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Testing a Multi-Dimensional Model of Organizational Performance: Prospects and Problems

ABSTRACT

Scholars have been preoccupied for generations with identifying the “best measure” and model of organizational performance. Drawing on previous work focused on the development of multi-dimensional frameworks or models of organizational performance, this paper presents our perspective on organizational performance, discussing a multi-dimensional model that emphasizes the importance of assessing the two primary dimensions of performance, management and program performance. We advocate for the use of both perceptual and objective measures in seeking to understand organizational performance, finding that examining these perceptual and objective measures has significant usefulness in seeking to fully capture performance. In addition, through the use of multi-level random coefficient (or hierarchical) modeling, we find various interconnections between management dimensions and program dimensions in understanding organization performance in 22 human service organizations providing early care and education services.
Introduction

Few topics have perhaps vexed public and nonprofit management scholars more than the question of what constitutes organizational performance or effectiveness. Numerous scholars throughout the development of organization theory have focused on developing the “best way” to define and/or measure organizational performance. The explosion of research has left the state of the field unfortunately with numerous and often conflicting models of organizational performance (Likert 1967; Miles 1980; Pfeffer 1982; Quinn and Rohrbaugh 1981, 1983; Rainey and Steinbauer 1999). The literature is not clear about what the most important explanatory factors for assessing and measuring the performance of public and nonprofit organizations are (Likert 1967; Miles 1980; Pfeffer 1982; Quinn and Rohrbaugh 1981, 1983; Rainey and Steinbauer 1999). In recent years, scholars have placed their focus on advocating for and developing more comprehensive, multi-dimensional frameworks of organizational performance, emphasizing that a concept as complex as organizational performance may be more appropriately captured through a multi-dimensional framework than through a single construct (Cameron 1978, 1981; Quinn and Rohrbaugh 1981, 1983; Rojas 2000). In previous work, we have sought to contribute to the work of these scholars exploring the concept of organizational performance or effectiveness, presenting our own multi-dimensional and hierarchical model of organizational performance or effectiveness (Sowa, Selden, and Sandfort 2001). In this paper, we are taking the first step toward refining this model with the use of multi-level random coefficient (or hierarchical) modeling to explore the proposed dimensions of this model.

Using data collected from 22 human service organizations providing early care and education services, this paper examines a model of organizational performance that
emphasizes the importance of capturing the multiple dimensions of performance, management and program performance, and the multiple hierarchical levels of operation existing in an organization. With this model and analysis, we are seeking to contribute to the scholarly debate surrounding the challenges of conceptualizing and measuring organizational performance. While this model and analysis does not provide the definitive answer to this debate and builds on the work of scholars before us, we believe that it provides some important re-thinking or re-conceptualization concerning the critical components of organizational performance that may help improve future debate and research.

**Conceptualizing Organizational Performance**

Organization theory has produced a plethora of models exploring organizational performance; in fact, some scholars have stated that there are as many models as there are studies of organizational performance or effectiveness.¹ Since our framework builds on the work of previous scholars, we will briefly review some of the criteria that have been employed in previous models of organizational performance prior to discussing and analyzing our multi-dimensional framework for measuring organizational performance.

Some scholars focus on internal organizational factors when defining criteria of performance, such as organizational goals or the procedures for accomplishing these goals. The rational goal or purposive-rational model of organizational performance assumes that organizations are designed to achieve certain goals, both formally specified and implicit. It focuses on the extent to which an organization reaches its goals as the key criterion of performance (Etzioni 1964; Price 1972; Pfeffer 1982). Other scholars emphasize different

---

¹ Scholars often use the terminology effectiveness and performance interchangeably to describe the same phenomenon, the overall ability of organizations to perform well or effectively pursue their missions. Therefore, for the sake of simplicity, we will refer to the phenomenon under investigation as organizational performance.
internal measures when they develop portraits of organizational performance, such as various measures of organizational health (Argyris 1964; Bennis 1966; Likert 1967). Some scholars focus on such internal organizational components as strong communication systems and stable policies and procedures that contribute to the achievement of organizational control. Others focus on human relations measures, such as workforce cohesion or morale through human resource development.

Still other scholars focus on external factors in developing criteria of performance, emphasizing the relationship of an organization to its environment. The system resource model, developed by Seashore and Yuchtman (1967), defines organizational performance through the overall survival of the organization, “the ability to exploit its environment in the acquisition of scarce and valued resources to sustain its functioning” (Seashore & Yuchtman 1967, p. 393). Therefore, in this conception, the inputs into an organization are more important than their outputs because an organization’s ability to maintain sufficient resources for survival is the most important indicator of performance. Finally, another approach to conceptualizing performance focuses on organizations’ relationships with key external actors. The ecological model or the participant satisfaction model defines organizational performance according to organizations’ ability to satisfy key strategic constituencies in their environment (Keeley 1978; Connolly, Conlon & Deutch 1980; Miles 1980; Zammuto 1984; Boshcken 1994).

This research demonstrates that, because every organization is slightly different, appropriate criteria for assessing performance might vary. Organizations with clearly defined and easily measured goals may be assessed using the rational goal model. On the other hand, organizations with more ambiguous goals may be better appraised using other factors, such as
fiscal health, ability to attract and sustain resources, or ability to satisfy key stakeholders. In addition, in selecting criteria, scholars exercise different value judgments about what is most appropriate in determining organizational performance (Cameron & Whetten 1983). Scholars recognize that different models may shed light on certain facets of performance, similar to the way in which individual pictures may only reveal one aspect of the subject under investigation (Morgan 1997).

Several scholars have tried to address this conundrum by incorporating aspects of each of these models into comprehensive frameworks that should provide a more complete picture of what constitutes organizational performance (Cameron 1981, 1982; Quinn & Rohrbaugh 1981, 1983). Cameron (1978, 1981, and 1982) developed a multi-dimensional approach that attempts to reconcile the system resource, rational goal, internal process, and participant satisfaction models. Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) developed a spatial model of organizational performance that attempts to acknowledge the competing values that surround the assessment of organizational performance. They demonstrate that there are generally three sets of competing values operating in the evaluation of organizational performance: an internal organizational focus versus an external focus, a focus on means versus a focus on ends, and a focus on flexibility versus a focus on control. While it may not be possible to reconcile these values into one measure of performance, by clarifying the values operating in the study of performance or effectiveness, these scholars argue that their framework will allow scholars to clearly articulate values, assign weights to these values explicitly, and then develop formula for combining scores on each criterion in the framework.

In summary, multi-dimensional models of organizational performance have gained increasing prominence among public management and nonprofit scholars, with many studies
using multi-dimensional approaches and others arguing that the nature of public and nonprofit organizations demands frameworks that capture multiple dimensions of these organizations. (Cameron 1982; Ostroff & Schmitt 1993; Kushner & Poole 1996; Herman & Renz 1997, 1999; Forbes 1998; Rainey and Steinbauer 1999; Rojas 2000). In our previous work, we have added to this by suggesting a model of organizational performance that puts an emphasis on both the multiple dimensions that comprise organizational performance but also the multiple, hierarchical levels at which performance must be measured in an organization in order to gain a complete picture as to its performance. We propose this model following the logic of Campbell (1977, p. 18), who states:

“A better way to think of organizational effectiveness is as a construct that has no necessary and sufficient operational definition but that constitutes a model or theory of what organizational effectiveness is. The functions of such a model would be to identify the kinds of variables we should be measuring and to specify how these variables, or components interrelate-or should be interrelated.”

The following section describes the assumptions that drive the model being tested in this paper, focusing on the dimensions of performance and the different measures that should be included in a multi-dimensional model.

A Multi-Dimensional Model of Organizational Performance

The model proposed in this paper posits that organizational performance is comprised of two primary and distinct dimensions: management and program. “Management” refers to organizational and management characteristics – the things which describe an organization and its capabilities and the actions of managers within it. Measures of management encompass variables that tap structure and process, as well as those that represent the outcomes of these management systems and activities. “Program” refers to the specific
service or intervention provided by the organization. It also has variables that relate to the structure and process of the program, as well as the outcomes created by the intervention. Before delving more deeply into the specific measures included in this framework, we present the underlying assumptions driving this framework or model of organizational performance.

Assumption 1: There are multiple dimensions of performance, with the primary dimensions being management and program performance.

In specifying multi-dimensional frameworks or models of organizational performance or effectiveness, scholars have generally differentiated dimensions along certain theoretical premises or assumptions. We believe that a fruitful distinction is between the effectiveness of management of an organization and the effectiveness of the programs that the organization operates. Organizational performance is more than the mere outcomes of the programs it operates or the services it provides. It is as importantly a function of its management structures, how well they operate, and their impact on the most crucial organizational resource, its employees. This is particularly true in public and nonprofit organizations, in particular human service organizations, where staff play an essential role in translating organizational “inputs” into “outputs” (Hasenfeld 1983). Improving management effectiveness or performance and overall organizational capacity may lead to better program performance, as organizational capacity or management effectiveness can provide a foundation for the sustainability, improvement, and growth of programs (Letts, Ryan, & Grossman 1999).

Assumption 2: Management performance and program performance are further composed of two sub-dimensions: 1) processes and structures and 2) outcomes.
For each primary dimension, this model examines two additional sub-dimensions of performance (Herman & Renz 1999; Scott 1977). The first encompasses both processes and structures and the second includes outcomes. Processes and structure refer to how the organization or program operates the structures in place and the operating processes that dictate and direct action. In operationalizing these processes and structures, we have collapsed them into two sets of measures that more completely capture these complex management and program characteristics, management capacity and program capacity. Outcomes are the results caused by management and program activities. Too often, outcomes alone become the indicators “of choice” for representing organizational effectiveness or performance. However, one only need interview staff within such organizations to discern complex dynamics hidden behind those outcome measurements. We maintain that to improve outcomes, organizations need to understand how their management and program capacities enable or hinder those outcomes.

It is not uncommon for scholars to use multiple indicators of processes/structures and outcomes in research about performance; however, they often examine indicators only within one of the primary dimensions. Assessments of program, along both process/structure and outcome, are found in schools (Ferguson 1991; Chalos & Cherian 1995; Arum 1996) and job training programs (Hasenfeld & Weaver 1996; Heinrich 1999). Assessments of management, along both process/structure and outcome, have occurred in public bureaucracies, state governments, and public health clinics (Ingraham & Donahue 2000a, 2000b; Ammar et al. 2001; Ingraham & Moynihan 2001). However insightful the results of these studies, we maintain that focusing on either program or management paints only half the picture of the dynamics of organizational performance.
Assumption 3: Both objective and perceptual measures are needed to fully capture the dimensions of performance.

For each of the sub-dimensions within management performance and program performance, we assert that researchers must collect two types of measures to understand the constructs, objective and perceptual. Social constructionist theory informs much recent work in organizational studies and teaches us about the impact of “meanings” made by staff, management and clients on how phenomena influence organizational operation (Scott 1995; Weick 1995; Herman & Renz 1999). Including both perceptual and objective measures enables scholars to better capture the full picture of the actual construct of organizational performance being studied. Merely having a state-of-the-art management system does not necessarily indicate that it functions effectively. An organization may have a sophisticated and integrated information technology system but may continue to process forms manually, such as program attendance sheets. By including perceptual measures along side objective measures, scholars may examine the degree to which these structures, processes, and outcomes align with the perceptions of those that participate in the organization on a day-to-day basis.

Therefore, based on these three assumptions we have developed the following ideal conceptual model that posits the inter-relationship between the different dimensions of

---

2 While some might argue that there are no objective measures, we distinguish the measures based on observation of the actual presence or absence of process and structure as “objective” and the measured based on staff perceptions or beliefs of these factors as “perceptual.”

3 In addition, we do not include measures of all possible external stakeholder perceptions in our model; the only external stakeholder we are including are the clients of the organization. As demonstrated by Herman and Renz (1997), stakeholders often have very different perceptions than the perceptions of the employees and clients of an organization as to what constitutes both effective practice and effective outcomes. Therefore, due to the different values that are often operating with stakeholder assessments of organizational performance in comparison to the values operating within the organization itself and within the client groups that the organization serves, we believe that it is most useful to view stakeholder assessment of organizational performance as a separate process that should be treated apart from an assessment of performance based on the management and program operations of an organization.
performance, management and program, and the sub-dimensions of management and performance, management and program capacity and management and program outcomes\textsuperscript{4}.

**Insert Figure 1**

The following section describes the methodology employed to test this model, including the data used to operationalize these multiple dimensions and sub-dimensions of performance.

**Methodology**

**Data and Methods**

The data used in this study were gathered from 22 human service organizations providing early care and education services to low-income children in New York State and the Commonwealth of Virginia. Gathered between June 2000 and June 2003 as part of a large multiple case study design, this data includes multiple surveys, archival document analysis, coded interview data, and structured observations. In addition, this data includes variables captured from both organizations and clients.\textsuperscript{5} We received a 100 percent response rate on surveys collected at the organizational level from managers and front-line workers. We surveyed 394 clients (parents) and obtained an 81 percent response rate.\textsuperscript{6}

Our analysis of the multi-dimensional model of organizational performance is two-fold, focused on exploring the selected measures to capture the different dimensions of performance and then exploring the relationship between the dimensions. First, we compare

\textsuperscript{4} Also included in this model are environmental control variables that can be adjusted depending upon the organizations being examined.

\textsuperscript{5} The front-line in this study is the classroom in which the early care and education services are being provided. Therefore, the teachers in the early care and education classrooms are the front-line workers in these human service organizations.

\textsuperscript{6} Since our field work spanned a year within site, we lost many of these parents because their children left the center.
the objective and perceptual measures of each of the primary constructs. We examine the reliability, correlations, and means of each set of measures. Second, we use multi-level random coefficient (or hierarchical) modeling to examine the relationship between the different aspects of management and program capacity on program outcomes, as measured by school readiness, taking into account environmental factors (Bryk and Raudeenbush 1992; Joreskog, Sorbom, du Toit, and du Toit 2000).

We use multi-level random coefficient modeling because you can simultaneously investigate relationships within a particular hierarchical level, as well as relationships between or across hierarchical levels. This method provides a direct means of describing the extent to which a given client-level outcome, such as school readiness, varies across organizations. It recognizes that clients within an organization may be more similar to one another than clients in other organizations. Because this approach models both individual and organization residuals, it captures the partial interdependence of clients within the same organization. In other words, it formally adjusts for non-independence of clients in the same organization (Bryk and Raudenbush 1992). If this type of non-independence is not modeled than the estimated standard errors may be biased downward. This may, in turn, lead to misleading conclusions about the statistical and substantive impact of organizational variables (Snijders and Boskers 1999). Multi-level random coefficient modeling explores both lower level and higher level unit variance in the outcome measure, while maintaining the appropriate level of analysis for the other variables.7

As mentioned previously, our study has two levels; the first level is client. Independent variables measured at this level include parental age, level of education, gross

7 For a thorough discussion of this method and an example of its application to model performance management see Heinrich (2002).
income, employment status, and perception of teaching quality. The response or dependent variable is the parent’s perception of their child’s school readiness. The second level is organization; we include measures about management outcomes, management capacity, and program capacity. In this study, we examine whether there is a relationship between management outcomes, management capacity, program capacity, and program outcomes. Ideally, we wanted to estimate the full model displayed in Figure 1; however, as with any attempt to measure or implement a theoretical “ideal” model, challenges arose, as multi-level modeling only allows response or dependent variables on level 1 (Mels 2003). As a result, we estimate only the direct effects of management processes (as captured as management capacity) on program outcomes (see Figure 2). In addition, because we are limited to 22 observations at level 2, we are unable to incorporate a confirmatory factor analysis structure into our analysis. Therefore, we developed a series of additive indices that are included in the analysis (see Appendix 1). We constructed each index after factor analyzing and examining the reliability of the indicators.

**Measures**

To operationalize the dimensions of organizational performance described in this paper, we drew indicators from the many studies of public and nonprofit organizational performance or organizational operation. The following discussion addresses the selected measures in more detail. Table 1 and Appendix 1 explain our measures. In addition, we

---

8 Gerhard Mels, SSI Scientific Software International, August, September 2003. Extensive research was undertaken to determine an appropriate statistical method to undertake full measurement of the ideal model proposed in Figure 1. Unfortunately, none was found at the time of conducting this analysis.

9 Determining what the “best” indicators to select can be an almost impossible task to perfect, as there are numerous measures that have been argued to be important for assessing performance. Campbell (1977), in an early examination of this topic, specified thirty different variables that had been used as indices of performance or effectiveness.
provide information on the operationalization of each of the variables included in the analysis and information about the construction of each index used in the analysis, including the range, mean, standard deviation, and alpha coefficient. In addition, we examine the relationship between measures to ensure that the measures are tapping different dimensions of the overall constructs of management outcomes, management capacity, and program capacity.

*Management Outcomes.* We include one set of factors related to management outcomes: voluntary turnover (objective measure) and operating staff job satisfaction (perceptual measure). In the human resources management literature, organizational turnover is often the primary indicator of the effectiveness of management, both its systems and procedures (Campbell 1977; Fitz-enz 1994; Markowich 1995; Delery & Doty 1996; Martinez 1996; Ulrich 1997; Davidson 1998). Lower turnover is indicative of a strong and more effective organization; in part, this is because turnover creates high organizational costs when an employee departs, such as the cost of recruiting and training a new employee and the time needed to bring a new employee through the learning curve (Price 1977; Cascio 1982). Turnover has been especially troublesome in particular job areas, such as information technology, and sometimes the difficulty of hiring and retaining in particular areas results in additional expenditures for higher salaries or recruiting bonuses or the reallocation of existing resources (Selden & Moynihan 2000). Finally, like Phillips (1996), we believe that employee job satisfaction, measured by the line staffs’ assessment of the satisfaction they have in conducting their duties and their overall motivation for work, is a perceptual measure of management outcomes. Many previous studies of organizational performance or effective management have included job satisfaction as key indicator of this concept (Campbell 1977; Van de Ven...
and Ferry 1980). Both of these measures are important outcomes of the management system; however, because these variables are not significantly related, they appear to be tapping something different in evaluating the performance of management in an organization. The correlation between these two variables is negative as expected, -.11, but not statistically significant. Moreover, as shown in Table 1, while voluntary turnover is exceeding high in the organizations examined in this study, on average 21% per year, in these organizations, the average employee’s job satisfaction does not reflect an overly negative view of the organization. Here, it is important to include both the objective and the perceptual measure of employee satisfaction to truly capture the dynamics in the organizations. The data indicates that employees are leaving the organizations rapidly, but they are not overly dissatisfied with their positions. The disparity of this finding raises serious questions about what is going on within the field of early care and education and the possible management systems and operation problems that may exist and how they are affecting the overall performance of the human service organizations in this field.

Management Capacity. Generally, scholars find that more effective nonprofit and public organizations have similar management practices, certain structures and processes that are generally accepted as the best practices within the field (Herman & Renz, 1998, 1999). We have collapsed many different processes and structures into the comprehensive management construct of management capacity. We view management capacity as the degree to which the necessary systems and processes are in place to maintain an organization (Ingraham & Donahue 2000a, b). Three sets of objective and perceptual variables are included as indicators of management capacity: management infrastructure, employee training, and
performance management system (see Table 1). First, we include three objective measures to probe the management infrastructure of the organization (IT system, mission statement, and written financial policies). We also include a perceptual measure of the infrastructure of management. Appendix 2 presents the correlations of these variables. Looking across the three objective measures, on average, the infrastructure is only partially developed, with just over half of the organizations studied, for example, having a mission statement. The perceptual measure of management infrastructure is also not overly positive, with the average value \((8.37/3=2.79)\) suggesting that management does not always create conditions that promote organizational learning and the management capacity present in these organizations may not be work to its full potential.

The other two other dimensions of management capacity relate to the human resource management (HRM) systems. The first component of the human resource management system examined is training. The two objective measures of the training system are not significantly correlated with the teachers’ perceptions of training (see Appendix 1). Both sets of indicators, however, do suggest that, on average, the organizations studied commit considerable resources to training. The second HRM system examined is the performance management system; this includes measures of feedback and compensation. All of the organizations in the study conduct annual performance reviews. However, comparatively, teachers do not perceive that regular feedback is an organizational norm. This further illustrates the importance of collecting both objective and perceptual information. Having a program in place does not necessarily mean it is implemented or that it produces meaningful information and/or action. Finally, teachers are extremely dissatisfied with their pay \(((6.12/4)=1.53 \text{ on a five point scale})\). Considering that the average salary of teachers in these
organizations is $18,539, this finding is not surprising. There is a moderate relationship between the average salary of teachers and teachers’ satisfaction with their pay ($r = .34$).

Program Capacity. We include several indicators of program capacity, indicators evaluating the capacity to provide early care and education services. We focus on the quality of the classroom, the quality of the teachers, and the nature of the services provided as the measures of the overall capacity of these organizations to provide early care and education services. We use the Early Care Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) to measure process quality or capacity in the classroom.\textsuperscript{10} The three other objective measures of program capacity include the education and experience of the lead teacher and the diversity of services provided by the organization, commonly used indicators of quality early care and education services (Helburn and Bergmann 2002; Lombardi 2003). We include one perceptual measure of program capacity, the parents’ perception of the quality of the teacher. The correlations between the variables capturing these dimensions are presented in Appendix 2.

Program Outcomes. As stated, we use parental assessments of the school readiness of their children as the program outcome produced by these human service organizations providing early care and education services. While school readiness is only one outcome sought by some of the programs examined in this study, we contend that it is one of the most important outcomes in a study of early care and education, the particular programming under examination. Many state legislatures have invested in preschool programs believing that

\textsuperscript{10} The instrument is comprised of 37 items in the following seven areas: personal care routines, language reasoning experiences, activities, staff-child interaction, program structure, and parent and staff. Each of the 37 items are rated a 1 (minimal) to 7 (excellent) by an observer (Harms, Cryer, and Clifford 1990). The instrument has been widely used in research on early education and care (Vandell and Wolfe 2002).
“participation in high quality early childhood education programs increases children’s
readiness for school” (Ferguson in Proceedings 1999, 2). Moreover, as the amount of public
support for early care and education increases, external pressures increase to hold those
programs accountable for school readiness (Bowman et al. 2000). The “best” method of
measuring school readiness has not yet been determined, presenting a challenge in selecting
the most appropriate measure of this outcome (Bowman et al. 2000; Love, Aber, and Brooks-
Gunn 1999; Proceedings 1999). Kagan notes that “a decade after the call was issued an
agreed-upon standard [of school readiness] is not yet in place (Kagan in Proceedings 1999, 3).
A report by the National Research Council notes the potential misuses of traditional
standardized tests and measurements and Love, Aber and Brooks-Gunn (1999) suggest using
a diversity of methods to gauge school readiness. Love et al (1999)’s recommendation is to
measure school readiness using parental reports, kindergarten and first teacher reports,
principal and assistant principal reports, as well as community data. Since we do not track
preschool students after they leave their programs in this study, we are limiting our analysis to
parental reports of school readiness.

The descriptive analyses presented in this section, Table 1, and Appendices 1-3
illustrate the importance of incorporating multiple dimensions of performance and different
types of measures. If studies rely primarily on “objective” measures of management and
program systems or capacity, they may fail to capture the complexity that plagues
management of all organizations – the gap between the adoption and implementation or
perceived implementation of management systems and program characteristics or capacity.
Given that the aforementioned indicators of management and programs are tapping different
aspects of management and program capacity (indicated by the bivariate correlations and
factor analysis (not presented but available from the authors), it is important to include the
different dimensions and measures of management and program capacity into an equation
explaining the ultimate bottom line for these organizations, client (program) outcomes.

Results

Table 2 shows the results of the multi-level random coefficient model of program
outcomes in the 22 organizations. The organization level variables explain 73 percent of the
organizational level variations in the school readiness outcome. The client level variables
explain 38 percent of the variation in the school readiness outcome. The later finding is
particularly interesting because approximately 74 percent of the total variation in the school
readiness measure is within organization (at the client level). Given that many factors outside
the context of the program a child’s is enrolled may influence a child’s school readiness, such
as a child’s innate cognitive capacity and family environment, it is not surprising that more
variation occurs at the individual level and that the model explains less of it. Other studies
have found similar trends (see for example Heinrich 2002).

When looking at the two measures of management outcomes, only the perceptual
measure, job satisfaction, is statistically significant. There is an expected increase of .09 in
school readiness for each unit increase in the teaching staff’s job satisfaction. Numerous
studies have demonstrated that in providing early care and education services, teaching staff is
a crucial variable in explaining early care and education quality (Gormley 1995). In addition,
more generally for human service organizations, employees are the crucial raw material of
these organizations; the service technology of most human service organizations depends
upon their front-line workers (Hasenfeld 1983). How well these employees are managing and
therefore the degree to which they are satisfied in the organization (the aforementioned management outcome) will have a significant impact on the programs provided by these organizations. Our results demonstrate that this is the case. Interestingly, voluntary turnover, our objective measure of management outcomes, is not statistically significant. Because voluntary turnover is so high in this field, parents may be used to teachers leaving during the year and therefore it may not influence their perception of how well their children are being prepared as long as the quality of the replacement staff is similar to the staff that left (Helburn and Bergmann 2002; Lombardi 2003).

Looking across measures of management capacity used to predict this model, all but one are statistically significant. However, three of the indicators have a negative impact on parents’ perceptions of their child’s school readiness. The management capacity variables that have a positive and significant impact on school readiness are adoption of an organizational mission statement, training expenditures per staff member, perception of performance feedback, starting salary of teachers, and satisfaction with salary. These variables would generally indicate a high management capacity and therefore a better capacity to accomplish organizational and program objectives.

The objective and perceptual measures of salary both have a positive and significant impact on school readiness. Historically, the salaries in the early care and education field are considered low compared to the civilian workforce (Whitebrook, Howes, and Phillips 1998). In fact the gap between wages of early education and care teachers and the civilian labor grows as educational levels increases (Whitebrook, Howes, and Phillips 1998). The National Child Care Staffing Study found that wages were the most important predictor of staff turnover (Whitebrook, Howes, and Phillips 1998, 74). Even controlling for turnover, we find
that teaching staff salaries and teachers’ satisfaction with their salaries are important
predictors of school readiness. The consistency in findings across the objective and
perceptual measures highlights the saliency and importance of compensation in this field.

Our measures of training are significant but not in the same direction. The positive
relationship of training dollars spent per early care and education staff demonstrates the extent
to which an organization actually commits to improving its teaching staff. However, there
appears to be a knowledge or learning gap between the actual training provided and the
degree to which the teachers in these organizations internalize that training (see Appendix 2).
Exploring that gap is beyond the scope of this project but represents an important line of
inquiry for future research. Nonetheless, the overall commitment of these organizations to the
training of their staff shows the positive impact that management capacity can have on
program outcomes. It also highlights the importance of looking at management capacity
variables, such as training, both from the organizational perspective and from the front-level
perceptive. It is not simply enough to understand the capacity in place, scholars also need to
understand how staff makes sense of that capacity (Weick 1995).

Like management capacity, the results for the indicators of program capacity are
mixed. Several of the objective measures, teacher experience and actual services offered have
a significant but negative impact on school readiness. On the other hand, as stated, our
perceptual measure of teaching quality, teacher education, and classroom quality are
positive and significant. Classroom quality is particularly important because it represents the
technology used to prepare a child for kindergarten. The data suggest that parents’
perceptions of quality and the actual classroom quality are important predictors of their
assessment of their child’s readiness for school. Our findings that teacher quality is an
important predictor is consistent with Henry, Henderson, and Baile’s (2000) research that demonstrated a strong linkage between teaching styles and child readiness for kindergarten. Also consistent with the early care and education literature, we found a significant linkage between the education of the lead teacher, another commonly used measure of quality, and student readiness for school (Bowman et al. 2000; Vandell and Wolfe 2002).

Therefore, while some of the indicators of program capacity do not perform as expected, possibly due to low overall measures of these indicators, in general we found that many of the important indicators of program capacity have the predicted impact on the program outcomes.

The model also included control variables related to parent’s socioeconomic level and whether the site is located in New York. Two control variables impacted parents’ perceptions of school readiness. One control variable that impacted school readiness is whether the organization is located in New York. There are many possible explanations for this, some that may be out of the purview of this paper. However, a strong possible explanation may be that parents in New York State have higher expectations for early education and care than those in Virginia. New York is generally considered one of the leading states in terms of resources and regulations in early education and care (Education Week 2002). Parents, possibly being aware of this, may expect more from these organizations providing early care and education in New York State in comparison to those parents in Virginia. However, without deeper exploration of the parents’ perceptions in the two states, it is difficult to surface an exact explanation for this finding. The second variable that impacted school readiness is parental education. Better educated parents were less positive about their child’s readiness for school.
Discussion & Conclusion

Limitations and Challenges

While the results of this analysis demonstrate some important inter-connections between the theorized dimensions of performance, they should be interpreted in light of several limitations arising from methodological challenges encountered. First, the multilevel random coefficient model provides more power than ordinary least squares regression when considering the impact of having a nested structure. The sample size at level 2 was relatively small. This may result in an inability to detect some possible effects. Moreover, it is impossible to estimate the indices using confirmatory factor analysis within the multilevel analysis because of the small level 2 sample. Replication of these findings using larger samples of organizations is needed.

Second, the negative relationships between some of the measures of management capacity and program outcomes may be influenced by the inability to estimate indirect effects in multilevel modeling. The methodological tool used in this analysis did not allow us to estimate the effects of management capacity on management outcomes and then the effect of these outcomes on program outcomes. The results presented in this paper are important but future research should explore other avenues to estimate the model proposed in Figure 1.

Third, because our sample is limited to a small number of early care and education organizations in New York and Virginia, these findings may not generalize to individuals living in different states. Moreover, selective attrition of parents may limit the generalizability of these findings. Because data were collected over an academic year, some parents left the programs under study.
Possibilities

Nonetheless, while we have not completely examined the theorized inter-relationships in our “ideal” model of organizational performance (as demonstrated in Figure 1), the analysis presented in this paper has advanced the development of this model in several important ways. First, we have demonstrated that these two dimensions of organizational performance, management and program, are clearly distinct and together must be assessed to provide a more complete picture of organizational performance. We have demonstrated that management capacity and management outcomes have an impact on program outcomes, along with the impact of the overall capacity of the program. In addition, we have shown that both objective and perceptual measures are crucial in evaluating performance. We explore the match (or lack thereof as demonstrated with some of our measures) between objective reality and staff’s perceptions of this reality. This approach can lead scholars to more fully understand what is occurring in an organization. In exploring the operation of any organization, we must be attentive to both the structure and processes in place and the degree to which these processes and structures (conceptualized here as capacity) are actually operating at the level intended. In addition, we have demonstrated that perceptions of management outcomes are as important as objectively assessed management outcomes and should therefore be included in any model seeking to capture organizational performance.

With this model and the empirical examination of it presented in this paper, we have provided persuasive evidence that scholars seeking to explore organizational performance should investigate factors at both the management and the program level. In addition, scholars need to gather both objective and perceptual measures on important indicators of performance in order to examine the full implementation and evaluation of these key indicators of
performance. Our model can be further developed through additional studies that employ larger samples in order to refine the concepts and measures put forward in this paper. In addition, this model can be further improved by examining the indirect effects discussed in the earlier section. Again, we recognize that the model and analysis presented in this paper by no means represents the final word on organizational performance. However, we believe that it is a useful contribution to the ongoing challenge of assessing the performance of nonprofit and public organizations and will hopefully contribute to increased dialogue about and further study and research of organizational performance.
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Table 2  
Multilevel Random Coefficient Model of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6.50***</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary turnover</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (Teacher perception)</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology system</td>
<td>-0.06***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written financial policies</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management infrastructure (Teacher perception)</td>
<td>-0.053***</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training expenditures per staff member</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of training provided (Teacher)</td>
<td>-0.15***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of feedback (Teacher)</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting annual teacher’s salary</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with salary (Teacher perception)</td>
<td>.04***</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom quality</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of services offered</td>
<td>-0.03*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of lead teacher</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead teacher’s years of experience in field</td>
<td>-0.03***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception teacher quality (Parent)</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>-.46***</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s age</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s gross income</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s level of education</td>
<td>-1.26**</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2*Log (Likelihood)= 496.81

***Significant at .01 level  
**Significant at .05 level  
*Significant at .10 level
Appendix 1: Construction of Indices

Program Outcome
School Readiness (mean=6.43, std=1.09, range= 1-7, Cronbach Alpha=.84)
Following two questions combined, all with scales from 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree.
   - How satisfied are you with how well the center is…
     - Helping my child to grow and develop
     - Preparing my child to enter kindergarten

Management Outcomes
Voluntary Turnover: Percentage of teaching staff that left the organization voluntarily (annual).

Teaching Staff Job Satisfaction (mean=14.70, std=1.49, range= 1-17, Cronbach Alpha=.74)
Following four questions combined, all with scales from 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree.
   - Overall, I enjoy the work I do.
   - In general, I am satisfied with my job.
   - I intend to work in early childhood education at least tow more years.
   - I’m not in a dead-end job.

Management Capacity
IT System (mean= 2.12, std=1.51, range= 1-5)
Following five questions combined, all with scales from 0=No to 1=Yes
   - Does your organization employ specialized computer software to do the following?
     - Track enrollment
     - Collect parent payment
     - Bill outside vendors
     - Track child assessments
     - Manage staff scheduling

Management infrastructure (mean=8.37, std=2.17, range= 1-13, Cronbach Alpha=.90)
Following three questions combined, all with scales from 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree.
   - We are encouraged to experiment when we are faced with a new situation.
   - We evaluate the results of these experiments and incorporate lessons into the way we “do business.”
   - We effectively maintain and utilize records of organizational experiences.

Teaching Staff Perception of Training Provided (mean=9.84, std= 1.77, range= 1-13, Cronbach Alpha=.90)
Following three questions combined, all with scales from 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree.
   - I get the training I need to go my job well.
• I get the training I need to further develop my skills.
• I have the opportunity to learn skills that will improve my chances for promotion.

Teaching Staff Perception of Performance Feedback Provided (mean=6.38, std= 1.39, range= 1-9, Cronbach Alpha=.80)
Following two questions combined, all with scales from 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree.
• I receive annual, formal feedback about my performance.
• I receive regular coaching and feedback about my performance.

Teaching Staff Perception of Satisfaction with Salary (mean=6.12, std=3.30, range= 1-17, Cronbach Alpha=.96)
Following four questions combined, all with scales from 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree.
• In general, I am satisfied with my salary.
• My salary is fair considering my background and skills.
• My salary is fair considering my job responsibilities.
• In general, I am satisfied with my pay given the amount of work I do.

Program Capacity
Parent Perception of Teacher Quality (mean=19.92, std=3.13, range= 1-22, Cronbach Alpha=.89)
Following seven questions combined, all with scales from 1=Never to 4=Always
• My child gets lots of individual attention
• The teacher is warm and affectionate to my child
• My child is treated with respect by teachers
• The teacher handles discipline matters easily without being harsh
• My child’s teacher is open to new information and learning
• The teacher is supportive of me as a parent
• The teacher accepts the way I raise my child

Diversity of Services (mean=10.68, std= 4.68, range= 1-20)
Following twenty questions combined, all with scales from 0=No to 1=Yes
Please provide the following information about the types of services that are provided to at least some children at the child care site.
Vision screening                  Physical therapy
Hearing screening                Transportation from home to program
Dental screening                 Transportation from program to home
Dental services                  Nutritionist available for parent consultation
Medical screening               Breakfast
Medical services                 Lunch
Social service referrals         Evening care
Mental health screening          Weekend care
Mental health counseling services Sick child care
Speech therapy
Social services assistance for parents
Table 1
Comparison of Objective and Perceptual Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>Perceptual Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary turnover</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>Job satisfaction (Teacher perception)</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology system</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>Management infrastructure (Teacher perception)</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement *</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written financial policies *</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training expenditures per staff member</td>
<td>$ 434.77</td>
<td>708.32</td>
<td>Perception of training provided (Teacher)</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual performance evaluation *</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Perception of feedback (Teacher)</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting annual teacher’s salary</td>
<td>$18,539.12</td>
<td>4675.49</td>
<td>Satisfaction with salary (Teacher perception)</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Quality</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of services offered</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of lead teacher ***</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Perception teacher quality (Parent)</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience in early education</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 0= No  
** 1-5 Scale (Strongly disagree to Strongly agree)  
*** 1- Some high school  
2- High school  
3- Advanced degree  
5- Some grad school  
6- Master’s  
7- Ph.D
## Appendix 2

### Correlation Matrix of Management Capacity Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Capacity</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>WFP</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>TrExp</th>
<th>TrP</th>
<th>Feedbk</th>
<th>ATS</th>
<th>SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information technology system (IT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement* (MS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written financial policies* (WFP)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management infrastructure (Teacher perce (MI)</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training expenditures per staff member (TrExp)</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of training provided (Teacher) (TrP)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of feedback (Teacher) (Feedbk)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting annual teacher’s salary (ATS)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with salary (Teacher perception)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at .05 level or higher

## Appendix 3

### Correlation Matrix of Program Capacity Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Capacity</th>
<th>CQ</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>YE</th>
<th>TQ</th>
<th>DS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom quality (CQ)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of lead teacher (LT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience in early education (YE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception teacher quality (Parent) (TQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of services offered (DS)</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance at .05 level or higher
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