

University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2007-05-01

An Empirical Study of Employee Relations and Managerial Malpractice Risks in a Four-Year Public Higher Education System

Robert Lee Brown EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Lee Brown, Robert EdD, "An Empirical Study of Employee Relations and Managerial Malpractice Risks in a Four-Year Public Higher Education System" (2007). *Dissertations*. 770.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/770>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

**AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF EMPLOYEE RELATIONS AND MANAGERIAL
MALPRACTICE RISKS IN A FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION
SYSTEM**

by

Robert Lee Brown

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education
University of San Diego

May 2007

Dissertation Committee
Dr. Fred Galloway, Ed.D., Chair
Dr. Ronn Johnson, Ph.D., Member
Dr. Robert Donmoyer, Ph.D., Member

© Copyright by *Robert Lee Brown* 2007
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Over the last decade, the rapid rise in college tuitions and fees has become a national priority, with congressional committees and scholars interested in solving this persistently stubborn and often intractable problem. Although a number of reasons for this phenomenon have been discussed, one theoretically plausible but untested explanation involves the extent to which campus climate may be empirically linked to the costs of managing various legal claims against the university, including workers' compensation, employment practice, and stress claims. To test the empirical validity of this hypothesis, this study gathered campus climate and claims data from 23 campuses and 25 auxiliary enterprises that comprise a large statewide system of public four-year higher education.

The campus climate data, which was generated via a survey of risk managers, human resource professionals, and select others, produced a series of four climate indices that described the state of communications, codetermination, support, and rewards among supervisors and employees. Results suggest that on campuses and in auxiliaries, the relationships among supervisors and employees are strongest in terms of support, followed closely by communications, rewards and codetermination. Most importantly, these index scores are almost exactly in the middle of the distribution, suggesting that on average, this system is neither excelling nor failing in terms of campus climate.

When this campus climate data was used together with select demographic measures to explain variation in the number, dollar value, and per-capita number of claims, two variables were consistent predictors – whether or not the unit was a campus or auxiliary and the size of the unit. Unfortunately, there was little evidence to support

the empirical linkage between campus climate and claims, with the exception of the codetermination index, which was a significant predictor of the dollar value of workers' compensation cases; specifically, the higher the level of codetermination the lower the dollar value of workers' compensation claims.

Taken together, these results suggest that there is clearly room for improvement in the campus climate within this system, and that furthermore, increases in the level of codetermination within the system may lead to reductions in the dollar value of workers compensation claims.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this research project to all working people!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Live as if you were going to die tomorrow and learn as if you were going to live forever – Ghandi.

Fred Galloway, simple words or deeds will never convey my sincere appreciation for the love and assistance I have received from you throughout this process! Thank you so much for being inspiring and providing me with the faith to believe that I could accomplish this goal! Throughout this journey you have been extremely kind, compassionate, caring and patient and to you I owe a great debt of gratitude. During our many conversations you convinced me that the true measure of a great student is not going through school but growing through school; not exceptional grade point averages but the desire to use what you've learned to make life better for others. I will forever be grateful to you for your teaching and promise to share what I've learned to help others.

I would like to also thank the other members of my dissertation committee, Bob Donmoyer and Ronn Johnson for your help and guidance during this journey. Like Fred, I also owe the two of you a great debt. In your unique and distinct ways you both have had a profound influence on my growth and development in the most important developmental stage of my life. Your belief in me and the way you've assisted me in this learning process provided me with a model to serve others in ways that will help them achieve their goals. I will forever be grateful to you for your support!

In addition to my dissertation committee I would like to thank all the professors, staff and fellow students in the School of Leadership and Education Science for sharing and making this journey not only enlightening, but enjoyable and fulfilling.

Additionally, I would like to acknowledge the friendship and support of so many of my co-workers and the following people during the years of my doctoral studies. A special thanks to Leslie Levinson, Melinda Coil, Charlene Minnick, Warren Johnson, Dan Howell and Michael Beatty.

Finally, I am forever grateful to my family and friends for their love, support and devotion; namely my wife Hella, my parents, brothers, sisters, children and grandchildren. Only through your belief in me, love and compassion has this growth of my life been possible and to all of you goes my largest debt of thanks. To you, I simply say, I love you very much!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT..... | vii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT..... | viii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | ix |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | xii |
| CHAPTER | |
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Problem Statement..... | 4 |
| Statement of Purpose..... | 4 |
| Research Questions..... | 5 |
| 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE..... | 6 |
| Importance of Jobs..... | 6 |
| Jobs Impact on Physical and Mental Health..... | 8 |
| Supervisor and Employee Relations..... | 10 |
| Risk Management in Higher Education..... | 14 |
| Climate Surveys..... | 17 |
| Definition of Key Terms..... | 21 |
| Codetermination..... | 21 |
| Communication..... | 21 |
| Management..... | 22 |
| Reward..... | 22 |
| Support..... | 22 |
| Supervisor..... | 22 |
| 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY..... | 24 |
| Sample Selection..... | 24 |
| Instrumentation..... | 25 |
| Survey Participants and Procedures..... | 27 |
| Data Analysis..... | 28 |
| Research Question #1..... | 28 |
| Research Question #2..... | 29 |
| 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS..... | 30 |
| Participants and Survey Procedures..... | 30 |
| Sample Demographics..... | 32 |
| Data Analysis Research Question #1..... | 34 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Differences in climate indices | 36 |
| Data Analysis Research Question #2..... | 40 |
| Regressions..... | 42 |
| Regressions Summary | 45 |
| 5. CONCLUSION | 47 |
| Contributions to the Literature | 47 |
| Findings | 50 |
| Policy Implications of Research..... | 52 |
| Implications for Future Research | 53 |
| REFERENCES | 56 |
| Appendix | |
| A. Supervisory Relationship Inventory Cover Letter..... | 63 |
| B. Supervisory Relationship Inventory | 65 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|------|
| Table 1. Demographic Profile of Campus and Auxiliary Respondents | p.33 |
| Table 2. Weighted Climate Indices for the Campuses | p.35 |
| Table 3. Weighted Climate Indices for the Auxiliaries | p.35 |
| Table 4. Means & Standard Deviations Climate Indices Risk Mangers | p.37 |
| Table 5. Means & Standard Deviations Climate Indices for H/R | p.37 |
| Table 6. Means & Standard Deviations Climate Indices for Others | p.37 |
| Table 7. Means & Standard Deviations Climate Indices for Supervisors | p.38 |
| Table 8. Means & Standard Deviations Climate Indices for Non-Supervisors | p.38 |
| Table 9. Means & Standard Deviations of Climate Indices for Females | p.39 |
| Table 10. Means & Standard Deviations of Climate Indices for Males | p.40 |
| Table 11. Average Number of Claims - Campuses and Auxiliaries | p.41 |
| Table 12. Average Dollar Value of Claims - Campuses and Auxiliaries | p.41 |
| Table 13. Per Capita Claims Data for Campuses and Auxiliaries | p.42 |
| Table 14. Estimated Coefficients and Levels of Significance for Variables in the Weighted Workers' Compensation Claims Regressions | p.44 |
| Table 15. Estimated Coefficients and Levels of Significance for the Variables in the Weighted Stress Claims Regressions | p.45 |

Chapter 1: Introduction

Over the last decade, the rapid rise in college tuitions and fees has become a national priority, with congressional committees, research institutes, and higher education scholars all interested in solving this persistently stubborn and often intractable problem. Although a number of reasons for the phenomena have been discussed, including the highly inelastic demand for higher education, the rapidly increasing costs of technology, and the observation that many cash-strapped state governments have been balancing their budgets on the backs of college and university students for years (American Council on Education, 1999), the currently accepted conclusion among analysts is that when it comes to understanding the reasons behind the rapidly increasing costs of college, “there is no overarching explanation” (Heller, 2001).

However, when the American public was asked their thoughts on the causes of this phenomenon, they had no problem identifying the number one factor as wasteful spending by college and university management (Immerwahr, 2002). Although few in the general public may understand the intricacies of college budgets and fund accounting, their beliefs have more than a little currency. In fiscal year 2003/04 a four-year system of public higher education, hereafter referred to as the Western State University system (WSU) spent approximately 35 million dollars to manage its employment practice, stress and workers compensation costs – despite the exhaustive cost control efforts by WSU’s Chancellor’s Office and its’ Risk Management Authority (in partnership with their insurance broker). And more importantly, since the indirect costs of managing risks are estimated to be about six times higher than the direct costs (St Paul Travelers, 2006) the WSU system may have expended as much as \$210 million to manage its 2003/04

employment related claims. To put this number in perspective, at current tuition levels within the WSU system, this amount of money would be enough to cover the tuition for more than 70,000 students.

Unfortunately, the large expenses incurred throughout the WSU system are fairly typical among institutions of higher education these days; in fact, Ende, Anderson, and Crego (1997) argue that the volume and complexity of legal issues involving institutions of higher education have grown enormously and shows no sign of abating. Equally telling is the recent trend towards full-time legal counsel on university and college campuses, in lieu of part-time or contract counsel (Slimak & Berkowitz, 1983). As Watson (personal communication, April 20, 2003) argues, "Employees in higher education feel more personally involved and emotions run higher. Consequently, there are higher incidences of employment practice lawsuits than in private industry and dollar settlements tend to be much higher than in the corporate world."

This increase in litigation has negative implications for higher education for at least two important reasons (Jones 1998). First, lawsuits divert colleges from their primary missions of teaching, research, and service. Deans, department chairs, and other supervisors often find themselves enmeshed in a myriad of employment-related issues that can arise under the most unexpected circumstances. It is not surprising, therefore, that administrators on college campuses have become increasingly concerned about saying or doing the wrong thing -- a reaction that could potentially stifle the open forum that those in the academy treasure. Second, in addition to the expenses directly related to the management and litigation of these claims, there are a number of less tangible indirect costs associated with increased litigation. These indirect costs include low employee

morale, reduced team-work, additional stress, increased time spent recruiting, hiring, and training new people, medical costs, absenteeism, reduced productivity, increased work loads and overtime.

Although there may be a number of disparate contributors to this precipitous rise in litigation on many college and university campuses, one potentially important explanation involves managerial malpractice, defined as the act of “encouraging and supporting practices that produce unprofessional, unproductive, and incompetent managers” (Gilley, 1996). Since between 60 and 70% of all the lawsuits filed against colleges and universities are employment related and since the majority of these claims are filed by current employees of the institutions (Letring, 1997), the managerial malpractice hypothesis certainly represents a quite reasonable explanation. And as Gilley argues, symptoms of such a problem include spending valuable time fixing managerial incompetence instead of hiring qualified managers; promoting people to management who don’t know how to manage; keeping managers who are not good at getting results through people; selecting new managers because they are the best performer or producer without regard for their people skills; keeping managers who preach the importance of teamwork but then reward individuals who work at standing out from the crowd; and allowing managers to say one thing but do another (Gilley, 1996).

However, despite the existence of anecdotal evidence suggesting a link between managerial malpractice and employment practice claims on many university campuses, there is little, if any, statistical support for this hypothesis. To begin to fill the existing gap, this study used multiple regression analysis to estimate the extent to which the perception of these practices among selected individuals at WSU campuses and auxiliary

units was linked to the frequency and severity of (a) stress (b) employment practice and (c) workers' compensation claims filed at those campuses and auxiliary units. This process involved gathering information on managerial malpractice from either; 1) human resources, 2) finance, 3) operations, 4) workers' compensation, and 5) risk management personnel through the use of a web-based survey, and from preexisting public databases that describe the number and direct costs of stress, employee practice and workers' compensation claims at the various WSU campuses and auxiliary units.

Problem Statement

During the last decade, the rapid increase in the volume and complexity of legal issues involving institutions of higher education has put significant upward pressure on college costs, which ultimately translates into increases in tuition and fees. Despite the attention of many analysts, there have been few, if any systematic attempts to test the managerial malpractice hypothesis on campuses. Since the only evidence linking managerial malpractice with increases in litigation on campuses is anecdotal in nature, the need exists to systematically document this potentially important linkage.

Statement of Purpose

To empirically test the relationship between managerial malpractice and the number of employee claims filed against that campus or auxiliary unit, this study first attempted to measure the level of managerial malpractice that exists in the Western State University system (WSU) as reported by selected individuals involved in human resources, operations, finance, workers' compensation and risk management.

This information was then used to estimate a series of multiple regression models that examined the extent to which perceptions of managerial malpractice, together with such demographic factors as primary job responsibility, leadership role, gender of respondent, female supervisory ratios and type of unit (campus or auxiliary), could be used to explain variation in legal actions taken against the particular unit, defined as (1) the number and costs of stress, employee practice and workers' compensation claims. As mentioned earlier in this section, the data on managerial malpractice was gathered through the use of a web-based survey of selected individuals while the demographic and litigation related data was gathered through public records kept by the WSU system.

Research Questions

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. Within the Western State University system, how do those responsible for either, human resources, finance, operations, workers' compensation or risk management processes describe supervisory practices within their campuses or auxiliaries?
2. To what extent do campus demographics and the perceptions of supervisory practices explain variation in frequency and severity of stress, employment practice and workers' compensation claims filed within the WSU system?

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of this chapter is twofold: to provide a conceptual framework or theoretical foundation that supports the proposed research, and to identify and review enough of the relevant literature to situate and contextualize this work. Since the intent of this study was to provide an empirical linkage between the perceived state of supervisor-employee relations within one of the nation's largest four-year systems of higher education and the frequency with which employment practice litigation and workers' compensation lawsuits are filed within the system, this chapter reviews several important areas in the literature. Specifically, this section first examines the state of supervisor and employee relations, including issues, trends, and unresolved concerns. The examination of supervisor and employee relations is then followed by a discussion surrounding both the incidence of, and costs associated with, the rapid rise in employment practice litigation and workers' compensation across the U.S. Afterwards, special attention is dedicated to litigation and risk management in higher education. This section then focuses on ways in which both individuals and organizations attempt to measure the extent of employer-employee relations, often referred to as climate surveys, assessments or inventories. To complete the chapter, the definitions of several key terms used throughout the dissertation are provided.

Importance of Jobs

Jobs are important to everyone because virtually all people have to work or have worked to provide for themselves and their dependents. The average person will dedicate more hours to work than any other activity throughout their adult life. In addition to the previous statement, many workers bring a set of both intrinsic and extrinsic values to

their work, which help guide their beliefs and work-related activities (George & Jones, 1997). As a result, one might reasonably assume there is a natural connection between a person's work life and all other aspects of his/her life. And despite the modern stresses associated with work (e.g., downsizing), individuals still need to be able to enjoy their work since work promotes high quality and social responsibility (Damon, 2004).

Jobs are important for other humanistic or motivational reasons as well. Abraham Maslow, for instance, identified a "Hierarchy of Needs" that he diagramed in the shape of a pyramid. Maslow believed that as men and women ascended to higher degrees of development, their needs changed. At the lower level their needs related to safety, food and shelter, and jobs are, of course, directly related to meeting these needs. At a higher level, needs change to social interaction and self worth, and in this respect jobs play a role too (Hoffman, 1988). As such, it is not surprising that for many individuals, their psychological identity is directly tied to their employment status.

Since the majority of individuals living in the U.S. will earn their livelihoods working for an organization, as opposed to being self-employed (Pfeffer, 1996), it is understandable that many people consider their coworkers to be their closest friends (Pfeffer, 2001). Given the role of jobs in helping people meet both basic and more advanced human needs, it seems that individuals will do almost anything to protect their jobs, which certainly includes filing employment-practice-related claims and engaging in legal battles. However, such filings are not always merely defensive moves.

The December, 2003 issue of the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, in fact, revealed that it is common in today's workplaces to find supervisors who are abusive to subordinates. The study, in fact, suggested that it is common for supervisors to engage in

sustained displays of hostile verbal or non-verbal abuse, use e-mails to harass employees, or intimidate employees by threatening job loss.

This disengaging behavior by supervisors, which occurs across industries, fuels a tendency for some employees to become engaged in fewer actions that promote organizational effectiveness, such as being team players or helping coworkers (Frank, Finnegan, & Taylor, 2004). Presumably, such behaviors might also increase employment-related litigation. Because of the potential impact that a supervisor has on an employee's life at work and away from work is significant, one might speculate that managing people in ways that are consistent with caring and understanding would be an uncontroversial idea (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997). Nonetheless, Giacalone & Jurkiewicz (2003) contends that people are often required to work in environments that promote dysfunction and conflict and are characterized by "fear, pressure, and impermanence." Clearly, employees deserve to be both productive and fulfilled at work and most people would agree that it is morally and ethically responsible to engage employees in ways that promotes caring and understanding.

Jobs Impact on Physical and Mental Health

One of the most powerful and, yet, non-surprising findings describing the effects of jobs on a employees health comes from researchers at the Tokyo Women's Medical University ("Blood Pressure Soars on Mondays," 2005) where researchers found that there were 20% more heart attacks on Mondays than on any other day of the week in Japan. An explanation for this finding was provided by Professor Keith Fox of the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary who theorized that, if somebody already has cardiovascular

disease, the stress of returning to work might just tip them over the edge and trigger a heart attack (BBC News, 2005).

Evanoff & Rosenstock (1994) reported that estimates of the annual direct and indirect medical costs associated with occupational stress in the United States have ranged from \$80 billion to \$150 billion and these estimates do not include the additional costs incurred from lost productivity. There are also numerous studies suggesting an association between psychosocial risk factors and workers' compensation claims (Pirainen, Rasanen, Kivimaki, 2003). One could conclude from credible research that some of these same psychosocial-emotional challenges could be positively influenced by supervisory practices promoting communications, rewards, support and teamwork. Consider for the moment the research conducted on job clarity, which requires quality communication between employees and their supervisors. Ryan, Bamptom (1988) and Ekberg (1994) have both shown a positive correlation between reports of role ambiguity (uncertain job expectations) and upper extremity disorders (particularly in the neck and shoulders), and uncertainty regarding the future of one's job has also found to be predictive of neck and shoulder discomfort (Hadler, 1998).

In addition to the empirical linkage between job clarity and upper extremity disorders, researchers have also found strong correlations between job dissatisfaction and upper extremity disorders. For example, in an empirical study of more than 3,200 machine operators, carpenters, and office workers, Tola (1988) found a strong positive correlation between job dissatisfaction and neck and shoulder physical complaints; similarly, Bigos et al (1991) found a positive correlation between job dissatisfaction and workers filing worker's compensation claims for back injuries. Upper extremity disorders

have also been empirically linked to the perceptions of control over one's job; the quality of work (Ekberg et al, 1994); the intensity of work (Heliovaara et al, 1991); and the amount of social support provided by supervisors and coworkers (Pot et al, 1998; Kompier, 1993). Taken together, the results of this research clearly suggest that an empirical linkage between select job-related characteristics and upper extremity disorders exists (Shoaf, Genaidy, & Huang, S. H. 1998); as such, one of the purposes of this research is to associate particular supervisory behaviors with variation in the number and costs of employee-practice-related complaints (e.g., stress and/or non-discriminatory free work environments) and worker's compensation experience modification rates in the various campuses and auxiliary units of the Western State University system (WSU).

Supervisor and Employee Relations

Successful organizations all have key characteristics in common -- they work together to 1) address problems to create a positive work environment, 2) assess the effectiveness of communication within a work group, 3) ensure that their employees feel that their hard work is both recognized and appreciated, and, last, but certainly not least, 4) strive for a climate that is conducive to the open exchange of performance expectations and feedback. Of course, managers and supervisors play a key role in making all of these things happen, and, as Whitener et. al. (1998) have shown, managers who collaborate with employees, explain decisions or provide opportunities for interaction, maintain open communication with, and show concern for individuals in the workplace are significantly more valued than those who do not.

Not surprisingly, a significant body of research has emerged that supports the contention that employees don't leave companies, they leave managers and supervisors

(Buckingham, 1999; Coffman, 2002; Collins, 2001; O'Reilly, 2000; Pfeiffer, 1998; Becker & Huselid, 1998). For example, according to recent research conducted by the Gallup organization, 55% of all U.S. workers are not fully engaged in their jobs and 16% are actively disengaged; taken together this means that 71% of the Americans who go to work every day aren't fully participating in their work. The implications from these two statements are both obvious and powerful: supervisors clearly play a crucial role in how well employees are engaged in the work place, and, if we as a nation are to move beyond operating at less than one third of our capacity, then we need to play close attention to the art and science of managing and leading.

To this end, by 1975 about two hundred books had been published on the subject of managing and leading, and, by 1997, that number had more than tripled and continues to increase at a rapid pace (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). During this twenty-two year period, more than nine thousand different systems, languages, principles, and paradigms have been used to help explain the mysteries of management and leadership (Coffman & Molina, 2002). However, given the rapid increase in the number of employee-related lawsuits documented by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC, 2006), clearly no magic bullet or simple strategy seems to exist that guarantees harmonious employer-employee relationships.

To protect workers and guarantee their employment-related rights, a number of important agencies and pieces of state and federal legislation have been created, including the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC 2006) in 1965, the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938, the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990, the Family Medical Leave Act in 1993, and a significant increase in OSHA safety

regulations. Despite the existence of these pieces of legislation, which clearly spell out the rights of employees, the number of lawsuits filed by employees alleging discrimination, harassment, and other employment-related violations has risen nearly fifty percent in recent years and damage awards in employment cases have catapulted to a record height (EEOC, 2004). Despite the fact that “employment disputes frequently concern the claimant's wish to be accorded dignity and respect as much as or more than they do the monetary or disciplinary remedies demanded” (Lind, Greenberg, Scott, & Welchans, T. D., 2000), even the amounts paid by employers in "routine" settlements are enough to devastate a small business. And unfortunately for many business owners, employment practices liability (EPL) lawsuits constitute the most common type of liability lawsuit today (AIG 2005). In fact, 57% of companies in the US have been named as defendants in at least one employment related lawsuit in the past five years, and almost 450 Employment Lawsuits are filed in the United States every day (Olson, 2006).

For employees that have incurred work-related injuries, workers' compensation laws were enacted to make litigation less costly for both employers and employees as well as to eliminate the need for injured workers to prove that their injuries were the employer's "fault". Employees who are injured on the job have an absolute right to medical care for that injury, and, in many cases, monetary payments to compensate for resulting temporary or permanent disabilities. Benefits of worker's comp laws vary among states, but usually include medical treatment, required rehabilitation, disability and continuing wages. Most employers are required to carry workers' compensation insurance, and in most states heavy financial penalties may be imposed on an employer that does not. Before the imposition of this system, however, employees who were

injured on the job were only able to seek compensation for their injuries from their employer through civil or torts law. Similarly, when new forms of workplace injury are discovered like work-related stress, the law often lags behind actual injury and offers no suitable compensation, forcing the employer and employee back to the courts. Taken together, this evidence suggests that managing workers compensation claims is a critical challenge that costs U.S. businesses approximately a billion dollars per week according to Brian Melas, of Liberty Mutual (<http://www.libertymutual.com>)

Interestingly, worker's compensation liability and income continuation laws that protect employees injured on the job were once thought to be exclusive remedies preventing employees from suing their employers for protections afforded them under Title VII. However, state and federal regulations mandating employment practices have continued to broaden, giving employees who feel they have been wronged greater recourse. In addition, the courts are imposing greater liability on employers in discrimination laws; one of the most significant examples of this is a recent ruling that, experts say, makes it critical that employers present evidence of their efforts to "prevent and correct" unlawful employment practices in order to avoid the enormous punitive damages that can accompany employment practices claims (Abelson, 2003) Clearly, policies that help promote workplace harmony between employers and their employees will not only help to prevent many employment practice claims, but will also correct any longstanding structural problems that may contribute to the filing of such claims.

Risk Management in Higher Education

Risk management involves designing, planning, organizing, leading and controlling certain activities to prevent losses and to lessen the adverse effect of losses that impacts an organization's ability to accomplish its goals. As such, the primary responsibility of risk managers is to diminish the risk of financial loss to an organization through the identification of loss exposures, implementation of risk control techniques to avoid or minimize losses, and the establishment of risk financing to pay for losses; often times, those responsible for risk management have had previous experience in the areas of human resources, workers' compensation, operations, and finance. The most common organizational risk exposures are people/workers compensation risks involving injuries, illnesses or death; litigation/liability risks, financial risks/loss of money, property risks, media risks and statutory risks.

Risk managers are also responsible for oversight and management of workers' compensation programs. To accomplish this, they review claims on an ongoing basis and represent or assign legal counsel on workers compensation legal matters. On employment practice related claims risk managers review investigations, perform claims investigations and analysis and coordinate investigation efforts with claims adjusters, supervisors and other involved parties. They also assist with determining loss value with commercial insurance carrier(s).

Within the college and university environment, the primary responsibility of risk managers is to prevent or minimize the number of incidents that could result in claims or lawsuits against the college. However, the growing complexity of a typical college or university makes that job all the more challenging; in fact, in recent years colleges have

faced mounting claims from their students, staff and faculty members, and even visitors. With litigation escalating and insurance premiums skyrocketing in higher education, the need to prevent losses is greater than ever (Farrell, 2001).

Even tracking the volume of lawsuits against colleges and universities is a daunting task; for example, Perry Zirkel, a professor of education and law at Lehigh University, found 1,763 cases involving colleges in the 1990s listed in Westlaw's educational database, although these numbers do not include many decisions by lower federal courts and most state courts. In addition, the vast majority of cases are settled before going to trial, often resulting in unusually costly settlements that are sealed and unavailable for analysis.

Robert D. Bickel and Peter F. Lake, law professors at Stetson University, in an expose about that shift in *The Rights and Responsibilities of the Modern University: Who Assumes the Risk of College Life?* (Carolina Academic Press, 1999) declared that universities have been hit hard, particularly in the last five years by their employees, and the courts for a number of reasons, including a changing attitude toward institutions of higher learning. They assert that colleges, which used to be considered largely exempt from the legal regulations applied to any other workplace, are now being held to a different standard. "Unfortunately, a lot of people see colleges and universities as places with deep pockets. American courts have slowly been in the process of mainstreaming higher education," says Lake. "This means that courts are imposing businesslike responsibilities on institutions of higher learning." Federal laws like the Family and Medical Leave Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act also provide fodder for litigation.

One of the greatest concerns for academe is "educators' legal-liability" claims, including tenure denial and alleged violations of civil rights, by both employees and students. Those claims, on average, are more costly and complex than general-liability claims, which include injuries suffered on a campus or due to negligence. United Educators, a risk-management collectively formed to insure higher education institutions, has more than 800 colleges and universities as clients, has found that the cost of defending against educators legal-liability claims surpasses what colleges usually pay to settle the claims. For example, for every indemnity dollar spent on general-liability claims, United Educators spends only 9 cents on defense costs, whereas for every indemnity dollar spent on educators legal-liability i.e., employment practice claims, United Educators spends \$1.06 on defense.

Although one may wonder why colleges and universities are willing to spend an average of about \$200,000 per case, many colleges and universities believe that settling out of court may ultimately be even more damaging and expensive. "Sometimes you want an official judgment just to protect you in the future," says David White, assistant risk manager at Tulane University. "If you have a lot of small claims in one area, chances are there is going to come a time when you will have a big claim, and if there's a record showing that you settled on similar claims in the past, it really hurts the university's defense, because it offers concrete proof of gross negligence."

Of course, the best way to avoid lawsuits is to prevent claims from arising in the first place. One effective tactic is to inform all faculty and staff members of the legal regulations and potential problems they face in doing their jobs. "There's a big effort on training managers and other staff members on how to act in the workplace," says

Christine Helwick, the chief lawyer for the California State University system. That includes "everything from educating people on what constitutes a disability to teaching people who grew up in a different time about what qualifies as sexual harassment."

Another technique is to record and analyze every incident that gives rise to a claim, to prevent the incident's recurrence.

Many risk managers strive to document their preventive measures, as a means of proving their good-faith efforts in future litigation. Still, only 400 out of the 4,000 higher-education institutions in the United States have a full-time risk manager, according to Leta C. Finch, senior vice president for the higher-education practice at Marsh Inc., the world's largest insurance brokerage company. As rising costs drive institutions to seek alternatives to traditional insurance, they will most certainly lean more heavily on risk-management strategies, according to many experts (Farrell, 2001).

Climate Surveys

There is little doubt that "campus climate" means different things to different people. A faculty member may be exposed to a climate not encountered by someone on the classified staff. A woman may experience a different climate than a man. "Climate is the way it feels to be here, the way people interact with each other. It's the working and learning environment of the university. It translates to students, faculty and staff being valued and respected regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, age, job class, ability/disability or any other characteristic that makes us different" , (Spear, 2006).

According to Perry, successful organizations work together to address problems and create a positive work environment (personal communications, September 1, 2006).

However, for organizations to actually be successful, they need regular monitoring and assessment, something that can be achieved only by engaging employees at all levels within an organization. In fact, a review of the literature suggests that the most common method of doing this is through the use of climate surveys, which typically measure the extent to which such factors as communications, co-determination, support, and rewards are present (or absent) in the workplace (Koehoorn, et. al 2001). Since a Supervisor Relationship Inventory was designed for and is proposed for use in this study, a brief history of climate surveys will be presented in this section, including a discussion of coverage issues and examples of pre-existing climate survey instruments.

The basic research underlying climate surveys had its beginnings with the seminal work of Kurt Lewin (Ashkanasy, Wilderom & Peterson, 2000), who, in his work with Gestalt psychology, suggested that the individual elements of perception are formed into wholes that represent more than the simple sum of the specifics of the individual elements. This notion – that the whole is more than simply the sum of the parts – was incorporated into the concept of social climate and introduced by Lewin, Lippitt and White into the vocabulary of social psychology (Ashkanasy, Wilderom & Peterson, 2000). This work was then extended in 1956 by Morse and Reimer of the Center for Group Dynamics (founded by Lewin at the University of Michigan) to include the influence of participation in decision making on process and outcome variables. Over the next ten years, a significant body of research extended this work to include the importance of the human context for organization performance and effectiveness, including an emphasis on both human and productivity outcomes, employee marginalization (Argyris, 1957; 1990), and the importance of trusting and supportive

relationships between managers and subordinates (McGregor, 1960 as cited in Ashkanasy, Wilderom & Peterson, 2000). Although more theoretical work would follow, taken together, this earlier work has served as an effective conceptual framework for the many organizational climate surveys that have followed. This conceptual framework has produced a wide assortment of actual climate surveys, which as mentioned earlier, typically focus on areas such as communications, reward, support, and co-determination. In practice, however, climate surveys are often more narrowly focused on such things as employee workload and stress, relationships with coworkers and superiors, compensation packages and company policies, overt managerial policies and practices, communication within particular workgroups, and all sorts of specific productivity issues. These surveys can also be conducted either internally or by external organizations, although external climate surveys have several obvious benefits, including greater candor and more honest responses (Vroom, 1990).

Although a variety of climate surveys have been produced to measure the extent to which organizations have been successful in creating a positive and productive work environment, one of the most popular early instruments, the Objective Judgment Quotient (OJQ), was developed in the early 1980's as a data gathering tool designed to help managers and executives better understand their organizations' people and challenges (McKenna, 2000). This highly accurate and objective multi-rater assessment tool has been used by many in management for critical decision regarding succession planning, as well as for identifying high potential candidates and for restructuring and downsizing in a more objective and reliable manner. Although this instrument, of course, has a significant

set of limitations, it does provide for comparisons between candidates, consensus ratings, and provides information as well regarding the quality of each rater's judgments.

Despite the popularity of this instrument, in 1983 John Perry, Tom Dortch, and John Brunstetter developed the Job Personnel Environment Assessment (JPEA), an instrument designed to help people better understand both the human dimensions and resource requirements of their job. Although an example of one of the more narrowly focused climate surveys, this instrument is unique in that it focuses exclusively on the individual and helps them identify the extent to which the job is either energy producing or energy consuming. More importantly, the JPEA expresses its findings in plain simple English, rather than the jargon often found in such psychological assessments, helping to facilitate conversation and minimize emotional distractions (Perry personal communication, May 20, 2006).

Another popular series of climate surveys was put together by Rod Napier of the Athyn Group, who introduced the first prototype for 360 degree feedback in the 1980's (Napier, R. & McDaniel, R. 2006). In a series of powerful and critically acclaimed books, Napier offers a variety of assessment instruments designed to improve leadership competencies, motivate teams, measure and build trust, reduce employee absenteeism, shorten production cycles, and increase profits. The results of his work suggest that in addition to the obvious value of 360 degree feedback, which provides managers and supervisors an opportunity to elicit performance feedback anonymously to help them understand how their effectiveness is viewed by others in the workplace, the most effective processes provide feedback that is based on behaviors co-workers and employees can see, and feedback that provides insight about the skills and behaviors

needed in an organization to accomplish its vision, mission, and goals Napier (personal communications, April 4, 2000).

Taken together, climate surveys have proven to be extremely useful in a wide variety of organizations, including businesses, governmental entities, and educational institutions. Although they may focus on different aspects of the work environment, these surveys share the common goals of identifying appropriate (as well as inappropriate) employer and employee behaviors associated with such workplace behaviors as communications, co-determination, support, and rewards. As such, this typology will be used to develop a climate survey for this study aimed at understanding the extent to which WSU institutions and their auxiliary enterprises display those employer/employee characteristics associated with successful businesses.

Definitions of Key Terms

Codetermination: A process designed to elicit worker participation in the management of companies. Codetermination rights vary from country to country; for example, in the United States, the workers' role in the management of companies is somewhat limited, however in part of Europe (e.g. Germany) their role is more influential. In systems with codetermination, workers in large companies typically form special bodies or work councils that elect worker representatives to act as intermediaries that help ensure workers rights. In addition to selecting worker representatives for managerial or supervisory assignments in companies, employees are often given seats on committees (e.g. audit committee) and positions on the board of directors.

Communication: A process by which information is exchanged between or among individuals through a common system of symbols, signs, and behavior, including

auditory means, such as speaking or singing, and physical means, such as sign language, touch, or eye contact. For true communication, there must be a transmission of thoughts, ideas and feelings from one mind to another. As a process, communication has synonyms such as expressing feelings, conversing, speaking, corresponding, writing, listening and exchanging.

Management: The act of directing and controlling a group of people for the purpose of coordinating and harmonizing the group towards accomplishing a goal beyond the scope of individual effort. Management encompasses the deployment and manipulation of human resources, financial resources, technological resources, and natural resources through such actions as planning, organizing, leading, motivating, and controlling.

Reward: An operational concept for describing the positive value an individual ascribes to an object, behavioral act or an internal physical state. The functions of rewards are based directly on the modification of behavior and less directly on the physical and sensory properties of rewards.

Support: To give aid or encouragement to a person, material or moral intended to contribute to the success of the person (Online Etymology Dictionary, 2001 Douglas Harper), or to provide (a person, family etc.) with a means of sustaining life, to sustain (a person, her/his spirits, etc) under affliction, to uphold and aid (a person) to endure or tolerate, esp. with patience.

Supervisor: An employee of an organization with some of the powers and responsibilities of management, occupying a role between true manager and a regular employee. Supervisors typically have the power and authority to give instructions and/or

orders to subordinates; are held responsible for the work and actions of other employees, and administer discipline and penalties to their employees.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

This study used a quantitative research design to investigate the statistical linkage between perceptions of employer/employee relationships on campus and various legal indicators of employee discontent. Data was gathered both from pre-existing data sources as well as surveys administered to those responsible for either human resources, operations, finance, workers' compensation or risk management processes from all 23 WSU institutions and 25 out of 36 auxiliary units that had at least one employee. To describe exactly how this methodology was implemented, in this section issues of sample selection, instrumentation, and survey procedures are presented, followed by a discussion of the research questions and the analytic techniques used to address them. This section then concludes with a brief discussion of the limitations involved in this particular piece of research.

Sample Selection

As mentioned in the introduction, the study focuses on one of the largest university system in the United States, the Western State University (WSU) system. With its 23 campuses and over 70 auxiliary units, which include foundations, enterprise corporations, associated student organizations, student unions, and housing corporations, this system currently employs approximately 44,000 faculty and staff and serves more than 420,000 students.

Since the unit of analysis for this study is the individual campus or auxiliary unit, all 23 campuses, together with the 25 qualifying auxiliary units form the population for this study.

Although all of the units were surveyed in an effort to gather data on the perceptions of supervisor/employee relationships, it is possible that some units may have failed to respond. If that occurred, an effort was made to check for non-response bias by comparing the distribution of responding institutions to the population in terms of size and organizational structure (i.e. campus or auxiliary). And if for some reason non-response bias did exist, no attempt was made to generalize the empirical findings of this study to those groups that were under-represented in the sample.

Instrumentation

To gather data from those responsible for human resources, workers' compensation, finance, operations and risk management processes, a twenty one question Supervisor Relationship Inventory was designed for the purpose of this research that was posted on the commercial website Survey Monkey (see Appendix 1). The first sixteen questions used a seven-point Likert scale to query respondents on four important aspects of employer-employee relations on their campus or auxiliary unit -- communications, codetermination, support, and rewards. Within each of these areas were four individual statements that those most responsible for human resources, finance, operations, workers' compensation or risk management processes were asked to agree or disagree with; and as mentioned above, these questions covered the extent to which supervisors are clear in their delegation of authority, the extent to which supervisors involved their employees in critical decisions, the extent to which they encouraged employees to develop their skills and talents, and the many ways in which employees are rewarded. In addition to these questions, the last five inventory items involve demographic information that cannot be gathered from available public databases – specifically, the primary job responsibility,

leadership role, gender of respondent, female supervisory ratios and type of unit (campus or auxiliary).

Once these data were collected, the answers to the first sixteen questions were used to construct four subscales or indices, corresponding to the four areas of supervisor-employee relations discussed earlier. Specifically, the total score from inventory statements 1, 5, 9, and 13 was used to form the *communications index*, the total score from questions 2, 6, 10, and 14 was used to form the *codetermination index*, the total score from questions 3, 7, 11, and 15 constituted the *support index*, and the total score from questions 4, 8, 12, and 16 formed the *reward index*. Since each of the subscales or indices consisted of four questions, a maximum score on any one of them is 24 points (6+6+6+6) and the minimum score 4 points (1+1+1+1), with higher scores indicating better treatment for the employees from their supervisors and managers. If, for some reason, a single question in any section remained unanswered, the sample mean for the three other questions in the section was substituted for the missing value; however, when more than one question in any section was unanswered, the entire inventory was not used in the analysis.

In addition to these four indices, the demographic information collected from the inventory that described the respondent's primary job responsibility, leadership role, gender of respondent, female supervisory ratios and type of unit (campus or auxiliary), was used to produce the independent variables for the regression analysis. Specifically, both the demographic variables and the indices of supervisor-employee relations were used in the regression analysis to explain variation in the frequency and severity of stress, employment practice and workers' compensations claims.

Survey Participants and Procedures

As mentioned earlier, to gather workplace climate data from the 23 Western State University campuses and their auxiliary organizations, those responsible for either, human resources, finance, operations, workers' compensation or risk management processes within each unit were asked to complete a twenty-one question inventory. The individuals (or their designees in some of the smaller auxiliaries) were first identified through a system-wide WSU database, and then sent an introductory e-mail that briefly described the study, identified those participating, reminded potential participants of the importance of answering all twenty one inventory questions, offered a summary of the research findings for interested participants, and most importantly, contained a link to the on-line inventory instrument. For those individuals who failed to respond within two weeks, a reminder e-mail was sent that stresses the importance of participation. For those individuals that still failed to respond by the stated four week deadline, another reminder was sent out imploring the individuals to respond and reminding them of the importance of the research. Throughout the process, respondents were reminded that their responses would be kept completely confidential and that their information would be used only in the aggregate and never presented by individual campus or auxiliary.

However, prior to the actual administration of the inventory, the inventory was first reviewed by the dissertation committee and several current and past members of the University Risk Managers and Insurance Association (URMIA), who were not affiliated with the WSU system, to establish consistency and face validity (Dillman, 2000, pp. 140-

147). After this process was completed, the instrument was then pre-tested on another group of URIMA members not affiliated with the WSU system, in addition to human resources, finance, workers' compensation, operations, risk management and insurance professionals in industries other than higher education so that any remaining problems with content or expression could be identified and solved. Only after this two-step process had been completed was the actual inventory posted on-line and the introductory e-mails sent out.

Data Analysis

As noted above, this study used a quantitative approach to examine the extent to which variation in campus climate and select demographic measures could explain variation in stress, employment practice and workers' compensations claims. In this section of the proposal, the appropriate analytical techniques are matched with the study's two research questions so that readers can see exactly how the analysis was carried out.

Research Question #1: Within the Western State University System, how do those responsible for either, human resources, finance, operations, workers' compensation, risk management processes or their designees describe supervisory practices within their campuses or auxiliaries?

To address this question, means and standard deviations are presented for all sixteen supervisor-employee climate statements, as well as for the four indices constructed from the sixteen statements. In addition, the same descriptive statistics are used to characterize all of the demographic information collected from both the inventory and the publicly available data sources.

In addition, the climate indices will also be presented by such demographic factors as primary job responsibility, leadership role, gender of respondent, and type of unit (campus or auxiliary).

Research Question #2: To what extent do campus demographics and the perceptions of supervisory practices explain variation in stress, employment practice and workers' compensation claims filed within the WSU system?

To address this question, hierarchical regression analysis was used to first estimate the extent to which variation in the two dependent variables could be explained by campus or auxiliary demographics. After these models were successfully estimated, the four indices were then added in the second stage to the significant variables previously identified (in the first stage) to arrive at the set of final models. Throughout the analysis, both F and t-tests were used at the $p=.05$ level to test hypotheses regarding the extent to which the two groups of variables, as well as the individual variables themselves, are correlated with the models' dependent variables. Furthermore, the goodness-of-fit measure R^2 was used to explain the percentage of the variation in the dependent variables explained by the final set of models.

Chapter Four: Data Analysis and Results

The purpose of this study was twofold; to first describe the state of employer-employee relations at each of the campuses and participating auxiliaries that comprise this particular four-year statewide system of higher education, and second, to test the hypothesis that variation in employer-employee relations, together with select demographic information, can explain variation in three types of claims brought against the campuses and auxiliaries – stress, workers' compensation, and employment practice.

As such, this chapter begins with a discussion of the survey procedures used to gather the requisite data from the various campuses and auxiliaries, and then moves on to the demographics of the responding sample. After this discussion, the focus then moves on to the two research questions, where the analysis and results associated with each will be presented sequentially, beginning with a discussion of the five indices of employer-employee relations (referred to as climate indices), and then concluding with the results of the multiple regression analysis that attempts to empirically link campus and auxiliary climate with various legal measures of employee discontent.

Participants and Survey Procedures

As described in the previous chapter, the survey instrument that was developed for this study was extensively pilot-tested before being administered. For example, after the survey was reviewed by all three members of the dissertation committee, the draft instrument was then reviewed for technical accuracy and readability by almost twenty past and present members of the University Risk Managers and Insurance Association; their backgrounds included insurance, risk management, human resources, finance, education, and technology. After receiving comments from these individuals, the survey

was then revised and sent back to approximately half of the group as well as several others who work in higher education administration outside of the system being studied. After receiving approval from all of these individuals as well as a final sign off from the dissertation committee, the researcher then prepared two versions of the instrument with identical directions -- a paper and pencil one for distribution at a statewide conference and an internet version posted to a commercial website, Survey Monkey.

Data collection began on December 13, 2006 when messages were posted on two system-wide list-servs managed by the Chancellors Office urging members to visit the Survey Monkey website and complete the survey instrument. The membership of these list servs included individuals involved in, or responsible for, risk management, human resources, workers compensation, emergency management, safety, finance and other related processes at the system's campuses and auxiliaries. Ultimately, data was collected from 59 individuals who visited the website, representing both campuses and auxiliaries, and the instrument was removed from the Survey Monkey website on January 26, 2007. In addition to collecting data from individuals directed to the website, a paper and pencil version was also administered to 21 individuals that participated in the annual state Auxiliary Organization Association (AOA) conference, which brings together members of the various auxiliary organizations. The conference was held in early January 2007 and the majority of survey respondents, as well as attendees, were human resource professionals who worked at one of the system-wide auxiliaries. However, to make sure that no one took the survey twice, a screening process was used so that anyone who had completed the survey on-line was not allowed to complete the hard copy version.

Taken together, a total of 80 surveys were completed with essentially no missing values, other than the occasional demographic question left unanswered. However, due to overlapping memberships on the list-serves, and the selective participation of conference attendees, the traditional notion of response rates makes little sense in this analysis. As such, response rates will not be calculated; instead the emphasis will be on the fact that there were respondents from all 23 campuses and the majority (25) of the auxiliaries that have actual employees.

Sample Demographics.

As shown in Table 1, eighty individuals participated in the study, with forty nine (61.2%) of those working on a campus and thirty one (38.8%) working for an auxiliary. The respondents included 37 males (46%) and 43 females (54%); the majority of respondents (77.5%) also reported they were supervisors. Among respondents, more than 80% reported that on their campus or auxiliary the majority of supervisors were male, with the modal category being 26% - 50% female. And finally, there was a fairly wide range of occupations reported among respondents, with the three largest groups in the sample being human resource professionals (23.8%), risk managers (21.3%), and other (36.3%), followed by operations, workers' compensation, and finance.

Although there were some demographic differences in the data collected from the commercial website and at the conference, the small sample size made these differences statistically insignificant. However, the data collected at the conference was slightly more likely to be from females and human resource professionals than the data collected from the commercial website, and conference respondents were also more likely to report a greater percentage of female supervisors in the workplace.

Table 1
Demographic Profile of Campus and Auxiliary Respondents

| Gender | Number | Percentage |
|---|--------|------------|
| Male | 43 | 54.0 |
| Female | 37 | 46.0 |
| Management | | |
| Supervisor | 62 | 77.5 |
| Non-Supervisor | 18 | 22.5 |
| Primary Responsibility | | |
| Risk Management | 17 | 21.3 |
| Workers' Compensation | 6 | 7.5 |
| Human Resources | 19 | 23.8 |
| Operations | 6 | 7.5 |
| Finance | 3 | 3.8 |
| Other | 29 | 36.3 |
| Percentage of Female Supervisors | | |
| <11% | 4 | 5.0 |
| 11% – 25% | 19 | 23.8 |
| 26% - 50% | 42 | 52.5 |
| >50% | 15 | 18.8 |
| Organizational Type | | |
| Campus | 49 | 61.2 |
| Auxiliary | 31 | 38.8 |

Data Analysis – Research Question #1

The first research question in this dissertation examined how those responsible for risk management, human resources, workers' compensation and other related tasks within a campus or auxiliary describe the state of employer-employee relations within their unit. Although these results will be presented from a variety of perspectives, Tables 2 and 3 show the weighted averages for all 23 campuses (Table 2) as well as the 25 responding auxiliary units (Table 3). These averages are weighted in the sense that each campus and auxiliary counts as one, so that multiple responses from a single campus or auxiliary ultimately get scaled down so that their sum, by construction, equals one. In other words, if a particular campus had four respondents then each gets a weight of .25, so that taken together, their weights sum to one; similarly, an auxiliary with two respondents would each receive a weight of .5. Of course, if a campus or auxiliary only had one survey respondent, then that respondent would have a weight of 1.

Examination of these two tables reveals some interesting findings. For example, Table 2 shows that for the 23 campuses the four climate indices are closely bunched, with the highest score for *support*, followed by *communications*, *rewards*, and lastly *codetermination*. And although these indices are tightly grouped, the least consensus, at least measured by the size of the standard deviations surrounding the indices, appears to be for the *support* index, with the greatest consensus for *communications*. Most importantly, the average scores are right in the middle of the 4 – 24 point scale, suggesting that the campuses are neither excelling nor failing in terms of the quality of employer-employee relations on campuses.

Interestingly, the results are strikingly similar for the auxiliaries. For example, Table 3 shows that the order of the indices to be exactly the same as was true for the campuses -- *support, communications, rewards, and codetermination* -- although the scores are slightly higher for the auxiliaries, suggesting a marginally more supportive environment in terms of employer-employee relations at the auxiliaries than on the campuses. And given the size of the standard deviations surrounding the indices, there appears to be slightly less consensus at the auxiliaries than on the campuses, although these differences are slight and may be reflective of differences in sample sizes. However, the fact that for both groups the codetermination index was the lowest suggests that this area might be the first targeted for improvement within the system.

Table 2
Weighted Climate Indices for the Campuses (n=23)

| Climate Indices | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Communications | 15.40 | 3.96 |
| Codetermination | 14.89 | 4.64 |
| Support | 15.93 | 4.94 |
| Rewards | 14.97 | 4.76 |
| Overall | 61.19 | 17.44 |

Table 3
Weighted Climate Indices for the Auxiliaries (n=25)

| Climate Indices | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Communications | 15.56 | 4.31 |
| Codetermination | 14.74 | 4.88 |
| Support | 16.47 | 4.36 |
| Rewards | 15.33 | 5.00 |
| Overall | 62.09 | 17.75 |

To determine if the differences in scores on the indices between the campuses and auxiliaries were significant, an independent samples t-test was conducted at the $p = .05$ level. However, given the relatively small sample sizes and numerically small differences between the indices, none of the differences between indices (e.g. the difference of .16 between the two *communications* indices) were statistically significant, suggesting that for each of the indices, there were no real differences between campuses and auxiliaries. Taken together, this suggests that for both the campuses and auxiliaries, employer-employee relationships are the strongest in terms of *support*, closely followed by *communications*, *rewards*, and finally, *codetermination*.

Differences in the climate indices by occupation, gender, and supervisory status

Since respondents differed by occupation, gender, and supervisory status, this section presents the values of the climate indices for different groups of individuals. Beginning with occupation, Tables 4-6 present the climate indices for risk managers, human resource professionals and others (which included workers' compensation, finance, operations and other occupations). Examination of these tables shows that the risk managers consistently rated the climate as more severe than did the human resource professionals, who in turn consistently rated the climate as more severe than did others. In other words, for each of the five indices the scores were lowest for the risk managers, followed by the scores for human resource professionals, and then the scores for others.

Interestingly, the orderings differed slightly among these three groups; for example, while the risk managers rated *communications* the highest, the others group rated it the lowest. Similarly, while *support* received the highest rating from the human resource folks and the others, risk managers rated it second. *Rewards* were rated third by

both risk managers and human resource professionals, while the others rated it second.

And finally, *codetermination* was rated the lowest by risk managers and human resource folks, and next to last by the others.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of the Climate Indices for Risk Managers (n=17)

| Climate Indices | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Communications | 15.12 | 4.75 |
| Codetermination | 12.94 | 5.09 |
| Support | 14.82 | 5.28 |
| Rewards | 13.65 | 5.51 |
| Overall | 56.53 | 19.86 |

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations of the Climate Indices for H/R Professionals (n=19)

| Climate Indices | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Communications | 15.21 | 4.05 |
| Codetermination | 14.16 | 3.55 |
| Support | 15.68 | 3.79 |
| Rewards | 14.16 | 3.35 |
| Overall | 59.21 | 13.62 |

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations of the Climate Indices for Other Respondents (n=44)

| Climate Indices | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Communications | 16.64 | 3.86 |
| Codetermination | 16.70 | 4.34 |
| Support | 17.77 | 4.14 |
| Rewards | 17.02 | 4.23 |
| Overall | 68.13 | 16.57 |

The strength of opinion also varied among these three groups, with the human resource professionals showing the most consensus (as measured by the size of the standard deviations surrounding the climate indices), followed by the others and then the risk managers. This result is not surprising, since the human resources folks typically have a more idealized version of the employer-employee interactions within their unit, and many aspects of their job involve minimizing any perceived workplace conflict. On the other hand, risk managers -- whose job it is to minimize risk throughout their unit -- typically have the broadest view of the campus or auxiliary, having both a visceral and legalistic understanding of the breadth and depth of employer-employee problems.

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations of the Climate Indices for the Supervisors (n=62)

| Climate Indices | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Communications | 16.66 | 3.63 |
| Codetermination | 16.05 | 4.51 |
| Support | 17.37 | 4.12 |
| Rewards | 16.11 | 4.59 |
| Overall | 66.19 | 15.96 |

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations of the Climate Indices for the Non-Supervisors (n=18)

| Climate Indices | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Communications | 13.61 | 4.88 |
| Codetermination | 12.72 | 3.95 |
| Support | 14.17 | 4.80 |
| Rewards | 13.94 | 4.19 |
| Overall | 54.44 | 16.93 |

As shown in Tables 7 and 8, there were also some interesting findings when reviewing the responses of supervisors versus the responses of non-supervisors. For example, the supervisors consistently rated the climate indices higher than did the non-supervisors, which may not be that surprising since many of the questions involved the behavior of those completing the survey. In fact, for four of the five indices (with the exception being the *rewards* index), the differences between supervisors and non-supervisors were statistically significant at the $p = .01$ level, suggesting that these differences did not occur by chance. More importantly, in terms of the relative order of the indices both supervisors and non-supervisors rated *support* the highest and *codetermination* the lowest. From a gender perspective, there were essentially no differences in the climate indices. As shown in Tables 9 and 10, both men and women rated *support* the highest, followed by *communications*, *rewards*, and *codetermination*. Furthermore, there were no statistically significant differences by gender for any of the five indices and the standard deviations surrounding the indices were strikingly similar.

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations of the Climate Indices for Female Respondents (n=43)

| Climate Indices | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Communications | 15.67 | 4.30 |
| Codetermination | 15.05 | 4.74 |
| Support | 16.58 | 4.51 |
| Rewards | 15.35 | 4.58 |
| Overall | 62.65 | 17.22 |

Table 10
Means and Standard Deviations of the Climate Indices for Male Respondents (n=37)

| Climate Indices | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Communications | 16.32 | 3.94 |
| Codetermination | 15.59 | 4.44 |
| Support | 16.73 | 4.46 |
| Rewards | 15.95 | 4.61 |
| Overall | 64.59 | 16.50 |

Data Analysis – Research Question #2

Since the second research question involves the extent to which variation in the climate indices, together with select demographic information, can explain variation in the three types of claims brought against campuses and auxiliaries (stress, workers' compensation, and employment practice), this section begins with a descriptive look at the claims data and then moves on to the subsequent regression analysis.

The claims data itself, which covers the years 2003 to 2006, provides data on the number and dollar value of all workers compensation, stress, and employment practice lawsuits filed against individual campuses and auxiliaries. Although this raw data will be transformed into several related measures for use in the regression analysis, Table 11 shows the average number of stress, workers compensation, and employment practice lawsuits by campus and auxiliary over this three-year period.

Not surprisingly, the differences in these values between campuses and auxiliaries were statistically significant for two of the three measures ($p=.01$), suggesting that there were significantly more stress and workers compensation claims filed against the campuses than the auxiliaries.

Table 11
Average Number of Claims for the Campuses (n=23) and Auxiliaries (n=25)

| Type of Claim | Campus | Auxiliary |
|----------------------|--------|-----------|
| Workers Compensation | 350.9 | 26.4 |
| Stress | 11.6 | 0.2 |
| Employment Practice | 1.7 | 0.9 |

Another important way to view the basic claims data is to look at the average dollar value of each type of claim, defined as the total dollar value of all claims in each category divided by the total number of claims in that category. As shown in Table 12, the average value of workers compensation claims for the 23 system-wide campuses was \$8,895, compared to \$5,367 for the 25 reporting auxiliaries, while the average values for employment practice claims were \$144,581 versus \$73,776 respectively. Although these differences were not statistically significant at the $p=.05$ level, the differences in the average value of all stress claims (\$10,794 compared with \$3,103) was significant at the $p=.00$ level, suggesting that the average value of stress claims at the campuses was significantly greater than at the reporting auxiliaries.

Table 12
Average Dollar Value of Claims for the Campuses (n=23) and Auxiliaries (n=25)

| Type of Claim | Campus | Auxiliary |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Workers Compensation | \$8,895 | \$5,367 |
| Stress | \$10,794 | \$3,103 |
| Employment Practice | \$144,581 | \$73,776 |

The final lens with which to view the claims data involved adjusting the number of claims to take into account the number of employees at each campus and auxiliary,

since those units with significantly more employees might be expected to have more claims filed against them than those with fewer employees. This data is presented in Table 13, and a comparison of the per-capita claims data suggests that while differences clearly exist between the campuses and auxiliaries, only the differences in per-capita stress claims were significant ($p=.00$), suggesting that per-capita stress claims were significantly higher on the campuses than the reporting auxiliaries.

Table 13
Per Capita Claims Data for the Campuses (n=23) and Auxiliaries (n=25)

| <i>Type of Claim</i> | <i>Campus</i> | <i>Auxiliary</i> |
|-----------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| <i>Workers Compensation</i> | 1613.11 | 1409.55 |
| <i>Stress</i> | 73.02 | 4.68 |
| <i>Employment Practice</i> | 146.92 | 2017.41 |

Regressions

As described in the methodology chapter, the second research question involves the extent to which variation in the climate indices, together with select demographic information, can explain variation in three types of claims brought against campuses and auxiliaries. To address this question, in this section three sets of regression models, each set corresponding to the three different types of claims used in the analysis, are specified, estimated, and then the models' estimated coefficients tested for statistical significance at the $p=.05$ level. Throughout this process, all of the data used are weighted so that each campus or auxiliary ultimately has a weight of one; as a result, those campuses or auxiliaries with multiple respondents have the same weight as those with only one.

The first set of models, which examine the effect of the climate indices and select demographic measures on four measures of workers' compensation claims -- the total dollar value of the claims, the average dollar value of the claims, the number of claims, and the per-capita number of claims -- are shown in Table 14. Examination of this table reveals some interesting findings; for example, in both the first two models, which involve the total dollar value and number of workers' compensation claims, the size variable, which distinguishes large from small units, and whether or not the unit was a campus or auxiliary, were both highly significant variables ($p=.01$). As expected, the signs of these two variables reveal that over the 2003 – 2006 time period, auxiliaries were associated with almost \$3 million dollars less in claims than the campuses as well as about 332 fewer claims. In addition, the larger units had a higher total dollar value and number of claims than did the smaller ones; specifically, 137 more claims and slightly more than \$1 million in total dollar value. Taken together, these two models explained almost two-thirds of the variation in their respective dependent variables.

Although in these first two models, none of the climate indices were significant predictors, the codetermination index turned out to be a highly significant predictor of both the average dollar value of workers' compensation claims and the number of per-capita workers' compensation claims ($p=.01$). More importantly, this effect was non-linear, revealing that while increases in codetermination initially cause a reduction in these two measures of workers' compensation claims, at significantly higher levels this effect turns positive. Unfortunately, despite the added significance of the campus-auxiliary variable in the average dollar value regression, the goodness-of-fit measures for

these two models were significantly worse than the first two, explaining about a third and a seventh of the total variation in the two claims measures.

Table 14

Estimated Coefficients and Levels of Significance for the Variables in the Weighted Workers' Compensation Claims Regressions (Only Statistically Significant Variables Shown)

| Independent Variables | Total Dollar Value of Claims | Number of Claims | Average Dollar Value of Claims | Per-Capita Claims |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Constant | \$2,620,559 ** | 303 ** | \$19,456 ** | |
| Campus/Auxiliary | -\$2,944,777 ** | -332 ** | -\$4,391 ** | |
| Size | \$1,017,396 ** | 137* | | |
| Codetermination | | | -\$2,218 ** | |
| Codetermination ² | | | \$93 ** | 4 ** |
| R ² | .65 | .71 | .33 | .15 |

The second set of models, which examine the effect of the climate indices and select demographic measures on the same four measures of stress claims are shown in Table 15 and also reveal some interesting findings. In fact, in all four models the final specification is remarkably similar; the campus-auxiliary variable is highly significant in all four regressions ($p=.01$) with the expected negative sign, suggesting that auxiliaries have significantly fewer and less expensive stress claims than do the campuses in this system. Although none of the climate indices are significant in this set of models, the size variable is significant in the number of stress claims model ($p=.01$) and has the expected positive sign, suggesting that larger units have more stress claims than smaller units, even after for controlling for the distinction between campuses and auxiliaries. Taken together, these models are reasonably explanatory, explaining between about one-third and two-thirds of the variation in the models' dependent variables.

Table 15
Estimated Coefficients and Levels of Significance for the Variables in the Weighted Stress Claims Regressions (Only Statistically Significant Variables Shown)

| Independent Variables | Total Dollar Value of Claims | Number of Claims | Average Dollar Value of Claims | Per-Capita Claims |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Constant | \$126,447 ** | 10 ** | \$9,780 ** | 73 ** |
| Campus/Auxiliary | -\$125,826 ** | -11 ** | -\$9,611 ** | -68 ** |
| Size | | 3 ** | | |
| R ² | .41 | .67 | .36 | .32 |

Unfortunately, the third set of models that focus on employment practice claims produced little, if anything to report. For example, only one of the four models revealed any significant findings, and that model, which examined the number of employment practice claims, explained so little of the variation in the dependent variable (8%) that it is not reported here, along with the other models. As such, it appears that neither climate, nor the demographic measures used in the analysis had any predictive ability in terms of employment practice claims.

Regression Summary

The results of this regression analysis reveal several interesting findings. First, it appears that significant differences exist between the campuses and auxiliaries for the various measures of workers' compensation and stress claims used; more importantly, in all of the models campuses had more claims and expended more money than did the auxiliaries. In addition, the size of the unit mattered as well – at least for two measure of workers' compensation claims and one measure of stress claims – and in all three cases the sign was positive, suggesting that larger units have more claims and at least in one case, a significantly larger dollar value as well. In terms of the climate indices, the

codetermination index was found to be significant in two of the workers' compensation regressions, revealing an interesting non-linear effect that was first negative (as originally hypothesized) and then turned positive at higher values. Unfortunately, this effect was only present in two of the twelve models estimated, suggesting that this inference is not robust and needs to be confirmed in other studies before confirming an empirical linkage. And finally, none of the variables used in this study had any real predictive power in terms of employment practice claims.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

In this final chapter, the results of the study will first be reviewed and then contextualized within the relevant literature. After this discussion, potential policy implications associated with the findings will be summarized, and the chapter then ends with some suggestions for future researchers interested in extending this emerging line of research.

Contributions to the Literature

Fifty seven percent of companies in the US have been named as defendants in at least one employment related lawsuit in the past five years, and almost 450 Employment Lawsuits are filed in the United States every day (Olson, 2006). A number of state and federal agencies and legislation have been created to protect workers and guarantee their employment-related rights, including the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC 2006) in 1965 & the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938. Despite the existence of these pieces of legislation, which clearly spell out the rights of employees, the number of lawsuits filed by employees, alleging discrimination, harassment, and other employment-related violations, has risen nearly fifty percent in recent years and damage awards in employment cases have catapulted to a record height (EEOC, 2004). Employment practice litigation is a claimant's method of demanding dignity and respect as much as or more than the monetary or disciplinary remedies awarded, (Lind, Greenberg, Scott, & Welchans, T. D., 2000). Regardless, disengaging behavior by supervisors continues across industries, causing employees to become less productive (Frank, Finnegan, & Taylor, 2004).

Because of the potential impact a supervisor has on an employee's life at work and away from work is significant, one might speculate that managing people in ways that are consistent with caring and understanding would be an uncontroversial idea (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997). People work to be able to meet both basic and more advanced human needs, it should not be surprising when they file stress, workers' compensation and employment practice related claims to protect those jobs.

In addition to the previous statements a significant body of research has emerged that supports the contention that employees don't leave companies, they leave managers and supervisors (Buckingham, 1999; Coffman, 2002; Collins, 2001; O'Reilly, 2000; Pfeiffer, 1998; Becker & Huselid, 1998). According to recent research conducted by the Gallup organization, 55% of all U.S. workers are not fully engaged in their jobs and 16% are actively disengaged; taken together this means that 71% of the Americans who go to work every day aren't fully participating in their work, which further suggest that employees are producing at 29 percent of capacity because of supervisory practices.

One of the most powerful findings describing the affects of jobs on a employees health comes from researchers at the Tokyo Women's Medical University ("Blood Pressure Soars on Mondays," 2005) where researchers found that there were 20% more heart attacks on Mondays than on any other day of the week in Japan. Prior to the Tokyo study a report by Evanoff & Rosenstock (1994), estimated that the annual direct and indirect medical costs associated with occupational stress in the United States ranged from \$80 billion to \$150 billion and those estimates did not include additional costs incurred from lost productivity. There are numerous studies suggesting an association between psychosocial risk factors and workers' compensation claims (Pirainen, Rasanen,

Kivimaki, 2003). Research conducted on job clarity, requiring quality communication between employees and their supervisors, Ryan, Bamptom (1988) and Ekberg (1994) showed a positive correlation between reports of uncertain job expectations and upper extremity disorders (particularly in the neck and shoulders), and uncertainty regarding the future of one's job has been found to be predictor of neck and shoulder discomfort (Hadler, 1998).

In addition to the empirical linkage between job clarity and upper extremity disorders, researchers have also found strong correlations between job dissatisfaction and upper-extremity disorders. Tola (1988) found a strong positive correlation between job dissatisfaction and neck and shoulder physical complaints; similarly, Bigos (1991) found a positive correlation between job dissatisfaction and workers filing worker's compensation claims for back injuries. Upper extremity disorders have also been empirically linked to the perceptions of control over one's job (Hoekstra et al; 1994); the quality of work (Ekberg et al, 1994); the intensity of work (Heliovaara et al, 1991; Pot et al, 1987); and the amount of social support provided by supervisors and coworkers (Pot et al, 1998; Kompier, 1998; and Hopkins, 1990). Taken together, the results of the aforementioned research clearly suggest an empirical linkage between select job-related characteristics and upper extremity disorders. One could conclude from that amount of credible research that psychosocial-emotional and physical job related challenges could be influenced by supervisory practices promoting communications, rewards, support and codetermination.

The implications previously noted are both obvious and powerful: supervisory practices clearly play a crucial role in organizational effectiveness and employee's

quality of life. And if the US as a nation is to move beyond operating at less than one third of our capacity, we need to pay close attention to the art and science of managing and leading.

Findings

The climate surveys were completed by 59 individuals who visited the website and 21 individuals that participated in the annual state Auxiliary Organization Association (AOA) conference. All eighty surveys were completed with essentially no missing values, other than the occasional demographic question left unanswered. Of the eighty (n =80) individuals who participated in the study, the majority of respondents (77.5%) reported they were supervisors, forty nine (61.2%) worked on a campus and thirty one (38.8%) worked for an auxiliary. Thirty seven of the respondents were males (46%) and 43 were females (54%).

For the most part, the findings suggest that the order of the indices is the same, and the relative order of the indices is also the same, regardless of respondent's gender, job responsibilities, role (supervisor versus non-supervisor), unit, unit size and female supervision ratios. In additions the survey results suggest that the four climate indices were closely grouped, with the highest score for *support*, followed by *communications*, *rewards*, and lastly *codetermination*. Hypothesis testing was conducted, to determine statistically if the indices were the same or different for campuses and auxiliaries, and the differences were insignificant. When variables were created to observe claims severity in general, cases required smaller dollar values to resolve and there are fewer incidents of claims at auxiliaries than on campuses. The lone exception involved employment practice per capita findings of \$146 per person for campuses and \$2017 per person for

auxiliaries. This reversal of pattern suggests it costs more to resolve employment practice claims at auxiliaries than on campuses. Regression measures (i.e., the dollar value of stress and workers' compensation claims and employment practice complaints), suggested two measures were significant, and they were, size of unit and whether the unit was a campus, or an auxiliary.

The first research question in this study explored how selected individuals describe the state of employer-employee relations within their unit. The average scores were right in the middle of the 4 – 24 point scale, suggesting that the campuses or auxiliaries are neither excelling nor failing in terms of the quality of employer-employee relations. The second research question assessed how campus demographics and the perception of supervisory practices explain variations in stress, employment practice and workers' compensation claims filed within the WSU system. Different values between campuses and auxiliaries were statistically significant for two of the three measures ($p=.01$), suggesting there were significantly more stress and workers compensation claims filed against the campuses than against the auxiliaries. Also the differences in the average value of all stress claims (\$10,794 compared with \$3,103) was significant at the $p=.00$ level, suggesting that the average value of stress claims at the campuses was significantly greater than at reporting auxiliaries. In terms of the climate indices, the codetermination index was found to be significant in two of the workers' compensation regressions, revealing an interesting non-linear effect that was first negative (as originally hypothesized), turning positive at higher values. This effect was only present in two of the twelve models estimated, suggesting that this inference is not robust and additional research is required before confirming an empirical linkage.

Policy Implications of Research

Given the results of the surveys, which suggested that this statewide system was neither failing nor excelling in terms of the supervisor-employee climate on their campuses and auxiliaries, there is clearly room for improvement -- especially when considering the distribution of climate indices that show that some individual campuses and auxiliaries are actually doing quite poorly. This is hardly surprising since according to Gilley (1998), the performance challenge facing every organization is in developing management systems that make employees an organizations greatest asset. In an effort to successfully accomplish that goal, universities need to design and implement supervisory educational and accountability processes that improve operations by combining cohesive systems focused on stakeholder valuation and synergistic relations. If those educational and accountability processes encourage managers and employees to collaboratively work together, then and only then will any desired outcomes will be accomplished (Gilley, Boughton & Maycunich, 1999).

Since at both the campuses and auxiliaries codetermination was the lowest rated of the four climate indices, this represents a natural place to start improving supervisor-employee relations. As such, efforts to increase the ways that supervisors value their employees' opinions, involve them in critical decisions and productivity improvement activities, and recognize and attempt to accommodate different work styles will increase the amount of codetermination within their unit, which, as the regression analysis shows may ultimately reduce the average dollar value of workers' compensation claims.

Of course, some of the campuses and auxiliaries have low scores in other areas besides codetermination, and individual units need to specifically address their areas of

weakness. One of the most successful methods for addressing some of these areas is through the implementation of need-based training or professional development programs. Moreover, since the success of these programs is dependent on rank and file involvement, training designs would necessarily have to incorporate rank and file interests; one possible solution would be to implement the Napier approach, which argues that supervisors should not be held responsible for more than seven direct reports. However, regardless of training method used, individual campuses and auxiliaries would clearly benefit from improvements in those climate areas in which they are deficient.

Support for these arguments come from a recent article written by Dianne Hales (2006) showing that researchers have consistently found high levels of burnout in the teaching profession; of course, when burnout is combined with poor relations with management, job satisfaction and performance ultimately suffer. And for colleges and universities interested in staying competitive in the rapidly expanding global higher education marketplace, inappropriate supervisory behavior, or for that matter any behavior that reduces the campuses' or auxiliaries' overall level of productivity, cannot be tolerated in the long run. Clearly, the supervisors of the future will have to model the sort of leadership behavior that results in more productive communications and support for all employees, as well as offering appropriate behavioral rewards and interacting in ways that promote true codetermination.

Implications for future research

Since this study appears to be the first to attempt to empirically link campus and auxiliary climate with various measures of legal claims filed against the campuses and auxiliaries, this section contains at least four significant recommendations for those

interested in pursuing similar lines of research. These recommendations, which include larger samples, inter-temporal analysis, replication, and broader measures of the climate indices, are now discussed in more detail.

The first and perhaps the most important of all the recommendations involves increasing the size of the respondent population significantly. Recall that in this study each campus or auxiliary had anywhere between a single respondent and as many as six respondents. However, each campus or auxiliary could be first stratified by administrative level and then literally hundreds sampled from each campus, or if size permits, the auxiliaries as well. In this manner, a more accurate estimation of the four climate indices could be undertaken, and with less measurement error involved from multiple sources, perhaps a stronger empirical relationship could be identified between the indices and the various measures of claims used.

The second recommendation, for future research in this area, involves introducing a longitudinal component to the analysis. Instead of measuring the climate indices at one point in time, they could be measure perhaps annually, which would allow researchers to look for statistical relationships that might involve time lags, since changes in climate most certainly take time to influence the filing of legal claims against the various units that comprise a particular college or university. However, such analysis was not possible given the design of this study; hopefully future researchers will be able to utilize such techniques.

The third recommendation involves possibly adding more questions to the climate survey, since for the purposes of this research, each of the four climate indices – communications, codetermination, rewards, and support – were constructed from only

four questions, which certainly may have influenced the amount of variation evidenced in the indices. Although no “magic” number of questions exist, techniques like factor analysis and principal components would certainly allow the number of questions to be expanded in a way that assures that each question has real value-added to the respective index.

Finally, the last recommendation involves replication in the sense that even if an inferentially robust empirical relationship had been found in this study between the climate indices and the various measures of claims used, the linkage would still need to be documented in other systems of higher education or among groups of like institutions. As such, researchers are urged to address the first three recommendations before attempting to replicate the results of this study among other systems of higher education institutions.

References

- Abelson, R., Bean, L., Donahue, J., Glater, J., Hicks, T., Marcelli, G., Montwieler, N. Siegelman, P. & Webster, L. (2003) The Law of Training Comes of Age. *National Employer Journal* 2003-2004 15, 1-23.
- AIG Employment practice lawsuits are more common than ever. (2005) Retrieved April 5, 2005, from <http://www.aigsmallbusiness.com/smallbusiness/broker/asbproduct/0,2187,142-14-480-13-4263,00.html>
- American Council on Education (ACE) (1999) Straight Talk about College Costs and Prices: The Final Report and Supplemental Material from the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education. Retrieved October 2, 2005, from <http://www.acenet.edu//AM/Template.cfm>
- Appelbaum, S., Hébert, D. & Leroux, S. (1999) Empowerment: power, culture and leadership – a strategy or fad for the millennium? *Journal of Workplace Learning* Nov Volume: 11 Issue: 7 Page: 233 – 254.
- Argyris, C. (1957) *Personality and Organization. The Conflict Between System and the Individual* New York: Harper Chapter IV Pages 7 & 20
- Argyris, C. (1990) *Integrating the Individual and the Organization*. Piscataway, NJ Transaction Publishers
- Ashkanasy, N.M., Wilderom, C.P.M., & Peterson, M. F. (2000) *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Ashmos, D.P., Duchon, D. (2000) "Work itself is being re-discovered as a source of spiritual growth and connection to others [Electronic Version] *Journal of Management Inquiry* faculty.business.utsa.edu.
- Becker, B & Huselid, M (1998) High Performance Work Systems and Firm Performance: A Synthesis of Research and Managerial Implications; *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* Greenwich: [Electronic Version] JAI Press Inc. Volume 16, Pages 53-101
- Bickel, R. D. & Lake, P. F. (1999), *The Rights and Responsibilities of the Modern University: Who Assumes the Risk of College Life?* Durham: Carolina Academic Press
- Bigos, S. (1991) A prospective study of work perceptions and psychosocial factors affecting the report of back injury. *Spine*, 1, pgs 1-6 Retrieved October 1, 2005, from the Pub Med database

- Blood pressure soars on Mondays, The stress of returning to work on a Monday morning can trigger a dangerous increase in blood pressure. (2005, January 31). *BBC News* Retrieved April 11, 2006, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/4223103.stm>
- Buckingham, M., Coffman, C. (1999) *First, Break All the Rules*. New York: Simon & Schuster Pages 33 & 46.
- Buckingham, M. (2005) *The One Thing You Need to Know: About Great Managing, Great Leading, and Sustained Individual Success*. New York: Free Press.
- Cartwright, S., Cooper, C. (1997) An intervention strategy for workplace stress. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 7-16.
- Collins, J. (2001) *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap and Others Don't* New York: Harper and Collins.
- Coffman, C., Gonzalez-Molina, G. (2002) *Follow this Path: How the World's Greatest Organizations Drive Growth by Unleashing Human Potential*. New York: Time Warner Books.
- Cooper, C. L., Murphy, L.R. (2000) Health and Productive Work
Pfeiffer proposed that a healthy work organization was one which offered "meaningful employment." (as cited in Cooper, C. L., Murphy, L. R., 2000).
- Conway, F. T. (1999). Mood State, Psychosocial Aspects of Work, and Musculoskeletal Discomfort in Intensive Video Display. [Electronic version]. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 11, 95-107.
- Damon, W. (2004) *The Moral Advantage: How to Succeed in Business by Doing the Right Thing*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Department of Labor Government e-laws <http://www.dol.gov/elaws/>
- Dillman, D. (2000) *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Designed Method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ekberg, K. (1994) Case-control study of risk factors for disease in the neck and shoulder area. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, Vol 51, 262-266
- Ende, H., Anderson, E. R., & Crego, S. (1997) - Liability Insurance: A Primer for College and University Counsel [Abstract] *Journal of College and University Law*, 23,609.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2004) *EEOC Litigation Statistics, FY 1992 through FY 2005*. Washington D.C: Government Printing Office. Retrieved December 1, 2005 from <http://www.eeoc.gov/litigation/study>

- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2006) *Litigation Statistics: FY 1992-2002*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Retrieved August 11, 2004, from <http://www.eeoc.gov/litigation/index.html>
- Evanoff & Rosenstock (1994) reported that estimates of the annual direct and indirect medical costs associated with occupational stress in the United States (as cited in Shoaf et al, 2004).
- Farrell, E. F. (2001, November 16) Colleges' Risk Managers Face a Rising Tide of Litigation -The growing field helps universities deal with costly lawsuits -- or avoid them entirely. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A:29
- Frank, F.D., Finnegan, R.P., & Taylor, C.R., (2004), *The Race for Talent: Retaining and Engaging Workers in the 21st Century. Journal of Human Resource Planning VOL 27; PART 3, pages 12-25.*
- George, J.M. & Jones, G. R. (1997) *Experiencing Work: Values, Attitudes, and Moods Journal of Human Relations Vol. 50, No. 4, 393-416.*
- Giacalone, R. A. & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003) *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance: Armonk: M. E. Sharpe.*
- Gilley, J.W. & Boughton, N.W. (1996) *Stop Managing, Start Coaching! How Performance Coaching Can Enhance Commitment and Improve Productivity.* Chicago: Times Mirror.
- Gilley, J. W., Boughton, N. W., & Maycunich, A. (1999). *The performance challenge: Developing management systems to make employees your greatest asset.* Cambridge, MA: Perseus, Pages 7-154
- Giltrow, M., & Lucius, R. (2005, December 2) *Climate survey information source.* Solicitation posted to Organizational Diagnostics Online, archived at <http://od-online.com/index.asp>
- Hadler, N.H., (1998) *Coping with arm pain in the workplace* Bamptom (1988) and Ekberg (1994) proposed that there is a positive correlation between job uncertainty and upper extremity disorders. [Electronic Version] *Clinical Orthopedics & Related Research*, 351, 57-62.
- Heliovaara, M. (1991) *Determinants of sciatica and low-back pain.* [Electronic Version] Research Institute for Social Security, Social Insurance Institution Ergonomics Initiative in Injury Prevention Publications. Retrieved October 2, 2005, from <http://www.escs.uwaterloo.ca/index.html>

- Heller, D. E. (2001) The Policy Shift in State Financial Aid Programs. *Journal of Higher Education* 17, 41 & 221-262.
- Hoffman, E. (1988, September). Abraham Maslow: Father of Enlightened Management [Electronic version] *Training Magazine* Retrieved February 18, 2002, from <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/hstein/hoff2.htm>
- Immerwahr, J. (2002) The Affordability of Higher Education: A Review of Recent Survey Research. San Jose: National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- Johnstone, D. B. (Ed.). (1998). *The Financing and Management of Higher Education: A Status Report on Worldwide Reforms. Preceedings from the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education*. Paris, France.
- Jones, L. G. (1998) Preventing Lawsuits: The Role of Institutional Research: New Directions for Institutional Research. *New Directions for Institutional Research Journal* 96, 1-120.
- Kane, T. (1999) *The Price of Admission: Rethinking How Americans Pay for College* Washington, D. C., Brookings Institution Press.
- Klein, M. & Napier, R. (2003) *The Courage to Act: 5 Factors of Courage to Transform Business*. Mountain View, Davies-Black.
- Koehoorn, M. Lowe, G.S., Rondeau, K.V., Schellenberg, G., Wagar, T. H. (2001) Creating High-Quality Health Care Workplaces - *CPRN Discussion Paper No. W14 Canadian Policy Research Networks Web*. Retrieved February 3, 2006, from http://www.fcrss.ca/final_research/commissioned_research/programs/pdf/cr-cpm_e.pdf
- Kompier, M. A. J., (1993). Psychosocial factors at work and musculoskeletal disease. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*, 19, 297-312. [Electronic Version]. Retrieved October 1, 2005, from <http://www.abdn.ac.uk/~psy363.pdf>
- Lakey, G., Napier, R., Robinson, J. & Lakey, B. (1995) *Grassroots and Nonprofit Leadership: A Guide for Organizations in Changing Times*.
- Letzring, T. D. (1997) Legal Cases and Institutional Research Involving Faculty Dismissals Based on Financial Exigency *New Directions for Institutional Research Journal* (96) 37 - 44.

- Lind, E. A, Greenberg, J., Scott, K. S. Welchans, T. D. (2000) The Winding Road from Employee to Complainant: Situational and Psychological Determinants of Wrongful-Termination Claims: *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45 (3), 557-590.
- Management Methods Incorporated <http://www.mmipproblemsolver.com/2-ojo.htm>
- McKenna, E. (2000) Business Psychology and Organisational Behaviour: A Student's Handbook - Page 542.
- Napier, R., Sidle, C. & Sanaghan, P. (1998) High Impact Tools and Activities for Strategic Planning: Creative Techniques for Facilitating Your Organization's Planning Process. New York, McGraw Hill.
- Napier, R. McDaniel, R. (2006) Measuring What Matters: Simplified Tools for Aligning Teams and Their Stakeholders. MountainView, Davies-Black Publishing.
- New Study Reveals Financial Burden of Workplace Injuries Growing Faster than Inflation (2003). Retrieved October 1, 2005, from <http://www.libertymutual.com/omapps/ContentServer?pagename=CorporateInternet/Page/PressReleaseTeal&cid=1003349317278&prid=1058287644297&pagestyle=Teal&dir=/CorporateInternet/CorpHomePage/CorpNewsRoom/CorpNewsReleases/2003/WorkplaceSafetyIndex03Fall%20>
- Olson, W. (2006) Employment Practices Liability Insurance: Understanding the Exposure and Preventing Claims. [Electronic version] *Employer Advisor Network Special Report Series* Retrieved March 1, 2006, from <http://www.hrthatworks.com/free/EPLIfree.PDF>
- Pfieffer, J. (1996) Understanding Organizations: Concepts and Controversies [Abstract] *Handbook of Social Psychology*. 2,733.
- Pfieffer, J. (2001) Business and the Spirit: Management Practices that Sustain Values: *Stanford University Graduate School of Business Research Paper Series #1713* <https://gsbapps.stanford.edu/researchpapers/Library/1713.pdf>
- Phin, D. (2006) Employment Practices Liability Insurance: Understanding the Exposure and Preventing Claims Employer Advisors Network, Inc. 2006.
- Piirainen, H., Rasanen, K. & Kivimaki, M. (2003) Organizational Climate, Perceived Work-Related Symptoms And Sickness Absence: A Population-Based Survey. *Journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine*. 45(2):175-184, February 2003.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (2000) Campus Climate Surveys: Where to Begin *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 180-185.

- Shoaf, C., Genaidy, A. Karwowski, W. & Huang, S. H. (2004) Improving Performance and Quality of Working Life: A Model for Organizational Health Assessment in Emerging Enterprises. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing* VOL 14; NUMB 1, pages 81-96.
- Slimak, R. E. & Berkowitz, S. R. (1983) - The University and College Counseling Center and Malpractice Suits. [Abstract] *Personnel and Guidance Journal* (61) (5) 291-95.
- Spear, P. (2006) The University of Wisconsin-Madison Campus Climate
<http://www.provost.wisc.edu/climate/>
- St Paul Travelers (2006) Direct and Indirect Cost of Accidents [Electronic Version]
Retrieved October 25, 2006 from
<http://www.travelers.com/SPT02PortalMain.asp?startpage=/iwcm/BusIns/riskcontrol/home/>
- Tola S, Riihimaki H, Videman T, Viikari-Juntura E, Hanninen K. (1988) Neck and shoulder symptoms among men in machine operating, dynamic physical work and sedentary work. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health* (5):299-305.
- University of Houston Supervisor Evaluation Scale
http://www.class.uh.edu/comd/files/SUPERVISOR_EVALUATION_SCALE.doc
- Vroom, V. H. (1990) [Introduction] In Presidents & Fellows of Harvard, *Manage People, Not Personnel: Motivation and Performance Appraisal*, Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Whitener, E.M. (1998) Managers as Initiators of Trust: An Exchange Relationship Framework for Understanding Managerial Trustworthy Behavior. *Academy of Management Review* 1998 Vol. 23, No. 3, S13-530 Retrieved September 1, 2005, from <http://www.jstor.org/view/03637425/ap010091/01a00120/0>

Appendix A
Supervisor Relationship Inventory Cover Letter

Supervisory Relationship Inventory Cover Letter

Your assistance is requested in completing an inventory that is part of a research project. The information gathered via this inventory will be used in a dissertation and kept entirely confidential. The purpose of this inventory is to gather data regarding the perceptions of how those most responsible for risk management processes regard the quality of supervision occurring within their campuses or auxiliary units. The inventory has 18 items and should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. By participating, you are contributing to the education of your colleagues in the WSU system. Participation is voluntary and responses will remain completely confidential, so please **do not** write your name anywhere on the inventory. Completing the inventory implies your consent. If you have any questions about the inventory, you may contact the designer, Robert L. Brown, at (619) 594-0858 or by email, rleebrown@foundation.sdsu.edu

Based on your knowledge and/or experience with supervisory practices in your organization, please click on the number to the right of the question that most accurately reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements below.

Appendix B
Supervisor Relationship Inventory

Supervisor Relationship Inventory

Please answer the questions to the best of your ability.

In this organization, supervisors and managers:

- | | Strongly
Disagree | | | | | Strongly
Agree |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 Provide clear and timely information to their employees | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 Value their employees' opinions. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 Provide timely help and support to their employees. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4 Praise their employees when they do good work. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5 Are clear in their delegation of authority to their employees | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6 Involve their employees in critical decisions | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7 Provide the resources employees need to perform successfully. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8 Fairly recognize employee contributions during the evaluation process. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9 Encourage employees to discuss their work progress with them. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10 Involve employees in quality and productivity improvement activities. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11 Encourage employees to develop their skills and talents on the job. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12 Reward employees fairly on the basis of their performance. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13 Are proficient in using a variety of communication skills and tools. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14 Recognize and attempt to accommodate different work styles. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15 Provide opportunities for professional development. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16 Publicly recognize the contributions of their employees. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> |

Demographics

Please tell us about yourself and your organization.

17. Primary Responsibility? Human Resources Workers' Compensation
 Operations Finance Risk Management Other
18. Are you a supervisor? Yes No 19. What is your gender? Male Female
20. Approximately what percent of supervisors at your organization are female?
 Less than 10% 11-25% 26-50% 50% +
21. Name of your campus or auxiliary

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION