addressed the relationship between key variables—Management Style, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Performance. Moderately high relationships were found between all key variables. While all component variables of the key variables were found to contribute to significant correlation, differences were found in the extent to which each component variable predicted variation. The strongest two component variables for each of the key variables are as follows: for Management Style, "View of Employee" and "Distribution of Power" were the best predictors of variation; for Organizational Climate, "Interpersonal Respect" and "Interpersonal Trust" were the best predictors of variation; and for Organizational Performance, "Information Quality" and "Efficiency" were the best predictors of variation.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The question addressed by this dissertation involves the nature of the relationship between management style, organizational climate, and organizational performance in a Public Mental Health Agency (PMHA). In this study, organizational climate refers to the psychological work environment. This study assumes that management style is the primary factor within the control of local management that impacts both performance and climate of the organization. Increased understanding of the dynamics among these organizational factors therefore should support the development of management training and techniques to improve organizational climate and organizational performance.

To explore this question, a survey was conducted at a mid-sized (about 700 permanent employees) PMHA in the American Midwest. Like other PMHAs, this organization is responsible for provision of a range of services for people with substance abuse problems, mental illness, and developmental disabilities. According to state law, services are provided on a direct or contractual basis for a geographical catchment area, primarily for individuals without private insurance. Problems addressed by PMHAs are often severe, chronic, and expensive to treat. The agency is subject to the regulatory and funding decisions of vast intersecting bureaucracies,
including state welfare programs, state public health programs, federal disability programs, and federal Medicaid and Medicare programs.

Based on the literature review and the researcher's 20 years of professional experience within a public mental health system, the hypotheses of the study were the following:

1. As management style (independent variable) becomes more unifying, organizational climate (dependent variable) and organizational performance (dependent variable) become more unifying.

2. As management style (independent variable) becomes more fragmenting, organizational climate (dependent variable) and organizational performance (dependent variable) become more fragmenting.

3. In a similar fashion, as mediating variables of management style (independent variable), organizational climate (mediating variable), and organizational performance (mediating variable) mutually influence each other in either a unifying or a fragmenting direction.

Organizational performance does not refer only to the outputs and outcomes of organizational activities; it includes the design and maintenance of the processes by which productivity occurs and how organizational members are involved in these processes.

Because the scope of the research question was broad and involved the relationship between human and technical factors, an Integral Organizational Model (Figure 5) was proposed as a general conceptual context for the study. The proposed
Integral Organizational Model, an adaptation of Ken Wilber’s (1997) “four quadrants” integral theory, brings together subjective (human) and objective (technical) factors. Wilber’s model may be seen in Figure 2. Although simple, Wilber’s “four quadrants” is an elegant typology in which all points of view (“I,” “We,” “It”) and all sources and types of knowledge—from the hard sciences to mysticism—are related. The two facets of Wilber’s theory utilized in the present study are: (1) the distinction of subjective (interior or depth) versus objective (exterior or surface), and (2) the distinction of individual (singular) versus collective (plural). In the proposed model, human factors (including assumptions, feelings, values) are representative of the subjective side of organizations and technical factors (including behavior of organizational members) are representative of the objective side.

The Integral Organizational Model was adapted from Wilber’s “four quadrants” as follows: Quadrant 1 represents the individual organizational member from the inside, or from the subjective “I” perspective; Quadrant 2 represents a collective of organizational members from the inside, or subjective “We” perspective; Quadrant 3 represents a collective of organizational members (or other collective organizational entity or process) from the outside, or objective “They” or “It” (plural) perspective; and Quadrant 4 represents an individual organizational member (or other individual organizational entity or process) from the outside, or objective “He,” “She,” or “It” (singular) perspective. In the proposed organizational model, the subjective experience of human beings as organizational members represents Wilber’s “subjective” (or “interior,” “depth”) side of the four quadrants typology. Similarly, the
technical elements within an organization, which include observable behavioral
procedures and activities by human beings, represent Wilber's "objective" (or
"exterior," "surface") side of his four quadrants typology.

Assumptions important to an integral standpoint, that underlie the survey
design, were as follows: (a) that human beings working in an organization have
intrinsic worth; (b) that human beings working in an organization are of equal value to
the productivity of the organization; (c) that human beings are inherently inclined to
be productive; (d) that as the health and vitality of human beings working in an
organization improves, organizational performance will improve; (e) that as
organizational performance improves, the health and vitality of human beings working
in the organization will improve; and (f) that it is a function of management to assure
that human and technical factors within an organization are balanced and mutually
supportive in the interest of fulfilling the organization's mission.

A literature review was conducted to identify organizational factors believed
to be critical to both human and technical functioning in organizations. The 13 factors
that were selected became the component variables of the three key variables of the
survey—Management Style, Organizational Climate, and Organizational
Performance. Component variables of the key variables were chosen based the
literature review and on the researcher's 20 years of professional experience in a
PMHA. Management Style was operationalized in terms of four component variables:
View of Employees, Distribution of Power, Use of Rules, and Focus (tending more
toward directing and controlling employees vs. tending more toward improving the
Organizational Climate was operationalized in terms of six component variables: Interpersonal Respect, Interpersonal Trust, Fear to Communicate, Stress, Organizational Commitment, and Intent to Leave the Organization. Organizational Performance was operationalized in terms of three component variables: Information Quality, Efficiency, and Service Quality.

Guided by the proposed Integral Organizational Model, the intent was to balance the human and the technical sides of organizational functioning in the survey design. Management Style was defined with both human or subjective component variables, (View of the Employee and Focus) and technical or objective component variables (Empowerment and Rules). Organizational Climate was defined completely with human or subjective component variables (Interpersonal Respect, Interpersonal Trust, Fear, Stress, Commitment, and Intent to Leave), and Organizational Performance was defined completely with technical or objective component variables (Information Quality, Efficiency, and Service Quality). The survey questions addressed perceptions of both human and technical factors.

The organizational questionnaire was developed to serve as a tool to explore the research question: What is the relationship between management style, organizational climate, and organizational performance in a PMHA? Each component variable was measured by one or more questions for which answers were recorded on an integral scale from 1 to 6. This integral scale, which was developed for the study, was used to record answers ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" and from "Very Low" to "Very High." The lower the number, the more disintegrative
or fragmenting was the response. The higher the number, the more integrative or
unifying was the response. Based on the content of the question, some questions were
reverse-scored, that is, the higher the number, the more fragmenting the response and
the lower the number, the more unifying the response.

In addition to the 36 questions answered on the integral scale, there were 5
demographic questions and 2 checklist questions. Given that the demographic
categories were broad, the questionnaires were not coded, and no hand-written
responses other than a check mark were involved, the possibility of identification was
virtually zero. Checklist questions gave a picture of survey respondents’ concerns,
priorities, and intent to leave the organization. One checklist question identified and
ranked possible sources of work-related stress, and the second checklist question
identified and ranked possible reasons for leaving the agency.

To control for possible effects of a budget crisis that was occurring at the time
the survey was implemented, individuals indicating a high level of stress due to the
possibility of being bumped or laid off were eliminated from analysis of the
relationship between variables. These respondents were eliminated because concerns
about being bumped or laid off, caused by the budget crisis, might have impacted the
relationship between managers and employees, thereby influencing perceptions
regarding variables in the study. Individuals who ranked stress regarding the
possibility of being bumped or laid off as their first, second, or third source of work-
related stress were eliminated from the analysis of relationship between the variables.
The survey was anonymous at all levels—for individual respondents, for administrative units, and for the organization as a whole. Respondents answered questions with regard to their "primary work environment," which was not identified. The PMHA that served as host for the study will not be named as the source of the data for this study. Prior to its use in the survey, the questionnaire was pilot-tested for clarity of questions, clarity of instructions, user-friendliness of format, and the time needed to complete the survey.

A secure printing and mailing service was used for distribution of the questionnaire. This printing and mailing company was approved by the human subjects research review committees of Western Michigan University and the PMHA. The response rate to this mailed survey was 39%.

Canonical correlation analysis was used to explore the relationship among the key variables—Management Style, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Performance. This statistical technique was used because it is able to determine the relative ability of component variables to predict variation within the key variable of which they are a part as well as within the other key variables of the study. Canonical correlation analysis is appropriate for an exploratory study involving multiple dependent variables.

Conclusions

This study was unique in the following ways: (a) a proposed Integral Organizational Model provided the context for a broad, empirical study;
(b) managers’ assumptions about employees formed the basis of a definition of management style; and (c) the relationship between management style, organizational climate, and organizational performance was addressed in an organizational survey. This study is also unique in that it was conducted at a PMHA. No studies within public mental health agencies were found that addressed integral organizational factors such as trust, empowerment, or efficiency as perceived by its organizational members.

The proposed Organizational Model draws attention to the importance of human factors in organizations and focuses on the dynamics between human and technical factors. An integral focus is helpful because it assists in consciously and effectively engaging human factors, which are easily taken for granted. The proposed model provides a simple, visual “picture” of the whole organization, in which the human and technical sides are seen as equally real, equally important, and integrally related. On an applied level, the Integral Organizational Model is a guide for managing in such a way that efforts to promote strong performance are supportive of strong organizational climate, and vice versa. The viewpoint from each of the four quadrants is an inseparable part of the whole, and must be taken into consideration for complete understanding.

The proposed model was found to be valuable as a guide for conducting the literature review and designing the organizational questionnaire because it provided a framework within which to balance the human with the technical. The proposed model, based on Wilber’s integral theory, provides an explanation for the relationship
among the four quadrants, or why a change in any one quadrant will ripple through all four quadrants. In essence, the reason is that all is One.

The building block of the four quadrants is the holon, or whole-part. A holon is any idea, entity or event and may be viewed from each of the perspectives of the four quadrants. The human being, who consists of both mind and body and is composed of various mental and physical components, is whole in himself or herself while being part of larger systems, including organizational subunits and the organization as a whole. The subjective, inner world of the individual organizational member is always present as part of the whole human being, along with his or her observable behavior. This is why a change on the subjective or human side impacts behavior, which is a technical or outer aspect of the organization, and vice versa. Likewise, a change at the individual level will influence the collective, and vice versa.

To apply the concept of the holon further, an individual PMHA as a human and technical entity that is whole in itself, is concurrently part of a larger system of mental health organizations, which is whole in itself and is part of a larger community, and so on. Ultimately, everything is related, everything is One, from the inside as well as from the outside.

Keeping in mind the four quadrants and their relationship to each other, depending on managers’ assumptions (a subjective, human factor) about employees regarding motivation and competence, very different management practices (technical organizational factors) emerge. If it is assumed that employees generally need extrinsic motivators and close direction and supervision, logically it follows that
empowerment would not be appropriate, that use of rules needs to be extensive and rigorously applied, and that management attention must be aimed at directing and monitoring employee behavior. On the other hand, if it is assumed that employees generally have an innate tendency to be self-motivated, and that through training employees, like managers, gain the understanding and skill necessary to make decisions within the scope of their job responsibilities, then it follows that it is possible and advisable to train and empower employees, use rules flexibly, and involve employees in the improvement of the systems in which they work. These two differing approaches, based on the underlying assumptions regarding employees, give rise to very different psychological work environments and very different ways of promoting high organizational performance.

The design of this study is based on the hypothesis that the second assumption is correct, that human beings at work are innately inclined toward being intrinsically motivated and toward increasing competencies. Therefore, a management style based on positive assumptions regarding employees was expected to correlate positively with a unifying, integrative organizational climate and unifying, integrative organizational performance. Likewise, an approach based on negative assumptions regarding employees was expected to result in a more fragmenting, disintegrative organizational climate and organizational performance. This is exactly what the data indicated.

Evolved Management Style, operationalized as consisting of a positive view of employees, empowerment of employees, flexible use of uses, and focus on improving
the systems of productivity, significantly correlated with perceptions of higher interpersonal respect, higher interpersonal trust, reduced fear to communicate, reduced stress, higher commitment to the organization, reduced intent to leave the organization, higher information quality, higher efficiency and higher service quality.

In the opposite direction on the integral scale, Hierarchical Management Style, perceived as characterized by a negative view of employees, retention of power within the hierarchy, inflexible use of rules, and focus on directing and controlling employees, was significantly correlated with perceptions of lower interpersonal respect, lower interpersonal trust, higher fear to communicate, higher stress, lower commitment to the organization, higher intent to leave the organization, lower information quality, lower efficiency, and lower service quality.

Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance were also found to correlate significantly. Perceptions of higher interpersonal respect, higher interpersonal trust, lower fear to communicate, lower stress, higher organizational commitment and lower intent to leave the organization were significantly correlated with perceptions of higher information quality, higher efficiency, and higher service quality.

Later in this section, the results of the correlation analysis will be reviewed in more detail, with the relative weightings or loadings of the component variables included. While some component variables were better predictors of variation than others, all component variables were significantly related to each other, as expected.
W. Edwards Deming's System of Profound Knowledge, with his Fourteen Points for Management, is considered by the researcher to be a virtually ideal integral organizational theory. If Deming's theory is this good, one might ask why the proposed Integral Organizational Model is necessary? The answer: A simple model, and one grounded in theory outside of the field of organizational management, may provide additional impetus for adequate inclusion of human factors in management theory and practice. Although Deming's theory seamlessly unifies the operation of human and technical factors within organizations, it has been difficult to implement in its entirety in large organizations due to traditional assumptions and practices with regard to management of human beings at work.

Deming's theory is difficult to implement in traditional, large organizations because it requires a fundamental shift in perspective—a paradigm shift in the operative mind-set regarding the nature of human beings at work. Complete application of Deming's model, implementing the spirit as well as the letter of this humane and knowledge-based approach to management, impacts all aspects of the design and operation of technical and human systems. Approaches prior to Deming were fundamentally mechanistic—the organization was a machine to be operated by management. Deming's System of Profound Knowledge implicitly embodies a concept of the organization as a living system, a fundamentally human entity. Because of the essentially human quality of an organization, it must be managed with sensitivity and respect, based on an understanding of psychology as well as knowledge of the technical factors influencing productive processes.
The proposed model may support more complete applications of Deming’s theory, applications that effectively integrate psychological factors. The benefits of a complete application of Deming’s theory in public organizations are hypothesized to include an organizational climate supportive of sustained high performance with continually improving quality. A positive, performance-oriented climate is considered by many to be critical during times of turbulence and change.

Although this study is not a test of Deming’s theory, his work was the primary guide for operationally defining the three key variables—Management Style, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Performance. Deming’s emphasis on psychology and the importance of “pride of workmanship” supported use of View of Employee as the primary component of Management Style. Likewise, Deming’s emphasis on psychology and the necessity to “drive out fear” supported the use of Interpersonal Respect, Interpersonal Trust, and Fear as three of the six defining component variables of Organizational Climate. Operationalization of Organizational Performance was based on a systems perspective, which is also fundamental to Deming’s theory. According to a systems perspective, inputs from suppliers are utilized in productive processes, thereby resulting in outputs used by customers who provide feedback regarding the quality of the product. Outcomes refer to the final results or impacts of the organization’s activity. In keeping with Deming’s systems

---

1 Deming’s system of profound knowledge has four integrally-related components—appreciation for a system, knowledge about variation, theory of knowledge, and psychology. Knowledge about variation and theory of knowledge are not addressed in the survey.
perspective, indicators of performance in this study were comprised of Information Quality (an input indicator), Efficiency (a process indicator) and Service Quality (an outcome indicator).

Regarding efficiency, it is important to note that in this study, efficiency was measured by perceptions of organizational members and not according to the amount of productive activity per unit of time, or the amount of activity assumed to be productive per unit of time. Deming was strongly opposed to the use of numerical work quotas. Rather than attempting to motivate employees to work harder by use of numerical process or output targets, Deming involved employees in the continuous improvement of productive processes, thereby improving quality. Reduction of waste, or efficiency, is a by-product of improving productive processes.

The prevailing wisdom in the literature is that both human and technical factors are important in organizations, and both need to be addressed (e.g., Carnevale, 2003; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003). Research supports a view of employees as inherently inclined to be motivated to be productive and as responding better to intrinsic, as opposed to extrinsic, motivators (e.g., Coens & Jenkins, 2000). There is also seemingly universal support for the management of an organization as a system.

Problems with organizational performance in public agencies are often attributed to bureaucratic structure and management. The results of this study indicate that a nonhierarchical, or evolved, management style may mitigate against the downside of bureaucratic structure, which cannot be entirely avoided in large
organizations. Unsuccessful change initiatives in all types of organizations are often attributed to lack of support by leadership and insufficient attention to the organization's human side. The present study was designed to highlight the importance and dynamics of juxtaposing human factors with technical factors in organizations. Thus, this study may encourage leadership support of an integral approach to management that gives sufficient attention to human factors.

It is important to distinguish hierarchical structure from hierarchical management style. Hierarchical structure refers to the line and box organization of positions in a pyramidal form. There is a chief executive at the top of the pyramid who oversees several vice presidents or directors, who in turn are responsible for supervising middle managers who oversee the activity of employees. While the number of levels in the hierarchy may vary, and job descriptions of managers and employees in relation to each other may vary, large organizations retain a basic hierarchical structure for planning and coordination within and between administrative units and to assure accountability.

Hierarchical management style refers to a pattern of assumptions and practices regarding employees that reflects limited expectations of employees' capacity and their role in mission accomplishment. A relatively flat organization with few hierarchical levels may include the practice of autocratic control by managers working with horizontal teams. At the same time, a traditional bureaucratic structure with a steep pyramidal hierarchy may include the use of an evolved management style, which
involves high expectations of employees and involvement of employees in monitoring and improving organizational performance.

Although there are differences in emphasis in organizational theories, the primary discrepancy in the management of public organizations is not between competing theories; it is between research and practice (e.g., Christensen and Laegreid, 2001). This gap primarily involves applying what is known regarding human motivation and capacity to be productive in organizations. Human resource practices, as well as the creation and maintenance of the systems of productivity within organizations, are largely based on assumptions about human beings. If human beings are generally considered to need extrinsic motivators and to need to be told what to do, management focus will be on motivating, directing, and controlling employees. However, if human beings are generally considered to be disposed toward wanting to be productive, management focus will be on developing the capacity of employees and involving them in the ongoing monitoring and improving of the systems in which they work. It should be noted that a generally positive view of employees does not eliminate the need to address inadequate or otherwise problematic behavior on the part of a small minority of organizational members, who may be found at any level of the organization. It can be argued that resolution of problems with individual organizational members is more effective within a context of integral management than within a context of traditional hierarchical control.

Demographic and checklist questions gave a picture of the characteristics, concerns, and priorities of the population surveyed. Demographic information
indicated a population that was predominantly professional, female, nonminority, over the age of 41, and with years worked at the agency approximately evenly distributed among the categories provided, which ranged from “0–5 years” to “21 years and over.”

A checklist question addressing stress indicated that the three top sources of stress were: (1) “Severity and urgency of consumer needs,” (2) “Possibility of being bumped or laid off,” and (3) “Excessive paperwork.” More stress was reported regarding Performance and Income/Security issues than Relationship issues. Individuals who indicated that they experienced no significant work-related stress comprised 12% of the respondents (Table 9). Performance issues may be viewed in two ways. They may be seen as concerns related to meeting the needs of service recipients. Or they may be seen as concerns related to succeeding in one’s job. Data provided by this survey do not address this distinction, although the data do indicate that organizational members’ commitment to the population(s) served was very high, having a median and modal score of “5” on the integral scale. At the same time, the checklist question that addressed possible reasons to leave the agency indicated that Income/Security issues received the highest priority, in comparison with Performance, Relationship, or Other issues (Table 13).

As shown in Table 13, the three top reasons for possibly leaving the agency were: (1) “Possibility of losing my job due to layoffs (I would be seeking more job security),” (2) “Better income or benefits package in another organization,” and (3) “Retirement.” Income/Security issues were the primary reasons for possibly
leaving the agency while Performance issues came next. Relationship issues were ranked lowest as possible reasons for leaving the agency. Seventy individuals (27.9% of respondents) checked the option that they had no reason to leave the agency (Table 11).

The Proposed Integral Organizational Model (Figure 5) was found to be helpful as a broad conceptual framework for exploring the relationship between human and technical factors, which were found to correlate in a public mental health organization. The integral scale developed for this study ranged from 1 to 6 in degree of “integralness.” This scale yielded results that were consistent with the hypothesized relationships between key variables. The three hypotheses regarding the relationships among Management Style, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Performance were supported by the survey results.

Management Style (a canonical variate in which “View of Employee” and “Empowerment” had the highest weightings among the four component variables) was found to correlate at the 5% level of significance with Organizational Climate—a canonical variate in which “Interpersonal Respect,” “Interpersonal Trust,” and “Fear to Communicate” had the highest weightings among the six component variables (Tables 15 and 16). This finding is consistent with conceptual studies that support a relationship between positive assumptions about employees and empowerment (Jenkins & Coens, 2000). It is also consistent with studies that associate increased trust with reduced fear in the workplace (Deming, 1982; Ryan & Oestreich, 1998).
Management Style (a canonical variate in which "Empowerment" and "View of Employees" had the highest weightings among the four component variables), was found to correlate at the 5% level of significance with Organizational Performance (a canonical variate in which "Information Quality" and "Efficiency" had the highest weightings among the three component variables) (Tables 17 and 18). Conceptually, this finding is consistent with a systems approach to the management of organizations (Deming, 1994; Lepore & Cohen, 1999).

The literature review did not indicate empirical studies that measured the relationship between Management Style, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Performance as operationalized for this study. In this study, "Efficiency" was measured according to the perceptions of organizational members, not according to the attainment of numerical work quotas or measurement of activity per unit of time or other resource cost. This is consistent with the Deming approach, which eliminates numerical goals because focus on quantity tends to cause problems with quality. With case examples, Deming showed that people will meet numerical quotas to protect their individual jobs, although this activity may involve misdirected time and energy and may result in defective work.

Organizational Climate (a canonical variate in which "Interpersonal Respect," "Interpersonal Trust," and "Fear to Communicate" had the highest weightings among the six component variables) was found to correlate at the 5% level of significance with Organizational Performance (a canonical variate in which "Information Quality" and "Efficiency" had the highest weightings among the three component variables)
(Tables 19 and 20). It is assumed in this study that while Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance mutually influence each other, this influence is best seen as mediating the primary impact of Management Style, which drives the formation and maintenance of both the human resource and performance systems.

The basis for believing that climate influences performance is that increased respect and trust, and reduced fear, will contribute to more effective communication and cooperation, which are needed to support sustained high performance. There is a growing literature that addresses the importance of trust (a concept closely related to respect) as leading to increased productivity (Nyhan, 2000; Shaw, 1997). The basis for believing that performance impacts climate is the assumption that human beings are innately disposed toward being productive (Fromm, 1947; Jenkins & Coens, 2000; Maslow, 1998).

A comparison of mean scores by job category (Table 14) indicated 23 instances of significant differences between job categories for component variables. The four broad job categories used in the survey were managers, support staff, professionals, and direct care staff and paraprofessionals. Information regarding differences in perceptions between job categories is an important part of the usefulness of the questionnaire as an organizational assessment instrument.

Differences in perceptions between managers and professionals and between managers and direct care staff with regard to information quality, efficiency, and service quality may indicate that managers are too distant, psychologically or physically, from the service delivery processes of the agency. Significant differences in
perceptions regarding performance indicate the need for an objective way to monitor
performance indicators. Furthermore, such a monitoring system would need to be
viewed as helpful and worthwhile by members of all job categories and would need to
be adaptable by work unit according to type of work and work context.

The Deming approach to continuous improvement involves employees in the
gathering and analysis of data, which is monitored according to knowledge of
variation and a theory of knowledge regarding the causal processes that are believed
to result in the generation of value, or productivity. A management style based on
positive assumptions about employees is the basis for building a performance system
that incorporates these two additional Deming principles—knowledge of variation
and a theory of knowledge. A management style based on positive assumptions about
employees is necessary because it supports inclusion of employees in understanding
and monitoring the productive processes in which they are engaged. Employees are in
positions to provide key insights regarding the efficiency of productive processes and
the intended and unintended impacts, in human as well as technical terms, of these
processes.

How This Study Adds to the Literature

Throughout the literature there are numerous conceptual studies that indicate
concerns regarding the management, culture, efficiency, and effectiveness of public
organizations. Empirical studies that address elements of these organizational factors
in public agencies were limited. Furthermore, no such empirical studies were found
regarding public mental health agencies. Therefore, this empirical study addressing the relationship between management style, organizational climate, and organizational performance in a public mental health agency is new.

Specific aspects of the study will hopefully also lay a foundation for similar studies in other organizations. One such area involves the measurement of efficiency based on the perception of efficiency by all organizational members. Efficiency is difficult to measure in a public mental health agency due to the complexity of services provided and difficulties associated with measuring outcomes of the services. This study initiates a perception of efficiency approach that could be replicated in other public service organizations.

Another aspect of this study not found in the literature review of public service agencies, or other kinds of agencies, was information quality viewed as a performance indicator. Since information is a primary input in the production of services and the base on which public agencies operate, it is assumed that it is important to provide complete, current, and accessible information to allow organizational members to perform optimally. In order to further explore information quality as a useful area of study, more studies need to be undertaken.

Deming listed fear as a major problem to be overcome in the workplace. A number of publications agree that fear interferes with communication regarding important organizational issues. Yet no studies were found in which fear was studied as a factor hypothesized to influence organizational performance. It would appear that
this study could be used as a precedent to examine fear as a climate indicator that may be influenced by management style.

Another area in the literature that has not been studied empirically until now is managers’ focus on the behavior of employees as the key to productivity rather than focus on improvement of the system as the key to improve productivity. This distinction between a hierarchical and a systems focus is a common theme in conceptual organizational literature, but no study was found in which management focus was empirically studied in relation to other organizational factors.

Limitations

The organizational survey conducted for this dissertation was not an evaluation of the host PMHA. The survey was an exploratory study designed to examine dynamics between three core organizational factors—management style, organizational climate, and organizational performance—within one PMHA. Results may be generalized to other organizations only to the extent that those organizations are similar to the host PMHA.

Norms regarding conflict and methods of conflict resolution were not explored by this study, primarily due to limitation in the number of variables that could be explored in one organizational survey. Conflict resolution closely relates to attitudes toward diversity in opinions—whether differences are suppressed, or accepted and even welcomed. It is not suggested here that an evolved management style, as operationalized for this study, would result in the elimination of conflict.
While it is likely that considerable labor-management conflict could be prevented, diversity in background, temperament, and ideas would continue. The important theoretical assertion that was not explored in this study is that in a developing organization, assimilation of differing temperaments and viewpoints is essential. As Mary Parker Follett discussed over 50 years ago, differences and conflict are an opportunity for integration and progress.

Recommendations

Based upon the literature review and the results of the organizational survey conducted for this study, the suggestions below are directed towards similar public mental health agencies (PMHAs). The survey was conducted in a unionized PMHA in the American Midwest with about 700 permanent employees. It is responsible for the provision of a range of services for people with substance abuse problems, mental illness, and developmental disabilities. According to state law, these services are provided directly by the PMHA or on a contractual basis for a geographical catchment area, primarily for individuals without private insurance. Problems addressed by PMHAs are often severe, chronic, and expensive to treat. The agency is subject to the regulatory and funding decisions of vast intersecting bureaucracies, including state welfare programs, state public health programs, federal disability programs, and federal Medicaid and Medicare programs. Economic problems in the country have led to budget cuts that have necessitated reductions in staff and the elimination of some programs.
Given the complex service needs and administrative challenges that exist within the public mental health system, it is important that the local, direct service level have an effective voice within the larger public mental health system. The local organization is the best place for the generation of knowledge regarding needed services, how best to deliver these services, and how to manage the organization for optimal mission accomplishment.

While the following recommendations are written for PMHAs similar to the one surveyed, other local public organizations providing human services may also find them helpful. Such organizations include public welfare and public health agencies as well as public schools.

Recommendations for Organizations Similar to the PMHA Surveyed

Consider fostering a Deming type of management style. An evolved or Deming type of management style, in addition to responsiveness to customer needs, includes management of the organization as a value-adding system rather than as a hierarchical structure, and involvement of employees in improving the systems of productivity in which they work. Any new management practice should be implemented first on an experimental basis, in a limited area of the organization, to allow for tailoring to the needs of the particular organization. The design of this study was guided by principles central to Deming’s theory, including a positive view of the motivation and capacity of employees, involvement of employees in improving productive processes, and managing the organization as a system. Management style,
operationalized consistently with Deming's theory, was found in this study to be positively correlated with integral or unifying organizational climate and integral or unifying organizational performance. Recommendations are as follows:

1. View change in management style at the local level as a first step in transformation of the public mental health system. Principles that apply to dynamics within an organization would also apply to dynamics between organizations. Unified organizational culture and sustained high organizational performance should contribute to empowerment of the agency within the mental health system. A unified local agency would have increased capacity to generate knowledge in key areas, thereby providing a means to gain influence with regulatory agencies for the purpose of improving the design of the mental health system. Important areas for generation of knowledge include improved accountability mechanisms and increased understanding of how productivity in public mental health services occurs.

2. Initiate training that addresses: (a) the importance of managers' underlying assumptions regarding employees motivation and capacity to be productive; (b) management from a systems perspective to continually improve the quality of mental health services; (c) involvement of employees in monitoring and improving the systems in which they work; and (d) additional aspects of a Deming approach, including listening to the voice of customers (both within and outside of the organization), distinguishing normal variation from special causes requiring management intervention, using a theory of knowledge to guide improvement and monitoring of productive processes, and understanding what cannot be measured.
3. Foster recognition of the value of diversity in backgrounds and ideas as a source of strength for the organization.

4. Foster understanding that constructive conflict resolution is a necessary component of organizational development.

5. Provide skilled organizational experts in specific areas of content and process to assist in the application of new concepts, techniques, and practices. It is unlikely that one professional could meet all of the organization's needs for training and ongoing assistance; therefore, it is recommended that multiple professionals, with different areas of expertise, be available as needed. Organizational experts would teach concepts and skills relevant to human as well as technical factors, facilitate feedback and discussion, mediate conflict, and provide hands-on assistance with the initial use of nontraditional techniques.

6. Use the Integral Organizational Questionnaire for periodic assessment of factors internal to and within the control of the local PMHA. The 13 factors assessed by this questionnaire—including View of Employees, Interpersonal Trust, Information Quality, and Effectiveness of Service provision—impact dynamics between human and technical factors in organizations. Information regarding these factors may indicate areas needing further exploration, possibly in focus groups, or additional training. Information regarding significant differences in perceptions between job categories is also useful for promoting mutually supportive relationships between job categories and between human and technical systems within the PMHA.
7. Provide all organizational members with an opportunity to attend an educational lecture regarding the evolution of large bureaucratic organizations beyond traditional hierarchical culture and practices.

8. Keep organizational members informed regarding changes in the fiscal and political environment that may impact the agency.

9. Provide all organizational members with an opportunity to identify areas of organizational improvement about which they are passionate and where they would be willing to work as part of a team. Provide organizational experts to support work groups in their implementation of special projects.

10. Engage the union as a partner in organizational change if the organization is unionized. The goal here is to decrease the incidence of grievances and disciplinary actions and increase proactive working together to improve organizational climate and organizational performance. Initially, it may be helpful to consult with representatives of a labor–management team that has been successful in fostering organizational change in the direction of an evolved, or Deming type, of management style.

11. Remind the executives of the organization that it is critical that they understand, support, and model the attitudes and practices necessary for a unified, empowered organization. Experience has shown that successful organizational development, which involves change in the organization's culture as well as in policies and practices, is virtually impossible without the active support of top management.
12. Keep the Board of Directors informed regarding the need for organizational development and the need for ongoing generation of knowledge. Progress in establishing an evolved or Deming type of management style may be undone following a change in executive director. Sensitivity to the human dimension in organizations is easily lost, and the integration of human and technical factors in an organization may be taken for granted.

13. Seek grant funding to help defray the costs of organizational change, and network with other PMHAs interested in fostering unified organizational culture and improving efficiency and effectiveness within the PMHA and throughout the larger public mental health system. It is expected that one PMHA, with the assistance of experts in organizational development, would take the lead in seeking funding from public and private sources.

14. Take further steps to become a learning organization. Invite academic research at the PMHA to address the development of improved administrative and accountability practices. These steps are in addition to the application of a Deming approach, which by design involves the ongoing generation of knowledge.

Suggestions for Further Research

Within the conceptual framework of the proposed integral organizational model, this was a preliminary study of the dynamics between management style, organizational climate and organizational performance in a PMHA. Because the argument of the dissertation was supported—that a hierarchical management style
results in fragmenting effects on organizational climate and organizational performance while an evolved management style results in unifying effects on organizational climate and organizational performance—further research to either corroborate or disprove this finding is warranted. The literature review indicated widespread agreement that a traditionally hierarchical approach to management tends to be problematic while a more evolved approach, with its increased sensitivity to human concerns and toward the involvement of employees, tends to be more productive.

While this study has filled some gaps in the literature—including provision of an initial empirical study of management style within a PMHA and an initial empirical study of organizational dynamics between human and technical factors in a PMHA, other significant gaps in the literature have not been filled. For example, the literature review for this study did not identify conceptual or empirical studies exploring the relative functionality and efficiency of alternative hierarchical designs within PMHAs. In addition to an improved management style that effectively integrates human and technical factors, increased understanding is needed regarding the impact of hierarchical design on organizational performance.

It may be that excessive demands for accountability between levels of government, based on fear and an unhealthy distrust and need to control, contribute to inefficient hierarchical structures that interfere with organizational performance and also fail to achieve optimal accountability. Rather than as a policing function between hierarchical levels or between organizations, perhaps accountability mechanisms
would be more effective and efficient if grounded in the monitoring of the performance system by a cross-section of organizational members within the local organization. Suggestions for further research are as follows:

1. That a follow-up study be conducted at the PMHA surveyed. The purpose would be to measure possible change in integral factors following exposure of organizational members to concepts presented in the survey, as well as any educational initiatives implemented at the PMHA following the survey.

2. That further research regarding the relationship between management style, organizational climate, and organizational performance be pursued in PMHAs and in other kinds of organizations. This research could be valuable on two levels: first, to increase understanding of causal relationships between key organizational variables, and second, to provide practical knowledge for application in the management of PMHAs.

3. That the organizational questionnaire be developed further as a research tool for studying the relationship between human and technical factors in organizations. This would include development of a standard integral measurement scale, as well as formal testing regarding the validity and reliability of the instrument with different types of organizations.

4. That the organizational questionnaire be developed further as an integral organizational assessment tool for use by organizations. As an assessment tool, the questionnaire may serve as an integral audit, indicating the status of factors internal to the organization that are important to integral functioning. The questionnaire also
shows differences in perceptions between job categories with regard to important organizational factors. Information provided by the questionnaire may be useful to the agency for planning training and other organizational development initiatives. Results of periodic surveys would provide a basis for measuring the success of educational and other change initiatives.

5. That the integral organizational model be used to guide further exploration of the dynamics between human and technical factors in organizations.

6. That the purpose and function of hierarchical levels within public mental health agencies be explored with regard to how managers add value to the work of administrative units and how accountability is best maintained. For sustained high organizational performance, hierarchical structure—which includes the number of levels and the definition of supervisory and subordinate functions—must be designed to maintain appropriate accountability and to maximize the addition of value. Optimal hierarchical design is expected to vary according to the type of work being done and the educational level of employees. Generation of knowledge in this area may support improved accountability mechanisms and improved organizational performance.

Final Words

These recommendations provide a significant challenge; however, achievement is possible. The recommendations are integral, each fitting together to improve organizational functioning based on a more accurate view of human beings at work and a more effective approach to managing organizational performance.
It is acknowledged that while conceptually the change to an evolved management style involves a radical shift of paradigm (that may occur suddenly or slowly at the individual level), in application, the change must be pursued cautiously and incrementally. Existing practices—such as annual evaluations of employees and use of numerical process or output measures as a basis for accountability—often are requirements of the current larger mental health system. It will take time to develop and grow into evolved structures and procedures for human resource and accountability systems. In the meantime, with understanding, the “down side” of problematic bureaucratic structures can be minimized.

Current PMHAs and the larger mental health system are for the most part getting the job done, generally under very difficult circumstances. There are many examples of excellence. This is to the credit of individuals at all levels throughout the mental health system who are dedicated to serving those in need. At the same time, there are great possibilities for increasing the capacity of the system in which these individuals work.

Public mental health agencies are in a strong position to implement change based on improved understanding of human nature. Fostering wholeness and psychological vitality—individually and in groups—is the business of public mental health. People go into the helping professions because they are sensitive to human needs and want to improve conditions in society. It is a natural step to extend this interest and concern to the work community, not only to improve mission accomplishment, but because the experience of human beings at work is important.
It must be acknowledged that times are hard for public mental health agencies. The fiscal situation has never been worse. Severe budget deficits throughout the country are resulting in continuing deep cuts to public programs. For many public mental health agencies, these cuts follow years in which funding has not kept pace with inflation and increased demand due to closure of state institutions.

The fiscal crisis provides further impetus for transformation. More must be accomplished with less. Changing how people at work are treated by management requires relatively little cost. Additional staff, work space, and equipment are not needed. Concepts and methodologies for change have been developed and are available for adaptation to public mental health agencies.

This study has shown that management style can vary remarkably within a traditional hierarchical organization. A local agency can begin the transition to evolved management without modification of structure at the local level or change within the larger mental health system. Management style, which includes the human element, can transcend traditional mechanistic structure. The key is the intrinsic motivation of individual organizational members and the capacity of organizational members for willing cooperation.
Appendix A

Organizational Survey
**ORGANIZATIONAL SURVEY**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Answer the following questions based on your experience in the work environment that is your home base, or the one in which you spend most of your time. “Manager” means a person with administrative authority. A work environment may have one or more managers. Position titles of managers include coordinator, supervisor, manager and director, but NOT home manager and NOT senior. “Immediate supervisor” may be a coordinator, supervisor, manager or director, but not home manager and not senior. Note to “managers”: your primary work environment is the one in which you supervise others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In my primary work environment, generally ...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Manager(s) recognize and rely on employees’ desire to do a good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Manager(s) view employees as competent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Employees have the authority they need to make decisions involved in carrying out the responsibilities of their jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Manager(s) seek employee assistance in the ongoing improvement of the service or support system in which they work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Manager(s) rely on external rewards and punishments (examples: ratings on employee evaluations or threats of disciplinary action) to influence employee behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Manager(s) use “command and control” (give orders and force compliance) as their basic style of supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Employees know what is expected of them by manager(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Manager(s) provide more supervision for employees who need help, training or monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Manager(s) support but do not overly supervise experienced, capable employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### In my primary work environment, generally ... (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Manager(s) focus on the performance of individual employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Manager(s) focus on the performance of the service and support systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Work is effectively planned and coordinated for the best results for consumers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Work is accomplished without waste of time and/or money.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Manager(s) overly monitor how employees use their time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Manager(s) give enough attention to improvement of service and support systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Manager(s) apply rules regardless of the circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Employees have the detailed information needed to do a good job. (Examples: location of all needed forms, steps to access and document consumer services.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The difference between the role of the immediate supervisor and the role of the employee is both clear and helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Person Centered Planning information is adequate. (Leave blank if not applicable.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Clinical information is adequate. (Leave blank if not applicable.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Agency policies, including job descriptions, provide clear guidance regarding employees' responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Agency policies are adequately communicated to employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>My primary work unit is successful in contributing to (the agency's mission statement printed here).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In my primary work environment, generally ... (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Slightly Low</th>
<th>Slightly High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24) The level of respect <strong>between manager(s) and employees</strong> is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) The level of respect <strong>among employees</strong> is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) The level of trust <strong>between manager(s) and employees</strong> is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) The level of trust <strong>among employees</strong> is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding myself...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28) I am committed to this organization, (name of agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) I would like to leave (name of agency), but have <strong>not</strong> taken steps to do this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) I am actively seeking employment outside of (name of agency).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) I am committed to the population(s) served by (name of agency).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32) Work-related stress is a serious problem for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) I sometimes do not speak up regarding problems I am experiencing at work due to fear of negative or punitive responses toward me by manager(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) I sometimes do not speak up regarding needs of consumers due to fear of nonproductive responses by manager(s). <em>(Leave blank if not applicable to your job.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35) My immediate supervisor encourages my growth through training and opportunities to try new assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) In the last eight workdays, my immediate supervisor has given me recognition or positive feedback for doing good work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37) **Within my primary work environment, I experience stress caused by the following factor(s):** First, check all that apply; second, RANK the items that you checked, starting with #1 as your main source of work-related stress.

- Severity and urgency of consumer needs
- High work load (number of cases or tasks assigned)
- Excessive paperwork
- Lack of support (regarding my efforts to do my job) from my manager(s)
- Difficulty balancing work and home/family responsibilities
- Relationship problems with my co-worker(s)
- Relationship problems with my immediate supervisor
- Relationship problems with person(s) that I supervise
- Disorganization or confusion (includes lack of information)
- Inadequate services to consumers by people in my primary work environment
- Possibility of being bumped or laid off
- I experience no significant work-related stress.

38) **If I were to voluntarily leave (name of agency) within the next year, it would be due to the following reasons:**

First, check all that apply; second, RANK the items that you checked, starting with #1 as your main reason for wanting to leave.

- Possibility of losing my job due to layoffs (I would be seeking more job security)
- Retirement
- Return to school
- High work load (number of cases or tasks assigned)
- Excessive paperwork
- Lack of support (regarding my efforts to do my job) from my manager(s)
- Difficulty balancing work and home/family responsibilities
- Relationship problems with my co-worker(s)
- Relationship problems with my immediate supervisor
- Relationship problems with person(s) that I supervise
- Disorganization or confusion (includes lack of information) within my primary work environment
- Inadequate services to consumers by people in my primary work environment
- Better opportunity to advance in another organization
- Better income and/or benefit package in another organization
- Need to move out of the area for reasons unrelated to my job
- I have no reason to leave (name of agency).
Background Information:

*Instructions: For each question below, please place a check after the appropriate choice.*

1) Job Category – Check One
   - Coordinator, Supervisor, Manager, or Director ____
   - Support Staff ____
   - Professional Staff (includes Seniors and Home Managers) ____
   - Direct Care and Paraprofessional Staff ____

2) Age Category:
   - 18 to 25 Yrs ____ 31 to 35 Yrs ____ 41 to 45 Yrs ____ 51 Yrs and over ____
   - 26 to 30 Yrs ____ 36 to 40 Yrs ____ 46 to 50 Yrs ____

3) Years Worked at (name of agency):
   - 0 to 5 Yrs ____ 11 to 15 Yrs ____ 21 Yrs and over ____
   - 6 to 10 Yrs ____ 16 to 20 Yrs ____

4) Gender:
   - Female ____  Male ____

5) Racial or Ethnic Minority Group:
   - Yes, I am a member of a racial or ethnic minority group ____
   - No, I am not a member of a racial or ethnic minority group ____

Please return this form right away in the stamped envelope provided, addressed to:
Pamela Meserve, Western Michigan University, Lansing Campus
6105 West Saint Joseph Highway, Suite 205, Lansing, MI 48917-4850
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Appendix D

All Possible Variate Pairs
Table 1. All Possible Pairings of the Management and Climate Variate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MGT_</th>
<th>MGT_</th>
<th>MGT_</th>
<th>MGT_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STYLE1</td>
<td>STYLE2</td>
<td>STYLE3</td>
<td>STYLE4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIEW</td>
<td>0.9266</td>
<td>-0.1936</td>
<td>0.1664</td>
<td>-0.2760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>0.9271</td>
<td>0.3139</td>
<td>0.0944</td>
<td>0.2054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULE</td>
<td>0.7874</td>
<td>-0.4198</td>
<td>-0.1561</td>
<td>0.4236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOCUS</td>
<td>0.7636</td>
<td>0.2193</td>
<td>-0.6031</td>
<td>-0.0706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPECT</td>
<td>0.9347</td>
<td>-0.0853</td>
<td>-0.1869</td>
<td>-0.1371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>0.8401</td>
<td>0.0750</td>
<td>-0.0829</td>
<td>-0.3851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT</td>
<td>0.4060</td>
<td>-0.2476</td>
<td>0.7375</td>
<td>-0.2836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENT</td>
<td>0.4456</td>
<td>0.2115</td>
<td>0.3910</td>
<td>0.2356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS</td>
<td>0.3853</td>
<td>0.8008</td>
<td>-0.0245</td>
<td>-0.0963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEAR</td>
<td>0.7697</td>
<td>0.4202</td>
<td>0.0336</td>
<td>0.3849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. All Possible Pairings of the Management and Performance Variate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MGT_</th>
<th>MGT_</th>
<th>MGT_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STYLE1</td>
<td>STYLE2</td>
<td>STYLE3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIEW</td>
<td>0.8557</td>
<td>-0.0226</td>
<td>-0.1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>0.9396</td>
<td>0.0040</td>
<td>-0.2088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULE</td>
<td>0.7479</td>
<td>0.6409</td>
<td>0.1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOCUS</td>
<td>0.8282</td>
<td>-0.1585</td>
<td>0.5281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO</td>
<td>0.9011</td>
<td>0.3362</td>
<td>-0.2738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFIC</td>
<td>0.8826</td>
<td>-0.4651</td>
<td>0.0694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES</td>
<td>0.7459</td>
<td>0.2034</td>
<td>0.6343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. All Possible Pairings of the Performance and Climate Variate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ORG_CLIM1</th>
<th>ORG_CLIM2</th>
<th>ORG_CLIM3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESPECT</td>
<td>0.9210</td>
<td>0.0574</td>
<td>-0.1281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>0.8813</td>
<td>-0.1237</td>
<td>-0.3057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT</td>
<td>0.4584</td>
<td>-0.1350</td>
<td>0.1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENT</td>
<td>0.5191</td>
<td>0.4908</td>
<td>0.3753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS</td>
<td>0.4923</td>
<td>0.4116</td>
<td>-0.1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEAR</td>
<td>0.7263</td>
<td>-0.2038</td>
<td>0.4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO</td>
<td>0.9438</td>
<td>-0.2801</td>
<td>0.1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFIC</td>
<td>0.8305</td>
<td>0.2869</td>
<td>-0.4775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES</td>
<td>0.7176</td>
<td>0.6076</td>
<td>0.3405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Key Variable Correlations, $F$ Values, and $p$ Values for All Possible Variate Pairs
Table 1

Management Style and Organizational Climate Variate Pairs (All Possible)
Showing Correlation, \( F \) Value and \( p \) Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variate Pairs</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variate Pair 1</td>
<td>.7871</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variate Pair 2</td>
<td>.2176</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.5868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variate Pair 3</td>
<td>.1361</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.7748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variate Pair 4</td>
<td>.0964</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.6571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Management Style and Organizational Performance Variate Pairs (All Possible)
Showing Correlation, \( F \) Value and \( p \) Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variate Pairs</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variate Pair 1</td>
<td>.7236</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variate Pair 2</td>
<td>.1955</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.1044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variate Pair 3</td>
<td>.1457</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.1545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Organizational Climate and Organizational Performance Variate Pairs (All Possible)
Showing Correlation, \( F \) Value, and \( p \) Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variate Pairs</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variate Pair 1</td>
<td>.7323</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variate Pair 2</td>
<td>.2620</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.0275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variate Pair 3</td>
<td>.2127</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.0930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


