

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:

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.

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

1 Our study describes organizational-level differentiation in terms of organizational climate
2 and organizational culture within Finnish public health and social care, which has undergone
3 a process of profound institutional deregulation of “social service state”, resulting in
4 increased local autonomy (Burau and Kröger 2004). Organizational climate and
5 organizational culture, which are the two key constructs of research on organizational social
6 context, have lived very much their own and separate lives within own disciplines and
7 traditions (James et al. 2008). Additionally, organizational culture has been studied mainly
8 by qualitative methods. However, within the last two decades the constructs have been
9 discussed simultaneously in the organizational literature (Schneider 1990), and reasons have
10 been given about their similarity (e.g. Schneider 2000), or overlapping (Denison 1996) or
11 distinctive character (Glisson and James 2002; Schein 2000). Taking the distinctive character
12 of the constructs as our point of departure, we explore the differentiation of organizational
13 contexts using both constructs. By climate we describe the differentiation from employees’
14 perspective. Comprising of individual-level experience, as “the way people perceive their
15 work environment”, climate helps to describe the character of organizations as psychological
16 environments (James et al. 1990). We connect institutional and professional values or
17 expectations (Cherniss 1980) with psychological climate, emphasizing social influence on
18 individual experience. By organizational culture we catch properties of organizational
19 systems or structures. The organizational culture construct, comprising collective-level
20 values and norms as “the way things are done in an organization” (Glisson & James 2002),
21 provides a more structural point of view. The differentiation of organizational social contexts
22 is probed with the help of an empirically supported measurement model (Organizational
23 Social Context, OSC), which has been developed in USA for measuring climate and culture
24 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 CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE 51 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).

31 FINNISH PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

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

40 METHODS 41

42
43
44 The collective and individual-level phenomena should be taken into account in measuring
45 organizational culture and climate. Justifying the aggregation of individual responses as a
46 representation of both organizational culture and climate requires within-group consensus.
47
48 Our precondition for aggregating values of individual responses into a measure of
49
50 organizational climate and culture is a value of 0.70 or above on the r_{wg} index measuring
51 within-group consensus. (Glisson and James 2002)
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 We used the Organizational Social Context (OSC) measurement system (Glisson et al. 2008)
2 to assess the key characteristics of culture, climate and morale comprising job satisfaction and
3 organizational commitment. Psychological and organizational climate are assessed with eight
4 first-order scales, forming the three second-order scales that define the organizational climate
5 profile including stress, functionality and engagement. Organizational culture is measured
6 with six first-order scales that form the three second-order scales that define the
7 organizational culture profile consisting of rigidity, proficiency and resistance. Work attitudes
8 are each service provider's affective attachment to the organization and positive reaction to
9 his or her job (Glisson and Durrick 1988). Work attitudes are measured as a single second-
10 order factor labelled morale, which is characterized by an employee's commitment to the
11 organization and satisfaction with his or her job.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

Analysis

1
2
3
4 We analyzed whether culture and climate vary by teams by examining within-group
5 consistency and significant between-group differences. Within-group consistency is assessed
6 with r_{wg} and between-group differences with ANOVA-based eta-squared (Glisson and James
7 2002). The associations of workplace-level predictor variables with the scale of morale were
8 examined by regression analyses. Because employees were nested within work units, resulting
9 in potential dependency of responses within organization, multilevel hierarchical linear model
10 analyses (HLM) were conducted. Multilevel models enable to control for the effects of the
11 nested data structure and to estimate the extent of the effect of the organizational level as a
12 whole, and the effects of organizational level variables on individual-level phenomena
13 (Raudenbush and Bryk 2002).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Because of a somewhat restricted number of upper level units, we restrict our regression
32 analysis to the work unit level. A three-stage approach for the HLM analyses was adopted
33 (Glisson and James 2002; Raudenbush and Bryk 2002). First, a base model was estimated
34 including only the random intercept and dependent variable in the model. Confirming our
35 estimations of the intraclass correlation (ICC), this allowed for a rough assessment of
36 organization-level effect on individual work morale. Second, we added individual employee
37 characteristics (Level 1 variables), getting estimates of the associations of individual-level
38 predictors with dependent variable and of the individual- and organization-level residual
39 variances. Thirdly, we entered organization-level characteristics (Level 2 variables) into the
40 model and assessed associations between both individual- and organization-level constructs
41 with work morale. In order to estimate the extent to which either climate or culture alone
42 accounted for organization-level effects, we also developed a model with only climate
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 variables and a model with only culture variables. The models were estimated using the
2 MLwiN software package (version 2.0).
3

4
5
6
7 Cronbach alphas for climate scales were .91 (stress), .77 (engagement), and .82 (functionality)
8 and for culture scales 0.82 (rigidity), 0.86 (proficiency), and .60 (resistance). The alpha for
9 work attitudes was .87 (morale).
10
11
12
13

14 RESULTS

15
16
17
18 The estimates of r_{wg} at both the work unit and upper organizational levels were clearly above
19 the critical value of .70. They were almost identical at the work unit and organizational levels.
20

21
22 Within upper level organizations the estimates varied for rigidity between .87 and .98, for
23 proficiency between .95 and .99, for resistance between .92 and .98, for stress between .93
24 and .98, for engagement between .95 and .99, and for functionality between .94 and .98.
25

26
27 These estimates of agreement indicate the existence of workplace and organizational level
28 climate and culture and justify using means of individual-level measurements of climate and
29 culture as measures of group-level climate and culture.
30
31
32
33

34
35
36
37 Differences in organizational social contexts among all units and organizations are presented
38 in Table 1 and differences in health care and home aid separately in Table 2.
39
40
41
42

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 Table 1

54
55
56
57
58 Table 2
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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

8 9 DISCUSSION

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

1 Functional climate differed within both health care and home aid. This implicates that there is
2 a common challenge for managers in public human services to promote functional climates.
3
4 This challenge is emphasized all the more by our observation of the significant effect of
5 functional climate on work morale, when individual and other organizational variables were
6 taken into account. Human service managers should promote circumstances where the
7 employees have a clear understanding of how they fit in and can work successfully within the
8 organization and where the employees are provided with the cooperation and help they need
9 from co-workers and administrators.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Concerning the practical importance of organizational social contexts on employee morale,
23 we should also note that the association of work unit or larger organization with employee
24 morale was remarkably modest in health care. This requires more attention in future research.
25
26 Is it really possible that organizational factors are not important for individual-level morale in
27 health care? Why is that?
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Our exploration with models of explanation including only climate or culture variables
37 indicates that researchers using only organizational culture as their way of approaching the
38 effects of organizational social context on work morale may need to practice some caution.
39
40 Their explanatory power of culture seems to disappear, if also climate is taken into
41 consideration. Researchers using only organizational climate may feel safer. When both
42 concepts were used, functional climate had a direct effect on employee morale. However,
43 because the possible impact of organizational culture was taken into account, our observation
44 of the impact of climate is a bit more qualified.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 CONCLUSION
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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 *Tamperensis, 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
53 Burau V, Kröger T (2004) The Local and the National in Community Care: Exploring Policy
54
55 and Politics in Finland and Britain. *Social Policy & Administration* 38:793-810
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 Review 21:619-654
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Elovainio M, Kivimäki M, Vahtera J (2002) Organizational Justice: Evidence of a New
20
21 Psychosocial Predictor of Health. *American Journal of Public Health* 92:105-108
22
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 *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 17: 112-132
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Glisson C (2000) Organizational Climate and Organizational Culture. In R. J. Patti (Ed.), *The*
37
38 *Handbook of Social Welfare Management* (pp. 195-218). CA: Sage, Thousand Oaks
39
40
41
42

43 Glisson C (2002) The organizational context of children's mental health services. *Clinical*
44
45 *Child and Family Psychology Review* 5:233-253
46
47
48
49
50

51 Glisson C, James LR (2002) The cross-level effects of culture and climate in human service
52
53 teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23:767-794
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
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, Dukes D, Green P (2006) The effects of the ARC organizational intervention on caseworker turnover, climate, and culture in children's service systems. *Child Abuse and Neglect* 30:855-880

Glisson C, Schoenwald SK, Kelleher K, Landsverk J, Hoagwood KE, Mayberg S, Green P (2008) Assessing the Organizational Social Context (OSC) of Mental Health Services for Implementation Research and Practice. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Services Research* 35:98–113

Gregory DM, Way CY, LeFort S, Barrett BJ, Parfrey PS (2007) Predictors of registered nurses' organizational commitment and intent to stay. *Health Care Manage Rev* 32:119-127

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

Hakulinen-Viitanen T, Pelkonen M, Haapakorva A (2005) Äitiys- ja lastenneuvolatyö Suomessa. Sosiaali- ja terveystieteiden tutkimuskeskus, Helsinki

James LR, Choi CC, Ko C-HE, McNeil PK, Minton MK, Wright MA, Kim K (2008) Organizational and psychological climate: A review of theory and research. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 17:5-32.

Jones GR (1983) Psychological Orientation and the process of organizational socialization: An interactionist perspective. *Academy of Management Review* 8:464-474

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
5
6

7
8
9 Katz D, Kahn RL (1966) The social psychology of organizations. Wiley, New York
10

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

21
22
23
24 Koepelman RE, Brief AP, Guzzo RA (1990) The role of climate and culture in productivity.
25
26 In B Schneider (Ed.), Organizational climate and culture (pp. 282-318). Jossey-Bass, San
27
28 Francisco
29
30

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

41
42
43 Laschinger HKS, Finegan J, Shamian J (2001) The impact of workplace empowerment,
44
45 organizational trust on staff nurses' work satisfaction and organizational commitment.
46
47 Healthcare Management Review 26:7-23
48
49
50

51
52
53 Laschinger HKS, Finegan J (2005) Using empowerment to build trust and respect in the
54
55 workplace: A strategy for addressing the nursing shortage. Nursing Economics 23:6-13
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
10 Schneider (Ed.), Organizational climate and culture (pp. 5–39). Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

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

41
42
43
44
45 CA: Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks

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

49
50 (2007) Katsaus ikääntyneiden kotihoidon kehitykseen. In M Heikkilä, T Lahti (Eds.),

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

53
54 tutkimus- ja kehittämiskeskus (STAKES), Helsinki

55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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

2 Terveys ja johtaminen. Terveyshallintotiede terveydenhuollon työyhteisöissä. WSOY,

3
4
5 Helsinki

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
13
14 Experience. J Occup Environ Med 49:417-429

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

20
21
22 Reading

23
24
25
26
27
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

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
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.