

Differentiation of organizational climate and culture in public health and social services in Finland

Rostila, Ilmari; Suominen, Tarja; Asikainen, Paula; Green, Philip

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Rostila, I., Suominen, T., Asikainen, P., & Green, P. (2010). Differentiation of organizational climate and culture in public health and social services in Finland. *Journal of Public Health*, 19(1), 39-47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-010-0353-7>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Editorial Manager(tm) for Journal of Public Health
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: JOPH-D-10-00014R1

Title: Differentiation of organizational climate and culture in public health and social services in Finland

Article Type: Original Article

Corresponding Author: Professor Ilmari Rostila, PhD

Corresponding Author's Institution: Professor

First Author: Ilmari Rostila, PhD

Order of Authors: Ilmari Rostila, PhD; Ilmari Rostila, PhD; Tarja Suominen, PhD; Paula Asikainen, PhD; Philip Green, PhD

Abstract: Aim: The aim of the study was to examine the differentiation of organizational contexts within Finnish public health and social services at both the workplace and local government (municipality) levels.

Subject and Methods: We focused on climate, comprising individual-level experience, and on culture, comprising the collective level as "the way things are done in an organization". Climate, as "the way people perceive their work environment", was interpreted to reflect personally relevant professional and moral concerns. As an exploration of antecedents of climate and culture we compared the scale of contextual differences among workplaces with the extent of differences at the municipal level. We also examined by multilevel hierarchical linear models (HLM) the importance of observed differentiation of workplaces in terms of impacts of both climate and culture on employee morale.

Results: There existed different organizational climates and cultures within Finnish public human service organizations at both the workplace and upper organizational levels. Differences in terms of climate were somewhat bigger than differences in culture.

Conclusion: Both climate and culture should be highlighted in the efforts to specify the characteristics of organizational social contexts as well as their antecedents and consequences in public human services.

Response to Reviewers: Our responses to Reviewers' comments

Reviewer #1: Title:

- better classification will be possible by: "Differentiation of ORGANIZATIONAL climate and culture(...)"

Our response: Title has been modified to "Differentiation of organizational climate and culture in public health and social services in Finland"

Presentation and length:

Relevance of the given information:

- CULTURE AND CLIMATE and DIFFERENCES ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE: summarize, prioritize, shorten, omit

Our response: The text has been shorted throughout by focusing on the most relevant issues. After critical evaluation of the relevancy of references about 20 references have been omitted.

Outline of the section:

- DIFFERENCES ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE:
to preserve the clarity, use subheadings in order to create transitions between the three aspects

Our response: The text has been shorted for clarity reasons. The titles have been changed and the topic presented now under four titles.

Language in general:

- try to avoid repeating of the same words within a sentence/paragrah: e.g thus, however, found, estimates, differ (-s, -ed, -ences, - entiation)
- check the prepositions
- check the vocabulary: e.g. CULTURE AND CLIMATE: "(...) researchers have differing MEANINGS(...)"

Our response: We have tried to avoid repeating the above words and deleted however (4 times), thus (7 times), found (4 times) and differ... (14 times).

Other:

- Assessment of consequences of the major institutional deregulation: shift from DIFFERENCES ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE to DISCUSSION, verifiable because of the results instead of conjectures?

Our response: Now antecedents and consequences still exist in the theoretical part but are presented just shortly.

Differentiation of organizational climate and culture in public health and social services in Finland

Informative title: Climate and culture in public health and social services

Authors: Ilmari Rostila
PhD, Professor
University of Tampere, Finland

Tarja Suominen
PhD, Professor
University of Tampere, Finland

Paula Asikainen
PhD, Administrative Head Nurse
Satakunta Hospital District, Finland

Philip Green
Research Scientist
University of Tennessee, USA

Correspondence:
Ilmari Rostila
University of Tampere
Department of Pori, Pohjoisranta 11
Box 181, 28101 Pori, Finland
tel. +358 50 366 9604, fax +358 2 627 2993
e-mail: ilmari.rostila@uta.fi

Abstract

Aim: The aim of the study was to examine the differentiation of organizational contexts within Finnish public health and social services both at workplace and at local governmental (municipality) level.

Subject and Methods: We focused on climate, comprising individual level experience, and on culture, comprising collective level as “the way things are done in organization”. Climate, as “the way people perceive their work environment”, was interpreted to reflect personally relevant professional and moral concerns. As an exploration about antecedents of climate and culture we compared the scale of contextual differences among workplaces with the extent of differences at municipal level. We also examined by multilevel hierarchical linear models (HLM) the importance of observed differentiation of workplaces in terms of impacts of both climate and culture on employee morale.

Results: There existed different organizational climates and cultures within Finnish public human service organizations both at workplace and upper organizational level. Differences in terms of climate were somewhat bigger than differences in culture.

Conclusion: Both climate and culture should be highlighted in the efforts to specify the characteristics of organizational social contexts, as well as, their antecedents and consequences in public human services.

Keywords: climate, culture, public health care, social services

Our study describes organizational-level differentiation in terms of organizational climate and organizational culture within Finnish public health and social care, which has undergone a process of profound institutional deregulation of “social service state”, resulting in increased local autonomy (Burau and Kröger 2004). Organizational climate and organizational culture, which are the two key constructs of research on organizational social context, have lived very much their own and separate lives within own disciplines and traditions (James et al. 2008). Additionally, organizational culture has been studied mainly by qualitative methods. However, within the last two decades the constructs have been discussed simultaneously in the organizational literature (Schneider 1990), and reasons have been given about their similarity (e.g. Schneider 2000), or overlapping (Denison 1996) or distinctive character (Glisson and James 2002; Schein 2000). Taking the distinctive character of the constructs as our point of departure, we explore the differentiation of organizational contexts using both constructs. By climate we describe the differentiation from employees’ perspective. Comprising of individual-level experience, as “the way people perceive their work environment”, climate helps to describe the character of organizations as psychological environments (James et al. 1990). We connect institutional and professional values or expectations (Cherniss 1980) with psychological climate, emphasizing social influence on individual experience. By organizational culture we catch properties of organizational systems or structures. The organizational culture construct, comprising collective-level values and norms as “the way things are done in an organization” (Glisson & James 2002), provides a more structural point of view. The differentiation of organizational social contexts is probed with the help of an empirically supported measurement model (Organizational Social Context, OSC), which has been developed in USA for measuring climate and culture as distinct constructs in human services (Glisson et al. 2008).

CULTURE AND CLIMATE

Many researchers consider culture and climate as more or less identical or overlapping constructs. Reichers and Schneider (1990) define climate broadly as the shared perceptions of “the way things are around here” concerning formal and informal aspects of organizational policies, practices and procedures. Thus both climate and culture attempt to identify the environment that affects behaviour in organizations, both deal with the ways by which members of an organization make sense of their environment, manifesting itself in shared meanings, and both seem to be learned through the socialization process and symbolic interaction among members. Climate is then conceptually very close to organizational culture, as something the organization has, “albeit the possession in climate research is through the perceivers of it” (Reichers and Schneider 1990). Gillespie et al. (2008) separate the concepts on explicitly epistemological grounds, seeing that climate refers to ways of knowing about narrow characteristics of the environment, whereas culture attempts to identify the shared basic assumptions of the group.

James et al. (2008) emphasize individual perceptions of “the way things are around here” as their point of departure in defining organizational climate. Individual biographically developed concerns and interpretative schemas guide a person’s perceptions of work environment (psychological climates). Due to similar personal values and social interaction for example, individuals’ perceptions of work environment get most often relatively close, justifying estimates of central tendency to represent organizational climate (Jones and James 1979). This organizational climate is still based on psychological climates as individual perceptions of work environment (James et al. 2008).

1
2 In contrast to “the way things are perceived around here” (climate), organizational culture
3
4 refers to “the way things are done around here”. Organizational culture is often defined as the
5
6 normative beliefs and shared behavioural expectations in an organization (James et al. 2008),
7
8 providing the supporting ideologies and justifications for the system norms (Katz and Kahn
9
10 1966). The system level values and expected behaviours are products of interactions among
11
12 system members designed to collectively develop a set of socially constructed schemas for
13
14 making sense out of the functions of the system (see also e.g. Weick 1979).
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Organizational climates consist of individual evaluations, whereas culture is a common
22
23 structure, pre-existing before those evaluations and existing more or less independently and
24
25 outside of individuals. Our ontological rationale for distinguishing climate from culture is that
26
27 culture is an attribute of a collective or system and climate is an attribute of an individual
28
29
30 (James et al. 2008).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 ANTECEDENTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE 41 42 43 44

45 Management influences culture and climate through organizational practices (Glisson 2000).
46
47 Thus organizational structure, core technology and leadership influence practitioners’ patterns
48
49 of interactions with other practitioners, clients and administration, creating behavioural norms
50
51 and stimulating shared perceptions of their work environment (Schein 1996). The
52
53 management may influence culture also by influencing climate (Glisson et al. 2006), but the
54
55 ways of influencing climate may be strongly preconditioned by organizational culture
56
57
58
59 (Koepelman et al. 1990).
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 One way to grasp the dynamism of organizational contexts in public human services is to
3
4 separate top-down influence, emerging from local political and managerial influence from the
5
6 municipal and organizational levels, and bottom-up influences, reflecting sense-making at the
7
8 level of face-to-face interaction between workmates at the workplace. Expectations and norms
9
10 may be either those promoted by the management or those determined by the job demands
11
12 and realities that workers face on a daily basis, regardless of the values and assumptions of
13
14 top management (Hemmelgarn et al. 2001). The latter can also be referred to as workplace
15
16 culture. We use this distinction in our exploration of organizational contexts.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The model of Koepelman et al. (1990) emphasizes especially the top-down influence of
25
26 managerial practices on climate. According to this model, managerial organizational practices
27
28 influence climate. From a bottom-up perspective a distinction between unit-level interaction
29
30 and organizational communication above unit-level may be useful. In a small organizational
31
32 sub-unit individuals probably interact frequently and intensively with all the other members,
33
34 combining culture and climate as unit-level phenomena through social interaction (Brown and
35
36 Kozlowski 1999). The formation of an organizational culture and climate at sub-unit level
37
38 could be seen as a rather fast and consistent process of emergence compared to what may
39
40 happen in larger organizations (Dawson et al. 2008).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE 52 53 54 55

56 Internationally both climate and culture have been shown to predict job satisfaction,
57
58 organizational commitment and voluntary turnover of employees in nursing and in various
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 caring work. Laschinger et al. (2001) reported that perceptions of “work empowerment
2 structures” had a direct effect on affective commitment and, through trust, an indirect effect
3 on commitment in nursing. Laschinger and Finegan (2005) also reported an indirect effect,
4 through trust and job satisfaction, on organizational commitment. In Finland organizational
5 justice was found to have an impact on several aspects of job satisfaction in caring work
6 (Elovainio et al. 2002; Kivimäki et al. 2004). Also a number of studies have linked
7 organizational culture in hospitals with job satisfaction or organizational commitment or both
8 (Gregory et al. 2007, Warren et al. 2007). In some studies both organizational culture and
9 organizational climate are used and measured. The results indicate the need to study the
10 separate impacts of culture and climate on employee outcomes (Glisson and James 2002;
11 Aarons and Sawitzky 2006).

12 FINNISH PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 The major institutional deregulation during the recent decades (Burau and Kröger 2004) has
37 probably led to a differentiation of organizational social contexts within Finnish public health
38 and social care. In the 1980s, a state controlled and coordinated planning system gave local
39 authorities detailed instructions on how to develop universalistic health and social services.
40
41 However, new demands of effectiveness and accountability led to the deregulation of the
42 public human service system and to the implementation of new public management. With the
43 reform in 1993, regulation as well as funding from the central authorities was radically cut,
44 and the state-controlled planning system and detailed regulation was abolished. In Finland
45 human services are organized by the smallest local administrative and political unit,
46 municipalities. The heterogeneousness in size, varied availability of material resources,
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 managerial skills and local political conditions, increase the probability of differences in
2 organizational practices.
3
4
5
6

7 The two biggest occupational groups in our study are nurses, who work in public health
8 centres, maternity and child health care units and home nursing, and home-helpers, working
9 in home aid teams within municipal social service departments. Public health centres have
10 lost much of their character as providers of universal services. In 2007 about 60% of the
11 population had visited public health centres during twelve months (Julkisten palvelujen
12 laatubarometri 2007). The growing calls for accountability and effectiveness may jeopardize
13 high quality care (Vuori and Siltala 2005), thereby undermining professional identity,
14 including the right to define and manage one's work in a way that is intrinsically motivating
15 (Ala-Nikkola 2003).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Free maternity and child health care is provided for all pregnant mothers or families with
32 children under school age, consisting of periodic examinations and counselling and
33 supporting families in the context of the examinations. The fundamental structures of the
34 system are in place, but the clinics are not able to adequately identify the children and families
35 in need (Hakulinen-Viitanen et al. 2005).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Home aid is the least professional of our research settings. The work consists of various
47 helping activities by home-helpers and nurses with non-academic qualifications within a
48 context of intensive home based human contacts (Perälä et al. 2006). Being traditionally part
49 of social services, home aid meets the special needs of elderly people with weakening abilities
50 of daily living, such as walking, washing, eating, and cleaning and often also suffering from
51 long term chronic diseases (Voutilainen et al. 2007). Interestingly, from the year 1999 to the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 year 2005, home aid has showed a particularly negative development in terms of employees'
2 assessments of workload concerning numerousness of clients' problems and poor motivation,
3
4 fit of one's abilities with work demands, possibility to influence one's work, low esteem of
5
6 one's work in the community and the intrinsic value of one's work (Laine et al. 2006).
7
8
9

10 11 12 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 13 14 15

16
17 First, we examined the characteristics and differentiation of organizational culture and climate
18
19 within Finnish community health care and home aid (part of social services). As an indicator
20
21 of proper organizational culture and climate we investigated if the members within work units
22
23 and within upper level local organizations agree on climate and culture. We examined both
24
25 work units and upper level local organizations in health care and home aid separately. Second,
26
27 we investigated the importance of the observed differentiation by exploring the extent to
28
29 which work unit culture and climate predict employee morale, characterized by employee job
30
31 satisfaction and commitment to his or her organization.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 METHODS 41 42 43 44

45 The collective and individual-level phenomena should be taken into account in measuring
46
47 organizational culture and climate. Justifying the aggregation of individual responses as a
48
49 representation of both organizational culture and climate requires within-group consensus.
50
51 Our precondition for aggregating values of individual responses into a measure of
52
53 organizational climate and culture is a value of 0.70 or above on the r_{wg} index measuring
54
55 within-group consensus. (Glisson and James 2002)
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

We used the Organizational Social Context (OSC) measurement system (Glisson et al. 2008) to assess the key characteristics of culture, climate and morale comprising job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Psychological and organizational climate are assessed with eight first-order scales, forming the three second-order scales that define the organizational climate profile including stress, functionality and engagement. Organizational culture is measured with six first-order scales that form the three second-order scales that define the organizational culture profile consisting of rigidity, proficiency and resistance. Work attitudes are each service provider's affective attachment to the organization and positive reaction to his or her job (Glisson and Durrick 1988). Work attitudes are measured as a single second-order factor labelled morale, which is characterized by an employee's commitment to the organization and satisfaction with his or her job.

Measurements took place in 2005 and 2006 in the Satakunta region in western Finland. A work unit or workplace in our research consisted of a group of employees having a common task, a common space providing for daily social contacts among unit members, and a common supervisor. The units were chosen by stratified sampling in order to include units of home aid and community health care from rural and urban areas. Because organization-level permission was not granted in time, three units of our sample had to be substituted. The data consisted of responses of 243 practitioners (72% of the total number of employees) in 30 work units, including 16 community health care units and 14 home help units. These workplaces belong to 18 upper level local organizations such as municipalities, municipal health consortiums or service sector departments. Data collection took place in group-meetings during working hours. After being informed about the confidentiality of information and giving a written consent, participants filled in the questionnaire in about 30-45 minutes.

Analysis

We analyzed whether culture and climate vary by teams by examining within-group consistency and significant between-group differences. Within-group consistency is assessed with r_{wg} and between-group differences with ANOVA-based eta-squared (Glisson and James 2002). The associations of workplace-level predictor variables with the scale of morale were examined by regression analyses. Because employees were nested within work units, resulting in potential dependency of responses within organization, multilevel hierarchical linear model analyses (HLM) were conducted. Multilevel models enable to control for the effects of the nested data structure and to estimate the extent of the effect of the organizational level as a whole, and the effects of organizational level variables on individual-level phenomena (Raudenbush and Bryk 2002).

Because of a somewhat restricted number of upper level units, we restrict our regression analysis to the work unit level. A three-stage approach for the HLM analyses was adopted (Glisson and James 2002; Raudenbush and Bryk 2002). First, a base model was estimated including only the random intercept and dependent variable in the model. Confirming our estimations of the intraclass correlation (ICC), this allowed for a rough assessment of organization-level effect on individual work morale. Second, we added individual employee characteristics (Level 1 variables), getting estimates of the associations of individual-level predictors with dependent variable and of the individual- and organization-level residual variances. Thirdly, we entered organization-level characteristics (Level 2 variables) into the model and assessed associations between both individual- and organization-level constructs with work morale. In order to estimate the extent to which either climate or culture alone accounted for organization-level effects, we also developed a model with only climate

variables and a model with only culture variables. The models were estimated using the MLwiN software package (version 2.0).

Cronbach alphas for climate scales were .91 (stress), .77 (engagement), and .82 (functionality) and for culture scales 0.82 (rigidity), 0.86 (proficiency), and .60 (resistance). The alpha for work attitudes was .87 (morale).

RESULTS

The estimates of r_{wg} at both the work unit and upper organizational levels were clearly above the critical value of .70. They were almost identical at the work unit and organizational levels.

Within upper level organizations the estimates varied for rigidity between .87 and .98, for proficiency between .95 and .99, for resistance between .92 and .98, for stress between .93 and .98, for engagement between .95 and .99, and for functionality between .94 and .98.

These estimates of agreement indicate the existence of workplace and organizational level climate and culture and justify using means of individual-level measurements of climate and culture as measures of group-level climate and culture.

Differences in organizational social contexts among all units and organizations are presented in Table 1 and differences in health care and home aid separately in Table 2.

Table 1

Table 2

1
2
3
4 Work units vary from each other in every respect, although differences in proficiency are only
5 slightly significant. Upper level organizations do not differ from each other in proficiency but
6
7 in all the other respects. This pattern of differences points both to top-down managerial/local
8
9 governmental influences and to bottom-up workplace influences on organizational social
10
11 contexts. Our data thus do not allow us to say which set of influences is stronger.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 In health care cultural differences concern resistance, whereas cultures in home aid vary in
20
21 terms of rigidity and at the workplace level also in terms of proficiency (see Table 2). Climate
22
23 differs in both fields concerning functionality, but health care organizations also in terms of
24
25 engagement, whereas home aid (part of social sector) organizations differ in terms of climate
26
27 stress.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The fact, that within home aid workplaces there are cultural differences concerning
35
36 proficiency, which seems to vanish at the upper organizational level, points to the relative
37
38 importance of bottom-up influences on client-centred culture within home aid.
39
40
41
42

43 Differences in terms of climate were somewhat bigger than those in culture. Organizational
44
45 norms and values may not be influenced by recent developments as much as climate.
46
47
48 Functionality differed most heavily, the differences being of approximately equal size in
49
50 home aid and in health care at both organizational levels. Actually about a quarter of the
51
52 variance of perceptions of functionality was associated with organization.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 About 8% of the variance in work morale was associated with work unit. This is not very
2 much, even though, as seen in Table 2, the variance of work morale was much bigger in home
3 aid units. We estimated the extent to which a random intercept model, a random intercept
4 model including individual background variables and a model with individual-level covariates
5 and team-level predictors explain variation in work morale (table 3). When all the
6 organizational variables were included, only individual age as an individual background
7 variable and functionality as an organizational variable affected work morale.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Table 3
20
21
22
23

24 According to the likelihood ratio statistics ($-2 \log L1 - (-2 \log L2)$; $1570.810 - 1553.901$
25 $=16.909$, $p<0.025$ on chi-squared distribution with 7 degrees of freedom), our random
26 intercept model including individual background variables explained variation in work morale
27 significantly better than our random intercept model. The model containing also team-level
28 predictors explained variation in work morale even better. Its value of likelihood ratio
29 statistics was 34.485 , $p<0.001$ compared to the random intercept model including individual
30 background variables.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 As an exploration of how conceptual choices may matter regarding contextual explanations of
44 work morale we also developed two other models, one with only climate variables and one
45 with only culture variables (models not seen here). It seemed that climate alone accounted for
46 organization-level effects. In this model also only functional climate affected work morale
47 ($t=4.50$, $p<0.001$). The work unit level variance of morale disappeared also in our model with
48 only culture variables, indicating that this was explained by culture variables. In this model
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 both rigidity ($t=3.77$, $p=0.001$) and proficiency ($t=2.582$, $p=0.015$) seemed to affect work
2 morale.
3
4
5
6
7
8

9 DISCUSSION

10
11 Our study describes the differentiation of organizational social contexts within two
12 organizational fields in Finnish public human services. Theoretically our concepts
13 organizational culture and climate sensitized us to separate aspects of contextual differences.
14
15 Climate opened up the employee perspective on organizational circumstances in terms of
16 psychological and collective concerns or interests (“organization for me and for us”). This
17 evaluation of organizational circumstances is not essential in culture, which captures the here
18 and now of the shared assumptions, values and norms of employees as organizational
19 members (actors in the category of a member in an organization). Taking into account
20 respondent agreement at the work unit and upper organizational levels and differences in
21 organizational culture and climate at both levels, we conclude that there exist different
22 organizational climates and cultures within Finnish public human service organizations at
23 both the workplace and upper organizational levels. Further, it seems that these existing
24 differences might have emerged from both top-down municipal influences as well as from
25 bottom-up influences of team-level management and workmate interactions. A stronger
26 bottom-up influence of team level was within home aid concerning culture related to
27 proficiency. It should be noted that there is much overlap in our data concerning unit and
28 organizational levels, which renders our conclusions tentative.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Actually, differentiation of organizational social contexts seems to be field- or service type-
57 related. The patterns of variation in cultural characteristics are not the same in services as
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 different as health care and home aid (part of social services). This is, of course, not surprising
2 as such, but our results may help to grasp more specifically what it is in organizational social
3 contexts, which is at issue during the previous profound institutional change of public human
4 services in Finland. If differentiation implies change, our results identify to some extent
5 'local' variants of change within professional service organizations, which need to be related
6 to their organizational and institutional contexts, instead of analyzing change in all
7 professions and contexts in terms of 'universal contingency' relationships or radical changes
8 of organizational archetype designs (Kirkpatrick and Ackroyd 2003).
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Rigidity varies only in home aid and resistance in health care. This may implicate that
22 institutional change has increased or decreased rigidity in home aid (part of social services),
23 but not in health care. Apparently the culture of professional and autonomous decision-
24 making has been preserved in health care as a 'professional bureaucracy', but developments
25 in home aid have resulted in different cultures concerning autonomous decision-making and
26 formality. In health care, but not in home aid, the change has invited more resistance in some
27 places than in others.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Similarly, the patterns of variation in climate were different in health care compared to home
42 aid. Health care professionals' in some organizations did perceive their work environments as
43 more engaging than did professionals in other health care workplaces. In some organizations
44 the professionals apparently have been able to experience their work as less boring and more
45 exiting than in others. In home aid, instead, it was the stress-related climate that made the
46 variation.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Functional climate differed within both health care and home aid. This implicates that there is a common challenge for managers in public human services to promote functional climates. This challenge is emphasized all the more by our observation of the significant effect of functional climate on work morale, when individual and other organizational variables were taken into account. Human service managers should promote circumstances where the employees have a clear understanding of how they fit in and can work successfully within the organization and where the employees are provided with the cooperation and help they need from co-workers and administrators.

Concerning the practical importance of organizational social contexts on employee morale, we should also note that the association of work unit or larger organization with employee morale was remarkably modest in health care. This requires more attention in future research. Is it really possible that organizational factors are not important for individual-level morale in health care? Why is that?

Our exploration with models of explanation including only climate or culture variables indicates that researchers using only organizational culture as their way of approaching the effects of organizational social context on work morale may need to practice some caution. Their explanatory power of culture seems to disappear, if also climate is taken into consideration. Researchers using only organizational climate may feel safer. When both concepts were used, functional climate had a direct effect on employee morale. However, because the possible impact of organizational culture was taken into account, our observation of the impact of climate is a bit more qualified.

CONCLUSION

1
2 Our observations argue for using both climate and culture as concepts in the efforts to specify
3
4 the characteristics of organizational social contexts as well as their antecedents and
5
6 consequences in public human services.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 Authors statement:
15

16 There is no conflict of interest.
17
18
19

20 REFERENCES 21

22
23 Aarons GA, Sawitzky AC (2006) Organizational Climate Partially Mediates the Effect of
24
25 Culture on Work Attitudes and Staff Turnover in Mental Health Services. Administration and
26
27 Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research 33:289-301
28
29
30

31
32
33 Ala-Nikkola M (2003) Sairaalassa, kotona vai vanhainkodissa. Etnografinen tutkimus
34
35 vanhustenhuollon koti- ja laitoshoidon päätöksentekotodellisuudesta. Acta Universitatis
36
37 Tampereensis, Tampere
38
39
40

41
42
43 Brown KG, Kozlowski SWJ (1999) Dispersion Theory: Moving, beyond a dichotomous
44
45 conceptualization of emergent organizational phenomena. Paper presented at the 14th annual
46
47 meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA, USA
48
49
50

51
52 Burau V, Kröger T (2004) The Local and the National in Community Care: Exploring Policy
53
54 and Politics in Finland and Britain. Social Policy & Administration 38:793-810
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Dawson JF, González-Romá V, Davis A, West MA (2008) Organizational climate and
2 climate strength in UK hospitals. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*
3
4 17:89-111
5
6
7
8

9 Denison DR (1996) What IS the difference between organizational culture and organizational
10 climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management*
11
12
13
14 Review 21:619-654
15
16
17
18

19 Elovainio M, Kivimäki M, Vahtera J (2002) Organizational Justice: Evidence of a New
20
21
22 Psychosocial Predictor of Health. *American Journal of Public Health* 92:105-108
23
24
25

26 Gillespie MA, Denison DR, Haaland S, Smerek R, Neale WS (2008) Linking organizational
27 culture and customer satisfaction: Results from two companies in different industries.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Glisson C (2000) Organizational Climate and Organizational Culture. In R. J. Patti (Ed.), *The Handbook of Social Welfare Management* (pp. 195-218). CA: Sage, Thousand Oaks

Glisson C (2002) The organizational context of children's mental health services. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review* 5:233-253

Glisson C, James LR (2002) The cross-level effects of culture and climate in human service teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23:767-794

1 Glisson C, Dukes D, Green P (2006) The effects of the ARC organizational intervention on
2 caseworker turnover, climate, and culture in children's service systems. Child Abuse and
3 Neglect 30:855-880
4
5
6
7
8

9 Glisson C, Schoenwald SK, Kelleher K, Landsverk J, Hoagwood KE, Mayberg S, Green P
10 (2008) Assessing the Organizational Social Context (OSC) of Mental Health Services for
11 Implementation Research and Practice. Administration and Policy in Mental Health and
12 Mental Services Research 35:98-113
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Gregory DM, Way CY, LeFort S, Barrett BJ, Parfrey PS (2007) Predictors of registered
20 nurses' organizational commitment and intent to stay. Health Care Manage Rev 32:119-127
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Hemmelgarn AL, Glisson C, Dukes D (2001) Emergency room culture and the emotional
28 support component of Family-Centered Care. Children's Health Care 30:93-110
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Hakulinen-Viitanen T, Pelkonen M, Haapakorva A (2005) Äitiys- ja lastenneuvolatyo
36 Suomessa. Sosiaali- ja terveystieteiden tutkimuskeskus, Helsinki
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 James LR, Choi CC, Ko C-HE, McNeil PK, Minton MK, Wright MA, Kim K (2008)
44 Organizational and psychological climate: A review of theory and research. European Journal
45 of Work and Organizational Psychology 17:5-32.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Jones GR (1983) Psychological Orientation and the process of organizational socialization:
53 An interactionist perspective. Academy of Management Review 8:464-474
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Julkisten palvelujen laatubarometri Huhti-toukokuu 2007.

2 Valtiovarainministeriö. www.vm.fi/vm/fi/04_julkaisut_ja_asiakirjat/03_muut_asiakirjat/Julkis
3
4 [ten_palvelujen_laaturbarometri_2007.pdf](http://www.vm.fi/vm/fi/04_julkaisut_ja_asiakirjat/03_muut_asiakirjat/Julkis)
5
6
7

8
9 Katz D, Kahn RL (1966) The social psychology of organizations. Wiley, New York
10

11
12
13 Kivimäki M, Ferrie JE, Head J, Shipley M, Vahtera J, Marmot MG (2004) Organizational
14 Justice and Change in Justice as Predictors of Employee Health: The Whitehall II Study.
15 Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health 58:931-937
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 Koepelman RE, Brief AP, Guzzo RA (1990) The role of climate and culture in productivity.
24 In B Schneider (Ed.), Organizational climate and culture (pp. 282-318). Jossey-Bass, San
25 Francisco
26
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 Laine M, Wikström G, Pentti J, Elovainio M, Kaarlela-Tuomaala A, Lindström K, Raitoharju
34 R, Suomala T (2006) Työolot ja hyvinvointi sosiaali- ja terveysalalla 2005. Työterveyslaitos,
35 Helsinki
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Laschinger HKS, Finegan J, Shamian J (2001) The impact of workplace empowerment,
44 organizational trust on staff nurses' work satisfaction and organizational commitment.
45 Healthcare Management Review 26:7-23
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 Laschinger HKS, Finegan J (2005) Using empowerment to build trust and respect in the
54 workplace: A strategy for addressing the nursing shortage. Nursing Economics 23:6-13
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Perälä M.-L, Grönroos E, Sarvi A (2006) Kotihoidon henkilöstön työ ja hyvinvointi.

2 Raportteja 8/2006. Stakes, Helsinki

3
4
5
6
7 Reichers AE, Schneider B (1990) Climate and culture: An evolution of constructs. In B.

8
9 Schneider (Ed.), Organizational climate and culture (pp. 5–39). Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

10
11
12
13
14 Schein EH (1996) Culture: The missing Concept in Organization Studies. Administrative

15
16
17 Science Quarterly 41:229-240

18
19
20
21
22 Schein EH (2000) Sense and nonsense about culture and climate. In N.M. Ashkanasy, C.P.M.

23
24 Wilderom & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), Handbook of organizational culture and climate (pp. xxiii-

25
26
27 xxx) CA: Sage, Thousand Oaks

28
29
30
31
32 Schneider B (1990) Organizational climate and culture. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

33
34
35
36
37 Schneider B (2000) The psychological life of organizations. In NM Ashkanasy, CPM.

38
39 Wilderom, MFPeterson (Eds.), Handbook of Organizational culture & climate (pp. xvii-xxi).

40
41
42 CA: Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks

43
44
45
46
47 Voutilainen P, Kauppinen S, Heinola R, Finne-Soveri H, Kattainen E, Topo P, Anderson S

48
49 (2007) Katsaus ikääntyneiden kotihoidon kehitykseen. In M Heikkilä, T Lahti (Eds.),

50
51 Sosiaali- ja terveydenhuollon palvelukatsaus 2007 (pp. 154-189). Sosiaali- ja terveystieteiden

52
53 tutkimus- ja kehittämiskeskus (STAKES), Helsinki

1 Vuori J, Siltala J (2005) Työorientaatiot, hyvinvointi ja johtamistehtävät. In J. Vuori (Ed.)

2 Terveys ja johtaminen. Terveystieteiden tutkimuskeskus terveydenhuollon työyhteisöissä. WSOY,

3
4 Helsinki

5
6
7
8
9 Warren N, Hodgson M, Craig T, Dyrenforth S, Perlin J, Murphy F (2007) Employee Working

10 Conditions and Healthcare System Performance: the Veterans Health Administration

11
12 Experience. J Occup Environ Med 49:417-429

13
14
15
16
17
18 Weick KE (1979) The social psychology of organizing (2nd ed.). MA: Addison-Wesley,

19
20 Reading

TABLE 1

Differences of organizational social contexts and morale among work units and upper-level municipal organizations. Means, ANOVA based eta-squared, significance of differences (p value), and ICC.

	Means max – min	Eta squared	Sig.	ICC
Work units (n=30)				
Climate stress	61.1 – 36.0	.239	.001	.131
Climate functionality	55.3 – 39.1	.324	.000	.255
Climate engagement	48.3 – 40.4	.250	.001	.141
Culture rigidity	43.2 – 30.7	.229	.001	.123
Culture proficiency	64.2 – 52.3	.183	.050	.068
Culture resistance	36.0 – 26.7	.250	.001	.143
Morale	70.6 – 54.6	.207	.014	.084
Organizations (n=18)				
Climate stress	55.1 – 36.0	.168	.001	.118
Climate functionality	55.3 – 39.1	.268	.000	.262
Climate engagement	48.3 – 40.4	.182	.000	.132
Culture rigidity	40.4 – 32.3	.152	.003	.085
Culture proficiency	64.2 – 53.4	.105	.118	.031
Culture resistance	36.0 – 26.6	.164	.002	.107
Morale	70.6 – 54.9	.166	.002	.097

TABLE 2

Comparing health care and home aid in terms of differences of organizational social contexts and morale in work units and upper-level municipal organizations. Means, ANOVA based eta-squared, significance of differences (p value), and ICC.

	Means max – min	Eta squared	Sig.	ICC
Health care				
Units (n=16)				
Climate stress	61.1 – 42.2	.192	.087	.080
Climate functionality	52.9 – 39.1	.346	.000	.242
Climate engagement	48.1 – 40.4	.245	.013	.139
Culture rigidity	39.8 – 30.7	.180	.116	.066
Culture proficiency	63.4 – 52.3	.150	.345	.028
Culture resistance	36.0 – 27.3	.269	.005	.166
Morale	67.4 – 54.9	.158	.264	.039
Organizations (n=9)*				
Climate stress	55.1 – 45.6	.094	.206	.044
Climate functionality	52.9 – 39.1	.266	.000	.274
Climate engagement	45.6 – 40.4	.182	.005	.128
Culture rigidity	39.8 – 32.4	.090	.221	.019
Culture proficiency	61.4 – 53.4	.127	.072	.071
Culture resistance	36.0 – 28.5	.178	.007	.125
Morale	62.9 – 54.9	.101	.176	.046
Home aid				
Units (n=14)				
Climate stress	54.7 – 36.0	.262	.002	.169
Climate functionality	55.3 – 40.3	.299	.000	.231
Climate engagement	48.3 – 43.9	.118	.460	.000
Culture rigidity	43.2 – 32.3	.239	.004	.152
Culture proficiency	64.2 – 52.4	.208	.023	.144
Culture resistance	33.9 – 26.7	.186	.068	.081
Morale	70.6 – 54.3	.270	.002	.185
Organizations (n=11)*				
Climate stress	54.7 – 36.0	.248	.001	.199
Climate functionality	55.3 – 40.3	.280	.000	.254
Climate engagement	48.3 – 44.2	.082	.546	.000
Culture rigidity	41.1 – 32.3	.199	.006	.137
Culture proficiency	64.2 – 52.4	.118	.187	.016
Culture resistance	33.0 – 26.7	.135	.124	.052
Morale	70.6 – 56.2	.252	.001	.186

*The sum of organizations is 20, because one health care unit and one home aid unit belong to the same municipality.

Table 3

Hierarchical regression results of workplace climate and culture on employee morale.

Model		Coefficient	SE	t-value	p-value
Random effects only	Constant	59.718	0.666	89.667	.000
	Team variance	5.289	3.492	1.515	.140
	Residual variance	58.876	5.953	9.890	.000
	ICC	0.082			
Individual-level covariates	Constant	51.822	3.234	16.024	.000
	Age	0.198	0.073	2.712	.007
	Work experience in this organization	-0.139	0.067	-2.075	.039
	Occupational group: Med doctor – home aid personnel	2.336	2.668	0.876	.382
	Occupational group: Educated nurse - home aid personnel	0.865	1.473	0.587	.558
	Occupational group: Nurse – home aid personnel	1.519	1.537	0.988	.324
	Occupational group: Other – home aid personnel	0.820	2.836	0.289	.772
	Team variance	4.995	3.333	1.499	.145
	Residual variance	56.360	5.714	9.863	.000
Individual-level covariates and team-level predictors	Constant	24.055	21.829	1.101	.272
	Age	0.192	0.070	2.742	.006
	Work experience in this organization	- 0.121	0.064	1.890	.060
	Occupational group: Med doctor – home aid personnel	2.546	2.741	0.928	.354
	Occupational group: Educated nurse - home aid personnel	0.673	1.552	0.433	.665
	Occupational group: Nurse – home aid personnel	0.447	1.443	0.309	.757
	Occupational group: Other – home aid personnel	1.220	2.775	0.439	.661
	Climate – Stress	- 0.170	0.113	1.504	.143
	Climate - Engagement	0.320	0.325	0.984	.332
	Climate - Functionality	0.545	0.194	2.809	.008
	Culture – Rigidity	- 0.316	0.221	1.429	.163
	Culture – Proficiency	0.040	0.235	0.170	.866
	Culture - Resistance	0.170	0.227	0.749	.459
	Team variance	0.000	0.000		
	Residual variance	51.688	4.884	10.583	.000

Dear Reviewers

Authors response to the reviewers' comments

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1: Title:

- better classification will be possible by: "Differentiation of ORGANIZATIONAL climate and culture(...)"

Our response: Title has been modified to "Differentiation of organizational climate and culture in public health and social services in Finland"

Presentation and length:

Relevanz of the given information:

- CULTURE AND CLIMATE and DIFFERENCES ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE: summarize, prioritize, shorten, omit

Our response: The text has been shorted throughout by focusing on the most relevant issues. After critical evaluation of the relevancy of references about 20 references have been omitted.

Outline of the section:

- DIFFERENCES ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE: to preserve the clarity, use subheadings in order to create transitions between the three aspects

Our response: The text has been shorted for clarity reasons. The titles have been changed and the topic presented now under four titles.

Language in general:

- try to avoid repeating of the same words within a sentence/paragrah: e.g thus, however, found, estimates, differ (-s, -ed, -ences, - entiation)
- check the prepositions
- check the vocabulary: e.g. CULTURE AND CLIMATE: "(...) researchers have differing MEANINGS(...)"

Our response: We have tried to avoid repeating the above words and deleted however (4 times), thus (7 times), found (4 times) and differ... (14 times).

Other:

- Assessment of consequences of the major institutional deregulation: shift from DIFFERENCES ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE to DISCUSSION, verifiable because of the results instead of conjectures?

Our response: Now antecedents and consequences still exist in the theoretical part but are presented just shortly.