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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Statement of Purpose

One area of concern within the discipline of sociology is the study of complex or formal organizations. Researchers in this area have concentrated on such aspects as the structure and functioning of organizations, organizational change, the relationships between organizations and their environments, the patterns of interpersonal relationships within organizations, and others. One area that has been greatly neglected by organizational researchers is the creation of organizations.

A review of the literature in the social psychology and sociology of organizations indicated that, while there was some concern for the emergence of organizations within these disciplines, the existing literature focused primarily on such issues as why people start organizations\(^1\) and activities that must be successfully undertaken to insure the survival of an organization.\(^2\) These writings are rationally informed speculations which were developed from the already existing literature on the sociology of complex organizations.

The existence of organizations is non-problematic to organizational researchers; thus, the investigation of the social psychological processes involved in the creation of organizations has been ignored. As current organizational theory is unable to describe or explain organizational emergence, an exploratory study was conducted to examine this process.
Specifically, it developed as a response to the author's concern for such broad questions as: "how does an organization get started?" or "what takes place during the creation of an organization?"

In order to empirically examine the processes of organizational emergence, a case study of the creation of a mental health office was undertaken; and, as is often the case in exploratory research, it was shaped by knowledge gained and questions formulated during the research process itself. Of course, ideas garnered from the existing literature on complex organizations provided an initial focus for the research. I was alerted to the fact that the already established network of mental health organizations (local, state, and federal) might influence the development of the office under investigation through existing regulations. My attention was also directed toward the process of secondary socialization within organizations and the fact that the culture or climate of an organization might impact on the activities of the emerging organization.

Since exploratory research allows the researcher to ground the study in the empirical social life under investigation, the result is often a clarification and narrowing of the actual research focus. The importance of new lines of inquiry become apparent while the significance of some pre-conceived dimensions shift. As applied to this particular study, the broad issues which provided the foci for the study were transformed into more clearly delineated concerns.
Thus, the purpose of the research presented herein is to describe the emergence of a mental health office by examining several interrelated dimensions: (1) the historical events which led to the creation of the office; (2) the members -- how they were recruited into the organization and the influence of their styles of interaction on the organization's development; (3) the work related tasks of the members; (4) the development of intra-organizational relationships; (5) the development of inter-organizational relationships; (6) factors affecting the legitimacy of the office; and (7) the emerging culture of the organization. As there are changes which take place in the aforementioned areas as the organization develops, another factor which had to be considered was time. The events will be presented in chronological order by utilizing the analytical notion of "stages of development" of the organization. These stages do not reflect the timetable for the accomplishment of specific tasks which were set by the organization. Rather, they are constructs developed by the author which demarcate significant changes in the organization.

The data depict the process of organizational emergence and is primarily the interaction of the individuals involved within the office. Many of their work activities, formal and informal conversations, and inquiries into their roles in the office are documented. Also, at times the organization's members will be allowed to speak for themselves on how they got involved with the work and how they viewed the office and their relationships to it. Thus, much of this account has an ethnographic quality.
Significance of the Study

As has already been pointed out, concern for the creation of organizations has not been foremost in the minds of organizational theorists. While most analysts acknowledge that individuals do create organizations, study of the process itself has been largely neglected. Sarason has noted this fact in his review of the literature.

The Handbook of Organizations (March, 1965) is an unusually large, comprehensive, and excellent summary of theory and research in regard to a variety of settings, including industrial, penal, educational. The creation of a setting or organization as a separate problem is not raised or discussed. Stinchcombe's (1965) chapter is the most relevant, but aside from stating in one paragraph why people create new settings, he says little about the developmental aspects.

It appears, however, that there may be a movement within the field of organizational studies to remedy this situation. A recent text devotes an entire chapter to the topic of the creation of organizations and an edited volume contains several chapters on issues related to the creation of organizations.

However, the importance of studying organizational emergence does not stem merely from the fact that there is a gap in our knowledge of organizations. Surely disciplines can develop extensive knowledge of their respective subject matter without investigating every possible area of concern. An area of investigation is important, nonetheless, when one has reason to believe (1) that knowledge generated from an investigation of the area will have an influence on other related areas or (2) that knowledge gained may be applicable to practical pursuits. It is on the basis of these two criteria, the relevance of the knowledge to
other ideas within the discipline and its applicability, that the importance of studying organizational emergence rests. Statements providing support for this position have been proffered by organizational analysts and some of these discussions will now be summarized.

The open system approach to the study of organizational structures which is championed by Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn requires an examination of organizational emergence. Within this framework they are able to assert the importance of early events as determinants of the subsequent functions of organizations.

Formal structures, once created, generate pressures for their survival and enhancement. Organizations cannot be understood wholly in terms of the interaction of past, present, and future environmental requirements and the personal needs of members. The very structures created to meet these demands exert a force in their own right. Once developed, a production system will exert profound influences upon the rest of the organization. Once developed, maintenance structures will be a powerful force for conservation in the perpetuation of existing practices.

Thus, they argue that while environmental factors do influence the structure of organizations, current structure is also dependent upon prior interactional patterns. Furthermore, structures created during the early days of an organization's existence are asserted to have a conservative influence on organizational innovation.

Pennings has also noted the importance of studying organizational emergence in his theoretical work on the ecological aspects of entrepreneurship. He remarks that the creation of a new organization is significant "... not only because it is the starting point of that life cycle
but also because it is an overriding factor in molding and constraining
the organization's behavior during the subsequent stages of its life
cycle."\textsuperscript{12} He laments that many writers explain differences between organ-
izations in their structure, patterns of change, and efficiency, while
taking for granted the emergence of new organizations. Furthermore, he
suggests that the weaknesses of these studies may stem from the fact that
development during the initial stage establishes patterns of social inter-
action and structural features which become relatively permanent and that
the organizational inertia which this produces is consequential in the
subsequent stages.\textsuperscript{13}

Van de Ven comments on both the basic and applied significance of
research on organizational emergence. He notes that questions concerning
the manner in which organizations are created, the impact that this has
on the success of new organizations, the obstacles encountered when
establishing an organization, the influence of these obstacles in the early and later life of an organization, and the degree to which the
occurrence of obstacles can be predicted from the manners in which organ-
izations are conceived and planned have been largely ignored by
researchers of organizations or management.\textsuperscript{14}

He adds that the importance of these issues and an overall focus on
the creation of organizations become evident when one considers that one
fourth of all businesses in the United States are one year old or less
and that the life expectancy of new business organizations is short. Since
World War II the median duration of new businesses has been approximately
one and three-fourth years. By examining estimates made by the U.S.
Department of Commerce (which does not include public or private non-profit
organizations) Van de Ven concluded: "In the American business population as a whole, 54 percent of all newly formed or acquired businesses survive one and a half years or less, one quarter survive six years or less, and only 19 percent remain in operation under the same ownership for more than ten years." This indicates a need for researchers to study organizations other than those which are stable and mature. Furthermore, Van de Ven's reported research in progress strongly supports the broad hypothesis that "... the initial processes in planning new organizations are strongly related to their subsequent implementation success." Van de Ven's argument is echoed by Miles and Randolph in their work on organizational learning. They comment that comprehensive reviews of the literature on organizational structures and change indicate that our knowledge of organizations is derived predominantly from ahistorical, cross-sectional research on well-established organizations. The result is that there is little knowledge of the evolution of organizational structures, such as patterns of decision-making. Being cognizant of the high mortality rate of new businesses and the costs to individuals and society stemming from poorly devised organizational creations, they recommend longitudinal and field studies of organizational creation.

Since the importance of the creation of organizations has recently been noted, it is interesting to speculate on why this area has been neglected for so long. John Kimberly suggests that the organizational literature has a static quality to it for several reasons. Researchers are frequently involved with organizations at a single point in time; therefore, they rely on cross-sectional research techniques. This leads
them to study organizations that are well-established. Furthermore, if the data collection techniques depend on responses from organizational actors -- people with only temporary affiliation with the organization -- it is likely that their understanding of organizational life will be truncated.

It is likely that the contemporary division between history and sociology has also contributed to this neglect. Organizational researchers who are trained in sociology or psychology are apt to be socialized to accept the values of traditional science. This leads to an emphasis on objectivity, empirical data, verification, and replication. The accompanying positivistic bias acts to limit the problems which are viewed as legitimate and worthy of investigation. This perspective devalues both historical analysis and detailed, descriptive case studies which emphasize organizational dynamics.

It is also commonly understood that academic structure encourages scholars, especially young scholars, to engage in research that is apt to lead to quick and frequent publication. Cross-sectional research is more compatible with these individuals' career demands than is longitudinal research. Furthermore, while it is easier for the younger researchers to adopt the role of the "acceptable incompetent" which is useful in field research, the academic reward structure inhibits this type of research.

Finally, much organizational research is sponsored by corporations, government agencies, etc., which influence the kinds of problems investigated and the amount of time spent on research. Frequently, research financed by these groups is concerned with improving the already existing
organization. Each of these inter-related factors (sponsorship, academic rewards, ahistorical bias, reliance on organizational participants, and brief encounters with organizations) contribute to a static orientation of organizational investigation.  

The scarcity of studies of the processes of organizational dynamics can easily result in a neglect of organizational emergence. Research has assumed the existence of relatively stable organizational activity; and, therefore, the processes which produced it were not the foci of investigation. In ahistorical, cross-sectional research the organization is a given. It is non-problematic.

The significance of the present study stems from the fact that it is an empirical contribution to the study of organizational emergence. Since it is grounded research, it can provide an analytical framework for the study of organizational emergence and present a description of the process itself. Hopefully, this will lead to a clarification of some of the dimensions involved in the formation of new organizations.
On Theoretical Perspectives of Organizational Behavior

It is commonplace in the sociological literature on organizations for the writers to begin their reports by discussing previous research and theories of complex organizations. Whenever there is some commonality in the perspectives utilized to direct a study, to analyze data, or to formulate explanations, the writings are generally catalogued according to the theoretical perspectives employed. This leads to an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the theories on the basis of their assumptions regarding the nature of social reality and the types of data gathered. The results of such an evaluation can be varied. Some writers reject the value of conflicting perspectives as they argue that the perspective which they selected is vastly superior for the understanding of the problem at hand. Thus, many previous contributions are utilized solely in "straw man" arguments. Others argue that all of the theoretical positions are valid, but that each is applicable to a specific domain of inquiry. In this case the proper theoretical orientation is selected on the basis of the unit of analysis or, as Kuhn suggests, on the basis of one's professional training and the current "normal" science paradigm. Others may examine the shortcomings of already existing theories and advance new theories. This can be accomplished by theoretical synthesis or the extension of existing theories in one scientific domain or discipline to the conventional subject matter of another.
In all cases, however, theories of complex organizations are not formulations that are produced when the investigation is completed. As Kaplan states, a theory "... has a greater responsibility than that of an accessory after the fact: it guides the search for data, and for laws encompassing them;" and the research to be presented here is not an exception. Nevertheless, as an inductive, exploratory study, a well-developed theoretical framework was not established prior to the initiation of the investigation. As Schatzman and Strauss comment: "Qualitative analysts do not often enjoy the operational advantages of their quantitative cousins in being able to predict their own analytic processes; consequently, they cannot refine and order their raw data by operations built initially into the design of the research." Yet, a theoretical framework is necessary to begin the investigation for this provides a starting point for the research.

The perspective which initially guided this research is that of interactionism as outlined by Herbert Blumer. This perspective was selected because it is compatible with case studies and exploratory research and it emphasizes the emergent character of social interaction. While other theoretical approaches could also be utilized, the assumptions of these perspectives regarding such factors as the sources of organizational change and conflict or organizational needs would undermine the purpose of this research. This would occur because certain aspects of organizational life would be rendered non-problematic.

Interactionism does not assume that organizational development is determined by objective conditions or the personality characteristics and attitudes of people. In his discussion of "emergence" Davis states:
"... the actual undergoing of the process set (sic) its own conditions for further action, the conditions themselves being an existential amalgam of previously emergent responses and events. This process, we would hold, defies simple causal reduction to some original state of immanence or fixed set of determining events. Although it is possible to detect, post hoc, certain regularities in the process, this is not to say that its end-states are wholly contained in its beginnings." The process of emergence involves perceptual changes and the re-evaluation of past, present, and future conditions.

The symbolic interactionism articulated by Blumer is based on three assumptions: (1) "... that human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them." (2) "... that the meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interactions that one has with one's fellows," and (3) "... that these meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretive process used by the person in dealing with the things he encounters." Each of these premises will be examined as they apply to the creation of organizations.

A concern for the function that meaning has for the behavior of those involved in establishing an organization suggests numerous lines of inquiry. What does the organization mean to those who are members of it? Is it perceived as a source of income, job security, an exciting challenge, a stepping-stone in one's career, or another source of alienating labor? Are one's co-workers and their activities perceived as cooperative friends or interfering pests? How do those who initially conceived of the organization view it? Is it an opportunity to provide more income, as a source of prestige, or an occasion to neglect other work
activities? What does the new organization mean to those outside of it who will have other dealings with it? Will it be a source of competition, conflict, or will it be insignificant?

The second assumption asserts that the source of meaning is social interaction. The meanings of such components to organizational life as its formal rules and regulations, its power structure, work activities, interorganizational relationships, etc. are themselves social products that are developed when people interact. The interacting individuals may be members of the organization or they may be others outside the organization. They can be those with whom one is currently interacting or those in the past. Their interaction toward an individual with respect to an object, activity, etc. produces the meaning that it has for the individual.

The final assumption acknowledges that the derivation of meaning involves an interpretive process, that is, people also interact with themselves and alter the meaning in accordance with their perceptions of the situational context. Thus, the meanings of the things which comprise an organization (as illustrated in the aforementioned question) are subject to change with variation in time and place. Previously formulated meanings are always subject to revision.

With this theoretical perspective in mind the collection of data was initiated. The focus was on the meanings that the organization had for those who were involved with it, the bases for the meanings, and their modification over time. However, as the investigation continued attention was directed to other aspects of organizational emergence, as well. The other significant dimensions will be outlined in the next chapter.
Social Assistance Systems

The organization which is the subject of this investigation is the Office of Social Assistance Systems (SAS). This is not the real name of the organization. Throughout this work some aspects of the organization are disguised to provide confidentiality. Additionally, the individuals discussed herein have been given pseudonyms.

SAS was a component of a midwestern state Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (DMHMR). The office was financially supported in part by the state and in part by the federal government through a contract awarded to the DMHMR by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). The contract was aimed at improving the quality of life for former adult psychiatric patients of mental hospitals. The concern was to provide a full range of services to meet the needs of the seriously mentally ill who had been "deinstitutionalized."

The goals of the Office of Social Assistance Systems were numerous, and they will be quoted from an official project overview.

Overall, the state project has the first-year goal of developing a statewide strategy to promote development and improvement of social assistance systems (SASs) appropriate to the needs and potentials of adults with serious and persistent mental or emotional disabilities.

In addition, the project has the following five state level objectives: (1) to establish under the auspices of the mental health system an organizational unit responsible for facilitating development and improvement of social assistance systems; (2) to identify, link together, and promote concerted action toward social assistance goals on the part of a broad-based constituency of key interest groups, state and local leaders, and decision-makers within the state; (3) to organize a participatory process that will provide a complete assessment of social assistance
systems needs and resources within the state; (4) to analyze the implications of social assistance goals for future human resources development, technical assistance and training efforts; and (5) to prepare a three year interagency state-community support strategy setting forth specific objectives, action steps, responsibilities, timetables, resource requirements, incentives, and sanctions. (Reference withheld for confidentiality).

The office was established in the late 1970s. It was located in the state capital and housed in the same building with many other offices of the DMHMR. The SAS office was to be headed by Nick Notting-ham, Ph.D.
Notes for Chapter One


4The term "emergent organizations" is used by Haas and Drabek to refer to "transitory interaction systems that are structurally more complex than gatherings." J. Eugene Haas and Thomas E. Drabek, Complex Organizations (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1973), p. 6.

In this report, however, the term is utilized to focus attention on the fact that the organization under investigation did not have a long history of existence prior to the study. The terms "emergent" and "emergence" are utilized to emphasize that the organization is being created and that the processes of creation are the concern of the study.


9These arguments are based on a series of interrelated assumptions. Statements which illustrate that this area of investigation is important assume that the broader field is also significant. Thus, the assumptions that the field of sociology, and knowledge in general are important are contained in these arguments.


11Ibid., p. 84.

13. Ibid., p. 136.


15. Ibid., p. 84.

16. Ibid., p. 128


18. Ibid., p. 82.


CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY

Methodological Selection

The forms of sociological investigation are many and varied, as are the arguments regarding the selection of appropriate research techniques. One factor which is often cited in discussions of methodological selection is the goals of social scientific enterprises. Cognizant of the diversity which exists in this area, Bruyn has analyzed this phenomenon in terms of polar orientations which contrast the "inner perspective" of participant observation with the "outer perspective" of Durkheimian empiricism.\(^1\) The former aims to achieve a "sensitively accurate interpretation and explanation of social and cultural life," and the latter seeks to accomplish "accurate measurement and prediction of behavior."\(^2\) While a consideration of the proper aim of sociological investigation is beyond the scope of this research, a consideration of research methods employed in light of the purpose of this dissertation is in order.

As was previously mentioned, the goal of this research is the production of an analytical description of the processes involved in the emergence of an organization. Due to the paucity of research in this area, the nature of this study is exploratory. The aim is the discovery of those factors and processes which appear significant to organizational emergence and a clarification of the relationships among those dimensions. The method selected to achieve this goal was participant observation.
As Zelditch has argued, the appropriateness of any research techniques involves a consideration of the types of information or data that are relevant to the study. He has categorized different types of information into three classes: (1) incidents and histories, (2) distributions and frequencies, and (3) generally known rules and statuses. None of these types of information were omitted a priori in this study for such a decision would certainly interfere with the discovery process inherent in exploratory studies. However, the second and third classes of information assume that the subjects do in fact possess the knowledge that the researcher wishes to obtain and that the researcher has specific questions to pose to the subjects. Therefore, it was evident that the second and third classes of information would have little utility in the initial stages of this research.

The first two classes of information consist of both the observations of the investigator and the reports of informants or respondents. Data of class I, incidents and histories, consist of both the observations of the researcher (what is actually seen to occur) and statements of subjects which express what the actions or events mean to them. The reports contained in information of the second class, distributions and frequencies, are quite different. These reports provide the basis for opinion polls and other systematic surveys.

The type of data needed to achieve the goals of this research is of the first class. These data include a record of ongoing events and conversations, descriptions of activities by the participants, and the meanings and explanations of these activities as they are reported by the participants. On the basis of this type of data, inferences can be made
and an analytical description of the organizing process can be developed.

Furthermore, participant observation is the prototypical method for obtaining this type of information if the adequacy of the information and the efficiency of data collection are considered.6 This method allows the researcher to directly observe the activities of those under investigation and to develop social relationships with them. It also provides an opportunity to be a part of on-going events, if that is desirable, or to gather documents which can provide information and/or be subject to analysis.

Another consideration in the formulation of a research problem and the selection of research techniques is the underlying perspective of the researcher regarding the nature of the social world7 or the phenomenon under investigation,8 in this case an emerging organization. As the research was guided by a symbolic interactionist perspective, it was necessary to gather data that are compatible with the aforementioned premises of this perspective. As Blumer states: "Symbolic interactionism holds that social action must be studied in terms of how it is formed."9 Regarding the methodological stance of symbolic interactionism, he notes the following:

On the methodological or research side the study of action would have to be made from the position of the actor. Since action is forged by the actor out of what he perceives, interprets, and judges, one would have to see the operating situations as the actor sees it, perceive objects as the actor perceives them, ascertain their meaning in terms of the meaning they have for the actor, and follow the actor's line of conduct as the actor organizes it -- in short, one would have to take the role to the actor and see his world from his standpoint.
Taking the role of the other is a common occurrence in everyday life as well as in sociological research. As Berger and Luckmann state, the most important experience that we can have of others, and the prototypical case of social interaction, is face-to-face interaction. It is through such interaction that the subjectivity of others is accessible to us, although there is the possibility of misinterpretation. Participant observation is the only research method which allows the investigator to participate in or to observe the immediacy of social interaction.

While symbolic interactionism does not necessarily restrict the investigator to the use of participant observation, this approach has other advantages for the researcher whose investigation is in the exploratory stage. The nonstandardized format of this type of research allows the investigator to redirect or alter the lines of investigation on the basis of information that is gathered during the research process. Thus, areas of investigation which were previously unknown or thought to be insignificant can be explored.

This research approach also allows the investigator to develop and utilize relationships with the participants in the events. To the extent that friendly and supportive relationships are developed, the researcher may be allowed to observe the subjects in informal settings where they may be more relaxed and spontaneous in their activities. The researcher may also gather "off the record" information or successfully inquire into the more private and confidential areas of the subjects' lives.
Lofland speculates that it is uncommon for an observer who was previously unknown to the gatekeepers of a research setting to be allowed access as a known observer. If he is correct, my entrance into the field is an exception to the rule. Prior to the time at which I contracted Nottingham, the chief of the Office of Social Assistance Systems (SAS), about the possibility of studying the creation of his office we had never met and we had no common acquaintances who might act as personal sponsors for me.

I heard from a friend and former employee of the Division of Mental Health (DMH), a component of the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (DMHMR), that a new office was being established and that Nick Nottingham was the head of this office. I telephoned him and asked if the information which I received was correct. After he stated that it was, I informed him that I was a graduate student in sociology with an interest in organizations and that I would be interested in studying the "birth" of an organization. His response was that he had mentioned to someone a few weeks earlier that his office would be great material for a dissertation for someone. He added that he didn't think that he had money to employ a part-time researcher. I said that finding financial support would be my concern, and we agreed that I should send an idea sheet to him regarding my research plans.

The idea sheet was a short letter in which I stated that, in my review of the literature on complex organizations, I could not find detailed descriptions of how organizations originate. I added that I
would like to do an exploratory study by utilizing participant observa-
tion and that, if the prospects for research appeared favorable, I would
seek the necessary financial support from other sources. I also said
that I was ready to begin my research immediately for I had reason to
doubt the reliability of retrospective studies of emerging phenomena.
Finally, I asked that he respond as soon as possible.

Nottingham did respond promptly and a meeting was arranged at his
office. The meeting was brief and casual, and Nottingham quickly gave
his approval. I could not help but wonder why my entrance was so easily
obtained. Later I discovered that Nottingham had a Ph.D. in industrial
psychology and that he had done research on organizations himself. His
doctoral dissertation involved an evaluation of an organizational
development strategy, and prior to taking his present position he fre-
quently worked as a researcher and organizational consultant. There-
fore, it is likely that my entrance to this setting was facilitated by our
common interest in organizational research.
Data Collection

I. Observation

My observations at the Office of Social Assistance Systems (SAS) began the following day and continued for approximately five months. I spent from three to five half-days a week at the office. Most mornings were omitted due to other responsibilities. I spent the entire day with the office members whenever it was possible. Most of the observation was done at the office itself, but I would occasionally accompany some of the subjects to meetings which were held away from the office, to lunch, dinner, or movies. This provided me with an opportunity to speak with them away from their co-workers and to observe their interactions with members of other organizations or offices within the DMH. I also traveled with them to local community mental health centers where they conducted site visits and to other locations where they were given specific job training and orientation.

The actual process of data collection was guided by suggestions presented by John Lofland in his work *Analyzing Social Settings.* Some of the specific aspects of this process will now be presented.

In my previous discussion with Nottingham we agreed that I would be a known observer in the office. I would present myself to the office workers as a graduate student who was interested in watching an organization being created. It would be left up to each individual member of the organization to allow me to accompany them throughout the day. As the new members were hired I introduced myself to them and none of them objected to my activities. To my surprise, none of them even questioned...
me in any detail about my research until I had been observing for approximately four months. I suspect that they were too concerned with discovering their own work roles to be concerned about my activities. The only work activity which I was excluded from was the process of interviewing potential office members.

At Nottingham's suggestion I presented myself to outsiders as a "field placement student" when I was introduced to them. We both agreed that it would be best if I identified myself as a student, but he also wanted it known that I was attached to his office. Whenever a written record of attendance at meetings was kept, he made sure that the secretaries would include my name and the title "field placement student."

Being a known observer, I was not faced with the additional difficulties that come with covert investigations. I was free to move about as I chose. I also suspect that as an outsider and student I was not threatening to the other office members. On one occasion I arrived at the office wearing a tie and was playfully mocked and teased for looking like a "bureaucrat." I stopped wearing a tie.

The student role facilitated taking field notes in the office. Frequently I would occupy a vacant desk in the office, open a textbook, and pretend to take notes from the book. In fact I was making notes of activities in the office and jotting down conversations. It was also easy to take notes at meetings and during the training sessions for it was commonplace for others to be taking notes in these situations also.

Following Lofland's advice, full field notes were typed every evening so that information would not be lost. On occasions when I did not have time to type the notes, they were tape recorded and transcribed
as soon as possible (usually on the following weekend). Copies of the full field notes were made with carbon paper or by xerox so that they could be catalogued as the analysis began.

My time spent at the office was also occupied with the collection of documents relevant to understanding the office. I was able to collect information on the request for proposals that initiated the process of creating the organization, the proposal which was submitted for funding, inter-office memos that related to these activities, minutes of meetings that transpired prior to my observations, documents which Nottingham had collected from NIMH, and rules and regulations of the DMH.

II. Interviewing

After approximately four months of observation, I interviewed those who were involved in the creation of SAS. This included some SAS staff members, others who were initially responsible for the conception of the office, and others who related to SAS on a regular basis. Some SAS staff members were excluded because sufficient information had been gathered during my normal interaction with them. One other founder of SAS was omitted because he no longer resided in the area.

Arrangements to interview SAS members were made in person. Others were contacted by telephone. No one declined to be interviewed, but one individual explained that he had very little to do with establishing SAS. This was corroborated by others; therefore, he was only briefly questioned over the phone.
Most interviews were conducted in private offices or unoccupied rooms near the end of the work day or after hours. The interviews lasted one to two hours each. With the respondents' permission, the interviews were tape recorded and a few notes were jotted down. One individual declined to have the interview recorded. Separate guides were prepared for each interview, but a general description of the interview process is in order.

Since I had already met the respondents on other occasions, the introductions were brief at this time. I explained to them that I was observing SAS because I was interested in studying how an organization gets started. I also said that I was a graduate student and that this research was being conducted as part of my Ph.D. requirements in sociology. I told them that the interviews would be confidential and then asked them to sign consent forms which related to the protection of human subjects.

After requesting permission to record the interviews, I explained that they need not answer all the questions. For the sake of accuracy, I asked them to inform me if they did not have a clear recollection of certain events. I felt that this tactic would provide me with more reliable responses for two reasons. First, if the respondent states that his/her memory of events is unclear, I would be less likely to consider the response as accurate. Secondly, it is easier to deny knowledge of events than it is to create fictitious accounts, especially when the interviewer provides this option. I believe that allowing respondents to skip questions and to say that they do not remember events makes the interviewing process less threatening to them.
Early in the interviews I sought information on the emergence of SAS prior to my period of observation. Respondents were questioned regarding the ways they first heard of the SAB project, their initial reactions, how they got involved with the project, and the nature of their involvement. Similarly, SAS staff members were questioned regarding their recruitment to the office. Next, they were questioned regarding their understandings of how they would relate to SAS.

This led to a consideration of their current relationships to SAS. Outsiders were questioned regarding their current relationships to SAS, how much contact they have with the SAS office, the nature of this contact, and their feelings toward the SAS office. SAS members were asked to describe their work activities, the people with whom they came in contact, and their current perceptions of the SAS office.

Next, the respondents were asked to speculate about the future of SAS. They were asked what they thought SAS would do and how they imagined that they would be involved in its activities. Then they were asked to evaluate the future of SAS.

At the close of the interview I asked them to put themselves in my place for a minute and to consider other important areas of investigation that I have omitted. Most respondents did not have any further suggestions. I concluded the interview by gathering information on their backgrounds, reminding the respondents that the interview would be confidential, and asking the respondents not to discuss the interview with others until I had completed all the interviews. They responded that they understood the importance of confidentiality on their part, and they assured me that they would not speak to others about the interview.
A concern of interviewers is the avoidance of "leading questions." While it may be presumptuous to state that no leading questions occurred during the interviews, I did observe from reading the interview transcriptions that my questioning style reduced the possibility of suggesting answers to the respondents. Often I would introduce a topic before actually formulating a question. The respondents, apparently eager to talk, frequently replied to my concern before the questions were asked. They also answered questions which were intentionally worded to be imprecise, such as, "what is the nature of your relationship to SAS?"
Analysis

As is common in field research, there was considerable overlap in the collection and analysis of data, that is, observation and analysis were concurrent activities. While most of the analysis occurred after the collection of data, much of the information was initially catalogued and filed during the observation period. Also, while doing observation, decisions were made regarding further observations and interviewing. For example, as it became apparent that some interorganizational relationships had only minor significance in regard to the creation of SAS, I began to pay less attention to them. During the early period of observation, I recorded many conversations and activities which also proved to be inconsequential. Later my observations became more selective.

As my familiarity with the SAS office increased, it became apparent that the historical context of the creation of the office was important. Quite simply, the activities of the office staff were confusing to me before I gathered this information. Events which transpired prior to the establishment of the SAS office were influencing it; therefore, these events had to be discovered. This was accomplished primarily through interviewing, informal conversations, and the examination of documents.

By necessity a study of social interaction must focus on the interacting individuals, but decisions had to be made regarding what aspects of the members to investigate. To avoid psychological reductionism, I did not study the personality characteristics of the members. Instead, the focus is upon their backgrounds as this related to how and why they got involved with the SAS office, their perceptions of the office and
their activities, and their manners of interacting with one another. While some of the information which will be presented in this study is not essential to the analysis of organizational emergence, nonetheless, it is included for it contributes to understanding the context of the emerging organizational setting.

During my observation period I focused on those activities which related to work-tasks, and the development of both interpersonal and interorganizational relationships. These areas were selected as it became apparent that they were important in the early conception of the SAS office. These categories also include processes that continued throughout the observation period.

A concern for organizational legitimacy developed after the observation period was completed. Only after reviewing my full field notes several times did I become aware that this was an area of concern for both the SAS members and the outsiders who related to the office. Literature on this topic suggests that legitimacy is important for the survival of organizations. Activities which influenced the legitimacy of SAS became significant in this investigation. As legitimacy is a status conferred by those outside the organization, others' views of SAS became important in this analysis.

A concern for organizational culture was anticipated at the outset of the investigation, but the conceptualization of culture was not determined until after the observation was completed. Geertz's semiotic conceptualization was selected for it was compatible with the perspective of symbolic interactionism and appropriate for short-term observation. Other conceptualizations of culture which incorporate the notion of
enduring values would be inappropriate for the investigation of emerging phenomena.

In order to accurately describe the process of organizational emergence, it was decided that the data be organized chronologically. A sociological calendar is utilized in the study as an analytical device. This tool focuses attention on the passage of time underlying social activities and demarcates the inter-related stages of the organizing process. When appropriate, the components of each stage can be analyzed in order to clarify the interaction among these phenomena. Most importantly the sociological calendar forces the researcher to perform the difficult task of discovering the significant aspects of organizational emergence. The calendar also facilitates the comparative analysis of each component over time and across dimensions.
Conceptual Framework

One of the first things that must be considered is the historical context within which the organization emerged. The purpose of this is two-fold. Knowledge derived from the historical study of organizations can be utilized to discover those aspects of the organization which are unique. The other purpose is to discover those aspects of the organization which it shares in common with others.  

Obviously, the goal is to develop generalizations regarding the creation of organizations, but this can only be accomplished if the historical context of organizational emergence has been considered in other research studies, as well.

A specification of the historical context will involve a delineation of the events which influenced the creation of the organization. Additionally, individuals and groups which were involved in the shaping of the organization must be identified. The specific contribution of each of these must also be indicated. The significant activities of organizational entrepreneurs must be discovered, and the role of government in facilitating or inhibiting the creation of the organization must be clarified.

The necessity of taking into account the processes that lead to the conception of an organization has been discussed by Blumer. He notes that any form of joint activity has arisen out of previous action and that it could not exist without the prior activity. Furthermore, the participants involved in the activity bring with them understandings and manners of interpretation that they already possess. Therefore, an
understanding of joint action must include a linkage with these past meanings and events.  

The relationships between social and cultural factors and the formal structures and interaction processes which occur within organizations has been explored and discussed by researchers investigating a wide array of phenomena in various settings.  

Stinchcombe has argued that in highly literate, urbanized societies with a money economy, there are both intellectual and financial resources available to the potential founders of organizations. In these societies, where traditional authority has been largely replaced by rational-legal authority, the founders are apt to be more aware of alternative courses of action. Yet, the organizations which are created reflect the dominant meaning-structures of their era.  

Or, as Silverman states: "... organizations originating within a bureaucratized society will tend to be created with a bureaucratic structure .... This is because the founders of organizations, whatever their aims, will usually take their ideas about efficient organizations from the stock of knowledge characteristic of their society at that time."  

Therefore, the historical analysis must also consider the cultural milieu which is prevalent at the time and place of organizational conception.

Aside from the historical context, seven other areas of organizational emergence will be considered in this report. These are the members, work-tasks, interpersonal relationships, interorganizational relationships, organizational legitimacy, organizational culture, and stages of organizational development. Each of these areas will now be described, and the significance of each to the study of organizational emergence.
from an interactionist perspective will be explained. It is important to note that this is not intended as an exhaustive list of every component of organizational emergence. Rather, these categories are analytical tools which were found to be useful in the ordering of data. Furthermore, by illustrating the relationships among these areas, a grounded explanation of organizational emergence could be developed.

I. The Members

Analysis of organizational emergence must focus on the individuals involved in the process. Mangham argues for the importance of the individual dimension in interactionist theory. Beginning with a reference to Weber which asserts that the understanding of social action is the task of sociology, Mangham also reasons that the individual actor takes others into account and modifies behavior in accordance with the account. It is through the subjective meaning that an actor attributes to behavior that the behavior becomes social action and future action is directed. Some of the thought of George Herbert Mead is relevant to this issue.

The human actor has the capacity for symbol manipulation and through the use of symbols can formulate an understanding of the present in conjunction with past experiences and the anticipated future. Human behavior is oriented by reference to the symbolic representation of past, present, and possible future experiences. Meanings are constructed and the individual acts in accordance with the meanings. The aforementioned premises articulated by Herbert Blumer are developments from the Meadian perspective and direct one's attention to individual action.
The acting individual is not viewed merely as a responder or as one who is acted upon. Nor is the individual viewed as being entirely self-directed, self-controlled or moved by internal forces, such as needs or instincts. As Mangham states: "From this perspective the social actor can be seen to exist in dual systems. He is both influenced by and influences the social order which he inhabits." 39

Kimberly has commented on the controversy that exists among organizational theorists regarding the attribution of organizational behavior to the characteristics of the individuals involved. He notes that sociologists, such as Charles Perrow, argue that organizational analysis is more fruitful if the tendency toward psychological reductionism, with its emphasis on personality factors and motivation, is avoided in favor of a structural approach. However, Kimberly cites some research on the creation of organizations which suggests that a purely structural approach is inadequate, and he argues that it is reasonable to assume that the importance of individual characteristics diminishes as an organization matures and its activities are more routinized and norm governed. Much of the formal structure is designed to eliminate individual influence. However, when a new social organization is being established, the individual actor may be more significant. 40

An interactionist perspective allows one to focus on individual actors without engaging in psychological reductionism for the attention is given to the interacting individuals. Denzin recommends that the researchers "... anchor the organization in the lives of the participants." 41 This involves a concern for the interrelatedness of public and private lives, and the individuals' perceptions of their life in the
organization. Past experiences and the understandings derived from them will certainly influence one's manner of interaction within the new organization. (A list of the individuals mentioned in this report is included in Appendix A.)

II. Work Tasks

At the onset of this research investigation, the concept of organizational goals was believed to be a fruitful area of investigation. Etzioni defines an organizational goal as "... a desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize." Viewing the organization's goals as its raison d'être, it seemed commonsensical to explore this area. David Sill's work documenting goal-succession suggested that I might witness an evolution in organizational goals during the creation of the organization, and Robert Merton's discussion of goal displacement indicated that the concern for organizational procedures instead of goals might be documented in this research. However, as Scott notes: "The concept of organizational goals is among the most slippery and treacherous of all those employed by organizational analysts." Scott remarks that the perceived function of organizational goals varies with the analytical framework employed. He notes that for rational systems theorists, organizational goals are viewed as sourced of criteria for the creation, evaluation, and selection of courses of action. This view emphasizes the cognitive role of goals in decision making and organizational activity. Cognizance of the goals by those involved is assumed. The cathetic function of goals is emphasized by natural systems theorists. Some will view them as sources of identification and motivation while Selznick stresses the ideological use of goals as
offensive and defensive weapons against environmental threats to the organization's survival. Others, such as Weick and March, question the assumption of the priority of goals over behavior. They view the use of goals as rational justification for behavior which has already occurred.

Conceptual issues aside, Hage and Aiken point out that the study of organizational goals does little to illuminate the processes of organizational change. While shifts in goals may produce a corresponding change in other organizational processes, goal alteration does not indicate what the other changes may be. Similarly, changes in organizational structures and processes may occur while the goals remain static. As the theoretical framework for the analysis of organizational creation was developed during the collection of data, the concept of organizational goals proved to be of little utility. Instead, the concept developed and employed throughout this research is work-tasks.

By work-tasks we mean any activities on the part of the members of the organization or interrelated groups that are directly related to achieving the formally stated ends of the organization. This includes the processes of task definitions and the processes involved in the selection of organizational procedures. The plural form is used to indicate that organizations have numerous work-tasks. The members may attribute various degrees of significance to separate work-tasks and this may be a source of conflict and frustration within the organization. Excluded from the concept of work-tasks are activities which are not related to the formally stated or agreed upon goals of the organization. These are behaviors, such as eating lunch or engaging in polite conversation, which are commonplace to various social settings. Work-tasks, on the otherhand,
are activities which are directly related to one's role in the organization.

Wilson has observed that the concept of role has different forms of employment within sociology. He notes that for analysts utilizing the normative paradigm "... interaction between actors is governed by the role-expectations of their relative statuses." and that "interaction in a given situation, then, is explained by first identifying structures of role-expectations and complexes of disposition, and then showing that the relevant features of the observed interaction can be deduced from these expectations and dispositions along with the assumptions embodied in the model of the actor." In contrast the interpretive paradigm, which includes interactionism, emphasizes role-taking or the process of creating a role. An individual is not viewed as one who occupies a social status which comes complete with a set of rules and attitudes to govern one's behavior. Rather, the actor must infer role behavior from interaction with others. On the basis of one's perception of others, the actor's patterns of behavior are developed.

III. Interpersonal Relationships

Often overlooked in investigations of organizational behavior are the activities of the individuals involved in the organization that are not directly related to their work roles. It was observed during the process of data collection that those involved in the organization under study spent a considerable amount of time engaged in conversations that have no immediate bearing on the achievement of work-tasks and that these activities are important in the development of interpersonal relations within
the office. While an investigation of these activities may be significant in its own right, for we are talking about activities that can be found throughout social life, the importance of these activities is noted in this report for they will influence how the members of the office define the situation and their participation in it. It will also influence the members' perceptions of their new-work tasks.

As Turner explains, this occurs because roles are not learned singly but in sets or pairs. They are performed in combinations, as well, for roles have both status and functional properties. Thus, in everyday life one may act as parent/antagonist, husband/friend, secretary/conspirator, or neighbor/mediator.

It is common for individuals to seek information about others and to use information that is already possessed when one encounters another. The information collected helps to define the situation, to clarify reciprocal expectations, and to manipulate the others involved. Furthermore, Goffman states: "If unacquainted with the individual, observers can glean clues from his conduct and appearance which allow them to apply their previous experiences with individuals roughly similar to the one before them or, more important, to apply untested stereotypes to him." Inferences that are made about another are based upon what the individual says about himself/herself, the evidence which is provided to support these claims, and prior experience with the individual.

Within an organizational setting, conversation is an important mechanism by which selves are revealed or masked and the order of the office is established on a day to day basis. While some conversations focus on
work related activities, others deal with various aspects of the personal lives of the individuals. Information gathered in both of these types of conversations is instrumental in directing the behaviors of the individuals. As Goffman also states: "In noting the tendency for a participant to accept the definitional claims made by others present, we can appreciate the crucial importance of the information that the individual initially possesses or acquires concerning his fellow participants, for it is on the basis of this initial information that the individual starts to define the situation and starts to build up lines of responsive action." Although these first impressions are apt to be modified during the continued course of interaction, the adjustments tend to be consistent with these first impressions. A lack of consistency may lead to confusion or the disruption of the interaction itself.

IV. Interorganizational Relationships

Another aspect of this analytical framework is one of growing concern for organizational researchers. This is the area of interorganizational relationships. Richard Hall and his associates note this trend and the significance of it.

The systematic analysis of interorganizational relationships has increased markedly in recent years. As the analysis of organizations has moved toward an open systems approach, it has become immediately apparent that other organizations are a critical part of the environment of any organization. Analysts of social power at the local, national, and international levels have begun to realize that it is interlocking organizations, rather than individuals, that are at the center of power systems. Consumers or clients of organizations are usually served, processed, changed, or harassed not by a single organization, but by a number of related organizations. Organizational members themselves are influenced when there are mergers,
acquisitions, and vertical integration among organizations.

Thus, interorganizational relationships influence decision making, members' perceptions of their work setting, and other forms of organizational activity.

Hall and associates assert that exchange theory is the dominant theoretical perspective employed to explain interorganizational relationships. While exchange theory does not have a single proponent, some of the principle aspects of this perspective can, nonetheless, be distinguished. A common assumption of various exchange theorists is "... that men have needs and that fulfilling these needs constitutes a reward." When the shift is made from the social-psychological level to the organizational level examined by systems analysts, the needs are viewed as components of goal attainment. The needs of an organization may be such things as clients, money, authority, resources, a stable environment, etc.

Exchange theory states that since other people are often the providers of rewards, social interaction is initiated. In order to induce the others to provide the rewards, an individual must provide them with something in return. The result is a mutual exchange and the formation of a power relationship. Much of the interaction which transpires consists of efforts to maintain a balance of power in the relationship.

It is argued that similar processes take place on the organizational level. Resources (rewards) are acquired through exchanges with other organizations, and balanced interorganizational relationships lead to both domain and ideological consensus, coordination among organizations, and respective positive evaluations. The balance, of course, can be
upset by external forces. 63

It has been reported that the exchange perspective is less useful when a formal or legal mandate is in fact the basis of the exchange. Such mandates undermine the significance of power in the relationship. Thus, the exchange perspective cannot be totally relied upon. 64

Exchange theory has also been criticized for its inability to explain the persistence of relationships which appear to an outside observer to be unrewarding to the participants. It has been pointed out that the omission of the study of subjectively meaningful behavior, that is, a concern for the actual experiences and interpretations of the interacting individuals, is one of the reasons for the shortcomings of the exchange perspective. On the other hand, the symbolic interactionist perspective concentrates on this area, and, as Singleman has shown, there are numerous points of convergence between these two perspectives. 65

Singleman explains that the rewards, which are so essential to exchange theory, "... are not inherent in the response itself, but must be defined as such by the reward-recipient before they can motivate his behavior." 66 Thus, it is equally important to note the symbolic significance that the rewards have for those engaged in interaction. It is the subjective understanding of the value of the reward (the response) which is involved in mutual exchange processes. 67

Therefore, in this report the activities involved in the development of interorganizational relationships will be examined with an emphasis upon the subjective understandings of these relationships to those involved. While it is possible that the aforementioned idea of goal attainment may be the motivation for engaging in such activities,
this is not to be assumed. It will be left to the individuals to reveal their needs and the mechanisms by which they choose to fulfill them.

V. Organizational Legitimacy

Another area of concern in this research, one that has a direct relationship to the study of interorganizational relationships, is organizational legitimacy. Maurer has defined legitimacy as "... the process whereby an organization justifies to a peer or superordinate system its right to exist, that is, to continue to import, transform, and export energy, material, or information." Dowling and Pfeffer remark that a state of convergence of societal values and those implied by the activities of the organization is sought by organizations for disparity can produce social, legal, or economic sanctions. They cite Parsons, noting that since organizations exist within a larger social system and utilize resources which might otherwise be allocated, the legitimacy of an organization is important for its survival.

Without disputing the validity of their claim, it is nonetheless important to recognize that this does not tell us how legitimacy is produced. Realizing that legitimacy is not merely a product of the interaction of the members of an organization, but rather a status which is conferred by those outside the organization, the perception of outsiders that have relationships with the organization must be considered. Their evaluation of many components of an organization (its members, work activities, domain or jurisdictions, etc.), determines the legitimacy of the organization. Therefore, our concern is with the interaction of the organization's members as they create the organization and
relate to those outside of the organization insofar as these activities influence the evaluation of the organization.

It is reasonable to expect that the significance of the legitimacy issue varies among organizations and across time. Pfeffer and Salancik comment that, like social norms, "... legitimacy is known more readily when it is absent than when it is present. When activities of organizations are illegitimate, comments and attacks will occur."\(^71\) Thus, well-established organizations that are not "under attack" will probably exhibit little concern for the strategic manipulation of the impressions of others. Legitimating activities, however, may be more important for organizations which are new or are engaged in deviant activities.

Emergent organizations begin as unknown quantities. As interorganizational relationships develop, the activities of the organization are revealed to a greater extent. When little is known of the organization, there is room for suspicion and doubt, and first impressions can contribute significantly to the magnitude of these feelings. My observations support this notion.

VI. Organizational Culture

Another area considered in this analysis is the culture of the new organization.\(^72\) One of the aims of the cultural anthropologist is to make the social worlds of strange and unfamiliar people clearer through the use of ethnographic accounts.\(^73\) Similarly, cultural description is important in exploratory research on organizational emergence. As the processes involved in organizational emergence have yet to be adequately described, it also is a realm with which we are unfamiliar. And, as the
organization itself is new, it also possesses the property of strangeness. The new organization is strange not only to the researcher but to those who will comprise it and those who will interact with it, as well.

Recognizing that the concept of culture has numerous definitions and manners of application, it is important to specify the conceptualization which is utilized in this report. A semiotic conceptualization which is espoused by Clifford Geertz and is consistent with the interactionist framework previously depicted is employed. Geertz briefly defines this notion: "Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning." Later he adds: "As interworked systems of construable signs (what, ignoring provincial usages, I would call symbols), culture is not a power, something to which social events, behaviors, institutions, or processes can be causally attributed; it is a context, something which can be intelligently -- that is, thickly -- described." The object of ethnographic analysis is the meaningful structures which are produced, perceived, interpreted, and acted upon. The ethnographer's task is to grasp these conceptual structures as they are illustrated in the behaviors of those under study, to relate them to one another, and to present them as a unified totality. However, in the case of the creation of a new organizational culture, it is conceivable that a complete cultural system does not exist for it is still in the process of formation itself. Thus, relating all of the elements may be premature for, in fact, the necessary connections may not exist. To
continue with the Weberian analogy, it is advisable to view the web as both incomplete and in the process of being constructed.

It is necessary here to note the difference between the culture of an organization and the previously discussed dimensions which are parts of this analytical framework. All of these areas are abstractions from the same phenomena and, therefore, are only separable conceptually. The areas of work-tasks, interpersonal relations and interorganizational relationships are viewed as aspects of the social realm of the organization. In these areas the primary concern is with actual processes of interactive behaviors and the patterns which develop. These behaviors are, of course, guided by the organization's culture. A description of organizational culture, however, is concerned with the social action in regard to the meaning that it has for those who are involved in the organization.76

VII. Stages of Development

The organization which is the subject of this research will be described as one going through a series of stages77 or periods of development while it was created. The concept of stage is used here as an analytical tool. Sequential-stage analysis allows the researcher to break up the observations into units which are manageable and, thus, to describe the processes included in organizational emergence in an orderly fashion.78 The stages are demarcated by changes in the aforementioned dimensions of this analytical framework, such as work-tasks and organizational culture.
The concept of "stages" of development has a variety of meanings in the social sciences. The extent of this variation will not be considered here but a clarification of the concept as it is being utilized in this analysis is in order. The term "stages" is not being used in a deterministic sense, as is the case in certain early social evolutionary perspectives. Rather, while each stage is an outgrowth of the previous stage and influenced by it, it cannot be stated that the stages are inevitable or distinct in themselves. Any statement regarding organizational emergence which supports a deterministic slant would be methodologically unwarranted since this is a case study. Also, such an orientation would be incompatible with the interactionist perspective employed here. Thus, the stages are conceptualized as periods in the organization's development during which the social processes under investigation emerge, remain stable, or diminish. Each stage is viewed as being dependent upon the prior stage or stages, but no stage is viewed as inevitable in its composition due to the previous stage.

In summary, this report describes and analyzes the emergence of a mental health office by exploring several inter-related dimensions which were discovered to be significant through direct observation of the process itself. An interactionist perspective is utilized to depict the linkages of organizational emergence to past events, the members' perceptions of their work setting, the work-tasks performed, the formation of interpersonal and interorganizational relationships, organizational legitimacy, and culture. As activities and meanings contained in these areas of investigation change over time, stages of organizational emergence are delineated. The relationships among these dimensions will be
examined and illustrated during the presentation of the chronological description of the formation of the mental health office.
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Sociologists and organizational analysts have been concerned with the relationship between culture and organizations. Frequently, however, culture is viewed as an external factor which influences organizational activity. Examples of this type of work are James C. Abegglen, The Japanese Factory (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958); Michael Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1964); James R. Lincoln, John Olson and Mitsuyo Hanada, "Cultural Effects on Organizational Structure," American Sociological Review, 43 (1978), 829-47; and the articles cited in footnote 34. The presumptions of these approaches are incompatible with the symbolic interactionist approach. This has been previously explained by Herbert Blumer. See Blumer, pp. 14-15, 74-75.


Much of the theory and research on organizational culture or climate (the terms are interchanged at times) has recently been reviewed by Lawrence R. James and Allan P. Jones. See their article: "Organizational Climate," Psychological Bulletin, 81 (1974), 1096-112. Having reviewed much of this research myself, I concur with their assessment that the definitions of the concept, its manner of operationalization and measurement are very diffuse. Organizational climate is viewed as an organizational attribute, a psychological attribute, the context of social organizational structure, as a median between the individuals and the organizational structure, or as a combination of these areas. James and Jones suggest that this state of confusion results from the fact that "... many climate researchers appear to be more concerned with measurement techniques than with understanding and explicating the underlying concepts or constructs they were attempting to measure." (James and Jones, p. 1108). Due to the conceptual confusion in this area, the manner in which the concept "organizational culture" is utilized in this report is discussed in the analytical framework.

CHAPTER III: PREPARATORY STAGE

Introduction

An examination of the emergence of any organization must take into account the historical factors which led to its conception. Blumer, in his discussion of joint action or organizational behavior, states that any new forms of social activity arise out of and are connected with previous activities. Regarding the study of organizational behavior, he emphasizes the importance of the socio-historical context: "one has to bring into one's consideration this linkage with preceding forms of joint action. One is on treacherous and empirically invalid grounds if he thinks that any given form of joint action can be sliced from its historical linkage. . . . Joint action not only represents a horizontal linkage, so to speak, of the activities of the participants, but also a vertical linkage with previous joint activities." Thus, in our consideration of the development of the Office of Social Assistance Systems (SAS), we must be cognizant of the historical developments which led to its conception and the societal context in which it emerged.

In this chapter the historical development of the SAS office will be outlined. Since this office operated in the area of community-based mental health programs and was supported by both the federal and state governments, the activities of these governmental bodies which influence community-based mental health programs must be considered. First, the
development of community-based mental health programs will be discussed with an emphasis on the role of the federal government in enacting legislation to promote such activities and in defining the legal rights of mental patients. The role of the state government will be similarly considered. Much legislation will be omitted, but a number of the more significant pieces of legislation will be cited. Our concern is with the consequences of this activity as they relate to the possible organizational activity of the SAS office.

Since SAS was created through a contract with the federal government, the activities which led to their contract will be examined. Our concern is with the development of the federal "Request for Proposals" (RFP). Specific attention is given to the interaction among various representatives of the federal government and members of the state Division of Mental Health (DMH). Then the actual proposal writing will be described. This section includes a brief description of the formal organizational structure of the DMH and the writers' positions within that structure. Additional considerations are the organizational and interpersonal issues involved in the writing and the meaning of the activity to the participants. Finally, we will deal with the processes that led to the creation of SAS as an office within the larger organization of the DMH.

This period of organizational emergence is termed the preparatory stage. As the label suggests, the events which transpired during this stage include those processes which provide for the possibility of the emergence of SAS. In the early part of this stage the office does not exist. In the latter part it exists, but in name only. This stage
includes those events which were discovered to be significant in producing
the context for the creation of the office. It also includes those pro-
cesses which were instrumental in promoting the transition from non-exis-
tence to nominal existence for the SAS office.

The preparatory stage of the emergence of SAS occurred during a
time of large scale structural and ideological changes within the area
of mental health. (See figure 1.) At the heart of these changes was a
shift away from hospital-based treatment to community-based mental health
care. Furthermore, the emergence of SAS was influenced by both confu-
sion and conflict within the DMH. The conflict stemmed from ideologi-
cal disputes and problems of interpersonal relations. These areas of
turmoil will also be discussed in this chapter.
Federal and State level activity emphasizes community-based mental health programs. State community programs both expand and decentralize.

Correspondence between NIMH and DMH regarding social assistance programs.

RFP is issued. DMH is unaware of this.

RFP discovered. Conflict within DMH regarding submission. Proposal is prepared and submitted.

Office of SAS nominally created. Federal funding is pending.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Preparatory Stage Simple Sociological Calendar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal and State level activity emphasizes community-based mental health programs. State community programs both expand and decentralize.</td>
<td>1946 - 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence between NIMH and DMH regarding social assistance programs.</td>
<td>Feb.-Apr. 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP is issued. DMH is unaware of this.</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP discovered. Conflict within DMH regarding submission. Proposal is prepared and submitted.</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Action

For approximately thirty years the United States federal government has been demonstrating an increasing interest in the care of the mentally ill in deinstitutionalized settings. With the establishment of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) in 1946 came a concern for community-based mental health agencies. The U.S. Senate Committee on Education and Labor noted that "mental out-patient clinics, conveniently located and offering facilities for early diagnosis and treatment, give every promise of being the most effective means at our disposal for combating mental disease." The National Mental Health Act of 1946 provided grants for manpower training and the staffing of outpatient clinics so that released patients could continue to receive care in the communities.

In 1955 Congress, aware of the rising cost of treating mental illness and believing that the outpatient clinics were providing better care and at a lower cost than the larger institutions where many persons received only custodial care, authorized the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health to conduct a nationwide survey of the problems, both economic and human.

The report of the Joint Commission was submitted to Congress in 1960. Among its recommendations were the following: creating community-based programs for the mentally ill; reducing the size of mental hospitals and improving the care given within them; creating community-based aftercare, intermediate care, and rehabilitation services; and involving the federal government to a greater extent in aiding the states and local governments in paying for the costs of mental health care.
This report was followed in 1963 by a special message from the President to Congress calling for a national program to combat mental illness with an emphasis on community-centered agencies and a goal of reducing the institutionalized population by fifty percent within two decades. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) provided additional funds, and this was bolstered by the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Center Construction Act of 1963. This act initiated a Congressional decision to construct community mental health centers rather than improve the existing State mental hospitals. Additional financial support to the mentally ill and to the States was provided by the Social Security Amendments of 1965, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Center Construction Act Amendments of 1965, Federal Assistance to State Operated and Supported Schools for the Handicapped, the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966, and the Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967.

In 1970, the report of the President's Task Force on the Mentally Handicapped recommended the continued emphasis on community-based care with greater emphasis placed on the needs of the mentally disabled by other agencies outside of the mental health arena and greater co-ordination of those agencies. The Social Security Amendments of 1972 provided for financial penalties to States which did not implement effective programs for controlling the unnecessary use of mental hospitals, thus, further reinforcing the de-institutionalization programs. Also in 1972, a U.S. District Court ruled that the mentally ill had a constitutional right to treatment in the least restrictive setting necessary. This case, Wyatt v. Stickney, was the first class-action suit brought against the
mental health system of an entire state with success. The decision was affirmed later by the U.S. Court of Appeals.

In 1975, the Social Security Amendments of 1974, the Special Health Revenue Sharing Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Amendments, and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act attempted to eliminate improper placement of the mentally ill, strengthened the program requirements of the community mental health centers, tried to ensure the availability of appropriate community services, and authorized grants to enable mentally ill children to attain public education in a deinstitutionalized setting. Furthermore, in the O'Connor v. Donaldson case, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a State cannot confine with mere custodial care a non-dangerous mentally ill person who can reside in a community alone or with the assistance of responsible and willing friends or family members. Later in the year, the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C. ruled that civilly committed patients at St. Elizabeth's Hospital had a right to placement in the least restrictive setting necessary for their care and that the Federal Government and the government of the District of Columbia must provide alternative facilities for those not needing hospitalization.

The Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1976 modified Title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide additional monies for eligible persons residing in small publicly operated community residences. The act also required that the states provide standards for group living facilities housing or likely to house Supplemental Security Income recipients and insure the enforcement of the standards. Thus, through legislative actions and judicial decisions, the federal government promoted the care of the
mentally ill in deinstitutionalized settings.
Likewise, the state had been increasing its efforts toward deinstitutionalization through the action of the state government, the policies of the Division of Mental Health and the involvement of voluntary organizations. In 1967 the Community Mental Health and Mental Retardation Act established community mental health and mental retardation boards, comprised of lay people and professionals, to provide alternatives to institutionalization. Fifty-three of these boards were established to provide services and programs related to mental health. The number of community agencies, including comprehensive community mental health centers, increased ten-fold since that time to more than 350 agencies. This increase led to the creation of the Office of Community Mental Health Center Programs and the Office of Quality Assurance and Accreditation for Community Mental Health Centers within the Division of Mental Health. These offices were to provide technical assistance and consultation to community agencies desiring federal funding and to assist the agencies in developing quality assurance programs, respectively.

In 1977 mental health administration was further decentralized by the establishment of twelve mental health districts throughout the state. Among the responsibilities of each district office staff is the insurance of continuity of care for those individuals released from the state mental institution. The district offices also evaluate planning and monitoring activities as they relate to community services and programs.

Under Public Law 94-63 the Peer Review Program was established to reduce inappropriate placements of the mentally ill and to ensure that
treatment is available to the needy. More recent legislation (H.B. 1215) demands a decrease in the number of institutionalized patients so that the state hospitals can meet the standards of the Joint Commission on Accreditation for Hospitals by July 1, 1979. This bill also established the Joint Advisory and Review Commission, a department-level unit charged with development of plans for community-based care and the phasing out of some long-term residential facilities. Citizens Advisory Boards were also established to increase the efforts of community advocates of community-based care.
As part of the interest by the federal government in caring for the deinstitutionalized population, correspondence between NIMH and state departments of mental health was initiated in early 1977. In order to comprehend the consequences of this correspondence, it is important to understand the formal structure of the Division of Mental Health (DMH). At the top of the hierarchy is the Director of the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (DMHMR); this is illustrated in figure 2. Directly beneath this individual in the mental health component of the department is the Commissioner of Mental Health. Next comes the Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Community Programs and the Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration. This creates a truncated dual authority system because all of the other mental health offices are organized under the offices of both Deputy Commissioners.

Furthermore, there were ideological conflicts within the DMH which centered around the positions of the Deputy Commissioners. While the state had mandated that the population of the mental institutions be reduced, some members of the DMH still asserted that many individuals would be better assisted within a hospital setting. Others supported the state's position and encouraged the improvement of community programs. The two Deputy Commissioners, each officially with equal power within the DMH, were viewed as advocates of their respective positions. Therefore, to work directly for either individual was generally viewed as supporting that individual's mental health treatment philosophy.
Figure 2. DMH Organizational Chart
One of the first documents to arrive was a memorandum from the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors (NASMHPD) to Dr. Larry Veatch, the acting commissioner of the state DMH. This memo stated that NASMHPD was forming a joint effort with NIMH to create pilot social assistance systems programs. To initiate these programs, federal money would be diverted from the Hospital Improvement and Hospital Staff Development programs. This money would be used to finance the pilot programs; therefore, the states were being asked not to apply for money which was still available under these programs.

This was followed by a letter from NIMH to the state Directors which specified that monies would be available to the states for research, demonstrations and training projects which support the development of social assistance systems for the deinstitutionalized. The letter also defined NIMH guidelines for states wishing to establish social assistance systems projects. Part of the response of the Department was to inform NIMH that they endorsed the program change to social assistance systems and that they would like to apply for a contract to develop a program in the state.

Their response was prepared by an assistant to the Director, Alice Wright. The correspondence occurred with very little visibility or general awareness by the office chiefs of DMH and other members. Most had no knowledge of these early communications because the correspondence received from the federal government was not widely circulated. As one office chief who was aware of these interchanges noted in an interview with me, this lack of awareness was to produce confusion in DMH: "We later discovered that the Division of Mental Health was not fully
cognizant of what this commitment was. So we got our bureaucratic foot in the door, you might say, but we weren't always sure whose foot it was."

Shortly several other communications and flyers arrived from NIMH. They stated what their interests were and that the request for proposals (RFP) would be issued shortly. These documents were also not widely distributed. A Deputy Commissioner blamed this on "some foul up in the system here. There is frequently a lack of clear cut routing of the mail. I received some of it, some apparently came to the Office of Federal Funds, some to the Community Mental Health Center Consultant's office, and no one got all the pieces of it; therefore, nobody really knew what was happening." The lack of smooth communication was further complicated by the fact that the Acting Commissioner, who was aware of some of these early documents, vacated his position leaving the Director of the department also in the position of the Acting Commissioner for a period of several months.

When the RFP itself was issued in late July, it was simply filed away. No one had been given the responsibility of responding to it and only a few people were actually aware of its existence. In addition, Alice Wright, the person who had replied to NIMH stating that the division was interested in this program, informed me that she was not aware that the RFP had been issued. If it were not for other informal channels of communication between the DMH and NIMH, the RFP would have been completely neglected.
Roger Aikens, the Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration, was aware of some of the earlier communications. During a trip to Washington, he discovered through his contacts at NIMH that the RFP had been issued. When Aikens returned with the RFP, he approached Alice Wright and asked, in a very excited manner, why nothing had been done to organize a response to the RFP. It was then that the failure in communication just discussed became evident for her response was "I didn't know they published it." Shortly afterwards, the Deputy Commissioner and the special assistant to the Director agreed that they ought to apply for the social assistance systems program contract since it coincided with the goals of the division. The Deputy Commissioner of Community Programs was also made aware of the RFP, as were some other members of the division.

At this time some resistance to the social assistance systems program started to develop within the division. Norman Lloyd, the Deputy Commissioner of Community Programs, informed me that there were several discussions concerning the division's response to the RFP. He stated that the issue of the development of social assistance systems programs or the model proposed by NIMH was not questioned, but "basically, the concern was the short time span left to write the grant and whether it could be put together in a way that would be meaningful and could be carried out." There was approximately one month left to submit a proposal before the application deadline.

Lloyd opposed applying for the contract at this time. The opposition was influenced by the fact that he was going on vacation out of the state at the time. In addition, there were other members of the division who
were either committed to vacations or to other meetings which could not be easily rescheduled without a loss of considerable time and personal income. When this particular Deputy Commissioner went on vacation, the person who was acting in his behalf reviewed the problem with the departmental Director and recommended to the Director that the division not commit itself to a response at that time. It was suggested that they apply for funding at a later date when applications would be reviewed again. As Lloyd understood it, the initial grants were being issued to tie up remaining funds from the previous fiscal year.

The Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration had a different understanding. While on his trip to Washington he learned that "some 60 or 80 people either already submitted proposals or agreed to submit them. Some of them had already submitted before. They (NIMH) said that if they got good proposals on the first cut, the second ones were out. I checked them all out, how many they were going to fund, how much money there was. I knew that if we didn't get it in under that time frame (the first submission deadline), we were going to play hell getting it in October (the second deadline)." With this in mind, Aikens went to the Director to get his permission to assemble a proposal-writing team. It is worth noting that the DMHMR was under fire at this time by the Democratic leadership of the state House of Representatives for not bringing in enough federal funds. The Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration was instructed by the Director to assemble a proposal-writing team comprised of members of both the hospital management and community services staff. Since there was still considerable friction between the two, community services was underrepresented in the actual proposal writing.
The actual proposal writing took place at a site removed from the main office of the DMH. It was written in a building which also housed the Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration. Under the "direction" of the Deputy Commissioner there were five individuals who did most of the actual proposal writing. First, there was Alice Wright, who had written the letter to NIMH stating the division's interest in the project. Aikens suggested to her that she coordinate the project, but she refused on the basis of inexperience. Yet, she did agree to work on it with others and began talking with some of her personal friends in the division about the project. One of these friends was Charles Davis, who at the time was working for the Deputy Commissioner, and he also agreed to work on the project.

Another person brought into the proposal-writing was Nick Nottingham. Nottingham, at the time, was not an employee of the DMH, but had done some work for them under the Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration previously. He had experience at writing grant proposals, and the Deputy Commissioner viewed him as "a natural" for the job.

Two other personal friends of Alice Wright were also members of the proposal-writing team. One was Ken Little, Chief of Support Services. His interest in the project stemmed from work he had been doing in computer simulation for the DMH, and he saw the community support project as an opportunity to apply the computer simulation as the project could supply him with money and data. The other member of the team was Vera Doyle of the Office of Planning. She was also approached by Ms. Wright and readily agreed to work on the proposal.
It is important to note, however, that while these individuals were agreeing to work on the project, it was not without some reservations. The long standing disagreements between those members of the division who were more sympathetic to the community programs and those who sided with the hospital section were rekindled during the discussion concerning whether or not the proposal should be written at this time. The members of the proposal-writing cohort who were also employees of the DMH felt that if they worked on the proposal they would be viewed as siding with the hospital ideology and with the Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration. This caused considerable uneasiness on their part for some of them strongly disliked the Deputy Commissioner personally as well. The uneasiness was brought to the surface on two significant occasions and throughout the proposal writing itself.

The first occasion involves the invitation to Vera Doyle to join in the proposal writing effort. Several weeks prior to Alice Wright's invitation to Vera Doyle, Rita Able, acting for the Deputy Commissioner of Community Programs, approached her to work on the proposal task force if, indeed, the division decided to submit a proposal. She agreed and left on vacation. When she returned to work she was approached by Alice Wright and once again she stated that she would contribute to the proposal writing. Shortly afterward she was informed by members of the team that there was considerable discussion over submitting the proposal while she was vacationing and that tempers had flared once again. They felt that since she had worked in the community area that she should be made aware that she might be alienating herself from the other community oriented
individuals if she agreed to work on this proposal under the Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration.

The second incident involves the selection of Nick Nottingham as the head of the proposal-writing team. With the exception of Aikens, none of the members of the team knew Nottingham; nonetheless, they agreed that they would work under him to avoid working under the Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration. As one informant stated "Aikens and I don't get along at all. Working for him is so completely distasteful to us that we would not participate under that circumstance." Nottingham was accepted as the leader to represent a compromise figurehead. He was viewed by the members as someone who the Deputy Commissioner would attempt to manipulate but it was viewed as being better than working for the Deputy Commissioner directly. "The selection of Nick Nottingham to head up the team to prepare the proposal was, in a sense, a compromise that kept Aikens from being the person," said one informant.

By the time the group had been assembled to write the proposal there was less than two weeks to meet the deadline for the initial review by NIMHi. This time shortage problem was compounded by the fact that the writers were not released from their other work duties to compose the proposal; therefore, the writing was done whenever the members could free themselves for a few hours during the day, during the evening, and on weekends. It was during this time that some of the employees of the DMH were forming their initial opinions of Nick Nottingham as a leader, and the opinions were unfavorable. In the words of one informant:
"Nick's particular style of management and coordination turned out to be not what the rest of us thought was necessary. He wasn't very directive to us. He didn't say Ken you write this, Charles you write this, etc. It sorta floundered and it kept floundering -- and the days got shorter and shorter." Eventually the four members divided up the labor among themselves and worked quite independently of their leader, and this approach produced even more confusion and anxiety. This is illustrated by the following statement: "Nick sat in a room with the door shut for days on end and wrote just reams and reams of paper. We didn't know what the hell he was writing, and we didn't know how it would fit in with what we were writing. We didn't know if we were doing what he wanted us to do."

Various people in the mental health area from the central office and from around the state and even individuals who were not directly involved with mental health were brought in to provide information to the proposal writers. It was finally composed and edited in a marathon session which involved working day and night over the final weekend. Secretarial staff were recruited to voluntarily perform clerical assistance, numerous letters of support from various dignitaries and officials around the state were also secured, a cover was hurriedly designed and, at the last minute, the proposal was signed by the Director and sent to Washington.

Reflecting back on this effort, though, with the frustration, confusion, and personal time spent on the project, the writers spoke of their efforts in positive terms. One informant stated that "it was such an intensive effort and it was so exciting and so stimulating that to come back and sit in your little grubby office was just a wipe out."
Another writer expressed his feelings in this manner: "There's a kind of chemistry that occurs where two or three people come together. They have a vision about something that they want to accomplish, and they do it working day and night and on weekends; and we ended up with over twenty-six hours without a break. That wears you out. All these grant development things end up that way. Somebody has to be highly motivated. Yes, I could have easily said that I'm not interested. There was something about the RFP that said I'm interested and said I know you'll be interested in this and I will help and Charles is interested in it and he will help, and we'll get this thing going. Maybe she sparked my team spirit in wanting to commit a week, and I had to drop everything, my office -- my staff just had to fend for itself. You can't order that to occur. If my boss came in and said I want you to send five days, I would have fifteen things that I was supposed to be doing that were more important to tell him right off the top of my head." One member, remembering that another wrecked his car due to fatigue from the long hours, even spoke with joy of the incident and of the ability of people to perform beyond their normal abilities when under stress.

Another described her feelings in terms of the personal motivation of these individuals: "I'm not sure we really saw ourselves getting anything out of the project. If we got the Federal bucks out of it, that was great; but it really was great for the department and the division and the clients we served more than for ourselves. And I suppose there was a personal drive to prove that we could do what some people thought we couldn't."
Thus, SAS was conceptualized in an atmosphere of confusion and conflict within the DMH. The routing of mail within the DMH produced a situation in which no one was completely aware of all of the correspondence between the DMH and the federal government regarding social assistance systems programs. On the basis of my interviews it appears as though no one was given the authority to coordinate the DMH response to the changes which were taking place on the federal level. The RFP would not have been acted upon if Roger Aikens had not accidentally learned that it had been issued.

The longstanding areas of conflict within the DMH were ideological and interpersonal. Some individuals believed that the mentally and emotionally impaired should be assisted within a hospital setting and they thought that this aspect of mental health programs should be improved. Others took the opposite position and supported the growth of community-based programs. While the trend favored the strengthening of community programs, those who supported the hospital-based programs were not willing to abandon their cause. They wanted the community programs to be organized around the hospital structure. Hospital administration would thus have considerable influence over community programs.

Another area of conflict surrounded the timing of the proposal writing. Some DMH members believed that a quick response would be inadequate. The basic belief was that a social assistance systems program could not be effectively implemented even if the grant was approved. They believed that prior involvement and approval of those who work on the community level should be obtained. Without the involvement of those in the community, they were apt to resent the activities of those
Finally, many members of the DMH disliked working with Roger Aikens. They informed me that his actions were frequently disruptive to the routine of the DMH. He would enter people's offices unannounced at times, and he would attend meetings to which he was not invited. Some people complained that he would phone them in the evenings and on weekends to attempt to coerce them into doing additional work. His aggressive style was generally not appreciated.

Conflicts such as the ones just described should not be viewed as unique to the DMH. As Pfeffer states: "It is fair to state that in many organizations agreement about preferences and technologies for achieving those preferences is the exception rather than the rule."

He points out that conflicts can arise from different beliefs regarding the effectiveness of specific strategies, different socialization and training, loyalty to an organizational subunit, differences in information, and the participation of the members in different social networks. All of these factors were operating in the DMH at this time.
Creation of SAS as an Office

The development of SAS as an office within the formal structure of the division of mental health was not predetermined by the federal government. The RFP stipulated that an "organizational unit" be established to develop social assistance systems. The meaning of the phrase "organizational unit" was not specified in the federal document, and there was some disagreement among members of the division as to the appropriate meaning of the term. Most felt that they were given considerable leeway by the federal government to select the most appropriate location within the structure of the division for the SAS project and that this freedom was designed to better enable them to meet the goals of the project.

Instead of creating a separate office to fulfill the tasks of the SAS project, it would have been possible to establish a work group within an existing office to accomplish the tasks. Another possibility was the creation of an inter-office work group comprised of representatives from offices which already had some responsibility for the care of the deinstitutionalized, such as the Office of Transitional Services, Community Mental Health Centers, and Planning. Either option could be viewed as a rational selection. Yet, the factors which eventually determined the creation of SAS as an office and its location within the formal structure of the division were far removed from either bureaucratic efficiency or rationality. The office emerged in a haphazard fashion which was influenced by interpersonal and ideological conflict, social influence, and accident.
Several factors underlie the creation of SAS as an office. First, when the proposal was written it was mentioned that SAS would be a separate unit and that Nick Nottingham would be the office chief. As one respondent said, "We had so little time to write it, we just made up something. We did not believe we were all committed to whatever the RFP said in terms of the organizational structure. We just wrote something quickly and as far as we were concerned the subject needed some rethinking. As it happens, the rethinking didn't occur." That SAS was to be an office and that Nottingham was to head the office was simply put there to appease the granting agency.

Other developments within the division were equally important in the creation of SAS. At the time the proposal was written, there was no individual acting as a full-time Commissioner of mental health. The Director of the DMHMR was acting in the capacity, as well, until a full-time Commissioner was secured. Also the two Deputy Commissioners were viewed as fundamentally at odds with one another in terms of their mental health ideologies, missions, and personalities. There was also the fear that the Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration might use the SAS project to advance himself by building an "empire."

Lloyd, the Deputy Commissioner of Community Programs, told me that most people in the division felt that Aikens wanted his model of service to be pre-eminent and that he was in the process of advancing his model through the SAS project. Since a number of offices were not supportive of Aiken's position, they did not want the SAS project reporting directly to the Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration. The feeling was that if it was a separate office it would be easier to supervise, manage,
and influence and, thus, undermine any attempts at manipulation by Aikens.

These fears on the part of the Deputy Commissioner of Community Programs and other office chiefs were not completely unwarranted. The Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration did view himself as more important and powerful than any other member of the division, with the possible exception of the department Director. He is quoted as saying that "for all intents and purposes, you know, he (the Director) had delegated most of the decision-making for the division to me." Yet he also stated that the SAS project should not report directly to him for he believed that its mission transcended both his office and that of the Deputy Commissioner of Community Programs and that the SAS project should report directly to the Commissioner. He also felt that the project should be under the Commissioner's office but that the project head should not be given the title of Deputy Commissioner.

Meanwhile, reconsideration of the position of the SAS project within the hierarchy of the division was taking place. The designated project manager was promoting the idea that he should be given the title of Deputy Commissioner. This idea was immediately rejected by the Director. Some respondents mentioned that they felt that the project should be under the Office of Planning or that it should be a task force staffed by members of various existing offices. These ideas, according to some respondents, were also immediately dismissed by the Director.

How this project would appear to the federal officials was another important consideration. One member of the proposal-writing team stated that "... the Feds would feel that it gave it more clout for the manager to report directly to either the Commissioner or the Director." A Deputy
Commissioner responded that "the motivating factor was that it would impress the Feds more if it were located high up in the system rather than the outskirts." The visibility of the project to the Federal officials as a separate unit with high priority was acknowledged by several office chiefs as well.

Also, influencing the creation of SAS as an office was the salary demands of the individual who was designated as the project director. It must be made clear, however, that no one had been officially selected to head the project. The designated head, Nottingham, was selected primarily to have a name to place on the proposal. Yet, this person was being considered for the job and if he were to actually occupy the position officially, his present situation had to be considered. This individual was a Ph.D. who had worked with the division of mental health on occasion over several years on a contract basis. He was not a civil servant, but I was informed that "he already had income demands that were equal to or above Mental Health Administrator IV, and if you are going to pay him what he's asking, he would require a high ranking job title. I suspect that it had a lot to do with very pragmatic, bureaucratic considerations." The salary of an office chief was adequate for Nottingham.

These situational factors -- the salary demands of the prospective project director, the fear of empire building on the part of a Deputy Commissioner by the office chiefs and the other deputy commissioner, the feeling that visibility of the project at a high level was important to federal officials, the brief amount of time to prepare the proposal itself -- all influenced the decision to make SAS a separate office within the division, but the ideological turmoil within the division and the lack of
a full-time Commissioner must be also emphasized. Several respondents spoke very strongly of the animosity that existed within the division centering around the two Deputy Commissioners. One respondent stated that if the project was responsible to either of the Deputy Commissioners, the consequences would have been "a battle royal." One office chief very eloquently described the situation in this manner. "At that time there was a rather wide cleavage and competitive relationship between the subordinate chiefs for the community services on the one hand and for the institutional services on the other, and the Deputy Commissioner for each of these respective functions in the Division of Mental Health were not having a very congenial relationship. And so the project director for the SAS program, if he is going to be accountable to either of these two Deputy Commissioners, he would have found himself on one side or another of an embattled frontier." At that time the two Deputy Commissioners were viewed as the prominent leaders in the division since there was no full-time commissioner, and it is believed that this factor exacerbated the disagreements within the division.

The appointment of someone to the position of Acting Commissioner was additionally crucial to the development of SAS as an office. It was the Commissioner who has the authority to create offices and to appoint office chiefs, but it was commonly felt that the new Acting Commissioner was being manipulated. Several respondents regarded the designated project director as a clever manipulator who managed to get a separate office under him so that he would have more operating freedom. It was also believed that the acting commissioner "... just didn't know what was going on up here enough to make any judgments. He didn't understand the
situation when he was first coming in." The general impression held by several office chiefs was that Nottingham manipulated the new Acting Commissioner to establish SAS as a separate office, reporting directly to the Commissioner, before the Acting Commissioner became aware of the varied opinions that the division staff had regarding the placement of SAS within their ranks. The decision was made to create SAS as a separate office. (It should be noted, however, that this decision was reconsidered by the Acting Commissioner several months later, but apparently due to a lack of consensus within the division as to the appropriate location of SAS within the hierarchy, the original decision was unchanged).

Thus, the creation of the SAS office can be viewed as the establishment of social order, a new social order which was to be compatible with an already existing larger order, and which was created through numerous negotiations and renegotiations. These negotiations were predicted upon and inevitably due to a combination of factors. First, the RFP did not make specifications regarding the "organizational unit." Secondly, the purpose of the SAS office, while shared by most if not all significant members of DMH to a certain extent, was an ambiguous one which can provide grounds for both disagreement and negotiation.

Having accepted the grant, the DMH was then required to implement its quickly-conceived-of plan and was forced to address the practical issues of the form of the new office, its location within the DMH, its leadership, and the appearance of SAS to members of the federal government. While these activities were occurring, a new Acting Commissioner was being appointed and the conflict between the two Deputy Commissioners was capable of being revitalized. At least this appeared to be the case...
in the minds of many. In this environment, with no one individual or group dominating the others, processes of negotiation were necessary to implement the program and to allow the individuals involved to achieve a sense that they contributed an element of rationality to the organization at that time.
Summary and Conclusions

The Preparatory Stage of the emergence of SAS was influenced significantly by considerable ideological and structural changes within the organization of mental health services. Over a period of thirty years a mental health treatment orientation which we can term a hospital-based paradigm was being replaced by another paradigm which emphasized community-based mental health care. This organizational change can be viewed as a paradigm shift analogous to changes in scientific activities. As is the case with scientific paradigmatic changes, new areas of interests and activities developed in the mental health field.

One of these new areas of interest was the development of community-based social assistance systems for the deinstitutionalized. Money was diverted from hospital programs to establish pilot programs in this new area of concern. It was in this milieu of ideological and structural change in the mental health arena that the Office of Social Assistance Systems was conceptualized.

The confusion and conflict which existed in the DMH during the creation of SAS has been discussed. These conflicts are outlined in the sociological calendar in figure 3. We suggest that the bases of these conflicts are non-bureaucratic and political factors which existed within the DMH. Two cases in point are the dual authority structure and conflicting ideologies which were evident in the organization. The DMH lacked clear lines of authority and consensus regarding its purpose, both of which are characteristics of bureaucratic organization. This situation allows for the development of contending groups or coalitions within organizations.
Federal and State level activity emphasizes community-based mental health programs. State community programs both expand and decentralize. State community programs both expand and decentralize. Correspondence between NIMH and DMH regarding social assistance programs. RFP is issued. Conflict within DMH regarding submission. DMH is unaware of this. RFP discovered. Proposal is prepared and submitted. Office of SAS nominally created. Federal funding is pending.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>Correspondence between NIMH and DMH regarding social assistance programs.</th>
<th>RFP is issued. Conflict within DMH regarding submission. DMH is unaware of this.</th>
<th>RFP discovered. Proposal is prepared and submitted.</th>
<th>Office of SAS nominally created. Federal funding is pending.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Areas of conflict within DMH:
Hospital-based versus community-based programs ..................................................
Adequacy of proposal.
"Empire building" of Deputy Commissioner of Mental Health
Location of SAS

Figure 3. Preparatory Stage Complex Sociological Calendar
When such groups exist it is likely that problems in communication, such as the one described earlier, will occur.

Several organizational theorists have argued that organizations do not make decisions on the basis of objective criteria. They state that decisions are often made in order to obtain something from the organization or to advance one's own interests. The welfare of the organization as a whole is not necessarily considered. Certainly it was the opinion of those interviewed and others within the DMH that this type of activity was influencing the establishment and location of SAS.

According to Udy, bureaucratization involves the separation of the organization from society so that rewards are based on performance, not on one's status in society. Yet, we noted that one of the reasons for the creation of SAS as an office was the salary demands of Nick Nottingham. This demand was based on his status in society. He was capable of attaining a well-paying position elsewhere. Therefore, the decision to create the office was influenced by non-bureaucratic concerns.

Another factor which influenced the location of the social assistance systems program was a concern for its visibility to NIMH. We suggest that in large institutionalized organizations, such as the DMH, the efficiency of activities is difficult, if not impossible, to evaluate. Furthermore, in the case of such public bureaucracies, a positive evaluation is important in securing necessary resources. As applied to SAS, continued federal funding would be contingent upon a positive evaluation of the program by NIMH.
When the products of an organization are difficult to evaluate, the appearance of the organization becomes more significant. The creation of SAS as an office can be viewed as a signal to the federal government that the DMH was serious about the project. Creating the office was an organizational change which indicated the intention of the DMH to alter its policies and practices regarding the treatment of the deinstitutionalized. Signaling a policy change by an announcement is less expensive than an organizational change, but announcements are more apt to be disregarded when resources are not behind them. Creating the SAS office was probably the least expensive and most effective means of announcing the new intentions of the DMH.
Notes for Chapter Three


2. *Returning the Mentally Disabled to the Community* (Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office, 1977). Data for this section was taken from Appendix I of this report.


4. Data for this section were gathered from an unpublished document of a state Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation. In order to maintain confidentiality, a precise reference will not be given.

5. Quotations used in this chapter are taken from interviews. The events which are discussed in this chapter transpired prior to the period of direct observation.

6. Even one year later some members of the DMH did not believe that the Director had actually given his permission to assemble a proposal-writing team. In my research I discovered an intra-division memo from the Director stating his support for the project and encouraging other members of the division to assist the team in this endeavor. To this the unbelieving members would reply that the Director did not have the RFP explained in detail or he would not have given his permission to write the proposal.

7. I put the term direction in quotes for several members of the team felt that the Deputy Commissioner was merely a hindrance to their activities.

8. It should be noted that in some states the care of the deinstitutionalized was coordinated by mental hospitals and not community mental health centers. Furthermore, some of the hospital run programs were evaluated positively and viewed as possible models for other states by NIMH.


12. *Returning the Mentally Disabled to the Community.*


16 Pfeffer, pp. 36-9.


18 Ibid.


20 Ibid.


22 Ibid., p. 494.
CHAPTER IV: PRIMARY EMERGENCE STAGE

Introduction

Organizational emergence is the ongoing development of an organization over time. It is not a social process or product which transpires at a specific point in time and then is completed. Rather, for emergence to occur each new event produces new definitions of the situation which are apt to be influenced by previous definitions and events.¹

Having examined the historical context for the creation of the Office of Social Assistance Systems (SAS), we will now explore the stage of primary emergence. This stage includes those activities which occurred when SAS was officially an office within the Division of Mental Health (DMH). The term primary emergence is used to emphasize that these activities were the initial events which transpired after the formal creation of the office and that emergence is not complete with this stage.

During this stage some of the staff began to work on the project itself. The activities included the preparation of job descriptions, recruitment of members, preparation for a period of formal staff training, and participation in interorganizational work groups that related to one another in a friendly and informal manner with deference to Nottingham on most occasions. The emerging culture of the office was similar to the rest of the DMH during this stage, but the legitimacy of the office within the larger organization had yet to be firmly established.
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The conceptual framework of Chapter Two is utilized to organize the material for this stage. This is outlined in figure 4.
| STRUCTURE | Preparing job descriptions, recruitment, preparing for training and orientation  
|           | Formation of interorganizational relationships (SSIS, P&RWHG, "learning community") |
| TIME      | January - April |

MEMBERS:

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS:

CULTURE:

LEGITIMACY:

Figure 4: Primary Emergence Simple Sociological Calendar
Members

In this stage the SAS office, with Nick Nottingham as its head, was an office practically in name only for several months. For four months the staff consisted only of Ann Ingrahm (the secretary), two individuals who were working part-time on the project, Ned Riley and Nancy Kimball, Alice Wright, and Rose Dash (a Kelly Girl). Riley and Kimball were full-time employees of the DMH who were on loan from other offices as part of the state government's contribution to the project. (The federal contract demanded that the state contribute a certain percentage in matching funds, and a part of this was a contribution in personnel).

Let us begin by looking at the cast of characters. Since Nottingham has been discussed previously, we will proceed with the other members. The first was Ann Ingrahm. Prior to working as a secretary at SAS, Ann Ingrahm had been a graduate student at a state university. Due to her displeasure with the program in which she was enrolled and dwindling financial resources, she left graduate school and signed on with an organization which supplied temporary clerical help to businesses. This organization sent her to SAS where she began working with Nottingham.

Although she was initially hired on a temporary basis, Ingrahm felt that she was offered the secretarial position on a permanent basis because she had been helpful to Nottingham in providing him with information regarding the functioning of the DMH. In an interview she stated that Nottingham "felt a little bit helpless" in the central office of the DMH for he had never worked in this specific locale (his previous employment with the DMH was at a psychiatric hospital), and "he didn't know how things were run. He depended on me to go around and scout that out."
Nancy Kimball's route to working within the SAS office was dominated by personal referral and mandate. While she was a student in public administration and social work, she discussed her prior occupational background and work interest with one of her professors. This individual referred her to a friend of his who worked with the state health department. This man interviewed her and learned that Kimball had an interest in "planning" and some experience in the mental health field. Thus, she was referred to George Raleigh, the Chief of the Office of Planning in the DMH, for he knew that there was currently an opening for a planner.

Raleigh interviewed her and expressed an interest in hiring Kimball when she had completed her academic work. At this time Raleigh did not explain to her what her tasks would be. Kimball stated that the specifics of the job were not too important to her for she was interested primarily in working for the state and being involved in planning. These events transpired prior to the Request for Proposals for social assistance systems projects coming to the attention of members of the DMH. By the time that Kimball was ready to begin work, however, it was clear that the SAS project was going to be undertaken. When she first reported to work she was told by Raleigh that she would be assigned to SAS on a half-time basis. She recalled that she was told to "perform staff support functions for Nottingham until the staff was hired and also perform a liaison role between SAS and the Office of Planning."

Prior to the creation of the SAS office, Ned Riley worked for the DMH in the Office of Education and Training. He had worked for many years in various aspects of mental health and was approaching retirement. He was assigned to SAS on a half-time basis to aid in the establishment of
training sessions for the new staff members.

Alice Wright and Rose Dash had limited involvement with the SAS office. Rose Dash was a temporary clerical worker who was hired on a daily basis from another organization. She spent most of her time xeroxing and filing documents which were prepared by Ann Ingrahm and other materials which Nottingham was collecting on mental health services in the state and on alternatives which were implemented in other states. She went about her tasks very quietly, seldom speaking to anyone.

Alice Wright was written into the SAS staff when the proposal was prepared. During an interview she informed me that she was written in because the proposal writing team felt that it was important to have people committed to the most important positions when the proposal was submitted. She also stated that because of her position in the DMH, that is her involvement in transitional services, the SAS project could be more easily implemented. Her involvement in the project was minimal because she was given other responsibilities within the division and was transferred from SAS.

The staff consisted of people who had little or no experience in the area of the provision of services for the deinstitutionalized. Alice Wright was the only member who had previously worked in this area in connection with the Office of Transitional Services. Additionally, Wright and Riley were the only members who had been previously employed on a regular basis in the central offices of the DMH. Nottingham, however, did have considerable experience as a researcher; but he had not been previously employed as an administrator.
Work-tasks

Ann Ingrahm and Dr. Nottingham were the only SAS members who were regularly present in the office. Nancy Kimball worked at her desk in the Office of Planning and Ned Riley spent half of his time in his office at a psychiatric hospital. The SAS office, which was located on a different floor than most DMH offices, was small and sparsely furnished. Nottingham's office was closed off from the rest of the office while Ann Ingrahm's desk was located at the entrance enabling her to receive those who came to SAS (see figure 5).

During the first four months the SAS staff occupied themselves largely with the problems of hiring and developing a training program for new staff members. Much of the preparatory work for the hiring process was delegated to Riley. Upon his arrival he learned that the office was yet to be staffed, and Nottingham requested that Riley prepare the job descriptions for the positions. The higher ranking positions in the office had been already filled on paper as names were attached to the research proposal. Riley, with some previous experience in personnel work, accepted this task.

The job descriptions were to be written in a manner that would enable the DMH to pay them a "respectable" salary, according to the standards of the DMH. In an interview, Riley explained that the highest salaries go to those individuals who either supervise others or have financial responsibilities within the organization. One member of the DMH (Alice Wright) was to transfer to SAS upon receipt of funding for the project; yet this individual was demanding a salary increase as well. Thus, one of the
Figure 5: SAS Office Diagram.
job descriptions for a high ranking position within the SAS hierarchy had to be written in a manner that would enable this individual to receive the raise. This was done by including a supervisory role (over one other individual) as part of this position.

The job descriptions developed by Ned Riley were modifications of the positions which were mentioned in the organizational chart of the SAS office in the proposal itself. According to the proposal the office was to be staffed by thirteen full-time employees and others with whom the organization would contract to aid in specific tasks. Yet, understanding that they were not obligated to adhere to the proposal, by February the number of full-time employees was reduced to eleven. The eleven positions were that of Office Chief, Community Services Research Administrator, Interagency Liaison Coordinator, Community Services Researcher, Funding and Facilities Researcher, Human Resources Researcher, Data-Evaluation Researcher, Secretary, Clerical Supervisor, Clerical Specialist, and Technical Typist.

The job descriptions and salaries were also designed to correspond to already established civil service classifications. Of course, the position of chief was already filled by Nottingham, and Alice Wright was in the position of Community Services Research Administrator at the time that the SAS project actually began. The job descriptions for these two positions were thus prepared by Riley with these two individuals and their salary demands in mind.

Riley and Nottingham disagreed in regard to the manner in which jobs should be advertised. Riley felt that they should be advertised only locally so that the staff could be hired more quickly. Nottingham,
however, believed that the jobs should be advertised in the newspapers of the largest cities in the state and through other media as well. In this case, Nottingham's ideas prevailed and the vacancies were advertised in the major newspapers in the state and within the DMH, as well. As resumes arrived the task of reviewing them went primarily to Nottingham and Kimball with some assistance from Riley. They were independently evaluated and ranked, and around two dozen individuals actually were interviewed.

The interview process itself was structured to be quite formal, and it took several hours. Applicants were given packets of materials dealing with the social assistance systems projects and the DMH to read and study. Then they were given a structured self-assessment questionnaire to complete and were asked to rank the jobs according to their own interests. In the self-assessment the candidates were asked to indicate the experience they had with the target population, related groups, the mental health system, human service systems, and in changing bureaucracies. They were also asked to evaluate their leadership skills and to briefly describe their experiences.

Before being hired, the applicants were also given a face-to-face interview which followed an established format with Kimball, Riley, and Nottingham in which they were asked about their current jobs that they held, their reasons for leaving and how they would attempt to accomplish the tasks of the prospective job. Applicants were notified shortly afterward by mail or telephone call or both regarding their being accepted or rejected.
In the early months, Ingrahm was occupied with typing job descriptions and other documents to be given to prospective interviewees. While the tasks of interviewing and selecting applicants for the positions to be filled belonged to Nottingham, Riley and Kimball, Ingrahm showed substantial interest in the activity. She and Nottingham would discuss criteria for hiring, such as knowledge and personality, and she would state her concern that the finest people work for the project. She felt that individuals with math and computer backgrounds should be hired while Nottingham was looking into other aspects. On one occasion she chided him for not "putting as much into this as you do 99% of the other things you do." He took offense at this and an emotional discussion followed. It ended with Nottingham stating that he appreciated her concern and that he would definitely consider her suggestions. (He also expressed that he was glad that their anger had been vented.)

Since Ingrahm and Kimball were newcomers to the DMH they were also occupied with acquainting themselves with the routines and formal procedures of the DMH. Kimball was especially engrossed in this for her initial task involved familiarizing herself with the SAS project by studying the proposal and other materials that Nottingham provided for her. She also spent a considerable amount of time discussing these materials with other members of the DMH. She was concerned with the broad scope of the project and was troubled that the tasks could not be performed in the time allocated. She also realized that she had to learn the terminology which was used at the DMH. Although she had worked in the mental health area before, she stated that "everytime you switch systems or switch within a system you have to go back and relearn a whole new language."
In summary, much of the early work-tasks dealt with preparing job descriptions, hiring, and becoming familiar with the SAS project and the DMH. The formal structure which was created continued to be influenced by the salary demands of specific individuals. During the preparatory stage we saw that SAS was created as an office to satisfy Nottingham's salary demands, and in the primary emergence stage the hierarchy was influenced by the need to provide a promotion and salary increase for Alice Wright. Thus, this aspect of the emerging organization was effected by both the characteristics of the members and the rules of the DMH.
Interpersonal Relationships

Through conversation related to work activities and the personal aspects of one another's lives, such as homes, families, and hobbies, the SAS members began to define some of their relationships to one another and to the office itself. Ingrahm, the secretary, viewed the relationship between herself and Nottingham as one based on mutual compatibility of personalities and needs. She needed steady work which he could provide for her, and she perceived her personal aggressiveness as a quality which he was lacking and she could provide. She stated that she made a personal agreement with Nottingham to work for him for a year and a half, the amount of time which they deemed necessary to formally establish the office and have it functioning smoothly; at the end of this period she intended to be involved in more professional employment, such as teaching.

During this stage Riley, the SAS member with the most experience in mental health, started to develop some admiration for Nottingham which would continue to grow as the office took shape. He viewed Nottingham as "a listener" to his suggestions although the advice was not always taken. Although they disagreed on the manner in which employees of SAS should be sought, the two men agreed on the importance of "participatory planning processes" for SAS.

"Participatory planning" was viewed as a mechanism for decentralizing the project. Nottingham's organizational philosophy led him to conclude that this was a necessary step in the accomplishment of the project's goals. Riley, on the basis of his experiences in mental health, was skeptical of decisions made in the central office for he felt that these administrators were too far removed from the delivery of services to fully comprehend the
problems or the possible solutions. The concept of participatory planning was quite important to both of these men, and their agreement on this issue increased their solidarity.

Early in the development of the office deference patterns developed. While the atmosphere in the office was casual and Nottingham was primarily a non-directive leader, it was clear to all that he was "the boss" and would make the final decision. Deference was evident also in the informal conversations that were held in the office. For example, upon returning from a meeting Nottingham informed his secretary of what had transpired at the meeting and of the people with whom he had been most impressed. Ann Ingrahm took this opportunity to relate an incident that happened to her while he was away. Laughing, she stated that she had mistakenly taken the stairs that were to be used for emergencies only and that none of the doors would open to let her back into the main part of the building. A maintenance man had to come to her rescue. The type of interpersonal relationship that had developed allowed her to laugh at herself publicly and to have her superior be a part of it, but at no time did Nottingham reciprocate with humorous stories about himself.

Deference, however, does not preclude the possibility of disagreement. As we have seen, Riley disputed Nottingham's inclination to recruit staff members by newspaper advertisements around the state, but Nottingham's ideas prevailed. Similarly, Ingrahm chided the office chief for what she felt was laxity in recruitment. We suggest that Nottingham's non-directive and, at times, egalitarian style of administration supported this type of interaction.
Interorganizational Relationships

An early work task for Nottingham was participation in meetings of a group concerned with the "... statewide development of referral/data inventories of human services, a common format and process for needs assessment, and a reporting system" which would be a further development of the State Services Identification System (SSIS). Nottingham and Howard Irving, the community mental health center consultant, were to represent the interests of the DMH at these meetings which included representatives from the Division of Mental Retardation, the Department of Public Welfare, the commission on Aging, the Department of Economics and Community Development, and other state and voluntary organizations. Nottingham was asked to attend these meetings for it was believed that such a system would help SAS in the identification of services and the needs assessment of the de-institutionalized, mentally disabled population. In other words, a segment of the goals of SSIS overlapped with some of the tasks of SAS.

At an early meeting of this group there was an attempt to "come to consensus" regarding the goals of the group so that a draft of its proposed objectives could be presented to the directors of the various agencies represented. During the discussions much "systems" terminology, such as "software", "output", "supersystem", and "system", was evoked. Also discussed was the legality of tracking individual clients for it was felt that this might violate the confidentiality of the client's records.

Nottingham informed the group that his office would be modifying its computer simulation taxonomy, but that it might not be possible to integrate SAS and SSIS efforts due to the fact that the projects would be
proceeding according to different timetables. This problem was acknowledged by other members of the group and it created a sense of urgency concerning the determination of the goals and proceedings of SSIS. A sub-group was designed to deal with these issues and the meeting adjourned. After the meeting representatives of the DMH spent some time in informal conversation with some of the more vocal members of the SSIS group.

Another activity which brought SAS members into contact with outsiders was participation in the "Policy and Resources Work Group" (P&RWG) which was created for SAS. The SAS P&RWG was formally established by the new Acting Commissioner, Lester Vorst, in February. Invited to attend these meetings were members of the SAS staff, selected members of the central office -- mostly office chiefs, the Acting Commissioner and Deputy Commissioners, and some district managers -- and some directors of mental health centers. The expressed intent of this group was to

... (1) identify and overcome obstacles to planning and development of improved community support systems for the state's severely and chronically mentally disabled, (2) ensure that SAS planning and development needs, requirements and efforts are assimilated and incorporated into ongoing operational responsibilities and activities of the Division of Mental Health to the maximum extent possible, (3) resolve SAS-related policy and resource issues, and (4) assist SAS project staff in identifying and involving key mental health constituencies in the SAS planning and development process.

Yet the meetings were also used to embarrass, impress, or covertly gain information from those attending the meetings. I overheard one member say that the meetings were a chance for people to "take pot shots" at one another. I also observed that after the meetings, as the individuals were returning to their offices, they discussed the people they liked and
disliked and attempted to overhear what others were saying about them. They even went out of their way by taking unnecessary elevator rides or making unnecessary trips to the restroom to eavesdrop.

Several members of the DMH felt that the P&RWG was established for reasons other than those made manifest in formal correspondence. One office chief stated that the creation of the P&RWG was a "clever flanking maneuver" on the part of Nottingham to "avoid any scrutinizing of what's really going on" by other members of the division. "It is his (Nottingham's) way of avoiding a steering committee. I think it gets Nick off the hook with respect to having to relate to others." Another chief believed that Nottingham sensed the hostility which existed throughout the DMH and toward himself as project director of SAS, in particular. This chief believed that Nottingham, with the approval of the new Acting Commissioner, devised this group to be "a coalition that would support what he was doing."

The internal conflict within the DMH is also cited by a Deputy Commissioner as the primary reason for the creation of the P&RWG. One Deputy Commissioner remarked that prior to the creation of the P&RWG several members of the DMH were going to the Acting Commissioner to voice concern regarding the role of SAS within the division. He perceived the formation of the group as "an attempt on Nick's part to channel that concern into a more manageable process -- to formalize the opposition, to control it and somewhat defuse it." The other Deputy Commissioner made reference to the "struggle" within the DMH and stated that he told Nottingham to establish an advisory group of decision-makers within the
division "to run the interference" for the SAS office.

It is interesting to note that at least one other member of the P&RWG viewed the Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration, Roger Aikens, as the obstacle to the SAS project. To him the P&RWG was established "to buy off Roger Aikens. It was a way to co-opt him." Aikens was viewed as a powerful figure within the organization, and a potentially disruptive one. It was believed that the creation of a committee, "a bonafide organizational structure where everybody gets input," to discuss policy matters could offset the influence of the Deputy Commissioner due to the large numbers of people who would be opposed to him. The informant remarked that "essentially, the reason Nick came up with it (the P&RWG) was that it was the only way he could figure out to keep Aikens out of his hair."

It should also be noted that in an interview with Aikens, he presented quite a different perspective. The Deputy Commissioner stated that he told Nottingham to establish a small group of advisors, not decision-makers, which would bring more unity to the division and enable SAS to avoid much of the conflict within the DMH. Thus, Aikens actually credits himself with the idea of creating the P&RWG.

Another activity involving some members of SAS, specifically Nottingham and Wright, was attendance at meetings referred to as "learning communities." One of these meetings was held during this stage of the SAS development. These meetings were attended by the leaders of the federally funded social assistance systems projects from sixteen states and by the regional and central office staff of the NIMH. The expressed purpose of the gathering was
... to exchange information and ideas on such issues as:

-- workable program development strategies
-- identification of federally-imposed policy obstacles, and development of strategies to remove or overcome them.
-- identification of long-range technical assistance and manpower development needs at state and local levels.

The activities of the learning communities had little direct impact on the activities of the SAS office except in that they provided Nottingham with information regarding the alternative social assistance systems which were being established or were already underway in other states.

Additionally, the preparations that were made for the training and orientation sessions brought SAS members, particularly Nottingham and Riley, into contact with individuals outside of their own office. Individuals were solicited from within the DMH, NIMH, and other organizations within the mental health area to participate in the program. Interchanges were primarily by letter or telephone. While the training and orientation sessions themselves were significant in the development of SAS, the interorganizational exchanges were of little consequence to SAS at this time.
Organizational Culture

The culture of the organization during the stage of primary emergence was primarily a product of the larger organizational structure of the DMH. This is evidenced by the job title classifications, pay scale, and other features of the formal organization of the DMH to which SAS would be subject. The SAS organization was also anti-bureaucratic, systems oriented, anti-academic, and characterized by friendly deference.

While SAS had several dimensions which would enable one to characterize it as being bureaucratic in its structure, it was pervaded by an anti-bureaucratic atmosphere. Ironically, while the establishment of the SAS office can be viewed as another step in the growth of bureaucracy, I never heard anyone in the organization speak positively of that type of organization. A bureaucracy was viewed primarily as an organizational system that was inefficient, difficult to manage and direct toward the achievement of desired goals, and damaging to the reputation and self-esteem of those who worked within them. One member of the group remarked that "no one ever looks good in a bureaucracy."

While bureaucratic ideals were devalued by all the members of the small group at this time, the notion of a "system" was deeply imbedded in the minds of Nottingham, Riley, Kimball, and Wright. Here there is a distinction between the clerical and non-clerical employees of SAS -- Ann Ingrahm and Rose Dash rarely used such terminology in their speech whereas the other did. It is worth noting that the social assistance project as it was referred to at the federal level, was transposed to the Social Assistance Systems with the establishment of this office at the
state level. The staff members frequently utilized terminology as was used at the aforementioned SSIS meetings, and one staff member even identified herself as a "systems change agent."

Noticeable, but probably less significant, were some rudimentary anti-academic values. Nottingham, at times, was mildly criticized and characterized by some of the staff members as being academic. By this they meant that he dealt too much with abstract ideas rather than with concrete everyday details. To be academic was to have one's "head in the clouds." University education was generally viewed as inferior to actual work experience and training sessions that one might attend on the job. This belief is related to an attitude of practicality, of attaining quick and demonstrable results, which permeated the values of the SAS staff.

The previously discussed deference pattern was also a part of the culture of SAS. We term the pattern "friendly deference" to indicate the multiple capacities of the staff members. The relationships between these individuals were clearly asymmetrical as they occupied statuses of unequal rank. Thus it was acceptable for Nottingham to be familiar with the other members while he was able to keep his own life quite private. Nonetheless, the office members were on a first name basis and tended to act in an informal manner.

Another aspect of the culture of SAS, at least for Nottingham and Riley, was the notion of participatory planning. This strategy for producing social change was included in the proposal itself. This process involves the identification of those who would be influenced by changes in the state's delivery of mental health services. These individuals
would be invited to participate in the planning process in order to eliminate future conflicts and to secure their commitment to the project. Both Nottingham and Riley were convinced that decisions made in the central offices of the DMH and imposed upon mental health workers in the community would lead to confrontation and the failure of the SAS project; therefore, they believed that it was essential to get input from others around the state throughout the duration of the project.
Organizational Legitimacy

During this stage of organizational emergence our concern with organizational legitimacy will deal principally with the evaluation of the SAS office by others within the DMH. At this time the organization had limited contact with others outside of the larger organization. The contract with NIMH indicates that SAS already had conditional legitimacy in regard to that organization. However, continued interaction between SAS and outside organizations must be noted.

The relationship between SAS and SSIS and its participation in the "learning community" helped to legitimate SAS. In interrelationships a member of SAS, Nick Nottingham, acted as an official representative of the DMH. This participation indicated the division's acceptance of Nottingham. These interorganizational relationships also produced exchanges of information and mutual support which contribute to, but do not in themselves, assure the legitimation of SAS.

The conflicting perspectives surrounding the motivation for the creation of the P&RG provide us with a more complex picture of legitimation for they indicate a mixture of motives on the part of the actors involved in the group. An interactionist approach assumes that group activity involves negotiation, that is, "... that the parties at one and the same time have both common goals as interdependent members of an organization and persistent differences as individuals separate and competing for resources within that organization." The establishment of the SAS office demanded that new roles be created. The SAS members were not able to be merely socialized into conforming with pre-established role
expectations; rather, the roles had to be made, the established social structure altered, and the newcomers had to engage in political processes to negotiate the redefined boundaries of permissible activities with the established members of the organization.

As the leader of the new group it was the responsibility of Nottingham to become involved in such activities. It was a responsibility which was apt to be thrust upon him by other members of the DMH if he were reluctant to readily accept it. As several established members of the DMH revealed in interviews, the mission of the SAS project was a previously established goal of the DMH. Many of the tasks of the SAS office were previously assigned to other offices within the division; thus, the new office was forced to wrest its domain of activities from others. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the entry of a new office chief would be disruptive to the existing social arrangements and that his visible activities within the organization be regarded with some suspicion.

A problem surrounding the legitimation of SAS stemmed from change in the division of labor within the DMH, an alternation which produced an increase in specialization. Where there was once several offices within the DMH which were responsible for the task of co-ordinating care for the state's deinstitutionalized mental patients, now there was a specific office with that task. The mere administrative establishment of this office does not resolve the problem of the division of labor because the social construction of institutionalized interrelationships between the offices must still take place. Thus, there was still confusion and conflict over the domains of the offices within the DMH.
The P&RWG brought various high status individuals from within the central office of the DMH and from mental health centers around the state into the decision-making apparatus of SAS. This co-optation of these political leaders could contribute to the legitimation of the new office and provide for the neutralization of opposition and the development of a base of influence or support. Yet, the process of legitimation requires interaction over time; therefore, SAS was still not firmly established.
Summary and Conclusions

In the stage of primary emergence a skeleton crew of workers was established, some work-tasks were initiated, interpersonal relationships, interorganizational relationships, and organizational culture began to develop, and the office began to legitimate its position in the mental health area (see figure 6). We suggest that these activities and social products contributed to a commitment on the part of the staff to SAS. The evidence which supports this contention is limited but significant due to the absence of contradictory findings.

It should be noted that the paths which led the members to become employees of SAS varied. Some individuals were assigned to the office while others sought employment there. Some viewed SAS principally as a source of financial reward while others believed that working at SAS was compatible with their career plans. In each case we can say that the actors were motivated by personal or egoistic concerns.

Yet, it appears as though involvement with the office produced a different source of motivation. Disagreement or complaints by SAS members are presented as evidence for this alteration. While complaints are viewed as expressions of self-interest, firm boundaries between self and organizational interest cannot be assumed. Instead, individuals can identify with an organization. Through acting in a certain capacity and presenting the appropriate motives, one can become what one initially appeared to be.

Disagreements arose between Riley, Ingrahm and Nottingham over the hiring processes. As these individuals explained their positions all
| STRUCTURE | Preparing job descriptions, recruitment, preparing for training and orientation  
|           | Formation of interorganizational relationships (SSIS, P&RWG, "learning community")  
| TIME      | January - April  
| MEMBERS:  | 3 full-time, 2 part-time, 1 temporary (one full-time member had very little involvement)  
| INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS: | Compatibility with deference  
| CULTURE:  | Anti-bureaucratic, systems oriented, anti-academic, friendly deference  
| LEGITIMACY: | Conditional legitimacy with NIMH  
|           | Accepted by other state agencies  
|           | Domain disputes within DMH  

Figure 6: Primary Emergence Complex Sociological Calendar
claimed to be concerned with the welfare of SAS. While we cannot assert that this concern was the only motivating factor for disagreeing with someone of superordinate status, it is difficult to conclude that the interactions were motivated simply by self-interest. Rather, Riley and Ingrahm were identifying with SAS.

On the other hand, other members of the DMH had quite limited involvement with the SAS office; therefore, they would be less likely to identify with it. Due to the domain disputes, they were also more suspicious of SAS activities. Thus, in their interactions with SAS they were more apt to be motivated by self-interest or the welfare of their own offices.
Notes for Chapter Four


3"Proposed Implementation of the State Services Identification System." A memo which circulated within the DMH.

4It has been reported that work groups, such as the P&RWG, are abundant in organizational life, and that systematic analysis of these groups has been largely neglected. See Peter M. Newton and Daniel J. Levinson, "The Work Group Within the Organization," Psychiatry, 50 (1973), 115.

5From a letter by the Acting Commissioner to members of the SAS Policy and Resources Work Group.

6"The Social Assistance Program," a briefing paper prepared for participants in an annual conference of the State and Territorial Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Authorities.


8Goffman, p. 480.

9Ibid., pp. 481-85.


13Dowling and Pfeffer.

14Izraeli.

15We use the term "commitment" in a different manner than was proposed by Becker. According to Becker, "The process of commitment consists in the linking of previously extraneous and irrelevant lines of action and sets of rewards to a particular line of action under study." He suggests that commitment leads to personal stability when confronted with a changing environment. Such commitment can only be discerned by observing behavior over
a period of time. See Howard S. Becker, "Personal Change in Adult Life," in Social Psychology Through Symbolic Interaction, eds. Gregory P. Stone and Harvey A. Farberman (Waltham, Mass.: Ginn-Blaisdell, 1970), pp. 583-93. In this study commitment is used to indicate a growing loyalty to the office as the members began to identify with it through their participation in the office.


CHAPTER V: INITIAL STAFF ADJUSTMENT STATE

Introduction

During the next stage of the development of the Office of Social Assistance Systems (SAS), practically all of the remaining members began work at the office. It was during this period that the new members began the process of creating roles for themselves within an organizational setting that did not have firmly established patterns of interaction for the strangers to adopt. The meaning of the novel organization to their lives was certainly not clear to them at this time, but a rudimentary culture was pre-established by the ongoing activities and the rules of the Division of Mental Health (DMH). To quote Peter Manning: "Strangers or new members of an organization are both a part and not a part of the organization. They act within the limits of the system but do not share the common-sense knowledge current among other members."\(^1\)

This chapter will highlight some of the initial struggles of the incoming individuals to establish themselves, or to be socialized, into the organization. The focus here, as in the previous chapter, will be on the interactions of the individuals as they initiate work related activities and present themselves to others through conversations\(^2\) and other joint activities. A good amount of the social performances of these individuals do not relate directly to normally defined work roles, but to various aspects of their personal lives. "Idle conversation" is also
documented for it is a mechanism by which selves are revealed or masked and the order of the office is established on a day-to-day basis.\textsuperscript{3}

As the new members were not very occupied with work related activities during this stage, they spent a considerable amount of time socializing with one another and familiarizing themselves with the SAS project and the DMH. Through these activities they formed their initial impression of one another, the office, and the larger organization.\textsuperscript{4} However, as will be illustrated, during this stage of initial staff adjustment the members became actively involved in creating the situation in which they would work as well as modifying their behaviors to suit the demands of the situation.

The activities that will involve them, time period, and the dimensions to be explored are presented in figure 7.
| Structure | Preparing for training and orientation, hiring, securing furniture, becoming acquainted with SAS and DMH  
Continued participation in SSIS, "learning community," P&RMG and attending conferences |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>May - June 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members:

Interpersonal Relationships:

Culture:

Legitimacy:

Figure 7: Initial Staff Adjustment Simple Sociological Calendar
Members

During this stage six more individuals became members of SAS. This would leave three vacancies at the office. Let us briefly look at the new members and the job descriptions for their positions. They will be introduced in the order in which they began working at SAS.

The first position to be filled was that of the Interagency Liaison Coordinator. The position summary developed in February described the job as follows:

Plan and participate in formation of an Interagency Coordinating Council and Technical Committees to ensure that mainstream human services become accessible to mentally disabled citizens to the fullest extent possible. Conceptualize the interagency aspects of model community support systems, incorporating these aspects into service models, client change models, and service utilization plans. Act as liaison with federal, state, and local agency representatives, and other Interagency Coordinating Council representatives and Technical Committee members. Develop the interagency aspects of the SAS action plan and field report. Develop service taxonomies, identify strategies for service improvements, and synthesize proposed solutions using participatory planning methods.

The person who filled this position was Rudy Geist. Prior to coming to SAS Geist had been involved as an architect developing facilities for the mentally retarded. When we met I inquired how his architectural skills would be utilized in the position of Interagency Liaison Coordinator, he replied that one of the goals of the project was to develop a prototype of facilities to be used by the deinstitutionalized. Mr. Geist was in his forties, with an average build, a rather quiet and calm disposition, and a foreign accent as he was originally from Holland.
The next person to join the SAS staff was Ira Williams. In an interview with me, he stated that before coming to SAS, he worked in the Division of Management Services of the DMHMR. Williams, also in his forties, said that he worked there for a couple of years but that the job was stifling for no one was willing to listen to him or try anything new. He complained that his job was very routine and boring, for the people who had established the "system" had a vested interest in it and would not allow anyone to change things. When he heard about the SAS project and the fact that it was largely funded by NIMH, he felt that it would be something new and possibly a new opportunity for himself to try something different and to learn something, as well. The position that he was most interested in was that of Interagency Liaison Coordinator, but since that position was already filled by Geist, he took the job of Funding and Facilities Researcher instead.

According to the SAS "Position Summaries" the job of the Funding and Facilities Researcher is described as follows:

- Identify existing and potential funding and facilities options to support development of improved community support systems.
- Identify gaps in SAS funding and physical facilities. Develop strategies for SAS development in collaboration with Funding and Facilities Committee and the Interagency Coordinating Council.
- Develop the funding and facilities aspects of the final plan and report for the SAS project.

The pay grade for this position was just below that of the Interagency Liaison Coordinator.

The following week the position of Data-Evaluation Researcher was filled by Rhonda Boyd. Mrs. Boyd, a woman in her early thirties, had known Nottingham prior to working for SAS for they had worked together earlier. Boyd had previously been a member of the Office of Quality
Assurance of the DMH, and Nottingham had served as a consultant to that office. As an employee of DMH, Boyd heard that there were new positions opening up within the SAS office and applied for one in March. Initially she applied for the position of Community Services Researcher because she had overlooked the job of Data-Evaluation Researcher. The position is described as follows:

- Develop simulator information for use by SAS unit staff in collaboration with Data Analysis contractor personnel. Plan and direct internal project evaluation activities for reporting on the SAS project in progress and final reports. Participate in the design and implementation of the national evaluation of Social Assistance Programs as required by the National Institute of Mental Health. Coordinate the SAS technical research and model designs, providing technical guidance, coordination, and reviews of project activities to assure achievement of SAS goals and objectives.

In an interview with Boyd she explained to me that she was prompted to apply for this position by other members of the DMH. She stated that Nottingham and Little had made an agreement regarding staffing in that area. According to Boyd, Nottingham had agreed to let Little select the individual to fill the position for the first three months. During that time Little would supervise that individual to assure that the data which they had was properly processed for computer analysis. After three months Nottingham would fill the position with someone of his choice and that individual would be trained by Little's selection. It was a conversation with Nottingham, Little, and a consultant with DMH that Boyd's name was mentioned. Boyd had worked with Little on computer simulation and it was known that she was a computer science major, so she was being considered for this job without her knowledge.
Previously, Boyd had indicated that she was unhappy in her present position and that she would like to work for him if the opportunity arose. With this in mind, Little called her to offer her a temporary position with SAS; he explained that they would find another position for her at the end of the three months. The new position would also raise her another pay grade (to that of Williams).

She agreed to accept the position on a Friday and the following Monday she received a call from Nottingham's office asking her to come in for an interview. She assumed that the interview was just to validate the temporary position, but in fact, after an informal interview, she was offered the full-time position. She viewed this move on Nottingham's part as an attempt to maintain control over his staff members rather than having them work under someone else. While she accepted the position, it was still six weeks from the time she was hired until she could actually start work on the SAS project for she was still obligated to train a replacement.

During the last week of this stage, two more clerical personnel were hired. They were Nora Eversole, a clerical supervisor, and Eve Ludwig, a technical typist. Both of these women were in their forties, and they had heard about positions at SAS informally through people whom they knew with DMH. Ludwig was a very quiet individual who kept to herself and appeared to be constantly busy. Eversole was more outgoing and became the spokesperson for the both of them.

The last SAS member to be hired during this stage was Tom Ingles. He accepted the position which was to be vacated by Alice Wright, that of Community Services Research Administrator. This position is described
as follows:

Identify and conceptualize model social assistance systems: develop service models, client change models, service utilization plans, and service taxonomies for use in data collection and service program design. Administer existing transitional services programs for the Division of Mental Health, including the Family Care, Extramural Care and Training for Independent Living Programs. Coordinate development of the SAS action plan and interim and final reports. Supervises Community Services Planner. Maintain liaison with personnel throughout the State mental health delivery system.

It is important to remember that this job description was written with Alice Wright in mind, and it is a better description of her activities within the DMH than the activities which were to be performed by Ingles. According to the records of the DMH, Wright was still in that position when Ingles arrived to take over. It took a couple of days to create a temporary position for her so that Ingles could officially begin work.

Prior to coming to SAS, Ingles was the director of a Community Mental Health Center in a rural area in the state. He held that position for five years and was looking for an opportunity, in his words, "to expand my horizons," when he sent his vita to the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation's (DMHMR) Office of Recruitment. He heard about the position when Nottingham phoned him directly and offered him an interview. In a conversation with me he stated that he did not know what the SAS project was all about when he agreed to the interview and he was not even certain what position he was applying for. He said that he selected the Community Services Research Administrator position because it was the highest paying position that was not already occupied and he also felt
qualified to be an administrator due to his previous experience. He also thought that this position would make him the second-in-command in the SAS office. He went through the formal interview procedure and was offered the position on the following day. His first appearance on the job was at the beginning of the Training and Orientation Sessions.

With the recruitment of these individuals, all of the staff of SAS who would be members of the organization during its period of emergence had been hired. Since Ingles would not appear at the office until the beginning of the next stage, he had no influence on interaction of the staff during this stage. Now the office consisted of three clerical workers, five full-time "professionals," and two others who had shared responsibilities with other offices in the DMH.
Ned Riley, on loan to SAS from the Office of Education and Training, was busy at this time making preparations for a "Training and Orientation Session" that was to be held for SAS. This period of introduction to the DMH, the idea of social assistance systems, and the problems faced by the de-institutionalized in the state would take two weeks, and it was scheduled to begin in about two weeks. It was Riley's task, under Nottingham's direction, to secure speakers for the occasion, prepare a schedule of events, and make arrangements so that the facilities would be available.

Riley spent practically all of his work day writing letters, making phone calls, devising a program and discussing problems with Nottingham as they arose. Since he was not a regular full-time employee of SAS, he had obligations to another office as well, and realizing that he did not have the ready access to Nottingham (because Nottingham may be away at meetings or Riley may be working at his other office), he would frequently attempt to speak to Nottingham in order to get direction for his work a couple of days in advance. He was also involved with interviewing prospective employees. This was a very busy time for Riley and he rarely engaged in any small talk.

One activity that had to be accomplished was the furnishing of the office. At this time they did not have the necessary chairs, desks, file cabinets, and other items that they would need for oncoming workers. They also lacked adequate office space. Office furniture was something that was neglected in the preparation of the proposal. It would be up to the state to solve this dilemma, but it was not clear how this would be done.
One day a memo arrived at the SAS office announcing that some federal surplus furniture was available and the procedures for obtaining it. Nottingham suggested to Ingrahm that she try to get it, but she instead turned the request back to him. Nottingham then called another individual in the DMH in order to get the required permission to purchase furniture, and it was immediately granted. He also asked when some of the furniture that had been ordered would be arriving; to his dismay he found that due dates were not specified for most items so they did not know when to expect them. When this information had been acquired, the task of procuring furniture was given back to Ingrahm and she made the necessary phone calls to locate a purchasing card that would be needed.

Near the final week of the initial staff adjustment stage, Williams began to work at the office. He and Ingrahm were assigned the task of selecting and purchasing more furniture for the office. (Other office equipment still had to be secured later.) Aside from this activity, Williams spent his time studying material related to the SAS project which Nottingham had provided for him.

Geist also spent his days reading SAS and DMH documents to familiarize himself with the organization and his place in it. He felt that it was important to "learn the language." Prior to his arrival at the office, he had attended a meeting of the Policy and Resource Work Group. This left him with the impression that most people involved with SAS did not understand the project any better than he did.

On Geist's first day on the job he was immediately given some responsibility of symbolic importance. He was to be a substitute for Nottingham at a conference that was to be held in Cleveland shortly. Nottingham
could not attend it, as had been previously planned, for he would be out of town at the time. So with no other "professionals" in the office, Geist quickly assumed the position of second-in-command.

Later, Boyd's appearance at the office prompted Geist to request that he be given a better description of what his role would be in the office. He also asked Nottingham for information on the other people who would be coming to work saying that this would be helpful to him. Nottingham did not provide him with much information, but he did assure Geist that they would have a division of labor in the office. For example, he told Geist that he would be accompanying him to an up-coming State Services Identification System (SSIS) meeting and that Boyd would not be going to the meeting, but Nottingham did not tell him why he was going to the meeting. During this stage Boyd had little to do at the office. She was not given work instructions from Nottingham, so she sought these instructions from Ken Little. She was under the impression that she was actually responsible to Little. Little, on the other hand, explained to her that he was not her boss. Boyd also had the impression that she would be preparing data for computer storage, but the data had not been collected yet. Eventually she was placed on an SSIS subcommittee charged with developing a taxonomy of services which the state provided.

Kimball occupied herself by preparing the "site visit methodology," an interview guide which would be used to gather information on the needs of the deinstitutionalized and the services provided for them. She also spent some time interviewing prospective employers. Since she did most of her work at her other office, she was rarely at the SAS office.
During this stage Ingrahm appeared to have trouble performing routine secretarial functions. At one point she needed a new typewriter ribbon, but she did not know where to find one. Nottingham told her where they were kept, and she said that she did not know how to replace the old one. Nottingham said that he would do it for her.

When she returned she interrupted Nottingham again. This time she wanted to know who had attended the last meeting of the Policy and Resource Work Group. As Nottingham recited the attendance, they engaged in a discussion of the minutes of the last meeting. The minutes had not been prepared, and Nottingham said that since he failed to do them the previous two times that he was not going to do them this time either. (No one kept the minutes at the earlier meetings.) He reasoned that keeping the minutes obviously didn't fit his role and that he was only responsible for preparing the meetings themselves. The implication was that Ingrahm was responsible for the minutes. They talked about the lack of a secretary who could take dictation or transcribe from a dictaphone. As Ingrahm left his office, she appeared angry and probably felt inadequate for she had not kept the minutes and did not know how to change a typewriter ribbon.

Later in the day she returned to his office once more to discuss the minutes. He dismissed her quickly by saying that it was not his problem. When Ingrahm left his office she went upstairs to talk with Kimball. Kimball was a confidante of and she spoke with her quite often. After this event when Nottingham was speaking with Kimball on the phone in regard to the day's activities, she mentioned the minutes issue to him.
Again he quickly ended the conversation by saying that "It is not a priority for me to do it, but it is a priority to have it done."

Ingrahm left the office before five o'clock for the first time on that day.

Nottingham was frequently away from the office during this stage. He was attending several conferences around the state and nation. When he was present, he occupied himself with preparation for the Training and Orientation Sessions, interviewing and hiring staff members, and attending meetings of SSIS and the P&RWG. Little time was spent explaining work activities to the new staff. For the most part he merely gave them material to read. Therefore, the new staff was not productive at that time. This gave them a considerable amount of free time to converse with one another and become better acquainted.
Early in this stage an event occurred that would be of concern to the members of the SAS and effect the interpersonal relationships within the office for some time. Ann Ingrahm applied for the position of Human Resources Researcher, one of the "professional" positions that had yet to be filled. This immediately produced some strain in the relationship between her and those individuals who were involved in the interviewing process and would later produce uncomfortable relationships between her and the "professional" and clerical staff that was yet to be hired.

While discussing this application with me, Ingrahm explained that while she was a doctoral candidate she had spent two years involved in research which allowed her to present herself as a researcher. But in her own estimation she felt that there were other candidates who were better qualified. She informed me that she felt strange being interviewed by people who had known her for a while and that they felt awkward, as well. She said that she really wanted the job and that she tried to impress that upon the interviewers. But the uneasiness of this unique situation is evident in the remarks which were made at the end of the interview. She commented that when she left the interview she said, "Don't forget to lock the door when you leave," and "How many other applicants remind you to lock the door as they leave?" Since she was already an employee of SAS, a co-worker of the interviewer, she could not act as a stranger to these people. On the other hand she had to act as a job applicant.
Ingrahm's interview was still a prominent event several days later when as she excitedly told Geist and myself of the interview and the strange feeling that she had at that time. Although this was Geist's first day on the job and Ingrahm had not known him before, she readily engaged him in a conversation about her desire for the job and how she would feel if she were not given the promotion. Geist referred to Ingrahm as a "big girl", and he said that since she was grown-up that she would simply accept Nottingham's decision. Ingrahm assured him that she would do so. With this brief conversation, two people who were unfamiliar with each other were providing support for the existing social order of the office. They agreed that the authority of Nottingham and the interviewing committee should not be challenged in this case and, even if Ingrahm's feelings might be hurt, that she would act with suitable decorum. Geist did not attempt to sympathize with Ingrahm, but rather he alluded to what would be expected of her should she be denied the promotion. Her expression of her feelings provided him an opportunity to discuss them with her, but it was the importance of non-problematic inter-relationships within the office that was given priority by Geist.

The following day the position which Ingrahm applied for was still open and a source of some irritation in the office. Nottingham, in a conversation with Riley, referred to Ingrahm as a "timebomb in front of the desk." While Ingrahm would not be promoted to the position which she sought, Nottingham had been contriving to lessen the disappointment. He explained to Riley that as more clerical help was hired, she would be removed from some of the routine tasks. He also said that he was trying to contract out the work for the position which Ingrahm sought to someone
else, but in order to do this he must get the permission of the Contract and Controlling Board for the individual would be receiving more than $10,000. The position, therefore, would not be eliminated, but it would not be filled either. Nottingham also said that he would try to move Ingrahm from her current position into a higher pay grade. He was hoping that the increase in salary and different job responsibilities would appease her. Nottingham asked Riley if he had any other suggestions for resolving this dilemma, to which he responded that he hadn't developed any other ideas. Riley proceeded to tell Nottingham that he was impressed with his plan and that "it's nice to have the other guy make the decisions." Ingrahm would not be informed of these recent developments.

Several days later, while Nottingham was out of his office and talking with Geist about diets, Ingrahm entered it and informed me that she was still trying to persuade Nottingham to promote her to the remaining position. She remarked that she was thinking of placing a tape recorder under his pillow and suggesting it to him in his sleep. I realized that she was joking, but I did not want to converse with her about this sensitive subject at this time; therefore, I ridiculously stated that she might also drop leaflets on his house and hoped that the dialogue would end on a humorous note. To my surprise and dismay, she went into the other office and informed Nottingham that she would be leafletting. He was just about to say something to her, but he was stopped by her comment and stated that he "forgot" what he wanted to say. Ingrahm then followed him into the office to ask what was on his mind, and he again said that he had forgotten. She then said that he would remember when he wanted to and left the room. Nottingham appeared to be slightly upset with this conversation.
Near the end of this stage Ingrahm again spoke to me of the position for which she had applied. She stated that she studied the SAS documents for days before her interview but that she didn't think that all the interviewers felt that she knew the full implications of them. By now she had drawn the impression that the work for the position would be contracted to someone outside of the DMH for a while and that she would be able to learn how to do the job from that individual. Then, when the contract expired, she would probably be promoted. She mentioned that Nottingham would have difficulty justifying a promotion for her now since she did not have the proper qualifications. She also envisioned that others in the DMH would remark that Nottingham hired her first as a temporary secretary, then as a permanent secretary, and then gave her another promotion in too short of time. She said that this would make Nottingham look bad in the eyes of some DMH members whose cooperation would be needed.

The interaction in the office following and related to Ingrahm's application for another position can be viewed as remedial work, that is the transformation of a potentially offensive act into one which is acceptable. We suggest that Ingrahm's application for the higher position is similar to making a request. "A request consists of asking license of a potentially offended person to engage in what could be considered a violation of his rights. The actor shows that he is fully alive to the possible offensiveness of his proposed act and begs sufferance." Of course, in this case permission to apply had previously been granted to all by the publication of the position vacancies and accompanying invitations. However, Ingrahm, unlike other applicants, was already a member of
the organization and a part of the interaction network, and she would still be a member even if her request were denied. With her request there is a greater risk involved for she would still be expected to engage in normal interaction with those who rejected her request.

Geist's comment indicates he was aware of the jeopardy in which he and others had been placed by Ingrahm's action. We suggest that he imagined the "virtual offense" that might occur and acted to encourage remedial work on Ingrahm's part. Her assurance that Nottingham's decision would be acceptable to her indicated to Geist that she had no intention of disrupting affairs of the office.

Similarly Nottingham realized Ingrahm's potential to upset smooth relationships with the office. However, he did not attempt to alleviate the situation through dialogue with Ingrahm. Rather, he was trying to pacify Ingrahm by providing a substitute for the desired promotion. He was taking the situation very seriously, perhaps more seriously than Ingrahm. As we have seen she did desire the promotion, but she was able to joke about convincing Nottingham to promote her. Nottingham did not respond to her attempted humor.

Many other conversations by the staff resulted in the creation of informal norms in the office. One conversation between Geist and Ingrahm turned to the issue of smoking in the office. Ingrahm was actively trying to establish a ban on smoking as the norm. Geist was a smoker while Ingrahm was not. She brought up the idea that it was going to be a small and crowded office so that it would easily fill up with smoke if it was uncontrolled, and then she suggested that decisions like this are best made by majority rule. It is certainly worth noting that at this time Geist
was the only smoker in the office. While Ingrahm was talking, Ira Williams stepped into the office, and she immediately tried to enlist his support. Williams, reiterated the fact that the office was a small one. The issue, however, was not finally resolved for Williams quickly changed the subject to the shortage of telephones in the office. Ingrahm assured him that they were going to have new phones installed so that she could notify people of incoming calls by buzzing their desks. Williams mentioned his annoyance at buzzers and then left the office. At this point Geist questioned about the proper procedures for making both internal and external calls. As she instructed him in this matter, the subject of smoking was dismissed. However, no one smoked in the office during this stage.

Later in the day, Ingrahm entered Nottingham's office to get some saltine crackers which he kept in his desk drawer, and she commented to him that Geist had taken the last of the hot water that was used for making coffee or tea out of the pot. She mentioned the need for a larger coffee pot and added that she didn't mind making coffee for him but that she wasn't doing it for six people. She also mentioned that it would appear to be unfair if she made coffee for him and not for the others. Nottingham stated that Geist should also fill the coffee pot and then went to discuss this matter with him. Thus, another office norm was created as Nottingham stated everyone should take turns filling the coffee pot and that the task should not be relegated to the secretaries. Geist agreed with this. (Other staff members were informed of this decision after they were hired. They were not members of SAS as yet.)
In addition to establishing norms, such conversations indicated the staff's perceptions of one another, some of their likes and dislikes, and their perception of the SAS office. For example, at the end of Geist's first day at work, Nottingham, Geist, and Ingrahm engaged in some small talk as they were getting ready to leave the office. During the conversation Ingrahm mentioned that her clock radio was broken and Nottingham said that his bed broke last night. Geist, addressing Ingrahm, remarked that possibly they should ask him how it broke, and Ingrahm replied that Nottingham was getting embarrassed. To this Nottingham replied that it could have broken in more interesting ways and that he would like to think that it did get broken in one of the more interesting ways.

At this point the subject of conversation changed (avoiding what could have been a troublesome situation for strangers rarely discuss sexual fantasies with one another). Geist immediately made known some of his feelings -- he was bothered about having to sit in a chair that had a plastic seat cover and complained that it made him too hot. Nottingham tried to appease him by explaining that it was difficult to get furniture and that those who have it also horde it. Ingrahm suggested that he bring in a seat cushion, but Geist rejected that idea. He considered aloud the possibility of bringing in his own chair but then dismissed it on the grounds that it was "probably illegal".

As he left Geist said that it had been an "interesting day". Nottingham asked in a humorous fashion if he would be back tomorrow, to which Geist smiled and nodded affirmatively. To this Ingrahm added, "I hope we didn't scare you off." And as I was packing up to leave the office Nottingham remarked that I ought to be able to come up with some good
indices of "confusion and anxiety" and Ingrahm chimed in with "dissonance". This indicated their personal feelings toward the operation of the SAS at this point. This was a busy time for Nottingham, and Ingrahm's request for a promotion had not been anticipated. He was probably feeling overburdened momentarily.

A couple of days later Riley, Geist, Ingrahm, and Nottingham were all quietly working at their desks when Riley asked Ingrahm for some letterhead stationery. She said, "None of the offices have their own. They would have to pay for it out of their own budget."

Geist then asked, "What about business cards?"

"Do you guys really want business cards?"

"Yes," Geist responded without consulting Riley.

"I'll have to ask Nick about that."

"I know what you can order them," Riley asserted.

Geist explained, "When I travel and leave, people will forget who I am. (With business cards) they could put me in their pockets." Later he added "And no plastic chair."

Then Williams entered the office again and another norm was established. Ingrahm addressed both Geist and Williams and asked if they had met.

Geist responded, "Yes. I'm glad to see no tie."

Riley joined the conversation saying, "You should have worked at the Bureau of Drug Abuse six years ago. You didn't have to wear shoes."

"Or pants," Williams mentioned jokingly.

Then Ingrahm explained to Williams the coffee making policy which had been established, but a dress code for males was established also. Coats and ties were rarely worn, but they were kept on hand in case there were
meetings with individuals outside the SAS office.

Other brief dialogues illustrate other aspects of the relationships that were developing among the SAS personnel. For example, Riley would ask Ingrahm how to spell words, such as "beginning" and "accompany" from his desk. He apparently did not mind making public his deficiency in this area and he would accept her word of authority. Riley always demonstrated deference to Nottingham, his superior in rank, but did not seem to expect subordinates to defer to him. During one interchange Ingrahm remarked to Riley that his handwriting was improving. To this he replied that he was making "a conscientious effort" for her.

In another conversation between Geist and Ingrahm, she was explaining to him the reimbursement procedures that were followed with the DMH. He would need to know this information since he would be leaving for a conference soon. He complained about having to collect receipts to document expenses and the amount of money that he would receive per mile driven. But Geist's complaints were not taken seriously by Ingrahm on this occasion for he had established himself as a person with a dry sense of humor during his first days at the office. In fact he was quite easily and warmly accepted into the group as his expression of his troubles generally induced smiles from the listeners.

On another occasion Boyd noticed a message to Nottingham indicating that he should call a woman who was scheduled to participate in the Training and Orientation Session. Boyd commented that this woman was attractive and aggressive toward men, and that because her ideas are not shared by many of the women in the DMH, she is not liked by many of them. She also stated that she was accustomed to working with aggressive male chauvinists
and that they did not bother her. This drew little comment, but Ingrahm had a sign on her desk which read "Women should make policy not coffee." Geist, noticing this, remarked "I hate women's lib," and added that women should make coffee, not policy.

We suggest that the discussion depicted in this section highlight a neglected aspect of a situational adjustment, that is, the creation of rules which govern the situation itself. Traditionally, situational adjustment is viewed as adult role learning or changes in people as they become involved in different situations. This process has been used to explain the changes in values and behavior of such groups as students and prisoners, those who must cope with problems inherent in specific highly institutionalized settings.12

According to Berger and Luckmann:

"Institutionalization occurs whenever there is a reciprocal typification of habitualized actions by types of actors. Put differently, any such typification is an institution. What must be stressed is the reciprocity of institutional typifications and the typicality of not only the actions but also the actors in institutions. The typification of habitualized actions that constitute institutions are always shared ones."

Further, institutions are characterized by historical and the content of human conduct. Thus, it takes time to produce institutional arrangement that predefine acceptable human conduct.14

Since SAS was still an emerging organization, the behavior of the members was not institutionalized. Rather than adopt already existing modes of behavior, the staff created its own norms to guide their behavior. In creating norms, the staff was, in part, adjusting to the desires of one another. This is clearly illustrated in the creation of
norms governing smoking, proper attire, and filling the coffee pot. Therefore, situational adjustment must also include the modification of the situation to satisfy the desires or demands of individuals.
Interorganizational Relationships

Few members of SAS had much significant contact with outsiders during this stage. Geist and Nottingham attended another meeting of the "learning community," and they attended other conferences as well. Yet these meetings had little influence on activities of the office. Others had some contact with outsiders as they made preparation for the Training and Orientation Session and attempted to secure furnishings and equipment for the office.

Geist and Nottingham also attended an SSIS meeting one afternoon. It was a brief meeting with only a few of the members present. Geist did not speak at all during the meeting and Nottingham only spoke occasionally as the DMH was also represented at this meeting by Howard Irving, the chief of the Office of Community Mental Health Centers. A representative from the Commission on Aging directed the meeting, and he mentioned initially that the Health Department was being uncooperative and that they would not send a representative to the meetings. Nottingham was concerned about this for he stated that he would need the cooperation of the Health Department to achieve the goals of SAS. The representative from the Commission responded that his contact person in the Health Department made a distinction between medical services and human and social services, and thus felt that the Health Department would have nothing to contribute to the group. He also said that he felt that there were other reasons that prevented the Health Department from getting involved, but he did not know what they were. Several members at this meeting stated that SSIS could only be effective if they got the Cabinet of the State involved to assure the
cooperation of all the necessary parties. A budget for SSIS was dis- 
buted along with a statement of its objectives and an agreement, or 
contract, which would obligate the selected state agencies to cooperate 
in the project.

Much discussion followed the perusal of these documents. Some wanted 
a more detailed budget. Others wanted the responsibilities of the agen-
cies to be more clearly delineated, and others wanted to know where the 
money would be coming from. Nottingham was concerned that the project 
was moving too slowly, and another individual stated that this was 
because the people who were attending the meetings were only authorized 
to do that and not to work on the project or to make decisions. One 
member pointed out that when questions were asked about SSIS they could 
not be addressed to anyone in particular for no one had been appointed 
to positions of authority or responsibility. The end result of all of 
this was that a Steering Committee was formed from within this group to 
discuss these things. The SSIS group was accomplishing very little, but 
it did serve as a mechanism by which Nottingham was able to gain infor-
ma tion about state agencies and to make known the needs of SAS.

All members of SAS (with the exception of Ingles, Ludwig, and Ever-
sole who were yet to begin working at SAS) attended a meeting of the 
Policy and Resources Work Group, as well. Other people at this meeting 
include the Deputy Commissioners, Alice Wright who was serving as a 
special assistant to the Acting Commissioner, the chief of the office of 
Planning and Program Evaluation and Research, and a mental health district 
manager. The SAS staff, with the exception of Nottingham, primarily acted 
as observers during the meeting.
The primary concern of their meeting was the determination of the definition of the SAS "target population," those deinstitutionalized individuals whom the office was designed to assist. Some asserted that SAS should concentrate only on those who were already receiving aftercare services. Others disagreed. Some wanted to exclude those with a "dual diagnosis," that is both mentally ill and mentally retarded. Others disagreed. There were also disagreements over the meanings of the terms "chronic" and "aftercare." And while some wanted SAS to concern itself with a limited population to make its task easier, others indicated that this strategy would eliminate many individuals who need assistance. Decisions could not be made on these issues; therefore, a committee was formed to further investigate the issues. Rhonda Boyd was the SAS member appointed to this committee.
Organizational Culture

During this stage several aspects of the culture of SAS which became evident during the stage of primary emergence were continued and more fully elaborated.

A clear distinction developed in the office between the secretaries and those of higher rank. The higher ranking individuals were referred to as "professionals," regardless of their education, training, or prior experience in the mental health field. The office was not rigidly stratified, however. Most of the members were on a first name basis. The exception to this was the two new secretaries, Eversole and Ludwig. They referred to Nottingham as "Dr. Nottingham". He was the only individual in the office with a title. These secretaries were on a first name basis with the others.15

The anti-bureaucratic feelings which were noted in the previous stage were strengthened during this period, as well. Geist appeared to have the most cynical perspective on bureaucracies of the staff. In a private conversation with me he stated that the SAS project would not work, that it had been tried in other states and cities within the state, and that the result was a larger bureaucracy with little or no change in the actual care being given. He felt that the planners and administrators were too far removed from the clients to know their problems. He continued to complain about "bureaucracy" by saying that a small portion of every dollar actually gets to the clients and that top administrators get high salaries. He also didn't think that the DMHMR needed such a large bureaucracy and that the only good aspect of it was that it gave jobs to many people.
Then he complained of excessive paper work and inadequate reimbursement policies.

While anti-bureaucratic sentiments were expressed by the entire staff during this stage, the strongest statement, and one which was to be heard in different parts of the DMH, was a letter written by Nottingham. The staff and myself became aware of this letter when Ingrahm was filling out forms to produce office materials. She told everyone in the office about the problem they had getting furniture. At one point she made reference to a "pirate letter." When I said that I had never heard of the pirate letter she produced a copy of it from her files and called for everyone's attention as she read it aloud.

The letter was a memo written by Nottingham to Ken Little and the Acting Commissioner. In the letter he remarked that he didn't see how the bureaucracy was going to meet the reasonable demands of the public when it was unable to meet the reasonable and routine function of securing furniture and office equipment. Whenever the word "bureaucracy" was used it was put in quotation marks. Nottingham also said that being in state government was similar to having your hands tied and walking the gang-plank. As the letter was mentioned to others in the DMH, it became known as the "pirate letter." Ingrahm added that it did get some results for they shortly received more furniture and file cabinets.

This reading was immediately followed by a discussion between Boyd and Ingrahm, primarily, for Ingrahm also remarked that Little might have been involved in blocking the effort to get furniture. Boyd, who had previously worked for Little, disliked this implication and stated that the letter might have angered some people with whom SAS members will have
to work. She suggested that it was a better idea to deal with these matters more formally. Ingrahm's reply was that "it was a rather firm memo, but it accomplished what we wanted." She reiterated that Nottingham was really angry. Geist added that it was best to first "fill out the forms, and then jump on them."

Boyd, still defending her former boss, said that other offices have these problems and that it took nine months to get furniture at the last place that she worked. She added that the problem is that many of the offices have "incompetent staff." Ingrahm refused to accept this explanation and mentioned the disagreement between Little and Nottingham over the participatory planning process and said that when the memo was written, both she and Nottingham felt that Little was trying to hinder the project. Boyd simply repeated that the problem of getting office equipment was not unique to SAS. Geist added that Nottingham could get a good job elsewhere and that he makes this clear to those with whom he is negotiating.

This discussion indicates that the staff, while being anti-bureaucratic, still sense the importance of formal rules and rationality. Meyer has noted that "research studies have shown that when asked to give rational, orderly accounts of organizations, people will do so." The assumption of rationality on the part of organizational members creates the possibility for structural changes to act as signals of the intention of the organization regarding such matters as changes in policy and strategy to both the members and to outsiders. The specific meaning of the structural change may not be immediately evident, but it is
assumed that the change has some meaning. It becomes evident, however, that actions, in addition to those which produce structural change, also serve as signals. This can be seen in the imputation of motives by individuals to others' behavior.

According to Weber, "a motive is a complex of subjective meaning which seems to the actor himself or to the observer an adequate ground for the conduct in question." Continuing with Weber's notion, Mills adds that motives are not springboards for action or forces which lie "in" someone, but rather they "... are the terms with which the interpretation of conduct by social actors proceeds." The avowal or imputation of motive follows an action about which there is some question. The response to the question is a verbal action, a statement of motive. Mills also proposes that "when an agent vocalizes or imputes motives he is not trying to describe his experienced social action. He is not merely stating 'reasons.' He is influencing others -- and himself. Often he is finding new reasons which will mediate actions."

The fact that SAS was having difficulty acquiring furniture produced a dilemma which required an explanation. In this case Ingrahm believed that the source of the problem was Little's desire to impede the progress of SAS. Boyd had her own reasons for believing otherwise. In each case their interpretation of these events are a function of their own prior experiences. The imputation of motive by Ingrahm provided an explanation which was adequate for her.

Similarly, when Boyd was offered a permanent position at SAS instead of the temporary one, she constructed Nottingham's reason for this development. Here she believed that he was motivated by a desire to have more
control over the staff members. In this case the question did not arise because of a situation which was viewed as problematic, but simply because an anticipated alternative course of action by Nottingham was not chosen.

The pattern of interaction termed "friendly deference" in the previous stage also underwent some modification. The office was becoming more egalitarian. The "professionals" began to view Nottingham as someone whose requests need not be taken too seriously. The following incident illustrates this point.

One afternoon when Nottingham was very busy, he asked to be left alone so that he could finish some work. (He would be absent from the office the following week). His request was not immediately granted, however. When he asked to be left alone, Williams came to Nottingham's office and said quite loudly "So you want some quiet time!" and suggested to Nottingham that he should leave his office since everyone else was in there. Nottingham responded that he would leave if he had a place to go. In the next half hour he was interrupted for minor things by other staff members as well.

The growing egalitarianism of the office was also evident in the norms that were being created in the office and the processes by which they were formed. While the decision that everyone should be responsible for filling the coffee pot was made by Nottingham, it was advocated by Ingrahm, technically a subordinate person in the office. We should also note that when Ingrahm was promoting a ban on smoking in the office she stated that the decision should be made by "majority rule." No individual could be more powerful than the others when each had only one vote.
Furthermore, we suggest that egalitarianism was evident in the absence of concerns for territorial claims. The staff members freely entered Nottingham's office, sat at each others' desks, and borrowed materials from one another. They also readily interrupted one another with questions or to engage in small talk.

However, there were norms regarding personal space. SAS members avoid bodily contact with one another. During this stage I noticed only two exceptions to this norm. One was ritual handshaking. The other took place during a playful interchange when Williams carried Ingrahm out of the office and locked her out for awhile. Generally individual's bodies were not topics of conversation either unless it was related to dieting. In this area Williams again was the only one to break this norm. On one occasion he told Eversole that she "certainly had enough fat," and on another occasion he described Kimball's appearance in a bathing suit to Geist. Since there were no negative reactions to encroachments in personal space, these actions should be viewed as permissible within the SAS context.
Organizational Legitimacy

In considering the legitimacy of SAS during this stage we should be mindful of the fact that the formal structure of SAS was designed to rigidly follow the pattern previously established by the DMH. The hierarchical arrangement of positions, job titles and descriptions, and rules governing the CSS members were those of the larger organization. Meyer and Rowan argue that the formal structure of many post-industrial organizations are reflections of myths in their institutional environments. In their discussion which derives from the work of Ellul, they identify two properties of these myths:

"First, they are rationalized and impersonal prescriptions that identify various social purposes as technical ones and specify in a rulelike way the appropriate means to pursue these technical purposes rationally. Second, they are highly institutionalized and thus in some measure beyond the discretion of any individual participant or organization. They must, therefore, be taken for granted as legitimate, apart from evaluations of their impact on work outcome."23

Furthermore, they argue that the efficiency of organizations in modern societies is difficult to determine due to the erosion of many market factors and the ambiguity of organizational outputs. Thus the success of organizations which they term institutionalized "...depends on the confidence and stability achieved by isomorphism with institutional rules."24 They site American schools as an example for the products are evaluated according to the pre-constructed requirements for certification.

Problems arise for such organizations as the demands for efficiency may run counter to the institutionalized rules, and the rules which have
their sources in various parts of the organization's environment may also be inconsistent. Several approaches to resolving these structural inconsistencies are available to organizations, and two mechanisms which are applicable to SAS must be examined. They are decoupling or loose coupling\textsuperscript{25} and the logic of confidence.

Institutionalized organizations frequently are not closely tied to others. This provides protection for them for they are less likely to be supervised and evaluated in terms of efficiency. What is more important for institutionalized organizations are the activities of coordination and adjustment with others. This is generally handled informally. The absence of tight integration minimizes the possibility of conflict and enables the organization to develop other resources and support from its environment. Attempts to integrate institutionalized organizations are likely to result in conflicts and a loss of legitimacy.

Expressions of confidence in the organization on the part of its members and others in its environment contribute to the legitimacy of institutionalized organizations, as well. The use of discretion, overlooking, and avoidance are three forms of interaction through which face is maintained. The maintenance of face by the members of an organization, in turn, produces confidence in the organization. On the other hand, when participants in the organization openly express cynicism regarding the structure of the organization and its work activities, the validity of the institutionalized myths are challenged. This undermines the legitimacy of the organization.\textsuperscript{26}
SAS, as an agency which would be involved in planning and coordinating activities, could never be entirely autonomous, and in its formative period it was quite dependent upon others. It existed within the larger structure of the DMH, and two of its most experienced members at this point were also members of other offices. CSS would also be dependent upon numerous others within DMH to contribute to the orientation of its members in the next stage. There was still a considerable amount of interaction with other offices as furniture was acquired, additional office space sought, employment forms to be filled, etc. It was still under the scrutiny of others with the DMH.

In interviews with me, some of the office chiefs and others expressed their displeasure with SAS. One complained that the CSS staff was too large for its work task (and then said that his own staff was too small to accomplish its mission). Others complained that the hiring procedure was too slow or that the participatory planning process was an unnecessary waste of resources. Another doubted that Nottingham could be an effective leader of the office while another suggested that Nottingham was only using SAS as a mechanism to gain a reputation with NIMH. Few of the pre-established goals of SAS had been achieved, and the efficiency of the office was being doubted.

Mechanisms for the maintenance of face were utilized by members of SAS. Nottingham never criticized any of his staff members, and at times he assured them and others that they could adequately perform their jobs. On one occasion he returned from a discussion with the Acting Commissioner and announced that this man had commented on the fine quality of the SAS staff. Riley also spoke of them with confidence. The "pirate letter,"
however, was a breach of faith.

This letter was an open attack on the efficiency of the DMH organization and it clearly indicated Nottingham's dislike of bureaucracy. This letter also provided an occasion for Ingrahm to express her displeasure with the exercise of power by some DMH officials. Even Boyd acknowledged that DMH operations did not run smoothly. With the exception of the "pirate letter" there were no other challenges to institutional myths.
Summary and Conclusions

During the stage of initial staff adjustment all of the SAS members who would be active in the emergence of the organization had been hired. All but one member, Tom Ingles, began working at the office. Riley was rarely at the SAS office during this stage as he worked primarily at the other office with which he was associated. Thus, his desk was made available for an on-coming member. Other furniture was secured for the additional members, but the office was quite crowded at the end of this stage. (The development of the office is outlined in figure 8.)

Nottingham was also frequently away from the office; therefore, he was not available to provide much work related instruction or direction to the new members. They spent most of their time reviewing documents which were related to the SAS office, the concept of social assistance, the situation of the deinstitutionalized, and the functioning of the DMH. Thus, they were able to become familiar with the areas that would relate to their future activities, but the information was not provided to them in a systematic fashion.

As the new staff was not very occupied with performing work-tasks, much time was available for the development of interpersonal relationships. Most significant was the creation of norms for behavior within the office. It is reasonable to expect that new recruits to an organization must first learn their occupational role expectations and of the informal structure of the organization. However, the new staff were not immediately introduced to their work roles for several reasons. First, training in the occupational roles would not occur until the following stage when such activities
| Structure | Preparing for training and orientation, hiring, securing furniture, becoming acquainted with SAS and DMH  
Continued participation in SSIS, "learning community," P&R/WG and attending conferences |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>May - June 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members:** 8 full-time, 2 part-time (one full-time member would not appear until the following stage)

**Interpersonal Relationships:** Remedial work surrounding Ingrahm's application. Norms established regarding smoking, dress, making coffee. Expressions of desires and situation of the office.

**Culture:** Continued development of distinction between "professional" and clerical, anti-bureaucratic ideas.

Egalitarianism (laissez-faire leadership), absence of territorial claims.

**Legitimacy:** Supported by formal structural isomorphism with DMH.

Challenge for lack of efficiency.

Efficiency of DMH also challenged.

**Figure 8:** Initial Staff Adjustment Complex Sociological Calendar
were planned. Secondly, Nottingham was frequently away from the office; therefore, he was unable to instruct the new staff members. Thirdly, Nottingham's style of leadership was very democratic or laissez-faire, and, thus, he provided little direction even when he was present. Finally, the "professional" staff was not scheduled to actually begin their work activities until after they had been trained.

Nor were the staff indoctrinated into the informal structure of SAS. Obviously this stems from the fact that the structure had yet to be created. We suggest that in emerging organizations situational adjustment involves, to a large extent, the creation of the informal context in which the recruits will participate by the recruits themselves. Furthermore, much of this adjustment is to the desires of the participants, that is, they established norms to satisfy one another.

A further word is necessary regarding the legitimacy of SAS during this stage. Thus far, we have described SAS utilizing Meyer and Roman's concept of institutionalized organizations. However, SAS is also in part a production organization which could be evaluated according to the degree to which it efficiently accomplished its tasks. It was on the grounds of efficiency that it was being challenged by some members of the DMH. These individuals were aware of the fact that SAS was behind schedule in completing some of its tasks. They were aware of this because a timetable had been included in the SAS proposal.

Additionally many mental health officials were dissatisfied with the existing structure of the DMH. They felt that the atmosphere created by the formal structure (which was described earlier) was confusing and tension-filled because they had two overseers. This was further
complicated by their understanding that the two Deputy Commissioners were ideologically opposed to one another, one supporting the advancement of community-based mental health services and the other promoting a further development of the mental hospital's role. Cynical beliefs regarding the efficiency of the DMH were rather widespread. Thus, there were no grounds to publicly question the legitimacy of SAS without jeopardizing the legitimacy of the DMH itself. To my knowledge, there were no attempts to remove Nottingham from his position or to alter the structure of the SAS by other members of the DMH during this stage.
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CHAPTER VI: FORMAL SOCIALIZATION STAGE

Introduction

The final stage in the development of the Office of Social Assistance (SAS) was marked by the beginning of the Training and Orientation Sessions. The stated purpose of the sessions was to expose the SAS staff to numerous issues, events, legislation, and plans related to the development of mental health delivery systems on the national, state, and local levels. The program also included visits to mental health facilities in the area and training and discussion sessions designed to teach the staff members their specific roles within the organization.

As the events which transpired during the formal socialization stage impacted several areas of the conceptual framework of this study, an account of the happenings will first be presented. (See figure 9 for sociological calendar.) This will serve as the context for the application of the conceptual framework. The events will initially be described and then analyzed. Therefore, the format of this chapter will deviate from the preceding ones.

The Training and Orientation Sessions lasted for two weeks and were held at locations away from the SAS office. During the first week the participants met in conference rooms of a suburban hotel. During the first two days presentations were primarily ceremonial rather than informative. Many of the speakers were federal officials and high ranking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Training and Orientation Sessions</th>
<th>Site Visit Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal Presentations</td>
<td>Site Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>June 12-23</td>
<td>June 26-27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members
Work-tasks
Interpersonal Relationships
Organizational Legitimacy
Organizational Culture

Figure 9: Formal Socialization Stage Simple Sociological Calendar
members of the state Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (DMHMR). They included a member of the President's Commission on Mental Health, a Supervisory Auditor of the U.S. General Accounting Office, the Assistant Chief of the Social Assistance Program of NIMH, a regional Mental Health Program consultant, the state Director of the DMHMR, the Acting Commissioner of the Division of Mental Health (DMH), a member of the Joint Mental Health and Mental Retardation Advisory and Review Commission, and the Deputy Commissioner of Community Programs.

The first sessions were attended by all of the SAS staff (except for Riley who was occupied with family matters) and some other invited members of the DMH. Nottingham sat at the side of the speakers table, and the other SAS members sat at tables near the front. All of the presentations were tape recorded, and Williams was given the task of operating the cassette recorder.

The speakers informed their audience that community care can be an effective alternative to institutionalized care and that support systems must be established to bring about the change. They added that the biggest problems of community-based care are that there is improper placement of the deinstitutionalized, inadequate follow-up, and unnecessary re-entry to the hospitals. The federal officials repeatedly stated that a "system" of services was needed for the deinstitutionalized.

During these presentations Nottingham acted very fidgety. He was moving his head up and down and looking around the room in a serious and apprehensive manner. The remainder of the SAS staff was quiet and appeared to have little interest in the presentations. Nottingham began to relax near the end of the day.
The first sessions went without incident despite attempts on the part of the Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration "to add controversy." After one presentation he asked the speaker from NIMH exactly what he meant by "community" and "after-care." The speaker defused the potential conflict by saying "We've given you the contract; give us the answers."

During another presentation it was mentioned that in the St. Louis area the hospital staff was large while the community mental health centers were poorly staffed. In the St. Louis area the hospital staff was able to follow-up the deinstitutionalized and give them support and training in their own residences. However, the speaker noted, this type of strategy might not work in this state because "for better or worse, you don't have a large hospital staff in this state anymore." Immediately Aikens exclaimed "for worse." Nottingham simply smiled at this remark.

During a break in the presentations, Nottingham, the two Deputy Commissioners, the Acting Commissioner, the NIMH representative and the regional consultant all huddled in the hotel lobby for a quiet conversation. The conference produced a different attitude toward SAS on the part of the Acting Commissioners, Lester Vorst. He stated that he was worried that the scope of the SAS project was too large to be accomplished in the allotted time. The federal representative responded that they were less concerned with completion dates than with task achievement. After the conference, Vorst announced to the SAS staff that his doubts about the project's success were diminished and that now he was very enthusiastic and supportive of the project.
Following the discussion two deinstitutionalized, former mental patients performed a skit depicting the problems of someone who was suffering mental anguish and feared being returned to a state mental hospital. These women were then introduced by Nottingham as "consumers of mental health services." They proceeded to speak of the problems which they had experienced both within and outside of mental institutions. They also mentioned that they appreciated being introduced as "consumers" rather than as "ex-mental patients."

Throughout their presentation there was extreme silence and attentiveness which was not evident during the other presentations. There were numerous questions after the talk and they were encouraged to describe their experiences in more detail. The representative of the President's Commission kept asking "what made the difference?" He wanted to know why they were in better condition now than they had been in the past.

The answers, which indicated that they were helped the most by people who would step outside of their professional roles and take a genuine interest in them, sparked much conversation around the tables. There was general agreement that the expression of a caring attitude was important. Organizational coordination and professional expertise were viewed as inferior to loving and authentically caring for the mentally or emotionally impaired.

I was informed the following day that this presentation produced some conflict, as well. One of the secretaries complained to Nottingham that they should have been warned that the skit was going to be performed.
She said that she could not take the excitement, and she was frightened when the women shouted during the performance. Nottingham, in turn, sharply criticized the secretary to a greater extent than he had criticized anyone before. Geist understood Nottingham's reactions as stemming from the tension that he was feeling at the beginning of the Training and Orientation Sessions. On the other hand, he viewed the secretary's complaint as a product of the fact that "her mind is in the typewriter."

The following day the sessions were more relaxed. Nottingham was the only man who was wearing a sports coat, whereas, all of the males wore sports coats the previous day. Now the federal representatives were gone. The women were wearing dresses, as they would during all of the sessions. Again the staff seemed to be disinterested in the presentations, except for that of the Acting Commissioner who spoke informally and confidentially at times.

During his presentation, Vorst acknowledged that there were some problems in the central office of the DMH. One problem was the organization's authority structure. He stated that having two Deputy Commissioners created a situation in which people did not know to whom they were responsible. He outlined his own plan to reorganize the division and added that it would be some time before he officially presented the plan.

Vorst also commented that anxiety was high in the central office because it was an election year. He added that this was not unusual for the elections typically produce anxiety. He cautioned the staff to act with integrity. To illustrate this point he said that state cars should
only be used for state business and that mental health employees should not date one another.

The last item produced a question from Williams. He wanted that clarified. Vorst modified his position somewhat and commented that he had even married a "girl" from mental health himself. He recommended that people refrain from dating their supervisors or immediate subordinates:

Vorst reiterated that he was behind the SAS project, and he reminded them that SAS "is like the new kid in town that still has to prove itself." Geist wanted to know how they could make themselves look more credible. He added that they would need the cooperation of others to be successful. Vorst stated simply that they should try to get along with the other offices, try to get their jobs done, and realized that they will not please everyone in the central office. Geist turned to me and said, "Well, it's good to see that the bosses are on our side — Lloyd and Vorst, especially Vorst."

Near the end of the second day of the Training and Orientation Sessions, two problems surfaced. The first involved a conflict between two secretaries, Ann Ingrahm and Nora Eversole. Ingrahm asked Eversole to take some papers to the office tomorrow so that she would not have to make a special trip herself. Eversole resented being asked to run the errand and stated that she was not going to be at the office tomorrow. She thought that she was going to attend the Training and Orientation Sessions. At this point Ingrahm informed her that she and Eve Ludwig would be returning to the office. Nottingham had made that decision,
but he had not informed Eversole or Ludwig.

Eversole was upset because Nottingham had not informed her of the change. Her response to Ingrahm was a firmly articulated statement: "Dr. Nottingham said that I would be here." Nonetheless, she took the papers from Ingrahm and walked toward the door. When Ingrahm began to ask her to do something else, Eversole turned around and angrily said, "I have to leave," and walked out.

Then Ingrahm began to discuss this incident with Nottingham. She complained that she did not know how to relate to Eversole. At times they were peers and at other times Ingrahm was like a boss. She said that she could not make requests of Eversole as she would other members of the staff. Nottingham simply defended himself by saying that he did not have the time to inform Ludwig and Eversole that they would not be returning to the Training and Orientation Sessions. Ingrahm was still upset and continued to complain for approximately ten minutes. For the most part, Nottingham listened. Finally she stopped and laughingly said, "Anything to keep from going home and moving into my new apartment."

The second problem dealt with the fact that Tom Ingles was having difficulty signing his contract with the DMH. Alice Wright was still officially occupying Ingles' position even though she was serving as an assistant to Vorst. She was getting paid as if she were on the SAS project. Vorst decided to give Ingles a special contract until Wright could be officially removed from the position. Nottingham apologized to Ingles for this dilemma and said that he himself would get a poor evaluation as a supervisor because of the incident. Then Vorst and Nottingham assured Ingles that the DMH usually runs more smoothly than it probably appeared
to him.

The sessions the following day were held in a smaller room at the hotel. The tables were arranged so that people faced one another. These sessions were smaller and they only included the presenters and the SAS staff minus Ludwig, Eversole, and Boyd. Boyd was attending an SSIS subcommittee meeting on that day.

Both Nottingham and Boyd had prior contact with one of the presenters, Mary Young. Young used to work for the DMH before moving to the west coast. Earlier I had heard Boyd tell Ingrahm that Young was "aggressive toward men" and not very well-liked by the other women in the division. On the other hand, Nottingham described her as intelligent, hard working, and very busy.

During Young's presentation Kimball asked several questions which could not be answered. She seemed to be testing the presenter's knowledge of federal policy. However, since some programs varied from state to state, Young could not give the specific information. But when the presenter was suggesting strategies for getting the cooperation of different agencies, Kimball and others in the room would agree with her.

The other presenters primarily discussed specific legislation which would impact on the SAS project. The staff seemed to be less interested in this information than they were in Ingrahm smoking a cigarette. She had been against smoking in the office. This act provoked many comments, and her only defense was, "Just because I lit a cigarette, you think I'm a fallen woman." Nottingham was the only one who appeared to have an interest in these presentations.
One presenter, Bea Rooter, suggested that the SAS office incorporate a specific administrative style, management by objective. This discussion provoked more interest. The staff was encouraged to document and quantify all of their activities. Rooter also suggested that they make it clear to other organizations that records are being kept of their interactions. She said that this makes everyone accountable even though the formal agreements are not legally binding.

The topic of clearly establishing priorities was also discussed. This arose as the staff was told that they should acquire all the equipment that they will need. When Nottingham stated that they were having trouble getting office space, desks, and other equipment, the speaker wanted to know what the source of the problem was. He explained that they had to work through Little's office and that he was being uncooperative. Rooter explained that Nottingham should see the Acting Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner to have them establish the priorities of the division in regard to SAS. If SAS is a high priority project, as she thinks it is, these officials should be asked to make that known to the other office chiefs. Nottingham wrote her suggestion down.

When the formal presentations ended a discussion developed among Ingrahm, Riley and Williams regarding the responsibility for paying for the meals during the training sessions. Riley had previously announced that the state would pay for their lunches and Williams repeated this position. Ingrahm, however, said that according to the Acting Commissioner the staff would pay for their own meals. Riley disagreed with this. Ingrahm's competence is at stake here for Riley began to list the
various conditions under which the state would or would not pay for meals. When Riley left, Ingrahm went to Nottingham and told him to solve the problem, and Williams mentioned that he was not as concerned about paying for the meals as he was with eliminating the confusion.

A couple of days later Riley, Williams and Boyd were discussing Bea Rooter. Although Boyd was not at the presentation she had had prior encounters with Rooter. They all agreed that she was incapable of empathizing with anyone. Boyd included an anecdote about Rooter being very bad for morale. She indicated that Rooter had caused so much trouble at a state mental hospital that she was forbidden to go there anymore. She added that the superintendent of the hospital, who was a very dynamic person prior to the incident, had lost all of his drive. Riley even said that Rooter was incapable of loving anyone.

At this point Boyd asked the others for their opinion of Mary Young. The response was that she seemed to be very well informed. From Boyd's previous comments about Young, I assumed that she wanted the discussion to be about Young's personality rather than her competence. When no one had anything negative to say regarding Young's character, Boyd remarked that "she must have calmed down a lot."

Shortly after this Nottingham engaged Boyd in a conversation regarding Bea Rooter. He spoke very highly of her presentation saying that her legal and administrative information was exactly what he wanted to hear. Boyd refrained from saying anything negative about Rooter during this brief conversation.

Roger Aiken's presentation to the SAS staff illustrated both his self presentation and the staff's views of him. Nottingham introduced Aikens
as someone who "needs no introduction." Aikens immediately described himself as the "vice-president for revolution." He stated that he had been fired four times and that he would be fired again, and he added: "Everyday when I see the boss I thumb my nose at him."

He indicated his expertise by stating that he worked in hospital administration for forty years in the military and said, "Nobody knows more about beds than I do." He added that he was accustomed to planning for times of great fluxuation in hospital usage, such as war. Having already had one career, he said that now he works for fun.

Aikens presented statistical tables and graphs related to the institutionalized population and the rates of recidivism. (Previously Boyd mentioned to Nottingham that she would not believe any of the statistics which he would present. They agreed, however, that his figures would not be challenged during this session.) He concluded that there was a "myth of rehabilitation," that many people could not be effectively cured, and that "ninety percent of health treatment doesn't make a difference." He also warned the staff of the dangers of moving patients from one setting to another because it would kill some of them. He presented an argument for hospital-based treatment and no one challenged his ideas.

The following week the Training and Orientation Sessions were held at Riley's office in a state mental hospital. The room was large enough to arrange several tables so that the participants were all facing one another. The staff was becoming more informally dressed. Nottingham and Ingles were the only two men wearing ties and Williams began to wear blue jeans. The women were still wearing dresses.
Kimball led one of the sessions and discussed the "site visit methodology the interview guides that would be used to "...document what components of the SAS Service Delivery System are in existence in the state." She indicated that all of the professional staff of SAS would be traveling around the state to gather the necessary data. At this time the ambiguity that the staff experienced toward their work activities became evident. Ingles turned to Nottingham and said that he was confused as to his role in the organization. The activities which were just discussed were not in his job description.

Nottingham said, "The problem isn't unique to you." To this Ingles asked, "Who is it unique to?" Nottingham answered, "Probably the whole staff here." Then he explained that, in order to get a number of people on the staff, different job descriptions had to be written. They could not have everyone doing the same thing. Riley interrupted, "Not unless you want to pay them $5,000." This comment brought some laughter.

Nottingham explained that he envisioned that all of the "professional" staff would be performing similar activities during the data collection period. He thought that it would be most efficient if they were to send a couple of people to an area for a day or two to gather data for the project rather than send the entire staff to an area for a couple of hours. He said, "Now you should consider yourselves to be generalists and you will do your specialties later. Then your job descriptions will come into play." Ingles remarked that he would like to discuss this later with Nottingham, and Geist nodded and said that he was confused about his job, as well.
This discussion was followed by a presentation by a community mental health center director after which Nottingham asked his staff what they would do if they were going to the center for a site visit. Geist mentioned that he would try to get a "broad overview" from the director. No one else volunteered anymore suggestions, and Geist repeated his statement again. Then some members suggested identifying other people to serve as informants in the area, but no one mentioned the specific types of information that they would try to gather. It appeared as though Nottingham was trying to determine if they understood their jobs. Since the staff had little to say, Nottingham and Kimball coached them on the types of questions they should ask.

The staff also went on two visits to local community mental health centers during the sessions. The questionnaire which was prepared by Kimball was not used yet. Instead, the visits were informal discussions between the SAS staff and the directors of the centers or some of their staffs. One director also advised the SAS staff on strategies for getting information from people. He suggested that the interviewers should have similar backgrounds to the informants. He also suggested getting involved with the community organizations on different levels and on a regular basis to develop a rapport with them.

The director also stressed that people in the community would be more likely to cooperate if the SAS staff could show them that SAS can make their work easier for them. It was stated that many people in the community were disappointed when they heard that the DMH central offices were creating a social assistance program. Community workers had their own plans in preparation and they wanted the money that went to create
SAS. Therefore, some people at the community level resented SAS. They also thought that the SAS project would be unsuccessful and that it would mean more paperwork for the mental health centers.

The community mental health center people also spoke of the "YAVAS syndrome." By this they meant the tendency of counselors to prefer to assist individuals who were Young, Attractive, Verbal, Active, and Successful (or Sexy). They alerted the SAS staff that those who did not fit into this category were apt to be the most neglected. At one center they said that they no longer use the term "geriatrics," and at the other center the term "chronically ill" is forbidden in an effort to change peoples' attitudes toward classes of individuals who may need the most care.

On the last day of the Training and Orientation Sessions the SAS staff returned to Riley's office. Nottingham initially took charge of the session and immediately expressed his disappointment in the staff. He passed out a diagram of manpower programs and funding sources related to mental health and commented that he did not think anyone on the staff was capable of producing that type of document, but he wished they could.

Next he referred to the tasks of SAS which were written into the proposal and divided these activities among the staff members. Some tasks were assigned to individuals, others to small groups, and others would be accomplished in conjunction with other members of the DMH. Other tasks would be contracted to private research organizations. When he asked if anything had been omitted from the plan, Kimball remarked that the amount of time that would be allotted for the completion of each task should be specified. He indicated that the time frames were already
establish in the proposal. No one else had any comments.

Geist had quietly complained to me and other staff members that he was getting tired from the presentations. For several days he appeared to have trouble staying awake. On the last afternoon of the sessions, Ingles also remarked that he was "burned out." Williams agreed that he was suffering from receiving too much information in a short amount of time.

Both Ingles and Williams told Nottingham that they needed "group process" time. Nottingham agreed with the suggestion and said, "Okay, what do you want to do?" Silence followed and the staff members stared at one another. They did not know what to do. The silence was followed by hysterical laughter, especially on the part of Williams and Ingles.

When the laughter died several members began to talk about the staff and the value of the Training and Orientation Sessions. Ingles, Williams, and Geist all said that the sessions had been very informative. Williams added that he learned more about the division over the past two weeks than in his previous two years as an employee of the DMH. Riley stated that he felt that the staff was a "good group," and he encouraged Nottingham to "try to hold on to Nancy (Kimball) -- at least fifty percent of her."

This conversation was short-lived as the group once again began to joke and clown. Williams jumped up on his chair and Ingles proceeded to shake his head while Geist was rolling his eyes. The women did not participate in this activity.

Nottingham said that he was relieved by this behavior. He had heard that a similar group in another state became very depressed upon
learning of the amount of work that would be required of them. Someone said, "We're more manic than depressive," and Ingles described them as "hebephrenic." Nottingham smilingly said, "I'd rather have any of those than depressive." Joking and complimenting one another continued until the session was about to end.

Near the end of the session Nottingham selected Geist to act in his place when he was away from the office. (Nottingham was scheduled to be away from the office for a few days the following week.) He stated that everyone in the office, including Ingrahm should report directly to Geist. To this Williams responded, "That will be interesting," and someone else asked if Ingrahm was aware of this. Ingrahm was not present at the meeting for she was working at the SAS office. In response to the question, Nottingham phoned her to inform her of the chain of command.

Immediately following the Training and Orientation Sessions, the staff had to prepare for site visits to a state mental health district. A staff meeting was arranged for this purpose. Tom Ingles led the discussion in Nottingham's absence. He distributed materials which they had received from the district and the group began to identify those individuals whom they felt they should contact and where these people were located.

When they realized the amount of territory that was included in the district, they became discouraged. They had intended to contact all "key people," and now it appeared to them that this would not be possible. Furthermore, Geist mentioned that he did not like the fact that Ingrahm would be making the arrangements for their visits. He didn't think that
she was competent as a secretary. This discussion ended quickly when someone asked what types of questions they would be asking. Williams pointed out that the purpose of the initial visit was to make contacts, to develop a constituency, and that data would be collected later.

After a break in the meeting, the legitimacy of SAS was discussed. Boyd mentioned that she was not sure of Vorst's relationship to the project. She noted that he had missed the last P&RWG meeting and that he was in the building at the time of the meeting. She said that she heard others say that Vorst avoided the meeting "because he wanted other people to cut down the project." (This P&RWG meeting was held prior to Vorst's discussion with federal officials at the Training and Orientation Sessions. The staff was unaware that Vorst's perception of SAS changed as a result of that conversation.)

Next, Boyd mentioned that if Nottingham were to promote Ingrahm into a "professional" position others would use that action to discredit him. Geist got very excited by this and said that he could not accomplish his tasks without the cooperation of others within the central office of the DMH. He added that he did not think the promotion was possible for it would necessitate large jumps in civil service classification. Others agreed with this and stated that they did not want to see Ingrahm promoted. Boyd felt, however, that Nottingham was going to recommend Ingrahm for a promotion. Geist, indicating that Ingrahm was not going on this site visit, suggested that Nottingham had not made the decision yet.

This discussion ended when Kimball entered the room. She was briefed on what was being discussed. She took this opportunity to inform the
staff that many people had problems with SAS from the beginning. She quickly outlined some of the conflicts that arose during the proposal writing period and that the proposal was rushed through the division while some important people were away on vacation. The staff had been unaware of the prior conflicts until now.

Ingles supported Kimball's comments by discussing a recent conversation that he had with Ken Little. He mentioned that Boyd had just taken him around to the other DMH offices because he wanted to meet the people. When Ingles tried to make casual conversation with Little about neutral topics such as baseball, Little immediately brought up the fact that he and Nottingham had different philosophies regarding planning. Little mentioned that he preferred computer simulation while Nottingham was committed to participatory planning. Ingles added that Little wanted to know whose side he was on. Then Ingles asked the staff, "Is it true that there are people in central office who would like to see SAS fail?" Kimball and Boyd responded, "Undoubtedly."

When the meeting was ending, Geist complained that he had never been taken around and introduced to people. He said that Nottingham should have done it to build constituency within central office. Ingles encouraged everyone to get to know the other members of the division, to have lunch with them if possible, in order to reduce the schism that existed within the central office regarding the SAS project.

At the end of the formal socialization stage, Riley had little contact with SAS. He did mention that he would like to assist SAS in developing any future educational programs that they may need. Kimball continued to work part-time for SAS. The other "professionals" began to assume their
work-tasks with a concentration on site visits. The clerical staff continued to work in that capacity.
Work-tasks

The work-tasks for most of the SAS members were quite simple during the training sessions. Nottingham and Kimball were the only SAS members who made presentations. Ludwig and Eversole attended only two days of the meetings, and they spent the rest of the time performing clerical functions at the office. For the most part the staff acted as passive participants during the sessions. Some of them took notes on the talks while others just listened. Some of them took notes on the talks while others just listened. At times they asked questions of the speakers. Williams had the additional task of recording the presentations for the secretaries to transcribe at a later date.

When presentations were being made the sessions resembled seminars. They were more formal when high ranking officials were speaking and very informal when others addressed them. Frequently the staff seemed unattentive and bored. Geist informed me that he had trouble staying awake during these meetings. Nottingham, on the other hand, acted very fidgety during the early sessions. As the sessions proceeded, he became more relaxed.

The "professional" staff began to express their feelings of ambiguity or confusion regarding their work-tasks during the last day of the training sessions. Task ambiguity, or the experience of the absence of clear guidelines for work, can arise for several reasons: (1) the information may not exist; (2) the information may not be communicated to the person who needs it; (3) the person may be given contradictory information; (4) the information may be communicated in a garbled or fragmentary
fashion so that the receiver does not understand it; and (5) the person may not be able to assimilate the information (e.g., cases of fatigue or a lack of technical expertise). We suggest that the task-ambiguity which was experienced by the SAS staff had three sources. First, some of them were not informed until the last day of the Training and Orientation Sessions that they would be going on site visits. Therefore, they had not been given all the information relevant to their work. Secondly, once they became aware of this information, their knowledge of their work-tasks was contradictory. Data collection was not included in all of the job descriptions. Thirdly, we suggest that the relevance of the information which was presented to the staff in the form of documents, handouts, and formal presentations, was not always indicated. Since SAS was a new project and some of the staff members had limited experience in the mental health field, they could not readily distinguish important information from irrelevant data. We suggest that an inability to determine the importance of specific information contributed in part to the degree of non-attentiveness during the Training and Orientation Sessions.

Nottingham's comment that the "professionals" would initially act as generalists and later as specialists reduced some of the expression of task ambiguity. Similarly, the ambiguity could have been reduced when Nottingham divided the tasks which were included in the proposal among the members. The silence which followed this activity could be an indicator that they were still apprehensive.

Task ambiguity was also present for Ann Ingrahm. This resulted from the fact that she was not acting fully in the capacity of a "professional"
or a secretary. She attended the Training and Orientation Sessions with the "professionals," but she was not included in the site visits. As one member indicated, "Until Nick (Nottingham) makes a decision regarding her job, two positions will remain vacant." During this stage Ingrahm would occasionally smoke and frequently had stomach discomfort. These stress-related indicators can be associated with ambiguity.²

During the formal socialization stage Ingrahm's capability as a secretary was also questioned. This stemmed from the fact that some of her work-tasks were not performed properly. On one occasion she was to file reimbursement forms so that Geist could be repaid by the DMH for travel expenses which he incurred. The forms were not filed properly and there was a lengthy delay in Geist's reimbursement. On another occasion she was given the task of arranging for the site visit to a local community mental health center. During their visit the staff would be given a tour of a residential facility. Since the facility was small, the center wished to only take two people on the tour. Ingrahm did not inform them of the size of the SAS staff, and problems ensued during the site visit.

Ingles was also troubled by his lack of administrative responsibility in the office. As noted earlier, Nottingham selected Geist to act as the office chief in his absence. Ingrahm had expected that he would be second-in-command. In an interview Ingrahm said: "What I had been feeling since I came on board is that Nick's threat level in relation to me is higher than hell, and, therefore, he's looked toward Rudy (Geist) to sort of fill that administrative assistant role. Sometimes when I've made suggestions to him about what I thought needed to be done
administratively, he'd get nervous — switch around in his chair — and more importantly, each and every one of these suggestions that I'd made he rejected. My perception is that if he would of followed some of them, we would be in better shape in certain areas than we are now."

On some occasions weaknesses in Nottingham's administrative abilities were evident. It has been noted that he had neglected to have Alice Wright removed from the position that Ingles was to occupy. This produced some administrative difficulty. He also did not resolve the conflict between Ingrahm and Eversole which had its source in Nottingham's failure to give Eversole her work instructions. Similarly, at times he gave Ingrahm the responsibility for supervising the clerical staff, but this was not written into her job description. Clerical supervision was Eversole's responsibility according to her job description.

Ingles believed that he had leadership qualities and that they were being recognized by other members of the staff. He felt that he was becoming an informal leader, and I observed that he did lead many discussions. However, his leadership role was never officially sanctioned and this bothered him. Task ambiguity would continue for Ingles, as with Ingrahm.

Geist also felt that it was Nottingham's responsibility as office chief to reduce the conflict that existed within the DMH. He stated that Nottingham should have personally escorted his staff around the central office to introduce them to the chiefs. Additionally, some staff members believed that Nottingham should have determined who was going to pay for staff lunches during the Training and Orientation Sessions prior to the
meetings.

While there was the tendency on the part of the staff to individuate the problems that were occurring, it is important to look at the situational factors which effected these dilemmas. Most significant is the fact that Nottingham was extremely busy just prior to the Training and Orientation Sessions and during the first few days of the meetings. Prior to the sessions he and Geist were away from the office at a meeting of the "learning community." Therefore, the first preparations for the sessions were made in his absence. Riley was the only one with experience in this area, but he was not aware of the potential problems which might arise. During the early days of the Training and Orientation Sessions, Nottingham was also busy confering with the high-ranking officials which were present. This led to a neglect of his own staff since no one was appointed to act as his administrative assistant at that time.
Interpersonal Relationships

Throughout much of the formal socialization stage the SAS staff did not have the opportunity to relate to one another on an informal, non-work related basis. Some exceptions to this were lunch breaks, brief periods between the presentations, and the "group process" time. Much of the conversation during these periods was also work related.

The interpersonal relationships which did develop, however, were mostly friendly and supportive. When interpersonal relationships were nonsupportive, this usually resulted from problems related to work-tasks. Sex differences and position in the SAS hierarchy also influenced these relationships.

Generally, men spoke with men and women with women. The men, when they were separated from the women, spent a considerable amount of time in sex related conversation. A few illustrations will adequately depict this type of conversation.

During one of the meetings Williams drew a diagram of three interconnected circles arranged vertically. He passed the drawing to other men and asked them what it represented. As the respondents were puzzled, he explained that it was ____ , ____ , and ____ (three overweight mental health officials) having group sex. This produced laughter from each man, except Nottingham. He only smiled.

Geist and Ingles also expressed their interest in the sex habits of members of the DMH. They would turn to Williams for information on sexual affairs. He would oblige by spreading the local gossip. The men would also speak of their desire for the attractive women with whom they had
contact. Once, when Ingles passed a woman as he was getting on an
elevator, he turned to me and commented, "I've had lunch. Now I'm
ready for dessert." He viewed the woman as dessert.

Ann Ingrahm was most isolated from the group. She was not recognized
by either the "professionals" or the clerical staff as being one of them.
The errors which she made in her work-tasks diminished her status in
the group even further. Geist tended to dehumanize her by referring to
her as "the thing." She was also viewed as a threat to the success of
the project due to the possibility of her promotion. Kimball remained
her friend throughout this stage, as the two women would frequently talk
with one another. However, I never noticed Kimball coming to Ingrahm's
defense or supporting her publicly in any way. 3

As mentioned earlier, the fact that Ingrahm smoked a cigarette
during the sessions attracted much attention. A consequence of this was
that people began to smoke in the SAS office after the Training and
Orientation Sessions. However, due to the lack of opportunities for
individuals to interact or discuss matters that were not work related,
interpersonal relationships remained relatively stable during this
period. The increases in the social isolation of Ingrahm and in sex
segregation with accompanying sex related conversations were the only
noticeable changes during this stage.
Interorganizational Relationships

Most of the activities of the formal socialization stage fall under the category of interorganizational relationships because the staff was educated primarily by those outside of the organization. SAS was dependent upon others to perform this function. The sessions also provided the DMH with an opportunity to contribute a segment of the state's share to the development of SAS as it was obligated to do according to the contract with NIMH. Some presenters who were not members of the DMH were paid for their services; others contributed their time.

Nottingham believed that it was significant that the presenters came to a location which was removed from the central offices of the DMH. He wanted the sessions to be held on his "turf." Since the sites for the sessions were selected and arranged for by SAS, he felt that this was accomplished. He got the speakers to come to them.

The sessions were uneventful initially. Several of the speakers outlined the background of the social assistance systems project and explained its mission to the audience. Since the SAS staff had already been given this information, they paid little attention to these speakers.

However, the sessions also provided contact with deinstitutionalized individuals and information on the problems within the central office of the DMH. Presentations of this nature aroused their interests. They were also interested in learning strategies for getting information on social assistance for the deinstitutionalized from others within the state. They seemed to be less interested in the effects of legislative activity and litigation on planning in this area.
We suggest that the staff had difficulty relating to information with which they were not familiar. None of them had much experience in the area of public policy, but some had experience in dealing with the mentally and emotionally disturbed and working in government bureaucracies. The tendency of the staff to focus on areas of familiarity was evident in the site visits, as well. Geist, an architect, would ask questions about housing regulations. Ingles questioned the mental health center directors about the array of services that they provided for the community. Williams repeatedly inquired about the types of drugs that were being used, while Kimball frequently made comments whenever the idea of a "systems approach" was mentioned. None of the "professional staff," except Nottingham, seemed interested in all of the information that was being made available to them.

Wheeler's typology of interpersonal settings assists our understanding of the behavior of the SAS staff during this stage. The Training and Orientation Sessions would be classified as a disjunctive, collective socialization setting. By this we mean that a number of people are being introduced to new information simultaneously, and the new recruits (the new staff members) do not have predecessors to serve as examples or models for them. In this type of situation the recruits do not have to rely on their own resources to determine what is significant. There is the possibility of collective problem solving. The recruits can also rely on their past experiences, as the SAS staff did, but knowledge gained from past experience may be irrelevant. Since the staff had little opportunity to determine significant information collectively, they were forced to rely on past experiences. Therefore, they concerned
themselves with topics that were familiar to them individually.

During the Training and Orientation Sessions some signs of competition among women became apparent. I saw no signs of intrasex competition among the SAS staff, but the female members acted in an aggressive or derogatory manner toward some female presenters. Nancy Kimball repeatedly sought the limits of Mary Young's knowledge during her presentation. To a more limited extent she also questioned Bea Rooter. She did not challenge any of the men in a similar fashion. Rhonda Boyd even made derogatory comments about these two women.

The literature on sex roles indicates that women are socialized to view women as inferior, that is, to have prejudice against them. Additionally, there is the tendency to devalue women who step outside of traditional female roles. These notions have been found to be held by both men and women. However, women are also taught to compete with other women for the attention of men. Women are to place their faith in men and to distrust other women.

Whitehurst has argued that the female status is similar to having a stigmatized identity. Through socialization a woman learns that she possesses a stigma and will apply the accompanying prejudices to herself. Therefore, she will have a relatively lower opinion of herself. Whitehurst concludes: "This may be related to the hesitation of many women to enter into situations of interactions with men; or to hold back comments in discussions with men." These tendencies may explain in part the observation that the female "professional" staff members challenged female presenters but not the males.
Organizational Legitimacy

Incidents which transpired during the formal socialization stage impacted the evolution of SAS in three ways. First, the doubts regarding the success of the project by the Acting Commissioner were reduced. This change occurred as a result of his conversation with NIMH officials. Vorst had been worried that the SAS office could not successfully attain its goals in the allotted time. When the officials indicated that their concern for completion dates was minimal, Vorst announced to the staff that he was supportive of the project.

Secondly, the "professional" members of the staff began to be more concerned with the evaluation of the office by outsiders. During Vorst's presentation he alerted the staff to the fact that they were viewed with suspicion by some members of the DMH, and on a site visit they were told by a community mental health center director that many people who operated community-based programs resented the fact that the federal money went to the central office rather than to the centers. The staff was also advised by a regional Mental Health Program Consultant that people in the community tend to dislike decisions made in the central office.

The staff realized that they would need the cooperation of both individuals in the central office and in the community for the project to be successful. Geist, Ingles, and Boyd all voiced their concern over this at various times. Their concern for the evaluation of the office by others was exacerbated by Boyd's suggestion that the Acting Commissioner may not be supportive of the project, Boyd and Kimball's proclamation that some members of the central office wanted to see SAS fail, Ingles'
awareness of the conflict between Nottingham and Little, and the possibility that Ingrahm may be prematurely promoted (from their perspective).

Finally, some of the office members began to question Nottingham's administrative abilities. Geist's and Ingles' criticisms have already been discussed, but the secretarial staff was having difficulty with Nottingham, as well. Ingrahm described him as "... absentminded and flaked out sometimes. He'll play around with something for months trying to get things perfect, trying to think of it in every angle, and he's always late with everything."

Eversole did not feel that Nottingham was capable of directing people. In an interview she said, "I've heard lots of psychological garbage since I've been up here. Far more than what I was accustomed to. Dr. Nottingham is intelligent. He is book intelligent. He is not intelligent as far as dealing with people, making them at ease, making them understand what it is he wants or needs from them. He tends not to know how to deal with people. He is trying to get his staff to work out their own problems, to set up their own areas, their own guidelines." After the Training and Orientation Sessions Nora Eversole began looking for another job.

Thus, the primary consequence of the formal socialization stage on the legitimacy of the office was an increase in concern for it on the part of the staff.
Due to the passivity of the SAS staff during the final stage, it was difficult to discern many noticeable changes in the culture of the organization. The group remained pragmatic and systems oriented. A systems orientation was encouraged by several presenters and Nancy Kimball. By a systems approach they meant that the staff must be aware of all of the factors which would impact on the formation of social assistance systems and the interrelationships of the factors. However, the factors themselves still had to be discovered by the staff. As the topics of the Training and Orientation Sessions indicated, Nottingham believed that they should be concerned with legislation, housing, the needs of the deinstitutionalized, the available mental health services, the interrelatedness of mental health organizations, and funding.

Interestingly, the staff felt that the deinstitutionalized also needed love and care. They were concerned for the human element of social assistance. This belief did not fit into the systems approach which would conceptualize the needs of the deinstitutionalized and the resources of the state into readily quantifiable variables.

The division between the "professional" and the clerical staff remained and was reinforced during this stage. The "professionals" had very little contact with the secretaries for they were physically separated. This division proved to be particularly frustrating for Ingrahm for she was not acting fully in either capacity.

Accompanying the division between the "professional" and the clerical workers was segregation based on sex. As in most organizations, the
secretarial staff of SAS was female. The same can be said of the rest of the DMH. We should also note that those with ranks above that of office chief were male in the DMH. While no women in the SAS staff openly complained of sexual discrimination, they did note that they had to work with "male chauvinists," and they appeared to accommodate to this situation rather than seriously challenge it.
Conclusion

By the formal socialization stage every position within the SAS office had been filled except one "professional" slot. This position would be filled in the following weeks. During this stage the staff generally acted as passive participants in their own training. Their passivity produced little change in the culture of the organization. Significant alterations were noted, however, in the areas of work-tasks, interpersonal relationships, interorganizational relationships, and organizational legitimacy. (See figure 10.)

Interorganizational relationships effected several changes in SAS. This is due to the fact that outsiders were given the task of educating the staff. First, through the presentations the staff became increasingly concerned with the evaluation of the office by others, and they were given the support of the Acting Commissioner. Secondly, as the staff gradually learned what their work-tasks would be, task ambiguity was produced. They discovered that their functions would be different than they had expected. Thirdly, the manner in which they were trained, formally rather than on-the-job, produced passivity on the part of the staff. And fourthly, through interorganizational contact the staff became increasingly aware of the conflicts that existed within the DMH.

The staff believed that the conflicts would make the success of the project more difficult to obtain, and they began to doubt Nottingham's ability to lead them to task achievement. They felt that he had done little to resolve the problems within the central office regarding SAS. Furthermore, they believed that the promotion of Ingrahm would be an
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**Members**

One more "professional" is present.

**Work-tasks**


**Interpersonal Relationships**

Segregation by sex and position; isolation of Ingrahm; male sex talk.

**Interorganizational Relationships**

Staff education; intrasex competition.

**Organizational Legitimacy**

Support of acting commissioner. Staff concern for legitimacy.

**Organizational Culture**

Emphasis on systems orientation.
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additional threat to the project. Also, his non-directive leadership style did not provide them with the guidance which they wanted.

Failures in the area of work-tasks also influenced the interpersonal relationships within the office. Most dramatically, Ingrahm was socially isolated from most of the group. Kimball remained her only friend. Ingrahm's difficulties can probably be associated with the fact that she had limited experience as a secretary, and she had yet to learn many of the procedures of the DMH. As Nottingham would expect of other members of the office, she was forced to solve her problems on her own.
Notes for Chapter Six

1 Some of these sources of task ambiguity are modifications of sources of role ambiguity suggested by Kahn. See Robert L. Kahn et al., Organizational Stress (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964), pp. 23-6.

2 Ibid., p. 24.

3 Kimball's lack of public support for Ingrahm can be explained by the Queen Bee Syndrome. See Carol A. Whitehurst, Women in America (Santa Monica: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1977), pp. 111-13.


8 Whitehurst, pp. 113-14.

9 Ibid., p. 114.

CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION

This study presented a description of the emergence of a mental health office. Organizational emergence was depicted as an ongoing process in which an organization develops over time. Influencing this development, though not necessarily determining it, are activities and conditions which are established during the process of emergence itself. Additionally, the socio-historical context in which an organization develops sets conditions for emergence.

In order to empirically discover the factors which effect organizational emergence, a case study was conducted of the creation of a mental health office. This approach to the investigation of social phenomena has certain limitations which must be recognized. A case study does not allow the researcher to ascertain the typicality of the social processes under investigation; therefore, the findings of this study are not to be considered representative of organizational emergence. Furthermore, most of the data for this study were derived from observations by the investigator and unstructured interviews. This creates the possibility that significant events were overlooked. The remedies for these shortcomings must be left to other investigations which incorporate the observations of several researchers or study the emergence of several organizations so that the typicality of the findings can be determined.
In the course of this investigation several areas were discovered to be significant in organizational emergence. These areas have been discussed in Chapter Two and throughout the succeeding chapters. Additionally, four stages of organizational emergence were delineated: (1) preparatory, (2) primary emergence, (3) initial staff adjustment, and (4) formal socialization. However, in order to illustrate that in organizational emergence the process itself sets many conditions for further emergence, two tasks remain to be accomplished. First, we must indicate the changes in each of the areas for the respective stages. Secondly, the consequences of activities in each stage for the succeeding stages must be specified. Variation in the areas of the analytical framework produce change in the organization over time. However, a degree of stability in these areas and development based on conditions established in preceding stages allows for the maintenance of the identity of the organization. Finally, this chapter will conclude with a consideration of approaches to studying the formation of new organizations and suggestions for future research.
Changes in Dimensions of the Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework employed throughout this study was not applied to development occurring during the preparatory stage. Since this stage was concerned with events which produced the establishment of the Office of Social Assistance Systems (SAS), the conceptual framework was not appropriate. Therefore, in our consideration of alterations in the organization's members, work-tasks, interpersonal relationships culture, and legitimacy, the preparatory stage will be omitted. We will be concerned with changes in each of these dimensions for the remaining three stages.

I. The Members

Changes in the membership of SAS were marked by steady growth. A skeleton crew occupied the office during the stage of primary emergence. The staff consisted of three full-time members, two part-time, and one temporary clerical worker. Nick Nottingham and Alice Wright were assigned to the office as they had written their names into the SAS proposal. Wright, however, never occupied a desk at the office, and her involvement was limited as she was assigned to another position within the Division of Mental Health (DMH) during this stage.

During the initial staff adjustment stage of the remaining members were hired. The staff consisted of eight full-time members and two part-time. Seven were considered to be "professionals" and three were in a clerical capacity. With the exception of Tom Ingles, all of the staff occupied their positions during this stage. Ingles began work during the formal socialization stage.
II. Work-tasks

During the stage of primary emergence, the staff's work-tasks included familiarizing themselves with the SAS project and the DMH, preparing job descriptions, and recruiting new members. Recruitment continued into the initial staff adjustment stage, and then the new recruits were given the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the SAS project and the DMH by reading documents which were provided for them. The new members were not very busy during this stage.

With formal socialization most of the staff became passive participants in their own job training. The exceptions to this were Nottingham and Kimball who made presentations during the training and orientation sessions. The staff also began to experience task ambiguity as they learned that their work roles were going to be different than they had anticipated. Task ambiguity was alleviated somewhat as they prepared to make a site visit to a mental health district, and their ideas regarding their work-tasks were put into action.

III. Interpersonal Relationships

When the office was small the members appeared to relate to one another in a friendly, compatible fashion. However, as the size of the office grew in the initial staff adjustment stage, norms were established to govern behavior in some-areas. These norms were related to the desires of the individuals rather than the accomplishment of work-tasks. Several members were also involved in remedial work, the purpose of which was the maintenance of orderly relationships within the office.
In the formal socialization stage interpersonal relationships were characterized by sex and official position differentiation. Men socialized with men and women with women. Additionally the clerical staff was isolated from the "professional" staff. This occurred as two of the clerical workers did not attend most of the training and orientation sessions. They were sent back to the office to transcribe the presentations of these meetings; therefore, they were spatially isolated. Ingrahm, on the other hand, was socially isolated for she was acting neither in the capacity of a secretary nor a "professional."

IV. Interorganizational Relationships

In the stage of primary emergence several interorganizational relationships were established. SAS interacted with outsiders as preparations were made for the training and orientation sessions, Nottingham and Wright participated in the "learning community." Nottingham represented the DMH at a State Services Identification System (SSIS) meeting, and the Policy and Resources Work Group (P&RWG) was formed. These relationships would continue in the succeeding stage, but different SAS members would attend these meetings. Since Wright was no longer with the office, Geist accompanied Nottingham to meetings of the "learning community" and SSIS. Geist and Nottingham also attended conferences on social assistance for the deinstitutionalized. All of the "professional" members attended a P&RWG meeting that occurred during the initial staff adjustment stage.

In the final stage the training of the SAS staff was done primarily by outsiders. These individuals, primarily mental health officials,
exposed the staff to issues and policies related to mental health delivery and impressed upon them the importance of their mission. Through these meetings the staff also became aware of some of the problems which existed within the DMH.

V. Organizational Culture

The culture of SAS in the stage of primary emergence has been described as systems oriented, anti-bureaucratic, anti-academic (or pragmatic) and marked by friendly deference. Other features of the office, such as job classification, and pay scale were part of the larger organization of the DMH. These formal aspects would remain a part of the organization's culture. However, other aspects of the organization's culture were subject to change.

The anti-bureaucratic ethos was strengthened in the following stage as the oncoming members also expressed anti-bureaucratic sentiments. Yet, this belief was modified as the importance of utilizing formal rules and channels was articulated. Additionally, the friendly deference of the preceding stage was transformed into a more egalitarian outlook. However, a distinction between the "professional" and clerical worker was also noted.

It was in the final stage that the importance of a systems perspective was re-emphasized. This aspect of the culture of SAS was dormant in the preceding stage. However, during formal socialization the staff was repeatedly reminded to employ a systems perspective by the presenters. Nonetheless, the notion of a systems orientation was undermined somewhat by the agreement of the staff that love could solve
problems better than systems planning. People were believed to be most effective when they stepped out of their professional roles.

VI. Organizational Legitimacy

Throughout the emergence of SAS the right of the organization to function in the manner which was being established was questioned by both those outside of SAS and the members themselves. Of particular significance are evaluations of SAS by NIMH and the DMH for it was through them that SAS received its financial support. During primary emergence SAS was granted conditional legitimacy with NIMH on the basis of the contract with that organization. The maintenance of this legitimacy would be dependent upon the completion of the tasks assigned to SAS by the contract. While SAS was also a formally legitimate office within the DMH, several of its functions had previously been assigned to other offices. The creation of the office produced a change in the division of labor within the DMH and, thus, necessitated an alteration in the interrelationships among various offices. Only with the establishment of new orderly relationships between SAS and other offices could legitimacy be obtained, and this would require interaction over time.

Legitimacy was supported in the stage of initial staff adjustment by the isomorphism of SAS with the rest of the DMH. However, it was threatened by the perception of some members of the DMH that the office was inefficient. They pointed out that the staff was too large, that the proposal planning process was ineffective, that the office was tardy in hiring and training the staff, and that Nottingham did not provide proper leadership. In turn the efficiency of the DMH was challenged by
Nottingham. We have suggested that the widespread knowledge of existing problems within the DMH undermined the potential public challenges to the efficiency of SAS.

Through discussions with NIMH officials in the formal socialization stage, the Acting Commissioner became supportive of the SAS project. His announcement of his newfound enthusiasm for the project was well received by the SAS staff. However, the staff became acutely aware of the negative evaluations of their office by some members of the DMH and of the fact that they would still have to demonstrate their worth to the division; and, as they began to acknowledge problems existing within SAS and the DMH, they became more concerned with the legitimacy of their own office.
Consequences of Emergence

Next we shall examine the consequences of activities performed in each stage of emergence for the succeeding stages. Some activities were discovered to set the conditions for change in the organization, to promote change, and to set the limits for change. Of course, some activities had no discernible consequences, and they will not be discussed.

Many occurrences in the primary emergence stage had antecedents in the preparatory stage, and several of them were consequences of stipulations of the SAS proposal. The positions of Nottingham and Wright in the SAS office were determined in part by the inclusion of statements asserting this fact in the proposal. However, they were also influenced by the later determination of SAS as an office within the DMH; that is, the proposal specified that Nottingham would direct the project but it did not specify his title. Yet, the position which he held in the last three stages was established during the preparatory stage. In the primary emergence stage SAS members participated in the "learning community" and prepared for the Training and Orientation Sessions. Both of these activities were also specified in the proposal. Since the proposal specified that the social assistance project was to be an organizational unit within the DMH, the formal structure of the new organization was determined by the larger organization. The part-time participation in the office by Kimball and Riley was influenced by the contract with NIMH for their activities represented part of the mandatory contributions to the project on the part of the state. Job descriptions for future employees, which were written with the requirements of the state DMH in mind, were also modifications of position
descriptions provided in the proposal.

Another activity which transpired during the stage of primary emergence which appeared to be influenced by factors associated with the preparatory stage, though not determining them, was the creation of the Policy and Resources Work Group. Several members of the DMH suggested that the P&RWG was designed to safeguard SAS from the conflicts which existed within the DMH. Since the preparation of the SAS proposal was another source of conflict, the project was apt to be a source of irritation to some DMH members.

In addition to these activities, the non-directive style of leadership which Nottingham exhibited during the preparatory stage would continue throughout the stages of initial staff adjustment and formal socialization. Participation in the "learning community" also continued into the stage of initial staff adjustment.

The stage of formal socialization was influenced significantly by events which transpired in the preparatory stage. First, the Training and Orientation Sessions, which were previously described in the proposal, occurred during this stage. Secondly, the SAS staff's concern for the legitimacy of their organization was in part a response to their new awareness of disputes which occurred and were never adequately resolved during the preparatory stage.

Similarly many of the events and characteristics of SAS during the stage of initial staff adjustment were effected by the primary emergence stage. Some elements of the culture of SAS (the division between "professionals" and clerical personnel, anti-bureaucratic beliefs) continued
into the third stage, as did most of the members from the previous stage. New members were hired to fill the positions created in the preceding stage. SAS staff members continued to prepare for the Training and Orientation Sessions and to participate in meetings of the SSIS and the P&RNG. Other aspects of the primary emergence stage were modified slightly during initial staff adjustment. Previously the office was staffed by non-smokers; later they established a ban on smoking in the office. The pattern of friendly deference became more egalitarian.

During the initial staff adjustment stage the staff attempted to secure furniture for the office. When difficulties arose, some members suspected that they were being hindered by Ken Little. They had to work through his office to secure furniture. While it could not be ascertained that Little was actually creating this difficulty, he and Nottingham had disagreed strongly over the importance of participatory planning in the preceding stage. Therefore, some members were predisposed to blame Little for the absence of furniture.

Many aspects of SAS during the formal socialization stage can be viewed as products of the previous two stages. The membership, the Training and Orientation Sessions, the division between the "professionals" and clerical staff, and the norms regarding proper dress are continuations from or consequences of the preceding stages. Additionally, we might note that Geist was re-appointed to be the second in command and that there was a growing concern for Ingrahm's possible promotion, a promotion for which she had applied in the initial staff adjustment stage. Since no decision had been made regarding the promotion, Ingrahm was not fully
acting in any role; this marginality produced a degree of social isolation for her. And finally we should note that the discrepancies between the staff's job descriptions which they learned in the initial staff adjustment stage and the information which they received during the formal socialization stage contributed to task-ambiguity.
Approaches to the Study
of the Formation of Organizations
and Suggestions for Further Research

As noted in Chapter One, issues related to the creation of organizations have been largely neglected. Nevertheless, some writers have focused on this area in recent years. Van de Ven has classified this research and theorizing into three approaches: (1) entrepreneurial, (2) ecological, and (3) behavioral. Let us begin by summarizing his critique of these approaches.

The entrepreneurial approach concentrates primarily on the characteristics of individuals who found organizations. Personality characteristics of these individuals are noted and they are contrasted with those of other managers. For example, the entrepreneur may be described as one with an ability to make proper decisions in the face of uncertainty, problems in relating to authority, and having a strong need to achieve. A major fault with this research is its inconclusiveness, that is, there is little evidence to support the notion that entrepreneurs are different from other leaders. Thus, Van de Ven concludes that the development of theory utilizing this approach is precarious for it would be based on the assumption of a "quasi-mythical figure." 3

The ecological or population ecology approach examines the population of organizations as a unit and the environmental factors (political, social structural, and economic) which promote the creation and dissolution of various forms of organizations. From this perspective environmental factors are viewed as the determining force of organizational creation.
This new approach appears to be very fruitful; however, it neglects the fact that people create organizations and that individuals and collective decisions are also instrumental in forming new organizations.\(^4\)

Finally, there is the behavioral approach proposed by Van de Ven himself. "The behavioral approach attempts to describe and explain the consequences of the series of events, strategic decisions, and human activities that occur when organizations are created."\(^5\) This approach incorporates some aspects of the previous perspectives. It acknowledges the importance of entrepreneurs but focuses on their behaviors rather than personality characteristics. The influence of various interest groups are also considered. Furthermore, Van de Ven suggests that the behavioral perspective should analyze the environmental factors which influence the activities and decisions involved in creating organizations. These factors may be identified through the use of the ecological perspective.\(^6\) The value of this approach has yet to be determined for Van de Ven's research is still in progress.

The behavioral approach illustrates that, with some modification, the three approaches are highly complementary. This increases the likelihood of a future synthesis and a more comprehensive understanding of organizational creation. The approach utilized in this study is also viewed as compatible with the other three and, thus, can contribute to our knowledge of this social phenomena.

Most significantly, what an interactionist approach adds to research in this area is an emphasis on the meaning of the organization to those individuals who are involved in the process of creating it. Additionally,
an interactionist approach allows one to incorporate many of the strengths of the other orientations. By focusing on the historical context of organizational emergence, one can examine the environmental factors which influence the formation of organizations as is suggested by the ecological approach. The emphasis upon the interaction of individuals, both within the organization and through interorganizational relationships, incorporates elements of both the entrepreneurial and the behavioral approaches. However, while an interactionist approach may focus on styles of interaction, it does not analyze the personality traits of those involved. We have also shown that an interactionist approach can incorporate a consideration of the informal relationships and the organizational culture which emerge as individuals carry out their work-tasks and engage in other interpersonal exchanges. Finally, by noting the evaluation of an organization by its members and others who have contact with it, the legitimacy of an organization can be examined by utilizing an interactionist perspective.

As the study of organizational emergence is still in its infancy, it would be premature to recommend that future research in this area be limited to a single methodological or theoretical orientation or that the researcher only focus on select issues related to this topic. Rather, we would like to promote a proliferation of orientations in this area. Nonetheless, several factors, some of which were considered in this study, should be investigated if we are to develop a more comprehensive study of this phenomenon.
We have argued for the importance of noting the sociohistorical context in which organizations are formed. Not only does knowledge of this context aid in the discovery of factors which influence organizational creation, but descriptions of the context will assist in the determination of their unique and common contributions to the formation of organizations.\(^8\) It is essential to realize that organizations exist in both time and place and that this should be noted. Furthermore, as emergence is a process which takes place over time, the duration of the process should be noted, as well.\(^9\)

Several variables which are frequently examined by researchers who study the relationships between structural features of organizations should be considered. Organizational size, differentiation, authority structure, and technology\(^{10}\) are just a few of the structural aspects which are apt to influence and be influenced by emergence. We may wish to note whether or not an emerging organization is sponsored by a parent organization, the nature of this relationship (as we have noted that SAS emerged in an organizational situation characterized by conflict), or the frequency with which a parent organization establishes other organizations. Needless to say, the emergence of a McDonald's outlet is probably drastically different from that of SAS.

Of course, we also suggest a continued investigation of the factors which were discussed to be of significance in this study and discussed in the analytical framework. An investigation of this nature in another organization would be fruitful in itself. However, a comparison of research findings from more than one organizational setting would promote the formation of grounded research hypotheses.\(^{11}\)
Hopefully, as we learn more of the process of organizational emergence we will also find better means of overcoming potential research obstacles. At the risk of being redundant, again it is emphasized that organizational emergence takes time, and thus the process itself cannot be adequately examined by using cross-sectional research techniques. Case studies (hopefully comparative studies of more than one organization) and longitudinal studies are required. With these approaches come the problems associated with access to organizations, commitment to longitudinal studies by host organizations, and the time commitment imposed upon the researcher.

Finally, it should be stated that the suggestions just discussed are not intended to be an exhaustive list of avenues for further investigation. Rather, these were some of the more obvious considerations which came to mind during the course of this research. Nonetheless, it is hoped that they will be useful.
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CHAPTER VIII: EPILOGUE

My observations at the Office of Social Assistance Systems (SAS) continued for approximately one month after the Formal Socialization Stage. I spent much of this time conducting interviews, and I gradually decreased my direct observation of the SAS staff. Then the decision was made to terminate my work in the field. This decision was influenced by my perception that the quality and quantity of new information being gathered did not warrant continued observation and that SAS had emerged as an organization by that time.

On the one hand, emergence can be viewed as an ongoing developmental process that is never entirely completed — although social forms and process may be characterized by only the slightest changes (or the rates of change may be variable over time). However, as Greer has noted: "An empirical criterion for determining the existence of a social organization is that if the group's characteristics are known, one can predict the behavior of individuals without reference to personality or character. Furthermore, behavior can be predicted more efficiently by referring to the group's characteristics than by using the individual's characteristics and ignoring the group." Since the behaviors of the SAS members became quite routinized and their activities appeared to be dominated by their roles rather than their personalities, that is, their activities became somewhat institutionalized, it was determined that SAS
did exist as an organization and that the period of formation had ended.

However, several months after I completed my fieldwork, SAS underwent some drastic changes. Nottingham, the office chief, was removed from his position, someone else was engaged to supervise the project, the office was disbanded, and eventually federal funding was discontinued. (The reader should note that, since these events transpired after I left the field, some of the details presented here may be inaccurate.) These events provide an impetus for additional consideration -- both theoretical, regarding the factors which precipitate the demise of an organization, and ethical, for Nottingham requested information from my field notes that he might use to better defend his activities as chief of SAS. Let us first speculate on the factors which were noted in the emergence of SAS which may have influenced the termination of the organization.

It has previously been noted that there was considerable conflict within the Division of Mental Health (DMH) prior to the discovery of the Request for Proposals and throughout the development of SAS. There was the ideological conflict surrounding the appropriateness of hospital-based versus community-based mental health services, disputes surrounding participatory planning processes, the placement of the SAS project within the division, methods of recruiting the SAS staff, and there was a fear of "empire building" on the part of Deputy Commissioner. After the creation of SAS there were still domain disputes within the DMH because the mission of SAS overlapped with that of already existing offices. Thus, it is suggested that one of the plausible reasons for the demise of SAS was the fact that it was established in a conflict filled environment.
Furthermore, SAS would require the cooperation of the participants in this conflict if it were to succeed. Analogously speaking, SAS can be viewed as an unwanted child whose early life was made difficult by the fact that there were many disagreements surrounding its birth.

Furthermore, we have already alluded to several aspects of SAS itself which may have hampered its acceptance in the DMH. The office had not demonstrated that it would be an effective mechanism for establishing social support for the deinstitutionalized to other members of the DMH. Much time was spent on hiring and training the new staff members because several of them had little experience in this area. Additionally, Nottingham's non-directive style of leadership did little to facilitate the learning of work-tasks. Eventually, some of the staff of SAS began to doubt Nottingham's leadership and administrative abilities.

In summary, it is suggested that the demise of SAS was influenced by several factors: (1) ideological conflict within the DMH, (2) formal structural organization of the DMH which promoted conflict, (3) domain disputes within the DMH, (4) lack of experience of the SAS staff, (5) Nottingham's non-directive leadership style, and (6) a lack of faith in the efficacy of SAS by some of its members and others within the DMH.

The ethical dilemma which arose following the completion of my fieldwork surrounded the protection of human subjects. Guidelines and ethical considerations in this area tend to be concerned with the risks involved to the subjects of the research and the appropriate techniques to minimize the risks. According to Duster, Matza, and Wellman, "Any social, psychological, or financial harm which might from research is considered to be a risk. The (HEW) definition does not isolate the
'Introduction of a stimulus.' By definition nearly all social science research constitutes some kind of risks to some groups of people.²

Although the Human Subjects Review Committee of The Ohio State University determined that my research at SAS did not constitute a risk to those involved with the organization, certain stipulations were made regarding the research process: (1) informed consent had to be obtained from the subjects, (2) pseudonyms had to be used in the final report to conceal the identities of individuals and the organization, and (3) information gathered at one level of the organizational hierarchy was not allowed to be communicated to other levels. The third stipulation proved to be a matter of concern when Nottingham requested that I release information to him from my field notes. He felt that he had been unjustly removed from his position and he wanted the information to defend his activities so that he might be reinstated. I explained to him that I was not allowed to provide the information and he both understood and accepted my explanation immediately. He made no further attempts to secure the notes.

Yet, this incident raises the following question: are some subjects being protected more than others by not revealing one's data? Arenas where social research is conducted are frequently characterized by conflicts of interest, and it is not always clear which subjects require the most protection. It can not be said with certainty that access to my field notes would have assisted Nottingham in his defense, but it does remain a possibility. If the field notes would have assisted him, then the restrictions placed upon my research served to protect the interest
of the DMH and not Nottingham.

Ideally, methods used to protect human subjects should not show favoritism. Yet, a solution to this dilemma will not be presented here. However, it appears as though the current formulation of principles designed to protect human subjects has built-in favoritism. Therefore, this aspect of the ethics of social science research deserves further consideration.
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APPENDIX A

LIST OF CHARACTERS

Rita Able An office chief in the DMH who substituted for the Deputy Commissioner of Community Programs in his absence.

Roger Aikens The Deputy Commissioner of Hospital Administration.

Rhonda Boyd SAS Data Evaluation Researcher.

Rose Dash A temporary secretary at SAS.

Charles Davis An assistant to Roger Aikens. He was involved with the SAS proposal writing.

Vera Doyle A member of the Office of Planning of the DMH who was involved with the proposal writing.

Nora Eversole SAS clerical supervisor.

Rudy Geist SAS Interagency Liaison Coordinator.

Tom Ingles SAS Community Services Research Administrator.

Ann Ingrahm An SAS secretary who applied for a promotion to a professional position.
Howard Irving
Chief of the Office of Community Mental Health Centers who had early correspondence with NIMH regarding the RFP. He also attended SSIS meetings.

Nancy Kimball
Part-time SAS member. She was also a member of the Office of Planning of the DMH.

Ken Little
Chief of the Office of Support Services. He was involved with the proposal writing and disagreed with Nottingham in regard to participatory planning.

Norman Lloyd
DMH Deputy Commissioner of Community Programs.

Eve Ludwig
SAS technical typist.

Nick Nottingham
Chief of the Office of Social Assistance Systems.

George Raleigh
Chief of the Office of Planning of the DMH.

Ned Riley
Part-time SAS member. He was also connected with the Office of Education and Training of the DMH.

Bea Rooter
A presenter at the Training and Orientation Sessions who explained an administrative style to the SAS staff. She was strongly disliked by several of the staff.

Larry Veatch
Acting Commissioner of the DMH during the proposal writing period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lester Vorst</td>
<td>Acting Commissioner of the DMH after the SAS proposal had been submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira Williams</td>
<td>SAS Funding and Facilities Researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Wright</td>
<td>A special assistant to the Director of the DMHMR who corresponded with NIMH prior to the release of the RFP. She later was part of the proposal writing team and briefly was a member of SAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Young</td>
<td>A presenter at the Training and Orientation Sessions who was challenged by some SAS female staff members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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