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Abstract

This study described the organizational culture of an agency that uses the sanctuary model. The culture was described through a four-variable survey tool which reviewed employee perceptions of involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission. The Organizational Culture Survey was distributed to 196 employees. Results of 42 respondents were analyzed to describe the organization’s culture and to review this organization’s culture compared to a database of other organizations who had used the Organizational Culture Survey to describe their culture. The results of the study concluded that the organization performed slightly above average. Performance levels were validated by ranking above the 50th percentile in each cultural trait area and conclusions were made for areas of improvement for the organization.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For the last several hundred years, health service organizations have been viewed as machines with interchangeable parts. These mechanistic type models of organization lacked feeling/emotions and exemplified authority and power as centralized, bureaucratic, and hierarchical (Bloom & Farragher, 2011). Not until the 1940s, when general systems theory emerged, was it realized that a mechanistic perspective of organizational function was oversimplified. General systems theory, defined as "a set of interrelated elements that respond predictably and interact with each other consistently over time" (Bloom & Farragher, 2011, p. 10), recognized organizations as having many interrelated components and thus identified organizations as living.

With the exploration of this new concept of systems as living, a better understanding of the many interconnected components of health systems began to become transparent. One such understanding was that of the operating system, known as organizational culture that binds the many interconnected components of health service organizations (Bloom & Farragher, 2011; Marcoulides & Heck, 1993).
Culture can present itself tangibly in an organization as visible symbols, slogans, languages, behaviors, histories and stories, dress codes, and rituals and ceremonies (Mobley, Wang, & Fang, 2005). Though when a group of individuals develop common traditions, rites, and history, more intangible signs of culture emerge such that the work group begins to work in an almost habitual or taken-for-granted way to achieving unitary objectives, core values, beliefs, and assumptions (Bloom & Farragher, 2011; Mobley et al., 2005). Organizational culture is therefore defined as a set of values, beliefs, common understanding, thinking, and norms for behavior that are shared by all members (Marcoulides & Heck, 1993; Mobley et al., 2005). These traits of organizational culture provide the foundation or underlying assumptions, strategies, goals, and direction of the organization thus often being referred to as the operating system of the organization (Bloom & Farragher, 2011). Because organizational culture has been identified as the operating system which guides the functioning and establishes the identity of an organization, organizational models have emerged to help structure the more unconscious/habitual elements of organizational culture (Bloom & Farragher, 2011).

One such recognized organizational model which provides a framework designed to help foster the culture of an organization is the sanctuary model. What began as a therapeutic milieu to treat traumatized clientele, expanded into an organizational change model designed to guide the development of structures, processes, and behaviors of the staff, clients, and community (Bloom &
Farragher, 2011). It does this by presenting basic principles, known as the seven commitments; creating a shared language, known as the SELF framework; and by providing concrete tools for intervention including community meetings, red flag reviews, self-care planning, safety plans, team meetings, and so on. As an integrated theory system, the sanctuary model represents a “theory-based, trauma-informed, evidence-supported, whole culture approach that has a clear and structured methodology for creating or changing an organizational culture” (“Sanctuary Model,” 2012a).

**Statement of Purpose**

This study aimed to measure the levels of adaptability, mission, involvement, and consistency of a multi-disciplinary organization that utilizes the sanctuary model as a system of organizational change.

**Conceptual Framework**

This study used a conceptual framework developed by Denison, Janovics, Young, and Cho (2006) called the organizational culture model (OCM) (see Figure 1). The OCM focuses on four main traits of organizational culture including involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission (Denison et al., 2006). These traits were chosen as the basis for the model, by the model’s developers, based on literature showing similarities between the traits and their relationship to organizational effectiveness (Denison, 1990; Denison & Mishra, 1995; Gordon & DiTomaso, 1992; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Sorenson, 2002). The traits are similar in that they are all based on functionalist and phenomenological
Figure 1. The Denison Model Circumplex.

Note. Permission to use this diagram can be found in Appendix A.
perspectives of organizations, with the functionalist perspective referring to the
innate beliefs and patterns of behavior of an organization and the
phenomenological perspective referring to the secondary phenomenon resulting
from the organization's beliefs and patterns (Denison & Mishra, 1995).

The four traits interrelate according to the sets of tensions or
contradictions that are often associated with many contemporary models of
leadership and organizational effectiveness, such as the trade-off between stability
and flexibility of an organization and the trade-off between an internal and
external focus (Denison et al., 2006). For example, when considering the trade-off
between internal and external focus, mission and adaptability describe the
traits that determine the ability of an organization to externally adapt; while
involvement and consistency describe the traits that determine the ability of an
organization to internally integrate policies/procedures/values. On the other hand,
when considering the trade-off between stability and flexibility, consistency and
mission are traits that describe the capacity for an organization to remain stable
and predictable; while adaptability and involvement are the traits that describe the
capacity of an organization to change. From these similarities and relationships,
four hypotheses were created and found to be true throughout the literature
(Denison et al., 2006).

Hypothesis 1: Effective organizations tend to be those that “build their
organization around teams, empower and engage staff, and develop human
capability at all levels” (Denison et al., 2006, p. 6).
Hypothesis 2: Effective organizations are “consistent, well integrated and are based on consensual governance” (Denison et al., 2006, p. 6).

Hypothesis 3: The better able an organization is “to create change, the greater the ability to survive and grow” (Denison et al., 2006, p. 7).

Hypothesis 4: Successful organizations are those that have “defined goals and objectives and have an expressed vision for the future” (Denison et al., 2006, p. 8).

Based on these hypotheses and conceptual framework, Denison et al. (2006) presents the four main traits of the OCM: involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission. Involvement is an important trait of organizational culture because it describes the commitment that organizational members have to their work. It fosters the level to which employees feel they have input into decisions affecting their work and determines the level to which employees feel their work is connected to the goals of the organization (Denison et al., 2006).

Consistency is additionally an important trait of organizational culture because it is a source of stability for the organization. For example, organizations that are well coordinated and integrated tend to have highly committed employees, tendency to promote from within, and a clear set of do’s and don’ts. These characteristics cause an organization to form a distinct method/way of doing business; thereby creating core values for the organization (Denison et al., 2006).
Adaptability allows the organization to translate the demands of the environment into action. Organizations that have the capacity to receive, interpret, and translate the demands of the environment improve the organization's chances of survival because of their ability to continuously change and improve the organization's ability to serve their clientele. Therefore, adaptability is an integral part of an organization’s culture since it allows for learning and change within the organization (Denison et al., 2006).

The organizational culture trait of mission is additionally important because it provides a purpose and meaning to the work that an organization does. Mission shapes the behavior of the organization by providing a clear direction and provides goals that determine how employees work day to day. An organizational culture that internalizes the mission of the organization is also advantageous since research has shown that being able to identify with an organization’s mission contributes to the commitment employees feel to the organization (Denison et al., 2006).

Denison et al. (2006) created a tool to measure the four traits of involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission within health care organizations. The tool measures characteristics of involvement through feelings of authority, initiative, and ability to manage work; team orientation; and capability development, which is measured by the amount an organization invests in enhancing employee skills. Consistency is measured by the core values or the level to which employees feel they share a set of values; agreement, or the level to
which employees feel they can reach agreement on issues that arise, and coordination and integration; meaning that all departments are able to work together to achieve a common goal. Adaptability is measured in terms of the organization’s ability to create change, the organization’s ability to understand and react to their customers, and the organization’s ability to interpret its environment and change accordingly. Lastly, mission is measured by the extent to which an organization’s purpose is clear to employees, also referred to as strategic direction and intent; the level to which the goals and objectives can be linked to the company’s mission, vision, and strategy; and possession of a clear vision of the desired future of the organization. Ultimately, the survey tool can be used to assess the four hypotheses of the OCM framework. The survey tool was used to review the adaptability, consistency, involvement, and mission of the organizational culture at the agency where this study was being performed.

**Significance and Justification**

Administration at this multi-disciplinary organization began implementation of the sanctuary model in 2008. Administration has since commenced in teaching the training modules to its employees. The modules help to provide employees with the tools to help themselves as well as their clients to heal from traumatic experiences. The sanctuary model, along with administration, claim that the model produces a culture that can effectively provide a cohesive context in which healing from traumatic experiences can be addressed; though, no measures of organizational culture have been reviewed at
this organization to conclude if the organizational culture is effective ("Sanctuary Model," 2012b). As commonly known, organizational culture evolves through the development of common traditions, rites, and history of the employees; therefore, it is significant to describe the culture from an employee viewpoint due to the fact that organizational culture evolves from the employees. Therefore, this descriptive study described the effectiveness of the culture of a specific organization utilizing the sanctuary model through the perspective of the employees. On a larger scale, organizational culture is an important attribute to review due to its influential nature on quality care of care outcomes and organizational performance outcomes. Therefore this study contributed to the field of organizational culture by providing an outline for companies to review their organizational culture.

Assumptions

For purposes of this study, it was assumed that participants will answer honestly on the survey questions presented. It was additionally assumed that humans interact with their environment and that this interaction makes a difference in employees' perceptions of organizational culture.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were as follow: At a multidisciplinary organization which services children and where the sanctuary model has been adopted:

1. What is the level of adaptability of the organization?
2. What is the level of involvement of the organization?

3. What is the level of consistency of the organization?

4. What is the level of understanding of the mission of the organization?

5. Is the organization internally or externally focused?

6. Is the organization flexible or stable?

7. How does the organizational culture of a sanctuary-based organization compare to the database of organizations using other models of operations?

**Definition of Terms**

The terms in the research were defined theoretically and operationally.

1. **Adaptability**—is theoretically defined as translating the demands of the business environment into action ("Denison Organizational," 2011); and operationally defined as the manifestation of creating change, customer focus, and organizational learning as represented in questions 31 through 45 on the Organizational Culture Survey.

2. **Consistency**—is theoretically defined as the values and systems that are the basis of a strong culture ("Denison Organizational," 2011), thereby translating to the ability to maintain a standard resulting in harmony between parts. Operationally defined as the manifestation of core values, agreement, and coordination and integration as represented in questions 16 through 30 on the Organizational Culture Survey.

3. **Involvement**—is theoretically defined as building human capability; ownership and responsibility refers to the feeling that one is part of something
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larger ("Denison Organizational," 2011). Operationally defined as the manifestation of empowerment, team orientation, and capability development as represented in questions 1 through 15 on the Organizational Culture Survey.

4. Mission—is theoretically defined as a meaningful long-term direction for the organization ("Denison Organizational," 2011); therefore, consists of guiding principles designed to meet defined goals. Operationally defined as the manifestation of strategic direction and intent, goals and objectives, and vision as represented in questions 46 through 60 on the Organizational Culture Survey.

5. Multi-disciplinary organization—refers to an organization that incorporates a variety of disciplines (i.e., occupational therapy, physical therapy, counseling, special education, etc.). Operationally defined as the organization at which the research was conducted.

6. Sanctuary model—is theoretically defined as a trauma informed template for system change based on seven dominant characteristics, all of which serve to heal individuals from trauma while creating a safe environment for clients, families, staff, and administrators (National Child Traumatic Stress Network, 2008). Operationally defined as an organizational change model implemented at the business at which this research took place.

Variables

Variables to be described include the four main traits of the circumplex: involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission.
Limitations

A limitation of survey design applies to this study; participants' responses are bound by the survey structure and content. Another limitation originates from the fact that the study was conducted in one multi-disciplinary organization based in Western New York (WNY). Survey data was not available prior to the implementation of the sanctuary model at the organization where the study was conducted. Therefore, conclusions cannot be made about how the culture may have changed. The culture can be described only at this point in time. Additionally, it is unknown whether the Denison database of companies to which the data collected in this study are compared is limited to health care organizations only.

Summary

Chapter I introduced the problem and purpose of the research. The conceptual framework OCM was summarized. The significance and justification was described along with the research questions, definition of terms, and variables and limitations associated with the study. Chapter II will present a review of the literature.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

As described previously, the aim of this study is to describe the organizational culture of an agency that uses the sanctuary model as an organizational change model. This chapter, therefore, presents the literature applicable to the context of study: the sanctuary model, organizational culture, and the model in which the survey tool is created from, the Denison model. The chapter is presented in the following order: organizational culture, effects of the sanctuary model, the Denison model, the sanctuary model history, and the operating systems of the sanctuary model. Many online databases, journals, and books were used to complete this literature review.

Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is the term used to describe underlying values, beliefs, and principles of an organization (Bloom & Farragher, 2011; Clark, 2002; Denison, 1990). Organizational culture determines how people enter the organization, survive within it, and learn to work within it (Bloom & Farragher, 2011). Because of its shared nature, culture can have a dramatic effect on an
organization, such that characteristics of organizational culture have been linked in the literature to various aspects of organizational performance.

As reviewed by Aiken, Smith, and Lake (1994), hospitals that have distinct organizational features and are thus desirable workplaces, have lower mortality rates. In their study Aiken et al. (1994) found that magnet hospitals, defined as “hospitals that embody a set of organizational attributes that nurses find desirable (and that are conducive to better patient care)” (p. 771), have lower mortality than matched hospitals. From Aiken et al.’s literature review, they hypothesized that the features of a hospital’s reputation which are created from nursing staff’s perception of their workplace and which cause a hospital to be considered a magnet hospital should be positively related to quality of patient care (a.k.a., mortality).

The study analyzed mortality rate among hospitalized Medicare beneficiaries at magnet hospitals to a set of hospitals who were unrepeateable in their nursing practice but comparable in respect to other factors that have been correlated with hospital mortality (Aiken et al., 1994). The study reviewed mortality rate data, as reported in the 1988 Health Care Financing Administration files, among 39 magnet hospitals. The researchers matched these 39 magnet hospitals with five control hospitals resulting in a total of 195 control hospitals. The researchers employed multivariate matching. Matching was determined on identification of three factors including propensity scores; random order, nearest available pair matching; and multiple controls per case. Analysis compared the
average mortality of the 39 magnet hospitals with those of the 195 control hospitals using \( t \) tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Aiken et al., 1994). Analysis was performed in three phases, also referred to as models. Model I analyzed the general effect of magnet hospitals on mortality, Model II analyzed the effects that were specific to a particular magnet hospital, and Model III reviewed chance error.

Model I estimated a reduction of approximately 9 deaths per 1,000 Medicare admissions. With hospital death rates averaging 113 per 1,000 in the sample, Model I estimates concluded that predicted mortality in magnet hospitals would be 7.7% less than their controls (Aiken et al., 1994). Model II controlled for differences in predicted mortality between magnet hospitals and their matched control hospitals. Analysis of results found that magnet hospitals, with the adjustment for predicted hospital-specific mortality, went from 0.9 to 9.4 fewer deaths per 1,000. A comparison between Model I and II found that over half of the original variable in estimates of mortality of magnet hospitals was attributable to not controlling the differences in patient characteristics between hospitals. Model III analysis found 4.8% less excess mortality in magnet hospitals (Aiken et al., 1994).

Because higher ratios of registered nurses to other nursing personnel have been associated with lower hospital mortality in other studies and because the mix or nursing personnel was one of the distinguishing characteristics of the magnet hospitals in this study, the researchers needed to review the potential that their
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results were skewed because of this nursing skill mix. Model II of the results was extended to include terms for within-block and compositional differences in the ratio of registered nurses to total nursing personnel (Aiken et al., 1994). The extended analysis found no evidence that the differences between magnet and matched hospitals’ nursing skill mix or nurse to patient ratios significantly affected mortality. With the potential bias resolved, the researchers concluded in saying that hospitals in the magnet hospital study have mortality rates that are lower than those among matched control hospitals by a factor of 5 per 1,000 Medicare discharges (Aiken et al., 1994).

A study performed by Lee and Yu (2004) looked to examine the possible relationship between culture and organizational performance among Singaporean companies. In this examination one of the questions to be answered included “Does cultural strength affect organizational performance?” (Lee & Yu, 2004, p. 343). To answer this question, Lee and Yu asked management level employees about their perception of the culture at their organization and cross analyzed this data with performance standard data from each organization.

Lee and Yu (2004) attempted to utilize a stratified random design for selecting organizations for this study. Letters were sent to 72 companies in three categories of industries including manufacturing, insurance, and hospitals. Of the respondents, 10 organizations were chosen for sampling based on high market share measures. Seven top level management employees per firm participated in the questionnaires pertaining to the study. Participants were presented with 54
value statements in which they were asked to sort the values according to the extent in which the item was characteristic of their organization. This instrument allowed the researchers to capture organizational values based on the employee perspective and thus create an organizational culture profile (OCP) for each company. Performance indicators were gathered for each company. Financial indicators including sales turnover, return on assets, and net profitability were collected for the manufacturing firm. Rate of growth of business in force for life policies, and annual premiums, net returns on investments, and persistency rates were collected for insurance companies. Internal improvement in bed occupancy rates; reduction in the average length of stay of patients in class A, B1, and B2 wards; and staff turnover rates were collected for hospitals (Lee & Yu, 2004).

Researchers began their analysis by first testing and retesting the reliability over a 12-month period of the OCP that the sampled respondents had determined. Once the validity of the OCP instrument was established, the OCP responses were factored and analyzed using principal components analysis and an orthogonal varimax rotation (Lee & Yu, 2004). A Q-factor analysis was performed to create model cultural profiles. Cronbach's reliability test was then performed on the five factors (innovation, supportive, team, humanistic, and task orientations) making up 41.5% of the observed variances in data. Factor loadings of the data that loaded as significant were transformed into weights. After adjusting for relative weights, the cultural models were calculated by merging all the respondents' scores together. Cultural strength was then assessed by
computing how many respondents from that particular organization belong to the same cultural model. The cultural strength data was then correlated with organizations’ performance indicators. Spearman’s rank correlation was used to provide data on the overall firms’ rankings on culture, work practice strength, as well as their relative performance (Lee & Yu, 2004).

Findings showed that insurance company number 2 had the highest cultural strength. Additionally in the insurance industry, cultural strength and innovation were significantly correlated with growth in business in force, annual policies, and sum insured; however, there was a negative correlation with net return on investment (Lee & Yu, 2004). Manufacturing company number 3 had the lowest cultural strength. Overall the manufacturing firm’s management practice strength and supportiveness were found to significantly correlate to growth in net profits. Hospitals’ practice strength, team orientation, and task orientation were found to be significantly correlated with staff turnover; however, supportiveness was negatively correlated with staff turnover rates (Lee & Yu, 2004). The researchers concluded in saying that the cultural strength of organizations, as reported by its employees, was related to organizational performance in some cases since results were mixed. Researchers believed that though there was some supporting evidence of the relationship between culture strength and organizational performance, it was not strong enough to provide a pattern for a wider sample (Lee & Yu, 2004).
In research by Smalarz (2006), organizational culture traits, as identified by organizational employees, were shown to have statistically significant effects on quality of care outcomes. The eight quality of care outcomes reviewed in this study included diabetic care including eye exam rates, HbA1c control rates, LDL control rates, nephropathy monitoring, cholesterol management rates, high blood pressure management rates, Chlamydia screening youth adult (21-26), and adolescent well visit rates; while the nine cultural traits hypothesized to affect the quality of care measures included collegiality, quality emphasis, organizational identity, information emphasis, organizational trust, innovativeness, cohesiveness, autonomy, and business emphasis.

The pre-test hypothesis proposed that collegiality, quality emphasis, organizational identity, information emphasis, organizational trust, innovativeness, and cohesiveness would have higher/better quality of care outcomes. While autonomy and business emphasis were expected to be negatively associated with the quality of care outcomes (Smalarz, 2006).

An organizational culture survey developed by Kralewski and colleagues (as cited in Smalarz, 2006), from the employee's perspective, looked to obtain measurements concerning nine traits: collegiality, information emphasis, quality emphasis, organizational identity, cohesiveness, business emphasis, organizational trust, innovativeness, and autonomy. Partaking in the survey were 734 physicians and 50 office managers/administrators from 57 physician groups in the state of Massachusetts. The survey results were analyzed first through a
factor analysis and then through a regression analysis (Smalarz, 2006). Seven of the nine cultural dimensions were statistically significant in the quality of care outcome measures reviewed. The research findings of Smalarz (2006) indicated the following:

1. Organizational trust/identity, collegiality, and information emphasis were associated with diabetic eye exam rates.

2. Organizational trust/identity, collegiality, information emphasis, innovativeness, and autonomy were associated with HbA1c control rates.

3. Organizational trust/identity and autonomy were associated with cholesterol management rates.

4. Organizational trust/identity and cohesiveness were associated with Chlamydia screening.

5. Innovativeness was associated with adolescent well visit rates.

Though seven of the nine traits were found to be statistically significant in being linked to an outcome measure, not all of the associations were as hypothesized. As hypothesized, organizational trust/identity, information emphasis, cohesiveness, and autonomy were all found to affect the outcome measures as hypothesized; collegiality and innovativeness had the opposite effect from what had been hypothesized (Smalarz, 2006). For example, collegiality had a negative effect upon the quality of care outcomes of diabetic eye exam rates and HbA1c control rates. Likewise, innovativeness was found to have negatively
impacted adolescent well visit rates and HbA1c control rates which was opposite of what had been hypothesized (Smalarz, 2006).

Quality emphasis and business emphasis were not found to be statistically significant in any of the regression analyses performed for the quality of care outcomes reviewed in this study. Likewise, there were additionally three qualities of care outcome measures that were found to have no statistically significant cultural traits associated (Smalarz, 2006). From the findings of this research it is conclusive that cultural traits, as identified from employees, affect quality of care outcomes.

A study analyzed by Glisson and Hemmelgarn (1998) at the Children’s Mental Health Services Research Center at The University of Tennessee in Knoxville Tennessee, provided evidence that organizational climate/culture is a major predictor of the outcomes and quality of children’s services. The study reviewed a pilot program in Tennessee that was developed to help improve the provision of services to children by focusing on the mechanisms used to coordinate services to these children. The study assessed the effects of organizational variables, as reported by caseworkers, parents, teachers, and so on, regarding service quality and outcomes of children being serviced in various counties of Tennessee.

Glisson and Hemmelgarn’s (1998) hypothesis for the study revolved around a test model which linked county demographics, organizational characteristics, and outcomes and quality of services using service coordination as
the model's central construct. The model led researchers to believe that service coordination can directly as well as indirectly affect other variables such as the climate of the organizations that provide coordinated services to children, the quality of the services provided to the children, and the inter-organizational relationship among organizations providing services to the children in respective counties. Overall the hypothesized model suggested that the attitudes and behaviors of those who directly serve and interact with the children must be affected positively in order for improved service outcomes to occur (Glisson & Hemmelgarn, 1998).

The method for study included examining the data from the 3-year state sponsored pilot project, which provided service coordination teams to 12 counties worth of organizations who coordinated services to children taken into custody (Glisson & Hemmelgarn, 1998). In the 3-year period, research team members worked with state administrators, the pilot service coordination teams, the children's service organizations, and the service system network to gather data. To assess the hypothesized model, the study selected 12 control counties for assessment. The counties were matched based on total population, child poverty rates, unemployment, and education levels. The subjects of this study thus included children entering custody and the caseworkers in the organizations responsible for their care. Therefore, out of the 600 children who had entered custody in one of the 24 counties, 250 children were selected in the study analysis.
Psychosocial functioning data were obtained from parents, parent surrogates, teachers, and service outcomes and was analyzed based on the improvement of psychosocial functioning within that first year. Organizational culture and interrelationships among the children's service systems data were collected from the Psychological Climate Questionnaire that was provided by 260 caseworkers (Glisson & Hemmelgarn, 1998). The questionnaire reviewed the degree to which employees view their work environment is beneficial versus detrimental to their own well being and the success of their work. Service quality measurements were obtained through measures of:

Comprehensiveness or the number of services received by each child during their first year in custody.

Continuity or the average number of contacts per month that the child's caseworker had with other professionals who provided services to the child.

Availability or the average number of personal contacts per month that the caseworker had with the child.

Responsiveness or the number of changes in residential placements that were made to improve the fit between residential placement and child.

(Glisson & Hemmelgarn, 1998, p. 410)
Glisson and Hemmelgarn’s (1998) study indicated service coordination was assessed through:

- Authorization or the number of separate authorizations required for a child to receive services from multiple systems.
- Responsibility or the number of individuals responsible for ensuring that needed services were delivered.
- Monitoring or proportion of monitoring services for each child. (p. 410)

Analysis of the data was performed in two stages/models. The first stage, also referred to as the measurement model, used linear structural equation analysis with LISREL VIII to examine the hypothesized model (Glisson & Hemmelgarn, 1998). Through the analysis, the measurement model determined if the observed indicators of improved service outcomes were related to the hypothesized constructs. The second stage, also referred to as the structural model, reviewed the relationship between the variables using a LISREL analysis. The structural model proposed to show any effects that organizational characteristics may have on outcome and quality of services to the individual children.

Findings from the analysis suggested that offices with more perceived positive climates/cultures had significantly greater improvements in the serviced children’s psychosocial functioning (Glisson & Hemmelgarn, 1998). Additionally, children served by agencies with more positive climates/cultures also received more comprehensive services with more continuity of services as
well as caseworkers who were more responsive and available. Organizational climate/culture thus had a positive effect on both process and results. The relationship between organizational climate/culture and outcomes of child services was especially significant because the two variables relied on separate methods of analysis such that organizational climate/culture was measured on self-report scales while psychosocial functioning was measured on independent descriptions of children's behaviors as provided by teachers (Glisson & Hemmelgarn, 1998).

**Effects of Sanctuary Model**

Recent research on the sanctuary model and its effect on restraints and critical incidents had been collected from a group of nine school-based programs over a 7-year period (2001-2008). One of these programs included the Andrus Children’s Center, a private nonprofit organization recognized for its treatment programs, training, and research center. The Andrus Children’s Center treatment programs include an award winning private special education school, outpatient mental health services, and preventative outreach programs for emotionally-disabled children and their families (Banks & Vargas, 2009c; “History of,” n.d.). Three of the programs were public school districts who were piloting the sanctuary model as well as one public school and four special education schools based in North Carolina, New York, and Pennsylvania who had fully implemented the model (Banks & Vargas, 2009a).
Over a 7-year period (2001-2008), the Andrus Children’s Center, experienced an 84% drop in restraints from 104 restraints annually to 17 restraints annually at the end of year seven. On a per child basis, the data show that in year one there were 85 restraints per 100 children and by the end of year seven there were nine restraints per every 100 children (Banks & Vargas, 2009c). Data collected from the other eight school-based programs found that when comparing pre-implementation of the model versus post-implementation of the model, all the programs had experienced drops in restraints. Drops in restraints ranged from 6% to 88% with three organizations having a decrease greater than 80% and six organizations having a decrease greater than 33% (Banks & Vargas, 2009a).

Over the same 7-year period (2001-2008), the Andrus Children’s Center, experienced a 90% drop in the number of critical incidents from 7,518 in year one to 747 by the end of year seven (Banks & Vargas, 2009b). On a per day basis, the average number of incidents decreased by 90% (from 20, in 2001/2002, to 2 in 2007/2008) despite a 54% increase in the number of students served (123 in 2001/2002 and 190 in 2007/2008).

Data collected from two of the school based-programs that served more than 100 children at a given time revealed a 30% decrease from baseline to end of year one of implementation. Even greater amounts were found for two of the programs serving less than 100 children at a given time, such that 60% of incidents decreased from baseline to end of year one (Banks & Vargas, 2009a).
The Andrus Research Center conducted a separate 3-year study of facilities using the sanctuary model and its effect on restraints/holds (R/H). Some of the facilities included in the study were a school serving students from grades K-9 with emotional challenges or autism and a residential treatment facility for the juvenile population. Of the seven organizations that had shown a statistically significant reduction of R/Hs, the organizations on average were 52.3% lower in R/H after the first year of implementation. Three facilities exhibited over an 80% decrease, two exhibited over a 40% decrease, one exhibited a 13% decrease, and one exhibited a 6% decrease (Banks & Vargas, 2009b).

In order to understand the specific variables associated with the reduction, Andrus researchers performed a linear regression analyses on the data (Banks & Vargas, 2009b). From the analysis, physical aggression was found to have positively affected R/H in that as the number of incidents of physical aggression (client to staff) increased, so did the number of R/H. Physical aggression (client to staff) was found to have the opposite effect in that as the number of incidents of physical aggression (client to client) increased, the number of R/H decreased. Thus the baseline data were conclusive in showing that physical aggression (client to staff) and physical aggression (client to client) was statistically significant in contributing to R/H. Year one data showed a significant decrease in the relationship between both client to staff and client to client physical aggression and R/H (Banks & Vargas, 2009b).
In a separate study reviewing seven organizations that had successfully implemented the sanctuary model, all had experienced a decrease in direct care staff turnover (Banks & Vargas, 2009a). The organization with the greatest decrease went from a 46% turnover to a 24% turnover in a 2-year period of implementation. All seven organizations sustained a 10% average drop or greater in direct care staff turnover when comparing baseline to end of year two implementation. The total decrease in these staff turnovers over the 2-year period averaged close to a $170,000 savings (Banks & Vargas, 2009a).

**Denison Model**

**Quantitative Findings**

An exploratory test on Denison’s cultural hypothesis was completed using the survey method (Denison & Mishra, 1995). Survey measures were obtained from the top executives (chief executive officers, chief operating officers, and chief financial officers) of a sample of major industries, and these survey measures were compared to subjective and objective measures of effectiveness including profitability, quality, sales growth, satisfaction, and overall effectiveness. Validity of survey items was conducted using factor analysis and multidimensional scaling. Survey responses were obtained from 764 of the 3,625 surveys distributed lending to just over a 21% response rate (Denison & Mishra, 1995). Results found that though 15 of 20 correlations between the culture indexes and subjective effectiveness items were significant as predictors of quality, employee satisfaction, and overall performance, they were weak.
predictors of sales growth and profit. When reviewing the objective measures of return on assets, the data revealed correlations for the total sample as positive but weak. Though for the sub-sample of organizations with greater than 100 employees, stronger correlations were found with mission being the strongest predictor of performance (Denison & Mishra, 1995). The results for the objective measure sales growth were similar in that the correlation between cultural traits was slightly less strong for the total sample than for the sub sample organizations. Between the objective measures, the cultural traits revealed to be a stronger predictor of return on assets than sales growth. Overall, the data supported the idea that cultural traits are related to measures of effectiveness and that size of the firm is a factor in the correlation (Denison & Mishra, 1995).

In one study performed by Denison (1984), performance was studied in terms of business performance measures associated with an organization’s ability to generate income/capacity to acquire resources from its environment. Therefore, the COMPUSTAT financial indicators reviewed in this study included income/investment and income/sales ratios. Financial indicators were compared to a compilation of surveys which assessed individuals’ perceptions of organizational practices and conditions. The survey consisted of a 125-item standardized questionnaire developed over a time span of 15 years at the University of Michigan’s Institute for Social Research (Denison, 1984).

Out of the Institute for Social Research database, survey data from 34 large American firms were self-selected for the study. The 34 companies
included in the sample represented 25 different industries as defined by Standard and Poor's four-digit industry code. Therefore the sample included the perceptions of 43,747 respondents in 6,671 work groups from the 34 companies that were included in the Survey of Organizations archive and Standard and Poor's COMPUSTAT listing (Denison, 1984).

The survey indexes reviewed included organization of work and decision making practices. The organization of work index was a composite of four survey items that reflected the degree to which work is sensibly organized, work methods are adapted to changing conditions, decisions are made at appropriate levels, and the goals of the organization are perceived by the individual as clear and reasonable (Denison, 1984). The organization of work therefore captures the potential of a company to efficiently reorganize and adapt both in the present and future. The decision-making practices index is a two-item measure indicating (a) the degree of involvement that individuals have in the decisions that affect them, and (b) the extent to which information is shared across levels of an organization in a way that brings the best information possible to decision makers. Based on the survey results, the 34 organizations were broken into one of two groups: the high group which consisted of organizations that ranked above average in the indexes of organization of work and decision making practices, or below average in the indexes of organization of work and decision making practices (Denison, 1984). The financial data of each firm were compared with all firms listed by COMPUSTAT within the same industry to create a standardized score which, for
purposes of the study, were converted to a percentile score (scaled from 1 to 100). The two survey indexes were presented in terms of two indicators of performance: income/investment ratio, which measures the effective utilization of resources over time by comparing income with total investment; and income/sales ratio which indicates operating efficiencies by comparing income with net sales (Denison, 1984). Therefore, the financial indicators were presented in terms of Return on Investment (ROI) and Return on Sale (ROS), and their standardized equivalents, were computed for each firm for the 5 years following the year in which the survey data were gathered.

The data showed that those companies perceived as having a well-organized work environment had a significantly higher ROI. As represented in the data, the organizations who were categorized as high in organization of work ranked 15 to 50 percentage points higher than the organizations that were categorized as below average. With the exception of year five, the gap between the highs and lows appears to widen over the years. The data for the survey index organization of work also showed a significant difference in ROS between the highs and lows in year 0 and grew consistently wider through year 5 (Denison, 1984). Because ROI and ROS consistently grew from year 0 through 4, researchers concluded in saying that organizations with a culture that encourages the development of adaptable work methods linking individuals to the goals of an organization have a clear competitive advantage (Denison, 1984).
In reviewing the survey index for decision making practices, the data showed no large difference in ROI for the companies categorized in the high versus low decision making practices at years 0, 1, and 2; though in years 3 through 5, the highs outperformed the lows by a factor of two or three to one. The data also showed that there was an initial difference between ROS for those companies categorized as high in terms of decision making practices versus low; but grew consistently wider over the 5-year period (Denison, 1984). Since ROI and ROS did not appear to produce significant differences until after year three, researchers concluded that participation in decision making appears to be an investment but one which takes some time to pay off (Denison, 1984). Overall, the researchers concluded that the cultural and behavioral characteristics of organizations have a measurable effect on a company's performance. With the results associated with decision making practices and ROI and ROS, researchers saw that organizations with a participative culture not only perform better than those without such a culture, but the margin of difference that widens over time suggests a possible cause and effect relationship between culture and performance (Denison, 1984).

In a different study, researchers used the Survey of Organizations (SOO) to compare behavioral data with performance data collected from 34 firms over a 5-year period (Denison, 1990). Findings suggested that the following four indexes of the involvement hypothesis directly contribute to organizational effectiveness: organization of work, emphasis on human resources, decision-
making practices, and coordination between organizational units. Though consistency was not directly addressed in the SOO, researchers viewed the variation in survey responses between work groups of the organization as a measure of consistency. The findings suggested that in the short term, high consistency is associated with high performance but not over a long-term period. From review, researchers found that in some cases, high consistency results in lower performance in the future. The evidence for impact on the index adaptability was limited due to the fact that only internal aspects of adaptability were reviewed, but a positive relationship began to emerge between organizations' responsiveness and ability to adapt work systems. Mission was studied indirectly by several measures in the analysis of the SOO. The finding that leadership ideals impact performance suggested that a vision or desired state can have impact on organizational effectiveness as well as the indexes of job clarity and goal emphasis (Denison, 1990).

**Qualitative Findings**

Of the 34 self-selected firms included in the Survey of Organizations archive and Standard and Poor's COMPUSTAT listing, case analysis was completed by comparing actual ROI and adjusted ROI scale to find performance rankings. After review of all 34 firms' performance rankings, five firms were chosen for review. The five firms were representative of differing combinations of involvement and performance. Three of the cases on the surface appeared to support the quantitative findings such that Medtronic appeared high performance,
high involvement; People Express appeared moderate performance, moderate involvement; Detroit Edison appeared below average performance, low involvement (Denison, 1990). On the contrary, two of the cases, on the surface, appeared to contradict the quantitative findings such that Procter & Gamble was below average performance with exceptionally high involvement, and Texas Commerce had exceptionally high performance with below average involvement (Denison, 1990).

Analysis of the five firms was conducted uniformly in giving the history including influence of leaders and founders, the culture including its ideology and belief system, normative system and management practices, review of how the firm’s culture had emerged, and its effects on performance and effectiveness (Denison, 1990).

People Express and Medtronic provided examples of informal, spontaneous, and autonomous involvement. Both organizations were found to be highly effective in the early stages of development but were unable, as the firms grew bigger, to transition to a more formal system thus resulting in less effectiveness (Denison, 1990). Procter & Gamble and Texas Commerce provided examples of large organizations with highly formalized systems of involvement which created systems of high levels of involvement and high effectiveness; thus, concluding that a distinction between formal and informal involvement is a determinant in effectiveness (Denison, 1990).
From analysis of the case studies, several forms of consistency became evident. The first being consistency between ideology and actual practice. People Express, when restructuring, and Medtronic, when struggling to carry out their founding ideology in business practice, exemplified this need for consistency. People Express and Medtronic also illustrated that an internalized type of system of shared values are the source of coordinated behavior and social commitment (Denison, 1990). Procter & Gamble and Texas Commerce exemplified a form of consistency that was bureaucratically controlled and externally focused. With being successful throughout the many external changes, the case analyses suggest that a high level of consistency and predictability may be associated with adaptation to change. The Procter & Gamble and Texas Commerce studies exemplified that standardized systems that allow for small amounts of flexibility appear to be the most effective. Conformity for the bureaucratic systems resulted in being counterproductive to producing a common ground and integration (Denison, 1990). Thus the case studies conclude that a well integrated structure with a tight system of control can be factor of motivation; autonomy and ambiguity, unless produced in an environment that can coordinate and direct, decrease motivation; while conformity can become a barrier.

All five firms exemplified that adaptability is centrally important to effectiveness; especially Medtronic to whom, when extreme growth occurred, a sense of entitlement became apparent, thus becoming a barrier to its customer
service (Denison, 1990). People Express had experienced an over concentration on its internal organization when restructuring, causing them to lose the ability to recruit, train, and socialize new organizational members. Procter & Gamble and Texas Commerce provided positive examples of how adaptability can be achieved. While Detroit Edison experienced slow change in their core values and systems as external factors took hold (Denison, 1990).

Medtronic was forced to reconsider their mission when they were faced with the emerging issues of increasing government scrutiny and growing competition, thus leading the firm to construct a tighter system of control and concern of the external environment (Denison, 1990). It was additionally found that with People Express, confidence was lost in the mission during the two most uncertain periods of their history. With external changes in Detroit Edison’s environment, the firm had to transform their mission in order to link their stakeholders to the firm, thus concluding that direction and the linking factors must be recreated when environment changes occurs (Denison, 1990).

The Sanctuary Model

History

The concept of the sanctuary model began in 1980 when a psychiatrist, clinical nurse specialist, and social worker began using a therapeutic milieu approach to treating patients in a psychiatric unit (Bloom, 2000). This therapeutic milieu referred to by Bloom as a carefully arranged environment for the treatment of patients, was designed to begin reversing the effects of growing up in situations
characterized by interpersonal violence. Through this treatment approach, the treatment team, as well as other clinicians (Bloom, 2000; Jacobson, Koehler, & Jones-Brown, 1987; Jacobson & Richardson, 1987), discovered that the majority of mental health patients had been exposed to severely traumatizing environments as children.

The Adverse Childhood Experience (ACE) Study supports these early findings. The ACE study, authored by Dr. Vincent Felitti and Dr. Robert Anda and funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Kaiser Permanente, represents the largest study of its kind to examine the effects of childhood adversity over the lifespan (Felitti et al., 1998). More specifically, the ACE study "assessed, retrospectively and prospectively, the long-term impact of abuse and household dysfunction during childhood on the following outcomes in adults: disease risk factors and incidence, quality of life, health care utilization, and mortality" (Felitti et al., 1998, p. 246). The study was conducted from 1995 to 1997 with more than 19,000 baseline participants. Methodology of the study commenced with each participant receiving a physical examination as well as completing a confidential survey with questions pertaining to childhood maltreatment, family dysfunction, current health status, and current health-related behaviors. Results of the survey included 8,056 of the participants and found that out of the seven categories of childhood exposure, 52.1% of participants experienced one or more categories of adverse childhood exposure, and 6.2% of participants experiencing 4 categories of adverse childhood exposure. The results also found that participants who had
reported one ACE were 65%-93% more probable to be exposed to an additional category of exposure (Felitti et al., 1998).

The sample ranged from 19-92 years with 56.1 years being the average and 43% being college graduates (Felitti et al., 1998). It is important to note the sample from this study because it shows that what we see as the normally developed and intelligent person has been exposed to ACE, therefore leading to the conclusion that at some point in time, almost everyone will experience a traumatic experience.

The results of the study also found that both the prevalence and risk of health risk factors such as smoking, severe obesity, physical inactivity, depressed mood, and suicide attempts increased as the number of childhood exposures increased (Felitti et al., 1998). Thus explaining why severely traumatized patients engage in forms of self-destructive behaviors such as self-mutilation, addiction, eating disorders, suicidality, and so on (Bloom, 2000).

From these explorations, Bloom (2000) believed that the basic assumptions of treatment for these mental health patients needed to be rethought. Through the process of conceptualization, sanctuary emerged, derived from the concept of sanctuary trauma, defined as “when an individual who has suffered from a severe stressor next encounters what was expected to be a supportive and protective environment and discovers only more trauma” (Bloom, 2000, p. 68). Therefore, from 1985-1991, Bloom and her colleagues worked to develop a trauma-informed approach to treatment. In 1991, The Sanctuary was formed
which utilized a trauma-specific program for adult survivors. As Bloom and her colleagues worked through learning what exactly it meant to create a trauma-informed system, several other mental health organizations sought consultation. The first being Homewood Hospital in Geulph, Canada, which took its Program for Traumatic Stress Recovery and applied it with Bloom’s therapeutic community milieu (Wright & Woo, 2000). Next was Salem Hospital in Salem, Oregon, which used elements of the emerging sanctuary model to eliminate the use of seclusion and restraint. Shortly after, the sanctuary model was being implemented in residential treatment programs for children in Hawthorne, NY. Most largely was the Andrus Children Center in Yonkers, NY who in the late 1990s sought consultation in creating a trauma informed culture for its multidisciplinary organization serving approximately 2,500 children and families each year (“History of,” n.d.). Then, in 2005, The Andrus Children’s Center and Dr. Bloom partnered to create the Sanctuary Institute, a training, education, and technical assistance program dedicated to helping organizations implement the sanctuary model (“History of,” n.d.).

**Operating Systems**

With the sanctuary model becoming a whole system approach, principles, otherwise known as commitments, were established to help guide the short term/everyday conduct as well as the long term strategy of the organization. The commitments provide the structure or operating system of the sanctuary model.
with the goal to support trauma recovery goals for clients, staff, and the organization. The commitments are as follows:

Commitment to Nonviolence – to build safety skills, trust, and resilience in the face of stress and inspire a commitment to wider sociopolitical change.

Commitment to Emotional Intelligence – to teach emotional management skills, build respect for emotional labor, minimize the paralyzing effects of fear, and expand awareness of problematic cognitive-behavior patterns and how to change them.

Commitment to Social Learning – to build cognitive skills, improve learning and decisions, promote healthy dissent, restore memory, unearth the skeletons in the organizational closet and give them proper burial, and ultimately to have the skills to sustain a learning organization.

Commitment to Open Communication – to overcome barriers to healthy communication, discuss the “undiscussables”, overcome alexithymia, increase transparency, develop conflict management skills, reinforce healthy boundaries.

Commitment to Democracy – to develop civic skills of self-control, self-discipline, to learn to exercise healthy authority and leadership, to develop participatory skills, to overcome helplessness, to develop skills for wrestling with complexity, and to honor the “voices” of self and others.
Commitment to Social Responsibility – to harness the energy of reciprocity and a yearning for justice by rebuilding restorative social connection skills, establishing healthy and fair attachment relationships, transforming vengeance into social justice, and concern for the common good.

Commitment to Growth and Change – to work through loss in the recognition that all change involves loss; to cease repeating irrelevant or destructive past patterns of thought, feeling, and behavior, and to envision, be guided by, skillfully plan, and prepare for a different and better future. (Bloom & Farragher, 2011, p. 359)

The sanctuary model also recognizes the four interdependent domains of healing which are necessities in helping an individual recover from bad experiences. The SELF acronym presents the four domains:

Safety – attaining safety in self, relationships, and environment.

Emotional Management – identifying levels of various emotions and modulating emotion in response to memories, persons, and events.

Loss – feeling grief and dealing with personal losses and recognizing that all change involves loss.

Future – trying out new roles, ways of relating and behaving as a "survivor" to ensure personal safety, envisioning a different and better future. (Bloom & Farragher, 2011, p. 360)
In the sanctuary model, SELF creates a nontechnical language that clients, families, staff, and organizations can share. This simplistic language demystifies the sometimes-confusing clinical or psychological terminology that is used when embarking in the recovery process (Bloom & Farragher, 2011).

Summary

The literature review defined and provided the many ways in which perceived organizational culture affects organizations' effectiveness. The chapter reviewed the sanctuary model and its studied effects, and the Denison model and its studied effects.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

As discussed in chapter I, the purpose of this study was to measure the levels of adaptability, mission, involvement, and consistency of a multidisciplinary organization that utilizes the sanctuary model as a system of organizational change. This chapter discusses the procedures for collection and analysis of data for this descriptive study that used survey methods.

Setting

The setting for this study was a not-for-profit organization based in Western New York that offers a variety of services including physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech language pathology, and counseling, as well as educationally based services to families of children aged birth to 5 years old. The organization provides these services through the three primary avenues of (a) the Early Intervention (EI) program, which evaluates and services children aged 0-3, (b) the Committee on Preschool Special Education (CPSE), which services preschoolers, and (c) the Committee on Special Education (CSE), which services school aged children.
Population and Sample

The accessible population is all employees of the agency at which this study was conducted. The studied facility had 196 employees, 170 direct care and 26 non-direct care, who could potentially participate in this study. Direct care level staff included occupational therapists, physical therapists, speech therapists, teachers, teacher aides, service coordinators, and counselors/psychologists; non-direct-care staff included administration, clerical staff, housekeeping, maintenance, and food service staff. The study sample included those who returned the survey to the researcher.

Data Collection Methods

After obtaining full approval from the D'Youville College Institutional Review Board (IRB) (see Appendix B), the Division Administrator of the agency was contacted (see Appendix C) for permission to conduct the study at the agency. After permission was received (see Appendix D) the study was introduced to the employees and the survey was distributed.

The survey was distributed through E-mail to all employees listed as the agency’s employee with a link to Survey Monkey (see Appendix E for letter of invitation including link to Survey Monkey). The cover letter of the survey was attached to the distribution email (see Appendix F). The cover letter included a brief explanation of the study and clarified to the employees that by completing the survey, they have consented to the terms in the cover letter. The participants were given a 2-week period to complete the survey. A reminder E-mail (see
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Appendix G) was sent out to all employees of the agency 1 week prior to the deadline for completion. An additional E-mail (see Appendix H) was sent out to all employees of the agency 2 days prior to the deadline for completion, as a final reminder.

**Human Rights Protection**

An exempt review application was submitted to the D'Youville College IRB and approval was received (see Appendix B). The cover letter was inserted as the first page of the electronic survey. The cover letter outlined the purpose of the study, selection criteria, duration of participation, and the expected procedure for completion of the survey. The cover letter also outlined that participation is voluntary and would remain anonymous. The completion and return of the survey represented the consent to participate.

No physical or psychological risk to participants was expected as a result of participation in this study; and if present, should not have exceeded risk experienced in normal day-to-day activities. Because the researcher was a director in the organization and has the power to fire employees, subjects may have felt additional pressure to respond to the survey because of fear of repercussions for not responding. Because of this factor, four precautionary steps were taken.

First, the consent letter explained that participation would remain completely anonymous and because of the survey tool used, the researcher would have no way of knowing who had completed or failed to complete the survey. As
explained on the Survey Monkey website, the storage of email addresses and IP addresses was disabled, thus leaving the responses completely anonymous to the researcher. Secondly, the researcher’s thesis advisor was listed as a contact person to address any questions a participant may have about the research or subjects’ rights. Thirdly, the consent letter reinforced the voluntary nature of the study and clearly stated to subjects that there were no penalties for not responding. Fourth, gender identifiers were removed from the demographics section of the survey due to the low number of males employed at the agency, thereby reducing any foreseeable threat to anonymity.

The participants’ data will be maintained on a CD in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s office for 3 years and then destroyed. Because of the anonymity of the study, participants are unable to withdraw their submissions.

**Tools**

The tool that was used to collect data in this study was titled Organizational Culture Survey (see Appendix I). This particular survey was chosen because it has been validated to measure performance of organizations by describing the organization culture through the four traits adaptability, mission, involvement, and consistency.

The survey was created by Daniel Denison and was designed to measure a number of dimensions of organizational culture that focus specifically on traits that explain differences in the performance and effectiveness of organizations (Denison et al., 2006). The survey contains four areas of concern, which are (a)
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involvement, (b) consistency, (c) adaptability, and (d) mission. Each of these areas is measured with three component indexes. Involvement includes the indexes of empowerment, team orientation, and capability development. Consistency indexes are core values, agreement, and coordination and integration. Adaptability consists of creating change, customer focus, and organizational learning. Mission consists of strategic direction and intent, goals and objectives, and vision (Denison et al., 2006). The total number of survey items is 60, each with six Likert-type response choices on a scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree, including neutral and not applicable.

Reliability and validity of the instrument was tested through a statistical analysis of 35,474 employees from 160 different organizations (Denison et al., 2006). The sample consisted of companies in various industries including manufacturing, services, high technology firms, public sector firms, and utilities. Analysis for validation was done in three phases. Phase one examined the psychometric properties of the tool or, in other words, the relationship of the survey questions to the underlying organizational model theory. Phase two consisted of an analysis of the homogeneity of the respondents' ratings. Phase three considered the relationship between the indexes and the four areas of study and measures of organizational effectiveness to analyze validity. Overall, the results of the survey provided strong support for the validity of the organizational culture survey as a measure for the areas of study outlined in the theoretical model (Denison et al., 2006).
Permission was granted by Denison as shown in Appendix A. Elimination in the demographic area of the sex of participants has been approved by Denison researchers and agreed upon that this change does not affect the validity or reliability of the survey.

**Treatment of Data**

As mentioned previously, three component indexes are the representative measurements for a larger area of concern (otherwise known as a trait). Such that:

1. Empowerment, team orientation, and capability development are representative of the trait involvement.

2. Core values, agreement, and coordination and integration are representative of the trait consistency.

3. Creating change, customer focus, and organizational learning are representative of the trait adaptability.

4. Strategic direction and intent, goals and objectives, and vision are representative of the trait mission.

Therefore in order to answer the research questions concerning the level of adaptability, involvement, consistency, and mission, the three indexes representative of the traits were averaged to provide one representative number for the trait. Such that:
1. The averaged scores from the indexes empowerment, team orientation, and capability development provided a representative number for the trait involvement.

2. The averaged scores for the indexes core values, agreement, and coordination and integration provided a representative number for the trait consistency.

3. The averaged scores for the indexes creating change, customer focus, and organizational learning provided a representative number for the trait adaptability.

4. The averaged scores for the indexes strategic direction and intent, goals and objectives, and vision provided a representative number for the trait of mission.

With 1 being the lowest possible score and 5 being the highest possible score, a representative number equating to a 1 would indicate a low level performer, a 3 would equate to an average level performer, and a 5 would equate to a high level performer. The averages for each trait were displayed in an excel sheet.

The results of the excel sheet were analyzed to answer the research questions concerning if the organization was internally or externally focused and whether the organization was flexible or stable. Such that:

1. A high combined average in the areas of involvement and consistency would equate to an internally focused agency versus a high combined average in
the areas of adaptability and mission would equate to an externally focused agency.

2. A high combined average in the areas of adaptability and involvement would equate to a flexible agency versus a high combined average in the areas of mission and consistency which would equate to stability of the agency.

In order to answer the last research question of how the organization reviewed in this study compares to other organizations, the survey results collected from this study were provided to the Denison Consulting company for comparison against their database of 931 other organizations who had used the Organizational Culture Survey to review culture at their organization. The survey results were provided to the Denison Consulting company via a template the Denison Consulting company had provided the researcher of this study. Denison Consulting compared the results of this survey to their database to produce a circumplex outlining the areas of involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission. In each of the four areas of involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission, the circumplex displayed percentile scores. The percentile scores represented the percentage the organization reviewed in this study scored in comparison to the compilation of 931 other organizations in the database. For example, if the circumplex produced by Denison Consulting had shown adaptability at the 32nd percentile, this would mean that perceptions of adaptability at the organization reviewed in this study fell at 32% and were lower than average (50%) when compared to Denison's database of 931 other
organizations who had used the Organizational Culture Survey to review culture at their respective organization.

Summary

This study was conducted at a multi-dimensional organization in Western New York. The study used a convenience population and sample. Precautions were taken to prevent perception of coercion and to protect anonymity since the researcher is a member of the management team. The Organizational Culture Survey was administered to review the traits of organizational culture including mission, adaptability, involvement, and consistency. Data were collected and analyzed using Denison templates and analysis.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter reports the results of this study which examined the levels of adaptability, mission, involvement, and consistency of a multi-disciplinary organization that utilizes the sanctuary model as a system of organizational change. Averages by index were calculated and utilized to produce averages for the traits of adaptability, mission, involvement, and consistency. The Denison Organizational Culture Survey Likert scale was used to interpret the trait average and was used to indicate a level of performance for the traits of adaptability, mission, involvement, and consistency for the multi-disciplinary organization reviewed. The percentile scores produced in the circumplex created by the Denison Consulting Company led to conclusions of how the organization reviewed in this study compares to other organizations. A sample of 42 respondents submitted the survey.

Description of the Sample

Of 196 employees, 86.7% (170) are direct care staff, but they are only 67% (26) of the respondents. The non-direct-care staff is only 13.3% (26) of the total employees, but they are 33% (14) of those who responded. The return rate
was 16.5% (28) for the direct care employees and 53.8% (14) for the non-direct-care employees. The overall return rate was 21% (42).

Research Questions

This study aimed to answer seven questions about the performance level of cultural traits of the organization in review.

Research Question 1

The first research question was: What is the level of adaptability of the organization? As seen in Table 1, the average for creating change was 3.27, customer focus was 3.70, and organizational learning was 3.34. Thus, the overall average for adaptability was 3.44. On the Likert scale of 1 to 5, the adaptability score falls in the middle.

Research Question 2

The second research question was: What is the level of involvement of the organization? As seen in Table 2, the average for the index empowerment was 3.54, team orientation was 3.62, and capability development was 3.57. The overall average for involvement was 3.58. On the Likert scale of 1 to 5, the involvement score falls in the middle.

Research Question 3

The third research question was: What is the level of consistency of the organization? As seen in Table 3, the average for the index core values was 3.57, agreement was 3.37, and coordination and integration was 3.28. The overall
Table 1

*Adaptability Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey ID</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total ÷ by 42</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Average per index</th>
<th>Average per trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>Creating change</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Creating change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>Creating change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>Creating change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>Creating change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Customer focus</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>Customer focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>Customer focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>Customer focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>Customer focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>Organizational learning</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>Organizational learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>Organizational learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>Organizational learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>Organizational learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Involvement Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey ID</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total + by 42</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Average per index</th>
<th>Average per trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>Team orientation</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>Team orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>Team orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>Team orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Team orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>Capability development</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>Capability development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>Capability development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>Capability development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>Capability development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Consistency Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey ID</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total + by 42</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Average per index</th>
<th>Average per trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Core values</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>Core values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>Core values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>Core values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>Core values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Coordination &amp; integration</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>Coordination &amp; integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Coordination &amp; integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>Coordination &amp; integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>Coordination &amp; integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
average for consistency was 3.41. On the Likert scale of 1 to 5, the involvement score for the organization studied falls in the middle.

**Research Question 4**

The fourth research question was: What is the level of understanding of the mission of the organization? As seen in Table 4, the average for the index strategic direction and intent was 3.77, goals and objectives was 3.63, and vision was 3.44. The overall average for mission was 3.61. On the Likert scale of 1 to 5, the involvement score for the organization studied falls in the middle.

**Research Question 5**

The fifth research question was: Is the organization internally or externally focused? As seen in Table 5, the combined trait average for involvement and consistency was 3.5. The combined trait average for adaptability and mission was 3.5. Both combined trait averages were equivalent.

**Research Question 6**

The sixth research question was: Is the organization flexible or stable? As seen in Table 6, the combined trait average for adaptability and involvement was 3.5. The combined trait average for mission and consistency was 3.5. Both combined trait averages were equivalent.

**Research Question 7**

The seventh research question was: How does the organizational culture of a sanctuary-based organization compare to the database of organizations using other models of operations? As seen in Figure 2, the organization reviewed in
Table 4

*Mission Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey ID</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total + by 42</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Average per index</th>
<th>Average per trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>Strategic direction &amp; intent</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>Strategic direction &amp; intent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>Strategic direction &amp; intent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>Strategic direction &amp; intent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>Strategic direction &amp; intent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>Goals &amp; objectives</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>Goals &amp; objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>Goals &amp; objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q54</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Goals &amp; objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>Goals &amp; objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q58</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q59</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q60</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

*Internally versus Externally Focused*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Adaptability</th>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait average</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined trait average</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Flexible versus Stable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Adaptability</th>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait average</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined trait average</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. The Denison Model Circumplex Percentiles.
this study ranked at the 71st \(\frac{(63+72+78)}{300}\) percentile for the mission trait. This percentile is an average of the scores for the three indexes within the mission quadrant of the circumplex including strategic direction and intent (63rd percentile); goals and objectives (72nd percentile); and vision (78th percentile).

The organization reviewed in this study ranked at the 60th \(\frac{(79+31+71)}{300}\) percentile for the adaptability trait. This percentile is an average of the scores for the three indexes within the adaptability quadrant of the circumplex including organizational learning (79th percentile); customer focus (31st percentile); and creating change (71st percentile). The organization reviewed in this study ranked at the 57th \(\frac{(66+66+39)}{300}\) percentile for the involvement trait. This percentile is an average of the scores for the three indexes within the involvement quadrant of the circumplex including empowerment (66th percentile); team orientation (66th percentile); and capability development (39th percentile). The organization reviewed in this study ranked in the 55th \(\frac{(68+50+47)}{300}\) percentile for the consistency trait. This percentile is an average of the scores for the three indexes within the consistency quadrant of the circumplex including coordination and integration (68th percentile); agreement (50th percentile); and core values (47th percentile).

Since the combined average of adaptability (60th percentile) and mission (71st percentile) ranked at the 65th \(\frac{(60 + 71)}{2}\) percentile compared to the combined average of involvement (57th percentile) and consistency (55th percentile) which ranked at the 56th percentile \(\frac{(57+55)}{2}\), this organization
scored more externally than internally focused according to the circumplex. Since the combined average of mission (71st percentile) and consistency (55th percentile) ranked at the 63rd percentile as compared to involvement (57th percentile) and adaptability (60th percentile) which ranked at the 59th \([\frac{(57+60)}{2}]\) percentile, this organization scored more stable than flexible according to the circumplex.

**Summary**

This chapter displayed the data analysis processes that were used to answer the seven research questions of this study. The organization reviewed in this study was an average level performer when reviewing the traits of adaptability, involvement, consistency, and mission, with involvement and mission scoring slightly higher than adaptability and consistency. When these data were compared with 931 other organizations, the organization reviewed in this study ranked best in mission and worst in consistency according to the percentiles represented in the circumplex. The organization was equally internally and externally focused as well as equally stable and flexible according to the raw data; though, when compared to a database of 931 other organizations, the organization reviewed in this study scored more externally focused and more stable. Out of the 196 distributed surveys, 42 surveys were returned.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Summary

The objective of this study was to measure the levels of cultural traits of a multi-disciplinary organization that utilizes the sanctuary model as a system of organizational change. The conceptual framework for this study was the organizational culture model which introduced the concept that the following four cultural traits of involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission were imperative to highly effective/performing organizations. The conceptual framework provided a survey tool to measure the levels of the four cultural traits through the perspective of the employee. The significance of this study was that it provided the organization reviewed in this study with identification of weak cultural areas that, according to the Denison model, would need to be improved in order to be an effective organization. On a larger scale, the significance of this study is that it provided a framework for organizations to review organizational culture and to learn how their culture can affect the effectiveness of their organization. It was assumed that the employees who participated in the study would answer honestly. It was also assumed that human interaction in their environment makes a difference in how the employees perceived the culture of
their organization. Seven research questions were identified to measure the levels of cultural traits of a multi-disciplinary organization including:

1. What is the level of adaptability of the organization?
2. What is the level of involvement of the organization?
3. What is the level of consistency of the organization?
4. What is the level of understanding of the mission of the organization?
5. Is the organization internally or externally focused?
6. Is the organization flexible or stable?
7. How does the organizational culture of a sanctuary-based organization compare to the database of organizations using other models of operations?

The following terms were defined theoretically and operationally in chapter I: adaptability, consistency, involvement, mission, multi-disciplinary organization, and sanctuary model. The variables identified for this study included the four cultural traits measured through the survey tool including adaptability, involvement, consistency, and mission. Because the study revolved around a Likert scale survey, the participants' responses were limited to the survey structure and content. Another limitation was that the culture of the organization can only be described at this point in time because of the study design; conclusions about how the culture may have changed at the organization cannot be made. It is also unknown if Denison's comparative database consisted only of health care organizations, therefore general comparative conclusions
cannot be made about this study’s results as they apply to health care organizations.

The literature review for this study explored the literature in the following areas: organizational culture, effects of sanctuary model, Denison model quantitative findings, Denison model qualitative findings, the sanctuary model history, and the sanctuary model operating systems.

The study was performed on a not-for-profit organization based in Western New York that offers a variety of services to children aged birth to 5 years old. The accessible population of the study was all employees of the organization in review including a total of 170 direct care and 26 non-direct-care employees. Data were collected through the use of Survey Monkey and notice of the survey was distributed through the use of email. Human rights protection was obtained from the D’Youville College IRB in which no physical or psychological risk to participants was expected. Participation in the study remained completely anonymous. The tool used to collect data included the Organizational Culture Survey which was designed to measure a number of dimensions of organizational culture including indexes of the traits adaptability, involvement, consistency, and mission. There were a total of 60 survey questions which participants scored on a Likert-type response scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree, including neutral. Averages of the indexes were calculated to provide one representative number for the trait with 1 being the lowest possible score and 5 being the highest possible score. Combined averages were calculated to answer research questions
pertaining to if the organization were internally or externally focused as well as flexible or stable. In order to answer if the scores of the organization compared to other organizations, the data were compared to a database of 931 other organizations that used the Organizational Culture Survey. Results were presented in a circumplex with percentiles for each trait index.

The data from 42 respondents, the study sample, were analyzed for the perceived level of adaptability, involvement, consistency, and understanding, as well as the conflicting demands of the traits. Findings of the analysis found that each trait scored between a 3.4 and 3.6 out of 5. Combined trait averages were 3.5 out of 5. The percentiles of the circumplex varied between 79 and 31.

Conclusion

Relationship of the Results to the Conceptual Framework

The organizational culture model provided a framework to examine the culture of an organization that utilizes the sanctuary model as a system of organizational change. The results of the study examined the culture according to the four traits outlined in the conceptual framework. Calculation of combined trait averages led to the conclusion that the organization was equally as internally focused and externally focused as well as as equally stable as flexible; thus, the results of the study did not show a set of tensions or a set of contradictions as was outlined in the conceptual framework. The survey results for each trait ranged between 3.4 and 3.6, while the circumplex produced by Denison Consulting Company showed that the results were not as evenly distributed
between the traits when compared to a database of 931 other organizations. According to the four hypotheses of the conceptual framework, the isolated results of the survey show that the organization is an average performer, but the circumplex shows how accurate and how truly effective the organization is by comparing the results to 931 other organizations. Therefore, reviewing the hypotheses and the circumplex results in the conclusion that the organization, when compared to other organizations, is above average in all trait areas since all trait areas average to over 50%.

**Relationship of the Results to the Literature**

The review of the organizational culture literature demonstrated that culture, and in particular staff perception of culture, provides an indication as to the effectiveness/performance of an organization. For example, the study performed by Aiken et al. (1994) reviewed the hypothesis that staff's perception of their workplace could be positively related to quality of patient care (a.k.a., mortality). Though this study did not directly review quality of patient care, this study did review the employees' perception of their workplace by asking survey questions pertaining to the culture of the organization. The survey questions allowed analysis of data which showed that the organization was average in the cultural traits of the organizational culture model which according to the Denison model, suggests that the organization would likewise be average when reviewing performance standards. Aiken et al. validated their hypothesis by finding that the magnet hospitals reviewed in the study had mortality rates lower than the matched
controls by a factor of 5 per 1,000 Medicare discharges. This study likewise, validated the employee’s perceptions by comparing the results to 931 other organizations resulting in conclusions that the organization was an average if not slightly above average organization causing the inference that quality of care items in this child service organization would be average. Therefore, the results of Aiken et al. as well as this study suggest that employees’ perceptions of their workplace may have a connection to the performance of the organization.

The study performed by Lee and Yu (2004) looked to review the hypothesized relationship between organizational culture and performance by reviewing management level employees’ perceptions of their organization’s culture and comparing it against performance standard data of each organization. The analyzed cultural strength data from each organization was correlated with performance indicators including innovation, sum insured, and investment. The study concluded in saying that in some cases, cultural strength, as reported by its employees, was related to organizational performance. This study similarly analyzed cultural strength data of the organizational culture survey that was produced from the perceptions of employees, and made inferences about the organization being an average performer. The organizational performance conclusions were verified as being an average if not slightly above average performer on cultural traits. Therefore, as in Lee and Yu’s study, cultural strength was related to performance just as in this study the circumplex displayed that the
perceived cultural strength of the organization was accurate and thus infers that the performance level of the organization would be average.

Smalarz (2006) reviewed employees’ perception of nine organizational traits. From these perceptions, Smalarz compared factors of quality of care outcomes. From reviewing Smalarz’s findings, organizational trust/identity was associated with four of the five outcome measures that were found to be statistically linked. Though the results of this study did not assess which cultural traits most contributed to the performance level of the organization, mission at this organization scored 71% higher than 931 other organizations. This highly scored trait suggests that the organization has a defined identity that employees understand. Thus, because Smalarz identified organizational identity as having a strong connection with outcome measures, it would be expected that the organization reviewed would similarly have high outcome measures which was not true since the organization’s hypothesized performance level scored only slightly above average.

The study performed by Glisson and Hemmelgarn (1998) provided evidence that organizational climate/culture is a predictor of the outcomes and quality of children’s services. Findings revealed that offices with more perceived positive climates/cultures had significantly greater improvements in children’s psychosocial functioning, had more continuity of services, and had more responsive and available staff. Though the results of this study could not directly comment on the relationship between culture and quality of children’s services,
this study did review the organizational culture of a child service organization. With this review, the results found that the culture of this organization was a slightly above average performer meaning that according to Glisson and Hemmelgarn, it may be speculated that the organization reviewed in this study understands children's psychosocial functioning, has some continuity of services, and has somewhat responsive and available staff but has room for improvement.

The quantitative and qualitative findings of the Denison model literature supported the theory that certain cultural traits of an organization are related to measures of effectiveness of the organization. Both quantitatively and qualitatively, the Denison model literature displayed that certain performance standards such as return on sales and return on investments were linked to cultural traits such as organization of work, coordination between organizational units, consistency, involvement, and so on. Though the results of this study did not directly compare measures of effectiveness to the cultural performance levels, based on the literature it may be implied that there is potential for the organization in review to be an above average performer when reviewing measures of effectiveness based on the fact that the organization was above average when reviewing cultural traits.

Though the results of this study cannot contribute to the literature of the sanctuary model in terms of it decreasing such things as restraints and holds, staff turnover, and so on, the results of the circumplex do display that the organization under review which services children under the sanctuary model ranked at the
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71st percentile. This indicates that this organization, which utilizes the sanctuary model, has a wide understanding of the focus and vision of the organization which may be correlated to the level of employee understanding of the commitment and principles of the sanctuary model.

**Relationship of the Results to the Research Questions**

With 1 being the lowest possible score and 5 being the highest possible score, a representative number equating to a 1 indicated a low level performer in the cultural trait area, a 3 indicated an average level performer in the cultural trait area, and a 5 indicated a high level performer in the cultural trait area. In this study, the overall average for the level of adaptability was scored as 3.4. The insight gained from a score of 3.4 is that the organization reviewed in this study has the ability to translate the demands of the environment into action but has not yet excelled in the ability to receive, interpret, and translate the demands of the environment (Denison et al., 2006). The ability of the organization to learn and change with the environment impacts the ability of the organization to be effective in a long term capacity which, according to Denison (1990), is needed to be an effective organization.

The overall level of involvement, as determined by the organization’s employees, was scored at 3.6. On the Likert scale of 1 to 5, this score fell in the middle, meaning that the employees of the organization felt that they have some amount of input into decisions that affect their work. From Denison’s model this score provides the insight that employees are committed or feel that their work is
connected to the goals of the organization, but that feelings of commitment could be increased if democratic decision making was more prevalent (Denison et al., 2006). Because organizational effectiveness is a "function of the level of involvement and participation of an organization's members" (Denison, 1990, p. 7), having employees who are not highly involved, or in this circumstance not scoring 5 in the area of involvement, do not feel the sense of ownership and responsibility that, according to Denison, is needed to be an effective organization.

The level of consistency for this organization was scored at 3.4 out of 5. With the level of consistency falling in the middle of the spectrum, employees do not have a completely clear understanding of the do's and don'ts of the organization's culture; which means that employees do not fully understand or share in the beliefs and values of the organization (Denison, 1990). Having shared beliefs and values provides insight into the ability of the organization to reach consensus on decision making and to carry out coordinated goals. This insight impacts the ability of the organization to be effective because as explained by Denison et al. (2006), "organizations are effective when they are consistent and well integrated" (p. 6); therefore an organization which does not have a complete clear understanding of the do's and don'ts of the culture will struggle to obtain a feeling of consistency as exemplified in the organization reviewed in this study.
According to the results, the level of understanding of the mission of the organization was scored at 3.6 out of 5. The insight into this score indicates the idea that the employees of this organization do not fully understand the purpose of the organization and the direction or goal which the organization works toward. Without a completely clear understanding of the purpose and the direction which the organization works toward, employees do not have a clear understanding of the beliefs and goals of the organization. According to Denison et al. (2006), effective organizations have a clear sense of purpose and direction; therefore this organization, which does not have a completely clear understanding of the direction or goals of their organization will not be able to be a highly effective organization until clear direction and goals are provided to the organization’s employees.

The combined trait average for involvement and consistency was scored 3.5 out of 5. This score shows that the organization recognizes the internal dynamics of the organization such as the systems, structures, and processes that make up the framework of the organization. But due to scoring 3.5 out of 5, it can be concluded that employees feel that the organization has not yet been able to perfect the dynamic of the three components to produce a high quality product ("Denison overview", n.d.). A combined trait average for adaptability and mission was scored 3.5 out of 5. This score shows that the organization has an external focus in which the organization does monitor the external marketplace. Though with a score of 3.5, the employees of the organization may not feel that
the organization is completely in tune with their marketplace or may have difficulty analyzing where the market is heading, thus causing the organization to score lower in this area ("Denison overview", n.d.). Though improvements in the areas can be made, both combined trait averages scored 3.5 out of 5 meaning that the organization has reconciled the conflicting demands of being internally versus externally focused; which according to Denison (1990) is the essence of effective cultures.

The combined trait average for adaptability and involvement was scored 3.5 out of 5. This score exemplifies that employees feel this organization has the ability to change in response to its environment, though employees may feel that the organization may not be flexible enough in a timely manner when changes occur in the environment thus causing this score to be lower ("Denison overview", n.d.). A combined trait average for mission and consistency was scored 3.5 out of 5. A score of 3.5 shows that the organization has the capacity to remain focused and predictable, but scoring 3.5 out of 5 may indicate that employees feel that the organization will not remain stable over time. Though both areas could use improvement to bring the score to 5, the demands of flexibility versus stability had equal scores meaning that the organization has reconciled the conflicting demands of being flexible versus stable, which according to Denison (1990) is the essence of effective cultures.

The results of this study, otherwise referred to as the raw scores, were compared to a database of 931 other organizations which had similarly used
Denison’s Organizational Culture Survey to review organizational culture. The circumplex in Figure 2 displays how the results of this study compared to a database of 931 other organizations. The circumplex helps to give meaning to the raw data results of this study, as described above, by helping to answer the question of “Is that good?” (“Denison overview”, n.d.). According to the results of the circumplex, mission ranked at the 71st percentile. What this means is that the raw score of 3.6 for the mission trait was a good score since it ranked at the 71st percentile and therefore was a strength area for the organization in review.

In comparison, employees’ perceived level of adaptability at the organization in this study ranked at the 60th percentile. This means that the raw score of 3.4 was a decent score since it ranked at the 60th percentile; though the organization reviewed in this study could use some work to improve the employees’ confidence in their organization’s ability to change according to the external environment. Involvement ranked at the 57th percentile. This means that the raw score of 3.6 for the trait involvement was reflective of being an average performer since involvement ranked at the 57th percentile. Thus the organization reviewed in this study could improve in the area of involvement by building teams and empowering employees. Consistency ranked at the 55th percentile. This means that the raw score of 3.4 was supportive of the previous assumptions that the organization in review was an average performing organization in the area of consistency. Therefore, because the organization ranked in the 55th percentile in the area of consistency, the conclusion can be drawn that the organization needs
to improve in being more consistent, well integrated, and based on consensual governance. Overall the organization in this study appears to be excelling in the trait area of mission since mission was ranked at the 71st percentile. The organization appears to be doing better than average in the trait areas of adaptability (60th percentile), involvement (57th percentile), and consistency (55th percentile); though it could stand to use improvement since they were only slightly above average which, in this circumstance, would be considered the 50th percentile.

With a combined average for adaptability and mission ranking at the 65th percentile compared to the combined average of involvement and consistency ranking at the 56th percentile, the organization reviewed in this study scored more externally than internally focused. What this means is that the organization has not reconciled the conflicting demand of external versus internally focused as originally represented by the raw data. The organization should focus its efforts on improving in the area of involvement and consistency in order to make the percentiles equivalent and the demand reconciled. With a combined average for mission and consistency ranking at the 63rd percentile, as compared to involvement and adaptability which ranked at the 59th percentile, the organization in review scored more stable than flexible. What this means is that the organization has not reconciled the conflicting demand of stable versus flexible as originally represented by the raw data. The organization should focus its efforts
on improving in the area of involvement and adaptability in order to make the percentiles equivalent and the demand reconciled.

Relationship of the Results to the Variables

The results were that the involvement and mission variables scored slighter higher than the adaptability and consistency variables. Based on these outcomes, the organization in review had employees with a higher perception of commitment and meaning to work and a slightly lower perception of how they are to function in their environment and how to adapt to their changing environment.

Relationship of the Results to the Study Design

The survey was carried out from the last week of August 2012 to the second week of September over a 15 day period. Of the 196 employees who had the opportunity to participate in the survey, 42 (21%) employees took the online survey. All of the completed surveys were completed fully and none were eliminated from the study. A larger response rate may have been possible if the timing of the study was different. For example 10-month employees were off from August 27th to September 4th; therefore approximately a quarter of the staff may have missed 7 days that the survey was offered if they did not read their emails while on their time off. Another variable that may have affected the response rate was the scenario that it was also the beginning of the 2012/2013 school year which is a very busy time of year for both the direct and non-direct-care employees at the studied organization.
Relationship of the Results to the Tools

As reviewed, the validity of the tool was tested through a statistical analysis of 35,474 employees from 160 different organizations. From the statistical analysis, the results of the survey provided strong support for the validity of the survey by showing the relationship between the traits and measures of organizational effectiveness (Denison et al., 2006). The results of this study similarly supported the validity of the tool since the results of the study scored the performance of the organization’s cultural traits as average. When comparing these results with 931 other organizations, the organization reviewed in this study likewise ranked above the 50th percentile for each trait, thereby giving validity to the original analysis that the organization in review was an averagely if not slightly above average performing organization. This validated that the survey tool accurately measures the performance level of cultural traits of organizations.

Relationship of the Results to the Data Analysis Methods

The data analysis was implemented as planned in chapter III. Measurements for the component indexes were combined and averaged for each trait. Such that the averaged score for the indexes empowerment, team orientation, and capability developed provided an averaged score of 3.6 for the trait involvement. The averaged score for the indexes core values, agreement, and coordination and integration provided an averaged score of 3.4 for the trait of consistency. The averaged score for the indexes creating change, customer focus, and organizational learning provided an averaged score of 3.4 for the trait of
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adaptability. The averaged score for the indexes strategic direction and intent, goals and objectives, and vision provided an averaged score of 3.6 for the trait of mission. With 1 being the lowest possible score and 5 being the highest possible score, all traits scored in the 3.4 to 3.6 range, meaning that the organization was an average level performer of these cultural traits. Combined trait averages were produced for the traits which showed that the organization reviewed was as equally internally as externally focused and was equally as flexible as stable. Lastly, the Denison Consulting Company produced a circumplex which compared the results of the organization in review against 931 other organizations. The circumplex showed that the organization in review ranked above the 50th percentile for each trait, supporting the conclusion that the organization was an average, if not above average, organization for the four cultural traits of adaptability, mission, involvement, and consistency.

Implications for Management

The overall purpose of research is exploration which is needed for all disciplines in order to enhance understanding. In order to enhance the understanding of the results of this study, a limitation must be addressed. The lopsided response rate in favor of the non-direct-care staff may have influenced the results due to the possibility that direct care and non direct care employees have different perceptions of the culture. Despite this limitation the organization in review was found to be an above average level performer; though it has room for improvement, especially in the area of consistency, which scored in the 55th
percentile. The results infer that management of this organization should focus on
the area of consistency first and foremost in order to promote a more balanced and
effective culture. Due to the fact that the organization utilizes the sanctuary
model to promote its culture, the low score in consistency may infer that the
modules of sanctuary are not being implemented uniformly in the organization.
Therefore, in order to improve scores of consistency, management should analyze
the way in which the modules of sanctuary are being taught throughout the
organization.

The raw data of this study were compared to a database of 931 other
organizations. It was unknown as to the types of organizations that encompassed
the database. Therefore the conclusions made about the percentiles outlined in
Figure 2 must be put in perspective in that the comparison database may have had
dissimilar organizations to the one reviewed in this study. For example, as seen
under the trait of adaptability in Figure 2, the organization reviewed in this study
scored at the 31st percentile for customer focus. The customer focus percentile
may have appeared low in this area because unlike the child service organization
reviewed in this study, the database may have consisted of a large number of for-
profit organizations. What this means is that normally for-profit organizations
need to stay very highly in tune with their customers due to the fact that they are
creating products that are designed to cater to customers. This is opposed to not-
for-profit service organizations which always has a large customer base due to the
fact that they are providing health services, which is a necessity as compared to a
product of a for-profit organization which produces products which often times are luxuries to customers. Though not-for-profits are not creating a product, they are providing a service which relies heavily on reputation such that individuals can be more likely to go to a service provision organization if they have a good reputation. Therefore, because the customer is such an integral part of service provision, management of the organization reviewed in this study should focus on listening to the needs of the customer in order to improve their level of adaptability and improve their performance level.

Though the conclusions of the study cannot be generalized due to the fact that only one child service organization was surveyed, the conclusions of this study suggest that child service organizations could benefit from utilizing a framework as presented in this study to review the strengths and weaknesses of their organization's culture. Identifying the weaknesses of the organization's culture allows management to prioritize areas of improvement which, according to the literature, would correlate to improvement in quality care outcomes. Thus the implications of this study help organizations to improve performance through identifying traits of culture needing improvement.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

For this particular study, recommendations to improve the results would be to separate the survey results into direct care and non-direct care. As expressed earlier, it is commonly known that organizational culture evolves through the development of common traditions, rites, and history of the
employees; therefore, organizational culture evolves from the employees. There is a difference with organizations that utilize an organizational change model due to the fact that administrative employees of the company typically are trying to create the culture from top down but, as revealed in the previous statement, it appears that culture can likewise evolve from the bottom up. In this study, administrative employees and non-administrative employees were combined to summarize results. A recommendation for future research which utilizes this framework would be to separate the results of the administrative and non-administrative employees to see if the two groups perceived the culture similarly or differently. This recommendation is made to more accurately review the culture of the organization and if compared to the commitments of the organizational change model, would help researchers to more accurately assess if the culture occurred from top down or bottom up methodology.

On the small scale, the framework of this study allowed the researcher to review the culture of an organization and compare it to 931 other organizations in order to give insight into the level of performance of the organization. No performance standards were used in this study to review the accuracy of the conclusions about the level of performance of the organization. If performance standards were used as a comparison factor in this existing framework, the framework could be used on a larger scale to further compare the relationship between cultural traits and performance measures. If these performance measures
were added to the framework and multiple organizations were reviewed, research could be produced to test specific organizational culture model effectiveness.

The framework reviewed in this study can be utilized for individual organizations to review their culture using a validated tool, though could not be utilized to review effectiveness of organizational change models. For example, though the organization reviewed in this study utilized an organizational change model, the results cannot be directly linked to the organization’s use of the sanctuary model due to the fact that there is no way to assess if the results were because the organization utilizes the change model. Therefore, a recommendation would be to utilize this framework as a pre- and post-implementation tool in order to review the effectiveness of organizational change models. This is an important recommendation since there is little outside validated research on the effectiveness of organizational change models in which organizations are relying on to improve their quality care and performance standards.
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Appendix A

Request for Approval Email to Denison

and Permission from Denison for Use of Survey
Approval Email for Use of Denison Organizational Culture Survey

Request to Obtain and Use Denison Organizational Culture Survey

Sent: Friday, April 15, 2011 2:08 AM
To: Kim Ichihara
Subject: Request to Obtain and Use Denison Organizational Culture Survey

Your research proposal looks interesting. Attached are the survey items and a data template for use if you would like us to benchmark your data to a database of 1,500 organizations. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me. I am looking forward to seeing the results of your work.

Best,

Kim Ichihara

File: Organiz_001.Final.pdf
File: Organiz_001_Data_template.xlsx

2 attachments — Download all attachments

[Download file] [Download file]
August 20, 2012

To whom it may concern:

Danielle Vacco has received permission to use Denison Consulting materials for publication and presentations with the understanding that these materials be used solely for research purposes. The details of this agreement are recorded in the Denison Consulting Terms of Use for Researchers.

Ken Uehara
Data Manager
Denison Consulting
121 W. Washington St., Suite 201
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
United States of America
kuehara@denisonculture.com
734-302-6085
Appendix B

D'Youville College Institutional Review Board

Full Approval Letter
TO: Danielle Vacco

FROM: Dr. Roger Fiedler
Institutional Review Board

DATE: July 30, 2012

SUBJECT: IRB FULL APPROVAL

I am pleased to inform you that your application to the D'Youville College Institutional Review Board entitled: "Organizational Culture Under The Sanctuary Model: A Descriptive Study" has been granted FULL APPROVAL with respect to the protection of human subjects. This means that you may now begin your research unless you must first apply to the IRB at the institution where you plan to conduct the research.

Please note that you are required to report back to this IRB for further review of your research should any of the following occur:

1. a major change in the method of data collection
2. unanticipated adverse effects on the human subjects
3. unanticipated difficulties in obtaining informed consent or maintaining confidentiality
4. the research has not been completed one year from the date of this letter

Congratulations and good luck on your research!

jg

cc: Director of Graduate Studies
Dr Elizabeth Miranda
file
Appendix C

Permission Request to Agency
From: dvacco  
To:  
Subject: Organizational Culture Survey  
Attachment: Cover Letter  

Dear  

As previously discussed, I would like to partner with your division to produce research on the Sanctuary Model.

I have attached the cover letter of the research proposal to further explain the research.

I am looking for written confirmation to move forward with distributing my survey to your division.

Thank you for your time and response,

Danielle Vacco  
Student – D’Youville College
Appendix D

Permission Letter from Agency
Ms. Vaccaro,

Please let this reply serve as my agreement with and approval to distribute your research survey to the employees within my Division.

I wish you luck in your research endeavor and offer any additional assistance you may require in this process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

---

From: Vaccaro, Danielle
Date: Wednesday, August 15, 2012 7:42 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Confirmation

Dear Mary,

As previously discussed, I would like to partner with your division to conduct a survey to describe perceptions of organizational culture under the Sanctuary Model.

I have attached the cover letter of the research proposal to further explain the research as well as the letter from DYC for IRB approval to conduct this study.

I am looking for written confirmation to move forward with distributing my survey to your division.

Thank you for your time and response,

Danielle Vaccaro
Stauton—Tennessee College
Organizational Culture
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Appendix E

Emailed Letter of Invitation
I am conducting a research study in partial fulfillment of the requirements for my master’s degree at D’Youville College. I am seeking your participation in a 25-minute survey about your opinions on the organizational culture within [Insert Name]. Your participation would be greatly appreciated.

This study is part of the academic requirement for my master’s degree. All results are anonymous.

Please click on the following link to Survey Monkey to complete the survey. All links allowing participant identification have been disabled. If you would rather complete a hard copy, you can use the link to print out the survey and return the hard copy anonymously via interoffice mail.

Survey Monkey link:

Thank you for your time and participation.

Danielle Vacco
Student – D’Youville College
Appendix F

Cover Letter Attached to Emailed Survey
I am currently conducting a research study for my master's degree entitled: Organizational Culture Under the Sanctuary Model: A Descriptive Study to determine your perceptions of organizational culture in an agency using the Sanctuary Model. You were chosen as part of the sample because you are an employee of such an agency. As a subject, you will be asked to fill out a survey which should require no more than 25 minutes. As you can see attached to this email, the survey must be completed through Survey Monkey. Completion and submission of the survey implies consent.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you choose to participate, you may change your mind at any time up to the point of submitting the survey. As surveys are anonymous and responses cannot be linked to any individual, surveys cannot be returned once submitted. There is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled to if you choose not to participate.

The procedures in this study are not considered experimental. Participation in this study has no more risk than what you experience in your normal day-to-day activities. There may be no direct benefits to you for participating in this research, but the knowledge gained from this research will be presented to the agency in group form only.

Any information you provide during the course of the study will remain anonymous. Your name will not be associated with your information and information about the study will be reported in group form only. The demographic section of the survey excludes sex identifiers to further protect the identity of participants.

The purpose of this letter is to assure that you are given sufficient information to make an informed decision as to whether you will consent to be a subject in a study involving research. If during the course of the study you have questions about the research, tasks, or activities you are asked to perform or complete, or your rights as a research subject, you may contact Dr. Elizabeth Miranda at [redacted] and your questions will be answered.

Thank You.

Danielle Vacco
[redacted]
Appendix G

One-Week Deadline Email Reminder
From: dvacco
To: [Email redacted]
Subject: Organizational Culture Survey
Attachment: Research survey

Dear [Name redacted],

This is a friendly reminder that there is one week left for me to collect the surveys for my research study. Your input is valuable to my study. If you have already completed the survey, thank you for your participation. If you have not yet decided to participate, or have not completed a survey, I would appreciate you taking the time to give your input for my study. The survey will be offered until (date).

Thank you again for your time and participation.

Danielle Vacco
Student – D’Youville College
Appendix H

Final Email Notice
Dear [Name],

This is a last follow up to ask for your participation in my research study. I will be collecting survey responses for two more days until date?? and would really appreciate having your input. If you have already completed the survey, thank you for your time and participation.

Danielle Vacco  
Student – D’Youville College  

---
Appendix I

Organizational Culture Survey
1. Are you direct care or non direct care? *Please see guideline below.

Direct care = occupational therapist, physical therapist, speech therapist, teacher, teacher aide, service coordinator, counselor or psychologist

Non Direct care = director, manager, clerical staff, housekeeping, maintenance or food service

2. In this organization, most employees are highly involved in their work.

3. In this organization, decisions are usually made at the level where the best information is available.

4. In this organization, information is widely shared so that everyone can get the information he or she needs when it's needed.
5. In this organization, everyone believes that he or she can have a positive impact.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

6. In this organization, business planning is ongoing and involves everyone in the process to some degree.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

7. In this organization, cooperation across different parts of the organization is actively encouraged.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

8. In this organization, people work like they are part of a team.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

9. In this organization, teamwork is used to get work done, rather than hierarchy.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree
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15. In this organization, the capabilities of people are viewed as an important source of competitive advantage.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

16. In this organization, problems often arise because we do not have the skills necessary to do the job.

1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Neutral
4 = Disagree
5 = Strongly Disagree

17. In this organization, the leaders and managers "practice what they preach".

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

18. In this organization, there is a characteristic management style and a distinct set of management practices.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree
**19. In this organization, there is a clear and consistent set of values that governs the way we do business.**

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

**20. In this organization, ignoring core values will get you in trouble.**

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

**21. In this organization, there is an ethical code that guides our behavior and tells us right from wrong.**

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

**22. In this organization when disagreements occur, we work hard to achieve "win-win" solutions.**

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree
### *23. In this organization, there is a "strong" culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>3: Disagree</th>
<th>5: Neutral</th>
<th>4: Agree</th>
<th>6: Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### *24. In this organization it is easy to reach consensus, even on difficult issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>3: Disagree</th>
<th>5: Neutral</th>
<th>4: Agree</th>
<th>6: Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### *25. In this organization, we often have trouble reaching agreement on key issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: Strongly Agree</th>
<th>3: Agree</th>
<th>5: Neutral</th>
<th>4: Disagree</th>
<th>6: Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### *26. In this organization, there is a clear agreement about the right way and the wrong way to do things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>3: Disagree</th>
<th>5: Neutral</th>
<th>4: Agree</th>
<th>6: Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### *27. In this organization, our approach to doing business is very consistent and predictable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>3: Disagree</th>
<th>5: Neutral</th>
<th>4: Agree</th>
<th>6: Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**20.** In this organization, people from different parts of the organization share a common perspective.
- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

**21.** In this organization, it is easy to coordinate projects across different parts of the organization.
- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

**22.** In this organization, working with someone from another part of this organization is like working with someone from a different organization.
- 1 = Strongly Agree
- 2 = Agree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Disagree
- 5 = Strongly Disagree

**31.** In this organization, there is good alignment of goals across levels.
- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree
### 32. In this organization, the way things are done is very flexible and easy to change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 33. In this organization, we respond well to competitors and other changes in the business environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 34. In this organization, new and improved ways to do work are continually adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 35. In this organization, attempts to create change are usually met with resistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 36. In this organization, different parts of the organization often cooperate to create change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. In this organization, customer comments and recommendations often lead to changes.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

38. In this organization, customer input directly influences our decisions.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

39. In this organization, all members have a deep understanding of customer wants and needs.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

40. In this organization, the interests of the customer often get ignored in our decisions.

1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Neutral
4 = Disagree
5 = Strongly Disagree

41. In this organization, we encourage direct contact with customers by our people.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree
### 42. In this organization, we view failure as an opportunity for learning and improvement.

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Neutral  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree

### 43. In this organization, innovation and risk taking are encouraged and rewarded.

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Neutral  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree

### 44. In this organization, lots of things "fall between the cracks".

1 = Strongly Agree  
2 = Agree  
3 = Neutral  
4 = Disagree  
5 = Strongly Disagree

### 45. In this organization, learning is an important objective in our day-to-day work.

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Neutral  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree

### 46. In this organization, we make certain that the "right hand knows what the left hand is doing".

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Neutral  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree
47. In this organization, there is a long-term purpose and direction.
   1 = Strongly Disagree
   2 = Disagree
   3 = Neutral
   4 = Agree
   5 = Strongly Agree

48. In this organization, our strategy leads other organizations to change the way they compete in the industry.
   1 = Strongly Disagree
   2 = Disagree
   3 = Neutral
   4 = Agree
   5 = Strongly Agree

49. In this organization, there is a clear mission that gives meaning and direction to our work.
   1 = Strongly Disagree
   2 = Disagree
   3 = Neutral
   4 = Agree
   5 = Strongly Agree

50. In this organization, there is a clear strategy for the future.
   1 = Strongly Disagree
   2 = Disagree
   3 = Neutral
   4 = Agree
   5 = Strongly Agree

51. In this organization, our strategic direction is unclear to me.
   1 = Strongly Agree
   2 = Agree
   3 = Neutral
   4 = Disagree
   5 = Strongly Disagree
*52. In this organization, there is widespread agreement about goals.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

*53. In this organization leaders set goals that are ambitious, but realistic.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

*54. In this organization, the leadership has "gone on record" about the objectives we are trying to meet.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

*55. In this organization, we continuously track our progress against our stated goals.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

*56. In this organization, people understand what needs to be done for us to succeed in the long run.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree
### Organizational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>57. In this organization, we have a shared vision of what the organization will be like in the future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>58. In this organization, leaders have a long-term viewpoint.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>59. In this organization, short-term thinking often compromises our long-term vision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>60. In this organization, our vision creates excitement and motivation for our employees.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>61. In this organization, we are able to meet short-term demands without compromising our long-term vision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>