

Influence of Director-Staff Discordance about Organizational Functioning on Implementation Attitudes

Rachel D. Crawley, M.S., Jennifer E. Becan, Ph.D.,
 Danica K. Knight, Ph.D., & Patrick M. Flynn, Ph.D.

Addiction Health Services Research Conference
 October 16, 2014 – Boston, MA

This study was funded by a grant to Texas Christian University (R01DA013093). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institute on Drug Abuse or the National Institutes of Health.

Research Studies on Organizational Functioning and Implementation

- Organizational functioning is important to promoting evidence-based practice adoption and implementation in the substance abuse treatment field (Amodeo, 2011; Lundgren, Chassler, Amodeo, M'Ippolito, & Sullivan, 2012; Simpson, 2002; Lehman, Simpson, Knight, & Flynn, 2011).
- Positive attitudes about implementation are related to the adoption of a new practice and may interact with treatment outcomes (Foreman, Bovasso, & Woody, 2001; Rogers, 1995).
- Research also indicates that being more open to change (Lehman et al., 2011; Rogers, 1995; Simpson, 2002) is related to new practice adoption.

The TCU Adolescent Implementation Study

Recruitment: Adolescent Substance Abuse/Mental Health Treatment Facilities

- 2013 - 2014
- Agency-level data collection
- Implementation Study

Implementation Study

January 2013 - June 2014

1 Month

Organizational Functioning Survey
 Stress, Communication, Openness to Change

4 Months

Implementation Attitudes
 Feasibility, Leadership Engagement

TCU ADOL Survey of Organizational Functioning and Leadership (SOFL) TCU ADOL Workshop Follow-Up (WAFU)

Facility-Level Study Sample

Inclusion Criteria:

1. The program director completed all measures of interest on the Time 1 survey.
2. At least 5 staff members completed the measures of interest on the Time 1 survey.
3. At least 3 staff members completed measures of interest on the Time 2 survey.

50 Initial Sample

38

22

22

22 Facilities

Analytic Strategy for Hypothesis 1: Director and Staff Discordance on Time 1 Measures

Hypothesis 1: Program directors and staff will generally disagree on organizational functioning measures of stress, communication, and openness to change.

Analytic Strategy for Hypothesis 1

- Accounted for data nesting (staff/directors nested within facilities) by using SAS PROC MIXED.
- Director scores were used as the reference group (intercept).
- If the directors' scores are higher than staff scores, then the slope will be negative.
- If the directors' scores are lower than staff scores, then the slope will be positive.

TCU 2014

Results for Hypothesis 1

Director and Staff Means on Time 1 Variables Controlling for Facility

	Intercept	Fixed Effects Slope (Person)	Level 2 Effects (F-value)
Stress	33.12***	-.05	.05
Communication	38.97***	-3.06*	4.55*
Openness to Change	38.51***	-1.94†	3.76†

***p < .001. †p < .05. *p < .10.

Summary:

- Directors rated organizational communication and openness to change more favorably than staff.
- There is a program effect on the differences between directors and staff members views of communication and change.

TCU 2014

Analytic Strategy for Hypothesis 2: Discordance Group Effects on Implementation Attitudes

Hypothesis 2: Facilities with director-staff discordance (compared to facilities with concordance) will report less favorable implementation attitudes at 4 months post-training.

TCU 2014

Analytic Strategy for Hypothesis 2

Concordance

Facility 1 – The director's score is within +/- 1 standard error range of the staff average.

Discordance

Facility 2 – The director's score is above the +1 standard error range of the staff average.

OR

Facility 3 – The director's score is below the -1 standard error range of the staff average.

This is an example using communication as the Time 1 variable. These steps were repeated for the Time 1 measures of stress and openness to change.

TCU 2014

Facility Sample Sizes for Hypothesis 2

Time 1 Facility Frequencies by Condition

Variable	Concordance	Discordance
Stress	14	8
Communication	17	5
Openness to Change	16	6

TCU 2014

Staff Sample Sizes for Hypothesis 2

Time 2 Staff Frequencies by Condition

Variable	Concordance	Discordance
Stress	76	19
Communication	88	34
Openness to Change	85	37

TCU 2014

Results for Hypothesis 2: Feasibility


**The Effect of Director-Staff Discordance on Time 2 Feasibility
Controlling for Program Membership**

	Intercept	Fixed Effects Slope (Person)	Level 2 Effects (F-value)
Stress	33.36***	.36	.09
Communication	34.16***	-2.29*	4.40*
Openness to Change	34.34***	-2.69*	6.46*

*** $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. † $p < .10$.

Summary:

- Facilities with director-staff discordance on organizational communication and openness to change rated feasibility to implement a new practice to be lower.
- There was a facility effect on the impact of discordance group on feasibility.



Results for Hypothesis 2: Leadership Engagement


**The Effect of Director-Staff Discordance on Time 2 Leadership
Engagement Controlling for Program Membership**

	Intercept	Fixed Effects Slope (Person)	Level 2 Effects (F-value)
Stress	31.36***	3.62*	6.02*
Communication	32.82***	-.45	.06
Openness to Change	32.76***	-.19	.01

*** $p < .001$. * $p < .05$.


Summary:

- Facilities with director-staff discordance on stress rated leadership engagement to be higher.
- There was a facility effect on the impact of condition on leadership engagement.




Conclusions

- Director-staff discordance on organizational communication and openness to change is related to lower post-training feasibility.
- Director-staff discordance on stress is related to greater post-training perceived leadership involvement.



Future Directions

- Does discordance among team members on perceptions of organizational functioning impact implementation factors?
- Does discordance between leadership and staff or among staff impact adoption of new practices?



Rachel D. Crawley, M.S.
 Graduate Research Assistant
 r.d.crawley@tcu.edu

www.ibr.tcu.edu

