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ABSTRACT

Human service organizations (HSOs) are increasingly being called upon to demonstrate their effectiveness. Yet there is both an absence of appropriate management models for HSOs and often a lack of recognition of inherent differences among HSOs. One important dimension on which HSOs can be differentiated is operational certainty, defined here as environmental certainty, technological determinacy and formal structuralization. Two descriptions of office skills-training programs were developed, to represent each end of the operational certainty dimension. A college-based office skills-training program was described with high environmental certainty, high technological determinacy and high formal structuralization and a community-based office skills-training program was described with low environmental certainty, low technological determinacy and low formal structuralization. It was hypothesized that while effectiveness in all organizations may be characterized by a single set of dimensions, the priority of the dimensions and the content and quantity of specific criteria used to define each dimension would be perceived to vary as a function of operational certainty. The purpose of the first part of the study was to empirically identify, using a group of experts, the most essential criteria for low and high operational certainty organizations. The goals of the second part of the study were to validate the initial findings with a group
reduce the number of indicators to a more meaningful set. As hypothesized, both participant groups identified more indicators as essential for the effectiveness of the community-based organization than for the college. Rather than two distinct sets of indicators, participants perceived numerous indicators as highly important to the community-based organization and a small subset of these indicators as moderately important to the college. Further, the indicators perceived as most important on each dimension varied for the two organizations. Although the relative priority of dimensions tended to vary, HSO staff and managers unexpectedly identified Human Relations as the overriding priority for both described organizations. The overall perception appeared to be that achieving effectiveness in low operational certainty organizations, such as the described community-based organization, requires attention to far greater detail than in high operational certainty organizations, such as the described college. In this latter case, monitoring of a few indicators was perceived as an acceptable approach. Implications for the evaluation and development of programs are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

This study examines the impact of operational certainty on the conceptualization and measurement of organizational effectiveness. The basic premise of the study is that although the effectiveness of all organizations may be composed of the same ultimate dimensions, their relative priority and the criteria defining the dimensions differ as a function of operational certainty.

To examine this premise, the study focused on one specific type of organization, the human service organization (HSO), defined here as a public and/or government funded nonprofit organization which provides health, education and welfare services (Stein, 1981). The human services constitute one of the largest and fastest growing occupational areas in Canada and the United States (Barber, 1986; Borst & Montana, 1977; Drucker, 1977; Gowdy, 1988; Werther, Davis, Schwind, Das, & Miner, 1985). In Canada, with the commitment to social welfare and increasing emphasis on tertiary industry, the human service organization will likely play an increasingly vital role.

Two key issues underscore the importance of closely examining effectiveness concerns in HSOs. First, despite their growing importance, an outpouring of dollars into the human services in the 1960's and
1970's resulted in only equivocal findings regarding program success. (See Orr, 1985, for a more extensive discussion.) Second, despite the recognized importance of HSOs, the pool of funds directed at supporting the provision of their services is shrinking (e.g., Abbott, 1990; Beckhard & Pritchard, 1992; Field & Dubey, 1987; Murray, 1987). Due to these government cutbacks, a lack of demonstrable program results, and the consequent demand for accountability, HSOs requesting government funding, both in Canada and the United States, are currently required to provide evidence of program effectiveness (Fallon, 1974; Hasenfeld, 1983; Reid, 1988).

Although the task of examining and demonstrating organizational effectiveness in HSOs may seem reasonably straightforward, in fact two issues greatly complicate the matter. First, although concern with organizational effectiveness can be traced back to the early 1900's, most theories of organizational effectiveness were developed with a vision of the commercial profit-making organization (CO), specifically the manufacturing organization. In these types of organizations effectiveness is expressed in quantifiable, measurable terms (e.g., rate of production, profit margin, [Austin, 1981; Barber, 1986; Harshbarger, 1974; Hasenfeld, 1983; Malka, 1989]).

Davis (1983), cited in Bowen and Cummings (1990), claims that "using industrial models to manage service-based corporations makes as
little sense as using farm models to run factories" (p. 1). Whereas the service aspect undoubtedly impacts on organizational management and functioning, at least both manufacturing and service COs have a common bottom line: profit making. HSOs find themselves in a further predicament. As service organizations, HSOs face the same problems as service-oriented COs, but in addition lack a profit-oriented bottom line. Whereas they may clearly want to break even financially, results and goals are not directly translatable into profit. According to Murray (1987), HSOs have been left to "muddle through" (p. 19), in the absence of an ideal model of a well-managed HSO (Austin, 1981; Barber, 1986; Gowdy, 1988; Manka, 1989; Patti, 1983; Sugarman, 1988). Clearly, HSOs and COs share certain characteristics, however, critical differences do exist, both within and between categories (Austin, 1981; Cyert, 1975; Drucker, 1977; Gummer, 1985; Hasenfeld & English, 1974; Levinson, 1987; McConkey, 1977; Solomon, 1986; Wolf, 1987). In short, there is a shortage of research and a lack of consensus and understanding of what organizational effectiveness means from a human service perspective (Herman & Heimovics, 1991; Murray, 1987).

The second complicating issue is that when HSOs have received separate attention, they have been grouped together and frequently stereotyped as large bureaucracies. For example, Harshbarger (1974) provides a list of HSO characteristics (i.e., resource base, the
organization itself [such as type of power, structure, task definition, job
tenure, output, nature of member involvement], beneficiaries, and
organization ecology) meant to distinguish them from COs. Upon closer
scrutiny, it becomes clear that many of these characteristics pertain only
to a subset of HSOs—those which operate in relatively certain
environments. For example, Harshbarger claims that resource stability in
HSOs is affected only by relatively long term economic fluctuations and
that the potential for risk and loss is relatively low. Similarly, he claims
that job tenure is in widespread use in HSOs, whereas in COs it is
limited or nonexistent. Whereas these characteristics may hold for
organizations such as community colleges, the Salvation Army and the
Children's Aid Society, they would not hold for those HSOs that spring up
in response to a particular new government policy direction or a recently
identified need and hence operate in uncertainty, such as community-
based training programs, food banks, multicultural projects, and teen talk
lines.

In fact, the issue of effectiveness raises one important distinction
among HSOs. Demands for proof of effectiveness and shrinking
financial resources do not impinge on all HSOs equally. Some HSOs
seem to continue to thrive, despite a lack of definitive evidence of
program effectiveness, whereas others fall by the wayside. Whereas
some HSOs are constantly forced to justify their existence, others seem
to enjoy a relatively secure existence and seem able to ignore the demands of strategic constituencies (Cameron, 1986; Herman & Heimovics, 1991).

It is proposed in the present paper that this apparent difference in HSO insulation from external demands exemplifies how HSOs differ in terms of the certainty with which they operate. It is also proposed that certainty of operation is comprised of three variables—technological determinacy, environmental certainty, and formal structuralization—that, as structural contingency theory would predict, play critical roles in determining how organizational effectiveness is conceptualized, measured, and achieved.

The technology of an organization may be defined as a series of procedures designed to transform raw material from one state to another in a predetermined manner (Hasenfeld & English, 1974; Martinko & Tolchinsky, 1982). **Technological determinacy** is a function of three major variables: the extent to which desired outcomes are tangible and well defined; the degree of stability and invariability of raw materials; and the quantity and quality of knowledge available about raw material and the predictability of treatment outcomes (e.g., Glisson, 1978). Consistent with Perrow (1967), for example, who summarizes all three dimensions, **technological determinacy** is defined in this paper as the extent to which the internal operations of the organization have certain
effects and are standardized, routinized, and predictable.

At the root of environmental certainty is the organization's concern for a continued flow of resources. It hinges on political and financial factors and reflects the notion of change, namely stability and turbulence, in the surrounding environment (e.g., Szilagyi & Wallace, 1980). To define the term most meaningfully for the organizations used in the present study, environmental certainty was operationally defined as the degree to which an organization is assured of its inputs (funding and clients) and can predict and control the impact of the environment.

Formal structuralization is defined in this paper as centralization of decision making—the extent to which decision making takes place at the upper echelons of the organization (e.g., Azma & Mansfield, 1981), vertical differentiation—the number of hierarchical levels (e.g., Hall, 1982), and formalization—the division of labour and procedural specifications (e.g., Glisson, 1978). This variable is the only one of the three that is under organizational control.

Organizational effectiveness is actually comprised of two components: management/administrative effectiveness and effectiveness of the organization's "business." The former component is concerned with the nuts and bolts of organizational functioning. Mills and Moberg (1990) refer to this component as the "outside-in" or strategic management paradigm, and Egan (1993) labels this component the
"organization." It includes issues related to human resource management, organizational management and adaptation. It is likely that environmental certainty would have its greatest impact on this component. The latter component, business effectiveness, is concerned with whether the organization is achieving its "production" goals, either in terms of goods or services. Egan (1993) similarly labels this component the "business," and Mills and Moberg (1990) refer to this component as the "inside-out" or technology management paradigm. Its focus is on designing an effective service delivery system. Technological determinacy would likely impact most strongly here. The appropriate choice of structure probably influences both organizational effectiveness components. Figure 1, based on a previous model of Bowen and Cummings' (1990), illustrates how all organization components tie into effectiveness. In point of fact, strategic management and organization and human resource management are aspects of management effectiveness, while operation management and marketing are aspects of business (or service) effectiveness. All components have to be functioning well in order for an organization to be effective.

In the case of COs, profit can serve as a measure of both components. For example, if clients choose not to buy a product or service, then the "business" would be deemed ineffective, since profit would be low. Similarly, there would be an absence of client and
Figure 1. Modified version of Bowen and Cummings' (1990) - Two components of organizational effectiveness: Management and service effectiveness.
financial resources to feed back into the system to keep it functioning. In other words, because CO clients pay for products or services, there is a direct connection between inputs, processes and outcomes. Lack of profit serves as a direct signal that management processes may be ineffective, inefficient, or irrelevant. Specifically, an absence of profit may indicate that either marketing, planning, and/or decision making are falling far short of the mark. Because in COs it is the shareholders/owners who must ultimately be satisfied with any management decision, the connection between profit and management is obvious.

HSOs do not have a comparable measure that simultaneously reflects both management and "business" effectiveness. Clients do not fund the services and hence the HSO must technically satisfy two different groups to be considered effective: clients (service/business effectiveness) and funders (management effectiveness). A program may be helping clients but if funders choose not to support it, it would cease to exist. HSOs must pursue "business" goals, but they must also be proficient in the political marketplace. Hence, measuring effectiveness in HSOs is a far more demanding task than is the case for COs. Further, it is the most demanding task in uncertain HSOs which require the highest level of monitoring.

The present study examined perceived organizational effectiveness in two prototypical organizations described as sharing the
common goal of teaching office skills. These two organizations were purposely polarized in terms of the certainty with which they operate, that is, in terms of technological determinacy, environmental certainty, and formal organizational structuralization. The choice of skills-training programs as the basis for hypothesis testing seemed ideal, given the range of organizations offering such programs, from relatively bureaucratic community colleges to innovative community-based agencies. As a result, descriptions could be based on actual organizations, increasing the external validity of the study. Two different perspectives were consulted in deriving sets of HSO-specific criteria that could be used in subsequent development of measures. Experts in the field (academics, consultants, government professionals, and other individuals associated with government initiatives) served as the first group of study participants and reduced a vast array of effectiveness criteria to what they perceived to be the most important criteria for each organization. Subsequently, the staff of actual skills-training organizations used the refined item pool and identified what they believed to be the most essential indicators of effectiveness.

**Human Service Organizations**

The following literature review discusses three issues: how HSOs are different from COs; how HSOs differ from each other; and how both of these differences influence the conceptualization, measurement and
achievement of effectiveness.

**HSO - CO Differences**

According to Hasenfeld and English (1974) and Hasenfeld (1983), HSOs are distinct from COs by virtue of two fundamental characteristics. First, while COs work with inanimate raw material, the subject of HSOs' change, processing or sustaining is people. While some COs, such as private, profit-making nursing homes, may have inputs and outputs involving humans, all HSOs by definition must have them. Second, the general mandate of HSOs is to provide a service. Again, one can invoke profit-making nursing homes as an example of COs that provide services, but service provision is not, in fact, their primary mandate. Their mandate, and that of all COs is making a profit, that is, earning money for the owners (Anthony, 1977; Collin, 1987; Friedlander & Pickle, 1968; Gummer, 1985; Solomon, 1986; Weiner, 1990; Wolf, 1987). This key point is where service-oriented COs and HSOs differ. Although there have been arguments that HSOs take financial considerations into account as well (e.g., Drucker, 1989; Egan, 1993), these financial concerns are of a decidedly different nature (Herman & Heimovics, 1991). It is obviously of concern for an HSO to be financially viable; however, goals are not stated primarily in financial terms (Wolf, 1987). An HSO's strategy is not based on money, nor is money the centre of HSO plans (Drucker, 1989).
Although this section is intended to elucidate HSO and CO differences, it must be pointed out up front that differences within each broad category complicate the discussion. These differences will be briefly touched on in the immediately following discussion, but will be discussed in greater depth in the subsequent section. Whereas Stein's (1981) definition of HSOs as nonprofit organizations dealing with health, education and welfare issues tends to promote the idea that HSOs differ only in the services they provide, actually, all organizations differ even within service categories. Just as there is a range of manufacturing COs, from job shops to assembly lines, clearly there is a parallel range of service COs, for example, from fast food chains to specialty restaurants that customize services (Sasser & Fulmer, 1990). HSOs also range from highly standardized bureaucracies such as government departments, hospitals, and community colleges to HSOs with more customized services such as community-based skills-training programs, multicultural projects and emergency drop-in centres.

In fact, HSOs have been categorized along a number of dimensions. In the most comprehensive treatment of the subject, Hasenfeld and Enright (1974) and Hasenfeld (1983) point out differences in HSOs in terms of extent of interest in the client, function of the organization, type of client compliance system, and adequacy of client functioning. However, the authors tend to ignore HSOs that have
relatively low degrees of environmental certainty, technological
determinacy, and formal structuralization. This focus on the "certain"
HSOs, those that are comparatively more routinized and structured and
have more tangible goals, is reflected in most of the research on HSOs.

While some organizations do "mature" from organic, flexible types
of organizations to more routinized types of organizations (see, for
example, Kimberly, Miles & Associates, 1980; Mintzberg, 1991; Quinn,
1988; Smith & Gannon, 1987), some organizations continue to function
effectively in uncertain environments with indeterminate technology and
without establishing formal structures.

Perhaps it is this treatment of HSOs (and COs) as undifferentiated
groups that has fueled the debate regarding whether there are
substantive differences between HSOs and COs. Even those writers
who question the existence of differences often end up by pointing them
out. For example, Levinson (1987) discusses the debate raging among
management theorists as to whether there is a different "mentality"
between the two types of organizations, but acknowledges a general
acceptance of "size" and "complexity" as distinguishing characteristics,
implying that COs are larger and less complex than HSOs. However,
Levinson is clearly envisioning a specific type of HSO, since there are
small, simple COs (e.g., corner stores), and small, simple HSOs (e.g.,
social groups), as well as large, complex HSOs (e.g., government
departments) and large, complex COs (e.g., multi-national organizations).

Cyert (1975) makes the same assumption that HSOs are all complex, in his argument that there are more similarities than differences between HSOs and other "complex" organizations, although he acknowledges profound differences in the areas of defining and increasing productivity, controlling resources, budgeting, and performance evaluation. Similarly, Solomon (1986) states that management functions in private (CO) and public (HSO) settings are conceptually similar, but concedes that "effective management of private and public organizations would depend on different criteria because each must adapt to different environmental contingencies" (p. 247).

Wolf (1987) believes that nonprofit managers must learn the same management techniques and analytical strategies that apply in the profit sector, but their application is dissimilar. Drucker (1977) states that in terms of management functions and leadership roles, the service organization is not very different from a business. He then paradoxically delineates differences between HSOs and COs in terms of purpose, values, needs, objectives, and contribution to society. In his perception, the biggest difference is in the way the organizations are paid: COs are paid for satisfying clients, HSOs are paid out of a general revenue stream "not specifically tied to what they are doing" (p. 22).

In an interview with Abbott (1990), Theodore Cooper, Upjohn
Company Chief Executive and past provost of Cornell University Medical College, makes the point, on the basis of his own experience, that "there is a lot of commonality in the management of all large organizations... the fundamentals are similar" (p. 68). The same can be said for all small ones. Still, there are fundamental characteristics which bind HSOs and COs to their respective categories.

Even with the growing recognition that service organizations have unique strategic issues (Bowen, Chase & Cummings, 1990), there is a long-term unity of vision that binds together all COs, whether they are mature or immature, service-, product-, or even research-oriented: profit-making (Cameron, 1986). Hence, organizational effectiveness can be assessed by variables such as return on investment, sales, profit margins, market share, and other easily calculated measures (Wolf, 1987). There are, as well, defining characteristics of HSOs. However, it is argued here that the nature of the differences across HSOs and the lack of across-the-board quantifiable measures means that different criteria of organizational effectiveness will be important across HSOs.

**Differences Among HSOs**

Although HSOs can be distinguished from COs, there are variations among HSOs as well. As has been previously stated, HSOs cover a wide range. At one end of the range are relatively well entrenched organizations with invariant structure and operating
procedures, such as the traditional community college or hospital. The other end of the range is marked by small experimental programs, with innovative, flexible modes of delivering services and nonformalized structures, such as skills-training programs aimed at disadvantaged groups (e.g., job training and development programs for street youths) and community-based health centres targeting the hard-to-reach public. This example well illustrates Stein's (1981) argument that gross contrasts exist not only between organizations in different service sectors, but between organizations within the same field (i.e., training and health care).

Whereas a number of variables have been outlined on which HSO differences can be assessed, one important dimension indirectly or directly touched on by several researchers is the certainty with which the organization operates. Weiner's (1990) categorization of HSOs in terms of size captures a host of other distinctions that parallel the certainty of operation classification outlined in Figure 2. His classification scheme moves from centres, to agencies, to institutions, to bureaucracies, and correspondingly the organization becomes more formally structured and technology would seem to become more determinate.

Salancik's (1981) work similarly supports the Figure 2 model. He distinguishes between HSOs in terms of the determinacy of the base technology, dividing HSOs into three categories: health-related,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSO</th>
<th>CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*service provision mandate</td>
<td>*profit making mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*public/mixed goods</td>
<td>*private goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*human raw material</td>
<td>*human or inanimate raw material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*external dependence</td>
<td>*internally driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ambiguous goals</td>
<td>*unambiguous goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>Car Manufacturer (e.g., GM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Environmental Certainty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Technological Determinacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Formal Structur-ization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Low                          | Community-Based Skills-Training Program | Custom Design Car Accessory Shop (Family Owned) |

**Figure 2.** Classification of HSOs and COs in terms of Certainty of Operation
education, and other. (The "other" category is comprised of social services, such as welfare and drug abuse programs, that aim to modify social and economic inequalities or reduce social and economic problems.) If one considers his three categories in terms of Figure 2, whereas education and health-related HSOs fall towards the high end of all three operational certainty variables (upper left hand quadrant), the "other" category is characterized by low degrees of environmental certainty, technological determinacy, and formal structuralization (lower left hand quadrant). Presumably, it is the traditional forms of schooling and health organizations to which he is referring, since holistic medicine with its disputable results, and unconventional delivery clearly does not have determinate technology.

According to Salancik, for health-related HSOs there exists a base technology for determining appropriate treatments, an established method for demonstrating effectiveness, and regulated accountability or standards of operating procedures. Education HSOs have a base technology, though it is not developed to the same extent as that of health-related HSOs, and standards of operating structures. It is known that certain elements, such as books and teachers, must be present for effective service. For "other" HSOs there is no base technology so there is no methodology for verifying or demonstrating the effectiveness of a particular process, or even of a treatment versus no treatment. Further,
there are only standard operating "myths," unproven beliefs about what works.

The fact that different operating standards characterize different HSOs has further implications. Both health and educational HSOs are conservative with respect to innovation; basic changes in core technologies occur slowly. In the case of health, change is slow because deviation from standards of practice are rare, but a verified new practice is easily incorporated. In the case of education, innovation is frequent, but the isolation of structure (e.g., teachers in different classrooms or schools) protects the system from change. For this reason, authors have referred to schools as "loosely coupled," meaning that structure is disconnected from technical activity, and activity is disconnected from effects (Cameron, 1986; Cameron & Whetten, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1978).

With "other" services, innovation is supported because it is aimed at solving problems whose solutions are unknown. Because of the unknown element and the fact that the organization must satisfy disparate societal interests to keep going (i.e., be politically responsive), the labels of treatment and programs serviced by such organizations should change frequently to be effective. If the organizational form of HSOs depends on the technological core, then stable forms of social service organizations (with high environmental certainty, high
technological determinacy and high formal structuralization) cannot develop until the technological core develops.

Perrow's (1970) HSO technology-based classification scheme also focuses on the certainty with which the organization operates. According to Perrow, technology is a function of both the perceived stability and uniformity of clients and the extent of knowledge regarding intervention procedures. The first concern is whether the clients are perceived to be stable and uniform, such that there is a perception of low variability in needs across clients, or unstable and nonuniform, such that there is perceived to be high variability in needs across clients. The second concern is whether the knowledge of intervention procedures is complete and the perceived nature of the raw material is well understood, or incomplete with poorly understood raw material. Hence, four cells are identified. The two cells which are important to the present discussion parallel the two poles of the operational certainty dimension. When clients have low variability and are well understood, technology can be routinized and determinate, such as in a vocational training program in a college. When clients are highly variable, and poorly understood, each must be treated as a unique case and have "treatment" fashioned around them, such as in an elite psychiatric agency, or in training programs targeted towards atypical, special needs students.

Sasser and Fulmer (1990) also present a model that mirrors the
certainty of operation model outlined in Figure 2. Originally proposed to
describe the range of service COs, it is also applicable to HSOs. The
essence of their model is that as the volume of work for an organization
grows and standardization increases, the work becomes more assembly-
line like. Hence, at the end of the continuum representing low volume,
low standardization, one of a kind service, Sasser and Fulmer describe
the appropriate process type as the flexible job shop. They provide the
example of a French restaurant. At the other extreme, they refer to a
high volume, high standardization service, and describe the process type
as assembly-line. In this instance, they provide the example of a fast
food restaurant: McDonald’s. Parallels can be drawn with community-
based, customized training at one end of the continuum, versus the more
standardized college training at the other end.

Quinn (1988) also touches on the operational certainty dimension
in his discussion of organization developmental stages. According to
him, effective entrepreneurial organizations should remain flexible, while
effective, more developed, formalized organizations should focus on
stability, rules, and efficiency. While the present discussion is not
concerned with development per se, the underlying dimension of
certainty, establishment and acceptance in one’s milieu is the same.

The delineated examples reflect a general, underlying acceptance
that while flexible, nonformalized forms of organizations are more
appropriate when the environment is uncertain and technology is indeterminate, formal structures are more appropriate in operationally-certain circumstances. The next section examines how an organization's level of operational certainty influences effectiveness, beginning with a review of the literature, focused on the "effective" management/administration of organizations. Because COs, rather than HSOs, have served as the basis for these theories, the "business" perspective of organization effectiveness is implicitly addressed. Recent pertinent findings regarding CO service organizations are also discussed. Subsequently examined is the limited HSO-specific effectiveness literature, which is mostly from a sociological or social work perspective (Herman & Heimovics, 1991; Martin, 1988; Reisman, 1986; Solomon, 1986; Sugarman, 1988). Specific issues regarding effectiveness arise for HSOs, due to the nature of their distinguishing characteristics, but the fact that some characteristics may be more exemplary of some types of HSOs than of others is seldom recognized in the literature. To address this shortcoming, the models of effectiveness are considered here specifically from an HSO perspective and implications for organizational effectiveness are outlined.
Organizational Effectiveness

The differences between HSOs and COs preclude the wholesale acceptance of CO based models and theories for HSOs. As implied by the model of HSOs and COs described in Figure 2, criteria and predictors of organizational effectiveness should differ, depending on the quadrant in which an organization falls. However, efforts to evaluate HSO effectiveness have had three main shortcomings. Some efforts have focused only on service effectiveness and ignored management effectiveness. Other evaluators have relied on theoretical models and empirical measures taken directly from assessments of organizational effectiveness in COs, particularly manufacturing COs, which fall in the upper right hand quadrant of Figure 2. Alternatively, writers have described the implementation of a management method without examining either the effects of the described method or the rationale for choosing the method. There has been little research to validate management methods in HSOs (Sugarman, 1988) and the literature on effectiveness does not provide much concrete help to administrators (Edwards, Faerman, & McGrath, 1986).

According to Rapp, Hardcastle, Rosenzweig, and Poertner's (1983) review of the human services management literature, less than half of the reviewed articles even mentioned the effects of implementing a particular method, and the authors report the same concerns five years
later (Rapp & Poertner, 1988). That situation does not seem to have changed much to date. There seems to be a general view that a topic is worthwhile if it is logical, reasonable, and related to organizations or human services; the focus is on understanding rather than on managing HSOs (Rapp, Hardcastle, Rosenzweig, & Poertner, 1983).

Competing theories have been advanced to explain organizational effectiveness in COs. However, if these theories are traced from their classical roots (e.g., Gulick & Urwick, 1937; Taylor, 1911; Weber, 1947), through human relations theories (e.g., Argyris, 1964; Likert, 1967; Maslow, 1954; McGregor, 1960; Ouchi, 1981) right up to present day contingency theories (e.g., Burns & Stalker, 1961; Emery & Trist, 1960; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Mahoney & Frost, 1974; Woodward, 1965), the focus has consistently been on profit maximization. That is, regardless of what has been theorized to enter into the equation, whether it is the classical approach of division of labour, hierarchy, and rules and regulations, the human relations approach of job satisfaction, communication and participation in decision making, or structural contingency theory predictions that the more uncertain the environment, the less bureaucratic the effective organization should be, the end result has always been measured in terms of financial considerations.

This focus on financial considerations is perhaps what led Cameron (1986) to make the important point that: "assessment problems
and theoretical issues (regarding CO effectiveness) are largely the concern of researchers, not of managers and the lay public" (p. 88). At least from a management perspective (and to the lay public) there is some consensus as to what effectiveness means for a CO. The bottom line is: COs exist to make a profit for their owners (Anthony, 1977; Baum & Parihar, 1984; Collin, 1987; Friedlander & Pickle, 1968; Gummer, 1988; Herman & Heimovics, 1991; Murray, 1987; Solomon, 1986; Weiner, 1990; Wolf, 1987). Definitions of organizational effectiveness should consequently revolve around the concept of profit (and/or productivity) (Anthony, 1977; Mohr, 1973; Patti, 1988; Solomon, 1986). Mohr (1982) points out the commonly held belief that "as long as the company is turning a profit, it must be meeting all relevant goals" (p. 228). This index can be further buttressed with measurements of variables such as market share, size of population served, return on investment, sales, number of new acquisitions, and debt-equity ratios (e.g., Patti, 1988; Wolf, 1987).

Although the use of financially related indices of organizational effectiveness has, to a certain extent, circumvented the need to examine differences in COs as they relate to measuring and predicting organizational effectiveness, it also has led to attempts at "universal" approaches to organizational effectiveness in HSOs. That is, differences in HSOs are rarely addressed with respect to implications for
effectiveness. Since structural contingency theory identifies the same variables that serve to distinguish between HSOs (namely environment, technology, and structure) as important to organizational effectiveness, it will be used as the framework for examining effectiveness in HSOs.

It is argued here that although all organizations are concerned with survival and viability, this concern is played out differently in, and differentially impacts on, COs and HSOs depending on their levels of environmental certainty, technological determinacy, and formal structuralization. For COs, profit and related indices of effectiveness imply survival and viability, since there is a direct connection between profit and survival/viability. HSOs that have high levels of environmental certainty, technological determinacy, and formal structuralization, as a result of their long histories, enjoy a relatively secure position and are less concerned with survival than with other goals. They also are less concerned with survival than are their counterpart HSOs that have low levels of environmental certainty, technological determinacy, and formal structuralization. For example, traditionally hospitals have rarely faced the prospect of closure. (Clearly, given the recent recessionary times, even traditionally secure HSOs, such as hospitals, are faced with considerably more uncertainty, and hence cutbacks.) Schools are another good example of this kind of HSO, being "a network of organizations that has grown rapidly for many decades, that obtains
huge economic resources in a reasonably stable way year after year, that is protected from failure by laws that make its use compulsory" (Meyers & Rowan, 1978, p. 89). In HSOs with low technological determinacy, low environmental certainty, and low formal structuralization, survival is always a pressing concern because of accountability requirements, their policy driven existence, and often their lack of history. Herman and Heimovics (1991) capture the essence of the point in their statement that nonprofits are more likely to die than government agencies. While the specific terms used differ from those in the present study, it is clear from Herman and Heimovics' discussion that in the first instance (nonprofits), it is operationally-uncertain, community-based HSOs to which they are referring, and in the second instance (agencies), operationally-certain, "mainstream" HSOs are being discussed.

Finch (1978) also touches on this idea of the tug between a survival focus and other potentially conflicting demands in his depiction of six possible administrative priorities in HSOs: expansion of the number of clients served; quality improvement; enhancing staff morale; cost minimization; new program and service development; and increased accountability to funding sources. When administrative concerns focus upon increasing the number of clients served, there is a decreased ability to address the other priorities. Concerns with minimizing costs and
increasing accountability similarly detract from other priorities.

Despite the use of profit and financial considerations as indicators of organizational effectiveness by lay people and owners, and the consequent failure to distinguish between management and business effectiveness, first for COs and then for HSOs, a number of competing operational models of organizational effectiveness have been advanced from a theoretical viewpoint. These models will be examined from an HSO perspective.

Operational Models of Organizational Effectiveness

Even if the ultimate criterion of CO effectiveness is profit and despite the implicit profit focus in most theories of organizational effectiveness, there still exists considerable theoretical debate as to how organizational effectiveness is to be operationalized both in COs and particularly in HSOs (Cameron, 1986). There is no clear consensus as to what is meant specifically by organizational effectiveness, nor how it is best measured (e.g., Bryman, 1989; Cameron & Whetten, 1983; Edwards, Faerman & McGrath, 1986; Elkin & Molitor, 1985; Quinn, 1988). For example, structural contingency theory predicts that an effective organization matches structure, context and environment but organizational effectiveness is not operationally defined.

Generally, the literature is marked by disagreement about what properties/dimensions are encompassed by organizational effectiveness
and whether it is uni- or multi-dimensional (Cameron & Whetten, 1983; Coulter, 1979; Elkin & Molitor, 1985; 1985; Goodman & Pennings, 1977; Kahn, 1977; Kimberly & Rottman, 1987; Mohr, 1982). Uni-dimensional views vary from the degree to which an organization reaches its goals (Etzioni, 1964) to the ability of an organization to adapt to, manipulate, or fulfill expectations of the external environment (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Multi-dimensional views similarly vary from criteria of adaptability, flexibility, productivity, satisfaction, profit, resource acquisition, and absence of strain (Steers, 1975), to the organization's ability to adapt, grow, survive, and maintain itself regardless of function (Schein, 1970).

To further complicate the issue, what have been used in some instances to operationally define organizational effectiveness (as an outcome variable), others have used as predictors of organizational effectiveness (Goodman & Pennings, 1977). For example, one element of Steers' (1975) definition of organizational effectiveness is satisfaction of organization members. Others (e.g., Miller, 1980; Pennings, 1975) predict that organization member job satisfaction is important insofar as it leads to organizational effectiveness (operationally defined in a number of ways). In the case of COs, all of these facets of effectiveness are integrally and ultimately related to profit, so the lack of consensus poses a greater problem with HSOs.

The classification scheme (Table 1) proposed by Quinn and
Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) is the most comprehensive treatment of the various proposed models of organizational effectiveness. It has certain unique aspects but shares common elements with other classification schemes (e.g., Astley & Van de Ven, 1983; Campbell, 1977; Coulter, 1979; Edwards, Faerman & McGrath, 1986; Goodman & Pennings, 1977; Hall, 1980; Kahn, 1977; Mohr, 1982; Molnar & Rogers, 1976; Scott, 1977; Seashore, 1983). It proposes four models of organizational effectiveness, each reflecting a different conceptualization. These models are actually compatible, and are conceptualized here as different facets of the organization process—from input to goals.

**Goal attainment model.** The goal attainment model of organizational effectiveness conceives of a rational organization, with a clear set of goals. Organizational effectiveness is equated with goal attainment, or the degree to which an organization is attaining its internally determined objectives (Georgopoulos & Mann, 1963; Georgopoulos & Tannenbaum, 1957; Mott, 1972; Perrow, 1961). According to Scott (1977), a mechanical model is implied, typically with emphasis on productivity and efficiency. The relevance of this approach for COs is clear, if goal is equated with profit, and it has been the most often endorsed model from a CO perspective (Keeley, 1984; Sung, 1985).
Table 1

**Models of Organizational Effectiveness Based on Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Definition of organizational effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Attainment</td>
<td>Goal attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rational Goal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>Satisfaction of members; morale; cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Process</td>
<td>Internal health of organization; quality of internal communication; quality of routine procedures; self monitoring of members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open System</td>
<td>Ability of organization to adapt; acquisition of scarce resources; adjusting to external changes; satisfaction of strategic constituencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From an HSO perspective, the goal attainment model may appear at first glance also to be straightforward and ideal. Since programs are set up to serve a particular purpose, one need simply see if the purpose is being met. However, two global problems are associated with this model, particularly when applied to HSOs. First, the management component of effectiveness is completely ignored. Second, given variable production inputs (i.e., clients), defining HSO goals and documenting human changes is not as well developed a process as is documenting profits from the sale of tangible outputs and is clearly a more serious problem in certain kinds of HSOs.

Bowen and Cummings (1990) have pointed out that in service COs the intangibility of service makes it difficult for management, employees and customers to assess output and quality. As a consequence, organizational climate is important in shaping both customers' and front line employees' attitudes about process and outcomes of service delivery. Although the same can be said for HSOs, Wolf (1987) further points out with respect to nonprofit HSOs: "unlike management issues in the profit sector which tend to be clear and related to specific economic measures, issues...are more nebulous because they relate to the abstract concept of public service" (p. 2), and are primarily commitments to certain values, norms, and ideologies (Hasenfeld & English, 1974). Since the mission centres around public
service, it is more difficult to define purposes—to identify and articulate the mission—and it is hard to find the proper yardstick to measure success in achieving this mission (Baum & Parihar, 1984; Patti, 1988; Sugarman, 1988; Wolf, 1987). For example, Murray (1987) questions what it means "to develop good citizenship in our youth" (p.20)—a goal he has encountered with many youth-oriented HSOs. Another example is whether the goal of an employment skills-training program for visible minority women is to change society's prejudiced attitudes; to encourage clients to return to school; to keep clients off welfare; or simply to project the appearance of doing something about a problem without having to change entrenched institutions.

Scott (1977) claims that since HSOs often lack reliable and valid measures of goal related effectiveness (particularly those that can be quantified), they tend to develop measures of effectiveness that are only indirectly related to the product goal of the organization. These approximate or indirect measures focus on processes rather than outcomes (number of clients processed or changed); efficiency rather than effectiveness (such as cost per client served); or client satisfaction and while they may all be important indices, they cannot always provide unambiguous and specific answers to questions of organizational effectiveness (Wolf, 1987), particularly when the organization is uncertain and the links from inputs through to goals are poorly established.
Clearly the problems and ambiguity in defining HSO goals (Grasso & Epstein, 1988; Hasenfeld & English, 1974; Martinko & Tolchinsky, 1982; Sarri, 1982) do not impact on all HSOs equally. In the literature, ultimate and output goals have been confused. Actually, there have been some advances in developing client outcome measures (e.g., Rapp & Poertner, 1988), but these have typically been in HSOs that have determinate technology, certain environments and formal organizational structures.

But also, in operationally-certain HSOs, it has been either proven or accepted by convention that the technologies used will lead to desired outcomes. As a result, focusing on processes is not the serious problem it is in HSOs with low environmental certainty, low technological determinacy, and low formal structuralization, since processes can serve as surrogate measures of outcomes. The use of processes as surrogate measures was the same notion discussed with respect to Salancik's (1981) use of standards of operating procedures and standards of structure as effectiveness yardsticks.

A final problem with HSO goal definition is that a number of different constituencies with disparate expectations and different and often competing criteria for assessing organizational effectiveness have stakes in the organization (Edwards, Faerman, & McGrath, 1986). Organizations define output goals in relation to a given task environment
— the set of organizations and groups with which the organization interacts and exchanges resources and services (Hasenfeld, 1983; Herman & Heimovics, 1991) in order to attain necessary inputs (e.g., knowledge, clients, and funding), to dispose of their outputs (clients processed, sustained, or changed) and to maintain the organization as a viable system. Organizations processing inanimate objects are more likely to obtain consensus between the task environment and their own personnel as to their output goals. HSOs' task environment is composed of a multitude of social groups and other formal organizations that have an interest in, or relations with, clients. Yet each social group or organization defines its own expectations regarding what should be done for, or to the clients, on the basis of its particular value system and interests (Herman & Heimovics, 1991; Reid, 1988; Whetten, 1978).

The multiple and sometimes conflicting goals (Finch, 1978; Hasenfeld & English, 1974) resulting from having to handle numerous constituencies and funders (Murray, 1987) is why many writers state that discussions of effectiveness must specify whose perspective is being considered (Gitterman & Miller, 1989; Patti, 1988; Pennings & Goodman, 1977; Reid, 1988). Murray (1987) illustrates, with the example of community settlement houses, how commitments to divergent constituencies can lead to competition for resources and personnel. In this case, programs for seniors, out of work youth, recent immigrants,
mothers and children compete and pose problems of integration and coordination for the organization (Hasenfeld & English, 1974; Solomon, 1986).

Whereas all interest groups may agree that the HSO is supposed to serve the public, disagreement is more likely regarding who specifically clients should be; what exactly should be accomplished in serving clients (Patti, 1983); and what form the service delivery should take (Wolf, 1987). The larger the gulf between the value system in the social milieu and the ideological commitment of the organization, the more likely it is that the organization's very existence (or acceptance in the community) is at risk (Hasenfeld & English, 1974). If the organization chooses to define its output goals to conform to the expectations of those interest groups upon whom it is most dependent—the dominant coalition—both the freedom of the organization to respond to new environmental exigencies and the basis of the organization's legitimacy may be significantly reduced (Hasenfeld & English, 1974). Alternatively, the organization can define its goals by finding some goal that all parties agree with, regardless of the triviality of the goal. In so doing the HSO may reduce the potential value of its product and increase the likelihood of being marginal.

Although contending with interest groups is an integral facet of all HSOs (Hasenfeld & English, 1974), HSOs operating in certain
environments are better able to ignore strategic constituencies because they share similar values with the larger society (Cameron, 1986). Because their "change" techniques are relatively more socially accepted they do not have to be justified to the same extent as do those of "uncertain" HSOs, and their goals are less ambiguous.

Clearly COs, as well, have to contend with external forces such as trade associations, unions, and customers. However, the difference lies in the answer to the question of who judges the success and controls the direction of growth of the organization. While CO customers might be assumed to be the final arbitrers in the marketplace, actually this is not the case. The shareholders and owners must ultimately be satisfied with any management decision and the connection with profit is obvious. In HSOs, funders have to be satisfied ultimately; successful service management depends on identifying the concerns and vested interests represented in oversight bodies (Riddle, 1990). The implication for organizational effectiveness is that in COs profit serves as a measure of both customer satisfaction and shareholder satisfaction, while in HSOs, customer and funder satisfaction must be measured differently. That is, effective HSOs, particularly uncertain HSOs, must promote many values, be accountable to many groups, and still accomplish service goals (Herman & Heimovics, 1991).

Further complicating the use of a goal attainment approach, there
are also potential differences between operative and official goals (Pennings & Goodman, 1977). In order to elicit funding the organization may commit to a particular official goal, which may be consistent with, but not identical to, the actual goals of the program.

Despite the criticisms levelled at the goal attainment model, it remains the most often endorsed model in the HSO literature. The most common implicit or explicit definition of organizational effectiveness in HSOs is "service effectiveness" (Anthony, 1977; Gitterman & Miller, 1989; Hudson, 1988; Martin, 1988; Petty & Bruning, 1980; Rapp & Poertner, 1988; Sung, 1985), measured in terms of service outcomes. The assumption has been that service effectiveness is the raison d'etre of HSOs, comparable to profit making for COs. From this perspective, the acquisition and efficient utilization of resources, and the satisfaction and development of staff may both be instrumental in maximizing organizational effectiveness, but they are not the same thing (Coulter, 1979; Patti, 1988).

Critics argue that this approach is superficial; service effectiveness is actually only one component of organizational effectiveness. Management effectiveness, which comprises resource acquisition and utilization and human resource development, is also important to organizational effectiveness and survival. In service COs, quality service has been tied to customer satisfaction (Groves, Downey, & Gregoire,
1992; Hogan, Hogan & Busch 1984; Jones, 1992), intention to return, and hence profit (Davis, 1983); however, the same kind of parallel cannot be drawn with HSOs. For example, in a study of a university, quality service was correlated with customer satisfaction, but the link with acquisition of resources is absent (Cameron, 1986).

The manner in which service effectiveness has been defined has varied considerably. Rapp and Poertner (1988) are representative of the simplest approach where service effectiveness is measured in terms of outcome goals. They claim that although measuring client outcomes is more complex than measuring profit, a host of techniques and instruments have been developed that discredit the criticism that HSO goals are ambiguous and idiosyncratic. Five types of outcome measures are identified that correspond to the type of service delivered: affective changes, learning, behaviour changes, status maintenance or change, and environmental modification. These instruments and techniques really pertain to mainstream HSOs; tests that measure learning in nonmainstream HSOs, for example, rarely have norms and demonstrated external validity.

Gebhardt-Taylor's (1982) assessment of the organizational effectiveness of a component of a multi county New York Department of Social Services educational training program used "learning" as the definition of organizational effectiveness. The training program being
assessed had the objective of enhancing workers' interpersonal skills and interviewing techniques. Learning was measured by a pre- posttest questionnaire for the nine participating counties; two of the nine counties also had formal interviews and nonparticipant observation. In this instance a single goal was relatively easy to specify; the program had one purpose. Within the constraints of a pre-post test experiment the extent to which the purpose had been achieved could be examined.

Others have expanded the definition of service effectiveness. For example, Petty and Bruning (1980), in their study of a financial assistance and social welfare agency (high technological determinacy, high environmental certainty, high formal structuralization), do not look at client outcome per se, but rather at the organization's error rate—a measure of productivity. While a productivity approach may work in this instance, since work is relatively routine and errors are easily measured, the appropriateness of a productivity approach for an HSO with low operational certainty is questionable, given the lack of a yardstick against which to compare performance and a limited numbers of clients.

Some efforts have taken a broader view of goal attainment, moved beyond service effectiveness and, in fact, illustrate the blurring between models of organizational effectiveness that is proposed here. A particularly good approach is Sung's (1985) use of a goal attainment model in his study of the organizational effectiveness of small "uncertain"
HSOs (18 public family planning clinics). The essence of his view is that
HSOs have internal and external goals. Internal goals are those
pertaining to the performance of staff and refer to the extent to which the
organization is internally consistent. Internal goal criteria are absence of
intraorganization strain (measured in terms of absence of tension and
conflict and absence of unreasonable pressure) and clinic flexibility
(measured in terms of adjustment to internally conceived change and
adjustment to externally conceived change). These criteria represent the
means by which the organization sustains its system and objectives.
This dimension of organizational effectiveness seems to correspond with
what Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) have labelled the internal
process model, overlaps somewhat with the open system model, and
parallels what has been labelled in this paper the management
effectiveness component of organizational effectiveness.

External goals appear to correspond to the goal attainment model
as it is typically described. External goals have two criteria: acceptability
of the physical and personal aspect of service to clients and number of
new and repeat clients. In this regard, Sung (1985) includes one aspect
of resource acquisition as a goal, while others have used resource
acquisition to define the open system model, described below.

Sung's own conclusion is that when internal effectiveness criteria
are attained, to a great extent external effectiveness criteria are likely to
be improved as well. He thereby illustrates the critical importance of internal variables and their instrumentality in achieving service goals.

**Human relations model.** The human relations model equates organizational effectiveness with staff job satisfaction, absence of conflict and tension, good interpersonal relations, and high morale. It is probably because of its compatibility with social work values stressing people concerns (Field & Dubey, 1987; Malka, 1989; McCormack & Devore, 1986) that this model has received much attention in the human services literature.

Although organizational members are an important constituency and satisfying them is an important goal (e.g., Malka, 1989), it is questionable whether it is the ultimate goal. In the case of a CO, if no profit is achieved but employees are very happy, it is unlikely that it would be judged as effective by anyone, with the possible exception of the employees. That is, although job satisfaction and low absenteeism are important, the underlying implication is that these factors are important because of their impact on the organization (i.e., service delivery). Satisfying the human element is perceived as a surrogate indicator of a final goal.

Unfortunately, the link between human relations and organizational performance has not been documented consistently enough to serve as a surrogate indicator. Rather, it is better conceived of as an important
facilitating or intervening variable, or an important determinant (Lawler, 1986). There has been a recent proliferation of literature examining the impact of interpersonal factors in service COs (Riddle, 1990), and some mirroring of this trend with the HSO literature. In seeking a competitive edge COs have implemented Total Quality Management (TQM) principles—a set of structured processes used to engage every organizational stakeholder in improved understanding of organizational priorities (Olian, 1992). In this approach to achieving organizational excellence, interpersonal factors are valued, including internal and external clients' needs and desires. In the case of COs, the TQM approach has been sold on the grounds that it contributes to the bottom line. The evidence from service COs indicates that good/quality service enhances bottom line returns (Davis, 1983) and employee attitudes are related to customer service ratings (e.g., Groves, Downey & Gregoire, 1992; Hogan, Hogan & Busch, 1984; Jones, 1992). Striving for quality and measuring effects is easy and achievable when dealing with products and measuring bottom-line returns. When effects are within people and these effects are not directly linked with acquiring financial resources the task is far more challenging.

Despite the absence of a connection with resource acquisition and management effectiveness, HSO findings do support the empirical findings from CO service organizations that TQM impacts positively on
service effectiveness. In HSOs, good relationships and happy workers have been correlated with various aspects of quality service delivery (Cherniss & Egnatios, 1978; Daley, 1986; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Hogan, 1992; Jones, 1992; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Petty & Bruning, 1980; Pincus, 1986; Sherwin, 1972; Spector, 1986; Ursprung, 1986) and with client satisfaction (Beatty, 1988; Buffum & Konick, 1982; Friedlander & Pickle, 1968; Schwartz & Will, 1961; Ursprung, 1986). Employee morale and job satisfaction have also been positively linked with employee commitment (Welsch & LaVan, 1981), and negatively related to turnover and burnout (Ursprung, 1986), and ultimately to poor client outcomes (Cherniss & Egnatios, 1978; Pincus, 1986; Plotnick, 1989; Sarason, 1972; Spector, 1986; Weiner, 1988; Wiggins & Moody, 1993).

The recognition of the employee-client interplay is important in HSOs; it is primarily through staff-client relations that HSOs seek to achieve change. Because people are the "production inputs," production in HSOs is by necessity a cooperative effort between staff and clients (Courage & Williams, 1986; Sarri, 1982). Glisson and Durick (1988) explain: "because these services depend on intense worker-client interactions for the resolution of problems for which available intervention techniques and resources are frequently inadequate the attitudes of workers are important to the success of the system" (p. 78). Yet, although employee attitudes are probably critical in all HSOs, "intense
interaction" and "indeterminate technology" clearly refer most strongly to low operational certainty HSOs.

One means of enhancing employee attitudes, participation in decision making, has also been linked with various aspects of service effectiveness (Jayaratne & Chess, 1984; Lawler, 1986; Reisman, 1986; Sarri, 1982). It has been positively correlated with staff morale (Barber, 1986; Fallon, 1974; McNeely, 1983; Spector, 1986) in community mental health programs (Cherniss & Egnatios, 1978), Israeli social work agencies (Malka, 1989), advocacy-oriented grass-roots agencies (Frank, Cosey, Angevine, & Cardone, 1985), the Child Protective Services function of a public welfare agency (Packard, 1989), an alcohol treatment centre, a regional office of a state department of family and child welfare, an alcohol rehabilitation centre, and HSOs dealing with child welfare, community mental health, probation, homeless males and delinquents (Field & Dubey, 1987). Participative decision making has also been positively linked with workers' and supervisors' perceptions of performance (Packard, 1989) and with improved service quality (Fallon, 1974; Gowdy, 1988; Malka, 1989; Spector, 1986).

McNeely (1983) takes the stance that given the heterogeneity of the raw material of HSOs, the lack of consensus regarding efficacy of interventive strategies, and the low predictability of therapeutic outcomes, treating clients in standardized ways denies their uniqueness and forces
employees into routinized and non skill development models of practice. Correspondingly, Carter (1988) argues that those who provide services should be given ample latitude to change the way services are provided. Malka (1989) also points out how professionals must be allowed to exercise their skills and participate in decision making to avoid counterproductive behaviours. And, Patti (1983) describes how clients present an array of different problems and capabilities such that direct service workers often find it necessary to develop unique approaches.

Again, although the literature tends not to distinguish between HSOs, it would appear that the concerns regarding heterogeneity of clients, low predictability of outcomes, and the necessity for latitude in treatment decisions all pertain to low operationally-certain HSOs. Although staff-client relations are important to some degree for all HSOs, one might hypothesize that HSOs defined by having less determinate technology are less certain of a standard approach to treatment, and hence staff-client relations are probably more critical. That is, the better the staff are armed with client information obtained through staff-client interaction, and the more discretion they are allotted, presumably the more likely they are to determine the best, customized approach.

**Internal process model.** In their third model Quinn and Rohrbaugh equate organizational effectiveness with the internal health of the organization (Table 1).
According to the internal process model, organization demands are so dynamic and complex that it is not possible to define a finite number of goals in any meaningful way. Instead the focus is on internal characteristics, such as quality of internal communication, quality of routine organizational procedures, and the ability of members to monitor their own behaviour.

The model recognizes one unique characteristic of HSOs: since service provision is collaborative, and often complex, front line staff are drawn increasingly from professional ranks (Baum & Parihar, 1984; Field & Dubey, 1987; Malka, 1989; Martinko & Tolchinsky, 1982; Packard, 1989; Welsch & LaVan, 1981). The new “professionalism” in HSOs is evidenced in the existence of trained early childhood educators for child care provision, registered nurses in nursing homes, and social workers in welfare organizations. Although Finch (1978) found a diversity of training in a sample of 12 HSOs, 68% of social service workers had at least an undergraduate degree directly related to social welfare, and an additional group was comprised of paraprofessionals and persons with degrees in psychology, nursing, and marriage and family counselling.

Though professionals and paraprofessionals are growing as a group, they are often missing in the situations where they might most be needed. Particularly in low operational certainty HSOs, staff are often called upon to perform a number of tasks, frequently outside their job
domain. However, these organizations cannot afford to pay the higher salaries associated with more training. The lack of staff training in these HSOs may directly impact on the quality of service delivery.

It is possible that what constitutes quality in staff differs between operationally-certain and uncertain HSOs. First, for uncertain HSOs, it may be more important to have staff who have a personal commitment to the organization's goals as opposed to extensive credentials. Second, training for uncertain HSOs may have a different bent, stressing flexibility and creative thinking as opposed to credentials.

According to Patti (1983), since clients usually present an array of quite different problems and capabilities, direct service workers often find it necessary to fashion treatments that are tailored to the unique problems, desires, and capabilities of each client. Patti further states that, if clients presented similar problems and reacted similarly to service provided, if desired outcomes could be specified, defined, and evaluated, and if the agency knew with some certainty that the application of selected procedures would result in predictable outcomes, then the administrative task would not be much different from that of other organizations, for example from a factory in which front line staff may have specialized training but are faced with routine work rather than unique cases that require service customization. Given the variability, active client cooperation is a necessary ingredient for effective service.
One might imagine that it is exactly along these lines that the two end points of the "certainty of operations" dimension can be distinguished. Some HSOs face more uniform and determinate technology than do others, inputs are less variable, and outcomes can be evaluated.

Thus, though HSO management may want the same kind of control as in most COs, in many HSOs front line staff press for greater freedom and discretion which they see as essential for forming effective client relations. The importance of participation in decision making has been partially touched on with respect to the human relations model. Grasso and Epstein (1988) point out that in contrast to COs where staff orientations are highly instrumental and focused on outputs, workers in HSOs tend to stress professional autonomy, humanistic objectives (e.g., personal growth), and tend to focus on the process, not the outcomes (Kouzes & Mico, 1979). While this point may be true of all HSOs, given the indeterminate technology and staff with a personal interest in the organization's goals, it may be particularly descriptive of uncertain HSOs. In some types of HSOs, allowing front line staff control over their own work again may be an important predictor of organizational effectiveness, or a facilitating variable, but it is certainly not a criterion.

A review of the literature revealed that the internal process model rarely seems to have been applied as a stand-alone model of effectiveness. Rather, some of its associated criteria tend to be included
as additions to other models. For example, Patti (1988), in defining service effectiveness, partially touches on internal processes while describing his goal attainment approach to effectiveness. He states that service effectiveness is reflected in three kinds of outcomes which may be, but are not necessarily, related. The first of these outcomes is essentially the same as Rapp and Poertner's (1988) measurable outcomes. They described techniques and instruments that correspond to: affective changes, learning, behaviour changes, status maintenance or change, and environmental modification. A second outcome, client satisfaction, similarly is used as an index of goal attainment. A third outcome, quality of service, or the extent to which the organization implements methods and techniques that are thought necessary to achieve service objectives, is one element of the internal process model.

Although service quality and measurable outcomes are directly applicable to operationally-certain HSOs, they are not as easily measured in uncertain HSOs, given the absence of appropriate outcome measures, and standards of structures or procedures to serve as yardsticks against which to measure effectiveness (Salancik, 1981). Therefore, it is likely that client satisfaction and other client-oriented, qualitative measures will be most useful in measuring effectiveness in uncertain HSOs.
**Open system model.** In this fourth model, organizational effectiveness is equated with the ability of an organization to adapt to the environment's demands by acquiring scarce resources; adjusting to externally induced changes; and satisfying strategic constituencies. Cunningham (1978) describes ability to adapt in a slightly different fashion as an organization's ability to search out and respond to particulars in the environment; to use its resources in producing outputs and in maintaining and restoring the system; and to bargain and optimize its use of resources in an environment with a number of decision makers having different objectives.

The open system approach emphasizes organizational processes and constraints rather than goal attainment and appears to be the most comprehensive. It does not refer to goals per se, but rather to exchange relationships with the external environment, pleasing multiple internal and external constituencies, and organizational survival and the impact the foregoing processes have on goal definition. As illustrated in Figure 3, any organization can be conceived of as an open system where inputs are fed into the organization structure, processes occur, outputs/outcomes are produced, and goals are attained. Compared to their less operationally-certain counterparts, HSOs with predictable environments, set routines and procedures, clear lines of authority, and centralized
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Figure 3. Hypothetical organizational model and its relationship to organizational effectiveness.
decision-making and hierarchy, are in every aspect invariant. This invariance means that the links between inputs, structures, processes, outputs, and goals are both understood and predictable. As a result, an assessment of their organizational effectiveness does not necessarily require a focus on all systemic parts.

Although a focus on outcomes alone is valid (comparable to a CO profit-oriented approach to effectiveness), so too is a focus on processes alone. The implicit assumption is that given the conventionally accepted links between inputs, structures, processes, outputs and goals, any of the links in the activity sequence can serve as a surrogate indicator for goal achievement. This conventional acceptance is obvious in discussions of client-focused services, such as with Total Quality Management, and service excellence in general, where organizational effectiveness in COs has focused on organizational climate or client satisfaction, but the assumption always is that profit will follow. The assumption requires that the organization is set in form and approach, since if processes change, one can no longer predict the same outcome.

As a result of unestablished links between inputs, structures, processes, outcomes, and goals, and the fact that low operationally certain HSOs are by necessity policy driven, a focus on outcomes does not tell much about processes. Conversely, the exclusive focus on processes does little to establish the process-outcome link. A more
systemic approach would appear to be indicated. Elkin and Molitor (1985) propose a similar idea in their analysis of HSOs into system components, each with a number of management indicators.

There are several examples of the open system model in the literature. Cameron's (1978; 1986) study of HSOs with high technological determinacy, environmental certainty, and formal structuralization—universities—had organizational effectiveness indicated by a mix between input measures, such as faculty satisfaction and quality of faculty; process measures, such as system openness and organizational health; and outcome measures, such as student education and student academic and personal development. Service outcome is important, but satisfaction and other "internal" variables are also critical, as is the ability to acquire resources and other "external" variables. Or, phrased differently, there is the inclusion of inputs, process, structure and outcome indices. Because the relationship between processes and outcomes is conventionally accepted, such variables as professional development and faculty job satisfaction could be used as surrogate indicators of organizational effectiveness.

Cameron's (1978; 1986) study is important for several reasons. First, it is a good example of multiple goals at different levels. Second, it used stakeholders to identify effectiveness criteria that form the developed measures. Third, some attempts have been made to validate
it; it was found to correlate with several measures of financial health. Fourth, it addresses the two-component (management and business/service effectiveness) model of organizational effectiveness employed here.

This two-component model is also explored in HSOs with low levels of technological determinacy and environmental certainty—social welfare agencies. Martin (1988) states that organizational performance must be defined broadly enough to include the competing interests, activities and goals of individuals and groups both within and outside an organization's boundary. It comprises service effectiveness, or the quality and content of core work activities. It also comprises organizational well being, supported through such legitimacy activities as acquiring financial resources and community goodwill, attracting and retaining qualified and respected staff and attracting appropriate and sufficient clients.

Similarly, in Elkin and Molitor's (1985) systems approach, there is an implicit recognition of management and service effectiveness. Six dimensions are incorporated into their definition of organizational effectiveness and none alone is sufficient or appropriate. They suggest that organizational effectiveness includes the appropriateness of resources, demand, and technology (management effectiveness), and the attainment of objectives, and proximate and long term impact on
clients and community (service effectiveness).

Summary

Although the operational models of effectiveness are useful as guides, their weaknesses should be acknowledged. At one time models may have been disparate, but the distinction between them seems to have become reasonably permeable. For example, if one considers the goal attainment model and the goal of the organization is set as "internal health" how, in fact, does it differ from the internal process model? There is latitude built into this definition of organizational effectiveness, in terms of what constitutes a goal. Similarly, if adaptability is critical to an organization under the open system model, is internal health not a critical key?

It has been pointed out in the preceding discussion that the four models of organizational effectiveness may all be valid, and simply address different facets of effectiveness. That is, indicators of organizational effectiveness can either be based on outcomes, as in the goal attainment model, on structures and processes, as in the internal process model, or on inputs and processes, as in the human relations model. Although the open system model is said to deal with organizational processes, it actually appears to deal with inputs, structures and outcomes as well. To the degree that the criteria specified by each of the models are met, one would expect greater
overall organizational effectiveness (see Figure 1), but the importance of a particular model may vary across HSOs.

**Implications of Organizational Effectiveness in HSOs**

When organizational effectiveness is considered in a human service context, links are sometimes weak between inputs, structures, processes, outcomes, and goals (i.e., they are weak in "uncertain" HSOs). In the absence of financial measures or, in fact, any other across-the-board relevant measures of organizational effectiveness in HSOs, it is argued that the conceptualization of organizational effectiveness in HSOs will vary as a function of whether the organization is characterized by high or low environmental certainty, technological determinacy and formal structuralization. Whereas the same dimensions of effectiveness may be important, the emphasis placed on the different dimensions and criteria will vary.

It has already been argued that organizational effectiveness is comprised of a management and a service effectiveness component. With respect to COs, organizational maintenance (or growth) without profit is irrelevant, but also the two are integrally related. In the private sector, clients and funders are the same and clients hence exert an influence on production. Clients' dissatisfaction with service or poor marketing reflects directly back into a lack of inputs to a service CO. Market dependence means automatic penalties and incentives for
reinforcing cost-reduction policies, operating efficiency--namely
management effectiveness—and effective performance—namely service
effectiveness (Solomon, 1986). Further, there is a direct link between
organizations’ outputs and inputs because survival ultimately depends on
whether the customer pays for the goods and services provided (Murray,
1987). If a private nursing home ceases to attract clients it will not
survive in the long term.

Whereas COs produce private goods, HSOs produce goods that
have a collective or public benefit (Austin, 1981). The nonprofit nature of
HSOs means resources are obtained through an appropriation process.
This means that the purchasers and recipients of the services are
separate groups and clients exercise little reciprocal power (Austin, 1983;
Sarri, 1982). Hence, there is no direct connection between client
satisfaction and outcomes, on the one hand, and funding and ultimately,
organizational survival on the other hand. Management effectiveness
cannot be addressed implicitly by focusing on service effectiveness, as it
can with COs. If an HSO only has two clients but they are serviced
effectively it is unlikely to be considered by individuals other than the
clients as an effective organization. Given this division, uncertain and
unstable financial and/or political environments may translate to the
precedence of political as opposed to client priorities (Levinson, 1987)
and may lead to a reduction of the relative emphasis on operational and
allocational efficiency (Drucker, 1977; Solomon, 1986).

Because HSOs must answer to outside parties the reporting structure is much more externally focused than in COs; external units have a powerful role in shaping policies and service patterns in HSOs (Courage & Williams, 1987; Hasenfeld & English, 1974; Herman & Heimovics, 1991; Sarri, 1982). By definition, however, external factors exert a more powerful influence for those HSOs with a lack of accepted technology and a more volatile existence, because these HSOs require greater efforts in lobbying for support. These organizations must be adaptable to changing community needs, stakeholder priorities, and funding requisites (Herman & Heimovics, 1991).

Gitterman and Miller (1989) claim that even though the service mission of the HSO is critical and that in the long run ignoring the interest of the client leads to "a sense of incompetence and powerlessness" (p. 102), in times of trouble, particularly in times of financial restraint, HSOs tend to focus on organizational maintenance. This focus is further exacerbated by accountability requirements.

In support of this maintenance focus and the priority assigned to the ability to acquire resources, Finch (1978) noted in his study of 12 HSOs (which included community mental health, child welfare, family services, child guidance, and medical and public health related settings) that the highest perceived priority was accountability to funding sources.
Only after that came concerns with improving service quality, expanding the number of clients, staff morale, minimizing cost, and innovating. Elkin and Molitor (1985) claim that a prime responsibility of top managers in HSOs "is to see that adequate resources are secured..." (p. 13) and Herman and Heimovics (1991) similarly claim that one of the major challenges for (uncertain) HSOs is finding financial resources. This finding is also consistent with other research in which administrators of small, multicultural bridging HSOs, characterized by highly uncertain environments and low technological determinacy, were queried regarding what they believed to be adequate indices of their HSOs' organizational effectiveness and several spontaneously mentioned "mere existence beyond one year" (R. Aman; M. Lynch; A. Rosas, personal communication, October, 1990).

In exploring the idea of the organization having two foci (maintenance/survival and service delivery), there has been an implicit distinction drawn between HSOs having high or low technological determinacy, environmental certainty and formal structuralization. In larger, "certain" HSOs, a service effectiveness focus, with the management component of organizational effectiveness a somewhat lower priority, poses no major problem. Since these HSOs typically deal with larger numbers of clients, frequently have relevant outcome measures, do not have to market their services, and have an accepted
technology, it is statistically possible and meaningful to look at
effectiveness of service in terms of goals/client outcomes. In fact, those
HSOs that fall at the very high end of the three variables actually might
profit from some of the CO-manufacturing based management strategies.
Because resources are reasonably assured, and processes have
become standardized given an established cause-effect connection, an
alternative approach to service effectiveness that is also appropriate, is a
focus on processes instead of outcomes. Addressing the management
effectiveness aspect of organizational effectiveness may be relatively
more important in those HSOs with more volatile existences (with low
technological determinacy, low environmental certainty, low formal
structuralization).

Figure 1 illustrates how all organization components have to be
functioning well in order for an organization to be effective, but given a
secure position and accepted procedures, an HSO may have the option
of temporarily focusing on the service side. For "uncertain" HSOs, with
few clients, indeterminate technology and an uncertain existence,
measuring service effectiveness in terms of pre- posttest differences,
even coupled with client satisfaction measures, may be neither
statistically meaningful nor particularly revealing. A focus on the process
aspect of service effectiveness is equally unviable, given the lack of
determinacy in processes. Further, since these HSOs are perpetually
faced with "financial restraint" and "trouble," it may be that maintenance
is always an important focus, that a systems approach is necessary, and
that all the components described in Figure 1 would require attention.
Sung's (1985) use of internal and external goals seems to address the
same issue.

Of course it needs to be acknowledged that organizational
maintenance/survival is not always a desirable goal. In fact, Wolf (1984)
describes a test for organized abandonment. The key point, however,
is that abandonment should result from careful deliberation, rather than
from a crisis, and typically should be a function of whether the
organization's mission has been achieved. The prospect of organization
abandonment, it would seem, actually distinguishes between
organizations' level of certainty. It is more of an issue for operationally
uncertain HSOs for several reasons. First, high operationally certain
HSOs' existences are rarely questioned. Second, low operational
certainty HSOs often are created to address a specific policy direction.
Third, if the low operationally certain HSOs address the needs for which
they were set up, their existence is questioned, but would be equally
questioned if they were not perceived to address the need.

Quinn (1988) reports how past attempts to identify characteristics
of effective organizations have resulted in lists of variables that differ
from one study to another. One possible explanation is the failure to
consider the role of operational certainty in defining organizational effectiveness. In fact, in Quinn's description of the developmental transitions of young organizations parallels can be drawn with the present study.

Two stages of development are of particular relevance to the present study. Quinn claims that in the entrepreneurial stage, the first stage of development, the success of an organization will be associated with open systems criteria of effectiveness: flexibility, growth, resource acquisition. Although they are also important at other stages, open systems criteria are particularly important at this stage. In the second stage of development, the collectivity stage, the success of the organization seems to be associated with the criteria described by the human relations model. In the third stage of development, the formalization stage, organizational stability, efficiency of production, rules and procedures, and conservative trends typify the organization. The most important criteria are goal setting, goal attainment, productivity, efficiency, information management-communication, and stability-control.

In the final stage of development, elaboration of structure, the organization monitors the environment in order to expand and/or renew. Once more, the heaviest emphasis is on the open systems model.

The characteristics of organizations in the first stage of development are also descriptive of the low operational certainty
organization as described here, whereas the third stage of development describes the high operational certainty organization as described in the present study. Just as different criteria are perceived to be important at different developmental stages, the same can be said for low versus high operational certainty organizations.

Salancik (1981) also seems to touch on the possibility that different types of HSOs require different models of effectiveness, with different indicators. He states that, depending on the determinacy of their technology, there may be differences in the kinds of HSOs that form and survive in the service delivery sector. He claims that the less the organization's technological determinacy and environmental certainty, the more flexible it must be. In this instance management effectiveness again would be of higher priority, to ensure organizational survival. This view is also mirrored by Herman and Heimovics' (1991) distinction between nonprofits' (i.e., uncertain HSOs) lesser likelihood of survival than government agencies' (i.e., certain HSOs), and the necessity for flexibility and adaptability in the former HSOs to address constantly shifting priorities.

Perrow (1970), paralleling Salancik, proposes that, as a function of technological type, different internal structures are required to be effective, although he does not define effectiveness. For example, according to Perrow, routine technology, signified by stable clients and
complete knowledge about intervention procedures, requires a classic bureaucratic structure. He provides the examples of HSOs that focus on determining social security benefits or vocational training (high technological determinacy, environmental certainty, and formal structuralization). Presumably, these types of HSOs would lend themselves relatively well to a goal attainment model. In fact, one need only envision a formula being consistently applied to determine benefits to see the parallels with an assembly line. Also, given the determinate nature of the technology, a focus on processes as surrogates for goals would be equally viable.

Perrow contrasts this structure to that demanded by nonroutine technology; when there are nonuniform, unstable clients and incomplete knowledge about intervention procedures, line staff should have considerable discretion and there should be shared authority. This type of HSO would need flexibility, and a goal attainment model does not seem to be advocated, since it would be equally important to consider processes and their relative merit. Focusing on a quantitative goal-attainment approach would detract from a focus on other administrative priorities, such as innovation of new services and staff morale (Finch, 1978), both of which are critical to less entrenched HSOs, as is resource acquisition. Whereas innovation and enhancing morale can be set as goals, they have been typically used to define other effectiveness
Similarly, Savage (1988) takes the approach that the effectiveness of an HSO is largely determined by the organization's capacity to match its technology to its clients' service needs. Thus, in HSOs where one technology has proven effective, and there are better understood needs, the goal attainment model is easily applied (or, alternatively, one of the other models). Because there are conventionally established links between systemic components, if client service needs are not being met, the organization is deemed as a whole to be ineffective.

The goal attainment model, however, is not appropriate in HSOs where no technology has proven effective, clients' needs are diverse or poorly understood, and there are no established links between system components. The organization should, in this instance, incorporate a repertoire of techniques, and is required to be highly flexible, tailoring approaches to the individual. A narrow scope technological repertoire will be effective only when technologies with proven effectiveness are employed and reliable instruments and processes for screening are available to match clients to technology, as is the case in entrenched, mainstream HSOs (Savage, 1988). This stance seems to parallel Salancik's prescription for frequently changing treatment labels when technology is indeterminate. Although it is important to examine client outcomes, they are not a sufficient index of effectiveness; if client
outcomes are successful, little is revealed about management effectiveness. Further, if outcomes are unsuccessful, it cannot be determined if screening processes are at fault, if clients are particularly difficult compared to mainstream organizations, if technology is inappropriate, or if processes for matching technology to clients are inappropriate. In short, in HSOs with low technological determinacy, environmental certainty and formal structuralization, an open system model once more seems to be advocated, where processes are examined in addition to outcomes, and attention is paid to the management effectiveness aspect.

Thus Quinn (1988), Salancik (1981), Herman and Heimovics (1991), Perrow (1970) and Savage (1988) all predict that "uncertain" HSOs require a certain amount of flexibility in order to be effective. As technological certainty increases, so too does routineness and hence the links between system components become better established. Appropriate effectiveness measures for "certain" HSOs may be pre- post-change measures, achievement of objectives, and satisfaction with service. In many of these organizations, because there are measures and norms for assessment of effectiveness, the other models may be viable alternatives. In HSOs with uncertainty of operation, effectiveness measures should focus on the links between inputs, structure, processes, outcomes, and goals, but should also reflect a priority with organization
maintenance and growth.

Summary

In summary, human service organizations face unique challenges in assessing effectiveness, particularly by virtue of their nonprofit status, the intangibility of service and their human "raw materials." These three characteristics have necessitated a closer examination of what is involved in effectiveness that a focus on profit has precluded. HSOs must take into account both the management and service components of effectiveness; achieving effectiveness requires satisfying two different groups: clients (service effectiveness) and funders (management effectiveness).

While HSOs are a distinct category, the variations among HSOs also impact on the conceptualization, assessment, and attainment of effectiveness. As a function of operational certainty, different models of effectiveness will be most appropriate and correspondingly different criteria will be of particular importance. Because operationally certain HSOs have proven links established from inputs through to outputs, any of the models would be appropriate. The easiest approach would be a focus on service effectiveness and goal attainment since standards are more readily available against which success can be measured. For operationally uncertain HSOs, the management effectiveness component takes on added importance; the lack of a secure existence means
considerable effort must be expended to maintain them. The appropriate model must be broader, encompassing the flexibility of the open system model.

**Hypotheses**

This research tested the general hypothesis that criteria of organizational effectiveness for skills-training organizations vary as a function of the organization’s operational certainty. The study attempted to address the main criticisms of past research on organizational effectiveness, namely that criteria of organizational effectiveness have been arbitrarily selected, that frequently they have not been clearly associated with organizational performance, and that major factors which indicate or predict effectiveness have not been specified (Cameron, 1986).

In order to have a context for hypothesis testing, descriptions of prototypical office skills-training programs were used, one college-based and one community-based. College-based programs offer skills-training within the larger framework of a college, and hence adhere to the college-level policies of the sponsoring institution. Ontario colleges also are part of a network called Ontario Colleges of Arts and Applied Technology, which sets province-wide standards of training, teaching and policy. That is, reporting structures extend beyond the programs themselves to larger college-wide and province-wide administrative
bodies, and changes in program functioning require approval from these governing bodies. Generally, there is a certain amount of "bureaucracy" to be tackled in all decision-making. Ontario colleges typically offer vocational training leading to a diploma or certificate, as opposed to a university degree.

Community-based skills-training programs, aimed at employment disadvantaged people, are offered from nonprofit community agencies and deliver many of the training and associated services in nontraditional educational settings. Although there are governing bodies overseeing their functioning, community-based organizations typically have a certain amount of leeway in designing programs to address particular needs of specific populations.

Structural contingency theory identifies three variables critical to the conceptualization of organizational effectiveness—certainty of environment, determinacy of technology, and formal structuralization. The same three variables describe the inherent differences in HSOs discussed previously. Some HSOs clearly face more diverse and vocal constituencies, are more externally dependent for resources, operate in more turbulent environments, have more variability in clients, have less knowledge about treatment, and have less predictable outcomes (e.g., community-based skills-training programs). Effective HSOs defined by these characteristics also tend to have less formal structures. It would
follow that HSOs will vary in terms of how they conceptualize organizational effectiveness.

College-based skills-training programs which exist in highly certain environments, employ determinate technology and have a formal structure also have a better demonstrated record of effectiveness. They operate within a framework with conventionally established links from inputs through to distal outcomes. As a result, demonstrating effectiveness may not require a focus on all parts of the system, and a focus on outcomes would be valid. However, given the conventionally established links from inputs through to outcomes, a focus on processes would be equally valid, such as that which Salancik (1981) describes with his standards of operating procedures and structures. The implicit assumption is that given certain processes, predictable outcomes will follow.

Community-based training programs, however, with indeterminate technology, environmental uncertainty, and nonformalized (or organic) structures, have poorly established links from inputs to distal outcomes. A focus on outcomes reveals little about processes, and conversely, a focus on processes reveals little about outcomes. A more systemic approach would be indicated where, as outlined by Elkin and Molitor (1985) and Martin (1988) for example, indicators would be required for all system components in order to adequately demonstrate effectiveness.
Therefore:

**Hypothesis 1:**

People will generally perceive a greater number of criteria as essential to indicating effectiveness in a community-based skills-training organization than they perceive as essential to indicating effectiveness in a similar college-based skills-training program.

As Quinn (1988) pointed out, neither goal attainment nor resource acquisition may be adequate indicators of effectiveness in and of themselves; however, they are clearly important for all organizations. Although organizational effectiveness in the prototypical college and community-based organization may be comprised of the same underlying, ultimate dimensions, which correspond for the most part to Quinn and Rohrbaugh's (1983) models of organizational effectiveness (Table 1), it is argued that the type and quantity of activities defining the dimensions may vary as a function of an HSO's operational certainty. These activities can be considered as proximal criteria, or short-term measures of some ultimate goal (namely the ultimate dimensions). They play an important role in monitoring organizational functioning. For example, while financial health is of some degree of importance for both described organizations, the types of activities required to achieve financial health will likely be different for the college, with its relatively secure niche, and the insecure community-based organization, where acquiring resources has a sense of urgency and will likely involve more creative solutions.
Therefore:

**Hypothesis 2:**

Proximal criteria that are identified as most important to indicating the prototypical community-based organization’s effectiveness will be different from those identified as most important to indicating the prototypical college’s effectiveness.

While hypothesis 2 will be tested with both participant groups—the experts in the field and the HSO staff and managers—if the hypothesis is supported with the first participant group, some additional, more specific subhypotheses will be tested with HSO staff and managers. These subhypotheses pertain to the types of criteria that will be perceived as comparatively more important on the dimensions for each type of organization. Specifically:

**For community-based skills-training programs:**

a) Items reflecting creativity and flexibility will be rated as comparatively more important for Organization Maintenance.

b) Interpersonal context items (e.g., co-worker relations, supervision, employee involvement) will be rated as comparatively more important on the Human Relations dimension.

c) Items focusing on personalized delivery will be rated as comparatively more important for Service Effectiveness.

**For college-based skills-training programs:**

d) Items reflecting smooth internal functioning will be rated as comparatively more important for Organization Maintenance.

e) Items related to staff development will be rated as comparatively more important on the Human Relations dimension.

f) Items reflecting the establishment of quality standards and
reducing error will be rated as comparatively more important in terms of Service Effectiveness.

In addition to criteria differing as a function of operational certainty, it is argued that the relative perceived importance of the dimensions will vary. This difference in emphasis may be reflected in different ordering of priorities for the organizations or further translate to fewer dimensions being perceived as necessary to assess effectiveness in operationally-certain HSOs. The identification of fewer dimensions would not mean that it was not perceived as essential to attain them, but rather that they were not perceived to require the same monitoring or amount of effort expenditure to achieve them. Given the links established between all aspects of organization functioning in operationally-certain HSOs, it may be assumed that they are being met if other dimensions are successfully met. For example, if the appropriate internal processes are in place, it is assumed that service effectiveness is being achieved as well. Cameron (1986) points out that for some organizations (e.g., community-based programs), where goals are more ambiguous and therefore more difficult to measure, a goal attainment model is inappropriate. For other organizations (e.g., college-based programs), looking only at external factors may not be appropriate since resource acquisition has little or no direct connection with the organization's products, and the organization decision makers are able to ignore strategic constituencies. Hence:
Hypothesis 3:

The ranking of the dimensions of effectiveness in order of perceived priority will differ for the prototypical college and community-based descriptions.

Clearly all organizations need a continued flow of inputs in order to keep functioning over the long term. However, organizations differ in the extent to which these inputs are assured. Almost by definition, community-based programs have unstable and uncertain funding and are buffeted by political forces. Management effectiveness would therefore likely be perceived to be of higher priority in terms of the amount of effort expended in both achieving and monitoring it.

Hence,

(a) For the community-based skills-training program, Organization Maintenance will be perceived as one of the more important dimensions.

However, HSOs are also unique in the fact that they deal with human clients, rather than inanimate raw material, and the outcomes of services impact on people in a particular way. As a result, since the interaction between staff and client is critical in service delivery and in bringing about change, human relations cannot be ignored. The evidence has been outlined linking service quality to a variety of human relations elements.

One might expect that human relations are even more critical for community-based HSOs, which typical serve variant, poorly understood
clients and which have no standard technology. These indeterminate factors may translate to stressors for the staff, which, in turn, may negatively impact on service delivery. Indeterminacy also means that staff must interact with clients in order to make appropriate service delivery decisions. Since there are no standardized processes, staff may be called upon to play an active role in deciding course of service delivery and must do so in cooperation at some level with clients.

Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

(b) For the community-based skills-training program, Human Relations will be perceived as an important dimension.

College-based programs have a more assured existence and do not require as intense a focus on organization maintenance as do community-based programs. Further, given less variability in clients and more determinate technology, human relations will not likely be one of the higher priority dimensions. In fact, an outcome focus may be considered most relevant and certainly easiest to demonstrate. As a result:

(c) For the college program, dimensions of Service Effectiveness, especially Establishing Quality Procedures, will be rated as the most important priority.
CHAPTER II

STUDY A

Method

The premise of this research is that criteria used to indicate an organization's effectiveness are related to perceptions of the organization's operational certainty. This general hypothesis was tested using prototypical organization descriptions of two types of office skills-training programs. These prototypes were purposely written to vary along the three critical dimensions of operational certainty: environmental certainty, technological determinacy and formal structuralization.

The choice of prototypical descriptions rather than actual organizations was based on several considerations. Real world constraints limit the manipulations that can be carried out on actual organizations. One cannot purposely vary actual organizations on specific dimensions, while controlling for confounding variables, such as external events impinging on the organizations. An alternative is to attempt to match organizations, as much as possible, on important dimensions; however, this method limits severely the total number of possible organizations that can be used.

The research was divided into two studies. Appendix A provides an overview of the two studies. Study A borrowed from Quinn's (1988) approach. Experts familiar with organizational effectiveness were asked
to identify criteria that they perceived to be essential to the effectiveness of the two office skills-training programs. The content validation approach recommended by Cascio (1987) was used whereby participant judges rate each item according to its perceived importance. Items rated as most important by a statistically significant number of participants can be identified to reduce an array of criteria to a more manageable number and the most meaningful criteria.

Participants

Thirty consultants and other professionals who were considered HSO or skills-training experts, either because of their membership in appropriate organizations, their employment focus, or their research interests, were selected as the purposive sample for the study. The purpose of selecting participants with this type of relevant expertise was to address previous criticisms of similar studies that criteria have been arbitrarily selected (Cameron, 1986; Quinn, 1988), and the present concern for practical utility and external validity.

Two approaches were used to identify participants. The first approach was a "snowball" technique. Three consultants who had helped refine the organization descriptions and the list of effectiveness criteria in the preliminary stages of the research were asked to identify other individuals who they believed would be appropriate participants for identifying and rating effectiveness criteria. Individuals whose names
were suggested were contacted by phone, and the project and their proposed role were explained. They were then asked to suggest additional names and these leads were followed up in a similar fashion. All referrals either agreed to participate in the study themselves or, in the case of government staff, referred another individual in their Ministry whom they thought would be more appropriate (n = 26).

The secondary source of candidates was the membership directories of associations of organizational psychologists (Ontario Psychological Association - Section of Industrial, Organizational Psychologists; Canadian Evaluation Society; and Canadian Psychological Association, n = 4).

The final sample of subjects who were asked to aid in identifying criteria included private consultants from Toronto and surrounding areas who had experience in evaluating and/or in improving the organizational effectiveness of a range of HSOs (n = 16) and other professionals working in relevant government ministries (i.e., Ministry of Education and Training; Ontario Skills Development Office; Council of Regents; Centre for Disability and Work, n = 8), government initiatives, such as Jobs Ontario (n = 3), and academic institutions (i.e., York University Faculty of Administrative Studies, n = 3).

**Materials**

This section describes the development of the final set of criteria
given to Study A participants, and the process used in scoring the criteria.

**Item Pool Development**

Content validation (Anastasi, 1962) was pursued through an extensive literature review which resulting in a comprehensive list of organizational effectiveness criteria applied to HSOs. The review included both academic and applied literature (e.g., material used by the United Way and a manual prepared by George Brown College in conjunction with an evaluation consultant: Evaluation of Community-Based Programs).

The construction of the preliminary list of effectiveness criteria was achieved through the analysis of organizational effectiveness into its two major components, management effectiveness and service effectiveness. These components were matched by the researcher, both with Bowen and Cummings' (1990) model of organizational effectiveness (Figure 1) and Quinn and Rohrbaugh's (1981, 1983) four competing models of effectiveness (Table 1) to allow further subdivision of the dimensions. The results of the process yielded a division of Management Effectiveness into Human Relations (Human Resources Management); Financial Health/Security (Organization Management); and Ability to Acquire Resources (Strategic Management/Marketing), and the division of Service Effectiveness into Client Orientation (Operations Management)
and Quality Procedures (Operations Management/Marketing). The resulting dimensions were thought to be common to all three approaches and hence common to all HSOs (e.g., financial health, good human relations). There is a notable similarity to Quinn and Rohrbaugh's models: Human Relations is the same; Financial Health and Ability to Acquire Resources correspond to the Open Systems model; Client Orientation corresponds to Goal Attainment, and Quality Procedures loosely corresponds to the Internal Process model.

Once the basic dimensions were outlined, the subsequent step was the intuitive assignment of criteria into the broad dimensions which best reflected their content and intent. For example, the criterion reflecting openness in problem solving was categorized under "Human Relations" along with other criteria expressing a similar concern for staff.

The preliminary list of criteria was intended to be as inclusive as possible, with items that could be perceived as applicable to both types of HSOs (college and community-based training programs).

Prototypical Organization Description Development

The prototypical organization description development was facilitated through the compilation of various definitions and examples of technological determinacy, environmental certainty, and formal structuralization from the literature. Attempts were made to purposely polarize the descriptions in terms of the three critical variables. The
description of a skills-training program in a college setting was constructed to depict high environmental certainty, high technological determinacy, and high formal structuralization; the other description, based on an actual community-based training program, described low environmental certainty, low technological determinacy, and low formal structuralization. While the development of both descriptions relied on information from actual programs, there was a slight modification to highlight the differences—to polarize the organizations on the operational certainty dimensions.

**Item Writing**

Individual items were written for each of the criteria generated in the literature review. Where possible, existing items drawn from other scales or studies were used verbatim. Original items were written in accordance with certain rules: avoiding lengthy items, keeping the language simple, avoiding double negatives and double barrelled questions, and avoiding ambiguous pronoun references (Fowler, 1988).

**Item Pool Refinement**

The item pool was refined with the aid of three experienced consultants who, through past researcher contact, were known to be familiar with a range of HSOs. This approach was similar to Cameron's (1978), who also used subjects “to identify characteristics that are typical of effective organizations with which they are familiar” and Quinn and
Rohrbaugh's (1983), who used organization theorists and researchers to judge effectiveness criteria.

The purpose of the present collaboration with experts was to ensure that organizational effectiveness criteria had face and content validity, to reduce the likelihood that items had been overlooked, and to ensure that the items were well understood. The independent editors were asked to add any additional, relevant items, and to change item wording if necessary. The intention was to be overly inclusive at this stage, so as to allow the subsequent participant/judges to reduce the preliminary pool to the most meaningful items. For conservation of space the preliminary questionnaire administered to the independent editors is not included, but Appendix C contains the item pool that resulted from the collaboration with the independent editors.

**Organization Description Refinement**

In order to ensure reasonable response rates where voluntary cooperation is required, the task and the measures must be perceived as relevant and appropriate to the stated purpose of the research (Anastasi, 1982). In this case, the purpose of the research was described as identifying criteria by which to assess whether an office skills-training program is functioning effectively so as to examine complaints from some HSO staff that their programs are evaluated on unfair criteria.

Correspondingly, the respondents' task was to identify what they believed
to be the most important criteria of organizational effectiveness for these types of programs.

Therefore, feedback in refining the descriptions and in sharpening the dimensions along which the descriptions had been purposely varied was requested of the three consultants who served as independent editors (Appendix B). It was necessary to ensure that the descriptions were perceived to vary in the intended way (in terms of technological determinacy, environmental certainty and formal structuralization) and that they seemed realistic. Otherwise, one could not generalize from the descriptions to actual organizations; also, the validity of the resulting list of items from Study A could be called into question.

Each dimension was defined by multiple organization verification items rated on a three-point scale. For example, one of the items measuring environmental certainty was: "Funding is reasonably assured from year to year." The independent editors had to indicate the extent of their agreement that the item accurately described the organization description, by selecting the appropriate choice: "Not at all true"(1), "Somewhat true"(2), "Very true"(3). Formal structuralization was measured by six items; three items measured high formal structuralization and three items measured low formal structuralization. Technological determinacy was measured by 14 items; seven measured high technological determinacy, seven measured low technological
determinacy. Environmental certainty was measured by eight items: four items measured high environmental certainty, four items measured low environmental certainty. While the organization verification items were based on the literature, they were designed specifically to measure the manipulations contained in the two descriptions. The community-based organization description was designed so that it would be scored high on the items measuring the low end of each dimension (i.e., low operational certainty), and the college description was designed so that it would be scored high on the items measuring the high end of each dimension (i.e., high operational certainty).

Scoring of items for the two organization descriptions was conducted separately. If a high operational certainty organization verification item applied to the college description was rated from "very true" to "somewhat true," averaged across the three independent editors, it was assumed that the manipulation was appropriately perceived. An average score of between "somewhat true" and "very true" for a low operational certainty item applied to the college description was taken as indication that the manipulation was not effective, and the manipulation was strengthened in the description for Study A.

The same process was followed for the community-based organization description. If a low operational certainty organization
verification item applied to the community-based organization description was rated as at least "somewhat true," averaged across the three independent editors, it was assumed that the manipulation was appropriately perceived. An average score greater than "2" for a high operational certainty item applied to the community-based organization description was taken as an indication that the manipulation was not effective, and the manipulation was strengthened in the description for Study A.

Based on the independent editors' feedback, there was a slight modification of the organization descriptions. For both organizations, the strengthening of technological determinacy was achieved through the inclusion of a "typical client day" in the organization. In the case of the college, a typical day was described as routine with specific training scheduled. For the community-based organization, the variability of clients and the need for constant flexibility in procedures was stressed. Also, the perception of low formalization of structure was sharpened by describing the organization functioning as a team and informal reporting mechanisms. In addition, the descriptions were changed to a bullet-point format to facilitate the retention of pertinent information.

**Final Study A Questionnaire Development**

The final list of 178 items incorporated the independent editors' comments and additional items and the literature review list. Each
participant/judge was asked to rate each item from the pool in terms of its importance as an indicator of effectiveness, first for the college description, and subsequently for the community-based organization description. A three point scale was used, where 1 meant the item "is essential," 2 meant it "is useful but not necessary," and 3 meant it "is irrelevant" to the organizational effectiveness of the described organization. Hence, participants went through the rating process twice—once for each organization description.

**Scoring**

The following statistical process for selecting items from the comprehensive pool was used. If a significant number of panelists rated an item from the pool as a "1" (essential to effectiveness), the item was retained. Significance was determined by the formula for calculating the Content Validity Ratio (CVR):

\[
CVR = \frac{(n_s - N / 2)}{(N / 2)}
\]

where \(n_s\) = the number selecting the item as essential; and \(N\) = the total number of panelists.

For example, if there were 20 panelists and 15 of them identified an item as essential, then:

\[
CVR = \frac{(15 - 20 / 2)}{(20 / 2)} = .50
\]

If the CVR did not reach statistical significance, according to established tables (Lawshe, 1975), the item was rejected. The process was carried out for the community-based organization and then repeated for the
college. Two sets of criteria could thus be developed—one appropriate for the high operational-certainty HSO description and one appropriate for the low operational-certainty HSO description.

Procedure

Contacting of Participants

The sample of 30 academics, consultants, professors, and government professionals were contacted by phone and asked to serve as participant/judges. They were told to expect the questionnaire within two weeks of the phone contact.

Questionnaire Administration

The thirty academics, consultants and professionals comprising the participant group provided the final content-related evidence of validity. A booklet containing the item pool of 178 items and the two prototypical organization descriptions (for conservation of space the refined descriptions that were also used in Study B are included in the Study B questionnaire, Appendix E) was mailed to all participants, along with a cover letter providing instructions and background information (Appendix D), and a self-addressed, stamped, return envelope. Participants were asked to rate each item on the three point scale provided, assessing their perception of its importance for both described organizations separately.
CHAPTER III

Results and Discussion

Sample Characteristics

In total, 16 of the original 30 participants returned useable (i.e., in majority completed and returned in the time frame) questionnaire booklets (53.3% response rate). This response rate was quite high, but had been anticipated because of the direct contact with all Study A respondents and their interest in the area. All relevant people who were contacted using the "snowball" approach agreed to participate in the study and only one individual of the five contacted from membership directories said he would not be appropriate for the study. Private consultants were mailed 16 booklets and 7 useable booklets were returned (43.8%); participants working in relevant government ministries were mailed 8 booklets and 5 were returned (62.5%); participants associated with government initiatives were mailed 3 questionnaires and all 3 were returned (100%); and academics were mailed 3 questionnaires and 1 useable booklet was returned (33.3%).

The four respondent settings can be grouped into two larger categories. Consultants and academics, who comprise one group, have similar backgrounds, have an overview of effectiveness issues, and typically have had contact with a range of HSOs. Government associated individuals, who comprise the second group, also have had
experience with a range of HSOs, may have less of a theoretical foundation than the previous group, but because they may be slightly more involved in HSO administration have equally valuable insight.

**Hypothesis Testing**

**Hypothesis 1 - Comparison of Number of Criteria Identified**

The first hypothesis proposed that given the indeterminate nature of the prototypical community-based organization's technology (i.e., student variability, lack of conventionally accepted links between the teaching process and outcomes), financial instability (i.e., environmental uncertainty) and lack of formal structure, a greater number of organizational effectiveness criteria would be perceived as relevant for indicating the effectiveness of the community-based organization than of the college description. Because of the determine nature of the described college's technology, its greater financial stability and formal structure, the organization is invariant and the links between inputs, structure, processes and outcomes are both understood and predictable. As a result, an assessment of organizational effectiveness would not be perceived to necessarily require a focus on all parts of the system, but might be perceived to distill down into a single measure.

According to the strict statistical criteria of Lawshe's (1975) significance tables, a minimum CVR value of .49 would indicate that a significant number of participants had identified the item as essential to
indicating the effectiveness of the prototypical description ($p < .05$).

Using this criterion level, 55 items were identified as essential for the community-based organization's effectiveness and only 7 items for the college's effectiveness. A chi-square analysis confirmed that this distribution of results was significantly different for the two prototypical descriptions, $\chi^2 (1, N = 16) = 45.04, p < .001$, thus supporting Hypothesis 1.

The finding that significantly more effectiveness criteria were perceived as critical for the community-based organization supports previous research. Salancik (1981) explained that in health-care and education there are standards for what constitutes appropriate procedures in the first instance, and appropriate structures in the second instance. As a result, demonstrating effectiveness does not require the measurement of outcomes, but instead one can rely on standards of procedures/structures as surrogate measures for effective outcomes. This approach would be comparable to a profit focus in COs, where profit actually serves as a surrogate measure for other indices. However, an alternative approach is to measure outcomes and, if they are as desired, the assumption is that the rest of the organization must be functioning appropriately. The point is that relatively few criteria would be perceived as critical to accurately assessing effectiveness, and this, in fact proved to be the case for the operationally-certain college
 Conversely, as a result of the unestablished links between inputs through to outcomes for the described community-based program (i.e., it is operationally-uncertain), and its more precarious existence requiring a dual focus on survival/viability and on service effectiveness, a more comprehensive approach with multiple criteria, is necessary. The indeterminacy in technology implies that there are only standards of operating "myths", unproven beliefs about what is effective. Since there is no method for verifying or demonstrating the effectiveness of a particular process or even structure, they cannot be used as surrogate measures (Salancik, 1981). For operationally-uncertain HSOs, such as the described community-based organization, there must be a focus on processes and outcomes and the reflection of a number of administrative priorities such as described by Edwards, Faerman and McGrath (1986); Elkin and Molitor (1985); Martin (1988) and Sung (1985) in his identification of internal and external goals.

 The finding of significantly more essential criteria for the community-based organization than for the college is important since it indicates that, according to at least this external group of experts, organizational effectiveness in community-based organizations is highly complex and should not reflect an overemphasis on outcomes, to the exclusion of other facets of effectiveness. This preliminary finding may
be critical for funding agencies to consider; it points to the possibility that there must be an inclusion of process measures, as well as measures of strategies for organization maintenance and for promoting desirable human relations. The lack of a focus on these alternative aspects of organizational effectiveness has been a complaint from the frontlines of community-based organizations and has been expressed in concerns about being misunderstood.

**Hypothesis 2 - Priority of Criteria.**

Hypothesis 2 pertained to differences in perceived relative importance of proximal criteria for the two prototypical organization descriptions. It was argued that even if it was recognized that effectiveness in all organizations hinges on the same underlying dimensions, it would be perceived that criteria defining these dimensions and used as indicators of effectiveness would vary for the college and community-based organization descriptions.

The original items rated by the participants and grouped into ultimate dimensions are included in Appendix C. From the findings, even the basic premise that the same ultimate dimensions would be perceived to hold for both organizations was not unequivocally supported. Clearly, the 55 items identified by a significant number of participants as essential for the community-based organization appeared to represent all dimensions. However, the majority (five of the seven items) of the items
perceived as essential to the college's effectiveness fell under the Quality Procedures subdimension of Service Effectiveness. Based on the number of important indicators identified for the college, the perception appeared to be that service effectiveness, especially the establishment of quality procedures, should dwarf all other concerns. There are at least two possible explanations for this finding, both of which will be discussed with respect to hypothesis 3(c) pertaining to priority of dimensions for the college.

An important point must be made with respect to the dimensions, pertaining to all the analyses in Study A, but especially to the analyses in Study B. Given few subjects and many highly intercorrelated variables, it was not possible to conduct factor analysis to verify that the intuitively derived dimensions actually were statistically distinct underlying dimensions. While this may be viewed as a limitation, it was deemed more important in the preliminary research stages to have intuitively derived meaningful dimensions, rather than statistically meaningful but uninterpretable dimensions. It should be kept in mind in interpreting the analyses that these were researcher-imposed dimensions, based on previous models and research.

The next analysis examines the hypothesis that different criteria would be perceived as most important for indicating effectiveness on each dimension for each prototypical organization. The question
addressed was whether, within each dimension, the priority of criteria were perceived similarly for the two organizations. That is, regardless of the actual importance placed on the items, was their relative ranking within each dimension perceived similarly?

To test Hypothesis 2, the mean item ratings on each dimension were ranked, from lowest to highest, for each organization description separately. Hence, each dimension would have two separate sets of rankings, one for the items applied to the college, one for the items applied to the community-based organization. According to Hypothesis 2, the question of interest was whether these rankings would be different.

The college and community-based organization sets of rankings were all compared using Spearman rank-order correlation coefficients. The analyses were conducted using only the items that had been identified as essential either for the college and/or for the community-based organization. This was to prevent possible agreement in ranking on the unimportant items from obscuring real differences in the ranking of essential items.

For the ten items defining the Organization Maintenance dimension, the ranking of each item's perceived importance for the community-based organization was compared to the ranking of each item's perceived importance for the college. As hypothesized, the correlations between the two sets of rankings was not significant, $r_s (10)$
= .18, p > .05. For Organization Maintenance, it was not simply that all
items were perceived as more important for the community-based
organization than for the college (Hypothesis 1); the priority of criteria
also differed.

The same process was followed for the 13 items defining the
Human Relations dimension; the two sets of rankings were not
significantly correlated, \( r_s (13) = .19, p > .05 \). It can again be concluded
that not only were more items perceived as highly important for the
community-based organization than for the college, but the priority of
items also differed.

For the 13 items defining the Client Orientation subdimension of
Service Effectiveness the results again indicate that the correlation
between the two sets of rankings were not significant, \( r_s (13) = .55, p >
.05 \). The same pattern described for the previous dimensions continues
to hold: in support of Hypothesis 2, more criteria were identified as
essential for the community-based organization and the priority of criteria
varied between the organizations.

Finally, when the rankings of the 23 items defining the Quality
Procedures subdimension of Service Effectiveness were compared
between the college and community-based organization, the rankings
again were not correlated significantly, \( r_s (23) = -.33, p > .05 \). Again,
Hypothesis 2 seemed to be clearly supported in that the organizations
had different priorities in terms of Quality Procedures.

In summary, in support of Hypothesis 2, the ranking of criteria in terms of their perceived importance on each dimension was different for the two prototypical organizations. Not only were more items identified as essential for the community-based organization, there also appeared to be differences in which items were comparatively most important for the two organizations. Since these proximal criteria are important in monitoring organization performance, the subhypotheses regarding which types of criteria are most important for the two prototypical organizations will be more closely examined in Study B.

The results of the ranking comparisons must be interpreted with two caveats. First, the fact that the rankings do not represent equal intervals may minimize some of the differences in perceived importance between items and maximize others. The second potential problem is that the items were rated on a restricted range. This may have contributed to the nonsignificant correlations between the sets of rankings.

**Hypothesis 3: Priority of dimensions of effectiveness.**

Hypothesis 3 and the subhypotheses stated that the two prototypical organization descriptions would be perceived to have different priorities in terms of the dimensions of effectiveness. Hypothesis 3(a) and 3(b) stated respectively that Organization
Maintenance and Human Relations would be the most important priorities for the community-based organization. The initial intention had been to use factor analysis to produce factor scores which could subsequently be used in the analysis to determine priority of dimensions. Again, because there were too few respondents and highly intercorrelated variables, a better solution was to substitute factor scores with the average of item ratings on each dimension, using only the items that had been identified by a significant number of participants as essential to the community-based organization. Given that not all items were of equal importance, each item's CVR was used to weight the means in computing the averages on each dimension. Table 2 lists the average ratings and the corresponding weighted average ratings on each dimension.

The weighted average scores on each dimension were then compared in a one way within-subjects ANOVA. There was a significant effect for the dimensions rated, $F(3, 11) = 39.49, p < .0001$. Using a within-subjects design, the procedure performs linear transformations of the dependent variables so that they are statistically independent and so that the sum of the squared coefficients is 1, hence "orthonormal contrasts" are automatically carried out (Norusis, 1992). The results indicate that, although all the dimensions were perceived to be of high importance for the community-based organization, Client Orientation was
Table 2

Mean Scores on Effectiveness Dimensions for Community-Based Organization Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Weighted SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Orientation</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Maintenance</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Procedures</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  *n = 16;  *n = 14.
Each item was rated on a three-point scale. Items were recoded for this analysis such that the higher the score the more the item was perceived as essential.
perceived as significantly most important, compared to the remaining dimensions, $F(1, 13) = 103.56, p < .0001$. Organization Maintenance was also perceived to be of significantly higher priority than the average of the remaining two dimensions: Quality Procedures and Human Relations, $F(1, 13) = 15.26, p < .005$. Even Quality Procedures was perceived as a higher priority than Human Relations, $F(1, 13) = 12.26, p < .005$. This is a clear indication to avoid assessing the effectiveness of community-based organizations on outcome measures alone. The primary focus was not perceived to be on numbers and quantifiable assessments, but rather on ensuring that the program remained flexible to address individual client needs and environmental contingencies.

In short, while there was equivocal support for hypothesis 3(a), 3(b) was not supported. Although it had been hypothesized that community-based organizations' unstable existences force an emphasis on survival and hence on maintaining themselves, respondents did not entirely perceive this to be the case for the described community-based organization. Whereas Organization Maintenance was not perceived to be the highest priority, it was still perceived as a high priority, being ranked second in importance out of four dimensions. The perception was that tailoring programs to ensure that client needs were met, that clients were supported and followed, and that their feedback was valued
outweighed all other concerns. Thus, based on the perception of these respondents, client input is an important component to build into evaluations of success. This finding is consistent with some of the research; service effectiveness has been most frequently used as the definition of HSO effectiveness. The assumption has been that since serving clients is the raison d’etre for a program it should be used as a success index (Anthony, 1977; Gitterman & Miller, 1989; Hudson, 1988; Martin, 1988; Petty & Burning, 1980; Rapp & Poertner, 1988; Sung, 1985).

A focus on clients is actually compatible with social work values (Field & Dubey, 1967; Malka, 1989; McCormack & Devore, 1986), and it is from the ranks of social workers that staff are frequently drawn. Whereas the shortcomings of a service effectiveness approach have been outlined, they have mostly been directed at a goal-oriented approach; the types of criteria identified here expand far beyond the criticized pre- post-test approach to defining service effectiveness. It should be clear, however, that while Client Orientation may be perceived as the highest priority by external experts, it was not endorsed as the sole priority, indicating that a multi-component assessment is still supported.

Although based on its average overall rating Human Relations was predicted to also be of high priority, in fact, it actually was
perceived to be the lowest priority of all four dimensions. It is interesting that this was the case, since these workers frequently complain about burnout and are extremely difficult to replace. Most of the current management trends tend to emphasize the importance of human relations. Given that these respondents were not directly involved in service delivery, this finding may be unique to this respondent group. The possibility that Human Relations should be assigned a higher priority, especially given the impact it has on clients, can be further examined in Study B with actual HSO staff.

It will be recalled that human service organizations were described as having to please two separate groups in order to be deemed effective: funders in terms of management effectiveness and clients in terms of service effectiveness. Correspondingly, the two highest perceived priorities reflect this split. While organization maintenance relates back to funders, and acquiring the means for the organization to function, client orientation relates directly to meeting the needs of clients.

The last part of Hypothesis 3 (H3c) pertained to the college description. It was hypothesized that for college-based programs, dimensions of service effectiveness would be rated as the most important priorities relative to the other dimensions of effectiveness. Given that the majority of items (five of the seven) identified as most essential by the participants did, in fact, originate from the Quality
Procedures subdimension of Service Effectiveness, it was not necessary to conduct further analysis. In support of H3(c), this finding can be taken as some indication that service effectiveness and, in particular, establishing quality procedures, was perceived by participants as the most important priority for the college.

There are two possible explanations for service effectiveness being viewed as so critical. One possibility is that, given colleges' conventionally established systemic links, the assumption is that by measuring service effectiveness the other facets of organizational effectiveness are implicitly measured. The other possibility is that service effectiveness is simply seen as the most important focus for colleges, independent and regardless of the other dimensions.

Although there has been criticism of such an exclusive focus on service effectiveness, most of the criticism has been targeted at uncertain HSOs, given their poorly established links between organization components and the indeterminate technology. Further, while the community-based organization has to please two separate groups (management and service effectiveness), given the college's assured resources, the focus on the service effectiveness aspect can be more pronounced.

Summary

It was clear from the participants perceived organizational
effectiveness differently for the prototypical college and community-based descriptions. The most important and remarkable finding was that significantly more proximal criteria were perceived as essential for indicating the effectiveness of the community-based organization. Given the lack of established systemic links, a number of indicators, spread across all dimensions, were clearly perceived as essential to the community-based organization's effectiveness. Not only was effectiveness in the college perceived as indicated by few criteria, these all tended to reflect quality—ensuring that the appropriate infrastructures were in place—much as with Salancik's (1981) discussion of standards of structures.

Interestingly, service effectiveness was perceived as the highest priority, for both organization descriptions; however, for the college it was the Quality Procedures aspect, and for the community-based organization it was Client Orientation. Patti (1988) described three outcomes defining service effectiveness. The first two of these outcomes, measurable changes and quality procedures, are consistent with what was identified as most important for the college. The third outcome, client satisfaction, is consistent with what was found as most important for the community-based organization.

While the rank ordering of proximal criteria did tend to differ between the two prototypical organization descriptions, most of the
proximal criteria tended to be perceived as more important for the community-based organization than for the college. There are two possible interpretations for substantially more criteria being perceived as essential to monitor in the community-based organization than in the college. The first possibility is that the initial item pool did not contain the most essential criteria for the college. Given that the literature review was extensive and that independent editors were asked to add any missing criteria, it is not likely that this was the case. The more plausible explanation is that when organizations are well entrenched in society, such as with the college, it is not expected that they have to demonstrate effectiveness to the same degree as is the case with the community-based organization.

Thus, from this group of experts there seems to be a clear understanding that organizational effectiveness must be conceptualized, measured and achieved differently as a function of an organization's operational certainty. This understanding is in direct contrast to what has traditionally tended to be the case; HSOs have been grouped together without recognition of how their differences will impinge on management and hence organizational effectiveness. In the case of the college-based description, likely as a result of its depiction of established systemic links, the perception seems to have been that conceptualizing, measuring and achieving organizational effectiveness may revolve
around measurable criteria, such as outcomes and the absence or presence of specific structures and procedures.

The experts here provided confirmatory support for the concern expressed by front line workers of operationally-uncertain HSOs that they not be evaluated by standards and criteria appropriate for operationally-certain HSOs. That is, the implication of these findings is that in striving for, monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of operationally-uncertain HSOs there should not be an overemphasis on outcome to the exclusion of process measures and other less quantifiable criteria.

From a community-based organization perspective, the finding has both positive and negative connotations. On the one hand, to the benefit of operationally-uncertain HSOs, the inherent differences in HSOs are recognized and the need for operationally-certain appropriate measures is affirmed. On the other hand, there seems to be an endorsement of a more intensive approach to demonstrating the effectiveness of uncertain HSOs. Given that the staff of these organizations tend to be overworked, called upon to play a number of roles, and highly engaged in the work process, an in-depth approach is not always looked upon favourably, but rather as an additional burden.

This point is critical and must be considered by those involved in setting up, consulting with and evaluating uncertain HSOs. If careful attention is paid to setting up the appropriate management and
monitoring systems for each facet of effectiveness when organizations are in the developmental phase, the process of demonstrating effectiveness becomes part of the daily organization functioning, not an additional requirement, and becomes integral to maintaining the organization's flexibility. Operationally-uncertain HSOs must be encouraged to develop appropriate management information systems which can actually reduce workload by serving multiple purposes. These multiple purposes may have an internal focus, such as tracking needs for improvement, changing community needs, the potential for adding on complementary services, and establishing community linkages, and an external focus, by providing the necessary information to multiple stakeholders. The importance of multifaceted monitoring must be emphasized to those individuals involved in service delivery; monitoring the organization through information systems is not simply "red tape," but can be an integral facet of improving organizational functioning.
CHAPTER IV
STUDY B

Method

Study B attempted to replicate Study A's findings using a different population—staff from actual skills-training programs—to corroborate Study A's findings and to reduce the criteria to a useful, shorter form that could be used in subsequent scale development. Theorists have suggested that multiple constituencies may have different perspectives as to what constitutes effectiveness (Gitterman & Miller, 1989; Patti, 1988; Pennings & Goodman, 1977; Reid, 1988), and this approach could verify the concurrence between external and internal stakeholders. A two way multivariate factorial design was used. The first factor was subjects' own occupational Setting (colleges - high operational-certainty; alternative programs offered in college settings - mid range operational-certainty; community-based organizations - low operational-certainty); the second factor was the type of organization description being rated (high or low operational-certainty).

Participants

In order to enhance the external validity of the study, the participants for Study B were staff members purposely selected from Ontario skills-training programs chosen to represent the range of operational-certainty, from college-based to community-based office
skills-training programs. Programs defined as intermediate included alternative programs offered on college campuses or affiliated with other established/mainstream organizations, such as Futures. While these latter programs may use some nontraditional approaches, they maintain some level of operational-certainty by virtue of their strong links with well-known institutions from which they may access resources.

There were several reasons for selecting these participants. First, these individuals are familiar with issues surrounding HSO operations and effectiveness and could knowledgeably rate HSO performance measures. Second, participants could apply the measures to their own organizations. Third, by using respondents from the three types of HSOs, biases associated with one’s own occupational setting could be tested.

In order to gain access to as many respondents as possible, umbrella and funding organizations were contacted by phone to request cooperation in identifying a number of specific organizations and contact people. Participant organizations were also solicited from a comprehensive list of Ontario colleges and Senior Adult Education Officers (who were responsible for the alternative programs offered in colleges), a United Way list of community-based programs, a list of community-based and alternative programs associated with Humber college, and through the Community Information Centre’s Blue Book.
Three groups of respondents were formed: college-based program respondents (selected from 15 colleges), community-based program respondents (selected from 75 different community-based organizations), and respondents from alternative programs, such as Futures (selected from 34 different organizations). When multiple respondents from one organization were selected, a maximum of two were selected from middle or upper management (including Department Heads, Department Chairs, and Area Coordinators for the colleges and Program Managers for the community-based and alternative programs) and the remaining respondents were front-line workers.

Although the maximum number of respondents solicited from any one community-based or alternative program did not exceed three, there were multiple respondents solicited from many of the colleges since they offered multiple office training courses. For example, some colleges offered short-term certificate programs, such as bookkeeping and wordprocessing, as well as longer diploma courses offering broader secretarial training and office/business administration. In some institutions secretarial training was further subdivided into legal and executive secretarial training; while there is overlap in courses they are considered separate programs. Using multiple programs from one college permitted as wide a subject pool as possible. The largest numbers of respondents from a single site were solicited from Sault
College (n = 12) and Humber College (n = 11). In total, 217 participants were mailed questionnaires and 45 participants actually took part in the study.

**Materials**

Although the Total Design Method dictates keeping the questionnaire as short as possible to increase response rates (Dillman, 1978), the resulting questionnaire was longer than optimal because of the large number of issues which had to be addressed. It was anticipated that the task's relevance and subjects' motivation in contributing to meaningful outcomes would compensate for the length of the questionnaire.

Most of the items were fixed alternative with a Likert Scale response format. Attempts were made to ensure that the questionnaire was attractive and that the task was simple and easy to complete; items were clearly worded, to the point, and relevant to the respondent, thereby increasing the probability of response to individual questions, and avoiding lack of response to ambiguous and open-ended questions (Sheatsley, 1983).

The questionnaire (Appendix E) consisted of four parts. The first part of the questionnaire requested demographic information regarding respondents' own organizations (e.g., organization chart, reporting structure, accountability requirements such as number of separate
stakeholders and frequency of reports, length of time for which their funding is assured, likelihood of funding being received yearly, number of funding sources, degree of latitude allowed in staff decision making, degree of routinization in the procedures, difficulty in recruiting clients, variability in clients). Where possible, questions provided alternative responses, however, this was the only section which also contained several open-ended questions. Respondents were also asked to indicate their employment positions and whether they would be willing to be interviewed.

The second part of the questionnaire included the two prototypical organization descriptions and organization-verification items that checked that the manipulations were perceived as intended. These organization-verification items were selected from the 28 items initially administered to the three independent editors, who aided in refining the descriptions (prior to Study A). The number of organization-verification items was reduced from the 28 initial items to six items; two for each variable manipulated in the descriptions (Appendix E). Three items were designed to verify that the prototypical college description was perceived to have high formal structuralization, technological determinacy and environmental certainty. Three items verified that the prototypical community-based organization had low formal structuralization, technological determinacy and environmental certainty. For example, in
terms of the formal structuralization dimension, "Decisions are made by a few key people at the head of the organization" was intended to verify that the described college was perceived as having a highly formalized structure and "Staff decide how to go about carrying out their own work responsibilities" was intended to verify that the described community-based organization was perceived as having a low degree of formalization. Based on the independent editors' suggestions, there was also modification in the organization-verification item rating scale, from the initial three-point scale to a five-point scale; the verification items were all fixed choice, ranging from "strongly agree" (1) to "strongly disagree" (5).

The third part of the questionnaire consisted of items from the initial item pool given to the 16 Study A participants. It will be recalled that using Lawshe's (1975) formula, seven items had initially been rated as significantly essential for the prototypical college and 55 items had been identified as significantly essential for the community-based organization. It was important to give the Study B subjects a reasonable range of criteria, covering all major dimensions, from which to choose essential items for the college description and also to allow for an equitable/comparable number of items from which respondents would select essential items for both the college and community-based organizations. As a result, the items that had been identified by Study A
respondents as least essential to the effectiveness of the described college were eliminated, but the cut-off point for identification of an item as essential to effectiveness was also lowered for the prototypical college (CVR = .25). This step allowed an additional 21 items to be included in the final list of items perceived as essential for the college. Even at the lowered significance level for the college, over 62% of the independent editors would have rated the item as "essential." At the same time, the cut-off point was raised slightly for the items identified as essential to the community-based organization, to reduce the number of items to 37 (CVR = .62).

The mean CVR, or Content Validity Index (CVI), was then calculated for the retained items for each organization description separately. This index represents the extent to which high scoring on the scale is perceived to represent actual organizational effectiveness (Cascio, 1987), and it provides a weighting of the perceived importance of the criteria. The CVI for the retained items for the community-based organization was .72. The CVI for the retained items for the college was .38.

Using these statistical criteria, of the 178 items that comprised the original item pool submitted to Study A participants, 28 items were finally selected as the item pool of essential items for the college and 37 items were chosen as the item pool of essential items for the community-based
organization in Study B. Clearly the decision to change the cut-off point for inclusion of an item as essential for either prototypical description had some impact on Study B, since the items selected for the community-based organization were all highly important items, while some less important items were included for the college. The two sets of items were combined and any redundancy was eliminated, which resulted in a refined set of 51\(^1\) items.

Respondents were asked to perform a similar task to participants in Study A and judge the importance of each item for the effectiveness of both prototypical organization descriptions and of their own organization, using the same three point scale. The community-based organization, the college and the respondent's own organization were all assessed on the final set of 51 items.

The fourth part of the questionnaire consisted of six items that globally assessed organizational success. Each of the six items was in the form of a statement followed by the same five-point scale that was used with the organization verification items, ranging from "strongly agree" (1) to "strongly disagree" (5). All six of the items were based on

\(^1\) Note. One of the 52 questionnaire items should have been eliminated when the cut-off for identifying an item as essential for the community-based organization was raised. It was not included in any of the analyses.
the literature but had to be modified to take into consideration the
nonprofit nature of the HSOs, and the fact that organization descriptions
and not actual organizations were being rated. The argument can be
made that the inclusion of six universal success items defeats the intent
of demonstrating that effectiveness criteria will vary with operational
certainty. They were included here to permit post-hoc comparisons
should the findings not clearly support the hypotheses. Also, they would
permit a greater understanding of how the two prototypical descriptions
were perceived and whether there were biases associated with one type
of organization.

Herman and Heimovics (1991) claim that the most clearcut
measure of nonprofit organizations’ effectiveness is survival, and
Reimann (1982) similarly identified survival as an ultimate criterion. One
item specifically tapped this idea: "How likely do you feel it is that the
organization will survive in the long run?"

Along the same lines as survival, Reimann (1982) identifies
growth as an ultimate criterion. That is, if an organization is to be
successful in the long term it must grow (or maintain itself). The item
from Reimann’s (1982) scale required a subjective assessment of the
potential for future growth in sales and/or profits, but in the present study
was translated to growth in human service terms: "How likely do you feel
it is that the organization has the potential for future growth in the
amount of clients it can handle" (Reimann, 1982). Finch (1978) also identified increasing client load as an indication of effectiveness. The item measuring growth in employment capacity was taken directly from Reimann (1982): "How likely do you feel it is that the organization has the ability to attract and retain high quality manpower?" Growth in revenues was also identified in the literature by Cameron (1986), who used indices of financial strength as one indicator of long-term success of universities, and Reimann (1982) who used a subjective assessment of average profitability, albeit in a manufacturing firm. The item: "How likely do you feel it is that the organization has the potential for developing a more extensive funding base" was aimed at tapping the notion of financial security and growth.

The final two global success items that were included attempted to tap notions of competition. The first item resulted from a modification of "How would your competitors rate your overall performance relative to your industry" (Reimann, 1982) to: "How likely do you feel it is that the organization will be more successful than others of its kind?" The second item attempted to translate the essence of: "How would you rate this company in terms of the contribution it makes to the community as a whole" (Miller, 1980) combined with Reimann's (1982) item requiring a subjective assessment of customer service performance. It was modified to: "How likely do you feel it is that the organization would be evaluated
favourably by outside constituencies?"

The order of the two prototypical descriptions within the questionnaire was counterbalanced across subjects, to control for order and position effects.

Procedure

Initial Contact

The majority of directors/managers or college department heads from identified organizations were first contacted by phone, informed of the intent of the proposed study and asked to participate. They were told to expect further correspondence within a two week time period. Where possible, more than one program from a specific college was used.

In the case of the community-based programs, not all organizations received a preliminary phone contact. In some cases, given time constraints and the fact that names of contact individuals were identified on the list of participants provided, the introductory step was omitted.

Questionnaire Administration

The questionnaires were administered by mail. This method was chosen rather than a face to face, or telephone interview, because it allowed for a relatively longer questionnaire, questions requiring some thought could be used, the expense and time could be reduced, and the
respondents could complete the questionnaire at their convenience. The questionnaire package, including a cover letter (Appendix F) and a self-addressed stamped envelope, was sent to each HSO.

Dillman (1978) suggests that the use of follow-up mailings substantially increases response rates. Hence, two follow-up mailings (Appendix G) were made, the first at three weeks after the initial mail-out, consisting of a reminder card emphasizing the importance of the respondent's participation. A telephone number was provided for those respondents who required an additional booklet. At six weeks, those respondents who had not yet returned their questionnaires were sent an additional reminder card. Two to three months after the initial mail-out, attempts were made to contact by telephone all recipients who had not yet responded. The time lag between the second reminder card and the final phone call was somewhat longer than ideal because of the unplanned interruption of summer holidays for many of the respondents.
CHAPTER IV

Results and Discussion

Qualitative data were used to supplement the quantitative data, in order to identify and illuminate possible trends which the limited number of respondents may have obscured in statistical analyses.

This chapter begins with a description of the sample. The subsequent section takes an inductive approach, focusing on how the prototypical organization descriptions were perceived. The third section discusses those items identified as important for effectiveness for both prototypical descriptions, and provides general descriptive statistics. The fourth section tests is more deductive in nature and examines whether Study B's findings are actually consistent both with Study A results and with the hypotheses.

Sample Characteristics

A total of 217 questionnaires were mailed out and 45 useable questionnaires (in majority completed and returned on time) were returned, resulting in an overall return rate of 20.7%. A number of factors, some confirmed by respondent feedback, may have contributed to the low return rate. These factors include the length of the questionnaire; the voluntary nature of cooperation; and the interruption of summer holidays in the questionnaire administration process. Further, the insistence of several contact people that they control questionnaire
distribution may have reduced response rate by prohibiting the sending of reminder notices to the specific people who received the questionnaire. Since every effort was taken at the outset to address these issues, by using the Total Design Method, providing self-addressed stamped envelopes, rendering the questionnaire attractive and easy to complete, and attempting to elicit the cooperation of managers in the organizations, the low response rate was somewhat unexpected. The primary impact of the limited number of subjects was that it eliminated the feasibility of certain multivariate analyses, particularly factor analysis to verify the existence of underlying dimensions. Although it is debateable whether the use of factor analysis would have even been advantageous for reasons previously outlined, to circumvent any potential problem, where appropriate, alternative analyses were conducted and univariate effects were also examined.

There was also a differential return rate. Seventy-eight questionnaires were mailed out to 15 separate colleges and 22 completed questionnaires were returned within the time frame of the study (28.2%), representing 10 different colleges. Eighty-nine questionnaires were mailed out to 75 different community-based organizations and 9 were returned (10.1%), representing eight different community-based organizations. Thirty-four separate alternative programs offered in colleges were sent 50 questionnaires and 14 were
returned (28%), from 11 separate organizations.

Appendix H details return rates according to the Total Design Method procedures. It was initially anticipated that the community-based respondents would have the highest interest in completing the questionnaire, given their struggle to demonstrate effectiveness; however, this did not prove to be the case. The particularly low return rate of the community-based organization respondents may retrospectively be explained by several reasons: they had the least amount of direct contact (by phone) of the three settings and, according to nonrespondent feedback, they are the most over-worked, most targeted for studies, and have the highest accountability requirements requiring constant completion of questionnaires. Many of these problems were exacerbated by the institution of the Social Contract which transpired in the midst of the research process and required enforced time-off.

Given the substantially lower return rate of the community-based organization respondents, the potential impact of respondents' occupational setting on the data was examined. Of concern was whether respondents believed that their type of organization was the most effective (or conversely ineffective) and correspondingly identified the description most like their organization as most effective (or ineffective), whether respondents selected items as essential on the
basis of how their own organization behaves, or alternatively, whether familiarity with one type of organization might influence responses in a systematic way. Whereas the analyses consider the effects of setting, it is possible given the few community-based participants, and the few participants overall, that subtle effects may not be detected.

Prototypical Organization Descriptions

The first question to be addressed was whether respondents perceived the two organization descriptions as intended. Specifically:

Question #1:
Were the two prototypical organization descriptions perceived differently in the intended ways, such that the community-based organization was perceived as having low formal structuralization, technological determinacy, and environmental certainty and the college was perceived as having high formal structuralization, technological determinacy and environmental certainty?

If the descriptions were not perceived as intended, then the remaining results could be called into question. Every effort was taken at the outset to ensure that, while prototypical, the descriptions were reasonably realistic. This aim was pursued by basing the descriptions on actual programs, and submitting the descriptions to experts for comment. If, in fact, the aim of having realistic descriptions was achieved, and the manipulations were appropriately perceived, it would also suggest that actual colleges and community-based programs are perceived as differing along these dimensions (an important finding if one wants to generalize from the data to actual organizations).
There are several indications that the manipulations were perceived as intended. First, on a three-point scale, ranging from "not at all" (1) to "to a great extent" (3), of the three respondent groups, those from colleges felt that their organization most closely resembled the college description ($M = 2.4$ versus $M = 1.2$ for community-based respondents and $M = 1.6$ for alternative program respondents), $F(2, 40) = 12.92, p < .00001$, and those from community-based organizations felt that their organization most closely resembled the community-based organization description ($M = 2.2$ versus $M = 1.42$ for college respondents and $M = 2.0$ for alternative program respondents), $F(2, 39) = 5.48, p < .01$. In each case, the alternative program respondents felt that their programs fell somewhere between the two other organizations. Ninety percent of those from colleges felt that their program at least somewhat resembled the college description, and 100% of respondents from community-based organizations felt that their program at least somewhat resembled the community-based organization description.

Second, analyses conducted on the six organization-verification items also supported the conclusion that the two prototypical organization descriptions were perceived as intended. Two items measured each of the three operational-certainty dimensions along which the two prototypical descriptions were purposely varied: formal structuralization, technological determinacy, environmental certainty. If the college was
perceived as intended, there would have been strong agreement that the three high operationally-certain items pertaining to centralized decision making; established and understandable work procedures; and assured yearly funding described the college, and disagreement that the low operational-certainty items pertaining to staff latitude in decision-making; many exceptions in work procedures; and funding being contingent on adapting to changing political demands accurately described the college. Conversely, if the community-based organization was perceived as intended, there would have been strong agreement that staff latitude in decision-making; many exceptions in work procedures; and funding being contingent on adapting to changing political demands accurately described the community-based organization description and disagreement that the three items pertaining to centralized decision-making; established and understandable work procedures; and assured yearly funding described the community-based organization.

Table 3 includes the means and standard deviations for the six organization-verification items applied to the college and to the community-based organization description. Items were rated on a five-point scale, where "1" indicated strong agreement and "5" strong disagreement. Although none of the mean ratings fell at either extreme of the scale, there were clear differences in how the two descriptions were perceived. According to the mean ratings, the college was rated
Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Organization Verification Items for Prototypical College and Community-Based Organization Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Prototypical College</th>
<th>Prototypical Community-Based Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structuralization:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions by few+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff decide own work*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Determinacy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly established procedures+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many exceptions*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Certainty:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding contingent on politics*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assured Funding+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A low score signifies strong agreement.

+Indicates high operational certainty items which should describe college.

*Indicates low operational certainty items which should describe community-based organization.
lower than the community-based organization (the lower the score the stronger the endorsement of the item) on the high operational certainty items. That is, there was strong agreement that the college was more operationally certain that the community-based organization. Conversely, the community-based organization was rated lower than the college on the low operational certainty items, again indicating there was strong agreement that the community-based organization had low operational certainty compared to the college.

Table 4 provides the results of a (3 × 2) doubly multivariate repeated measures analysis of variance testing the significance of the differences between ratings on the organization-verification items for the two prototypical organization descriptions. Each respondent rated multiple variables (the six organization-verification items) at multiple times (the two organization descriptions). Respondents were assigned to one of three groups on the basis of their occupational setting: college, community-based organization, or alternative program. Hence, two independent variables were included: the respondents’ occupational Setting (college, community-based programs, and intermediate/alternative programs) and Description (high operational-certainty in the college description and low operational-certainty in the community-based description). The paired organization-verification items were the repeated measures.
Table 4

MANOVA of Organization Verification Items as a Function of Respondents' Setting and Description Rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Pillai</th>
<th>Hypoth. df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>15.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting By Description</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F - tests for Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>F(1, 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisions by few</td>
<td>49.77</td>
<td>43.46</td>
<td>45.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff decide own work</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>37.26</td>
<td>61.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly established procedures</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>36.98</td>
<td>28.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many exceptions</td>
<td>37.42</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>33.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding contingent on politics</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>60.84</td>
<td>16.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assured Funding</td>
<td>48.10</td>
<td>34.51</td>
<td>55.75*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .0001.
Using Pillai’s criterion, there was no significant multivariate interaction effect between Setting and type of Description rated, $F(12, 72) = 1.22$, $p > .05$, and the respondents' own occupational setting had no multivariate impact on the ratings, $F(12, 72) = 1.32$, $p > .05$. Most important for the remainder of the analyses, as Table 4 indicates, the basic assumption on which the hypothesis testing rests was supported; the two descriptions were rated multivariately, significantly differently on the organization-verification items, using Pillai’s criterion, $F(6, 35) = 15.39$, $p < .0001$. Univariate F tests indicate that, as expected, all the variables that were manipulated across the two descriptions were rated significantly differently and examination of their means, displayed in Table 3, indicates that the differences were in the appropriate direction. The college was rated as more certain on all three dimensions, with an overall mean score of 1.90 (corresponding to "mostly agree") for the three items which measured high certainty. The community-based organization had an overall mean score of 1.88 (also corresponding to "mostly agree") on the three items measuring uncertainty on the three dimensions.

Both prototypical organizations were rated in the intended direction on the three items designed to provide confirming evidence; the college was rated as having formal structuralization, technological determinacy and environmental certainty and the community-based
organization was rated as having low formal structuralization, technological indeterminacy, and environmental uncertainty.

Because neither description received two high nor two low ratings on both items from the same dimension, there is indication that the two items from the same dimension were clearly seen as leaning towards opposing ends of a dimension. When the verification items were applied to the organizations for which they were not intended, some of the ratings were more neutral and there was a wider range of responses. There are several possible explanations for these more neutral ratings. Items may have been seen as more ambiguous when they were applied to the description for which they were not intended. Alternatively, since the two verification items were meant to describe a dimension and neither organization was perceived to fall at the extreme ends of the dimension, it is possible that, without being inconsistent, respondents might perceive one end of the dimension as somewhat to strongly descriptive of the organization and the other end as neutral or somewhat undescriptive of the organization. Finally, if respondents were extrapolating beyond the descriptions to organizations with which they were familiar, this wider range of responses may indicate a perception of varying standards, particularly across colleges.

Descriptive Statistics

Having ascertained that the two prototypical organization
descriptions were perceived as intended, this section describes how
Study B respondents perceived effectiveness in the two prototypical
descriptions. Specifically, this section addresses the following multi-
component question:

Question #2:
How did Study B respondents rate the two prototypical
organizations; what did they perceive to be most important and
unimportant indicators of effectiveness; how did their perceptions
compare to those of Study A's judging panel?

Respondents rated each of 51 items in terms of its importance for
indicating the effectiveness of the college, and separately for the
community-based organization description. The 51 items consisted of 28
items that had been identified by Study A participants as most essential
to the college description (referred to hereforth as Study A college items)
and 37 items that had been identified as most essential to the
community-based organization description (referred to hereforth as Study
A community-based items). (There was an overlap of 14 items that were
perceived as essential for both organizations.) Items were scored using
the same three-point scale as in Study A, where "1" meant the items was
"essential to the effectiveness" of the described organization, "2" meant
the item was "useful, but not necessary to the effectiveness" of the
described organization, and "3" meant the item was "irrelevant to the
effectiveness" of the described organization.

Table 5 includes HSO staff mean ratings and standard deviations
for the 51 items applied to the college and the community-based organization descriptions. The items identified by a significant number of respondents as essential to the described organization's effectiveness, using Lawshe's (1975) formula, are underlined.

Effectiveness Item Ratings for Prototypical College Description

There was substantial concurrence between Study A and Study B respondents in their ratings of items applied to the prototypical college. This finding increases faith in Study A results insofar as the items the participants in Study A identified as essential were also identified as essential in Study B. Conversely, only one of the 13 items identified as essential to indicating the college's effectiveness in Study B ("The organization must remain adaptable to possible changes") ($M = 1.39; CVR = .44, p < .05$) was not perceived as essential in Study A, even after the criterion had been made more lenient ($M = 1.50, CVR = .12, p > .05$). (It will be recalled that the cut-off point for identification of an item as essential to the college in Study A was lowered to allow inclusion of a more representative range of items for Study B, from seven to 28 items.) Further, items perceived as least important for the college in Study B either tended to be Study A community-based items, or had only been included after the selection criterion was made more lenient. Of the 10 least essential items, verified as such by selecting the ten highest mean items ($M > 1.84$) and comparing the average of these ten items to
### Table 5

**Means and Standard Deviations of Items Applied to Prototypical College and Community-Based Organization Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College Description</th>
<th>Community-Based Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive staff training</td>
<td>1.24* .48 COL</td>
<td>1.26 .44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good info management believed imp't</td>
<td>1.56 .69 COL</td>
<td>1.21 .41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff abreast of training developments</td>
<td>1.33* .56 COL</td>
<td>1.12 .32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff encouraged to keep up training</td>
<td>1.35* .68 COL</td>
<td>1.23 .43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff believe in org goals</td>
<td>1.44 .62 COL</td>
<td>1.07* .26 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/open problem solving</td>
<td>1.49 .66 COL</td>
<td>1.09* .37 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers nonconfrontational</td>
<td>1.56 .66 COL</td>
<td>1.23 .48 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of quality instilled</td>
<td>1.40 .69 COL</td>
<td>1.26 .44 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open communication with managers</td>
<td>1.56 .66 COL</td>
<td>1.16 .37 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because believe important, work hard</td>
<td>1.44 .66 COL</td>
<td>1.07* .26 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff input valued</td>
<td>1.66 .78</td>
<td>1.14 .35 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality internal communication valued</td>
<td>1.58 .78</td>
<td>1.14 .35 CB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Organization Maintenance** |                     |                             |
| **Financial Health**        |                     |                             |
| Org applies financial control system | 1.34* .53 COL   | 1.30 .51 CB                 |
| Multiple funding pursued | 1.95 .77            | 1.28 .55 CB                 |
| Prog Manager actively seeks funders | 2.09 .82         | 1.53 .70 CB                 |

| **Resource Acquisition**   |                     |                             |
| Org attracts/retains quality staff | 1.29* .41 COL   | 1.12* .33 CB                 |
| Org links with local businesses | 1.51 .67       | 1.12* .32 CB                 |
| Org is proactive           | 1.64 .78            | 1.14* .35 CB                 |
| Org tracks community needs | 1.62 .72            | 1.23 .43 CB                 |

<p>| <strong>Service Effectiveness</strong>  |                     |                             |
| <strong>Quality Procedures</strong>     |                     |                             |
| Quality monitored/controlled | 1.49 .63 COL      | 1.49 .67                     |
| Balanced Board             | 1.71 .79 COL       | 1.42 .54                     |
| Board has professional expertise | 1.70 .63 COL   | 1.60 .62                     |
| &quot;Policy&quot; Board not &quot;Hands-on&quot; | 1.72 .73 COL   | 1.46 .59                     |
| Service designed for quality | 1.66 .79 COL      | 1.45 .63                     |
| Quality standards established | 1.25* .44 COL   | 1.33 .52                     |
| Policy manuals establish guidelines | 1.66 .78 COL | 1.60 .66                     |
| Service quality measured | 1.61 .69 COL       | 1.59 .58                     |
| Target service levels set | 1.50 .63 COL       | 1.42 .59                     |
| Reporting mechanisms in place | 1.29* .46 COL   | 1.32 .47 CB                 |
| Prog accessible to disadvantaged | 1.73 .79 COL   | 1.14 .35 CB                 |
| Students' progress tracked | 1.46 .70 COL       | 1.16* .37 CB                 |
| Student entry needs assessed | 1.89 .84 COL   | 1.19 .50 CB                 |
| Org seeks out placements | 1.64 .65            | 1.37 .58 CB                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client centred approach</th>
<th>1.98</th>
<th>.79</th>
<th>1.16*</th>
<th>.37 CB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff must plan/goal set</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.47 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prog set around individuals’ needs</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.58 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement to try out new ideas</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.37 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff free to explore new directions</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.16*</td>
<td>.37 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org adaptable to changes</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.09*</td>
<td>.29 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry requirements flexible</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.67 CB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Client Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grads tracked to ensure hired</th>
<th>1.95</th>
<th>.78 COL</th>
<th>1.37</th>
<th>.54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement supervisors evaluate clients</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.72 COL</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.45 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning monitored</td>
<td>1.32*</td>
<td>.56 COL</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.51 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client feedback valued</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.49 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual client needs addressed</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.12*</td>
<td>.32 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client personal development important</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.43 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client complaints considered</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.37 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies built around client needs</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.16*</td>
<td>.37 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients asked if needs addressed</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.16*</td>
<td>.37 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student true needs identified</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.41 CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients influence program development</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.48 CB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The lower the score, the more the item was perceived as essential to the described organization's effectiveness; * Indicates items that were most essential on each dimension;

Underlined items were those identified as essential by a significant number of respondents using Lawshe's (1975) formula. COL indicates items that were identified as essential to college in Study A; CB indicates items that were identified as essential to community-based organization in Study A.
the average of the remaining 41 item means, \( t(35) = 7.22, \ p < .0001 \), eight items had been included in Study B because of their perceived importance to the effectiveness of the described community-based organization and the remaining two items had only been identified as essential for the college description after the cut-off point was lowered. These least important items tended to cluster in Service Effectiveness dimensions and pertained to innovative, proactive approaches, customizing services, and composition and functioning of the Board.

Similarly, illustrating the correspondence between Study A and B, the least important items on each dimension, based on their means, tended to be those items that had been identified as essential to the community-based organization in Study A. This was the case on the Human Relations dimension: the average of the two items with the highest means, both Study A community-based items ("Employee input is valued," \( M = 1.66 \) and "Quality internal communication on every level is believed to be of paramount importance," \( M = 1.58 \)), was perceived as statistically less essential for the college than was the average of the ten remaining items on the dimension, \( t(43) = -3.01, \ p < .005 \). This was also the case on the Organization Maintenance dimension: the average of the two items with the highest means, again both Study A's community-based items ("The program manager actively seeks out funders," \( M = 2.09 \); "Multiple funding sources are actively pursued," \( M = 1.96 \), was
also found to be statistically less essential than was the average of the five remaining item means, \( t(42) = -6.85, p < .0001 \). The average of the four highest mean items on the Quality Procedures subdimension of Service Effectiveness, three of which were Study A's community-based items ("Each students' needs are assessed upon entering the program," \( M = 1.89 \); "Entry requirements are purposely flexible," \( M = 2.19 \); "The program is fashioned around individual needs," \( M = 2.14 \); "A client centred/flexible approach is followed," \( M = 1.98 \), was again statistically less essential than was the average of the remaining 17 item means, \( t(37) = -5.85, p < .0001 \). Finally, the average of the three highest mean Client Orientation items, two of which were Study A community-based items, was significantly less essential than was the average of the remaining eight item means, \( t(41) = -4.63, p < .0001 \).

Based on Lawshe's (1975) content validity ratios (CVRs), 13 items were identified as significantly essential to the college's effectiveness. While there were representative items from all dimensions, the vast majority reflected a theme of quality control, and were clustered in Human Relations and Quality Procedures, each with five items. (This finding should be interpreted in the context of the fact that these dimensions initially comprised the most items.) These 13 items also tended to have the lowest means, indicating that they were perceived as most essential by this criterion, as well. The items with significant CVRs...
and the lowest means mostly pertained to achieving quality, standardization, and error reduction. The three most important items defining Service Effectiveness centre around instituting the appropriate structures for measuring and controlling quality. Two originated from the Quality Procedures dimension: "Quality standards are established" ($M = 1.25$) and "Reporting mechanisms are in place" ($M = 1.29$), the third item was on the Client Orientation subdimension, "Student learning of office skills is monitored" ($M = 1.32$).

The three most important items on the Human Relations dimension again emphasize setting quality standards through training/development. These items included: "Staff are extensively trained" ($M = 1.24$); "Staff are kept abreast of important developments that may affect client training" ($M = 1.33$); "Staff are encouraged to keep their training up to date" ($M = 1.35$). The link with efficiency and quality, that Quinn (1988) suggested would be important, is apparent.

On the Organization Maintenance dimension, the most important items reflect smooth internal functioning and a focus on quality and efficiency: "The organization attracts and retains quality staff" ($M = 1.20$), followed by: "The organization applies a financial control system" ($M = 1.34$).

As was discussed with respect to Study A, the items identified as most important, whether by their means or by their CVRs, are consistent
with what is reported in the literature. Salancik (1981) reported that standards of structures may be used as surrogate measures of effectiveness. He concluded that when organizations are "certain," a base technology exists and standards of structure can be used as yardsticks against which to measure effectiveness; it is known that certain elements must be present for effective service and the assumption is that if the right structures and standards are in place, effectiveness will follow. But, the other important point is that measuring the adherence to standards is a far easier task, particularly given that, in "certain" organizations, norms and outcome measures exist to facilitate setting standards and measuring progress (Rapp & Poertner, 1988).

Cameron's (1978; 1986) study of high certainty universities similarly identified quality of faculty as an important index of organizational effectiveness. Finch (1978), in studying 12 HSOs, also found that meeting standards was perceived as critical, whether expressed in the notion of accountability as the most important priority, or in the provision of quality service as a second priority. Quinn (1988) stated that for organizations at a formalization stage (high operational certainty), criteria associated with stability-control, goal attainment, productivity, and efficiency are critical (i.e., goal attainment and internal process models). Having standards in place is key to assessing whether the criteria are achieved.
Summary

Based on both HSO staff and the external experts in Study A, the most important finding is the perception of only a few items as essential to indicating the college's effectiveness. While it had initially been assumed that all the dimensions would be equally reflected, the identified criteria tended to cluster in two main areas and reflected a concern with setting and monitoring quality standards.

The most important items defining each dimension, based on their means, were all identified in Study A as essential to the prototypical college. That is, even though the college was rated on both Study A's college and community-based items, as was expected, HSO respondents tended to converge on the same items that had been identified in Study A as essential for the college. While this might seem an obvious conclusion, it was important to verify that this was the case given admonitions in the literature that individuals with different perspectives tend to identify different effectiveness criteria. (e.g., Edwards, Faerman & McGrath, 1986; Martin, 1988). In fact, this did not prove to be the case, although Study B participants did identify additional criteria as essential to the college.

Effectiveness Item Ratings for Prototypical Community-Based Organization Description

Similar to the findings regarding the prototypical college, there was
substantial correspondence between Study A and Study B respondents' ratings for the prototypical community-based organization. Although only 25.5% of the 51 possible items were identified by a significant number of subjects as being essential for the effectiveness of the described college, 84.3% of the 51 items were identified by a significant number of HSO respondents as essential to the effectiveness of the described community-based organization. It will be recalled that a similar pattern held in Study A; 55 items were initially identified as significantly essential to the community-based organization and the cut-off point was rendered more stringent to reduce the number of items (37) to be more comparable to the number identified for the prototypical college (28).

Although the number of items identified by a significant number of HSO staff as essential to the community-based organization (43) exceeds the 37 Study A community-based items, correspondence with Study A can still be demonstrated. First, there is a reinforcement of the pattern found in Study A of substantially more numerous and diverse items perceived as essential for the described community-based organization's effectiveness than for the described college's effectiveness. Second, only two of Study A's community-based items were rated higher than $M = 1.40$ by HSO staff, indicating that they were all perceived as highly essential. Third, the two least important items ($M = 1.60$) overall were actually Study A college items: "The Board has
professional expertise" and "Policy and procedures manuals establish guidelines". The average of these two item means indicates that they were perceived as significantly less essential than the remaining items, $t(39) = -5.71, p < .0001$. Finally, the discrepancy between the number of significant items identified in Study A and B was less pronounced than it appeared. While there were only 37 Study A community-based items included in Study B, two additional items that were significant in Study A but had been discarded when the cut-off for determining CVR significance was raised, actually were included in Study B because they had also been perceived as essential for the college. Thus, there was only a discrepancy of four items that were identified as essential in Study B but not A.

As was the case in Study A, the 12 most important ($M < 1.15$) items for the community-based organization tended to reflect all the dimensions of organizational effectiveness, although half of these items pertained to Human Relations. (Interestingly, Human Relations was perceived to be the dimension of lowest priority in Study A). The average of these 12 items was found to be significantly more important than the average of the remaining 39 item means, $t(39) = -7.19, p < .0001$.

All seven of the items on the Organization Maintenance dimension had been identified by Study A's participants as essential for
indicating the community-based organization's effectiveness and
similarly, six of the items were identified by a significant number of HSO
respondents as being essential, according to their CVRs. The three
most important items defining Resource Acquisition, based on their
means, were: "The organization establishes links with local businesses
that provide needed resources" ($M = 1.12$); "The organization thinks
proactively" ($M = 1.14$); and "The organization attracts and retains high
quality staff" ($M = 1.12$), $t(41) = -3.64, p < .001$

Items defining Financial Health, according to their mean ratings,
were not rated among the most important (although two of the three
financial items had significant CVRs). This finding may be explained by
Finch's (1978) point that concerns with minimizing costs may detract
from other priorities. The reverse may be equally true; while financial
concerns may be important, acquiring other types of resources and
meeting client needs may be perceived as more important priorities. In
support of this interpretation, all the Resource Acquisition items were
found essential by a significant number of respondents, three, as
discussed above, were perceived as highly essential and, in Study A,
Client Orientation was the most important dimension.

Another possible interpretation is that while activities directed
toward achieving and maintaining financial health are critical, they may
be perceived as important only in as much as they are means to an end.
That is, if the overriding objective is to address some need (e.g., helping visible minorities overcome institutionalized barriers to employment), the financial activities are considered as instrumental in supporting the organization in achieving the objective. This downplaying of a financial focus may be unique to community-based organizations. They tend to attract staff who highly identify with, and become immersed in, organization objectives and achievement of these objectives tends to be viewed as most important.

The finding that items defining Resource Acquisition were the most important on this dimension is consistent with much of the literature. Quinn (1988) identified open systems criteria, such as resource acquisition, and establishing external support, as most critical for entrepreneurial organizations and low operational-certainty organizations seem to present characteristics similar to those of entrepreneurial organizations. Similarly, Herman and Heimovics (1991) identified the development of informal networks and external relations as key activities for uncertain HSOs.

Egan (1993) suggests that in turbulent times (such as those faced habitually by low operationally-certain HSOs), organizations must learn from and adapt to the environment. Linking with businesses can be construed as an organization's attempt to address the insecurity associated with limited resources, by sharing and expanding the support
base. This explanation is also consistent with Salancik's (1981) finding regarding uncertain HSOs: namely, because of the absence of standards of operating structures and procedures and the nature of the raw material, disparate societal interests must be maintained and increasing external links is a sensible approach.

The identification of acquiring quality staff as an essential effectiveness criterion is an important finding. While it has already been discussed that community-based organizations tend to attract staff who closely identify with the organization's aims, the perception is that it should not be at the expense of training and credentials, as evidenced by the endorsement of the items pertaining to training on the Human Relations dimension (see below). In fact, these organizations operating in turbulent environments are the most in need of highly trained staff to deal with high client variability. They also have the greatest difficulty in hiring and retaining highly credentialed staff because of relatively low pay, extensive job demands, and the necessity for intense worker-client interaction that frequently results in high levels of staff burnout (Ursprung, 1986; Welsch & LaVan, 1981). Thus, quality staff from a community-based perspective may refer to dedication to the organization's objectives, as well as having appropriate training.

Human relations have received the most attention in the human services literature and consistently, all items on the Human Relations
dimension were found to be essential, both by their CVRs and by their ratings. While this was particularly true of the eight Study A community-based items, Study A college items also were viewed as essential. The items that had particularly low mean ratings: "Staff believe in the organization's goals" ($M = 1.07$); "People work hard because they believe their work is important" ($M = 1.09$); "Problems are dealt with in a fair and open manner" ($M = 1.09$), $t(42) = -3.39$, $p < .005$, are consistent with the discussion thus far. There seems to be a recognition of the instrumentality of staff in achieving the organization's goals and objectives. As a result, it is of particular importance to acquire quality staff, but especially staff who endorse and support the organization's goals. The logical follow-up point is that staff must be treated fairly, as expressed by the third important indicator on this dimension.

The content of these items pinpoints a difference from those Human Relations criteria that were identified for the college. In the community-based organization, the emphasis seems to be on the recognition of staff value which promotes organization commitment and in turn, impacts on their performance and hence service delivery. In the college, the emphasis was on streamlining/training staff as a means of controlling quality and potential impact. The recognition of staff potential in community-based organizations is consistent with the point raised in the introduction, that while staff in all HSOs may want professional
autonomy (Grasso & Epstein, 1988; Kouzes & Mico, 1979), it is perceived as essential for community-based organizations, given the link established between staff job satisfaction and client satisfaction (Beatty, 1988; Buffum & Konick, 1982; Friedlander & Pickle, 1968; Schwartz & Will, 1951; Ursprung, 1986) and ultimately between staff job satisfaction and client outcomes (Cherniss & Egnatiou, 1978; Pincus, 1986; Plotnick, 1989; Sarason, 1972; Spector, 1986; Weiner, 1988; Wiggins & Moody, 1983).

For the remaining items defining Quality Procedures, there was a mixture of results; not all the items had significant CVRs and there was a wider range in mean ratings. A number of items pertaining to setting standards, which were perceived as essential for the college (e.g., "Quality is monitored and controlled at all levels;" "Policies and procedures manuals establish guidelines;" "Target service delivery levels are set;" "Service delivery is designed as quality control"), were not perceived as significant by their CVRs. All four of these items had actually been Study A college items.

The items pertaining to the Board, which also were not identified by a significant number of HSO staff also has been Study A college items. Although this demonstrated some correspondence with Study A ratings, this finding is contrary to Herman and Heimovics' (1991) identification of a powerful Board as a key to effectiveness in uncertain
HSOs. Consistent with present findings where the item "The Board strikes a balance between, client, community, and professional representation" was not identified as essential by its mean or by its CVR, Herman and Heimovics (1991) do acknowledge that, although it is helpful to have a representative Board, it is not essential.

The five items from the Quality Procedures subdimension that were identified by their means as being most important for Service Effectiveness, rather than focusing on standardization/reducing error, focused on personalized delivery; two were at a service delivery level, three were organization-level responses to tailoring the organization to meet the needs of targeted groups. The two items reflecting a client-focused service delivery approach were: "Students' progress is monitored and tracked" (M = 1.16); "A client centred/flexible approach is followed" (M = 1.16). The three items reflecting the organization-level response were: "The program is accessible to disadvantaged groups" (M = 1.14); "The organization must remain adaptable to possible changes" (M = 1.09) and "Staff are free to explore new directions in training" (M = 1.16). While this last item reflects innovation, it is also a means of rendering the organization more able to respond to client needs. The average of these five items was significantly different than the remaining Quality Procedures items, t(41) = -5.92, p < .0001.

The finding that these specific items were viewed as particularly
essential was also consistent with Patti (1983), McNeely (1983) and Carter (1988) who found that direct service workers need to fashion specific treatments to address an array of different problems. Quinn (1988) also identified criteria associated with flexibility as critical for the entrepreneurial type of organization which is struggling to survive.

Every item on the Client Orientation subdimension was rated as significantly essential to the community-based organization's effectiveness. The three items perceived as most important, again determined by comparing their average to the average of the remaining eight item means, $t(41) = -3.00$, $p < .005$, all also reflect client input:

"Individual and/or special client needs are taken into account" ($M = 1.12$);
"Clients are queried as to whether they are getting what they need out of the program" ($M = 1.16$); "Strategies are built specifically around client needs" ($M = 1.16$). Again, the identification of these items as particularly essential is what one might expect, given that the latter items were identified by Quinn (1988) as the type of criteria important for entrepreneurial organizations.

**Summary**

Based on both HSO staff and the participant judges, a wide range of items appear to be perceived as essential to indicating the community-based organization's effectiveness. These items tend to reflect all the dimensions of effectiveness and include items that had
initially been included in the Study B questionnaire because of their perceived importance for the college. This finding raises the possibility that there may not, in fact, be separate college and community-based items, which can be confirmed in the next analyses.

Analysis of Consistency Between Study A and Study B Findings

It was initially hypothesized that different criteria would be important for the two organizations. It logically follows that if these criteria were developed into measures of effectiveness an effective organization would be scored as more effective on its appropriate set of criteria. That is, effective colleges would be rated better than effective community-based organizations on the college items and effective community-based organizations would be rated better than effective colleges on the community-based items. The next series of analyses focused on the possibility that this, in fact, might not be the case. The consistency between Study A and Study B findings was examined to determine whether there was convergence on two final sets of criteria that distinguished between the two organizations, or whether this approach should be abandoned. Specifically,

Question #3:

Was there consistency with Study A findings, such that the items identified by a significant number of judges in Study A as essential to the community-based organization were also rated in Study B as significantly more essential for the community-based organization than for the college and conversely, were the items identified in Study A by a significant number of judges as
essential to the college rated as significantly more essential for the college than for the community-based organization in Study B?

These analyses were of interest particularly from the college description perspective, given that it appeared that so many of the items were rated as more essential to indicating the community-based organization's effectiveness, regardless of whether they initially were Study A college or Study A community-based items.

Two series of 3 X 2 (Occupational Setting by Description) multivariate analyses of variance were carried out on the data, each using a doubly multivariate repeated measures analysis of variance design. All participants rated all the items on two occasions (each description). The possibility of any biases associated with the respondents' occupational setting was tested as a second independent variable to determine whether one's own work setting influenced responses. The first series of analyses compared the respondents' ratings of the college description and the community-based organization description on Study A community-based items, with respondents' occupational Setting as the second independent variable. The second series of analyses compared the mean ratings of both prototypical organization descriptions on Study A college items, with respondents' occupational setting as the second independent variable. The MANOVAs were carried out on sets of items grouped in terms of the
ultimate dimensions for which the items were initially written.

The Application of Study A Community-Based Items to
Community-Based Organization and College Descriptions. Thirty-seven
Study A community-based items were included in the questionnaire
administered to respondents in Study B and, overall, the majority of
Study A's community-based items continued to be rated as more
important for the community-based organization's effectiveness than for
the college's effectiveness.

The respondents' occupational setting had no significant effect on
the ratings on items which defined the Human Relations dimension,
using Pillai's criterion, either in interaction with Description $F(16, 68) =
1.17, p > .05$, or as a main effect, $F(16, 68) = 1.13, p > .05$. There was,
as predicted, a significant multivariate main effect for Description, $F(8,
33) = 3.24, p < .01$. Table 6 lists the univariate effects for the individual
community-based Human Relations items when they were applied to
both the college and the community-based organization descriptions.
With the exception of one item, "The importance of service quality is
instilled in employees," all Study A community-based items on the
Human Relations dimension were rated as significantly more important
for the community-based organization than for the college.
Table 6

Univariate F values of Study A Community-Based Human Relations

Items as a Function of Description Rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description Rated</th>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff believe in organization's goals</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality communication at all levels valued</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems are dealt with fairly/openly</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of service quality instilled</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open communication with managers</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff work hard because believe important</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff input valued</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers nonconfrontational</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01. **p<.001.

Note. The lower the score the more the item was perceived as essential.
The three Human Relations items that best discriminated between the two types of organization description, based on their F values, all reflect the interpersonal context aspect of Human Relations: "Problems are dealt with in a fair and open manner," \( F(1,40) = 18.53, p < .0001 \); "Employee input is valued," \( F(1,40) = 18.49, p < .0001 \); and "Quality internal communication on every level is believed to be of paramount importance," \( F(1,40) = 14.18, p < .001 \). These items had been hypothesized to be the most important Human Relations items for the community-based organization and results indicate that they were more important for the community-based organization than for the college.

A doubly multivariate repeated measures analysis of variance was next conducted on the seven Study A community-based Organization Maintenance items. There was no interaction effect of Setting by Description, \( F(14, 66) = .37, p > .05 \), nor a main effect of Setting \( F(14, 66) = .63, p > .05 \). There was, however, an overall multivariate effect of Description, \( F(7, 32) = 3.00, p < .05 \). As well, five of the seven items had significant univariate effects, and the items that were not rated significantly differently when applied to the two descriptions had actually been perceived as essential to both described organizations' effectiveness in Study A. As indicated in Table 7, every difference was in the expected direction, rated as more essential for the
community-based organization than for the college.

Three items accounted for the largest differences between the ratings of the college and the community-based organization, using Pillai's criterion, with an F value significant at the .001 level or lower: "The organization is proactive," $F(1, 38) = 13.41, p < .001; "Multiple funding is actively pursued," $F(1, 38) = 19.68, p < .0001; "The Program Manager actively seeks out possible funders," $F(1, 38) = 12.55, p < .001.

It had been hypothesized that creative approaches to addressing uncertainty would be most important for the community-based organization and based on these findings, it can be concluded that they were perceived as more important for the community-based organization than for the college. While this finding is consistent with the hypothesis, it still remains to be seen whether these criteria were perceived as the most important criteria for maintaining the community-based organization. The items that were identified indicate a difference in organization character between the two described organizations. There is the recognition that while creativity is important for community-based organizations, the types of activities described were not perceived as important for the college.

These criteria are consistent with Quinn's (1988) finding that effective entrepreneurial organizations must focus on external support,
Table 7

Univariate F Values of Study A’s Community-Based Organization

Maintenance Items as a Function of Description Rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description Rated</th>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>F (1,38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization links with local businesses</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>10.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization is proactive</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>13.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization tracks community needs</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>7.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization attracts/retains quality staff</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple funding actively pursued</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>19.68***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program manager actively seeks funders</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>12.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization applies financial control</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05.  **p<.01.  ***p<.001

Note. The lower the score the more the item was perceived as essential.
resource acquisition, and establishing external relations with other organizations (Herman & Heimovics, 1991).

The next set of 12 items analyzed were from the Quality Procedures subdimension of Service Effectiveness. Using Pillai's criterion, there was no interaction between Setting and Description, \( F(24, 54) = .95, p > .05 \) and no multivariate main effect of respondents' own Setting, \( F(24, 54) = 1.32, p > .05 \). There was, as expected, a multivariate effect of Description, \( F(12, 26) = 2.56, p < .05 \), and Table 8 lists the effects of Description for each item separately. As Table 8 indicates, 75% of the items were rated significantly more important for the community-based organization than for the college and of the three items for which there was a nonsignificant difference, one: "Reporting mechanisms are in place" had also been rated in Study A as essential for both organizations. Three additional items that had been rated in Study A as also essential to the prototypical college's effectiveness were rated in Study B as more essential for the community-based organization ("The program is accessible to disadvantaged groups;" "Students' progress is monitored and tracked;" "Each student's needs are assessed upon entering the program."

Five items best discriminated between the two organizations on the Quality Procedures subdimension, with significance at the .0001 level of probability. Three items reflected a theme similar to that
Table 8

Univariate F Values of Study A Community-Based Quality Procedures

Items as a Function of Description Rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>F (1,37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff encouraged to try out new ideas</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>19.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting mechanisms in place</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff free to explore new directions</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>13.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program accessible to disadvantaged</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>11.90***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client centred approach followed</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>32.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program set around individuals' needs</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>21.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization seeks out placement sites</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' progress tracked</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>4.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization adaptable to changes</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>5.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry requirements flexible</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>17.83***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student entry needs assessed</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>18.04***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff must plan/goal set</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Note. The lower the score the more the item was perceived as essential.
expressed by items identified solely by their low means: "Staff are encouraged to try out new ideas," $F(1, 37) = 19.16, p < .0001; "A client centred/flexible approach is followed," $F(1, 37) = 32.45, p < .0001; "The program is fashioned around individuals' needs," $F(1, 37) = 21.33, p < .0001. Of the remaining two items, one reflected a client-centred approach: "Student entry needs assessed," $F(1, 37) = 18.04, p < .0001; one item reflected innovation: "Student entry needs flexible," $F(1, 37) = 17.83, p < .0001.

The next set of analyses was for the remaining Service Effectiveness items on the Client Orientation subdimension. There was no interaction between Setting and Description, $F(20, 58) = 1.17, p > .05 and no main effect of Setting, $F(20, 58) = .60, p > .05. Contrary to what was expected, however, there was also no multivariate effect of Description, $F(10, 29) = 1.76, p > .05. However, as Table 9 indicates, all but one of the items were rated as significantly more essential indicators for the community-based organization than for the college; the one exception was actually perceived as essential for both organizations' effectiveness in Study A. Five items best discriminated between the organizations on the Client Orientation subdimension, as indicated by an $F$ value significant at a probability level of .001 or lower: "Clients influence program development," $F(1, 37) = 17.17; p < .0001; "Students' true needs are identified," $F(1, 37) = 12.98, p < .001; "Clients
Table 9

Univariate F Values of Study A Community-Based Client Orientation

Items as a Function of Description Rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>( F (1,37) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students' true needs identified</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>12.98***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients asked if needs addressed</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>14.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client feedback valued</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>5.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/special client needs addressed</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>13.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client personal development important</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>10.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients influence program development</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>17.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning monitored</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement supervisors evaluate clients</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>7.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client complaints considered</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>7.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies built around client needs</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>11.80***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Note. The lower the score the more the item was perceived as essential.
are queried as to whether they are getting what they need out of the program, $F(1, 37) = 14.31, p < .001$; "Individual and/or special client needs are taken into account," $F(1, 37) = 13.56, p < .001$; "Strategies are built specifically around client needs," $F(1, 37) = 11.80, p < .001$.

The items that were rated significantly differently are consistent with what was identified as important for Quality Procedures and what was hypothesized as important for the community-based organization: personalized delivery. As with the other dimension, although these criteria were found to distinguish between the two types of organizations, whether they are also the most important items for the community-based organization remains to be tested.

The Application of Study A College Items to College and Community-Based Organization Description. Overall, the analysis of Study A college items revealed some unexpected findings. Although the two organizations were scored significantly differently on the majority of items, in all but one case it was in a direction opposite to that predicted; the majority of Study A college items were rated as more important for the community-based organization than for the college. For items defining Human Relations seven of the ten items were rated as significantly more important for the community-based organization (Table 10). Although the two Study A college items defining Organization
Maintenance were not rated significantly differently for the college and community-based organization, \( F(2, 37) = .66, p > .05 \), both items were also part of Study A community-based items. Finally, for the Service Effectiveness dimension (both Quality Procedures and Client Orientation), which also was not rated significantly differently, \( F(16, 21) = 2.66, p > .05 \), only one item ("Policy manuals establish guidelines") was rated as significantly more important for the college than for the community-based description, \( F(1, 36) = 7.10, p < .05 \) (Table 10).

The possibility is advanced that quality staff may be defined differently for community-based organizations and colleges. It was hypothesized that training would be perceived as less important for the community-based organization than for the college. That, in fact, does not appear to be the case. Training, apparently was viewed as important in the community-based organization, as well, but simply the other Human Relations criteria were perceived to be of greater importance. Training in community-based organizations may be viewed as key to keeping abreast of innovations, since service delivery in this context is highly dependent on experimentation to discover which procedures work best, with which clients and under what conditions. This focus of training is different than the more standardized training leading to certification to work in colleges.

At this point, a pattern has emerged that will impact on the
Table 10

Univariate F Values of Study A College items as a Function of Description Rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Community-Based M</th>
<th>College M</th>
<th>F(1,40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensively trained staff</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers manage nonconfrontationally</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>8.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff believe in organization's goals</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>9.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems are dealt with fairly/openly</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>18.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff abreast of training developments</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>6.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff encouraged to keep up training</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of quality instilled</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good info management believed important</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>9.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open communication with managers</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>11.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff work hard because believe important</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>11.35***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Effectiveness</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F(1,36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality monitored/ controlled</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting mechanisms in place</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality measured</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program accessible to disadvantaged</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>7.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy manuals establish guidelines</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' progress tracked</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>7.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target service levels set</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students entry needs assessed</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>16.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service designed for quality</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning monitored</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality standards established</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students followed to ensure hired</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>14.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement supervisors evaluate clients</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>4.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Board</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>4.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Policy' Board not 'Hands-on'</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board has professional expertise</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Maintenance</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F(1,38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization applies financial control</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization attracts/retains quality staff</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05.  **p<.01.  ***p<.001.

Note. The lower the score the more the item was perceived as essential.
remaining analyses. While the intention was to develop two separate sets of criteria to assess effectiveness in both types of organizations, it appears that the criteria for the college are actually largely a subset of the criteria for the community-based organization. As a result, the community-based criteria were perceived as more important for indicating the community-based organization's effectiveness than for the college's effectiveness, but the college criteria were also perceived as more important for indicating the community-based organization's effectiveness than for the college's effectiveness. This finding does not necessarily mean that the criteria identified for the college are invalid; it may simply reflect the view that, due to its operationally uncertain nature, all the criteria simply are perceived to demand more attention for the community-based organization, while the college does not necessarily have to work at demonstrating effectiveness. The finding does impact on the remaining analyses insofar as the idea that Study A identified "college" and "community-based" items must be abandoned.

**Summary**

Clearly, subjects differentiated between the college and community-based program. Only a few items were identified as essential to indicating the college's effectiveness, while to achieve effectiveness in the community-based organization, an extensive number of items were perceived to be essential. These items overlap to a great
degree with criteria perceived as essential to indicating the effectiveness of the prototypical college but also include numerous other criteria. Items associated with quality standards and error reduction were perceived as most important for the college description. The underlying focus seems to be on appropriate structures and processes, whether it is acquiring and training staff, instituting reporting structures, and financial systems or measuring client outcomes. All these criteria are readily measured/monitored; standards are available against which to measure outcomes and against which to compare the appropriateness of structures. Most items that were perceived as important, however, clustered in two dimensions: Human Relations and Service Effectiveness.

For the community-based organization description, essential items reflected all the dimensions and can be conceived of as attempts to counter and derive sense out of uncertainty. The types of items that were perceived as most important for the community-based organization alternatively focused on the human component, (whether expounding personalized service to address client needs or appreciation of the importance of staff), or on flexibility, (whether on a service delivery level or on an organization level expressed as a proactive, creative approach to survival).

The fact that multiple criteria were identified supports Edwards, Faerman and McGrath's (1986) and Martin's (1988) findings of the
necessity for multiple criteria when the organization has multiple constituencies, as with uncertain HSOs. Similarly, Sung (1985) pointed out the need for internal and external goals, and Elkin and Molitor (1985) described how organizations have numerous managements indicators. While Cameron (1978; 1986), in the study most similar to the present study, also identified a number of indicators, these were for an operationally-certain HSO—a university. It is argued here that it would not be perceived as essential for operationally-certain HSOs to use all the indicators, since they have well established links between organization components. And, in fact, the operationally-certain HSO only had a few items perceived as essential indicators.

The results were also consistent with Study A results. The participants in Study A had initially chosen a far greater number of items as critical to monitoring the effectiveness of the community-based organization in comparison to the college-based organization. When items were selected for inclusion in Study B, the level of significance for the inclusion of an item was lowered for the college description and raised for the community-based organization description. This step allowed for a more equitable number of items, increased the range of included items to cover the major dimensions, and presented a sufficient and reasonable item pool from which Study B respondents could select important indicators for the prototypical college. However, what also
resulted was that all items included in Study B, because they were perceived in Study A as essential to the community-based organization, were highly important items, while some items perceived as less important to the college in Study A were included in Study B.

Consequently, the vast majority of items was actually endorsed by a significant number of HSO respondents as being essential for indicating the community-based organization's effectiveness (82.7%), regardless of whether they were Study A college or Study A community-based items. In contrast, the majority of items was not endorsed by a significant number of HSO respondents as essential for the effectiveness of the college (75%) and all but one of the items that were endorsed as essential for indicating the college's effectiveness were Study A college items.

Clearly the majority of Study A community-based items were rated as more essential to indicating the effectiveness of the community-based organization than of the college. But, unexpectedly, Study A college items were also rated as more essential for the community-based organization's effectiveness; only one item, pertaining to policy manuals, was actually rated as more important for the college-based versus the community-based organization description.

The findings suggests that respondents simply saw every item as critical to the effectiveness of the community-based organization,
regardless of whether it was a Study A college or community-based item, and respondents' occupational setting did not seem to bias the results. There are clear implications for the evaluation and assessment of community-based programs. The first possibility is that there really are not college and community-based items. It seems that there is a set of criteria that are perceived as highly essential as indicators of the community-based organization's effectiveness. Of these items, there is a subset that is viewed as moderately essential to the college. Given the extensive, detailed procedure carried out to ensure as wide a variety of items as possible, it is unlikely that essential college items simply were missed in the process. It is more likely that, given their mainstream status, these types of organizations simply are not perceived to have to demonstrate effectiveness to the same extent as community-based organizations, nor is it perceived to be as arduous a task to achieve effectiveness.

The items that were identified as essential indicators for the community-based organization, beyond being more numerous than those identified for the college, also are more difficult to quantify and assess. Although there have been past criticisms that nonprofit organizations of this nature need to function in a more business-like fashion, this type of admonition fails to recognize that they are unable to impose the same sorts of structures and measuring success requires a more multi-faceted
approach. The identification of essential indicators, as achieved in the present study, is clearly an important step in being able to develop instruments specifically targeted to community-based organizations' types of concerns. Based on testimony and input from internal and external perspectives, there must be a holistic approach to evaluating community-based organizations. Such an approach demands attention to the softer more qualitative elements of management, such as organization culture and climate, as well as an understanding that attempts to pin down a single standardized process are counterproductive.

Hypothesis Testing

The previous section described HSO staff's perceptions regarding the prototypical college and community-based organization descriptions. The analyses first established that the two prototypical organizations were perceived differently; the prototypical community-based organization was rated as having low operational certainty and the prototypical college description was rated as having high operational certainty. The results of HSO staff ratings of the two prototypical descriptions were discussed next. It appeared that, just as in Study A, different items were perceived as most important as indicators of effectiveness for each organization description. As well, more numerous indicators seemed to be identified for the community-based versus the college organization. However, what also emerged was the finding that all the items, with one exception,
were perceived as significantly more important for the community-based organization. When both organizations were rated on the separate sets of criteria from Study A, the items were perceived as more important as indicators for the community-based organization in both cases. This finding has implications for the remaining analyses. Given that it does not appear that there are two separate sets of criteria for assessing effectiveness in the two organizations, but rather one comprehensive set for the community-based organization and one subset for the college, it no longer makes sense to continue using the distinction between Study A community-based items versus Study A college-based items in hypothesis testing, except to refer to consistencies between the studies. The remaining analyses will alternatively either focus on what was identified in Study B as essential (similar but not identical to Study A) or use the entire set of items in analyses.

The remaining section takes a deductive approach to examine the hypothesis proposed in the introduction. In particular, it will be considered whether statistically more criteria were perceived as essential for the effectiveness of the community-based organization versus the college (H1); whether different proximal criteria were important for the two prototypical organization descriptions (H2), such that the most important criteria for the community-based organization on each dimension would be creativity and flexibility for organization maintenance
(H2a), interpersonal factors for human relations (H2b), and personalized delivery for service effectiveness (H2c) and for the college smooth internal functioning for organization maintenance (H2d), staff development for human relations (H2e) and quality for service effectiveness (H2f); and which dimensions were perceived to be of higher priority for the two prototypical organization descriptions (H3a-c).

**Hypothesis 1: Comparison of Number of Criteria Identified**

In 'hypothesis 1 it was stated that more criteria would be perceived as essential for the described community-based organization's effectiveness than for the described college's. As in Study A, Lawshe's (1975) formula was used to calculate the content validity ratios (CVRs) for each item, and to determine which items were identified by a significant number of subjects as essential to the effectiveness of the described organization. These CVRs were presented in Table 5 and have been briefly discussed above. The CVR would have to have a value of at least .27 to be significant at a .05 probability level.

As predicted by Hypothesis 1 and consistent with a pattern established in Study A, while 43 items were identified as essential to the community-based organization description, only 13 items were identified by a significant number of the subjects as essential to the prototypical college description. A chi-square analysis confirmed that the distribution of items with significant CVRs was significantly different for
the two prototypical descriptions; 25% of the items had significant CVRs for the college while 82.7% had significant CVRs for the community-based description, $\chi^2 (1, N = 43) = 45.3, p < .001$.

Similarly, in Study A initially 55 items were identified for the community-based organization and seven items were identified by a significant number of judges as essential for the college. The 55 items were reduced to 37, by using a more stringent criterion and the seven items were increased to 28 by using a more lenient criterion for determining whether an item was essential. The 43 items identified as essential by respondents in Study B encompassed all 37 that had been identified by Study A's judging panel as essential to the prototypical community-based organization's effectiveness, plus an additional two items that were significantly essential in Study A but had been discarded when the cut-off was raised. However, only four of the seven items identified in Study A as essential for the college were also identified by Study B respondents as essential for the effectiveness of the prototypical college. Although an additional nine items were also identified in Study B, eight of these were from the 28 Study A college items. Thus, although a similar pattern was found as in Study A, of more numerous and diverse items being identified for the community-based organization's effectiveness, and although there was correspondence between the items identified in both studies, the items identified were not identical
between the two studies

In addition, organizational effectiveness in the two prototypical descriptions was not perceived to be comprised of the same ultimate dimensions. For the community-based organization, clearly almost all the items were seen as essential, whether judged by their means or their CVRs. In the case of the college description, while there were two significant items on the Organization Maintenance dimension and one significant item on the Client Orientation subdimension of Service Effectiveness, the majority of items (76.9%) identified as essential, by a significant number of subjects, tended to cluster in Human Relations and Quality Procedures, with each containing five significantly essential items. In Study A, even taking into consideration that the total number of significant items was lower than in Study B, there still was not the same kind of split on two dimensions: five of the seven essential items came from the Quality Procedures subdimension of Service Effectiveness.

Although there seems to be a strong consensus among Study A and B participants regarding what criteria are important to the community-based organization's effectiveness (numerous criteria from the initial item pool in Study A and the vast majority of items included in Study B), and consensus that fewer items define effectiveness in the college, there was less consensus as to the specific items that were important for the college. A possible explanation is that, given the
organizational links in colleges, as long as service effectiveness and outcomes are measured in some capacity, the specific items are not perceived to be important. But also, while service effectiveness seemed to be an important dimension for the college, in terms of the number of criteria perceived as important, in Study B Human Relations was also perceived as equally important based on these terms. Again, this finding should be interpreted in light of the fact that these dimensions also were defined by the most numerous criteria in the first place. Given that Study B respondents were staff working in HSOs, they may have perceived human relations as more critical than did Study A participants who had a more external perspective. These HSO respondents may feel more strongly that how they are treated impacts on service delivery and the TQM literature supports the perception that committed organization members positively impact on service delivery and effectiveness in general.

Hypothesis 2: Priority of Criteria

Having examined how the descriptions were differentially perceived in terms of effectiveness, this section begins by considering Hypothesis 2 and all its related subhypotheses pertaining to the relative importance of the proximal criteria on each dimension for the two prototypical organization descriptions. Subsequently examined is whether the most important criteria for one type of organization (i.e.,
college or community-based organization) were also perceived as significantly more important for that type of organization than for the other prototypical organization. For example, if "staff believe in the organization's goals" was identified as one of the most important Human Relations criteria for the community-based organization, the next step was determining if it was also perceived as more important for the community-based organization than for the college. Hence, the next hypothesis to be tested was:

**Hypothesis 2:**

Proximal criteria identified as most important to indicating effectiveness for the prototypical community-based organization description will be different from those identified as most important to indicating effectiveness for the prototypical college.

In order to test the first part of hypothesis 2, the mean item ratings on each dimension were ranked for both organization descriptions separately. The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was computed on each dimension to test whether the sets of rankings were correlated. In support of hypothesis 2, for the 7 items defining Organization Maintenance, the mean item rankings were not significantly correlated for the college and community-based organization, \( r_s (7) = .58, p > .05 \). This also proved to be the case for the remaining dimensions: for the 12 items defining the Human Relations dimension, results indicated that the two sets of rankings were not significantly correlated, \( r_s (12) = -.184, p > .05 \); for the 11 items defining Client Orientation, the two
sets of rankings were not significantly correlated, \( r_s (11) = -.16, p > .05 \); for the 21 items defining Quality Procedures, item rankings also were not correlated, \( r_s(21) = .05, p > .05 \).

There are two potential problems with the approach that was used. First, as described with respect to Study A, the rankings do not represent equal intervals. As a result, some of the perceived differences in importance between items may be minimized, while others may be maximized. Some important information may be lost. The second potential problem is that the ratings were on a restricted range which may have contributed to the lack of significant correlations. To partially address these concerns, which impacts more on the subhypotheses, paired t-tests were conducted to determine which of the differences in rankings represented significant differences in mean ratings.

Within the limits of the delineated caveats, given that the priority of criteria within each dimension was perceived to vary for the two organization descriptions, the types of items that were most important for each organization were then examined.

**Priority of Criteria—Community-Based Organization**

It was stated in Hypothesis 2(a) that for the community-based organization, items reflecting creativity and flexibility would be perceived as relatively more important than the other criteria on the Organization Maintenance dimension. It was hypothesized that the organization would
have to be proactive, innovative and flexible in order to garner resources in the unpredictable, uncertain environment in which it operated (Egan, 1993). Consistently, in earlier analysis (of only the Study A community-based items on the Organization Maintenance dimension), items reflecting this theme were found to be significantly more important for the community-based organization than for the college. However, when examining the relative importance of all criteria defining this dimension for the community-based organization, there were mixed results and hypothesis 2(a) was not unilaterally supported.

In fact, all but one item on this dimension were perceived as significantly essential for the effectiveness of the community-based organization, based on their CVRs. This one exception that reflects a creative approach to finding financial backing: "The program manager actively seeks out funding source," had a comparatively higher mean ($M = 1.53$) than the other items, yet was still perceived as at least "useful but not necessary" for effectiveness. This item, which was ranked as the lowest priority, was the only one whose mean was found to significantly differ from the item that was ranked as the next closest priority on the dimension, $t(42) = -2.42, p < .05$.

Three items reflecting attempts to acquire the necessary resources to maintain the organization were identified by their average ratings as most important on the dimension: "The organization attracts
and retains high quality staff” (M = 1.12); “The organization establishes links with local businesses that provide needed resources” (M = 1.12) and “The organization thinks proactively” (M = 1.14). The mean ratings of these three items were averaged and compared to the average of the remaining item means on the dimension and were found to be significantly more important t(41) = -3.64, p < .001.

Although attracting quality staff may be critical to developing a flexible organization, the item in itself does not illustrate creativity. The latter two items, however, do support Hypothesis 2(a). The first of these items is a creative approach to countering insufficient resources and uncertainty in the environment. The second of the two items is a direct statement that flexibility and adaptability are perceived as essential and had been similarly identified as most important on the dimension in Study A. The remaining resource acquisition item, "The organization tracks community needs," while not rated as among the most essential by its mean, depicts a similar focus on flexibility, and was still identified by a significant number of respondents as being essential. Although there is some support for hypothesis 2(a), and there is an element of creativity to some of the items endorsed, the theme is certainly not clearly expressed and the hypothesis is not supported unequivocally.

Whereas it was hypothesized that some of the items would be perceived to be of higher importance, it was not in dispute that the
organization maintenance items would all be of some importance since they had been identified elsewhere as important; Quinn (1988) identified resource acquisition and establishing external support as being essential and Herman and Heimovics (1991) focused on the importance of informal support systems. The conclusion would seem to be that when the organization is uncertain, it needs to garner as much and as wide support as possible. This support can be achieved by maintaining vigilance towards the environment, to anticipate and adapt to environmental demands and opportunities. At the same time, establishing networks provides a flow of resources that are not always available from funding sources, prevents service duplication and ensures that organizations can work together to address community needs. Given across the board funding shortages for social services, the notion of a network to prevent duplication is timely and is currently being explored, along with holistic approaches to addressing all client needs in one setting.

Hypothesis 2(b) stated that interpersonal factors (i.e., co-worker relations, supervision, employee involvement) would be perceived as most important on the Human Relations dimension. The potential importance of human relations is well summarized in Egan's (1993) observation that when the environment is turbulent, organizations must be able to quickly gear the nature of authority, decision-making and
communication systems, and employee involvement to constantly evolving conditions. Given that evolving conditions characterize community-based organizations, it was hypothesized that employee involvement in decision making is probably most critical to effectiveness precisely in these circumstances. Because of the intense relations required for resolution of problems for which available intervention techniques and resources are frequently inadequate (e.g., Salancik, 1981), staff must be given latitude to make decisions. In previous analyses it was determined that interpersonal items were perceived as more important for the community-based organization than the college, but this analysis only included Study A community-based items.

In fact, similar to the results regarding Organization Maintenance, all items on the Human Relations dimension were perceived as essential for the community-based organization, both by their CVRs and by their mean ratings; even the least important items still had a low mean of 1.26. While interpersonal factors were perceived as important, it would seem that so were all items on this dimension regardless of whether they were Study A college or Study A community-based items. In fact, a series of paired t-tests between item means of adjacent rankings revealed that no two adjacent rankings were perceived as significantly different.

However, in support of hypothesis 2(b) and previous research,
when three of Study A community-based items were averaged together and compared to the average of the remaining item means on the dimension, they were viewed as particularly important: "Problems are dealt with in a fair and open manner" (M = 1.09); "People work hard because they believe their work is important" (M = 1.09) and "Staff believe in the organization's goals" (M = 1.07), t(42) = -3.39, p < .005. The first item reflects supervision, and the latter two items an appreciation of the value of staff input. Both of the latter items illustrate a perception that it is critical to have staff who embrace the organization's goals, who have an affective commitment to the organization, given their potential impact on service delivery.

The perception by internal and external experts that these Human Relations items are of particular importance has implications for hiring and managing staff. The importance of hiring quality staff has been discussed with respect to Organization Maintenance; while it is possible that quality may refer to training and credentials, it is also possible that quality may have a less traditional definition. There is support for this latter interpretation in the complementary finding that it was also perceived as essential that staff believe strongly in goals. Given that the jobs in community-based organizations are typically low paying (Wolf, 1984), recruiting staff who believe in the organizations' goals is common, and probably a good idea since they are harder to replace.
Further, given the intense demands placed on staff from variable clients, there is an appropriate recognition that staff must have flexibility and input into how they carry out their work (Grasso & Epstein, 1988; Kouzes & Mico, 1979) and in decision-making (Jayaratne & Chess, 1984; Lawler, 1986; Reisman, 1986; Sarri, 1982).

Despite the link that has been established between participation in decision making and various aspects of organizational effectiveness (Jayaratne & Chess, 1984; Lawler, 1986; Reisman, 1986; Sarri, 1982), some of the items defining participation in decision making were not rated as essential in Study A and were not included in the final questionnaire in Study B (e.g., "Staff input into procedures is solicited"; "Staff participate in decision making re: running of the organization"). An additional item was discarded when the cut-off for inclusion in Study B was raised ("Front line staff have a wide latitude in decision making in their own areas"). A possibility is that, had they been included, these items may have been perceived as more essential by Study B respondents, especially community-based respondents, given that they work in actual HSOs and are perhaps more familiar with the complexities in daily functioning.

Additional items were included in Study B that reflect a similar theme of participation in decision making. Although the general perception from both participant groups seemed to be that staff
participation is unnecessary in organization-level decision making, there seems to be evidence that participation in decision making was perceived as important with respect to employees' own work areas. This was reflected by the identification of "Employee input is valued" (M = 1.14) as highly essential on the Human Relations dimension; there were additional items from other dimensions supporting this interpretation, that were found highly essential: "Staff are free to explore new directions in training" (M = 1.16); and "Staff are encouraged to try out new ideas" (M = 1.17) on the Quality Procedures subdimension.

As a result, recruiting strategies for community-based organizations should focus on targeting individuals with knowledge, attitudes and interests related to the organization's mission. But, job candidates should demonstrate flexibility and creativity, given the changes with which they will be faced perpetually.

Hypothesis 2(c) stated that items centring around personalized delivery (e.g., client input, client centred approach) would be rated as the most important items defining the dimension of service effectiveness in the community-based organization. In previous analysis, items pertaining to personalized delivery were, in fact, found to be significantly more important for the community-based organization than for the college. However, these analyses only compared ratings of Study A community-based items for the two organizations. Although this was an important
distinction between the two organizations, of interest was whether these types of criteria, of all the criteria defining Service Effectiveness, were the most important for the community-based organization.

Thirteen items from the Quality Procedures subdimension, were identified by a significant number of HSO respondents as essential to the effectiveness of the community-based organization. Of these items, five that were Study A community-based items and had the lowest means were compared to the remaining item means on the dimension. In support of Hypothesis 2(c), the average of these five item means was significantly more important than the average of the remaining item means on the dimension, t(41) = -5.92, p < .0001. While all five of these items directly reflected a client-focused approach, two were at a service delivery level: "Students' progress is monitored and tracked" (M = 1.16); "A client centred/flexible approach is followed" (M = 1.16), and three reflected an organization-level response to allowing service to remain responsive: "The program is accessible to disadvantaged groups" (M = 1.14); "The organization must remain adaptable to possible changes" (M = 1.09); "Staff are free to explore new directions in training" (M = 1.16).

In further support of hypothesis 2(c), all items on the Client Orientation subdimension were identified as essential by a significant number of respondents in Study B, just as they were in Study A, and all
reflect a focus on client needs. The most important items on this subdimension, determined by comparing the average of these item means to the average of the remaining item means on the dimension, were: "Individual and/or special client needs are taken into account" (M = 1.12); "Clients are queried as to whether they are getting what they need out of the program" (M = 1.16); "Strategies are built specifically around client needs" (M = 1.16), t(41) = -2.43, p < .05.

The finding that a personalized client focus was perceived as essential to service effectiveness is also consistent with findings reported in previous research. Perrow (1970) and Sasser and Fulmer (1990) reported that when clients have high variability and are not well understood, technology should be less routinized and more flexible. Patti (1983), McNeely (1983), and Carter (1988) similarly detailed the necessity for direct service workers to be able to fashion treatment to address an array of problems. Flexibility is precisely the criterion identified by Quinn (1988) as critical for the entrepreneurial organization functioning in an uncertain environment.

These findings have several implications. As was hypothesized, the findings suggest that, because there are unestablished links between organization components, measures of structures and processes cannot be used as surrogate measures of effectiveness. Organizational effectiveness must include items assessing service effectiveness but
further, service effectiveness must be measured in a variety of fashions, beyond simple outcome measures. In fact, the only service effectiveness items either not identified as essential, or of comparatively less importance, were those pertaining either to the structure of the Board or to standardization of processes. Second, any monitoring systems in community-based organizations must be able to embrace the necessary flexibility in process and in requirements and incorporate a more qualitative component to capture the essence of the organization. Client feedback is critical not only for shaping the services, but also for assessing the effectiveness of new strategies and overall program delivery. This qualitative component can provide detail about broader program outcomes that may not be detected either because they are beyond the scope of learning office skills, because they cannot be quantified, or because they are more subtle than in more traditional programs. In fact, for nontraditional programs, the broader changes may often be more important and long-lasting than the specific area of learning targeted by service delivery.

Having determined which items were perceived as most essential on each dimension for the community-based organization, it was also important to determine whether the two organization descriptions were rated significantly differently on these items. Since each respondent rated both prototypical organization descriptions on all items, the mean
ratings of items determined as most important for the community-based organization could be compared to the mean ratings for the same items applied to the college. In these analyses, any possible effect of respondents' occupational setting was examined, given the possibility raised earlier that greater familiarity with one type of setting may have influenced responses. Three by two (Occupational Setting by Description) doubly multivariate repeated measures analyses of variance were carried out on the "best" items for each prototypical organization, on each dimension. The three levels of occupational setting corresponded to where respondents themselves worked (i.e., college, community-based organization, alternative/other program) and the description was either the prototypical college or the prototypical community-based organization.

Respondents' ratings of the community-based and college organizations were compared on the most important items for the community-based organization, from each ultimate dimension, which was determined in the previous analyses. The 14 items that were identified as most important on their respective dimensions were used. These include: three from Human Relations (with means ranging from 1.07 to 1.09), three from Organization Maintenance (with means ranging from 1.12 to 1.14), five from Quality Procedures (with means ranging from 1.09 to 1.16), and three from Client Orientation (with means ranging from
There was no interaction effect of setting by description, $F(28, 50) = .69, \ p > .05$, nor a main effect for setting, $F(28, 50) = .79, \ p > .05$, nor of description, $F(14, 24) = 1.64, \ p > .05$. Given the small number of subjects and large number of variables considered in the comparisons, the univariate effects were examined, as well. Table 11 lists the univariate effects of each of the most important community-based items, applied to the college and community-based organization. With the exception of one item, which had also been identified as part of Study A’s college items, in each instance the item was rated as more important for the community-based organization than for the college. Hence, the items that were perceived as most important for the community-based organization’s effectiveness were also perceived as significantly more important indicators of the community-based organization’s effectiveness than of the college’s effectiveness.

**Priority of Criteria—College**

The following section discusses the hypotheses (H2d-f) related to the college description. It will be recalled that, with one exception, no item was rated as significantly more important for the college than the community-based organization. Nonetheless, with the understanding that all the effectiveness criteria were, at best, only perceived to be moderately important for the college, the relative priority of these criteria
Table 11

Univariate F Values of "Most Essential" Community-Based Items as a function of Description Rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>F(1,37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff believe in organization's goals</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>7.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems solved fairly/openly</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>13.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff work hard, believe it's important</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>10.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization links with local businesses</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>10.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization is proactive</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>12.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual client needs assessed</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>12.94***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization is adaptable to changes</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>5.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program accessible to disadvantaged</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>11.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization attracts/retains quality staff</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients queried whether needs met</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>12.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies built around client needs</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>11.81***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ progress tracked</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client centred/flexible approach</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>27.97***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff free to explore new directions</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>11.45**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Note. n = 40
for the college can still be examined.

Hypothesis 2(d) stated that items reflecting smooth internal functioning would be rated as most important for Organization Maintenance. Because the organization was described as operating in a relatively secure, stable and abundant environment, it was thought that resource acquisition would not be perceived as a key activity, but rather the focus would be on constant maintenance or improvement of internal operations, such as setting up appropriate internal systems. The two Organization Maintenance items, both Study A college items, that were identified by a significant number of respondents as essential support the hypothesis. Given that these two items were the only ones identified as essential to the college's effectiveness on this dimension, it was judged to be unnecessary to conduct further analyses. These two items, which did not significantly differ in perceived importance were: "The organization attracts and retains quality staff" (M = 1.20), also identified as the only essential item in Study A, and "The organization applies a financial control system" (M = 1.34), t(42) = 1.48, p > .05. Both items reflect attempts at quality control as a means of organization maintenance. The general focus, which seems to be repeated across the dimensions, seems to be on instituting the appropriate infrastructures to maintain quality.

The finding that quality and smooth internal functioning were most
important support Quinn's (1988) finding that all the criteria associated with the goal attainment and internal process models, such as stability-control and efficiency are most important for this type of organization. These criteria are easier to monitor and achieve than are those "most important" criteria identified for the community-based organization.

Hypothesis 2(e) stated that items related to staff development would be rated as most important on the Human Relations dimension. Since the staff were presumed to have less need for discretion, given standardized approaches and less inclusive relationships with clients, it was thought that the respondents would perceive quality control as most important, and this could be achieved by hiring the best/most credentialed staff and training the staff to continue delivering the program to the best of their ability.

Although none of the differences between means receiving adjacent rankings were significantly different, the average of the three items with the lowest means compared to the average of the remaining item means indicates that they were perceived as significantly more important, \( t(43) = -3.29, p < .005 \). These items identified as most important on the Human Relations dimension, which all happened to be Study A college items, included: "Staff are extensively trained" (\( M = 1.24 \)); "Staff are kept abreast of important developments that may affect client training" (\( M = 1.33 \)) and "Staff are encouraged to keep their
training up to date" ($M = 1.35$). Cameron (1978; 1986) similarly identified quality of staff as an important criterion in his study of universities. Again, the general focus seems to be on setting standards and is consistent with Quinn's identification of quality criteria discussed above.

If one considers the most important Organization Maintenance and Human Relations items, there seems to be a perception that both hiring trained staff and continuing to enhance training is a key activity. One implication of these findings, previously noted with respect to the community-based organization, is that quality staff may be defined differently in community-based organizations and colleges. In community-based organizations quality in staff may encompass training, but also having staff who are aligned with the organization's pursuits and who are flexible and creative. In colleges, it appears to refer to extensive training, credentials and development, all tangible characteristics. The implication seems to be that when hiring staff in colleges attention should be paid to credentials. In practice, this seems to be a distinction that is drawn between the two types of organization: colleges typically have more trained staff and community-based organizations often have difficulty recruiting highly credentialled staff. However, given that community-based staff perform diverse roles, "training" takes on a different connotation. It appears critical that
community-based staff have the flexibility to perform numerous tasks, and as long as they have the basic skills requirements, this may be more critical than high credentials.

Hypothesis 2(f) stated that items aimed at establishing quality standards and reducing error would be rated as most important in achieving and maintaining service effectiveness. In fact, in support of the hypothesis, all of the most important items across all the dimensions pertained to quality. Further, the three most important items on Service Effectiveness dimensions do centre on quality. Given that few items on the Client Orientation dimension were judged to be essential for Client Orientation, the two service effectiveness subdimensions were considered together. The average of the three lowest mean items: "Quality standards are established" ($M = 1.25$), "Reporting mechanisms are in place" ($M = 1.29$), and "Student learning of office skills is monitored" ($M = 1.32$) was compared to the average of the remaining item means and was found significantly more important $t(36) = -6.17$, $p < .0001$. Again, there is the same focus on developing the appropriate infrastructure, whether it is staff, communication networks, or monitoring systems.

These findings support those of previous research; Finch (1978) identified quality as highly important, as did Salancik (1931) in his discussion of standards of operating structures. Quinn (1988) also
detailed the necessity for such a focus in formalized organizations. Apparently, it was not perceived that qualitative client feedback is a critical criterion, and one can rely on structures and straight outcome measures to assess effectiveness.

Even though earlier analyses have revealed that all the criteria tended to be viewed as more important for the community-based organization, it still was of interest to examine the "best" college items and how they were perceived when applied to the community-based organization. That is, while specific hypotheses were being tested regarding how organizational effectiveness is differentially defined as a function of operational certainty, an ultimate goal of the present research was to derive a set(s) of criteria that could be used in subsequent development of effectiveness assessment tools. If the best college items were also perceived as important for the community-based organization, it is possible that one measure could be developed comprised of the best college items, that could be used for both organizations. While these may not necessarily be the best community-based items they would still suffice.

A similar "most important item analysis" process was followed as for the community-based organization. Items were chosen as most essential if they had been identified in the previous analyses as most important on a dimension. Using these criteria, eight items were
selected (Table 12): three from Human Relations, three from Service Effectiveness, and two from Organization Maintenance.

A doubly multivariate repeated measures analysis of variance was used to compare the mean ratings of the most essential college items applied to the college and the community-based organization. The results indicated that neither the interaction of setting by type of description being rated $F(16, 64) = .65, p > .05$, nor the main effect of the subject's own occupational setting $F(16, 64) = .36, p > .05$ had significant effects. However, there also was no significant multivariate effect of the type of description being rated $F(8, 31) = .57, p > .05$). On a univariate level, only one variable: "Staff are kept abreast of important developments that may affect client training" was rated significantly differently for the college and the community-based organization, $F(1, 38) = 4.61, p < .05$, and it was in the opposite direction than one would expect—the most essential item for the college was actually rated as more essential for the community-based organization's effectiveness than for the college's.

Given that even the items identified as most important for the college still are perceived as more important for the community-based organization, there is reinforcement for the suggestion that there really are not Study A college and community-based items. Rather the perception is that there is a large set of items that can be used to
Table 12

Univariate F Values of "Most Essential" College Items as a Function of Description Rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>F(1, 38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff are extensively trained</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff abreast of training developments</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff encouraged to keep up training</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting mechanisms in place</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization attracts/retains quality staff</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization applies financial control</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning monitored</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality standards established</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Note. The lower the score the more the item was perceived as essential.
indicate the effectiveness of community-based organizations. Of these items, there is a subset that can be used to evaluate colleges. It is possible that these items could be used to develop a short form of an assessment tool for both types of organizations.

**Summary**

Across all dimensions more items appear to be perceived as essential for the community-based organization's effectiveness than for the college's. This remains true, whether one uses CVRs or means as the basis for this determination. Also, the most important community-based items tended to be perceived as more important for the community-based organization than were the most important college items for the college, \( t(40) = 3.49, p < .001 \).

Generally, the most important items for the community-based organization tended to reflect a humanistic concern for staff and clients, hence supporting flexibility towards both. In fact, the most important items overall were on the Human Relations dimension. For the most part, hypotheses pertaining to the most important items for the community-based organization (H2a-c) were supported. Personalized delivery was, in fact, found to be important for Service Effectiveness and interpersonal factors as opposed to training types of issues were found most important for Human Relations. It was primarily Organization Maintenance that had mixed findings. While acquiring resources was
perceived as a key activity, all items reflecting creativity were not necessarily endorsed and some items that did not reflect creativity and flexibility per se were endorsed as essential.

For the college, the most important items tended to pertain to setting standards and structures; and while there were a few items distributed across the dimensions, the majority tended to cluster in Human Relations and Service Effectiveness. For the most part, hypotheses pertaining to most important college items were supported (H2d-f); Staff development factors were perceived to be most important to Human Relations; quality control and standardization were perceived as most important to Service Effectiveness; and the hypothesis pertaining to Organization Maintenance was supported, the only two items perceived as essential reflected instituting staff and structure to ensure smooth internal functioning. However, at the same time, all these items were perceived as more important for the community-based organization than for the college.

Clearly experts perceived different types of items to be most important on each dimension for the two descriptions. Items identified as essential for the college were more focused on standardizing and ensuring that appropriate mechanisms are in place to do so. While these items were also found important for the community-based organization description, items that were perceived as most essential
seem more concerned with maintaining the organization's ability to respond, whether to staff, clients, or environmental changes.

**Hypothesis 3: Priority of Dimensions of Effectiveness**

Whereas even the most important items for the college still seemed to be rated as more important for the community-based organization, the perceived priorities for the organizations can still be tested separately. That is, regardless that all the items, and hence all the dimensions, tended to be more important for the community-based organization than for the college, it is possible to determine which dimensions were of highest priority for the college, and similarly for the community-based organization. Hence it was hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 3.**

The ranking of the dimensions of effectiveness in order of priority will differ for the prototypical college and community-based organization.

In order to test Hypothesis 3, the relative perceived priority of dimensions had to be considered, for each description. Too few subjects and intercorrelated variables precluded the use of factor analysis to derive factor scores for each dimension which could then be compared. Instead, mean item ratings were averaged on each dimension using all the items regardless of whether they had been identified as essential for the particular organization for which priorities were to be determined.
For this analysis the items were reversed scored such that the weighting would correspond with the magnitude of the score, and the higher the mean, the more the item was perceived as essential. By using each item's CVR as its weight in the calculations, more important items would correspondingly contribute more to the overall dimension score. Given the findings from previous analyses that there did not appear to be two distinct sets of effectiveness criteria for the organizations, all the 51 items were used in determining priorities for the two organizations.

The hypotheses regarding priority of dimensions (H3a-c) were tested using two within subjects analyses of variances, in a mixed two factor design. The community-based organization was considered first, using the weighted average scores on each dimension, as the within subjects factor and the subjects' occupational setting as the independent, between subjects factor.

For the community-based organization, there was no interaction effect of Setting by Dimension, $F(6, 72) = 1.08, p > .05$, nor of Setting as a main effect, $F(2, 37) = .82, p > .05$. There was a large significant difference, however, in perceived importance of the four dimensions, $F(3, 35) = 1109.50, p < .0001$. It had been hypothesized, based on the literature, that Organization Maintenance (Hypothesis 3a) and Human Relations (Hypothesis 3b) would be perceived to be the highest priorities for community-based organizations. Somewhat in support, Human
relations was actually perceived to be the most important dimension (weighted \( M = 1.87 \)), \( F(1, 37) = 868.87, p < .0001 \), and Organization Maintenance (weighted \( M = 1.56 \)), was tied with Client Orientation (weighted \( M = 1.56 \)), \( F(1, 37) = .07, p > .05 \) as a second priority. Quality Procedures (weighted \( M = 1.25 \)) was perceived as the significantly least important of all the dimensions, \( F(1, 37) = 991.79, p < .0001 \) (see Table 13).

These priorities were different than those identified by the external experts in Study A. In Study A, Client Orientation had been perceived as the highest priority, followed by Organization Maintenance, however, only items identified as essential to the community-based organization were used in the analysis. There was agreement between both studies that Quality Procedures was the lowest priority. This finding is consistent with the literature that had identified these types of criteria to be of greater importance to more formalized organizations (e.g., Quinn, 1988). Also, in both studies Organization Maintenance was the second highest priority (tied with Client Orientation in Study B).

The real difference between the two groups of experts was in the perception of Human Relations: while more external experts focus on client orientation as being critical, here it was second in importance and human relations was most critical. It is possible that, given that
### Table 13

**Weighted Mean Scores on Effectiveness Dimensions for Community-Based Organization Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Weighted SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Orientation</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Maintenance</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Procedures</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Each item was rated on a three-point scale. Items were recoded for this analysis such that the higher score the more the item was perceived as essential. All items from the dimension were included in calculating averages.
respondents in Study B were staff in actual HSOs, they may be biased towards human relations issues. Interestingly, both reflect "people" concerns albeit from a different angle. It may be that staff are more aware of how the organization climate affects clients. In fact, Patti (1988) identified climate as important in shaping how clients evaluate services.

The findings, however, were slightly different than those of Gitterman and Miller (1989) who claim that in unstable times organizational maintenance is the most pressing priority and Quinn's (1988) identification of acquiring resources as particularly critical at the entrepreneurial stage. Here it was actually a second priority.

A similar analysis was conducted for the college, with the average weighted scores on each dimension as the within subjects factor, and the subjects' occupational setting as an independent factor. For this analysis the items were again reversed scored, such that the weighting would correspond with the magnitude of the score, and the higher the mean, the more the item was perceived as essential. There was no significant effect of setting by dimension being rated, $F(6, 62) = .66, p > .05$, nor of setting as a main effect $F(2, 32) = 1.59, p > .05$.

As hypothesized, the results indicating priorities, however, were completely different than for the community-based organization. Hypothesis 3(c) stated that for the college, the most important perceived
priority would be Service Effectiveness and especially Quality Procedures. If number of items identified as essential on a dimension is used as the basis for determining priority, Human Relations and Service Effectiveness would have been tied as the highest priority, since so few items were identified on the other dimensions. However, using a within subject analysis of variance, results did not support the hypothesis (see Table 14); the most important dimension was perceived to be Human Relations (weighted $M = .58$), followed by Organization Maintenance (weighted $M = .21$), Quality Procedures (weighted $M = .03$) and Client Orientation (weighted $M = .00$), $F(3, 30) = 226.47$, $p < .0001$. The orthonormal contrasts revealed that Human Relations was perceived as significantly more important than the three remaining dimensions, $F(1,32) = 296.76$, $p < .0001$; Organization Maintenance was perceived as the next highest priority, $F(1, 32) = 193.35$, $p < .0001$; and Quality Procedures was found significantly more essential than Client Orientation, $F(1, 32) = 15.69$, $p < .0001$. This finding was not consistent with the hypothesis, nor with the research indicating that internal process and goal attainment models would be essential for this type of organization (Quinn, 1988). Although so many of the important items were from the Service Effectiveness dimension, apparently overall these items were of lesser importance than some of the other items defining other dimensions. In other words, though there were only two
Table 14

Weighted Mean Scores on Effectiveness Dimensions for College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Weighted SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Maintenance</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Procedures</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Orientation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Each item was rated on a three-point scale. Items were recoded for this analysis such that the higher score the more the item was perceived as essential. All items from the dimension were included in calculating averages.
items that were found as essential on the Organization Maintenance dimension, these two items may have been perceived as requiring more focus than the five essential items from Quality Procedures. This finding does not mean that achieving service effectiveness was not perceived as essential, but rather that, in terms of time and effort expended, Human Relations was perceived as requiring greater emphasis.

In summary, while it was predicted that the two organization descriptions would be perceived to have different priorities in terms of effectiveness, this did not, in fact, appear to be the case in Study B. Although the criteria defining Human Relations may vary, it was perceived that both organization should have Human Relations as the highest priority. For community-based organizations the emphasis seems to be on promoting a supportive climate where the importance of staff in achieving service goals is recognized. In the case of colleges the emphasis seems to be on hiring and training for quality. This latter focus is consistent with current trends in organization management, where human relations has taken on the utmost of importance. Given that all HSOs are currently facing some degree of uncertainty, having to make do with less, there may be more of an emphasis on Human Relations, even in operationally-certain HSOs. Because of intense competition for limited resources, the focus has shifted to how much employees can contribute to the organization in new and creative ways. Job security
seems to derive from proving one's worth to the organization by "adding value." As a result, operationally-certain HSOs may find themselves pursuing a similar route to their less certain counterparts where staff are able to don a number of hats and further think up creative solutions to address shortages. These may be the types of concerns perceived by HSO staff who work in the milieu and while the description of the college was meant to reflect operational certainty, in a secure environment, current exigencies may have been reflected in their responses.
Post Hoc Analyses

A number of items were included in the questionnaire administered in Study B to allow for post-hoc analyses that were not necessarily related to the hypotheses per se and also to allow analyses of the respondents' own organizations on the identified effectiveness criteria.

Global Success Items

Six items were included in the questionnaire that were presumed to measure the likelihood of the organization's success—a global measure of effectiveness. Each item was rated on a five point scale, ranging from "strongly agree"(1) to "strongly disagree"(5). Whereas it had been hypothesized that effectiveness criteria would vary as a function of operational-certainty, the inclusion of these global success items would permit more in depth analyses should this not, in fact, prove to be the case. Although the effectiveness did vary, given that so few items appeared to be perceived as important as indicators of the college's effectiveness, these global items might also provide some insight as to whether there was some kind of a bias associated with the college. For example, the possibility could be explored whether respondents were disenchanted with the described college approach. Of interest was whether estimates of the likely success of the described organization would similarly vary as a function of the described
organization's level of operational certainty.

Results from reliability analysis indicated that the global items hang together as a scale. Global items applied to the college were highly intercorrelated with an alpha of .88; and the global items applied to the community-based organization were also highly inter-correlated, with an alpha of .85.

Respondents applied each of these six global items to the college and the community-based organization description and results were compared in a doubly multivariate repeated measures MANOVA, with respondents' own occupational setting as one independent variable (college, community-based, alternative programs), the description rated as the other independent variable (college or community-based) and their rating on the global items as the repeated dependent variables. Their responses to the six global items applied to the college description were compared to their responses to the six items applied to the community-based organization.

Using Pillai's criterion, there was a significant multivariate interaction effect of Setting by Description, $F(12, 66) = 2.07, p < .05$. Respondents from alternative programs tended to have a slightly different view than the other two respondent groups; they tended to view the community-based organization as more effective than the college and they also tended to view the community-based organization as more
effective than did the other two respondent groups. Of particular interest was that the alternative respondents perceived the community-based organization to be more likely to survive in the long run than the college, while the other two respondent groups had the opposing view, $F(2, 37) = 9.48, p < .0001$.

Although college respondents rated the community-based organization most negatively of the three respondent groups, and the alternative program respondents rated the college most negatively of the three respondent groups on all six items, the multivariate effect of Setting did not reach significance, $F(12, 66) = 1.62, p > .05$. Given the small sample size the univariate effects were also considered; two of the univariate effects were significant. The college respondents were least certain that the community-based organization "would survive in the long run" ($M = 3.05$), followed by community-based respondents ($M = 2.37$), and finally the alternative program respondents ($M = 1.77$), $F(2, 37) = 4.79, p < .05$. Further, the community-based description was rated least likely to be "evaluated favourably" by the college respondents ($M = 2.58$), followed by the alternative program respondents ($M = 2.23$) and the community-based respondents ($M = 1.88$), and the college description was rated least likely to be "evaluated favourably" by the alternative program respondents ($M = 3.39$), followed by college respondents ($M = 2.58$), and community-based respondents ($M = 2.38$), $F(2, 37) = 4.62, p$
<.05.

The impact of Setting seems to lend some credence to the point noted above, that there might be a slight bias in responding associated with one's setting. Although it did not impact on the ratings of effectiveness criteria associated with hypothesis testing, it did seem to impact somewhat on perceptions of likelihood of success of the two organization types. In this case, college respondents were most likely of the three groups to see the community-based organization, most dissimilar to their own, as least likely to have long term success compared to the other respondent groups, but alternative respondents viewed the college least favourably and the community-based organization most favourably of the three groups. This latter finding is understandable given that the alternative programs often have sprung up in response to perceived shortcomings in the traditional college in reaching particular groups and respondents from these settings would be more likely to be aware of the college's inadequacies.

Despite the more negative view of the college-based respondents for the community-based organization description, and the more negative view of the alternative program respondents towards the college, there was a multivariate effect of Description, using Pillai's criterion, $F(6, 32) = 3.23, p<.05$. As Table 15 indicates, on all six of the items globally measuring the perceived likelihood of success, the community-based
Table 15

Means, Standard Deviations, and Univariate F Values for Global Success

Items as a Function of Description Rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>College Description</th>
<th>Community-Based Description</th>
<th>F(1,37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization will survive in long run</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization has ability to attract staff</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization will be more successful than others of its kind</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>15.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization has potential to develop funding</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>9.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization would be evaluated favourably</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization has potential for growth</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>4.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001

Note. The lower the score the stronger the endorsement of the item.
organization was rated as more likely to succeed and four of these
differences were significant: "The organization would be more successful
than others of its kind," $F(1, 37) = 15.43, p < .0001; "The organization
has the potential for developing a more extensive funding base," $F(1,37)
= 9.73, p < .005; "The organization would be evaluated favourably by its
constituencies," $F(1, 37) = 4.64, p < .05; "The organization has potential
for future growth," $F(1, 37) = 4.17, p < .05.

This finding does seem to support the view that there was some
disenchantment with the described college. A possible explanation for
the more positive appraisal of the community-based organization
description is that given today's uncertainty, the innovative, adaptive
community-based organization seems better able to cope with change. In
fact, Beckhard and Pritchard (1992) point out that today, even the largest
organizations are prone to the recession and that organizations will need
to innovate, learn, respond quickly and design the appropriate
infrastructure to meet demands. Thus, when respondents rated the likely
success of the organization, they may have done so in the context of
today's political arena, where even the typically highly certain HSOs are
faced with stressors, and not in the environmentally certain context that
was described. Somewhat in support of this possibility, of the three
respondent groups, the alternative program respondents, who by
definition offer alternatives to traditional approaches, found the college
programs least likely to succeed.

**Analysis of Respondents' Occupational Setting**

Given that demographic data were obtained for respondents' own occupational settings, a number of post-hoc comparisons were also possible in this regard. As a starting point, a repeated-measures ANOVA was carried out on the item ratings of how similar respondents felt their own organization was to the described prototypical college and to the described prototypical community-based organization. A three-point scale was used: "not at all" (1); "somewhat" (2); "to a great extent" (3). There were two independent variables: Occupational Setting (three levels) and the Description Rated (two levels). As one would expect, a significant interaction was found between Setting and Description, $F(2, 38) = 13.76, p < .0001$. The results of an ANOVA comparing respondents from the three occupational settings on how closely they felt that their own organizations resembled the college description indicated that of the three groups, respondents from colleges felt that they most closely resembled the college-based organization description ($M = 2.37$), followed by the "other"/alternative programs ($M = 1.64$), and finally the community-based organization ($M = 1.25$). $F(2, 38) = 10.64, p < .0001$.

Similarly, results from an ANOVA comparing the respondents from the three occupational settings in terms of how closely they felt that their own organization resembled the community-based organization
description indicated that respondents from the community-based programs felt that they most closely resembled the community-based organization description ($M = 2.25$), followed again by the "other" group ($M = 2.00$) and followed up by the college respondents ($M = 1.42$), $F(2, 38) = 5.76, p < .01$. In short, it seems reasonable to conclude that the descriptions were perceived as intended, that the manipulations were effective and that the two descriptions were perceived as reasonably realistic.

The next set of analyses compared two groups of respondents' ratings of their own organization to the matched described organization; college respondents' ratings of their own organization were compared to their ratings of the described college and community-based respondents' ratings of their own organization were compared to their ratings of the described community-based organization. Of interest was whether respondents from colleges would identify the same items as essential to their own college as they had for the described college (rate the two organizations similarly) and whether respondents from community-based organizations would rate their own organization similarly to the described community-based organization. This analysis was of particular interest from the college perspective, given that so few items had been identified as significantly essential to the described college's effectiveness.

The first MANOVA compared college respondents' ratings of the
importance of Study A college items for their own organization's
effectiveness as compared to that of the described college. It was
decided to begin by using Study A college items because they were
more numerous than those items identified as significantly essential in
Study B and would hence permit contrasts between items that had not
been perceived as essential in Study B. Items were grouped into the
ultimate dimensions.

For the items defining Human Relations, there was no significant
multivariate effect of which organization was being rated, $F(10,12) =
2.04, p > .05$, but univariate F tests did reveal a number of differences
on the individual item level: "Staff believe in the organization's goals;"
$F(1, 21) = 5.33, p < .05$; "Staff are encouraged to keep their training up
to date," $F(1, 21) = 4.34, p < .05$; "Good information management and
communication are believed important to service goals," $F(1, 21) = 5.33,
p < .05$; "Front line staff openly communicate with managers;" $F(1, 21) =
18.44, p < .0001$; People work hard because they believe their work is
important," $F(1, 21) = 6.72, p < .05$. Interestingly, in every instance
respondents rated the item as more important for their own organization's
effectiveness as opposed to that of the described college. Only two of
these items had been identified as essential for the described college in
Study B, and both were identified as significantly more important for
respondents' own organizations: "People work hard because they believe
their work is important" ($M = 1.45$ versus $M = 1.09$) and "Staff are encouraged to keep their training up to date" ($M = 1.36$ versus $M = 1.04$).

For the Service Effectiveness items, there was also no multivariate effect of the organization being rated, $F(16,4) = 1.47$, $p > .05$, but again, there were several significant differences at the individual item level: "Service quality is continually measured," $F(1,19) = 5.94$, $p < .05$; "The program is accessible to disadvantaged groups," $F(1,19) = 6.33$, $p < .05$; "Each students' needs are assessed upon entering the program," $F(1,19) = 4.41$, $p < .05$; "The Board has professional expertise," $F(1,19) = 12.67$, $p < .005$. Again, each item was rated as more important for their own organization versus the described college and in fact, none of the items had been identified as essential for the described college in Study B.

A second MANOVA compared the ratings on items identified in Study B as essential to the college to ratings for the respondents' own organization. While there was no multivariate effect $F(6, 36) = 1.55$, $p > .05$, of the five items that were identified, two were perceived as more essential to actual colleges: "The organization must remain adaptable to possible changes" ($M = 1.09$ versus $M = 1.40$), $F(1, 21) = 7.86$, $p < .01$ and "Students' progress is monitored and tracked" ($M = 1.48$ versus $M = 1.19$), $F(1, 21) = 6.83$, $p < .05$.

For items aimed at Organization Maintenance, there were no
significant multivariate nor univariate differences.

A MANOVA could not be carried out comparing community-based respondents' ratings of their own organizations and the described community-based organization on Study A community-based items, because there were too few respondents and so many items with no variance. The paired items were examined individually, using paired t-tests, to provide a rough estimate of how similarly respondents rated the importance of items for their own organization compared to the described community-based organization. Using multiple t-tests can be problematic because observations are not statistically independent but all are on the same subjects, and the likelihood of finding significant differences hence increases as the number of comparisons increases, and the probability of Type 1 error increases. However in this case, none of the items were significantly different, when they were looked at with paired t-tests. In fact, over a third of the items were rated identically.

This finding may indicate that, in fact, the community-based items have high test/retest reliability, in that similar results occurred when the items were applied to two different organizations (the prototypical organization, and their own).

Given that the ratings were so similar for the described and actual community-based organizations, the likelihood is that the description was perceived to quite closely describe the intricacies of actual organizations.
Further, this finding is indicative that the items are generalizable to actual organizations.

The findings regarding the college are more puzzling. All the items tended to be viewed as more essential for actual colleges than for the prototypical college. One possible interpretation is that actual colleges, in fact, are more flexible and generally less operationally certain than the college program described in the prototypical descriptions. As a result, and consistent with current predictions, more criteria were perceived as essential than was the case with the more operationally certain description. This may, as well, be the reason why the described college was generally perceived as less likely to have long term success. In fact, the evidence is that, in order to survive in current recessionary times, traditionally operationally-certain HSOs are increasingly being forced to become innovative and flexible.

Another possibility is that respondents perceived the described community-based organization and their own organizations as more complex, and/or more familiar, than they perceived the described college. This perception resulted in more indicators being perceived as critical. Why this would be the case, however, is unclear.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to test hypothesized differences in perceptions of organizational effectiveness as a factor of operational certainty. Prototypical organization descriptions were developed, polarized along three critical dimensions of operational-certainty—environmental certainty, formal structuralization, and technological determinacy. The study integrated literature from psychology, sociology, social work, and business to examine organizational effectiveness from a comprehensive basis.

This study addressed two major concerns of human service organizations. First, evaluators, researchers, and other organization consultants have expressed concern regarding the shortage of HSO models. Second, evaluations of operationally "uncertain" HSOs have frequently relied on standards and approaches derived from operationally "certain" HSOs. To these ends this study identifies indicators of effectiveness for both operationally-certain and uncertain HSOs, perceived as critical by stakeholders from high, mid level and low operational-certainty HSOs, as well as evaluators and funders.

Generally, external experts and HSO respondents alike perceived that measuring and achieving organizational effectiveness required
attention to substantially more criteria in the community-based organization than in the college. The criteria identified as important to the college tended to be subsumed under the community-based organization criteria.

One conclusion of the study might be that colleges are not perceived as needing to meet many criteria to demonstrate effectiveness. This interpretation is not unequivocal. When participants from colleges were asked to identify which of the indicators were essential to their own college's effectiveness, they identified many more items than they had for the college profiled. Yet, there are two indications that participants did perceive that the college description was realistic. College-based respondents described their own organization as resembling the college description more so than the community-based description. Furthermore, college respondents felt more strongly than did the community-based and alternative program respondents that their respective organizations resembled the college.

The question that clearly needs to be further explored is whether different results would have been obtained had real organizations been used. At issue is whether the difference in perceptions between the described and actual organizations was an artifact of not using actual organizations, or whether there is an alternative explanation. A possible interpretation, in the first instance, is that when participants are asked to
objectively assess an organization in which they have no vested interest, they perceive that less criteria are critical to the organization’s effectiveness and these criteria are focused more on standards. When their own organization is at issue, they perceive a greater need for flexibility, and the need for staff input, such as what is proposed by the human relations model and built into TQM. This interpretation seems unlikely given that when the community-based description was rated, many items were identified as essential by all three respondent groups. Further the ratings of the actual and described community-based organization were very similar. As a result, either the bias is limited to just the college, which seems unlikely, or there is some other more likely explanation.

There are several other alternative explanations. A possible consideration is that the description of the college was simply seen as less realistic than the community-based organization description and the identification of essential criteria was thus rendered more difficult. This explanation also seems unlikely given that college respondents rated their own colleges as resembling the profiled college more closely than community-based respondents rated their own community-based organizations as resembling the profiled community-based organization.

An alternate interpretation is that although the college description may have been perceived, in large part, as realistic and reasonably
similar to respondents' actual colleges, it also may have been perceived that the operational-certainty dimensions were more extreme in the description. In other words, even though the profiled college was perceived as reasonably realistic, there was still an underlying perception that its technology was more determinate, that it was more formally structured and that its environment was more certain than in actual colleges.

Thus, the differences in ratings between the profiled and real organizations may be due not to the distinction between rating actual versus described organizations but rather to perceived differences in operational-certainty. The perception may be that the more uncertain the organization, the more it is clear that numerous and specific criteria must be used to assess every aspect of functioning. When the organization is certain, the specific criteria identified may not be perceived as quite as important. The assumption may be that when the described high operational certainty conditions are true it would be the case that few criteria would be essential to a college's effectiveness. But, actual colleges perceived in the context of today's highly uncertain economy, were perceived to be less rigid, thus accounting for the higher number of indicators and the greater focus on flexibility that were identified as essential for their own colleges. Based on this most likely explanation, the answer to the initially posed question, is that different results would
have been obtained using actual colleges, only providing the actual
colleges were perceived as less operationally-certain.

Given that colleges today are faced with increased competition for
resources, a lesson might be learned from private sector industry.
Technology is no longer perceived as the sole vehicle to gain a
competitive edge since advances are typically incremental. Forward
thinking organizations have moved the focus to unleashing human
potential to allow for maximal creativity and flexibility. The movement is
away from standardizing and controlling, to encouraging innovation,
freedom, and team work to the ends of enhanced quality and hence
customer loyalty.

Another interpretation to consider is whether ratings were coloured
by respondents’ appraisal of the profiled, rigid college within the context
of today’s more turbulent and competitive environment and a consequent
assessment that it was ineffective. This interpretation is distinct from the
previous one. On the one hand, respondents may possibly perceive a
highly technologically determinate, formally structured college, operating
in a highly certain environment and assess that these conditions do not
describe their own organizations (the previous point). On the other hand,
respondents may perceive the same technological determinacy and
formal structure, but do so in the context of today’s greater uncertainty
and assess that the rigid approach is no longer desirable. As noted, in
this first instance, the conclusion might be that when the high operational certainty conditions are true, then few criteria are perceived as essential. In the latter instance, the conclusion is more tenuous. If the profiled college was not perceived as a currently effective approach, it may have been difficult to identify effectiveness indicators and this difficulty, in some way, may have resulted in few criteria being perceived as essential. Based on this explanation, the identified indicators could only be cautiously generalized to actual colleges. There is some credence lent to this latter interpretation since the profiled college was perceived as unlikely to survive in the long term, but it is not clear whether respondents were placing the described college in today's context when identifying effectiveness indicators. There is some indication that it may be more appropriate to focus on the actual colleges to draw conclusions regarding what is currently perceived as essential for colleges.

As a means of weighing the various interpretations, a subsequent study might use HSO college staff to interpret the findings and to explain their differences in ratings. One approach would be to provide each respondent with a range of college descriptions, systematically varied in terms of operational certainty (high, mid level, low). Respondents could rate each profiled description and their own college on organization-verification items, such as those used in this study. In this regard, the profile perceived most similar to each respondent's own college could be
identified. Respondents could also rate effectiveness indicators for each profile, as well as for their own college on a similar three-point scale and provide the rationale behind each rating. The inclusion of a range of descriptions and matching respondents' actual organizations with the described organization that is most similarly rated on the verification items, could allow the examination of whether any perceived differences in indicators are a function of rating actual versus described organizations or, as is more likely, attributable to differing perceptions of operational certainty. In the first instance, if differences are due to the task of assessing actual versus described organizations one would expect greater similarity in number and content of indicators between any of the three described organizations than between the matched actual and profiled organizations. In the latter instance, if differences are due to perceptions of operational certainty, one would expect more similar indicators to be identified for the matched actual and profiled organizations than for any pair of described organizations.

A final interpretation that should be considered is the possibility that for both the college and community-based descriptions, respondents really were describing how an effective organization should look and function, but it does not necessarily follow that all the indicators demand equal attention. For example, there may be the perception that an effective community-based organization should focus on a variety of
criteria, but each one does not necessarily have to be measured to demonstrate effectiveness. Again, this type of interpretation could be validated in a subsequent study where rationale is tied to ratings.

Regardless of the reason why, the finding of significantly less criteria perceived as essential for the profiled college does raise the possibility that assessing and monitoring effectiveness in the two types of organizations may not depend on distinct sets of criteria. Rather, it may be possible to develop a comprehensive instrument for community-based organizations, and a shorter version selected from the comprehensive list for colleges. With the exception of a few items specific to office skills-training programs, the items are generic such that, with minor alterations, any subsequent instrument developed from the indicators identified and validated in the present study, would be applicable to other types of organizations. However, the question of why respondents' own colleges were perceived to require a higher degree of monitoring must be further explored prior to adopting such a course of action. If one accepts the interpretation that actual colleges were rated differently because of their lower operational certainty than the profiled college, there still is support for using one monitoring instrument for the two types of organizations. Again, a subsequent study might take a more inductive approach, focusing on why particular indicators were perceived to be important.

The types of indicators that were identified as important for the
community-based organization, and the fact that a multi-dimensional approach to organizational effectiveness was identified for the described and actual community-based organizations, for the actual colleges, and, to a lesser extent, for the described college, mirror current trends aimed at improving organizations. Recent management trends, such as Total Quality Management, and the principles of "continuous Improvement" and "employee Involvement" (e.g., Egan, 1993), all promote surpassing high standards and delighting internal and external customers. There is a similar recognition of the organization as an interrelated system of humans and processes, and the need for multiple indicators of effectiveness. Organizational effectiveness thus tends to be defined beyond mere service outcomes, to include the human potential through which quality and financial returns can be achieved.

The implication is that the type of organization that is perceived as best able to function effectively in uncertainty has specific, identifiable characteristics. That is, given the numerous forces of uncertainty operating in today's economy, the extent to which these specific features are descriptive of an organization is perceived as related to the organization's likely survival. From an organizational viewpoint, this implies that there must be assurance that there is not an exclusive focus on a single outcome goal, but rather a monitoring of management practices, the degree of client orientation, and the development of
partnerships/networks. All these facets are ultimately aimed at gaining customer loyalty, increasing market share, and developing strategic alliances to reduce uncertainty. From a private sector perspective the link between pleasing customers and financial returns is obvious. From a nonprofit perspective the link is absent, given that funders and service recipients are two different groups. However, concerns from a funding perspective may focus on preventing service duplication and gaps in service. Both of these foci are a function of having a strong client orientation and focusing on achieving quality. Hence there is somewhat of a link in this regard.

From a consultant’s perspective, the findings provide a template of the areas which might be the focus of organizational development efforts. Evaluations of an organization’s effectiveness should not focus on service outcomes to the exclusion of the other facets of effectiveness. Whereas such a focus may have been reasonable in traditional colleges and other high operational-certainty organizations, it would be erroneous and misleading in organizations operating in uncertainty, such as in highly competitive markets. That is not to say that ultimately learning must not take place, but rather additional indicators would be appropriate. For instance, indicators might focus around instilling the appropriate climate of concern for staff and clients, promoting flexibility and innovation, and establishing a network of resources. These criteria
directly impact on the organization's capacity to achieve quality, increase market share and attain fiscal health.

Given the better established links between organizational components for operationally-certain HSOs, it may not have been perceived as necessary to measure as many criteria and service outcome was perceived as more readily relied on. But, even for the high certainty organization, effectiveness did not distil down into a single effectiveness measure; multiple criteria were identified. Given that uncertainty currently affects most organizations to some degree, multiple criteria beyond service outcomes have become necessary. The highest recognized standards of quality in the general service industry, such as the Malcolm Baldrige Award, endorse the multi-component approach.

Quinn (1988) contends that, although all models are of some degree of importance for all organizations, at various points in an organization's life cycle (depending on operational certainty) particular models of effectiveness take on greater importance. Generally, for the college, the perception seemed to be that imposing structure and standards to reduce error—quality control were particularly important to achieve effectiveness. Egan (1993) similarly reported that in relatively stable environments where markets are well understood (both of which define the profiled college), organizations can focus on improving efficiency. This type of management approach has characterized much
of North American Industry since post World War II. Although in times of abundance it worked well, in the face of increased global competition and ever changing technology, it has also been credited with being responsible for the demise of America's competitive advantage over Japan.

In the community-based organization, perceived priorities seemed to reflect a humanistic concern, consistent with the tenets of TQM and characteristic of much of a Japanese management approach. Flexibility, proactivity, team work, and employee involvement were perceived as important and can be considered as tools to meet customer needs, maintain their loyalty and increase market share. This finding too is consistent with Egan's (1993) description of what organizations in turbulent environments should be like: "open to learning from the environment," and able to quickly "gear the organization of work, the nature of authority and decision making, communication systems and employee involvement to constantly evolving conditions" (pp. 171). In the private sector, even traditionally highly structured organizations are now embracing these types of ideals in appreciation that intense competition and limited resources render the former management style ineffective.

Consistently, in the present study the community-based organization, which embraces these ideals, was rated more likely to
succeed over the long run. As noted in the introduction, traditional education has been relatively insulated from external instability. The perception of the college as less effective may reflect a current societal change. Institutes of higher education are currently faced with unprecedented demands for cut-backs, streamlining and other changes. These demands may require a change in what has traditionally been perceived as an appropriate approach in "mainstream" HSOs. Egan (1993) points out: "the inability of many educational systems to learn to adapt to economic, political, and social turbulence has led to an unparalleled crisis in education" (pp. 171), and the recognition of this crisis may be what caused respondents to identify the described traditional form of the college, namely highly formally structured, as less effective in the long-run, than the more responsive form of the described community-based organization.

This is an interesting finding given that the community-based organization has often been implicitly compared to its mainstream counterpart, by using standards developed on these latter organizations. The perceived lower likelihood of long-term success for the college may possibly signal that the time has come when mainstream organizations can learn from the more fluid, organic community-based organization that is better able to respond to change. The perception of the college's less likely long-term survival may reflect the understanding that the college is
unable to satisfy the broad range of needs with which it is faced, using its relatively structured approach. Community-based organizations (and alternative program) not only serve a narrower, albeit more complex, population but in fact actually evolved because of the perceived failure of traditional education to meet the needs of special groups with a structured approach.

A follow-up study might replicate the findings on another service sector, similarly varying in operational certainty. For example, other appropriate types of organizations might be hospitals versus community-based health care. Given the political impetus for developing community centres, such a focus is timely. Interestingly, hospitals, to even a greater degree than colleges, have also been traditionally sheltered from uncertainty but are now facing budget cuts. One focus of the resulting restructuring and reengineering process is "client orientation." Hospitals are being reorganized from the viewpoint of patient centred care, as opposed to along traditional functional lines. Again, a tentative link between funders and service recipients is that a client orientation will be financially advantageous by its removal of unnecessary bureaucracy, unproductivity, and error.

An alternative research question might be to see how the present findings compare with profit-making skills-training programs. The same procedures that were used in Study A to develop the two sets of criteria
could be used. Relevant experts could be given a slightly modified item pool, and asked to rate items in terms of how essential they are to the effectiveness of a described profit-oriented skills-training program. Given a profit motive, it would be interesting to note whether a single outcome measure around financial concerns is identified or whether this type of organization, in similar recognition of high uncertainty, will be perceived as requiring multiple indicators of effectiveness.

In summary, it will be recalled that the initial premise was that organizations must match their structure and technology to their environment in order to be effective. In today's context, there is the implication that colleges might actually begin to fashion themselves after community-based organizations in terms of structure and practices, given that they no longer can be considered as environmentally certain. In fact, this seems to be the general movement across industry as well, with the promotion of the learning organization as the ideal culture. The basic philosophy underlying the learning organization is constant learning as a means of improving, requiring a culture of vigilance for unexploited opportunities (Egan, 1993). This possibility raises the question whether traditional colleges, that were once thought most stable, are becoming obsolete.

Limitations of Study.

There are three main limitations to this study. The first problem
was a limited sample, smaller than planned, that impacted in several ways. First, some differences in perceptions of importance may not have appeared as significant. That is, even though the two descriptions were perceived quite differently in terms of effectiveness indicators, it is possible that these differences would have been even more dramatic with a larger sample. Second, more complex analyses were not possible, such as factor analysis and analyses of covariance. Third, the three respondents groups, in some instances were too small to allow analysis of differences. This proved to be a problem, for example, when community-based organization respondents' ratings of their own and the profiled community-based organization were compared. To compensate for these first three problems, the data were discussed from a content perspective and alternative strategies were employed for analysis. In all multivariate analyses, univariate effects were examined as well. Given that results were reasonably consistent across the two studies and that the same pattern of more criteria being perceived as essential for the community-based organization held, confidence in the findings is enhanced, despite the small sample size.

The last potential problem posed by the small sample was that, while the results are noteworthy and revealing, they also must be interpreted with the caution that they are based on results of a small percentage of potential HSO respondents. Inevitably, in a study of this
nature involving a survey component, the possible impacts of a low response rate and self selection in responding on the generalizability of the findings must be considered. Although the respondents did not appear to be different in any meaningful way from the nonrespondents and the selection of the initial respondent pool was not biased (all programs in a given region were contacted), increased confidence in the findings can be achieved through a replication study.

A second possible limitation concerns the rating scale that was used in both studies. Because it was only a three-point scale many of the differences might have appeared more subtle than had a wider range scale been provided. With a less restricted scale differences in importance between the two descriptions on any item(s) might have appeared to be more dramatic. The limited choice in responses also allowed very little variance. This seemed to be more of a problem with the community-based organization, since so many of the items were perceived as essential. Had more choices been available, there might have been finer discrimination, and a wider range of responses. For example, for the community-based organization, many items were perceived as essential to the same degree on a particular dimension. A wider response choice might have differentiated between some of these items in terms of priority.

Finally, the results should be interpreted with the caution that
perceptions are being assessed, not objective reality. That is, based on the results it appears that respondents perceived their own colleges differently than actual colleges, at least in terms of effectiveness indicators. One might assume that their own colleges were perceived as less operationally-certain, because the types of indicators that were identified as essential were hypothesized to be associated with low operational certainty. This, however, does not prove that their colleges were less operationally-certain, simply that they are perceived that way. A subsequent study might include the organization-verification items for respondents' own organizations to provide more of an objective assessment of degree of operational certainty.
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Appendix A
Overview of Study
Items marked by an asterisk were part of Study A, while those without were part of Study B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Process/ Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1. Literature Review</td>
<td>Gathered operational definitions of environmental certainty, technological determinacy, formal structuralization to aid in development of prototypical descriptions. Generated all possible criteria of organizational effectiveness (OE) to form a preliminary list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2 Prototypical Organization Description Development</td>
<td>Developed 2 descriptions of organizations, one with high and one with low levels of three operational certainty variables, that served as the basis for hypothesis testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3. Contacting of Independent Consultant</td>
<td>Elicited the help of 3 independent consultants, experienced with both types of HSOs, to enhance the external validity of final effectiveness criteria selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4. Writing of Items</td>
<td>Wrote items covering each criterion from Step 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5. Consultant Feedback on Criteria</td>
<td>Had 3 independent consultants add to/modify the list of OE criteria to ensure comprehensive list.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*6 Consultant Feedback on Organization Descriptions

Had 3 independent consultants evaluate prototypical organizations, to ensure that they were realistic and that manipulations were perceived to be in the intended direction.

*7. Preliminary Item Pool Development

Combined consultant feedback and literature review into list of criteria for Study A questionnaire.

*8. Contacting of External Experts as First Respondent Group

Contacted consultants/academics/relevant Government personnel first by phone, using snowball approach and professional membership directories.


Forwarded questionnaire by mail. Respondents rated generated criteria in terms of their importance as indicators of OE in both prototypical organizations, to end up with two final sets of most important items — one for the high certainty HSO, one for the low certainty HSO.

10. Contacting of Key People for Study B

Took a top down approach in eliciting the cooperation of central funding sources and other umbrella organizations in identifying HSOs (both college and community based programs) from which to recruit Study B respondents.

11. Initiation of Contact with HSOs

Used the Total Design Method so as to increase response rate

12. Development of Study B Questionnaires

Combined the criteria from Step 9 into one instrument by eliminating redundancy. Also included: global assessment of effectiveness items; demographic
items from respondents' own HSOs, and items checking the manipulations of the independent variables.

13. Administration of Questionnaires to HSO Respondents

Sent questionnaire with the purpose of gathering information re: the perceived importance of each criterion in evaluating OE for both prototypical organizations, to see if respondents differentiated between HSOs in terms of effectiveness criteria. Each respondent rated own HSO on both sets of criteria.

14. Sending of Reminder(s) to HSO Respondents

Sent three week reminder to each HSO, according to Dillman's Total Design Method. Phoned as final reminder all remaining HSO respondents that have not responded.

15. Analyses

Tested hypotheses regarding how criteria of OE vary as a function of whether an HSO is high or low on technological determinacy, environmental certainty and formal structuralization.
Appendix B

SCORING OF ORGANIZATION-VERIFICATION ITEMS
The organization verification items are grouped below in terms of the dimensions they measure. Items marked by a "+" count towards the high end of the dimension. The college based organization description should score high on these items. Conversely, items marked by a "-" count towards the low end of the dimension and community based organization description should score high on these items. Items were rated on a 3-point scale from (1) not at all true to (3) very true.

**Format structure**

+ Decision-making is all done by a few people at the top of the hierarchy.
- Staff exercise discretion in their work.
+ There are numerous levels to this organization.
+ The reporting structure is complex and pyramidal.
- Generally, the organization is like a team with an even distribution of power.
- There is relatively little power differential.

**Technological determinacy**

- Tasks are rarely the same from day to day.
+ Work is routine.
+ One can greatly rely on established procedures and practices to do the work in the organization.
- There lacks a clearly known way to do the work in the organization.
+ There is an understandable sequence of steps that can be followed in
  the work in the organization.

- It is difficult to describe a typical procedure since they vary from client to
  client.

+ In this organization the rule of thumb is to make rules to cover all
  possibilities.

+ Everything in this organization is covered by rules and regulations.

- It would be very difficult to outline clear procedures to follow in every
  instance.

- It is difficult to have rules to cover all processes since there are so many
  exceptions.

+ Clients rarely present problems that have never been encountered
  before.

+ The same procedures can be used in solving most of the client
  problems encountered.

- The same kinds of client problems would rarely be encountered.

- Decisions made by workers with respect to clients are dissimilar from
  day to day.

**Environmental certainty**

+ Funding is reasonably assured from year to year.

+ There is a stable group of loyal funders.
The organization is well entrenched in larger society.

- Funding depends on being able to adapt to changing needs.
- New requests for funding have to be made yearly.
+ The organization has financial independence.
- The organization's funds are given with strings attached.
+ The organization has a financial cushion to fall back on in times of need.

**Scoring:** The manipulation items were scored separately for organization description A and organization description B. A mean score of "2" or more on the organization appropriate item (the "+" items for the college based description and the "-" items for the community based description) would indicate that the manipulation was appropriately perceived. On the organization inappropriate items a mean score greater than "2" would indicate that the manipulation may not have been effective.

Modifications to the descriptions were made based on the consultants' ratings.
Appendix C

Mean Ratings for Prototypical College and Community-Based Organization (Study A)
Tables C-1 to C-4 list the participants' mean ratings of all the items applied to the prototypical college description and the prototypical community-based organization description. The significant items identified by Lawshe's (1975) formula are identified and the most essential (lowest mean) items on each dimension are all underlined.

Table C-1

Organization Maintenance Items: Mean Ratings for Prototypical Community-Based and College Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description Rated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCIAL HEALTH/SECURITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone in org is well versed in writing grant proposals.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program manager actively seeks out possible funders.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The lower the score, the more the item was perceived as essential to effectiveness. Items indicated by an * were rated as essential by a significant number of panellists using Lawshe's (1975) formula; underlined items were most essential items (lowest means) on dimensions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant amount of prog mger's time spent soliciting donations.</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program manager is very creative in finding needed resources.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program manager is always on the lookout for new funders.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program manager solicits funds from stable pool of funders.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program manager negotiates for best deals for material resources.</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org actively generates revenues from available sources.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple funding sources are actively pursued.</td>
<td>1.12* CVR=.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts are made to please multiple constituencies.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program manager balances conflicting funding demands.</td>
<td>1.31* CVR=.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative financial planning is critical managerial skill.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization works very closely with funding sources.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding sources help determine program direction.</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed budgets presented to external constituencies regularly.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting is an important concern.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Community-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed accounting system to ensure costs never exceed funds.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial planning dictates what activities are pursued.</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies have been developed for financing in deficit situations.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The org makes creative use of its facilities.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses budgeted to give priority to programs over administration.</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The org applies financial control system.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ABILITY TO ACQUIRE RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program supported in community in incoming and outgoing referrals.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is sharing of information with other orgs with same clients.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org links with local businesses that provide needed resources.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org is well known to other community based organizations.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members serve on community committees.</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint ventures with other orgs and inter-org collaboration encouraged.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support of the org shown.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based</td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org demonstrates awareness of various communities in area.</td>
<td>1.25* CVR=.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization actively targets clients.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing to prospective clients is important org function.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of approaches used to attract clients.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization frequents where prospective clients spend time.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconventional recruiting to reach prospective clients.</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities are located near clients.</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org tries to reduce perceived risk associated with service.</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org communicates appropriately with different groups.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization thinks proactively.</td>
<td>1.06* CVR=.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org highly adaptable to demands from external constituencies.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization responds well to internal demands.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization makes policy/strategic decisions without outside approval.</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org must have outside approval prior to changing directions.</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization maintains its mission without involuntary change.</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Org periodically reviews/revises mission in view of community needs.  
1.25* CVR=.50 1.56

Org tracks community needs.  
1.12* CVR=.75 1.56

Organization attracts and retains high quality staff.  
1.12* CVR=.87 1.25* CVR=.62

Org's recruitment/hiring/promotion practices reflects catchment area.  
1.50 1.73
Table C-2

**Human Relations Items: Mean Ratings for Prototypical Community-Based and College Descriptions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description Rated</th>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction is critical objective.</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor staff morale immediately dealt with.</td>
<td>1.25* CVR=.50</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful/cohesive environment is the goal.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff absenteeism/turnover are indicative of org problems.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management addresses staff concerns.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management displays general concern for employees.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems are dealt with fairly/openly.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers express appreciation of staff.</td>
<td>1.25* CVR=.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff consensus sought re org goals.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff believe in org's goals.</td>
<td>1.12* CVR=.75</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The lower the score, the more the item was perceived as essential to effectiveness. Items indicated by an * were rated as essential by a significant number of panellists using Lawshe's (1975) formula; underlined items were most essential items (lowest means) on dimensions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People work hard because they believe their work is important</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive incentives are enforced.</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities are created for increased levels of competency.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees' needs are targeted as carefully as clients.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support systems designed to help employees.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards are offered for work well done.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee assistance programs provided</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality internal communication believed of paramount importance</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A smooth information flow is pursued</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good info management/communication important to service goals</td>
<td>1.31* CVR=.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front line staff openly communicate with managers</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many opportunities for informal communication with senior personnel</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many opportunities for formal communication with senior personnel</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff extensively trained</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff encouraged to keep up training</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff kept abreast of developments that may affect client training.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees provided with resources needed to develop themselves.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally credentialed staff actively recruited.</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization spends money on professional development.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of service quality instilled in employees.</td>
<td>1.00* CVR=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are trained so that there is overlap in skills.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals/community linked staff are actively recruited.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff representative of the target group.</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members represented on decision making bodies.</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front line staff have wide latitude in decision making in own areas.</td>
<td>1.25* CVR=.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff participate in decision making re: running of organization.</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors must formally approve almost all decisions.</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff must have permission to deviate from any procedures.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff input into procedures is solicited.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee input is valued.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid policies interfering with staff problem solving eliminated.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No power differential in organization.</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one gets unearned special privileges.</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff freely question authority.</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers get along like a team.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people are considerate of each other.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism is accepted constructively.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building workshops held regularly.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior personnel go out of their way to be helpful.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff in organization frequently don a number of hats.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work team represents a number of disciplines.</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers know how to manage without being confrontational.</td>
<td>1.25* CVR=.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers do a good job in guiding staff.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C-3

**Service Effectiveness Items: Mean Ratings for Prototypical Community-Based and College Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>掮YLENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client personal development is important objective.</td>
<td>1.06* CVR=.87</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients' true needs are identified.</td>
<td>1.12* CVR=.75</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization strengthens individuals/families/communities.</td>
<td>1.20* CVR=.50</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client satisfaction used as measure of program success.</td>
<td>1.25* CVR=.50</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client complaints taken into consideration.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients leaving program followed up to determine why.</td>
<td>1.25* CVR=.50</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients influence program changes/development.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client evaluations of programs are valued feedback.</td>
<td>1.06* CVR=.87</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client representatives on Board.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The lower the score, the more the item was perceived as essential to effectiveness. Items indicated by an * were rated as essential by a significant number of panellists using Lawshe's (1975) formula; underlined items were most essential items (lowest means) on dimensions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client individual and/or special needs taken into account.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62 1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies built specifically around client needs.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62 1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients asked if needs addressed by program.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62 1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients highly involved in service delivery.</td>
<td>1.56 2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement site supervisors asked to evaluate client skills.</td>
<td>1.12* CVR=.87 1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients are followed up to ensure they are eventually hired.</td>
<td>1.37 1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client learning of office skills monitored.</td>
<td>1.06* CVR=.87 1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUALITY PROCEDURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients progress is monitored/tracked.</td>
<td>1.00* CVR=1.00 1.25* CVR=.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery convenient to clients.</td>
<td>1.31 1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization seeks out placement sites for clients.</td>
<td>1.06* CVR=.87 1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff use a case by case approach.</td>
<td>1.20* CVR=.50 1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff decide which approach to follow for each client.</td>
<td>1.27* CVR=.50 2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A multi component approach with support services is encouraged.</td>
<td>1.27 2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each client's needs assessed upon entry.</td>
<td>1.06* CVR=.87 1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program is fashioned around individuals' needs.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in clients' needs are closely monitored.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training is based on performance and competency.</td>
<td>1.14* CVR=0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self directed learning is an important component.</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization must remain adaptable to possible changes.</td>
<td>1.07* CVR=0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client centred/flexible approach followed.</td>
<td>1.13* CVR=0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong component of org strategy is attention to community needs.</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program is accessible to cultural groups.</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program is accessible to disadvantaged.</td>
<td>1.33* CVR=0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A trained counselor provides counselling.</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are well developed procedures for equivalency assessments.</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and goal setting demanded from all staff.</td>
<td>1.25* CVR=0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to plan ahead is highly valued.</td>
<td>1.31* CVR=0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff encouraged to take long term view.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies are built into most planning.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning meetings are held regularly.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting mechanisms are in place.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication networks with regard to work are well developed.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org effectively shares resources within org and across orgs.</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisals are tied to quality service delivery.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance is monitored by peers.</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target service delivery levels are set</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management wanders around org to remain in touch.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning conducted periodically.</td>
<td>1.31&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;CVR=.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers used wherever possible.</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs well integrated.</td>
<td>1.25&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;CVR=.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality is continually measured.</td>
<td>1.25&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;CVR=.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality standards are established.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality is monitored and controlled at all levels.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery is designed as quality control.</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and procedures manuals establish guidelines.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective recovery mechanisms are developed for service failure.</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality audits are built into system.</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of the loyal customer is recognized.</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff schedules are set.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High number of staff relative to clients.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information collected/analyzed for all program components.</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff are free to explore new directions in training.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying out new ideas is encouraged.</td>
<td>1.19* CVR=.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for innovative approaches even if they end in failure.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff decide if modifications to be made to individual's training.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry requirements are purposely flexible.</td>
<td>1.13* CVR=.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra layers of management are added to oversee each other.</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work atmosphere emphasizes efficiency and usefulness.</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A standard approach to training is followed for all clients.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict entry requirements are upheld.</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is manual dictating procedures for all instances.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single component/training only program is encouraged.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facility is designed to control customer movement.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee discretion is reduced.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has client and community representation.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's composition reflects catchment area/target group.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board is general policy, not &quot;hands-on.&quot;</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board leads strategic planning process</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Covering Letter for Study A
Andrea Plotnick  
Department of Psychology  
University of Windsor  
401 Sunset Ave.,  
Windsor, Ontario.  
N9B 3P4  

April 30, 1993.

Consultant's Name and address

Dear (Consultant's name);

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my research. As we discussed, I am a Ph.D. student in Applied Social Psychology at the University of Windsor. My doctoral research, being supervised by Dr. Durhane Wong-Rieger, focuses on identifying important criteria of organizational effectiveness, specific to skills training programs. As a professional who is familiar with organizations and what makes them run effectively, you are uniquely qualified to supply vital information on this topic.

Your role involves completing the following sequential tasks, which should take no longer than 45 minutes.

(1) Please read the attached description of Organization A.

(2) Using the list of organizational effectiveness indicators which follows Organization Description A, please rate each item on the 3 point scale provided.

(3) Please read the description of Organization B.

(4) Using the list of organizational effectiveness indicators which follows Organization Description B, please rate each item on the 3 point scale provided.

(5) Please return the entire package in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided.

Since this is a multi-stage research project, subsequent stages depend on your prompt response. PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE WITHIN THREE WEEKS OF RECEIPT. Your time and effort are greatly valued and appreciated. If you have any questions, or would like to receive summary findings, please feel free to call me at: (416) 322-6595, or my dissertation supervisor at (519) 253-4232, extension 2248. Thanks very much.

Sincerely,

Andrea Plotnick, M.A.
Appendix E

Questionnaire for Study B
IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

THIS IDENTIFICATION NUMBER WILL ENSURE THAT AFTER YOU REPLY YOU WILL NOT BE CONTACTED ON THE FOLLOW-UP MAILINGS. ASIDE FROM YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS, I HAVE NO INFORMATION ABOUT YOU OTHER THAN WHAT YOU PROVIDE IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. IF YOU HAVE ANY GENERAL QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS, PLEASE CONTACT ANDREA PLOTNICK AT (416) 322-6595 OR DR. DURHANE WONG-RIEGER AT (519) 253-4232, EXT. 2248. ANY ETHICAL CONCERNS MAY BE ADDRESSED TO DR. RON FRISCH, CHAIR, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY ETHICS COMMITTEE, 253-4232, EXT. 7012.

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I, the undersigned understand that the purpose of this research is to obtain information regarding what are believed to be important indicators of organizational effectiveness for skills training programs.

I understand that the information collected from me will be used only as part of a larger collection of information provided by other equally anonymous individuals and reported in group form only. No information from individual questionnaires will be accessible to anyone else. Thus, confidentiality will be safeguarded.

I agree to voluntarily participate in this study by completing the attached questionnaire and returning it to the investigator no later than three weeks after receiving it.

I understand that this questionnaire is a research undertaking being supervised through the Department of Psychology at the University of Windsor and that it has been reviewed by the Department of Psychology Ethics Committee.

Date: __________________ Signature: __________________
(Print) Name: __________________

Thank You

WOULD YOU LIKE TO RECEIVE A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY? IF YES, PLEASE SUPPLY YOUR RETURN ADDRESS IN THE SPACE BELOW.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Finally, please indicate below if you would be willing to participate in a brief (One-half hour) follow-up interview

___ I would be willing to participate in a follow-up interview
___ I would not be willing to participate in a follow-up interview

** Please note that this sheet will be detached from the questionnaire upon receipt by the investigator.
Instructions

This questionnaire takes approximately 45 minutes to complete. If you wish to participate in this study, please read and sign the "Informed Consent Form," complete the questionnaire and mail it in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided. If you do not wish to participate, please return the questionnaire so that you will not be troubled with further mailings.

Who am I?

My name is Andrea Plotnick. I am a Ph. D. student in Applied Social Psychology at the University of Windsor, being supervised by Dr. Durhane Wong-Rieger. Over the past five years I have been involved in evaluating a wide range of programs/organizations.

What is the purpose of this questionnaire?

As part of my doctoral research I wish to identify criteria by which to assess whether an office skills training program is functioning effectively. In the process of conducting numerous evaluations I have frequently heard organization staff complain that funders do not always evaluate human service organizations on appropriate criteria. One aim of this study is to address this problem by having people who actually work in and with these organizations identify what they think may be appropriate indicators of effectiveness.

What will happen to the questionnaires?

The questionnaires and data will be stored in a secure place. Only group data will be reported and disseminated. The information provided in this questionnaire will provide the basis for my doctoral dissertation and for subsequent papers, presentations, and publications. I will send a summary of the results of this questionnaire to interested participants. No one will be informed if you choose not to respond. ALL OF THE INFORMATION THAT YOU SUPPLY IS CONFIDENTIAL.
Organizational Effectiveness in Office Skills Training Programs
PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS

The following questions pertain to the organization in which you work. They are intended to help me better understand the different types of organizations that offer skills training.

Background:

(1) Please indicate with an "X" the setting in which you currently work.
   ___ College   ___ Community based program (e.g., not part of an established institution)
   ___ Other (specify)_____________________

(2) What is your position in your organization?______________________________

Accountability

(3a) Who is your immediate supervisor? (his/her position)_____________________

   b) Whom do you supervise? (their positions)______________________________
      If possible, could you provide an organization chart?

(4) How many separate funding sources does your organization have?
    (If possible, list them in order of importance)__________________________
    __________________________
    __________________________

(5) How frequently must the organization/program submit reports to funders? (Please indicate by an "X")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (more than once per year)</th>
<th>2 (yearly)</th>
<th>3 (less than once per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 1:</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 2:</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 3:</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 4:</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) What type of information is included in reports?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
(7) How long is the funding period? (*Please indicate by an "X")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (less than a year)</th>
<th>2 (one year)</th>
<th>3 (more than one year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 1:</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 2:</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 3:</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 4:</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) What is the likelihood that funding will be renewed on a regular basis? (*Please indicate by an "X")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (very likely)</th>
<th>2 (somewhat likely)</th>
<th>3 (somewhat unlikely)</th>
<th>4 (very unlikely)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 1:</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 2:</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 3:</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source 4:</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) Are there other groups, besides funders, to which your organization is held accountable (e.g., various community groups, umbrella organizations, etc.)? (*Please list them*)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work processes**

(10) Which of the following statements best describes how decisions are made in your organization? (*Please indicate by an "X")

_____ All general policy decisions and basic procedural decisions in program areas (e.g., material used, curricula followed, and training approaches) are made from the top down.

_____ Staff have input into decisions affecting their own area (e.g., choice of material, curricula, and the training approaches they will use).

_____ Staff decide how to go about doing their own work (e.g., they choose material, curricula, how they will instruct, scheduling) and they help in general policy decisions.

(11) Which of the following statements best describes the work procedures in your organization? (*Please indicate by an "X")

_____ There are clearly established and understandable procedures and practices which dictate how the work in the organization is carried out.

_____ There are general guidelines to follow in providing training, but the occasional
problem occurs which calls for deviations from the normal approach.

---

It would be difficult to outline clear procedures to follow, since there are so many exceptions and tasks seem to vary from day to day.

(12) Which of the following statements best describes how students find out about your office skills training program? (Please indicate by an "X")

---

Most of the students have to be aggressively recruited (i.e., actually going to places where they "hang out").

---

Most of the students learn about the program through word of mouth.

---

Most of the students recognize the program as a well-established institution and enroll on their own initiative.

(13) Which of the following statements best describes the variability in students' needs from your program? (Please indicate by an "X")

---

Students frequently have complex and diverse needs which can interfere with training.

---

Occasionally students have needs which cannot be met with the usual training approaches.

---

Needs are quite similar across students.

*******

Please read the organization description on the next page and answer the questions that follow it.

*******
Program Purpose:

- within a community based setting (i.e., not part of an established institution) to provide severely employment disadvantaged teenagers with the skills training, upgrading, and experience necessary to gain long term, full time employment in offices

Program Key Characteristics:

- complete program cycle lasts 40 weeks on average
- teaches office skills (keyboarding, microcomputer, business English, bookkeeping, reception, secretarial, budgeting)
- teaches life skills (stress management, networking, appropriate work habits) to address other areas of need
- participants are hard to recruit because of their past failures in school and/or in work
- intake is staggered to address needs as they arise; participants are accepted as soon as there is space
- entry requirements are purposely flexible; all employment disadvantaged teenagers are accepted
- to off set operating costs, the organization operates a word processing business that participants work in for 28 weeks to gain relevant work experience
- off site job placement arranged for 7 weeks in a variety of local businesses
- participants are followed for 52 weeks post training to provide support and to aid them in job search

Service Delivery Model:

- very flexible service delivery model
- each teaching segment is made up of a number of independent units and individual assignments tailored to individuals' highly variable needs
- difficult to schedule in advance; crises frequently arise that call for deviations, (e.g., "Typical" day for beginning students: morning - learning/practicing extensively a computer skill; afternoon - learning/practicing reception duties and receiving life skills training. But, given complex nature of students' needs, counselling and crisis intervention frequently take precedence; life skills must often be built right into the office skills training as needs arise.)
- critical part of program is the counselling
- students must be competent in a set skills area prior to program completion, however, given the diversity in clients' needs, training procedures often have to be set on a case by case basis
- formalized testing is not carried out because of students' past failures with school system; instructor makes competency based assessments from assignments and in class work
- teaching processes are often experimented with to address particular needs (e.g., longer or accelerated training as needed; experiential, hands-on or structured learning as needed)
• clients perform a critical feedback link and are widely involved in planning, fine tuning and evaluation.

**Administrative Structure:**

• emphasis placed on selecting staff with specialized knowledge of client group
• staff interact like a multidisciplinary team
• staff members informally report to program manager about students' progress, or a particular problem they may be having, but they are responsible for making changes in their own program area
• staff discuss policy informally on an as needed basis and make all formal organization-wide decisions in bi-weekly group meetings
• in group meetings, staff discuss problem areas and brainstorm for solutions
• staff have much leeway in what they do, because they often have to make on the spot decisions

**Relations with the External Environment/Finances:**

• several funding sources with different requirements (government and nonprofit organizations like United Way); each require biannual reports
• detailed reports include: demonstration of mission's relevance, adherence to monthly budget, demonstration of funding activities, client tracking, client satisfaction, community needs assessments, and outcome/process measures
• must reapply yearly for funding
• past severe funding cutbacks indicative that funding may cease, so currently searching for new ways to maintain itself
• tremendous pressure to increase fund raising because of increased program costs, decreases in funding, lack of clients for program's word processing services
• great reliance on volunteers or people putting in extra hours because funding does not really cover all operating costs
• community based Board of Directors serves primarily as a community link
• finding off-site work placements can be difficult because of institutional prejudices in the larger community

******************************************************************************

**Questions about Organization A**

Please answer the following questions about Organization A by putting an "X" beside the number response that best represents your feelings.

Does your organization resemble Organization A?

1____1=NOT AT ALL    2____2=SOMewhat    3____3=TO A GREAT EXTENT
For the remaining questions please evaluate to what extent **you** agree with the statement about Organization A. Remember, I am only asking for your **opinion**. There are no right or wrong answers, so if you are not sure, take your best guess.

(1) Decisions are made by a few key people at the head of the organization.

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Strongly agree} & \text{Mostly agree} & \text{Neither agree nor disagree} & \text{Mostly disagree} & \text{Strongly disagree} \\
\underline{1} & \underline{2} & \underline{3} & \underline{4} & \underline{5} \\
\end{array} \]

(2) Staff decide how to go about carrying out their own work responsibilities.

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Strongly agree} & \text{Mostly agree} & \text{Neither agree nor disagree} & \text{Mostly disagree} & \text{Strongly disagree} \\
\underline{1} & \underline{2} & \underline{3} & \underline{4} & \underline{5} \\
\end{array} \]

(3) There are clearly established and understandable procedures and practices which dictate how work in the organization is carried out.

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Strongly agree} & \text{Mostly agree} & \text{Neither agree nor disagree} & \text{Mostly disagree} & \text{Strongly disagree} \\
\underline{1} & \underline{2} & \underline{3} & \underline{4} & \underline{5} \\
\end{array} \]

(4) It would be very difficult to outline clear procedures to follow in every instance, since there are so many exceptions.

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Strongly agree} & \text{Mostly agree} & \text{Neither agree nor disagree} & \text{Mostly disagree} & \text{Strongly disagree} \\
\underline{1} & \underline{2} & \underline{3} & \underline{4} & \underline{5} \\
\end{array} \]

(5) Yearly funding depends on being able to adapt the organization's objectives and procedures to changing political demands.

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Strongly agree} & \text{Mostly agree} & \text{Neither agree nor disagree} & \text{Mostly disagree} & \text{Strongly disagree} \\
\underline{1} & \underline{2} & \underline{3} & \underline{4} & \underline{5} \\
\end{array} \]

(6) Funding is reasonably assured from year to year.

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Strongly agree} & \text{Mostly agree} & \text{Neither agree nor disagree} & \text{Mostly disagree} & \text{Strongly disagree} \\
\underline{1} & \underline{2} & \underline{3} & \underline{4} & \underline{5} \\
\end{array} \]
INDICATORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS FOR ORGANIZATION A

INSTRUCTIONS

The following list includes 52 items which one might use to evaluate whether an office skills training program is operating effectively.

Your task is to read each item, then decide how important you believe the item should be for the effectiveness of Organization A by CIRCLING the appropriate number on the three point scale provided. Remember, I am asking for your opinion, so where you may not be certain, take your best guess. There are no right and wrong answers.

PLEASE ANSWER USING THE FOLLOWING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESSENTIAL TO ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (Essential)</td>
<td>USEFUL BUT NOT NECESSARY FOR ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (Useful)</td>
<td>IRRELEVANT TO ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (Irrelevant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Staff are extensively trained in their jobs. 1 2 3
2) The Board strikes a balance between client, community and professional representation. 1 2 3
3) Staff believe in the organization's goals. 1 2 3
4) Quality internal communication on every level is believed to be of paramount importance 1 2 3
5) Quality is monitored and controlled at all levels. 1 2 3
6) Problems are dealt with in a fair and open manner. 1 2 3
7) Staff are kept abreast of important developments that may affect client training. 1 2 3
8) Client evaluations of programs are valued feedback. 1 2 3
9) Managers know how to manage without being confrontational. 1 2 3
10) The organization establishes links with local businesses that provide needed resources (e.g., equipment, referrals, placement sites) 1 2 3
11) Staff are encouraged to keep their training up to date. 1 2 3
12) Multiple funding sources are actively pursued. 1 2 3
13) The importance of service quality is instilled in the employees. 1 2 3
14) The organization thinks proactively 1 2 3
15) Individual and/or special client needs are taken into account. 1 2 3
16) Good information management and communication are important to service goals 1 2 3
17) Staff are encouraged to try out new ideas. 1 2 3
18) Reporting mechanisms are in place. 1 2 3
19) The Board has professional expertise. 1 2 3
20) The program manager actively seeks out possible funders. 1 2 3
21) Front line staff openly communicate with managers. 1 2 3
22) People work hard because they believe their work is important 1 2 3
23) The organization tracks community needs. 1 2 3
24) The organization attracts and retains high quality staff. 1 2 3
25) Client personal development is an important objective 1 2 3
26) Placement site supervisors are asked to evaluate client skills. 1 2 3
27) The Board is a general "policy" rather than a hands-on Board. 1 2 3
28) Client complaints are taken into consideration. 1 2 3
29) The organization applies a financial control system. 1 2 3
30) Clients leaving the program are followed up to determine why. 1 2 3
31) Staff are free to explore new directions in training. 1 2 3
32) Service quality is continually measured.  
33) Strategies are built specifically around client needs.  
34) The program is accessible to "disadvantaged" groups (i.e., physically challenged, low income, women, single parents).  
35) Policies and procedures manuals establish guidelines.  
36) Clients are queried as to whether they are getting what they need out of the program.  
37) The organization seeks out placement sites for clients.  
38) Students' progress is monitored and tracked.  
39) The organization must remain adaptable to possible changes.  
40) Student entry requirements are purposely flexible.  
41) Target service delivery levels are set.  
42) Each student's needs are assessed upon entering the program.  
43) Employee input is valued.  
44) Service delivery is designed as quality control.  
45) Student learning of office skills is monitored.  
46) Students' true needs are identified.  
47) Quality standards are established.  
48) A client centered/flexible approach is followed.  
49) Planning and goal setting are demanded from all staff.  
50) Clients influence program changes/development.  
51) The program is fashioned around individuals' needs.  
52) Students are followed up to ensure that they are eventually hired.
If you feel that any indicators that you would rate as a "1" (essential to organizational effectiveness) for Organization A are missing from the list, please provide them below.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Please answer these last questions about Organization A, by indicating how much you agree with each statement. Again, since these are opinions, there are no right or wrong answers.

(1) Organization A will survive in the long run.

___1 _2 _3 _4 _5
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree
nor disagree

(2) Organization A has the ability to attract and retain high quality manpower.

___1 _2 _3 _4 _5
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree
nor disagree

(3) Organization A will be more successful than others of its kind.

___1 _2 _3 _4 _5
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree
nor disagree

(4) Organization A has the potential for developing a more extensive funding base.

___1 _2 _3 _4 _5
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree
nor disagree

(5) Organization A would be evaluated favourably by outside constituencies.

___1 _2 _3 _4 _5
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree
nor disagree

(6) Organization A has the potential for future growth in the amount of clients it can handle.

___1 _2 _3 _4 _5
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree
Instructions:

Please read the description of Organization B and answer the questions that follow.

**ORGANIZATION "B"**

**Program Purpose:**

- within an institutional, college setting, to provide students with the technical skills training, upgrading and experience necessary to gain long term, full time employment in office settings

**Program Key Characteristics:**

- program follows a standard academic year, beginning in September, running for three semesters
- training limited to office skills including general office skills (e.g., filing, typing, reception duties, secretarial) and computer skills (beginning with keyboarding and ending with computerized accounting)
- no on-site work experience is provided
- off-site job placements arranged for one semester by the college
- students only admitted in September, at the beginning of the academic year
- enrollment has increased substantially over the years and students sometimes are forced to wait until the next year
- program entry requires completion of grade 11 and a good command of the English language determined through a test; no exceptions are allowed
- no follow-up provided although students can use college resources to job search

**Service Delivery Model:**

- highly structured delivery model in terms of teaching materials, curriculum and testing procedures
- no acceleration through the course; all students must complete all components in the same amount of time
- students must pass finals at the end of each semester or the relevant program component must be repeated
- "typical" student day would include computer classes in the morning and office skills classes in the afternoon in a simulated office environment - practice homework is assigned
- there is a set skills area that must be covered, and staff take a systematic approach by using training procedures that have been fine tuned over time
- the program is set up to deal with training needs only, so students with problems that interfere with training are referred elsewhere
- a weekly itinerary is set and followed by staff
- instructors may differ slightly in their teaching approaches but there is a set curriculum that is followed and specific materials that are used; instructors do not deviate from the set approach
• changes rarely made to training process since program is perceived as successful in meeting needs

**Administrative Structure:**

• emphasis placed on hiring a credentialed instructor
• vertical chain of command from instructor to Department Chair, to the Dean of the area, to the administrative councils
• decisions regarding program changes must be made by administrative councils
• staff must operate within a proscribed set of guidelines that dictate appropriate curricula, reporting procedures, and ways of handling student complaints
• approval for deviations must always come from higher up the chain of command
• faculty meetings are held on a monthly basis, at which point staff can make formal requests (e.g., program changes)

**Relations with the External Environment/Finances:**

• businesses know about the program, and actively seek out interns for job placements
• wide network of support for the training program from well established institutions and society at large
• college funding cutbacks will not have a pronounced effect on the skills training program; future funding is assured
• funding cutbacks have forced more creative thinking, but sharing of resources (e.g., equipment, space) with other college programs always possible
• funded primarily through Ministry of Colleges and Universities
• reports consist of college wide statistics submitted to funding bodies yearly regarding program enrollment, budgets, staff credentials
• program must be able to demonstrate a need for its services; consistent high enrollment figures, and successful placements given as evidence
• for the most part, funding covers operating costs

*********************************************************************

Questions about Organization B

Please answer the following questions about Organization B by putting an "X" beside the number response that best represents your feelings.

Does your organization resemble Organization B?

_____1=NOT AT ALL   _____2=SOMewhat   _____3=TO A GREAT EXTENT
For the remaining questions please evaluate to what extent you agree with the statement about Organization B. Remember, I am only asking for your opinion. There are no right or wrong answers, so if you are not sure, take your best guess.

(1) Decisions are made by a few key people at the head of the organization.

   ____ 1  ____ 2  ____ 3  ____ 4  ____ 5
   Strongly agree  Mostly agree  Neither agree  Mostly disagree  Strongly disagree
   nor disagree

(2) Staff decide how to go about carrying out their own work responsibilities.

   ____ 1  ____ 2  ____ 3  ____ 4  ____ 5
   Strongly agree  Mostly agree  Neither agree  Mostly disagree  Strongly disagree
   nor disagree

(3) There are clearly established and understandable procedures and practices which dictate how work in the organization is carried out.

   ____ 1  ____ 2  ____ 3  ____ 4  ____ 5
   Strongly agree  Mostly agree  Neither agree  Mostly disagree  Strongly disagree
   nor disagree

(4) It would be very difficult to outline clear procedures to follow in every instance, since there are so many exceptions.

   ____ 1  ____ 2  ____ 3  ____ 4  ____ 5
   Strongly agree  Mostly agree  Neither agree  Mostly disagree  Strongly disagree
   nor disagree

(5) Yearly funding depends on being able to adapt the organization's objectives and procedures to changing political demands.

   ____ 1  ____ 2  ____ 3  ____ 4  ____ 5
   Strongly agree  Mostly agree  Neither agree  Mostly disagree  Strongly disagree
   nor disagree

(6) Funding is reasonably assured from year to year.

   ____ 1  ____ 2  ____ 3  ____ 4  ____ 5
   Strongly agree  Mostly agree  Neither agree  Mostly disagree  Strongly disagree
   nor disagree
INDICATORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS FOR ORGANIZATION B

INSTRUCTIONS

Please repeat the same process that you completed for Organization A. Your task is to read each item, then decide how important you believe the item should be for the effectiveness of Organization B, by CIRCLING the appropriate number on the three point scale provided.

PLEASE ANSWER USING THE FOLLOWING SCALE

1 2 3
ESSENTIAL TO USEFUL BUT NOT NECESSARY IRRELEVANT TO ORGANIZATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS EFFECTIVENESS EFFECTIVENESS (Essential) FOR ORGANIZATIONAL FOR ORGANIZATIONAL (Useful) EFFECTIVENESS (Irrelevant)

1) Staff are extensively trained in their jobs. 1 2 3

2) The Board strikes a balance between client, community and professional representation. 1 2 3

3) Staff believe in the organization's goals. 1 2 3

4) Quality internal communication on every level is believed to be of paramount importance 1 2 3

5) Quality is monitored and controlled at all levels. 1 2 3

6) Problems are dealt with in a fair and open manner. 1 2 3

7) Staff are kept abreast of important developments that may affect client training. 1 2 3

8) Client evaluations of programs are valued feedback. 1 2 3

9) Managers know how to manage without being confrontational. 1 2 3

10) The organization establishes links with local businesses that provide needed resources (e.g., equipment, referrals, placement sites) 1 2 3
11) Staff are encouraged to keep their training up to date.  
12) Multiple funding sources are actively pursued.  
13) The importance of service quality is instilled in the employees.  
14) The organization thinks proactively.  
15) Individual and/or special client needs are taken into account.  
16) Good information management and communication are believed important to service goals.  
17) Staff are encouraged to try out new ideas.  
18) Reporting mechanisms are in place.  
19) The Board has professional expertise.  
20) The program manager actively seeks out possible funders.  
21) Front line staff openly communicate with managers.  
22) People work hard because they believe their work is important.  
23) The organization tracks community needs.  
24) The organization attracts and retains high quality staff.  
25) Client personal development is an important objective.  
26) Placement site supervisors are asked to evaluate client skills.  
27) The Board is a general "policy" rather than a hands-on Board.  
28) Client complaints are taken into consideration.  
29) The organization applies a financial control system.  
30) Clients leaving the program are followed up to determine why.  
31) Staff are free to explore new directions in training.  
32) Service quality is continually measured.  
33) Strategies are built specifically around client needs.
34) The program is accessible to "disadvantaged" groups (i.e., physically challenged, low income, women, single parents).  
35) Policies and procedures manuals establish guidelines.  
36) Clients are queried as to whether they are getting what they need out of the program.  
37) The organization seeks out placement sites for clients.  
38) Students' progress is monitored and tracked.  
39) The organization must remain adaptable to possible changes.  
40) Student entry requirements are purposely flexible.  
41) Target service delivery levels are set.  
42) Each student's needs are assessed upon entering the program.  
43) Employee input is valued.  
44) Service delivery is designed as quality control.  
45) Student learning of office skills is monitored.  
46) Students' true needs are identified.  
47) Quality standards are established.  
48) A client centered/flexible approach is followed.  
49) Planning and goal setting are demanded from all staff.  
50) Clients influence program changes/development.  
51) The program is fashioned around individuals' needs.  
52) Students are followed up to ensure that they are eventually hired.

If you feel that any indicators that you would rate as a "1" for Organization B are missing from the list, please provide them below.
Please answer these last questions about Organization B by indicating how much you agree with each statement. If you are not sure, take your best guess.

(1) Organization B will survive in the long run.

___1  ___2  ___3  ___4  ___5  
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree

nor disagree

(2) Organization B has the ability to attract and retain high quality manpower.

___1  ___2  ___3  ___4  ___5  
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree

nor disagree

(3) Organization B will be more successful than others of its kind.

___1  ___2  ___3  ___4  ___5  
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree

nor disagree

(4) Organization B has the potential for developing a more extensive funding base.

___1  ___2  ___3  ___4  ___5  
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree

nor disagree

(5) Organization B would be evaluated favourably by outside constituencies.

___1  ___2  ___3  ___4  ___5  
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree

nor disagree

(6) Organization B has the potential for future growth in the amount of clients it can handle.

___1  ___2  ___3  ___4  ___5  
Strongly agree Mostly agree Neither agree Mostly disagree Strongly disagree

nor disagree
**Instructions**

For this final task please consider your own organization. Again, read the list of indicators but this time, rate each item in terms of how important you believe it should be for your own organization’s effectiveness.

*PLEASE ANSWER USING THE FOLLOWING SCALE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESSENTIAL TO ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS</strong> (Essential)</td>
<td><strong>USEFUL BUT NOT NECESSARY FOR ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS</strong> (Useful)</td>
<td><strong>IRRELEVANT TO ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS</strong> (Irrelevant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Staff are extensively trained in their jobs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The Board strikes a balance between client, community and professional representation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Staff believe in the organization’s goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Quality internal communication on every level is believed to be of paramount importance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Quality is monitored and controlled at all levels.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Problems are dealt with in a fair and open manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Staff are kept abreast of important developments that may affect client training.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Client evaluations of programs are valued feedback.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Managers know how to manage without being confrontational.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) The organization establishes links with local businesses that provide needed resources (e.g., equipment, referrals, placement sites).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Staff are encouraged to keep their training up to date.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Multiple funding sources are actively pursued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) The importance of service quality is instilled in the employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) The organization thinks proactively.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Individual and/or special client needs are taken into account.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Good information management and communication are believed important to service goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Staff are encouraged to try out new ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Reporting mechanisms are in place.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) The Board has professional expertise.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) The program manager actively seeks out possible funders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Front line staff openly communicate with managers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) People work hard because they believe their work is important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) The organization tracks community needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) The organization attracts and retains high quality staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Client personal development is an important objective.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Placement site supervisors are asked to evaluate client skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) The Board is a general &quot;policy&quot; rather than a hands-on Board.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) Client complaints are taken into consideration.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) The organization applies a financial control system.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) Clients leaving the program are followed up to determine why.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) Staff are free to explore new directions in training.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32) Service quality is continually measured.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) Strategies are built specifically around client needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) The program is accessible to &quot;disadvantaged&quot; groups (i.e., physically challenged, low income, women, single parents).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35) Policies and procedures manuals establish guidelines.

36) Clients are queried as to whether they are getting what they need out of the program.

37) The organization seeks out placement sites for clients.

38) Students' progress is monitored and tracked.

39) The organization must remain adaptable to possible changes.

40) Student entry requirements are purposely flexible.

41) Target service delivery levels are set.

42) Each student's needs are assessed upon entering the program.

43) Employee input is valued.

44) Service delivery is designed as quality control.

45) Student learning of office skills is monitored.

46) Students' true needs are identified.

47) Quality standards are established.

48) A client centered/flexible approach is followed.

49) Planning and goal setting are demanded from all staff.

50) Clients influence program changes/development.

51) The program is fashioned around individuals' needs.

52) Students are followed up to ensure that they are eventually hired.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix F

Covering Letter for Questionnaire (Study B)
Appendix G

Reminder Notices
Just a reminder!

It has now been three weeks since you will have received my questionnaire: *Organizational Effectiveness in Office Skills Training Programs*. If you have already returned the booklet, please ignore this reminder and accept my thanks for your help. If you have not already returned the booklet, I would appreciate it if you could do so at your earliest possible convenience. If you require an additional booklet, or have any questions, please call me at 416-322-6595.

Thanks again,

Andrea Plotnick
Approximately six weeks ago you received my questionnaire: ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN OFFICE SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAMS. If you have already returned the questionnaire, thank you very much for your participation. If you have not yet returned the questionnaire, I would appreciate it if you could do so as soon as possible. If you have misplaced the booklet or have any questions please call me at (416) 322-6595

Thanks again.

Andrea Plotnick
Appendix H

Total Design Method Response Rates by Respondents' Occupational Setting and Mailing
### First Mailing

**Step 1 (June 8)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailed</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useable</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reminder Card 1 (July 14)**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailed</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reminder Card 2 (August 17)**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second Mailing

**Step 1 (July 15)**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reminder Card 1 (August 15)**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reminder Card 2 (September 10)**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Third Mailing (Only community-based organizations)

### Step 1 (August 18)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailed</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reminder Card 1 (Sept. 10)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailed</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reminder Card 2 (Sept. 28)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailed</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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