

# Human Service Systems and Organizational Stress

---

---

*Thinking & Feeling Our Way Out of Existing Organizational Dilemmas*

**Author:**

Sandra L. Bloom, M.D.

**Adapted from:**

*Living Sanctuary: Complex Antidotes to Organizational Stress in a Changing World* (in preparation)

and

“Organizational Stress as a Barrier to Trauma-Sensitive Change and System Transformation” written with the support of the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors

CommunityWorks, 2006

PMB 138

12 W. Willow Grove Avenue

Philadelphia, PA 19118

[www.sanctuaryweb.com](http://www.sanctuaryweb.com)



---

## Table of Contents

---

<i>Introduction</i> .....	4
<i>Organizations as Living Systems</i> .....	5
Organizational Health & Dysfunction.....	6
Organizational Health? Not By Ignoring the Workforce .....	7
<i>What Constitutes Workplace Stress?</i> .....	9
<i>Parallel Processes</i> .....	12
<i>Chronic Stress and Collective Trauma</i> .....	14
<i>Lack of Basic Safety</i> .....	16
<i>Lack of Emotional Management</i> .....	17
<i>Organizational Learning &amp; Organizational Amnesia</i> .....	19
<i>Systematic Error</i> .....	22
<i>Increased Authoritarianism</i> .....	23
The Inherent Problem of Authoritarianism .....	24
Bullying in the Workplace.....	25
Petty Tyranny.....	26
Fitting Leadership Style to the Situation .....	27
<i>Impaired Cognition and Silencing Of Dissent</i> .....	27
Participation and Decision Making.....	28
Group Decision Making .....	29
Decision Making Under Stress.....	30
The Importance of Dissent.....	31
Silencing of Dissent.....	32
<i>Interpersonal Conflict and Impoverished Relationships</i> .....	33
The Nature of Conflict.....	33
Conflict , Emotional Intelligence and Collective Disturbance .....	34
Different Kinds of Conflict .....	35
Conflict Management Under Stress.....	37
Conflict and Organizational Learning .....	38
<i>Disempowerment and Learned Helplessness</i> .....	39
Learned Helplessness .....	39
Risky Risk Avoidance.....	40
<i>Increased Aggression</i> .....	42
Moral Development and the Ethical Organization .....	44
Workplace Aggression .....	45
I Heard It Through the Grapevine – Rumors and Gossip at Work.....	46
<i>Organizational Trauma, Grief and Change</i> .....	48
Disenfranchised Grief.....	49
Systemic Reenactment .....	50
Organizational Decline .....	51
Successful or Permanent Failure.....	52
<i>Loss of Meaning &amp; Demoralization</i> .....	52
Factors That Lead to Burnout .....	53
Conflicting Values for Mental Health & Social Service Professionals .....	53
<i>The Result</i> .....	54
<i>Creating Sanctuary: A Parallel Process of Recovery</i> .....	55
Recovery from Chronic Stress and Collective Trauma.....	55
Commitment to Basic Safety.....	55
Development of Emotional Management Skills.....	55
Reintegration of Function.....	56
Opening Up Communication .....	56
Redefining Authority Relationships.....	56
Improved Problem-Solving and the Welcoming of Dissent.....	57
Cultivation of Relationships .....	57
Empowerment and Mastery.....	57

Nonviolence and Social Responsibility.....57  
Griefwork.....57  
Hope and Restored Meaning.....58  
*The Sanctuary Model*.....58  
*References*.....60

---

## Introduction

---

*It must be remembered that there is nothing more difficult to plan, more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to manage than the creation of a new system.... The hesitation arises.... From the general skepticism of mankind which does not really believe in an Innovation until experience proves its value.*

Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*, (p.15)[332]

For the last twenty years, the human social service system has undergone significant change and a great deal of loss. These changes have resulted in a significantly heightened level of individual and organizational stress for the programs that continue to struggle to respond to the needs of adults and children who suffer from serious emotional difficulties.

As a result the problems within all of these systems have been accumulating and compounding insidiously. Clients present at the doors of mental health and social service programs seeking remedy for their problems but they often leave with few solutions and sometimes with even more difficulties than they brought with them. Staff in many treatment programs suffer physical and psychological injuries at alarming rates, become demoralized and hostile, and their counteraggressive responses to the aggression in their clients create punitive environments. Leaders become variously perplexed, overwhelmed, ineffective, authoritarian, or avoidant as they struggle to satisfy the demands of their superiors, to control their subordinates, and to protect their clients. When professional staff and nonprofessionally trained staff gather together in an attempt to formulate an approach to complex problems they are not on the same page, they share no common theoretical framework that informs problem-solving. Without a shared way of understanding the problem, what passes as treatment is little more than labeling, the prescription of medication, and behavioral "management". When troubled clients fail to respond to these measures, they are labeled again, given more diagnoses and termed "resistant to treatment".

Meantime, the system grinds on, people go to work, workers do the best they can. They frequently change jobs searching for a better place to work while longtime -workers become profoundly demoralized, and clients do not get the benefit they could and should be receiving. Managed care companies, recognize – and in some cases take full financial advantage of - the disarray, but instead of truly fixing the problem, add to the burden of paperwork and bureaucratic wrangling and thereby increase the amount of routine stress.

At the same time, knowledge about the traumatic etiology of many of these serious problems has been exploding and significant efforts are underway urging both public and private systems to become "trauma-informed". This paper explores the notion that organizations are living systems themselves and as such they manifest various degrees of health and dysfunction, analogous to those of individuals. Organizations like individuals are vulnerable to the impact of repetitive and/or chronic stress conditions, but since we do not recognize our systems as alive, we treat them as if they were machines, slaves to the whims of current political, social and economic forces.

Becoming a truly trauma-informed system therefore requires a process of reconstitution within our organizations top to bottom. It is the job of the staff to become trauma-informed about the impact of past experiences on the evolution of the clients problems. But it is the shared responsibility of staff and administrators to become "trauma sensitive" to the ways in which past and present overwhelming experiences impact individual performance, leadership styles, and group performance.

A system cannot be truly trauma-informed unless the system can create and sustain a process of understanding itself. A program cannot be safe for clients unless it is simultaneously safe for staff and safe for administrators. Lacking such a process and despite well-intentioned training efforts, there will be no true system transformation in systems that are now for the most part, "trauma organized" repeating, rather than healing, the injuries previously experienced by clients and staff.

This paper explores the notion that mental health and social service organizations, like individuals, are living systems and that being alive, they are vulnerable to stress, particularly chronic and repetitive stress. Organizations, like individuals, can be traumatized and the result of traumatic experience can be as devastating for organizations as it is for individuals. And the outcome of a traumatic experience will be in part determined by the pre-traumatic level of organizational health and integrity. At this point, our human service network is functioning as a “trauma-organized system”[1] still largely unaware of the multiple ways in which its multiple adaptations to chronic stress has created a state of dysfunction that in some cases virtually prohibits the recovery of the individual clients who are the source of its underlying and original mission, and damages many of the people who work within it.

Just as the encroachment of trauma into the life of an individual client is an insidious process that turns the past into a nightmare, the present into a repetitive cycle of reenactment, and the future into a terminal illness, so too is the impact of chronic strain on an organization insidious. As seemingly logical reactions to difficult situations pile upon each other, no one is able to truly perceive the fundamentally skewed and post-traumatic basic assumptions upon which that logic is built. As an earthquake can cause the foundations of a building to become unstable, even while the building still stands, apparently intact, so too does chronic repetitive stress or sudden traumatic stress destabilize the cognitive and affective foundations of shared meaning that is necessary for a group to function and stay whole.

Applying concepts from trauma theory to organizational function can serve multiple purposes. While it provides the leaders and staff of the organization a framework for understanding the frequently dysfunctional adaptations they have made to chronic stress, it simultaneously serves to heighten their awareness of the ways in which exposure to chronic stress has impacted their clients and provides a window into the interaction between organizational dysfunction and individual dysfunction. Better identification of the true nature of the problems leads to better approaches to solve those problems.

---

## *Organizations as Living Systems*

---

The central position of this paper is that a human service agency – and every organization - is a living organism. Some of the most useful explorations of organizations as collective and living organisms derive from the study of *organizational culture*. Organizational culture can be defined as a “pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group has learned as it solved its problems...and that has worked well enough to be considered valid and taught to new members” or “How we do things around here”. Organizational culture matters because cultural elements determine strategy, goals, and modes of operating.[2]. A system is a set of interconnected elements that are *interdependent* so that changes in some elements or their relations produce changes in other parts of the system. A system is comprised of a set of components that work together for the overall objective of the whole [3, 4].

Unlike a machine - like your car, or your vacuum cleaner - a helping organization is a living system – open, complex, and adaptive. It is comprised of the administrators, staff, the clients, and their families. Each organization embedded within a larger social service system that is a component of city, county, state, and national government. The past history of each organization, like the histories of individual clients, continues to determine present behavior and in every moment, present behavior is playing a role in determining the future. A variety of these components – individual, group, organization, local government, national government, global influences, past, present and future – all are interacting with and impacting on each other in complicated ways, all of the time – that’s what makes things so *complex*. It is this complexity that compels the usual oversimplification that occurs whenever an individual or a group of individuals encounters the apparently overwhelming complexity of changing systems.

Living systems are *open systems* because they accept input from their environment, they use this input to create output, and they then act on the environment. Living systems are adaptive because they can *learn* and based on that learning, they can adapt to changes in their environment in order to survive. As a living system, the mental health system and every component of that system has an identity, a memory, and has created its own processes that resist changes imposed from above, but will evolve and change naturally if the circumstances are conducive to change.

Living systems are not entirely controllable by top down regulation. Like the human body, a living system functions through constant feedback loops, flows of information back and forth. In the body, there certainly are hierarchies but these hierarchies are “democratic hierarchies” – power distribution is circular [5]. Regulation comes through feedback mechanisms and changes constantly over time, adjusting and readjusting to internal circumstances that have been altered and reacting and adjusting to external changes in the environment. Information from below in the hierarchy has as much influence as control mechanisms higher in the hierarchy. (If you find this difficult to believe, just try focusing your own intellectual attention on something when even your little toe is throbbing with pain.) A living system evolves, regenerates, and self-organizes to adapt to changing circumstances. Living systems learn and use that new information to alter present and future behavior. A living system is constantly balancing and rebalancing to maintain homeostasis. You cannot feed a living system and then leave it alone - it must be fed and maintained all the time. And in a living system there is no such thing as a fixed or permanent state of health – health is a relative term.

Unlike machines, living systems are *nonlinear*. They frequently do not do as they are told, they are not predictable, and the more we try to exert control over them to get them to do what we want them to do, the more contrary and unpredictable – and stubborn - they appear to be. Being able to learn is one of the definitions of a healthy, self-organization system. Therefore to help living systems heal, learn and grow it is necessary to create *processes* that encourage learning and development including learning from mistakes. But traumatized organizations, similar to traumatized individuals, adapt to their injuries in ways that can result in significant barriers to learning.

## **Organizational Health & Dysfunction**

It is well established that there is a strong relationship between the culture and people practices of organizations and the productivity and health of their people, a relationship so strong that investing in people is seen as a wise strategy for achieving and maintaining high levels of bottom-line success in the business world [6].

The importance of creating an organizational culture that relies on mutual trust is recognized as critically important. *“The implementation of high performance or high commitment work systems requires ... a serious commitment to doing things differently ... It is almost impossible to successfully implement high performance or high commitment work practices in the absence of mutual trust and respect. But trust is missing in many employment relationships – and ... the atmosphere in the work place is crucial. All work place practices and changes should be evaluated by a simple criterion: Do they convey and create trust, or do they signify distrust, and destroy trust and respect among people?”* [7].

The result of an erosion of basic trust in the organizational lives of employees can be similar to the loss of basic trust within families – a profound erosion of the basic social contract. As in the case with diagnoses of individual problems, more attention has been paid to defining what comprises an unhealthy organization than describing a healthy one. Some of the earliest explanations were psychodynamic in origins, from describing the organization as an environmental mother so that when an organization breaks down, the effects are not dissimilar to maternal breakdown: *“its containing function is destroyed. The safety provided by the external frame is replaced by a sense of danger, and primitive anxieties and defense mechanisms abound (p. 254)”* [8]. Erich Fromm described “socially patterned defects” wherein “the individual shares a defect with so many others that he is not aware of it as a defect, and his security is not threatened by the experience of being different, of being an outcast, as it were” (p. 15) [9].

Whether we refer to the “declining organization” [10] or the “neurotic organization” [11], the “snakepit organization” [12], the “addictive organization” [13], or “high fear organizations” [14], unhealthy organizations have a great deal in common. There is a general air of degradation and a sense that everything is always falling apart and one must be very careful to make sure that it does not fall on you. There is a general lack of energy, low motivation and low morale among the people in the organization. Organizational goals and standards are not generally agreed upon by the employees, and frequently the stated goals are not consistent with what actually occurs, although this discrepancy is never directly confronted.

Standards tend to be low and norms are disrupted, unclearly stated, and unmonitored. There is a great deal of individual unhappiness, dissatisfaction and complaining, but the complaining is

usually indirect and frequently takes the form of gossip or rumors that in a circular way tend to lead to more dissatisfaction. The environment is rife with conflicts but these are not dealt with directly and communication tends to be indirect, confused and ineffective. Memos or email frequently substitute from meaningful interpersonal communication. There is a long list of things that cannot be discussed because of the fear of negative repercussions, even if no one has ever actually witnessed such repercussions. The boss is never to be questioned at any level of the hierarchy and the hierarchy is fairly rigid. Decision-making is not shared and there is little feedback from below to above once decisions are made.

The atmosphere of routine boredom and unhappiness is interspersed with periods of crisis that creates intense feelings and allows people to momentarily work together for the common good, but this commonality is rapidly eroded with the return to business-as-usual, until the next crisis occurs. There is a repetitive, reoccurring pattern of behavior and the general attitude of the staff is that "nothing really changes here". Learning from the past does not appear to happen and there may be a loss of corporate memory for events that could be instructive, were they to be recalled. Change efforts are met with a passive resistance that tends to chase off competent leaders, leaving less confident and competent leadership in its wake. There is a lack of transparency and an air of secrecy, even about events that could easily be aired publicly and openly. Ultimately, this is an environment that leads to dishonesty and ethical deterioration.

Such an unhealthy environment lends itself to the emergence of what have been described as "toxic leaders". Toxic leaders are subtly or overtly abusive, violating the basic standards of human respect, courtesy, and rights of the people who report to them. They tend to be power-hungry and appear to feed off of the use and abuse of the power they have. They play to people's basest fears, stifle criticism and teach followers never to question their judgment or actions. They lie to meet their own ends and tend to subvert processes of the system that are intended to generate a more honest and open environment. They compete with rather than nurture other leaders, including potential successors and tend to use divide-and-conquer strategies to set people against each other. Toxic leaders will not hesitate to identify scapegoats and then direct followers' aggression against the designated scapegoat rather than themselves. They frequently promote incompetence, corruption, and cronyism and exploit systems for personal gain [15].

### **Organizational Health? Not By Ignoring the Workforce**

In the organizational development literature, the criteria used to define a healthy organization relate to the management of the people actually doing the work of the organization – team management, professional development, learning opportunities, shared decision making, a substantial rewards system, recognition for innovation and creativity, a high tolerance for different styles of thinking and ambiguity; respect for tensions between work and family demands; job sharing, parental leave, childcare, a specific corporate social agenda; job safety awareness; and change management – all are criteria that are, for the most part, not discussed in any of the recent national reports which are notably silent about the people who actually do the work in the mental health and social service systems but speak overtly about systems that are in crisis. Using the mental health system as an example, the system has taken a real beating in the last two decades, a beating so severe that it can be considered a "system under siege". State and federal cutbacks and twenty-five years of reductions in the social service system are taking a toll on every aspect of the social network including mental health. Mental health had still not achieved parity with the physical health system by the time the incursion of managed care companies into the diagnosis and prescription of treatment began to severely limit care. This has had a demoralizing effect on many individual and organizational clinicians and has increased the amount of paperwork exponentially. Regulatory agencies have been tightening their hold over what organizations can and cannot do without necessarily fully considering the already existing constraints on the organizations. Consumers have become increasingly vocal about compromised care.

Funding changes have caused reductions in staffing patterns reduced staff training, reduced lengths of stay, and higher acuity of patients who come into care. Since every treatment program is interdependent with every other aspect of the social service system, anything that jeopardizes the function of one part, can negatively affect the other parts. Competition for labor has meant a decrease in the educational level of many of the staff hired in institutional settings. Lawsuits have not

significantly diminished, nor has there been significant tort reform to save institutions from the ever-present fear of legal involvement. All of these stressors comprise the background “noise” of chronic stress that makes the reactions to acutely stressful situations magnified and unmanageable. In their Interim Report for the President’s New Freedom Commission on Mental Health, the conclusions were that:

*“Our review for this interim report leads us to the united belief that America’s mental health service delivery system is in shambles. We have found that the system needs dramatic reform because it is incapable of efficiently delivering and financing effective treatments—such as medications, psychotherapies, and other services—that have taken decades to develop. Responsibility for these services is scattered among agencies, programs, and levels of government. There are so many programs operating under such different rules that it is often impossible for families and consumers to find the care that they urgently need. The efforts of countless skilled and caring professionals are frustrated by the system’s fragmentation. As a result, too many Americans suffer needless disability, and millions of dollars are spent unproductively in a dysfunctional service system that cannot deliver the treatments that work so well” [16].*

This lack of attention to the people who actually deliver the service that is the centrally stated mission of the each component of the human service system is not surprising if we consider the working model of organizations as machines. In such a model, the workers are simply pieces of the machinery and being such, their feelings, beliefs, and thoughts do not need to be considered, any more than you would consider the feelings, beliefs or thoughts of your refrigerator. All that matters is the behavior and if the behavior fails to meet the needs of the system, you replace the people and get new ones, just as you replace your old refrigerator.

The latest enthusiasm is for “evidence-based practices” as the only form of service delivery that should be permitted. Although a rigorous concern about outcomes should be the basis of any form of treatment, the burden of expecting practitioners to only use double-blind, scientifically demonstrated treatment methods is short-sighted and absurd for many reasons, not the least of which is that we already know that therapy works – and no therapy seems to work better than any other. The simpler the problem, the simpler the approach may be. But likewise the more complex the problem, the greater the demand for complex approaches to healing and recovery. Complex approaches have been well-described already and well studied. According to those who have thoroughly reviewed the existing literature, successful outcomes hinge on four fundamental factors: 1) factors related to what the client brings to the situation (accounting for about 40% of outcome); 2) the therapeutic relationship (accounting for about 30% of outcome); 3) expectancy and placebo factors – also known as “hope” (accounting for about 15% of outcome), and 4) an explanatory system that guides healing rituals (accounting for the last 15% of outcome) [17]. This means that 60% of what accounts for whether or not a person responds to treatment hinges on the people delivering the treatment. If they develop a positive, warm, supportive and empathic relationship, support the development of hope that progress can be made, have a clear rationale for what they are doing that outlines a therapeutic map of recovery, and empower the client to help themselves, there is likely to be improvement.

This explains why the human service system is in such dire straits and why so many workers within these systems have become profoundly demoralized. The very factors that appear to make the largest contribution to outcome are those most affected by the radical changes in mental health and social service institutions – relationship, hope, and therapeutic healing rituals. Little attention has been given to the impact of downsizing, increased workload, increases in job complexity, loss of role definition, frustrated career development, increased levels of risk, toxic organizational cultures, or severe ethical conflicts on the workforce within these systems.

To find a way of even thinking about how these components of workplace stress affect the central healing mission of our human service networks, we have to turn to the world of business and finance where these subjects have been studied. The business community has been reckoning with the impact of chronic and recurrent stress on employees and on the system as a whole because of the negative impact on the bottom line of companies.

---

## What Constitutes Workplace Stress?

---

According to several of the most significant contributors to the study of organizational stress, stress is not a factor that resides in the individual or the environment; rather, it is embedded in an ongoing process that involves individuals transacting with their environments, making appraisals of those encounters, and attempting to cope with the issues that arise. It is this transactional characteristic that makes the stress concept so useful and consistent with thinking about the impact of a variety of factors on complex adaptive systems. But it also means that stress on individuals is likely to produce strain on the organization-as-a-whole and stress that the organization experiences - such as funding changes, loss of programming, downsizing, and mergers - are likely to strain individual coping skills.

There are many indicators of individual stress including: an increase in unexplained absences or sick leave, poor performance, poor time-keeping, increased consumption of alcohol, tobacco or caffeine, frequent headaches or backaches, withdrawal from social contact, poor judgment/indecisiveness, technical errors, constant tiredness or low energy, unusual displays of emotion [18]. The ways in which individuals respond to workplace strain is multiply determined by individual, job-specific, and organizational sources [19].

As for the cost of workplace stress, a writer for the Harvard Business Review has estimated that 60-90% of medical problems are associated with stress and one large insurance company estimates that 45% of corporate after tax profits are spent on health benefits [20]. But that only reflects a portion of the actual cost. A true analysis must include absenteeism, job turnover, replacement cost for employees who leave the job, accidents, workplace injuries (and in the worse cases, death), the long-term use of tobacco, alcohol and drugs and the health consequences of those, to say nothing about the costs of quality control, administration, and customer service problems related to stress. According to a group called The American Institute of Stress, chronic stress adds over \$300 billion each year to cover associated health care costs and absentee rates. That represents a cost of over \$600 to every "stressed" worker without getting anything in return. Even worse the cost for health insurance of a single employee doubled over the last few years and is still rising [21].

Bill Wilkerson, CEO of Global Business and Economic Roundtable on Addiction and Mental Health, conducted a survey to find the top ten workplace stressors. The top ten workplace stressors included: "the treadmill syndrome" where employees have too much or too little to do; random interruptions - telephone calls, walk-in visits, demands from supervisors; pervasive uncertainty as a result of organizational problems, unsatisfactorily explained and announced change; funding changes; mistrust, unfairness, and vicious office politics; unclear policies and no sense of direction in the organization; career and job ambiguity resulting in feelings of helplessness and lack of control; no feedback - good or bad; no appreciation; lack of communications up and down the chain of command leading to decreased performance and increased stress; lack of control as the greatest stressor in the workplace because employees feel that they have no control over their participation or the outcome of their work [20]. Although there seems to be no similar survey on mental health organizations themselves, the similarities in employee complaints cannot be ignored. It is important to note that these sources of stress appear to have very little to do with the work itself. Instead, the main sources of stress on workers are the ways in which organizations operate and the nature of the relationships that people experience within the work setting.

Repeated downsizing has become a staple of the human services world with negative consequences to morale, program development, innovation, training, supervision and virtually every aspect of mental health care. Since human beings are human beings and not replaceable parts of a machine, people suffer as a result of layoffs, and not just those who are laid off. Research on downsizing has shown an array of negative results and minimal positive results for organizations, confirming a decline in job satisfaction and organizational commitment among survivors as illustrated by one study that looked at downsizing in a large medical rehabilitation hospital [22]. Research, published in the February 2004 British Medical Journal, found that the risk for a worker having a heart attack and hospitalization doubled after downsizings, along with a number of other conditions and that the risk occurred at a higher incidence following rapid expansion as well [23].

Severe funding cutbacks in the mental health field as an example have resulted in cutbacks in most mental health service providers and therefore the loss of jobs and key personnel. In the case

of line workers, this often means the loss of someone upon whom you have depended for a sense of safety, not just for collegial relationships. In dealing with volatile, sometimes dangerous clients in situations that are highly emotionally charged, social support is likely to be the only attenuating factor that helps staff members manage difficult situations in a constructive way. When team members are laid-off or leave because of adverse work conditions, the vital network of social support is eroded. The impact of these losses on teamwork, communication, and emotional management is frequently devastating to the total environment. The impact on the most vulnerable members of the community is likely to be devastating, but the impact on every member of the mental health sector that does not lose his or her job and must pick up the slack and therefore ration services will also be devastating. And despite the fact that there are far fewer people necessary to do the work, no individual will be held any less legally liable should someone fall through the cracks and suffer harm as a result. The emotional, physical, and professional toll that lawsuits take on the individual are well established since individuals are frequently held to be legally responsible for problems that are far more complex than the individual and instead involve the entire system [24].

Research has demonstrated that there are many job-related sources of stress that are major contributors to stress-related problems. One is workload – both too heavy and too light a workload can be stressful. Research in acute mental health settings has demonstrated that a lack of adequate staffing is the main stressor reported by qualified staff and qualified nurses reported significantly higher workload stress than unqualified staff. In one important study, approximately half of all nursing staff showed signs of high burnout in terms of emotional exhaustion [25].

One's role in an organization is also another potential source of job-specific stress. Role overload is determined by how many different roles a person has to fulfill. This factor is known to be stressful because it creates uncertainty about an individual's ability to perform adequately and is well established as a major correlate of job-related strain (Cooper, 1987). Ambiguity and role conflict as well as the burden of responsibility are other sources of role strain. As one expert put it, "*for some workers, responsibility for other people's lives and safety is a major source of psychological strain*" (p. 41)[19].

In many human service settings, the roles of professionally trained clinicians tend to be fairly well defined and certainly, trained professionals are well-aware of the burden of moral and legal responsibility they carry. It is at the level of the line staff – case managers, childcare workers, shelter staff, mental health techs, etc. - that problems with role overload, role ambiguity and conflict, and the burden of role responsibility is most likely to surface and has not been well-studied, particularly in many residential settings. Line staff are with their clients for eight to ten hour shifts at a time. In each setting they may have to serve as parent-surrogate, educator, disciplinarian, housekeeper, caretaker, driver, mediator, therapist, nurturer, and security guard – often within the space of a single shift. This level of extreme role ambiguity can be a constant source of stress. Additionally, many line workers must work more than one job, or volunteer constantly for overtime in order to make ends meet at home, while working shift work is well-established as a significant workplace stressor [19].

There may be a poor fit between the personality of the individual and the role requirements but when jobs are scarce people may find themselves taking jobs in human service settings without being fit for the role, without a prior understanding of the responsibilities that are going to be expected of them, and with unclear notions of the roles they will be expected to fill. In areas where there is fierce competition for qualified workers but limited resources to compete, organizations may hold on to employees who are minimally capable of responding to the complex roles demanded of them. Over time, the role of the case manager, mental health technician or childcare worker may become more clearly defined but the role definition becomes too simple to reflect the needs of these very troubled children, adults and families. In this way, systems may devolve a system that has line workers doing little except enforcing rules and meting out punishments, inadvertently sifting out anyone capable of the more complex role demands that should be fulfilled in order to help clients recover.

Level of job complexity is known to be another source of stress and it is difficult to conceive of a subject more complex than trying to help someone recover from the long-term effects of multiple traumatic and abusive experiences in a limited period of time with radically reduced resources. Yet that is what virtually every mental health practitioner should be doing and this is notion is at the heart of the movement to make services "trauma-informed". This demand is particularly challenging for staff in children's programs, since the child is still developing and the outcome of treatment may – or may not – alter a child's destiny. As a result, the demand from federal and state authorities to become "trauma-informed" and thereby significantly increase their ability to respond to complex problems with

complex responses is perceived by many systems – and the individuals within those systems - as an absurd, dangerous and unrealistic demand, putting further strain on a workload that is already overwhelming.

Relationships at work, such as those with supervisors, colleagues, and subordinates are key ingredients to either attenuate stress or increase work stress. Negative interpersonal relationships and a lack of social support from others in the workplace have been established as significant stressors [19]. Stressors on the organizational level can produce changes in the bureaucratic structure that then negatively affect individuals when supervisors are stressed and take it out on workers, when colleagues leave, when there is inadequate time to resolve interpersonal conflicts, when subordinates blame supervisors for what are problems attributable to larger forces. All of these can contribute to an atmosphere that is not only stressful because of the failure of interpersonal relationships but because those relationships are the only source of buffering against the other difficulties inherent in mental health practice.

Interpersonal conflict is a serious source of job stress and has been demonstrated to interfere with job performance. Conflict can arise between a manager and a line worker when the manager communicates what the line worker perceives as mutually incompatible expectations such as “you must always treat the patients with kindness and respect” and “it is your responsibility to guarantee safety and order”. There may be conflicts between one’s own expectations and the values of the organization, “these children are sick and you need to understand their behavior”, and “these kids are just bad – they need more discipline”. Mental health settings are fundamentally rife with conflicts because that is the nature of the work – the clients end up in treatment because of intrapsychic and interpersonal conflicts they have not been able to resolve within the scope of their own resources. Managing conflict while creating and sustaining a healthy relational network is a critical component to helping people recover but this relational network is extremely vulnerable to the impact of workplace stress.

A significant aspect of job stress is level of risk and it is the high degree of risk and the fear attendant on that risk that has been a significant contributor to why so many individuals and institutions in the mental health system have been reluctant to change established practices of seclusion and restraint and forced medication, even though these practices are so frequently associated with negative - sometimes disastrous - outcomes in the patients. In crisis environments the “constant state of arousal may be a special health risk [19].

Organizational culture is an astonishingly powerful force that affects all of us who function within organizational settings, all of the time, but it is also the most overlooked force because it works indirectly and frequently at the level of nonverbal communication. As an example of the impact of organizational culture, researchers surveyed over 21,000 registered female nurses to prospectively examine the relationship between psychosocial work characteristics and changes in health related quality of life over a four year period. They looked at physical functioning, role limitations due to physical health problems, bodily pain, vitality, social functioning, role limitations due to emotional problems, and mental health. The study found that low job control, high job demands, and low work-related social support were associated with poor health status at baseline as well as greater functional declines over the four year follow up period. Examined in combination, women with low job control, high job demands, and low work-related social support had the greatest functional declines. The authors concluded that adverse psychosocial work conditions are important predictors of poor functional status and its decline over time [26].

Ethical conflicts are one of the most underestimated, but chronically unrelenting sources of stress in today’s human service environment. A lack of congruence regarding the ethical values of employees and their organization is typically referred to as an ethical conflict. An ethical conflict pertains to situations in which an employee’s personal ethics are not compatible with the organization’s practice ethics and hence the behavioral expectations and norms of the organization [27]. Years ago, clinicians were warning that “*the managed care approach to provision of human services will dominate professional work for the near future and possibly beyond. This approach raises serious concerns about the capacity of professionals to work within the structure of managed care without encountering serious ethical and clinical conflicts*” (p. 47)[28].

Many studies have examined the consequences of a lack of congruence between the personal characteristics of employees and the attributes of the organization at which they are employed [29]. This assumption has been supported by research demonstrating that a conflict between the characteristics of the employees and their organizations is related to job dissatisfaction,

low organizational commitment, substandard job performance, job stress, and turnover [30, 31] In the highly managed mental health environments and in many other components of the human service sector, one of the greatest sources of stress – although certainly not the only source – is the potential conflicts of interest that are intrinsic to many aspects of the system [32, 33]. Should the clinician promote the interests of the patients over all other interests, as is consistent with most professional codes of ethics? Should the clinician promote what is considered the “general social good” by rationing care? Should the clinician promote their own financial well-being which may be at the expense of the other interests [34]? If clinicians do not comply with the demands their organizations are forced to make by the dictates of managed care, they risk losing their jobs and their incomes. If they do comply, they may have to make decisions and engage in behavior that they inwardly believe compromises the level of care they offer to their clients. Should clinicians advocate for their clients with managed care companies even if there will potential acts of retribution [35]. Is it ethically wrong to give the client a wrong diagnosis if that is the only way to get them services because of the diagnoses that managed care companies will and will not cover [36]? As the authors of one study note, “widely accepted ethical principles may be rationalized in practice in regard to either what is in the best interest of the client, or perhaps, on the basis of the inherent ‘unfairness’ of the managed care system” (p. 209) [37].

As discussed by two social work academics, “when a clinician must lie or omit crucial information in order to ensure that appropriate services are provided, the secondary conflict is clearly one of a legal-ethical nature. The professional in such a situation must violate the principle of integrity in order to provide what is clinically necessary for the client” (p.47) [28]. Inpatient providers may be faced with repetitive and frustrating dilemmas because they have so little control over decisions impacting their work. For inpatient services, Glen Gabbard points out that a big roadblock has been the existence of a “largely mythical treatment model designed for a mythical psychiatric patient” (p. 27), for whom rapid pharmacological stabilization is followed by discharge with no regard for the actual complexities of a person’s problems, the psychodynamics of noncompliance and decompensation [38].

One investigator has expressed her concerns about the far-reaching implications this could have on clinicians as they adapt to the demands of managed care. She suggests that “the meaning of managed care for this group of clinicians lies in the prospect of being gradually, unknowingly, and unwillingly reprofessionalized from critics into proponents simply by virtue of continuing to practice in a managed care context, and in losing a moral vision of good mental health treatment in the process” [39].

---

## Parallel Processes

---

The concept of parallel process is a useful way of offering a coherent framework that can enable organizational leaders and staff to develop a way of thinking “outside the box” about what *has* happened and is happening to their treatment and service delivery systems, as well as to the world around them [40-44]. Identifying a problem is the first step in solving it. The notion of parallel process derives originally from psychoanalytic concepts related to transference and has traditionally been applied to the psychotherapy supervisory relationship in which the supervisory relationship may mirror much of what is going on in the relationship between therapist and client [45].

In their work with organizations, investigators have recognized that conflicts belonging at one location are often displaced and enacted elsewhere because of a parallelism between the conflicts at the place of origin and the place of expression. As Smith described it:

*When two or more systems – whether these consist of individuals, groups, or organizations – have significant relationships with one another, they tend to develop similar affects, cognition, and behaviors, which are defined as parallel processes .... Parallel processes can be set in motion in many ways, and once initiated leave no one immune from their influence. They can move from one level of a system to another, changing form along the way (p.13) [46]*

It is the contention of this paper that parallel processes are at play that interfere significantly with the ability of the human service system to address the actual needs of the children, adults and families who present to these systems with complex, often multigenerational problems. Instead, because of complex interactions between traumatized clients, stressed staff, pressured organizations, and a social and economic environment that is frequently hostile to the aims of recovery, our systems frequently recapitulate the very experiences that have proven to be so toxic for the people we are supposed to treat.

Just as the lives of people exposed to repetitive and chronic trauma, abuse, and maltreatment become organized around the traumatic experience, so too can entire systems become organized around the recurrent and severe stress of trying to cope with flawed mental models for organizational function. When this happens, it sets up an interactive dynamic that creates what are sometimes uncannily parallel processes. The clients bring their past history of traumatic experience into the mental health and social service sectors, consciously aware of certain specific goals but unconsciously struggling to recover from the pain and loss of the past. They are greeted by individual service providers, subject to their own personal life experiences, who are more-or-less deeply embedded in entire systems that are under significant stress. Given what we know about exposure to childhood adversity and other forms of traumatic experience, the majority of service providers have experiences in their background that may be quite similar to the life histories of their clients, and that similarity may be more-or-less recognized and worked through[47].

For many institutions the end result of this complex, interactive, and largely unconscious process is that the clients – children and adults – enter our systems of care, feeling *unsafe* and often engaging in some form of behavior that is dangerous to themselves or others. They are likely to have difficulty managing *anger* and *aggression*. They may feel *hopeless* and act *helpless*, even when they can make choices that will effectively change their situations, while at the same time this chronic *helplessness* may drive them to exert methods of control that become pathological. They are chronically *hyperaroused* and although they try to *control* their bodies and their minds, they are often ineffective. They may have significant *memory problems* and may be chronically dissociating their memories and/or these feelings, even under minor stress. They are likely therefore to have *fragmented* mental functions. The clients are likely never to have learned very good *communication* skills, nor are can they easily engage in *conflict management* because they have such problems with emotional management. They feel *overwhelmed*, *confused* and *depressed* and have *poor self-esteem*. Their problems have emerged in the context of disrupted attachment and they do not know how to make and sustain healthy *relationships* nor do they know how to *grieve* for all that has been lost. Instead they tend to be revictimized or victimize others and in doing so, repetitively *reenact* their past terror and loss.

Likewise, in chronically stressed organizations, individual staff members - many of whom have a past history of exposure to traumatic and abusive experiences – do not feel particularly *safe* with their clients, with management, or even with each other. They are chronically frustrated and *angry* and their feelings may be vented on the clients and emerge as escalations in punitive measures and humiliating confrontations. They feel *helpless* in the face of the enormity of the problems confronting them in the form of their clients, their own individual problems, and the pressures for better performance from management. As they become increasingly stressed, the measures they take to “treat” the clients tend to backfire and they become *hopeless* about the capacity for either the clients or the organization to change. The escalating levels of uncertainty, danger and threat that seem to originate on the one hand from the clients, and on the other hand from “the system” create in the staff a chronic level of *hyperarousal* as the environment becomes increasingly crisis-oriented. Members of the staff who are most disturbed by the hyperarousal and rising levels of anxiety, institute more *control* measures resulting in an increase in aggression, counter-aggression, dependence on both physical and biological restraints, and punitive measures directed at clients and each other. Key team members, colleagues, and friends leave the setting and take with them key aspects of the *memory* of what worked and what did not work and team learning becomes impaired. *Communication* breaks down between staff members, interpersonal *conflicts* increase and are not resolved. Team functioning becomes increasingly *fragmented*. As this happens, staff members are likely to feel *overwhelmed*, *confused*, and *depressed*, while emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and a *loss of personal effectiveness* lead to demoralization and burnout.

And how are these parallel processes manifest in organizational culture? Under these circumstances, the organization becomes unsafe for everyone in it. Emotional intelligence decreases

and organizational emotions, including anger, fear, and loss are poorly managed or denied. The crisis-driven nature of the hyperaroused system interferes with organizational learning. When the organization stops learning it becomes increasingly helpless in the face of what appear to be overwhelming and hopelessly incurable problems. Radical changes in reimbursement and regulation force radical changes in staff, positions, and role descriptions. People and programs depart and the organization begins to suffer from the consequences of organizational amnesia. Communication networks breakdown and error correction essentially stops and instead errors begin to systemically compound. Leaders respond to the perceived crises by becoming more controlling, more hierarchical, more punitive. In an effort to mobilize group action, leaders silence dissent which further diminishes active participation and essentially ends innovative risk-taking. As participatory processes are scaled back, decision making and problem solving processes are deeply ravaged. As a result, decisions tend to be oversimplified and may create more problems than they solve, despite the leaders' best efforts. Staff respond to the control measures by various forms of aggressive and passive-aggressive acting-out. Interpersonal conflicts escalate and are not resolved, further sabotaging communication. Systemic function becomes ever more fragmented and stagnant. Ethical conflicts abound, organizational values are eroded, hypocrisy is denied. If this process is not stopped, the organization steadily declines and may, in the way organizations can, die sometimes by dying through closure, sometimes by committing organizational suicide, and sometimes by continuing to function but representing a permanent failure of mission and purpose.

---

### ***Chronic Stress and Collective Trauma***

---

As organizational research has demonstrated, uncertainty is a main contributor to the perception of stress, and there is nothing so uncertain in corporate life as organizational change. The literature clearly demonstrates that the combination of uncertainty and the likelihood of change, both favorable and unfavorable change, produces stress and, ultimately, affects perceptions and judgments, interpersonal relationships, and the dynamics of the business combination itself [48].

Over the last two and a half decades, for the last two decades, change has been steady and certain only in its tendency to be unfavorable to the practice of the human social services. We organize our social institutions to accomplish specific tasks and functions, but we also utilize our institutions to collectively protect us against being overwhelmed with the anxiety that underlies human existence. We are, after all, the only animal that knowingly must anticipate our own death. The collective result of this natural inclination to contain anxiety becomes a problem when institutional events occur that produce great uncertainty, particularly those events that are associated with death or the fear of death. Under these conditions, containing anxiety may become more important than rationally responding to the crisis, although because of our relative ignorance and denial about our unconscious collective lives, this is likely to be denied and rationalized. As a result, organizations may engage in thought processes and actions that may serve to contain anxiety but that are ultimately destructive to organizational purpose [49-51].

Isabel Menzies, building on the work of the group theorist, Jacques, described the ways in which mental health systems create "social defense systems". She described how systems develop specific and static protective mechanisms to protect against the anxiety that is inevitably associated with change. The defense mechanisms she describes sound uncannily like those that we see in victims of trauma - depersonalization, denial, detachment, denial of feelings, ritualized task-performance, redistribution of responsibility and irresponsibility, idealization, avoidance of change.

Just as individuals respond to acute stress and chronic stress in variable ways, so too can organizations experience the effects of both acute and chronic stressors. The effects of stress in organizations and within whole systems are cumulative. A series of small, unrelated, stress-inducing incidents can add up to a mountain of stress in the eyes of people that work there and receive services within these settings. Therefore, there is no such thing as minor and major stress; minor stress can multiply into often irresolvable dilemmas [52].

In the case of whole organizations, the concept of "collective trauma" is a useful one. Referring to the impact of disasters, Kai Erikson has described collective trauma as "*a blow to the basic tissues of social life that damages the bonds attaching people together and impairs the prevailing sense of communality. The collective trauma works its way slowly and even insidiously into*

*the awareness of those who suffer from it, so it does not have the quality of suddenness normally associated with 'trauma'. But it is a form of shock all the same, a gradual realization that the community no longer exists as an effective source of support and that an important part of the self has disappeared... 'I' continue to exist, though damaged and maybe even permanently changed. 'You' continue to exist, though distant and hard to relate to. But 'we' no longer exist as a connected pair or as linked cells in a larger communal body" (p.233) [53].*

Since every organization has its own culture, each culture can be traumatized. Patient deaths and injuries – from natural causes, accidents, and most particularly suicide and deaths while in restraints or the death of a child under the surveillance of child protection workers; staff deaths or injuries; loss of leaders; lawsuits; downsizing – all may be overwhelming not just for the individuals involved but for overall organizational function. Because we are group animals, we identify with the institutions we belong to. As a consequence, group stress and trauma affect the whole AND each individual.

Over time and as a result of collusive interaction and unconscious agreement between members of an organization about the employment of defenses like denial, rationalization and detachment, these defenses becomes a systematized part of reality which new members must deal with as they come into the system. These defensive maneuvers become group norms, similar to the way the same defensive maneuvers become norms in the lives of our individual patients and their families and then are passed on from one generation of group participants to the next. Upon entering the system each new member must become acculturated to the established norms if he or she is to succeed. In such a way, an original group creates a group reality which then becomes institutionalized for every subsequent group [54]. This aspect of the “groupmind” becomes quite resistant to change, rooted in a past that is forgotten, now simply the “way things are” [55].

Taking the idea of systemic conflict to even deeper realms, a German professor of Political and Administrative Science has explored the idea of “successful failure” when an organization or social sector continues to be funded, albeit inadequately, despite its apparent failure to solve the fundamental problem it has been created to service.

*“One prerequisite of continuous resource mobilization despite low performance is that the principals at both levels (board and public) are interested in failure rather than in achievement of the organization they are in charge of...Second, another prerequisite of continuous resource mobilization despite low performance is that the principals at both levels prefer not being confronted with dilemmas that the organization has to cope with. Consider the organization's job being something terrible, disgusting, or just puzzling. Again, the mere remoteness from public attention may facilitate forgetting about those job”. (p. 99-100) [56].*

He notes that the probability of successful failure increases if: organizations find themselves in a peripheral position outside the dominant spheres of the public and private sector [i.e. *the mental health system has yet to achieve parity within health care*]; those providing resources to the organization are interested in failure rather than in achievement [i.e., *there are no performance standards that insist that the clients have made significant change*]; those providing resources to the organization prefer not to be confronted with dilemmas the organization has to cope with [i.e., *it is currently politically incorrect to focus on poverty, racism, child maltreatment as the etiology of mental illness, child abuse, domestic violence, etc*]; plausible ideologies are available that protect the organization against the “inappropriate” application of efficiency and accountability standards thus mitigating the cognitive dissonance caused by the gap between poor performance and the standards of organizational efficiency and accountability [i.e., *biological models of mental illness*]; demand for ignorance is satisfied, which stabilizes the illusion of the compatibility of organizational performance and the standards of organizational efficiency and accountability. *“Why delegate [particularly pressing problems] to an institutional segment whose resource dependency, governing structure, and ideology imply weak rather than strong performance? ... we may assume the public at large to be interested in weak rather than strong organizational structures when coping rather than problem solving is requested”, p. 103 [56].*

These very deep individual, organizational, and systemic conflicts about what mental illness and social irresponsibility really is and how to deal with it are chronic, underlying and largely hidden sources of chronic stress within every component of the human service sector.

---

## ***Lack of Basic Safety***

---

Threat does not just arrive in the form of physical intimidation, but can come from a number of sources and in a variety of forms. Fear can be conveyed through the actual experience of people in an organization – what has happened directly to a person or what they have directly observed in the present or the past. Then there are the stories about other people’s experiences that rapidly circulate within any organization, and are especially likely to be taken seriously if the person conveying the experience is liked or trusted and when the trustworthiness of the organization is already in question. Threat may also be conveyed via the negative assumptions about other people’s behavior and intentions about what has happened that reside within the company and fuel many self-fulfilling prophecies. And then all change is potentially threatening, but externally imposed change is the most threatening – and it has been largely externally imposed change that has characterized the mental health system [14].

It has been clear to organizational development investigators that trust in the workplace is key to productivity and ultimate to the lifespan of the organization [57]. The fundamental problem with creating atmospheres of threat and mistrust is that the more complex the work demands, the greater the necessity for collaboration and integration and therefore the more likely that a system of teamwork will evolve to address complexity. In fact, in the business world, “Fortune’s 100 Best Companies to Work For” are more likely to have cultures in which trust flourishes, and have half the turnover rate (12.6% vs. 26%) and nearly twice the applications for employment of companies not on the list [58].

The list of behaviors that can trigger mistrust in staff is a long one and includes both verbal and nonverbal behavior. Silence, glaring eye contact, abruptness, snubbing, insults, public humiliation, blaming, discrediting, aggressive and controlling behavior, overtly threatening behavior, yelling and shouting, public humiliation, angry outbursts, secretive decision making, indirect communication, lack of responsiveness to input, mixed messages, aloofness, unethical conduct all can be experienced as abusive managerial or supervisory behavior [14]. According to Bill Wilkerson, CEO of Global Business and Economic Roundtable on Addiction and Mental Health, mistrust, unfairness and vicious office politics are among the top ten workplace stressors [20].

It is not just psychological injury, however, that is the source of unrelenting stress for workers in the human service sector. The Bureau of Labor Statistics data shows that in 2000, 48 percent of all non-fatal injuries from occupational assaults and violent acts occurred in health care and social services. Most of these occurred in hospitals, nursing and personal care facilities, and residential care services. Nurses, aides, orderlies and attendants suffered the most non-fatal assaults resulting in injury. Injury rates also reveal that health care and social service workers are at high risk of violent assault at work. Bureau of Labor Statistics rates measure the number of events per 10,000 full-time workers—in this case, assaults resulting in injury. In 2000, health service workers overall had an incidence rate of 9.3 for injuries resulting from assaults and violent acts. The rate for social service workers was 15, and for nursing and personal care facility workers, 25. This compares to an overall private sector injury rate of 2. [59]

It is not surprising then, that after law enforcement, persons employed in the mental health sector have the highest rates of all occupations of being victimized while at work or on duty. Professional (social worker/psychiatrist) and custodial care providers in the mental health care field were victimized while working or on duty at similar rates (68 and 69 per 1,000, respectively) – but at rates *more than 3 times* those in the medical field. Workers in the mental health field and teachers were the only occupations more likely to be victimized by someone they knew than by a stranger [60]

Workplaces that are experienced as fundamentally unsafe – physically and emotionally dangerous, untrustworthy environments - are experienced collectively as dangerous as well. When a large number of people collectively experience fear, difficult-to-resolve and even dangerous strategic dilemmas arise that contain within them the potential for violence [61]. The tendency of a staff to escalate coercive control measures in psychiatric settings is likely to occur whenever they fear for their own safety or the safety of their colleagues, and when they do not trust the organizational structures and norms to contain potential or real violence.

---

## ***Lack of Emotional Management***

---

The idea of organization emotional life is not a comfortable one in most of the literature, largely because there has been a “myth of rationality”, a generally held belief that organizational behavior can best be explained in rational cognitive terms [19]. But stress models are fundamentally about emotional reactions and so the emotional nature of organizational behavior can no longer be ignored. In fact, one group of investigators have argued that *“emotions are among the primary determinants of behavior at work .... And profoundly influence both the social climate and the productivity of companies and organizations”* (p. 154) [62].

How does an organization “manage” emotional states? It does so through the normal problem-solving, decision making, and conflict resolution methods that must exist for any organization to operate effectively. The more complex the work demands, the greater the necessity for collaboration and integration and therefore the more likely that a system of teamwork will evolve. For a team to function properly there must be a certain level of trust among team members who must all share in the establishment of satisfactory group norms. These are the norms that enable the group to: tolerate the normal amount of anxiety that exists among people working on a task; tolerate uncertainty long enough for creative problem solutions to emerge; promote balanced and integrated decision making so that all essential points of view are synthesized; contain and resolve the inevitable conflicts that arise between members of a group; and complete its tasks [41].

Although most organizations within our society function in a fundamentally hierarchical, top-down manner, in a calm, healthy, well-functioning system there is a certain amount of natural democratic process that occurs in the day-to-day operations of solving group problems, making decisions in teams, and resolving conflict among members of the organization. In fact research has demonstrated that self-managed teams with decentralized decision making abilities are among the most important practices for high performance in the current business climate [7].

In organizations under stress, however, this healthier level of function is likely to be sacrificed in service of facing the emergency. Organizations under stress can manifest traits similar to stressed individuals. As anyone knows who has worked in a setting facing some kind of threat, everyone’s attention becomes riveted on the latest rumor and little productive work is accomplished. Because human beings are “hard-wired” for social interaction, a threat to our social group can be experienced as a dangerous threat to our individual survival and can evoke powerful responses.

What is a crisis? A crisis is a condition where a system is required or expected to handle a situation for which existing resources, procedures, policies, structures, or mechanisms are inadequate [63]. It describes a situation that threatens high priority goals and which suddenly occurs with little response time available [64]. In a crisis, the things that people are used to doing and comfortable doing, are not working and the stage is set for the possibility of disaster or new learning.

An organizational crisis will be sensed by everyone in the sphere of influence of the organization almost instantaneously regardless of how strenuously leaders attempt to contain the spread of information. Emotional contagion –without cognitive input – occurs within one-twentieth of a second and although employees of an organization may not know what the problem is, they will indeed know that there is a problem [65]. Tension literally fills the air. Within minutes or hours of a particularly disturbing piece of gossip, news, or crisis, everyone in an organization will be in an alarm state with all that goes along with that, including compromised thought processes[66].

Organizations respond to crisis in observable ways. When a crisis hits, most managers want to do the right thing. But one of the things that makes a crisis is that no one really knows what to do for certain, yet everyone expects the organizational leaders to know what to do. Different leaders will respond in different ways but this is often the time when a charismatic leader exerts the most influence either by creating a different frame of meaning for followers, by linking followers’ needs to important values and purposes, through articulation of vision and goals, or by taking actions to deal with the crisis and then moving to new interpretive schemes or theories of action to justify the actions [63].

At such a time, every person throughout the system is under stress, so everyone’s ability to think complexly will be relatively compromised. Stress increases a person’s vigilance towards gathering information, but it can also overly simplify and perceptively distort what we see or hear. Negative cues are usually magnified and positive cues are diminished or ignored altogether.

Furthermore, the stress of an event is determined by the amount and degrees of change involved, not whether this change is good or bad [52]. Under these conditions, command and control hierarchies usually become reinforced and serve to contain some of the collective anxiety generated by the crisis. Command hierarchies can respond more rapidly and mobilize action to defend against further damage. In times of danger, powerful group forces are marshaled and attachment to the group radically increases. Everyone in the organization is vulnerable to the risks the organization faces as a whole – everyone feels vulnerable [67].

But when crisis unrelentingly piles upon crisis - frequently because leaders leave, burnout, are fired, or fail - an organizational adjustment to chronic crisis occurs. Chronic fear states in the individual often have a decidedly negative impact on the quality of cognitive processes, decision making abilities, and emotional management capacities of the person. Impaired thought processes tend to escalate rather than reduce, existing problems so that crisis compounds crisis without the individual recognizing the patterns of repetition that are now determining his or her life decisions.

In similar ways, significant problems arise in organizations when the crisis state is prolonged or repetitive, problems not dissimilar to those we witness in individuals under chronic stress. Organizations can become chronically hyperaroused, functioning in crisis mode, unable to process one difficult experience before another crisis has emerged. The chronic nature of a stressed atmosphere tends to produce a generalized increased level of tension, irritability, short-temper and even abusive behavior. The urgency to act in order to relieve this tension compromises decision making because we are unable to weigh and balance multiple options, arrive at compromises, and consider long-term consequences of our actions under stress. Decision-making in such organizations tends to deteriorate with increased numbers of poor and impulsive decisions, compromised problem-solving mechanisms, and overly rigid and dichotomous thinking and behavior.

Organizations under stress may engage in a problematic emotional management process that interferes with the exercise of good cognitive skills, known as “group think” when certain conditions give rise to a group phenomenon in which the members try so hard to agree with each other that they commit serious errors that could easily have been avoided. An assumed consensus emerges while all members hurry to converge and ignore important divergences. Counterarguments are rationalized away and dissent is seen as unnecessary. As this convergence occurs, all group members share in the sense of invulnerability and strength conveyed by the group, while the decisions made are often actually disastrous. At least temporarily, the group experiences a reduction in anxiety, an increase in self-satisfaction, and a sense of assured purpose. But in the long run, this kind of thinking leads to decisions that spell disaster. Later, the individual members of the group find it difficult to accept that their individual wills were so affected by the group [68].

Another significant group emotional management technique that is particularly important under conditions of chronic stress is conformity. Another social psychologist, Solomon Ash, demonstrated that when pressure to conform is at work, a person changes his opinion not because he actually believes something different but because it's less stressful to change his opinion than to challenge the group. In his experiments, subjects said what they really thought most of the time, but 70% of subjects changed their real opinions at least once and 33% went along with the group half the time [69]. If a psychiatric setting is dominated by norms that, for instance, assert that biological treatments are the only “real” medicine that a patient needs, or that the only way to deal with aggressive patients is to put them into four-point restraints, or that “bad” children just need more discipline, then many staff members will conform to these norms even if they do not agree because they are reluctant to challenge the group norms.

Specialists in the corporate world have looked at the impact of chronic fear on an organization. Just as exposure to chronic fear undermines the ability of individuals to deal with their emotional states and to cognitively perform at peak levels, chronic fear disables organizations as well. Lawsuits, labor unrest, the formation of unions and strikes are typical signs of a high-fear environment. A lack of innovation, turf battles, social splitting, irresponsibility, bad decisions, low morale, absenteeism, widespread dissatisfaction, and high turnover are all symptoms of chronic fear-based workplaces [14]. *“In all these instances, the hidden factor may be an absence of group cohesion and commitment and the presence of unbearable tensions which create particular stresses for the individual. In these circumstances, the workplace is experienced as unsupportive, threatening to the emotional and physical well-being of the employee. At its worst, the workplace becomes a paranoid-schizoid environment, a nightmare existence”*, p. 250 [8].

---

## ***Organizational Learning & Organizational Amnesia***

---

Much talk is made these days of organizational learning but what exactly is that? The concept implies that organizational learning is both a cognitive and social process; that it involves capturing, storing and diffusing knowledge within the organization. It is the product of certain organizational arrangements and decisions and it often involves reassessing fundamental assumptions and values. Organizational learning begins with learning at the individual level and then involves diffusing the knowledge generated to other parts of the organization. The end result of organizational learning is organizational adaptation and value creation [70].

Another way of understanding how organizations learn is by using a framework that involves four processes of learning: intuiting, interpreting, integrating, and institutionalizing. Intuiting occurs when an individual recognizes a pattern or possibility in a situation and shares this intuition with the organization. Through a process of interpretation, the intuition is discussed and refined through a social activity involving the group, producing a convergence of meaning. Integration involves the development of shared understand and coherent collective action that helps develop a new understanding of how to adapt so that learning takes place at the group level and is linked to the organizational level. Institutionalizing occurs when the learning becomes embedded in systems, structure, procedures and organizational culture [71].

Extensive research on corporate knowledge concludes that “knowledge exists in two forms: explicit knowledge, which is easily codified and shared asynchronously, and tacit knowledge, which is experiential, intuitive and communicated most effectively in face-to-face encounters”. Explicit knowledge can be articulated with formal language. It is that which can be recorded and stored. Tacit knowledge is that knowledge which is used to interpret the information. It is more difficult to articulate with language and lies in the values, beliefs and perspectives of the system [70, 72].

According to some investigators, there is a widespread failure to capture tacit knowledge because Western culture has come to value results-the output of the work process-far above the process itself, to emphasize things over relationships [73]. In the mental health/social service world, tacit knowledge has often been referred to as clinical “wisdom” or “intuition”. Although frequently widely agreed upon, clinical wisdom is difficult to test, and is therefore vulnerable to the present demand for “evidence-based” practices. In the current environment, information that does not have “evidence” – meaning a sufficient number of double-blind, controlled studies - is more likely than ever to be discounted as meaningless and this determines what gets funded. But in the effort to provide methods of helping people that have been shown to be effective, we are in danger of retaining only explicit knowledge and losing the equally valuable tacit knowledge within the mental health system as a whole.

Individuals create certain ways of knowing, or schemas, that serve to reduce uncertainty. Organizations, too, are said to create interpretive schemes or frames of reference to filter information that is considered within an organization. These organizational-level schema may then block, obscure, simplify or misrepresent some of the information that organization must process and remember [74]. The diagnostic system created by the American Psychiatric Association is an extremely influential filtering system for the mental health and social service professions. The Diagnostic and Statistic Manual has become a method for reducing – or at least trying to reduce – the uncertainty that has always accompanied “madness”. Using the ancient method of giving a name to what we most fear, we give madness names and descriptions and believe therefore that it is less frightening and more manageable. However, staff members, particularly line staff who are not trained to understand that these are only oversimplified and reductionistic descriptive labels for which we have no agreed upon etiology – begin to reduce the patients to the diagnoses they carry. Unless patients are willing to pay out of pocket, the only way they can enter the mental health system is to get a diagnosis. The diagnosis then carefully filters what can and cannot be discussed, understood and shared. The diagnosis implies expected behavior consistent with that diagnosis. Because our minds are set to see what we expect, the diagnosis cues a staff member to expect certain behaviors, provides an explanatory framework for that behavior, and thus minimizes curiosity about what the behavior may actually mean. Being social creatures, and thus vulnerable to being influenced by other people’s expectations, the patients respond with the expected behavior. In this way a diagnosis easily becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The sociologist, Thomas Scheff described this labeling process years ago but his work and the work of those like him, is little discussed today because it is inconvenient and because it leads to an increase in uncertainty that cannot be tolerated, particularly in a stressed environment [75-77]. The information that has been most systematically screened out via this mechanism is the impact of previous traumatic experience on the evolution of so many diagnostic categories. The traumatic origins of what is perhaps a majority of behavioral dysfunction, is enormously threatening to this hugely embracing categorization system that the mental health profession has adopted to feel more secure in a shifting world. Trauma restores context to what has increasingly become a decontextualized meaning framework in mental health practice.

For learning to occur, organizations must have memory. Some modern philosophers believe that all memories are formed and organized within a collective context. According to them, society provides the framework for beliefs, behaviors, and the recollections of both individual and groups [78]. Organizational memory refers to stored information from an organization's history that can be brought to bear on present decisions. This information is stored as a consequence of implementing decisions to which they refer, by individual recollections, and through shared interpretations [74]. Like individual memory functions, organizational memory is distributed, not concentrated in one place or domain.

But where in an organization is memory stored? One postulate is that there are five "storage bins" that comprise the structure of memory within an organization [79]. The first storage bin includes the recollections that individuals have of what has transpired in and about the organization. This information is embodied within the individual in the form of actual memories and in belief systems, causal maps, assumptions and values. Individuals also keep written records and files of things that occur in the workplace that also serve as memory storage components. In the mental health system, the staff members within the organization comprise the first storage bin. The files they keep, their notes in the patient charts all represent forms of this kind of memory storage.

Organizational culture represents the second memory storage bin. Organizational culture structures the way future situations will be dealt with by the organization. The learned cultural information is stored in a variety of ways including language, symbols, stories, and the grapevine. Every mental health organization has a unique culture and the older the organization, the more likely it is that the established organizational culture will exert a strong effect on individual members as they join the organization.

The third form of storage is embedded in the transformations that occur in organizations. Transformation occurs in a psychiatric hospital between the patient at admission and the patient at discharge, or between the new staff member and the experienced staff member. Patient or staff member, people rapidly learn the standard operating procedure of the organization – the role they are to play, the way they are to play it, what is expected of them under different circumstances – and these procedures provide a frame of reference grounded in the past history that constrains innovation and that often become self-fulfilling prophecies [74, 79].

Organizational structures become the fourth form of memory storage. Individual roles of each person within the organization provide a repository in which organizational memories can be stored. The role labels form the social expectations and these social expectations link individual enactment with collective rules – the formal and informal codifications of "correct" behavior, what is to be controlled and who is to be in control. The ways in which the organization is structured then come to reflect the institutionalized myths of the organization and/or the society as a whole. The organization's memory then serves to legitimate those myths [74]. In the mental health system, particularly in hospital settings, roles have historically been clearly delineated, sorted into an established medical hierarchy of authority.

The fifth memory storage bin is represented by the actual physical structure or workplace ecology of an organization. Physical space often reflects values, beliefs, assumptions and culture of the organization and is known to powerfully influence employees' workplace experience. A mental health or social service facility that has no room large enough to gather the entire community conveys the lack of value it places on community. Dingy, ugly, dirty, colorless settings convey attitudes toward both clients and staff. In hospitals, barriers that separate staff from patients define lines of authority and social expectations.

Finally, external archives are another, more external form of organizational memory storage. Reports, books, personal accounts, other people's reminiscences all can be part of this external archival memory. In the mental health sector, much of the original material on the practice of therapeutic community is out-of-print. One of the first things to be closed under budget constraints are

specialized libraries that were accessible to students and psychiatric residents right in the environments within which they were working. Patient charts have simultaneously increased in relatively useless documentation while decreasing in meaningful information. Now they are likely to be only the barest representation of the people they purport to describe.

Organizational memory is vital if organizations are to learn. But organizational memory appears to be vulnerable to some of the same circumstances that affect individual memory. Critical events and organizational failure change us and change our organizations, but without memory we lose the context. Studies have shown that institutions do have memory and that once interaction patterns have been disrupted these patterns can be transmitted through an organization so that one “generation” unconsciously passes on to the next, norms that alter the system and every member of the system. But without a conscious memory of events also being passed on, organizational members in the present cannot make adequate judgments about whether the strategy, policy, or norm is still appropriate and useful in the present [80].

*Corporate amnesia* has been defined as a loss of organizational memory [81]. Analogous to the division in individual memory between verbal, explicit and situational implicit memory, literature in the corporate world refers to explicit and implicit or “tacit” corporate memory, the latter referring to vital, organizationally-specific knowledge that is cumulative, slow to diffuse, and rooted in the human beings who comprise the organization in contrast with the explicit corporate memory which is embodied in written documents, policies and procedures.

Organizational amnesia can result from break down in any of the four stages of learning: intuition, interpretation, integration, and institutionalization [70]. There may be no mechanism for intuitive knowledge of the individual to be transferred to the organization, or individual intuition may be looked down on, effectively silencing individuals resulting in time-based memory loss. Tacit knowledge – often in the form of skills or corporate wisdom – is much more difficult to transfer than explicit knowledge so that much that goes on at a tacit level may not be transferred to other parts of the organization and cause “space-based” memory loss. Integration and institutionalization may help the organization retain explicit information gained over time, but the tacit information is more easily lost. When this happens rules may replace norms as guides for the group. Additionally, presumed causal relationships may be in error, but may become institutionalized, while accurate causal relationships are ignored. Selective perception and attribution also come into play, as individuals and groups systematically ignore information that does not fit into established schemas.

Corporate amnesia becomes a tangible problem to be reckoned with when there is a loss of collective experience and accumulated skills through the trauma of excessive downsizing and layoffs [82]. It is now generally recognized that corporate layoffs can have devastating effects not just on individual but on corporate health as well, even producing what has been termed “survivor sickness” in the business world [83, 84]. Corporate memory loss at any level in the organization is significant. However some investigators believe that when it happens at the senior team level it has the greatest impact. Senior team members hold the strategic piece of the organization and a sense of the intended vision for the future direction. There are fewer members at this level and they hold more power. Therefore decisions made have a greater global impact throughout the organization. They are responsible to maintain the integrity of the organization and that loss can impact not only the organization, but the community it serves as well [72].

It is the valuable tacit memory that is profoundly disturbed by the loss of personnel in downsizing. According to investigators in the field, the average length of a U.S. employee's tenure with any given company is approximately five years. *“The dramatic shift in the nature of employment toward short-term tenure is among the biggest damaging influences on productivity and competitiveness in companies today. That’s because short-term tenure translates into short-term organizational memory. And when a company loses its medium and long-term memory, it repeats its past mistakes, fails to learn from past successes and often forfeits its identity... Hard-won and expensively acquired organizational memory walks out the door every time an employee retires, quits, or is downsized”* p. 35 [85].

Organizations must reckon with past failures and the fragmentation of meaning and purpose that accompanies these failures, much like individuals. Organizations can distort or entirely forget the past – or important parts of the past – just like individuals do, and the more traumatic the past the more likely it is that organization will push some memories out of conscious awareness. Changing leaders, even changing the entire staff does not erase the organizational memory, nor does it excavate and provide decent burial for the skeletons in the organizational closet. As one author puts it, *“Pain is*

*a fact of organizational life. Companies will merge, bosses will make unrealistic demands, people will lose their jobs. The pain that accompanies events like these isn't in itself toxic; rather, it's how that pain is handled throughout the organization that determines whether its long-term effects are positive or negative"*p.12 [86].

The result of organizational amnesia may be a deafening silence about vital but troubling information, not dissimilar to the deafening silence that surrounds family secrets like incest or domestic violence. There is reason to believe that maintaining silence about disturbing collective events may have the counter effect of making the memory even more potent in its continuing influence on the individuals within the organization as well as the organization as a whole much as silent traumatic memories continue to haunt traumatized individuals and families [87].

---

## **Systematic Error**

---

Miscommunication within systems can occur for a variety of reasons: channels may be inadequate for the volume of information that is entering them – they may be too few, too narrow, or too slow. Communication networks can become blocked as a result of interpersonal conflict. This particularly describes the situation of increasing organizational stress. As stress increases, perception narrows, more contextual information is lost, and circumstances deteriorate to more extreme levels before they are noticed, all of which leads to more puzzlement, less meaning, and more perceived complexity. Communication is necessary to detect error and crises tend to create vertical communication structures when, in fact, lateral structures are often more appropriate for detection and diagnosis of crisis.

In any crisis situation, there is a high probability that false hypotheses will develop and persist. It is largely through open exchange of messages, independent verification, and redundancy of communication channels that the existence of false hypotheses are likely to be detected. Therefore in a crisis there is a premium on accuracy in interpersonal communication [88]. Research has shown that organizations are exceedingly complex systems that can easily drift toward disaster unless they maintain resources that enable them to learn from unusual events in their routine functioning. When communication breaks down, this learning does not occur [89].

Crises are never totally secret – all stakeholders in an organization are likely to feel the anxiety and uncertainty in the environment, even if they know relatively little about what is happening. Informal networks of communication – rumors, gossip – are likely to increase under these conditions as formal networks withhold information. But it is during times of crisis that leaders most need to get feedback, adjust actions accordingly, rather than wall themselves off or “shoot the messengers” who bring bad news. By definition, in a crisis things are out of control and there are no easy and obvious solutions to the problems. Constant feedback becomes more critical because of the high degree of uncertainty about ongoing actions taken to address the crisis. Organizations that already have poor communication structures are more likely to handle crises poorly [90].

Instead of increasing interpersonal communications, people in crisis are likely to resort to the excessive use of one-way forms of communication. Under stress, the supervisory structure tends to focus on the delivery of one-way, top-down information flow largely characterized by new control measures about what staff and patients can and cannot do. Feedback loops erode under such circumstances and morale starts to decline as the measures that are communicated do not alleviate the stress or successfully resolve the crisis.

When professionals acquire more complex responses so that they can sense and manage more complex environments, they do not become more complex all at once. Instead, they develop their complexity serially and gradually. Under pressure, those responses acquired more recently and practiced less often, unravel sooner than those acquired earlier, which have become more habitual. When some or all of these communication pathologies are already in play, small events can lead to potentially disastrous outcomes. Organizational theorists have observed that when important routines are interrupted, when pressures leads people to fall back on what they learned first and most fully, when coordinated actions breaks down, and when communication exchanges become confusing, more errors occur, error detection is decreased, errors pile upon and amplify each other. Complex and complex collective responses are all more vulnerable to this kind of disruption than are older, simpler, more over-learned, cultural and individual responses (Weick, 2001).

Another source of systematic error resides in the hierarchical nature of most organizations that is exacerbated by stress. When people are fearful of the response of the person above them in a hierarchy they are likely to do things to communicate in ways that will minimize the negative response from their superior but which may significantly distort the message [91]. They do this in a variety of ways: by gatekeeping and thereby filtering some information in and other information out; by summarizing; by changing emphasis within a message; by actually withholding information, and by changing the nature of information [92].

---

### ***Increased Authoritarianism***

---

At present, most organizations and institutions in our society are more hierarchical and bureaucratic than democratic. Investigators in the field have pointed out the strong tendency within organizations to gravitate toward hierarchical modes of structuring themselves [93]. A strong tendency toward hierarchical control has been noticed, even in organizations that claim to be democratic. It has even been argued that management resists free speech more stubbornly than any other concession to employees [94] and this has been substantiated by a review of court decisions pertaining to freedom of speech in the workplace revealing a general assumption *“that conflict and dissent are always bad and no good can come from them; a concept that flies in the face of modern thought on organizational conflict and free speech”* (p.260) [95].

When a crisis occurs, centralization of control is significantly increased with leaders tightening reins, concentrating power at the top, and minimizing participatory decision making [90]. Even where there are strong beliefs in the “democratic way of life”, there is always a tendency in institutions, and in the larger containing society, to regress to simple, hierarchical models of authority as a way of preserving a sense of security and stability. This is not just a phenomenon of leadership – in times of great uncertainty, everyone in the institution colludes to collectively bring into being authoritarian organizations as a time-honored method for providing at least the illusion of greater certainty and therefore a diminution of anxiety [49].

From an evolutionary standpoint, this makes a great deal of sense. Terror Management Theory has experimentally shown that reminding people of their own mortality enhances and strengthens their existing world view, religious beliefs, group identifications, and their tendency to cling to a charismatic leader [51]. When danger is real and present, effective leaders take charge and give commands that are obeyed by obedient followers, thus harnessing and directing the combined power of many individuals in service of group survival. Fear-provoking circumstances within an organization are contagious. Within a group, emotional contagion occurs almost instantly and predictable group responses are likely to emerge automatically [65]. Threatened groups tend to increase intra-group attachment bonds with each other, and are more likely to be drawn to leaders who appear confident, take control and are willing to tell other people what to do. Longstanding interpersonal conflicts seem to evaporate and everyone pulls together toward the common goal of group survival producing an exhilarating and even intoxicating state of unity, oneness and a willingness to sacrifice one’s own well-being for the sake of the group. This is a survival strategy ensuring that in a state of crisis decisions can be made quickly and efficiently thus better ensuring survival of the group, even while individuals may be sacrificed.

Under crisis conditions, the strong exercise of authority by leaders coupled with obedience to authority by followers may be life-saving. In a group confronted by new, unique and dangerous conditions, if someone in a position of authority - or someone with the confidence to assume authority - gives orders that may help us to survive, we are likely to automatically and obediently respond. But, when a state of crisis is prolonged, repetitive, or chronic there is a price to be paid. The tendency to develop increasingly authoritarian structures over time is particularly troublesome for organizations.

Chronic crisis results in organizational climates that promote authoritarian behavior and this behavior serves to reinforce existing hierarchies and create new ones. Under stress, leaders are likely to feel less comfortable in delegating responsibility to others and in trusting their subordinates with tough assignments when there is a great deal at stake. Instead, they are likely to make more decisions for people and become central to more approvals; this in turn builds a more expensive hierarchy and bureaucracy [14]. Communication exchanges change and become more formalized and top-down. Command hierarchies becomes less flexible, power becomes more centralized, people below stop

communicating openly and as a result, important information is lost from the system. *“It is the increased salience of formal structure that transforms open communication among equals into stylized communications between unequals. Communication dominated by hierarchy activates a different mindset regarding what is and is not communicated and different dynamics regarding who initiates on whom. In situations where there is a clear hierarchy, it is likely that attempts to create interaction among equals is more complex, less well learned, and dropped more quickly in favor of hierarchical communication when stress increases”*, p. 138 [88].

The centralization of authority means that those at the top of the hierarchy will be far more influential than those at the bottom, and yet better solutions to the existing problems may actually lie in the hands of those with less authority. *“There is a tendency to centralize control during a crisis period, to manage with tighter reins and more power concentrated at the top. The need for fast decisions may preclude participative processes. But this is risky. Centralization may transfer control to inappropriate people; if top managers had the ability to take corrective action, there might have been no crisis in the first place”*, p. 243 [90]. In this way, *“the same process that produces the error in the first place, also shapes the context so that the error will fan out with unpredictable consequences”*, p. 140 [88]. Lipman-Blumen has studied the dynamics of leadership and has recognized that *“Crises can create circumstances that prompt some leaders, even in democratic societies, to move beyond merely strong leadership to unwarranted authoritarianism. In tumultuous times, toxic leaders’ predilection for authoritarianism fits neatly with their anxious followers’ heightened insecurity..... Set adrift in threatening and unfamiliar seas, most of us willingly surrender our freedom to any authoritarian captain”*(p.99-100) [15].

### **The Inherent Problem of Authoritarianism**

The nature of people who were recognized as highly authoritarian was studied in the late 1940’s after Hitler’s totalitarian regime had caused such enormous global suffering. In the work of Adorno, Sanford and others, nine interrelated personality dispositions indicated an authoritarian personality. These included: Conventionalism (a tendency to accept and obey social conventions and rules); Submission (an exaggerated emotional need to submit to authority); Aggression (aggression towards individuals or groups disliked by authorities, particularly those who threaten traditional values); Destruction and Cynicism (generalized hostility); Power and Toughness (identification with those in power); Superstition and Stereotypy (a tendency to shift responsibility to outside forces beyond one’s control and a tendency to think in rigid categories); Anti-intraception (rejection of the subjective, imaginative and aesthetic); Projectivity (a tendency to transfer internal problems to the external world and to believe in the existence of evil); and Sex (exaggerated concerns with respect to sexual activity) [96, 97].

In his seminal experiments immediately after World War II, psychologist Stanley Milgram warned, *“A substantial proportion of people do what they are told to do, irrespective of the content of the act and without limitations of conscience, so long as they perceive that the command comes from a legitimate authority”*[98]. Robert Altemeyer has been studying authoritarian behavior – particularly right-wing-authoritarian behavior - for the last twenty-five years and his work illuminates the central cognitive problems in authoritarian behavior that pose significant challenges when people high in these traits become employed in the mental health and social service systems [99].

Altemeyer has reduced the nine personality dispositions to three fundamental and interrelated characteristics: *Authoritarian submission* described as a high degree of submission to the authorities who are perceived to be established and legitimate in the society in which one lives; *Authoritarian aggression* which is a general aggressiveness, directed against various persons, that is perceived to be sanctioned by established authorities; and *Conventionalism* determined by a high degree of adherence to the social conventions that are perceived to be endorsed by society and its established authorities.

People who are high in authoritarian submission generally accept the statements and actions of established authorities and believe that those authorities should be trusted and deserve both obedience and respect, by virtue of their positions. They place narrow limits on other people’s rights to criticize authority figures and tend to assume that critics of those authority figures are always wrong. Criticism of established authority is viewed as divisive and even destructive and motivated by little

except a desire to cause trouble. For such people, when authority figures break the law, they have an inherent right to do so, even if the rest of us cannot.

Those who are high in authoritarian aggression are predisposed to control other people through the use of punishment and they advocate for physical punishment in childhood and beyond. They deplore any form of leniency toward people who diverge from established authority and advocate capital punishment. Unconventional people and anyone considered to be socially deviant are believed to pose a threat to the social order and therefore aggression toward them is justified, particularly when condoned by authority figures.

Conventionalism indicates a strong acceptance of and commitment to the traditional social norms of one's society. Anything that is based on long-standing tradition and custom and that maintains the beliefs, teachings, and services in their traditional form is preferred. Such people reject the idea that people should derive their own moral beliefs to meet the needs of today because moral standards have already been established by authority figures of the past and should be obeyed without question. This requires endorsing traditional family structure within which women are subservient to men and "keep their place" and the only proper marriages are between men and women. Other ways of doing things are simply wrong and potentially dangerous.

But for all the social problems connected to extreme authoritarian behavior, it is the impact on mental functioning and the behavior that follows associated with authoritarianism that has the most bearing for the functioning of the mental health system. In investigating the cognitive behavior of authoritarianism, Altemeyer found that authoritarians do not spend much time examining evidence, thinking critically, reaching independent conclusions, or seeing whether their conclusions mesh with other things they believe. They largely accept what authority figures have told them is true and have difficulty identifying falsehoods on their own. They copy other people's opinions without critically evaluating them if those opinions come from someone with established authority and as a result they end up believing a number of contradictory things without even being able to see the contradiction. They do not mentally reverse situations and put themselves in "the other person's shoes". They examine ideas less than other people and tend to surround themselves with people who agree with them and do not contradict them. They show a "hefty double standard" when testing whether something is true or not: if evidence supports what they believe they accept it unquestioningly as truth; if evidence fails to support what they believe they tend to throw out the evidence. Since they tend not to be able to think for themselves, they are vulnerable to mistaken judgments and can be astonishingly gullible when an insincere communicator bears the trappings of authority [99].

The inability to think critically, synthetically, and diversely is an enormous handicap in trying to assist those with complex physical, psychological, social and moral difficulties secondary to exposure to repetitive stress, trauma, and violence. If authoritarian leaders assume key administrative positions within mental health organizations the result is likely to be highly detrimental to true trauma-informed change because they will be unwilling to shift away from what are now "traditional" explanations of emotional problems embodied in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual. They are likely to insist on a centralized and traditional hierarchy, discourage true staff participation, be unable to facilitate team treatment, punish dissent, and surround themselves with people who will agree with their view of the world. Authoritarian leadership is likely to encourage the same leadership style throughout the organization. As a result, the organizational norms for all staff are likely to endorse punitive behavior, empathic failure, and traditional methods for managing difficult situations. It is hard to imagine a situation more detrimental to long-lasting, positive change in the lives of trauma survivors. As for the staff, when authoritarian behavior comes to dominate a situation, the result can also be devastating. Unchecked authoritarians can become bullies at any organizational level but when they are given power, they can become "petty tyrants".

### **Bullying in the Workplace**

Workplace bullying has been defined as "*repeated and persistent negative acts towards one or more individual(s) which involve a perceived power imbalance and create a hostile work environment [100] or "the repeated, malicious, health-endangering mistreatment of one employee (the Target) by one or more employees. The mistreatment is psychological violence, a mix of verbal and strategic assaults to prevent the Target from performing work well. It is illegitimate conduct in that it prevents work getting done. Thus, an employer's legitimate business interests are not met (p.3)*

[101]. Einarson points out that it is *“the systematic persecution of a colleague, a subordinate or a superior, which if continued, may cause severe social, psychological and psychosomatic problems for the victim [102].*

Bullying behaviors may include social isolation or the silent treatment, rumors, attacking the victim’s private life or attitudes, excessive criticism or monitoring of work, withholding information or depriving responsibility and verbal aggression. They may include changing work tasks or making them difficult to perform, personal attacks on the person’s private life by ridicule, insults, gossip; verbally humiliating workers in public, and threats of violence [102]. The main difference between “normal” conflict and bullying is not necessarily what and how it is done, but rather the frequency and longevity of what is done.

Increased fear and authoritarian behavior combined with a breakdown in communication is likely to lead to an increase in workplace bullying and gives license to those employees who are already prone to engage in bullying behavior to continue and escalate their negative behavior towards others. Bullying has been shown to be associated with higher turnover, increased absenteeism, and decreased commitment and productivity. It has been reported to result in lower levels of job satisfaction, psychosomatic symptoms, and physical illness as well [100]. Research has shown that workplace bullying is commonplace in many different organizations and professions including health care and mental health care settings. In one large survey, 8.6% of respondents experienced ongoing bullying and non-sexual harassment at work during the six months prior to the survey [102]. There are no similar figures available for U.S. health care settings but in a survey of 217,000 National Health Service staff in the United Kingdom, 10% of those surveyed had been bullied and harassed by colleagues in the 12 months to March 2005. This figure rose to 37% when abuse from patients or their relatives was included. Additionally, 1% had been physically assaulted by fellow employees, 42% of these workers across the UK would not report incidences of bullying in the workplace; 39% of UK managers say they have been bullied in the past three years; and 70% of managers believe misuse of power or position is the number one form of bullying [103]

Organizational factors are clearly important in the emergence, maintenance, prevention and response to bullying behavior. Thirty years ago Brodsky studied over a thousand cases of work harassment in the U.S. and concluded that for harassment to occur there must be elements in the organizational culture that permit or reward such behavior [104]. Bullying will only occur if the offender believes he has the overt or more usually covert support from superiors for his or her behavior. Organizational tolerance for, or lack of sanctions against bullying serves to give implicit permission for the bullying to continue. Aggressive or predatory behavior that starts on a one-to-one level can end up splitting an organization into opposing camps. Conditions that serve as enabling structures and processes that make it possible for bullying to occur include power imbalances between the victim and perpetrator, low perceived costs of bullying from the point of view of the perpetrator, and dissatisfaction and frustration in the workplace.

One of the obstacles in dealing with bullying in the workplace is that the organization frequently treats the victim, not the perpetrator as the problem, tending to accept the prejudices of the offenders and blaming the victim for their own misfortune [102]. One investigator has pointed out four key factors that are prominent in eliciting bullying behavior at work 1) deficiencies in work design; 2) deficiencies in leadership behavior; 3) a socially exposed position of the victim; 4) low moral standards in the organization [105].

## **Petty Tyranny**

Under what is arguably the worst conditions, an organizational leader, predisposed to authoritarian behavior and acquiring power, may evolve into what has been described as a “petty tyrant” [106]. A petty tyrant is someone who arbitrarily and in a small-minded way, exercises absolute power oppressively or brutally. Petty tyrants believe certain things about their employees, a set of beliefs that have been termed Theory X - that the average person dislikes work, lacks ambition, avoids responsibility, prefers direction, and is resistant to change [107]. They do this in definable ways. They use their authority in ways that are unfair and that reinforce their own position or provide personal gain. They play favorites. They belittle subordinates and humiliate them in front of others. They lack consideration and tend to be aloof, cold, and unapproachable. They force their own point of view on others and demand that things be done their way. They discourage participation of others and

discourage initiative. They are likely to be critical and punitive toward subordinates for no apparent reason.

Although few organizations openly condone such arbitrary and abusive use of authority, the organizational norms may facilitate the emergence of petty tyranny, particularly in “total institutions” such as prisons or mental hospitals. In one well-known study, investigators simulated a prison environment and randomly assigned subjects to the role of either guard or prisoner. During the 6-day simulation, the experimenters found that the guards began—and quickly escalated—harassing and degrading the prisoners *“even after most prisoners had ceased resisting and prisoner deterioration had become visibly obvious to them”* (p. 92), and appeared to experience this sense of power as *“exhilarating”* (p. 94) [108]. The effect of power over others can become so intoxicating that (1) power becomes an end in itself, (2) the powerholder develops an exalted sense of self-worth, (3) power is used increasingly for personal rather than organizational purposes, and (4) the powerholder devalues the worth of others [109]. In a mental institution, Nurse Ratchett in the movie, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest*, most vividly illustrates the development of a petty tyrant.

### **Fitting Leadership Style to the Situation**

There is a role for neither petty tyrants nor bullies in the human services environment. However, there is no “one best” leadership style for decision making, leading, and motivating. It is the “situational approach” that offers leaders the most useful framework for leadership. Leadership styles can vary depending on basically two factors: the *quality of the decision*, meaning the extent to which the decision will affect important group processes, and *acceptance of the decision*, or the degree of commitment of employees needed for its implementation. This theory suggests that when the decision will affect few members of the group and little commitment from others is required, the leader should use an autocratic style. But when the decision is likely to affect many people and can only be implemented if employees buy in to the decision and carry out the implementation, then leaders should use a participative style [110]. Effective leaders know how to match styles to situations and get things done. Ineffective leaders do not. Ineffective leaders are likely to employ only one dominant style and then use that style in all situations. They are therefore ineffective in addressing the real complexities of the modern work environment.

---

## ***Impaired Cognition and Silencing Of Dissent***

---

What defines “good” decision making abilities? To begin, people *learn* to make effective decisions – the skills are not innate. Since making good decisions is a skill, it is possible to evaluate what goes into building those skills. The best decisions are likely to come out of a process rather than “just happening” which are unfortunately, the kinds of decisions we are most likely to make under stress. Effective decision makers define as specifically as possible the decision that needs to be made and decide whether they are really the ones to be making that decision. Faced with a decision, good decision makers search for alternatives; rely on multiple sources of information not just expert opinion; consider short and long-term consequences of each possible decision; carefully weigh the pros and cons of each alternative; are sensitive to and aware of the influence of group process on decision making; listen to and integrate information from intuition and “gut” feelings; draw upon both positive and negative past experience; and are aware of their own short-comings, vulnerabilities, and blind spots that may influence the decision making process.

This process of effective decision making is characterized by thoughtfulness and information informed by emotion and intuition. It is careful, methodical and well-reasoned. It is also difficult and demanding and the greater the complexity of the situation or the decision that needs to be made, the greater the demand on the individual. It is for this reason that repetitive and routine decisions are expediently managed by authoritarian systems of control while complex decisions require a very different approach.

Decision making may be profoundly affected by emotion. Positive emotion increases creative problem-solving and facilitates the integration of information while negative emotion produces a narrowing of attention and a failure to search for new alternatives. People who are in pleasant moods

tend to deliberate longer, use more information, and reexamine more information than others. People in aroused or unpleasant moods tend to take more risks, employ simpler decision strategies and form more polarized judgments [111].

But this analysis of decision making focuses on the individual decision maker. At the workplace, individual decisions certainly must be made very day, but even individual decisions must be made in the context of “the group” – whatever that group happens to be. What do we know then, about the process of decision making when many factors must be taken into account, when many people must participate in the decisions, and when decisions that are made may have significant and lasting consequences?

## **Participation and Decision Making**

Lack of participation in the decision-making process, lack of effective consultation and communication, office politics, and lack of a sense of belonging have all been identified as potential organizational stressors for workers, while increased opportunity to participate has been repeatedly associated with greater overall job satisfaction, higher levels of emotional commitment to the organization, and an increased sense of well-being [19]. To some extent, the need to participate is influenced by education – the more professionally developed the workforce, the greater their desire to participate in decisions that affect their job [5]. However, relatively few people have actually had the opportunity to practice the skills required to encourage, support and sustain active participation. Despite that fact that here in the United States we grow up in what is presumed to be a democracy, in reality most people learn that authority is not to be questioned – at home, at school, in the military, and at work.

In truth, regardless of the work that people are doing, it has to be organized, and the typical form of organization is that of the hierarchy. For the most part, hierarchies are assumed to be necessarily autocratic – the higher level tells the next lower level what to do and they do it. *“This assumption explains why most of the organizations and institutions, even government agencies, in a democratic society are managed autocratically. It is argued that they need hierarchy to organize work, and that hierarchy is necessarily autocratic. Those who are bothered by the irony of this try to soften hierarchical autocracy by decentralizing some of the decision making”* (p.115) [5]. Hierarchy is often also equated with bureaucracy, defined by the famous sociologist Max Weber as “a fixed division of labor among participants, a hierarchy of offices, a set of general rules which govern performance, a separation of personal from official property, and rights, selection of personnel on the basis of technical qualifications and employment viewed as a career by participants” (p. 12) [112]

Whatever their educational background, human beings are adversely affected by helplessness and become more motivated, creative, committed, and engaged *if* they are included in decisions that affect them. Worker participation has been described as comprising *“organizational structures and processes designed to empower and enable employees to identify with organizational goals and to collaborate as control agents in activities that exceed minimum coordination of efforts normally expected at work”* (p.357) [113].

Generally speaking, participatory processes engage workers at all levels in a greater variety of activities and offer them more knowledge about the organization than they would otherwise have had. Participation changes organizational communication, and often alters beliefs and values, decision making, and problem-solving methods. Participation must enter the real life of the organization, where work gets done and evaluated, what is paid attention to, how problems are appraised, what is compensated, and who gets promoted [114]. Where participation is really happening we should see greater amounts of communication – *“more people talking to more people about more things more of the time”* (p.358) [113]. We should see frequent and complex interactions between and among people as the desire for coordination increases. We should see greater information richness and greater commitment to the execution of decisions and analysis of the results of those decisions. The results of expanding participation and making it a vital part of the fulfillment of organizational mission can reap significant rewards.

Unfortunately, “empowerment” can become simply a catch-word like anything else. *“We already tried empowerment here but it didn’t work”*, one executive confessed to a consultant. *“Not the E word again!”* another client moaned, *“We’re sick of it.”* (p.240-241) [114]. But resistance to participation is more likely to be related to a lack of preparation than a fixed desire not to participate.

Since people generally have relatively few experiences with actively participating in making organizational decisions, they are likely to lack the basic skills and the self-confidence to voice their opinions, offer dissenting opinions or engage in conflict. If they have been exposed to fear-based organizations, they are likely to worry that the invitation to participate is simply a guise of some sort, and that managers cannot be trusted. They are then likely to sit silently or refuse to come to meetings for fear that they will say or do the wrong things that will get them into trouble. As one investigator observes, *"We do a terrible job of preparing people to participate in change and of preparing our supervisors to help people participate. .... We continue to limit workforce participation to relatively trivial issues because we view them as unable to take part in more meaningfully discussions. We view participation as a gimmick to increase their satisfaction and motivation, rather than as a potent force to enhance organizational survival"*. (p. 43) [115].

Besides a failure to prepare people for the challenging work of true participation, participatory schemes can become corrupted in a number of ways. A dominant group can take over control and dominate the discussion. This results in the appearance of participation without the substance. Or participation may be very narrowly defined so that it has no real impact on the way an organization actually functions but simply comforts managers that they are creating a more "democratic" work environment.

But sham participation is likely to give way to true participation for those organizations who hope to be successful.. As one observer points out, *"Sick of it or not, empowerment of workers will change the form of every organization in the twenty-first century. Empowerment is not a fad that failed. It is a core idea of the future that forces antiquated organizational forms to adjust to both societal change and the expansion of workers' attitudes. Better-educated workers will reject nineteenth-century authoritarianism on the job as they have rejected it in so many other aspects of their lives"* (p.240-241) [114]. Recently, successful organizations have been urged to change the way they do things in order to cope with a globally challenging economic environment. According to experts, they need to become: more knowledge intensive, radically decentralized, participative, adaptive, flexible, efficient, and responsive to rapid change [113]

But are these same ideas relevant to the mental health care and social service environments as they are the world of business? It is relatively easy to make the simple argument that when lives – not just the bottom line – are at stake, these principles become even more important. Given the challenging physical, emotional, social, and ethical problems that confront most helpers and caregivers today, creating more participatory systems is critical. The difficulties our clients have are simply too complex to be addressed by the stagnant, bureaucratic, and autocratic environments that are so typical of the non-profit world and in the private, for-profit sector of the health care environment, the search for profitability in a financially constrained environment, makes it necessary to apply both internal and external pressures that advocate for good patient care.

But ensuring better participatory systems and therefore relying on less individual decision making judgment means that we must become aware of the dynamics of group decision making and the forces that can affect those kinds of decisions. This means understanding the mechanisms of group polarization, social loafing, conformity, and groupthink.

## **Group Decision Making**

When participatory schemes result in groups making decisions rather than individuals, things do not necessarily get easier, but the forces at work may be different. One theme that runs through much of the research on group decision making is that basic processes in groups can lead to both good and poor performance. Apparently the same processes that can produce poor individual performance can also produce poor group performance [116].

The classic studies of social influence were done by Solomon Asch half a century ago. Asch showed that when a person's private judgment was unlike the judgments expressed by other people, the person would abandon his own judgment, even when his judgment was correct. However, this influence could be attenuated by even one other person who sided with the person. With just that much support, the person could stick to his own position.

Social loafing occurs when someone in a group takes the opportunity to "free-ride" on other group members' efforts and is unwilling to do the work that other people in the group are doing. This effect appears to be stronger in people who are strongly individualistic or who see themselves as

better than other people. The effect is minimized by strong group cohesion or anticipated punishment for poor performance, while the effect is strengthened when the cost of task performance to the social loafer is increased and when conditions in some way reduce the individual's sense of responsibility to the group [116].

Group polarization has been found in hundreds of studies involving over a dozen countries, including the United States, France, Germany, and Afghanistan. In countless cases, like-minded people, after discussions with their peers, tend to end up thinking a more extreme version of what they thought before they started to talk (p.112) [117]. When the majority of a group initially leans toward one position – even when that position is extreme – their consensus tends to influence others in the group that hold a more moderate position and then the whole group moves toward the extreme position [118]. People respond to the arguments made by other people and when a number of people are predisposed in one direction, the entire group will become skewed toward that predisposition. Those who hold a minority position often silence themselves or otherwise have disproportionately little weight in group deliberations. The result can be *hidden profiles* – important information that is not shared within the group. Group members often have information but do not discuss it. The result is to produce inferior decisions [117].

Additionally, people with extreme views tend to have more confidence that they are right and as people gain confidence they become more extreme in their beliefs. By contrast, those who lack confidence and are unsure what they should think tend to moderate their views. The result is that increased confidence can increase extremism as well. This is particularly likely to happen if the person exuding confidence about his point of view also has high status in the group. Other people are likely to keep quiet about their reservations, simply because of their desire not to incur the disfavor of the high status speaker. Indeed, they might silence themselves simply because they do not want to cause internal tension. Seeing their views corroborated and uncontradicted, the first speakers then becomes even more confident still, and hence more extreme. Groups that are highly bonded through affectional ties may be particularly susceptible to polarization because the tendencies are so strong to agree with each other. All these effects, however, are invisible to the participants, so as other people continue to reinforce the extreme position, confidence grows based on further agreement, not necessarily because evidence has actually been presented that supports the conclusions that are being reached.

Over time, group polarization can have very detrimental effects on an organization because those with more moderate opinions stop contributing or leave the group altogether and as a result, extreme positions may come to dominate the organizational climate.

It is interesting to consider the influence of biological psychiatry in this light. Faced with the profound uncertainties of human existence and the complex social realities that have such an impact on our patient's lives, how comforting it is to be utterly confident about the function of neurotransmitters and the drugs designed to affect them. How easy it is to become contemptuous of those who minimize or even question the utility of such treatments. Did the virtual takeover of psychiatry by biological psychiatrists and the accompanying displacement of most psychodynamically-oriented psychiatrists have everything to do with "truth" and "best practices"? Or could it be a recent example of group polarization in mental health practice?

## **Decision Making Under Stress**

Under stress, individual performance changes and all of these group processes will be exacerbated. Stress tends to increase performance quantity while decreasing quality. Attention becomes narrowed to include only the most vital task features. Information processing becomes simplified [116]. Under stressful conditions, decision makers are likely to experience what has been termed *decisional conflict* referring to the simultaneous tendencies within a person to accept and to reject a given course of action. Prominent signs of this are hesitation, vacillation, feelings of uncertainty, and signs of psychological distress [119]. All of these are threats to self-esteem and threaten the aura associated with leaders and the centralization of authority that typically occur in a group under stress. As a result, decision makers are likely to display premature closure by terminating a decisional dilemma without generating all the possible alternatives and consequences of the decision. To add to the problem, under stress the cognitive function of decision makers is not likely to be at its best but instead is typified by a narrowing of focus, attention only to threat, and increasing cognitive rigidity. These deficiencies result in a premature narrowing of alternatives, overlooking long-

term consequences, inefficient searching for information, erroneous assessment of expected outcomes, and oversimplified decision rules that fail to take account of the full range of values implied by the choice being made [68]. In this way the gap between effective decision making and impaired decision making is likely to widen.

If we look at how groups respond to stress, groups adapt to stress at first and the increase in stress may actually increase performance. But then as stress increases, group performance begins to degrade as has individual performance [116]. Stressful group work conditions tend to increase the “need for closure” – the desire for definite, nonambiguous solutions – within the group. Groups under stress exhibit a strong desire for uniformity of opinion or preference and are likely therefore to exert influence on anyone who diverges from this uniformity of opinion. Pressures to conform to the will of the most powerful and persuasive members of the group intensify. As a result, stress tends to result in a “closing of the group mind” described as an aversion to unpopular options, an acceptance of authoritarian leadership and existing groups norms [116].

As a result of these pronounced tendencies under stress, one organizational consultant has emphasized that “*given the tendency for communication among equals to turn hierarchical under stress, it would appear necessary that those at the top of the hierarchy explicitly legitimate and model equal participation if they are to override the salience of hierarchy*” (p. 142) [88].

In organizations, as systemic stress increases and authority becomes more centralized, organizational decision making processes are likely to change as well. We like to believe that important decisions are made rationally and unemotionally – and under normal conditions this may indeed be the case. But under stressful conditions, emotions are likely to play a much more important role in a decision making process that may already be compromised by inadequate access to all needed information. Stressful conditions do not just originate from actual life threat – particularly within organizations. Instead, stress is generated by feared losses, worrying about unknown consequences that may negatively impact on the work environment, concern about self-esteem, and conflicting values.

## **The Importance of Dissent**

Given the pressures within a group that may push for conformity it may take a great deal of courage to dissent, but given these same pressures, it is vital that individuals use their own perceptions when they see something they believe to be problematic within an organization. Dissent can be defined as expressing disagreement or giving voice to contradictory opinions about organizational practices and policies [120]. Dissent can be triggered by a number of circumstances, but research has shown that the most common dissenting accounts were related to perceived unjust treatment, organizational change and the implementation of those changes, decision making, inefficient work practices and processes, roles and responsibilities, use and availability of resources, unethical practices, performance evaluations, and dangerous circumstances involving self, co-workers or clients [121]

Investigators looking at the process of dissent in the workplace have pointed out a number of existing variables that determine what is meant by dissent and what conditions promote or discourage someone from expressing their dissenting voice. Employees express dissent in response to individual, relational, group and organization influences and decide to voice their opinions after considering how they will be perceived by other people and whether or not there is likely to be retaliation for expressing contrary opinions [120].

There are a variety of ways in which people voice their dissent within the workplace. *Articulated dissent* occurs when employees believe they will be perceived as constructive and that there will not be any retaliation for voicing their opinions. It involves expressing dissent within organizations to audiences that can effectively influence organizational policy or positions. Articulated dissent involves expressing dissent directly and openly to management.

*Antagonistic dissent* occurs when employees believe they will be perceived as adversarial but also feel they have some safeguard against retaliation. For reasons like seniority, expertise, family relationships, or personal friendships, antagonistic dissenters believe they have a degree of immunity against retaliation. They tend to dissent primarily about issues that have some personal advantage for them and they express this dissent to someone they think has the means to influence their concerns in their favor.

*Displaced dissent* entails disagreeing without directly or confronting or challenging anyone in a position of authority. Instead, dissenters voice their opinions to either external audiences such as family, neighbors, friends, or strangers or to internal audiences, like co-workers who have no power to really do anything. This variety of dissent tends to occur when employees believe that their opinions will be viewed as adversarial and are likely to lead to retaliation [120].

Creating environments that support direct and open dissent are important for a number of reasons. Worker satisfaction is increased when employees feel they can freely voice their opinions and be heard. Participation appears to increase satisfaction and commitment. Workers sense whether dissent is acceptable in the organizational culture and then determine their reactions based on their perceptions [120, 122]. But most importantly perhaps, dissent serves as corrective feedback within an organization that can avert disaster. But to be useful it must be direct, and therefore the conditions that promote dissent within an organizational culture must be conducive to free speech without retaliation.

## **Silencing of Dissent**

As useful as dissent is, it has rarely been welcomed in the workplace. There is empirical data that employees often feel compelled to remain silent in the face of concerns or problems – a phenomenon that has been termed *organizational silence* [123]. In one study that interviewed employees from 22 organizations throughout the U.S., 70% indicated that they felt afraid to speak up about issues or problems that they encountered at work. The “undiscussables” covered a wide range of areas including decision-making, procedures, managerial incompetence, pay inequity, organizational inefficiencies, and poor organizational performance [14].

The silencing of dissent is arguably even less welcome in environments characterized by chronic stress. One investigator who characterized organizational expression as “*an enduring problem of fundamental tension between the individual and the collective*” (p. 127), noted that such tension tends to be resolved in favor of organizational interests [124].

For managers, particularly under stressful conditions, dissent may be seen as a threat to unified action. As a result escalating control measures are used to repress any dissent that is felt to be dangerous to the unity of what has become focused organizational purpose, seemingly connected to survival threats. This encourages a narrowing of input from the world outside the organization. It also encourages the development of split-off and rivalrous dissenting subgroups within the organization who may passively-aggressively, or openly subvert organizational goals. As group cohesion begins to wane, leaders may experience the relaxing of control measure as a threat to organizational purpose and safety. They may therefore attempt to mobilize increasing projection onto a designated external enemy who serves a useful purpose in activating increased group cohesion while actively suppressing dissent internally. But the suppression of the dissenting minority voice has negative consequences. As dissent is silenced, vital information flow is impeded. As a result the quality of problem analysis and decision making deteriorates further. If this cycle is not stopped and the organization allowed opportunity to recuperate, the result may be an organization that becomes as rigid, repetitious and ultimately destructive and even suicidal as do so many chronically stressed individuals [66].

---

## ***Interpersonal Conflict and Impoverished Relationships***

---

Conflict in the workplace can be, as one author put it, “*good, bad or ugly*” and in part, good or bad or ugly will be determined by the impact of stress [227]. Under conditions of acute stress, conflicts will be submerged as individuals, groups, and the organization as a whole struggle to cope with the emergency, rallying strong group pressures to produce unified group action. But under conditions of chronic and repetitive stress, old conflicts are likely to emerge again – with a vengeance – and new conflicts are likely to develop as time constraints make it difficult for the normal mechanisms of conflict management to be utilized. In this section we will look at the nature of conflict, the different kinds of conflict, the relationship between conflict and emotional intelligence, the impact of conflict, and what happens to conflict under the impact of chronic stress.

The mental health and social service literature is notable for its apparent lack of interest in the issue of conflict management in our workplace settings, though perhaps no other settings could be more prone to conflict, nor could successful conflict management be more important, since conflict is at the heart of emotional and relational difficulties. And yet, as one social worker in a children’s residential treatment program pointed out, “*how can we possibly expect the children to resolve their conflicts when we cannot resolve the conflicts among us – and they see that every day*”. The ways in which staff conflict affect service delivery are rarely mentioned, nor do most programs appear to have formal conflict management strategies that work consistently and effectively among and between various components of the organizations. So it is necessary, once again, to turn to the business literature to find a framework for understanding the issue of workplace conflict. In this section we will look at the nature of conflict, the different kinds of conflict, the relationship between conflict and emotional intelligence, the impact of conflict, and what happens to conflicting parties under the impact of chronic stress.

### **The Nature of Conflict**

Conflict or disagreement is characterized by discord of action, feeling, or effect. A simple way of understanding conflict is that it arises when two or more individuals view a situation from different frames of reference and demand mutually exclusive outcomes [228]. Another simple definition is that conflict is a process in which one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party [229]. For many people the word conflict immediately generates a ‘mental collision’ a perception that a quarrel, a fight, or a battle, a competition or struggle is occurring. Under these circumstances, people’s reaction to this conflict usually reflects their feelings of stress and creates both cognitive and physiological effects [230].

Because conflict is always with us, conflict has been a topic of enormous interest in the world of business and finance. Conflict, of course, is the bedrock of all forms of therapy, and yet relatively little has been written about conflict and conflict management in the mental health system itself. This is despite the fact that virtually every mental health and social service setting is rife with conflict because we are human beings and human beings engage in conflict routinely, and because there are fundamental aspects of these settings that breed conflict: differences in personality traits, race, age, gender, ethnicity – the various forms of diversity that affect every setting - but also differences in professional background, ideological framework, values, goals, and basic underlying beliefs about the clients and the role staff members are to play in the clients’ lives. These sources of conflict – largely unexamined – have always been with us but have been exacerbated by the influence of the enormous changes that have impacted all of our caregiving systems.

Workers in the field of conflict management have identified the potentials for conflicts that exist in five different levels when teams are working together: 1) individual group members; 2) content of the issue; 3) interaction or psychosocial level; 4) method level; 5) external relations level [231].

At the level of the individual group members, people experience a variety of intrapsychological tensions and conflicts and are likely to express them within interpersonal work contexts. These tensions, colored by an individual’s past experiences, beliefs, and values, may alter the person’s perceptions, feelings, and behavior. The Adverse Childhood Experiences Study and a growing body of

research indicate that regardless of the setting, a majority of workers within that setting are likely to have experienced childhood adversity themselves [see earlier discussion of Adverse Childhood Experiences Study]. Unlike other less emotionally stimulating workplaces, mental health and social service settings are likely to trigger whatever unresolved memories or emotions are leftover from the workers' past lives and may lead to a variety of interpersonal conflicts with clients, their families, other staff members, and management. These effects are likely to be particularly potent whenever someone's safety is jeopardized. The more unsafe the treatment or service delivery environment is, the more likely that these intrapsychic and individual conflicts will play themselves out in the environment - with detrimental results.

Conflict over the content of task-related issues can be very useful, but emotion inevitably accompanies conflict and the "heat" of a conflict over issues can spill over into interpersonal conflict rather easily. Without good conflict management skills in the group, task-related conflict can lead to misunderstanding, miscommunication, and increased team dysfunction.

In many teams that have been working together for some time, roles are clearly delineated: one person is the arguer, one person is the creative one, and another individual is passive, while still another tries to settle disputes. Psychosocial conflict arises when a group member feels pressure from the group to assume a role which they do not want or for which they do not feel prepared or when the group constrains someone from changing their assigned role when they wish to do so. In many mental health settings, role is determined by professional training and the rather rigid hierarchy so typical of the medical model. Psychosocial conflicts may arise when changes are suggested that encourage greater participation in decision making of staff members who are lower in the command hierarchy, and especially when structures are created that encourage more participation of clients.

Methods chosen for decision making, problem solving, and simply getting work done may also be the cause of conflict. The more complexly interdependent a system is, the more likely it is that a change in one area will produce reverberating changes throughout the system - and change creates conflict. Leaders - pressured by time and demands for decisions from above - may use methods of problem solving that are not participatory, even though their decision may be the right decision to make and the one that would have come from a participatory process anyhow. But the method chosen - autocratic decision making - may end up creating more conflict - and therefore more problems, than a more participatory process would have created.

And then, always, there is the issue of conflict between one component of a system, like a team, and other teams or components within the organization and conflicts between the organization-as-a-whole and other components of the wider system. It is not unusual in institutional settings to have conflicts between different shifts and different professional groups. And there are usually conflicts between institutions, state regulatory agencies, and funding sources.

But these very rational definitions of conflict leave out the most troubling aspect of all conflict situations - distressing emotions. To be in conflict is to be emotionally activated. In fact, human conflict does not exist in the absence of emotions and dealing successfully with conflict requires the development of both individual and organizational emotional intelligence [232].

## **Conflict , Emotional Intelligence and Collective Disturbance**

Conflict evokes emotion and conflict in the workplace has largely been seen as bad or dysfunctional, an interference with the smooth running of any operation, similar to the ways in which emotions at work have tended to be downplayed, considered irrational and counterproductive. To be in conflict is to be in an emotionally charged situation. There probably is no such thing as a purely intellectual conflict. Human emotions and thought are too hard-wired together. Effectively managing conflict in the workplace requires the development of emotional intelligence in individuals within the organization and in the organization-as-a-whole.

Emotional intelligence has been defined as *"the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotions; to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotions and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth"* [233]. Later this definition was amended as *"an ability to recognize the meanings of emotions and their relationships, and to reason and problem-solve on the basis of them. Emotional intelligence is involved in the capacity to perceive emotions, assimilate emotion-related feelings, understand the information of those emotions, and manage them"* (p. 267) [234]. In

research findings, emotional intelligence has been associated with: success at work, career advancement, superior leadership behavior, effective team leadership and team performance, better physical and psychological well-being, higher in-role job performance. The dimensions of emotional intelligence most related to the workplace environment have been defined as four clusters of social competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and social skills [235]. All of these competencies can be seen as necessary for good conflict resolution skills.

When people or groups are in conflict, it is never a purely intellectual affair. Our cognitive processes are always being affected by our emotions and when we are in conflict situations, levels of emotional arousal rise significantly for a variety of reasons, some of which are individual and some of which – like emotional contagion- are a product of the group [151]. When conflicts are resolved in a group, the emotion of the group converges. Hope appears to be associated with positive emotions in a group, and likewise, hope is one of the key factors in psychotherapeutic healing [5]. Groups higher in positive emotions will be associated with higher performance on tasks, although this effect seems to work best when groups periodically experience negative emotions that then must be converted into more positive emotions. Fear in a group appears to be associated with negative emotions and in terms of task performance, there is empirical evidence that at least some fear is an essential ingredient, while high levels of fear leads to impaired decision-making.[236].

So, emotion and conflict go hand-in-hand and are complexly interrelated. Emotional arousal can cause conflict, can be the product of conflict, can result from the resolution of conflict [236]. In fact, emotional arousal is what keeps conflicts in play, and it is conflict that propels change. Research has shown that the higher the level of emotional intelligence, the better able employees can manage stress and the higher their organizational commitment [237].

The level of emotional intelligence in an organization is likely to determine how rapidly and effectively a group manages a common but largely unconscious phenomenon known as “collective disturbance”. In sociological studies of the mental hospital and the democratic therapeutic community dating back to the 1950’s, it became clear to researchers that individual patients who became the focus of attention on a psychiatric unit were those who were the subject of unexpressed staff conflict and that as soon as the staff conflict was surfaced, the individual patients’ behavior improved. Similarly, collective disturbances involving several patients or an entire unit could be traced to conflicts originating near the top of the institutional hierarchy and the intensity of emotional interpersonal conflict could be followed down through the staff and into the patient community. These originating conflicts usually seemed to revolve around disagreements between the priorities of institutional purposes or incompatibility between a given purpose and some institutional need. The signs of an impending collective crisis were abundant: errors in technique, doors left unlocked, messages forgotten, increased absenteeism frequently due to functional illness, staff preoccupation with problems of or with other staff, increased withdrawal by key staff members, increased sense of helplessness, breakdown in communication, missing or canceling meetings, inability to make decisions and finally, a sense that “something bad is going to happen”. If the evolving crisis was not attended to and resolved, violence on the part of several, although not all, patients would be the result [238, 239]. If the managers and staff members were able to confront their own unspoken conflicts they could prevent or at least terminate a collective disturbance and in doing so, reduce the level of violence within the therapeutic community.

### **Different Kinds of Conflict**

If organizations are viewed as machines, then conflict is viewed as an evil that must be eliminated because it creates disorder in an otherwise supposedly orderly world. When this kind of philosophical position is in play, conflict is viewed as a problem of poor design or inadequate structure that must be corrected through more elaborate job descriptions, or greater exercise of authority, or through the active suppression of or passive avoidance of conflict. But organizations that must respond creatively to complex problems and that must change rapidly to accommodate changing circumstances must have the ability to successfully manage and even promote conflict or they will stagnate. Conflict creates opportunities for organizational and individual learning and must be harnessed in service of the collective goals. But not all conflict is the same [227].

Research evidence indicates that emotional conflict – also known as relationship conflict, social-emotional conflicts or affect conflict - impedes group performance by limiting the ability of

individuals and groups to process information and to think well [240-243]. It also diminishes group loyalty, team commitment, intent to stay at the organization, and job satisfaction because of escalation in levels of stress and anxiety [211, 240-242, 244]. High levels of personal conflict are associated with bad performance – if people are fighting because of personal animus they are less likely to accomplish their tasks. There is another lesson from the empirical literature: that group members should neither like each other too much, if too much liking squelches dissent, and they should not like each other too little, if too little liking creates personal tension [212]. As one researcher states it, *“relationship conflicts interfere with task-related effort because members focus on reducing threats, increasing power, and attempting to build cohesion rather than working on task.... The conflict causes members to be negative, irritable, suspicious, and resentful (pp.531-532) [244].* The bottom line is that if people in a group do not like each other and spend their time in personal conflict, the group as a whole will perform badly.

High levels of personal conflict are associated with bad performance; if people are fighting because of personal animus, they are less likely to accomplish their tasks. Conflict over process is generally harmful as well – a finding that makes sense in light of the risk that if people argue over process, they will spend less time doing what they are supposed to do [245].

Substantive conflict also known as task-related conflicted happens when two or more organizational members disagree on their task, or disagree on the recognition and solution to a particular problem. Research indicates that a moderate level of substantive conflict is good for an organization or a team because it stimulates discussion and debate and urges a group on to a higher level of performance [211, 246]. Groups that report task-oriented conflict generally have higher performance because there is more likely to be the sharing of various viewpoints and alternative solutions [241, 242, 246-248]. This is particularly true for groups performing tasks that were not routine and that required complex problem-solutions. Groups that report substantive conflict are also able to make better decisions than those that do not because substantive conflict encourages greater understanding of the issues and that leads to better decisions [240, 249-252].

When the underlying tasks are complex and call for a degree of creativity, dissenting views and a measure of conflict about how to perform those tasks lead to better outcomes [241, 242]. For effective performance of given tasks, diversity of information appears to be the crucial variable [242]. Jehn found that if group members impose pressure toward agreement, they will *“squelch the creativity needed to complete nonroutine tasks effectively, because members will focus on building consensus rather than entertaining new ideas”* (p. 260) [241]. Diversity can operate along many different dimensions. – geography, race, age, gender, ethnicity, values, information [212]

Groups that report substantive task-related conflict are also able to make better decisions than those that do not because substantive conflict encourages greater understanding of the issues and that leads to better decisions [240, 249-252]. Groups perform well if they allow open discussion and hence foster conflict about the substance of the task. New insights often result from the exchange of perspectives within groups [253].

Sharing values in a group matters as well because although diversity about opinions enhances outcome, diversity about basic values can produce unproductive conflicts. For a team to have high morale (higher satisfaction, intent to remain, and commitment), or to perceive itself as effective, it should be composed of participants with shared values [242]. Jehn summarizes her findings this way *“For a team to be effective, members should have high information diversity and low value diversity. For a team to be efficient members should have low value diversity. For a team to have high morale (higher satisfaction, intent to remain, and commitment) or to perceive itself as effective, it should be composed of participants with low value diversity”.* (p. 758) [245].

It appears that the story of Goldilocks and the Three Bears most suits the issue of substantive conflict because there is an amount of organizational conflict that is “just right” – not too much and not too little, as long as it is of the right kind of conflict. The inherent difficulty is that the two dimensions of conflict – emotional/interpersonal and substantive or task-related – are positively correlated. When substantive conflicts increase, emotional conflict is likely to increase as well [254].

Organizational conflict – or defensive routines as Argyris calls it – consists of procedures, policies, practices, and actions that prevent employees from having to experience embarrassment or threat. This *“makes it highly likely that individuals, groups, intergroups, and organizations will not detect and correct errors that are embarrassing and threatening because the fundamental rules are 1) bypass the errors and act as if they were not being done, 2) make the bypass undiscussable, 3) make its undiscussability undiscussable (p.43) [211, 255].*

## **Conflict Management Under Stress**

Conflict management strategies must meet some important criteria: 1) they must be designed to enhance organizational learning by enhancing critical and innovative thinking. This involves proper diagnosis and intervention of the correct problem; 2) they must be designed to satisfy the needs and expectations of all of the stakeholders while achieving a balance among them – and this involves figuring out who all the stakeholders are and solving the right problem; and 3) they must involve ethical decision making [211]. As one organizational consultant has remarked, *“if we can’t define a problem so that it leads to ethical actions that benefit humankind, then either we haven’t defined or are currently unable to define the problem properly”* (p. 148) [257].

To meet these criteria effectively conflict management cannot simply focus on individual conflict but must look to the ways in which conflict is – or is not – managed within the organizational culture. A successful strategy must minimize emotional conflicts at various levels within the organization, while promoting a moderate level of substantive, task-related conflict. It should also teach people to use different kinds of conflict management styles to fit varying circumstances.

Many of the existing conflict resolution strategies such as dispute resolution, negotiation and bargaining, mediation and arbitration can be very useful in minimizing emotional conflict but they do not necessitate significant change in the organization. Finding and maintaining the right level of task-related conflict, however, is likely to require shifts in fundamental organizational approaches toward double-loop kinds of learning (see below) [211].

When stress is acute - as when an organizational crisis occurs – interpersonal conflict is likely to be submerged in the interests of the group. Human beings tend to “circle the wagons” under conditions of acute stress and mobilize powerful group forces to deal with the crisis. Individual and group conflict and competitive strivings that normally exist between people are always a threat to rapid, unified action during a crisis. Efforts must be made to minimize the normal tensions, conflicts and aggressive behaviors that inevitably arise in any group. Leadership emerges within the group and frequently, an external enemy is targeted that helps to mobilize in-group bonds. The external enemy becomes the object upon whom the group can project all its own negative emotions and desires in service of group cohesion. Blame for the crisis is sought, and the search commences for an external enemy or scapegoat who will shoulder this blame. The more externalized the blame can be, the more the blaming behavior will increase group cohesion as internal conflict is projected externally. The greater the consistency between this psychosocial need and actual events, the easier it becomes to define friend and foe. The greater the perceived differences between “us” and “them”, the greater the ease in labeling the enemy and doing whatever it takes to defend “us” [102, 103]. Under these circumstances, in mental health settings, there are times when the patient becomes “the enemy”, particularly when the behavior of a patient has resulted in staff injury, or when an individual staff member or the institution itself is threatened with a lawsuit, newspaper exposure, or some other public embarrassment.

Chronic stress has a very different impact on workers. As work related stressors increase, employees develop negative perceptions of their co-workers and the organization as a whole and this may precipitate serious decreases in job performance. Negative interpersonal relationships and the absence of support from colleagues and superiors is a major stressor for many workers. Social support in the form of group cohesion, interpersonal trust, and liking for a supervisor is associated with decreased levels of perceived job strain and better health. On the other hand unsupportive or inconsiderate behavior from a supervisor appears to contribute significantly to job strain [258, 259]. Although the direct effect of social support on stress has been extensively researched, it is only recently that focus has been directed at examining the interaction of social support with a “buffering effect.” which suggests that the relationship between stress and outcomes is dependent upon the amount of social support available. For example, coworker support had a more pervasive buffering effect than did support from either supervisor or from one’s non-work context [260].

Under stress, lacking social support and unable to see the larger system influences that are at work, people become frustrated and angry with their co-workers, supervisors and managers who they can see and as a result interpersonal conflicts increase and this leads to further decreases in collective efficacy [261]. Hierarchical structures concentrate power and in these circumstances, power can easily come to be used abusively and in a way that perpetuates rather than attenuates the concentration of power. Transparency disappears and secrecy increases under this influence.

Communication networks become compromised as those in power become more punishing, and the likelihood of error is increased as a result. In such a situation, conflicts tend to remain unresolved and tension – and resentment – mount under the surface of everyday group functioning. Interpersonal conflicts that were suppressed during the initial crisis return, often with a vengeance, but conflict resolution mechanisms, if ever in place, deteriorate under stress. Helplessness, passivity, and passive-aggressive behaviors on the part of the underlings in the hierarchy increase while leaders become increasingly controlling and punitive. In this way the organization becomes ever more radically split, with different parts of the organization assuming the role of managing and/or expressing different emotions that are then subsequently suppressed [103]. Such conditions as these make an organization ripe for collective disturbance that may go unresolved and unrecognized, while policy changes are made that insure the underlying conflicts will remain out of conscious group awareness.

### **Conflict and Organizational Learning**

Conflict is a necessary component of a learning environment because conflict is a necessary component of learning. Conflict spurs motivation and the desire for change. Organizational development researchers have defined organizational learning as “detection and correction of error” and have described two types – single-loop learning and double-loop learning. [262]. In single loop learning a problem is recognized, diagnosed and addressed without changing the underlying policies, assumptions and goals. In double-loop learning the recognition, diagnosis and intervention requires changes in the underlying policies, assumptions, and goals.

This latter form of learning is what is necessary to address the astonishingly complex problems of adults, children, and families who enter treatment environments and present challenging problems for staff members whose goal it is to help them. Trauma-informed learning is double-loop learning. Mental health and social service workers have to change paradigms of thinking and behaving in order to meet the goals of recovery that trauma-informed change necessitates.

But all too often, this kind of shift in underlying paradigm is inhibited by defensive reasoning on the part of organizational members because they so fear complaints of errors in judgment or incompetence that they will not take the risk of making a mistake and learning from it [211]. As one group of investigators have pointed out,

*“Call it escalation of commitment, organizational defensiveness, learning disability – or even more bluntly – executive blindness. It is a phenomenon of behavior in organizations that has been widely recognized. Organizational members become committed to a pattern of behavior. They escalate their commitment to that pattern out of self-justification. In a desire to avoid embarrassment and threat, few if any challenges are made to the wisdom and viability of these behaviors. They persist even when rapid and fundamental shifts in the competitive environment render these patterns of behavior obsolete and destructive to the well-being of the organization”* (p. 642) [263].

When organizations cannot deal directly with conflict using methods that utilize good conflict management skills, the organization cannot learn from its own mistakes and error is likely to become systemic. Employees are likely to develop escalating negative feelings about the organization that include loss of trust or pride in the organization resulting in diminished dedication and commitment; increase in political or self-protective behavior; contemplated or real job transfers; petty revenge or sabotage; lack of any extra effort; making and hiding mistakes or failing to meet deadlines or budgets; loss of effective problem solving, work on wrong priorities, poor methods; loss of creativity, motivation, and risk taking; negative feelings about oneself, loss of self-esteem, self-criticism; negative emotions of anger, frustration, depression, disappointment, disillusionment and tension; deepening cultures of cynicism (p. 111-116) [46].

---

## ***Disempowerment and Learned Helplessness***

---

Culture is important because it acts as a buffer and supportive system for its members and provides members with a stock of knowledge about the way things work and a set of meanings that makes sense of that work. Collective trauma tests that stock of knowledge and if the organizational culture cannot answer that test of explanation to its members, then the members are left disempowered, helpless, and unable to make sense out of their experience [265]. This is an apt description, applicable to all of the mental health professions who have rallied little organized protest to the devastating impacts of the changes that have occurred, whether those changes have resulted in significantly diminished services to their clients or significantly diminished incomes and job satisfaction for themselves.

### **Learned Helplessness**

Learned helplessness was first defined as a concept in the early 1960's when Overmier and Seligman began doing experiments on the reaction of animals to shock. The basic idea was that a perceived lack of control over one's environment leads to future inaction. Seligman suggested that human beings, born in a state of total helplessness, gradually develop a sense of control as the child learns that his intentions direct his voluntary movements and that he/she also has an impact on the people around him [266]. Under the right circumstances a child comes to believe that his or her actions will predictably affect outcomes and increasingly develops a sense of mastery and self-efficacy.

Studies of learned helplessness in humans have shown that exposure to recurrent unsolvable problems can undermine performance on a subsequent test task. In terms of the original theory, these deficits result from a reduction in a person's expectancy of control. Upon recurrent failure to solve a problem, people may develop the expectation that nothing they do will affect the outcome and may transfer this expectation to other tasks. As a result, they may put less effort into subsequent tasks and consequently show performance deficits. Research has consistently shown that people who attribute failure to internal/ stable/global causes perform worse in a new task than people who make an external/ unstable/specific attribution [269, 270].

Learned helplessness at work has been defined as a debilitating cognitive state in which individuals often possess the skills and abilities necessary to perform their jobs, but exhibit suboptimal or poor performance because they attribute prior failures to causes which they cannot change, even though success may be possible in the current environment [271]. When applied to the mental health system it is possible to see parallels between the helpless responses of the clients and the helpless responses of the staff and managers who serve them. Historically, our systems of care have not focused on empowering clients to make their own decisions but have instead created "expert" cultures within which the client is chronically dependent for help on a medical model that places expertise solely in the hands of caregivers. Helpless passive or passive-aggressive dependency is likely to be the result. Visit many mental health care, health care, or social service environments today and you will see the same behavior mirrored in the staff.

In a controlling, non-participatory environment exercising top-down management, every subsequent lower level of employee is likely to become progressively disempowered. This organizationally-induced helplessness has been described as the antithesis of empowerment [272]. After years, decades, and even generations of controlling management styles, reversing this sense of disempowerment can be extremely difficult, particularly under conditions of chronic, unrelenting organizational stress.

All workers bring to the workplace environment various personal dispositional factors such as optimism or pessimism – seeing the glass as half empty, or half full. The Big Five personality factors that have been shown to positively influence performance include: extroversion, emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience. These factors are likely to influence the way workers do their job and the results they get. Individuals then attribute cause for the outcomes they get. When the cause is obvious, this factor plays less of a role but when the cause is ambiguous, people tend to fall into their own habitual way of explaining bad events that befall them.

Learned helplessness is associated with a style that is stable – happens all the time – and internal – “it’s because there is something wrong with me”[273]. In other research this “external locus of control” – believing that you are a pawn at the mercy of external forces – contrasts with an “internal locus of control” where you believe you are in control of your own behavior [271].

And then there are significant situational factors that may influence performance level. People regularly subjected to role conflict, role overload, and role ambiguity along with a pervasive sense of helplessness may feel prevented from asking for help, getting clarification, and receiving support. Tasks may be ambiguous or poorly defined. Feedback may be nonexistent or be so distant from the actual behavior that it is meaningless. Success may be very difficult to assess and may be only distantly related to day-to-day actions on the part of the worker [273]. In many mental health situations, roles are very ambiguous, particularly for institutional line workers and their tasks are frequently ill-defined. Although they are supposed to help clients “recover”, what this means is unclear, while they are likely to be punished if they fail to “control” the clients. Feedback for the ways in which they convey empathic regard for the clients may be minimal, while feedback for the ways in which they do not make the clients follow the rules may be rapid, punishing and pervasive. And in virtually all mental health and social service environments, there are great distances between what individuals do on a day-to-day basis and long-term outcomes. In this way, providing these services bear a closer similarity to parenting than to most other kinds of jobs.

In an organization, employees may engage in specific behaviors that contribute to organizational helplessness. They may stop striving for high levels of achievement because they harbor a fundamental belief that no matter what they do, they will not make a significant difference. Other people become passive, failing to seek out any new or innovative ways of approaching a problem and resisting anyone else’s suggestions as impossible. Some become passive-aggressive, sticking to the letter of the rules – and doing nothing above and beyond those rules. Many will not make decisions, even when urged to do so because they are afraid of negative consequences [274].

Research has demonstrated that employees of centralized, bureaucratic organizations that rely on formal rules and policies often experience feelings of alienation, frustration and helplessness [275]. Not being able to control work methods, performance evaluations, decision making all contribute to the sense of helplessness within an organization and the less participation an employee has, the more this is likely to be the case. As one investigator stated, “*Aspects of the organizational environment such as traditional appraisal systems, flawed reward systems, poor leadership, counterproductive personnel policies, and inappropriate organizational structure are all said to lead to feelings of helplessness on the part of organizational members. If organizationally induced helplessness results in lowered feelings of performance efficacy, both for new tasks and those currently being performed by these members, strategies to decrease and even reverse these feelings are critical*”(p.408) [276].

Given the argument made in this paper for the critical shortcomings in the mental health and social service system, it is easy to see where the issue of learned helplessness fits in. It is visible everywhere. In the mental health system, the systematic takeover by managed care, the pressures of deinstitutionalization, the desacralization of psychotherapeutic healing, and the increased medicalization of service delivery have represented an uncontrollable series of events to everyone within the system [277]. Individual personality differences notwithstanding, it appears that the system-as-a-whole has responded with an inability to protect itself, suffering blow after blow with little if any protest. The impact on clients, however, has been recognizable. Many mental health organizations promote further helplessness in their workers through fundamental flaws in structure and process and then the staff of these organizations encounters the complex problems presented by their clients as insolvable problems that simply frustrate them further. Helpless to protect themselves, feeling embattled, hopeless and helpless, the staff and management often engage in risky risk avoidance – risk management policies that may virtually prevent therapeutic change.

## **Risky Risk Avoidance**

The notion of risk comes from the French, *risqué* which at the turn of the nineteenth century referred to a wager between individuals taking account of the probability of losses and gains (Beck 1992). In its present usage, risk has been defined as “*the project of a degree of uncertainty about the future on to the external world*” (p.5) [278]. Between 1967 and 1991, the number of articles

published about “risk” went from 1000 article in the first five year period, to 80.000 in the last five year period reviewed, suggesting to the investigator that medical practice specifically, and Western society in general have become preoccupied with minimizing risk, just at a point in time when the risk of so many major threats to human health are lower than at any other point in history. One author calls this a “risk epidemic” and relates it to the growing belief that we can – and should – control all the risks to our safety, to our health, to our existence [279]. Others have pointed out that we live in a “risk society” [280, 281].

This kind of attitude has never existed before and we can attribute it to the combination of discoveries in science and the ability of computers to meet enormous statistical challenges and calculate all kinds of relationship among variables. Unlike our forebears who carried a reasonably fatalistic attitude toward our inevitable demise, a prevalent social attitude – backed up by many legal proceedings – is that people can identify and eliminate risk factors through proper “risk management” and can thereby prevent disease and ..... death [279, 282]. What unfortunately accompanies this notion is the linkage of risk factors with causal hypotheses. And if knowing someone is at risk leads to a supposed cause for a problem that medical professionals are assigned to treat, then failure to control supposedly high-risk situations leads to malpractice claims and rising expectations of health care – and mental health care.

Nowhere is the problem of risk assessment, risk management, and risk avoidance more evident than in the delivery of mental health services. To assess risk it is necessary to classify risk – and in mental health this means classifying people into various forms of mental disturbance. This would not be so problematic if, as in pneumonia or heart disease, we were able to take a blood test or a radiology study of some sort, and scientifically diagnose a problem. But psychiatry is not a science based on data but on the subjective determination of more-or-less skilled and experienced clinicians. As pointed out by the author of the Study Guide to DSM-IV, *“the diagnoses in DSM-IV are like ready-made suits that come in a variety of standard styles and sizes. They fit many patients well, others adequately, and some barely at all. The clinician’s task, like the clothier’s, is to fit individuals with specific characteristics into standard, predefined categories...The art of diagnosis depends on the clinician’s ability to find and fix the patient into the appropriate diagnostic category even if he or she has atypical signs and symptoms* (p.175-176 quoting Fauman, 1994) [283].

A significant problem with this approach is that the diagnostic label defines reality – even when the person does not actually fit the label very well at all. Although mental illness has and still does exist, each new version of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual has expanded the number of categories that are considered to be mental disorders until virtually everyone could be seen as having some symptoms typical of some disorder that may or may not be causing some form of debilitation. Given that every kind of behavior can fit into this nosology, individual choice is largely superseded by a definition of medical disorder and since mental health professionals are presumed to be expert at providing the remedy for the mental versions of medical disorders, then mental health professionals become responsible for preventing the problems related to – or caused by – the individuals bearing these diagnoses. And if problems still occur, even though these diagnosed individuals are under the care of medical experts, then the medical experts can be held responsible for the failures in “treatment”.

This becomes a particularly pressing issue when people in certain kinds of diagnostic categories do harm to themselves or harm to others. Relatively few mental health professionals will quibble over the responsibility they carry when treating someone who is acutely psychotic, manic, or psychotically depressed. But what about the “liminal” disorders – the people who carry diagnoses of personality disorders? [284]. Sometimes recognized as “sick”, other times as “bad”, these patients are notoriously at high-risk for harmful and destructive behavior and yet they are generally considered to be neither legally insane nor incompetent. Nonetheless, a significant amount of time, resources and energy in all mental health practices is spent on trying to figure out how to assess and manage the risks these individuals pose because the ever-present danger is that they will act destructively in some way and that the mental health professional and his or her system will be held liable for the patient’s conduct.

Several investigators reviewing the issue of risk management have noted that the behavior generally focused upon as risky is selective and narrow. Never is there a thorough investigation of the risks to the patient of risk management or of the risk to the clinician of not resorting to the DSM-IV diagnostic system [283]. In reality, an over-emphasis on risk management is likely to lead to “treatment” environments within which real treatment is impossible because the possibility for the

individual actually taking risks and thereby engaging in the process of change is so minimized that stagnation occurs. And it is impossible – unless there is some source of private funding – to even enter the systems of care without having a diagnosis. And relatively little attention is paid to the risk of using psychotropic medications in spite of a large body of evidence supporting the established dangers of many of these medications [285].

In many settings, the confusion is profound and frequently results in restrictive, controlling mental health settings that at times may minimize the risk of some forms of danger but also minimize the possibility that anything will change. The underlying mental model that holds up the mental health system is a fundamental part of the problem. As long as troubled and troubling people are either “sick” or “bad” (or both), the definitions of what constitutes sickness and the legal wrangling surrounding these definitions will inevitably continue. A model that views most psychological dysfunction as a sign of “injury” can lead to very different premises upon which to make sounder judgments [3]. Regardless of how divergent their point of view, injured people – as long as their basic cognitive functions are intact – are seen as having agency and as individuals who are responsible for their own choices. Risky risk avoidance happens when mental health organizations become so risk avoidant that they inhibit therapeutic change and instead insist on trying to “control behavior”. The only way we can control someone else’s behavior is to completely restrict their freedom and when we do that we also eliminate their capacity to make the choice to change.

---

### ***Increased Aggression***

---

Punishment has been defined as the presentation of an aversive event or the removal of a positive event following a response which decreases the frequency of that response [286]. Although failures to perform and other disciplinary problems are common occurrences in the workplace, the typical response to such problems is instituting some kind of punitive measures. This is particularly likely to occur as institutional stress increases, workload intensifies, employee frustration rises, interpersonal conflict escalates, and leaders become more desperate to achieve rapid and positive responses to a changing environment. As one investigator summed it up, “*decreased worker performance led to increased punitive and autocratic leader behavior*”, p.135 [287]

Stressful times are difficult for employees and as interpersonal conflict increases, it is likely that workers will express their anger, frustration and resentment in a variety of ways that have a negative effect on work performance. When changes are rapid, there is likely to be a clear statement of new principles. But when change is gradual and slow – as has been the case in the human service sector – there may be no real clarity of intention and managers adjust to the changes by interpreting the changes individually and idiosyncratically. Frequently, bureaucracy is substituted for participatory agreement on necessary changes, and the more an organization grows in size and complexity, the more likely this is to happen [288]. Research has demonstrated that the lower performance gets, the more punitive leaders become and that very possibly just when leaders need to be instituting positive reinforcing behaviors to promote positive change, they instead become increasingly punitive [287]. But is punishment effective?

In studies that look at the impact of punishment there appear to be key variables that determine the effectiveness of punishment. The first is timing. An aversive stimulus can be introduced at different times – while the negative behavior is occurring, immediately after the behavior, or some time after the behavior. According to the research, the sooner the aversive event is delivered the more likely it is to be effective [289]. This is one significant contributor to why punishment usually fails to be very effective in most organizational contexts and certainly in those related to social services – rarely does the problematic behavior and the consequences of that behavior occur close together in time. Because of other factors that are likely to be in play – in-group loyalty, distrust of supervisors, distrust of the system, bureaucratic inefficiency – there are likely to be protracted time periods between infractions and response. By the time the employee actually experiences the punishment, so much time has elapsed that he or she is likely to perceive the response as unfair and even abusive instead of an appropriate and even helpful corrective response.

Another fairly well-demonstrated proposition is that moderate levels of punishment are more effective than low or high intensity levels [289] [289]. But how do we define low, medium, and high

intensity? This is likely to be individually variable and if the match between person and punishment is not correct, it is likely to lead to adverse outcomes rather than a change in positive behavior.

Another variable is the relationship to the punishing agent and this reflects research taken directly from work with children. Warm and affectionate parents achieve greater effectiveness with punishment than cold and unaffectionate parents but it is unclear whether this is a result of the punishment or the withdrawal of affection. The implication for organizations is that punishment is likely to be most effective when administered by warm and friendly supervisors [289].

The effects of punishment also depend on the schedule of punishment. In laboratory experiments, punishment is most effective if administered on a continuous schedule after each negative behavior. In at least one study, absenteeism decreased when employees received punishment every time they were absent compared to those who received punishment for the same behavior intermittently. To be effective in administering punishments, managers must be consistent over time, punishing the same behavior each time it occurs; consistent across employees; and every manager must be consistent with every other manager. But this demand for consistency may interfere with the individual reasons for problematic behavior and if a manager always must be viewed by others as both fair and equitable, an individual approach must be entirely eliminated [289]. These demands for consistency are virtually impossible across a large, complex, frequently under-staffed and poorly funded organization.

The effects of punishment – at least on children – are improved when children are offered clear, unambiguous reasons explaining why the punishment occurred and what the future consequences will be if it recurs. This kind of reasoning may make late-timed punishment and low-intensity punishments more effective than they would otherwise be. Effectiveness of punishments are also greatly enhanced when there are clear alternative responses that are available to people [289].

There is another key recognition that must be taken into account, particularly when we focus on punishment within the context of a caregiving organization. The rate of exposure to adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) is likely to be extremely high within these settings – in the clients and in the staff. As mentioned previously in the discussion of the ACE's Study, as far as we know now, only a third of adults – at best – have an ACEs score of 0. This being the case, we can assume that many workers in the human services will have been victimized at some point in their own lives and are likely to get triggered by the reenactments of the children or adults who enter their treatment environments. They are vulnerable to becoming drawn into reenactment scenarios with the clients and with each other that may lead to the breakdown of discipline and a wide variety of behavioral problems.

Knowing this changes the responsibility of the supervisory system and the organization as a whole. How can we expect to see change in our clients if we remain as resistant to change as they frequently are? How can treatment be successful if we continue to unwittingly reenact our own early childhood scarring experiences through our own negative behavior punitive responses toward them? People who have been unfairly treated and punished as children are likely to respond to punishment in the present as further evidence of a fundamental injustice that they have been exposed to since childhood, while at the same time setting themselves up to be punished over and over again. For them, untimely, harsh, non-relational punitive systems are likely to be further damaging.

Manager's perceptions of their fair punishment practices have been shown to be associated with their belief that the subordinate knew that the behavior was wrong and expected to be punished [286]. But managers hold a variety of beliefs about their employees and may attribute far more conscious awareness about the wrongness of the behavior than is warranted. This is particularly true when supervisors have far more professional training than the people they supervise. It is difficult to imaginatively go back in time and remember what we once did *not* know. Supervisors may mistake ignorance for a conscious and deliberate decision to engage in wrongful behavior.

Additionally, employees who through their misbehavior are reenacting some earlier and largely unconscious conflict are unlikely to be able to describe the role this played in their behavior which is likely to be compulsive in nature. But even so they may still respond quite negatively to what is internally experienced as an unfair response that they do not really understand. They may be unable to take full responsibility for their actions simply because they do not truly have control over their own behavior. For them, the early experiences of injustice may have been fundamentally traumatizing, and further experiences with perceived injustice may compound existing problems and lead to even more aggression. This is particularly likely to happen when managers' punishment decisions are based not on constructive, forward-looking dialogue with the problematic employee but instead is motivated by a desire to "make an example" of him or her. When this is happening, it is likely that the same staff

members are then reenacting these punishing scenarios with the clients who may have very similar backgrounds.

The ideas that most people have about punishment originate in their early experiences of childhood and the definitions that parents give to children. There is a frequent confounding of notions of punishment – sometimes applying to the idea of achieving justice and retribution which is a “past orientation”, and at other times being applied instrumentally as a way of changing or modifying behavior which is a “future orientation” [289]. In the laboratory these two fundamental ideas about punishment may be easy to separate. In the practical application of punishment in the complex situation that defines an organization, these two concepts may easily appear simultaneously and interactively. Since “getting even” is likely to produce unethical behavior in the workplace, while aiming at changing behavior may have no untoward ethical implications, when they are intertwined the result is likely to produce negative consequences. These are particularly problematic scenarios for organizations that treat troubled children or adults because the ways in which organizations respond to employees may mirror the damage originally done to the clients and by doing so set up parallel processes that create toxic environments within which healing cannot take place.

Managers may have other reasons for punishing an individual besides trying to actually bring about a change in the behavior within that person. They may be very concerned about the other employees in the environment and use the punishment as an example setting experience to reinforce behavioral standards, making an example of the violator, and thus maintaining that the organization is a place where people “get what they deserve”. Effective disciplinary action can, in fact, result in important learning for everyone in the organization but managers do not always think about whether the employees are learning what they want them to learn, no more than the employees consider whether the children or adults in their care are learning what they want them to be learning. If the employees see punishment administered unfairly, inappropriately severely, non-contingently, without cause, in an untimely way, with a disregard for privacy or constructive suggestions for improvement they are likely to see the manager involved, and the system as a whole, as unfair and untrustworthy [286]. Such an environment promotes secret-keeping, cliques, and mutual protectiveness and as a result, conduct can go wildly wrong before management even is aware of the problem.

Studies over many years have demonstrated that leader reward behavior generally correlated positively with performance in employees. In fact, the relationship between reward behavior and subordinate performance is much stronger than the relationship between punitive behavior and performance [287]. In one series of studies, punitive behavior had no correlation with performance for professional and technical groups and in administrative and service groups, punishment was *inversely* correlated with performance [287]. In many other studies, punitive behavior on the part of supervisors was associated with lower productivity, higher turnover, and aggressive feelings on the part of employees [290].

Disciplinary actions taken to correct workplace problems are frequently operationalized long after the events have actually taken place, do not necessarily take into account individual differences that could account for the failures in discipline, are vulnerable to the exercise of favoritism by managers, and are often viewed as unfair and capriciously applied by workers. As the psychological distance grows between an employee and management, arbitrary punishments are likely to emerge to cope with workplace problems. Many of these interventions designed to punish the employee often compound the problem by seeming to punish innocent people – if an employee is suspended, demoted, or fired the result is more work for everyone else.

It has been demonstrated that in the workplace, punishment of infractions only works under certain conditions. As one early investigator put it, *“Experience indicates that even severe punishment achieves nothing to redirect behavior into more desirable channels, at least in the large majority of cases... the troubles experienced in our [workplace] seem more consistent with the hypothesis that, in adults, punishment generally produces many undesirable – and few if any, desirable – results (p. 65) [288].*

## **Moral Development and the Ethical Organization**

Recently, some ethics researchers are taking the issue of reward and punishment in the workplace a step further and it is work that has immediate implications for treatment as well. Using Kohlberg’s stages of moral development, they propose that the heavy reliance on rewards and

punishments fosters low levels of moral reasoning and in the long-term contributes to unethical behavior. In exploring why some employees behave unethically, although there are admittedly some “bad apples”, in general management researchers conclude that corporations elicit, inculcate, or even encourage unethical behavior by employees [291].

According to these ethics researchers, organizations, like individuals, have stages of moral development. Kohlberg divided the progression of moral reasoning into six stages. Stages 1 and 2 he called “pre-conventional” usually achieved in elementary school, Stage 1 is represented by obedience and punishment, Stage 2 as individualism, instrumentalism and exchange. Stages 3 and 4 he called ‘conventional’ and typify most of the people in society, Stage 3 representing “good boy or girl”, while Stage 4 emphasizes law and order. For Stage 5 and Stage 6 he used the term “post-conventional” and claimed that relatively few members of society reach this level of moral development. Stage 5 is represented by the social contract and Stage 6 by principled conscience [292].

Organizations that are operating at Kohlberg’s lowest levels of moral reasoning have specific design mechanisms that shift employees’ focus from ethical behavior toward stakeholders, to acting in ways that generate rewards or avoid punishments. Performance appraisal systems usually assess behaviors that contribute to profitability or achievement of the organization’s strategy and goals and may lower employees’ moral reasoning by focusing their attention on behaviors that result in rewards and avoid punishment, regardless of whether it is ethical behavior or not. Reward and punishment systems may create workplaces that are low in trust, in which people feel controlled and are not encouraged to learn, progress, or consider ethical positions. Size matters as well – large organizations in which an employee only has a small part of a task may discourage moral reasoning because they have little role in decision making and because they are simply a small cog in a very large wheel. Access to information may be denied some people and therefore their reasoning cannot be complete because they lack sufficient information to make complex judgments. Codes of ethics may focus on nothing but adhering to rules and regulations which encourage Stage 4 moral reasoning [291].

Leaders may model a low level of moral reasoning and research has supported that a group’s moral reasoning decreased when the group leader operated at a low level of moral reasoning [291]. It is clear that employees make more effort to understand and follow top management’s ethical values and guidelines if the organization rewards people who follow desired ethical practices and punishes or sanctions those who fail to behave ethically [293]. Unfortunately, according to young managers who were interviewed, very few companies embodied values consistent they hoped to live by [294]. Gaps may actually exist between a manager’s level of moral reasoning and the organization’s level of moral reasoning and this may put the manager in conflict with the organization’s system of rewards and punishment [295]. According to some investigators, research suggests that reward and punishments systems may sometimes reward unethical behavior and punish ethical behavior.

Communities socialize employees and make them aware of their relationship with and responsibilities to each other and the larger society, not just as self-interested individuals. Heavy reliance on a system of rewards and punishments assumes that employees will only work on this basis, that they cannot be counted on to “do the right thing”. In more corrupt institutions the system of rewards and punishments implies that employees can be counted on - with sufficient incentives - to do the *wrong* thing. Organizations that are designed with many layers of bureaucracy, with rigid control systems, complex sets of ever-expanding rules and regulations, limited access to information and compliance systems all signal an employee that they cannot be counted on and are not responsible for moral reasoning. When firms react to wrongdoing, or perceived wrongdoing with a tightening of controls, increased suspicion and supervision, more rules and regulations they simply reinforce these notions without ever considering what the employees are really learning [291]. Some commentators are urging that organizations must be designed and operated as ethical communities. According to them, it is clear that *“firms are typically designed for the few individuals who might behave unethically and take advantage of the organization rather than for the majority of employees who can be trusted to conduct themselves responsibly and ethically... When we view a corporation as a community – or more specifically, as an ethical community - we begin to focus on how the organization shapes and develops the character of employees working within it (p.362-363) [291].*

## **Workplace Aggression**

Investigators have recognized that there are many ways that employees can express aggression. The most obvious – and the most feared – is active, violent aggression against clients, co-workers, and managers. For the most part, policies and procedures are in place in most workplaces to address the issue of physical violence and much has been written about safety policies in the workplace. In mental health and social service settings, steps have been taken to protect clients from injury at the hands of staff. The recent national emphasis on reducing seclusion and restraint is instrumental in reducing staff-client injury.

But every episode of violence has a history. Violent physical or sexual assault always emerges within a context and can usually be traced to various forms of less appreciated forms of violence that may occur routinely within an organization. Dirty looks, defacing property, stealing, hiding needed resources, interrupting others, obscene gestures, cursing, yelling, threats, insults, sarcasm, the silent treatment, “damning with faint praise”, arbitrary and capricious decisions, ignoring input, unfair performance evaluations, showing up late for meetings, causing others to delay actions, spreading rumors, back-stabbing, belittling, failing to transmit information, failing to deny false rumors, failing to warn of potential danger – all of these actions on the part of management, staff and clients are forms of aggression which can terminate in the emergence of violence [296]. But even if that is not the outcome, these kinds of behaviors can have devastating effects on individuals and the organization-as-a-whole.

It is clear from a large research base that employees need to have their basic psychological needs met in order to feel satisfied at work. These include autonomy – having choice, voice, and initiative; competence – being seen as effective and challenged; relatedness – being connected to others and belonging to the group. When these conditions are met, workers are likely to have greater self-motivation and better adjustment..[298]. These necessary elements for job satisfaction run in parallel to the necessary elements for therapeutic change as well [5]. Any work environment that thwarts satisfaction of any of these three needs undermine self-motivation, performance, and wellness for staff and for the clients [299]. All of the behaviors listed above undermine autonomy, competence and relatedness in interacting and complex ways. Setting aside individual problematic characteristics, there are a number of known catalysts for producing anger at work that then decrease productivity and block teamwork. These include: general harassment – sexual or otherwise; favoritism of one employee over another; insensitivity by managers; depersonalization of the contemporary workplace; unfair performance appraisals; lack of resources; lack of adequate training; lack of teamwork; withdrawal of earned benefits; lack of or violation of trust; poor communication; absentee bosses [297]. A sure sign of an increase in aggression in the workplace is an escalation of vicious gossip and unsubstantiated rumor.

### **I Heard It Through the Grapevine – Rumors and Gossip at Work**

In his song, famous with the over-fifty set, Marvin Gaye moaned that he “*heard it through the grapevine, Not much longer would you be mine. Oh I heard it through the grapevine, Oh and I'm just about to lose my mind*”. The traditional organization grapevine, is often the first way that employees hear bad news and when rumors fly about it certainly can feel like “I am about to lose my mind” if you are a worker in an environment loaded with unanswered questions about what is going on at work.

The notion of “the grapevine” apparently originated during the Civil War when telegraph lines were strung from tree to tree resembling grapevines, but the messages transmitted often were garbled, and these distorted messages were said to “come from the grapevine”. One study contended that 70% of all organizational communication comes through this system of informal communication and several national surveys found that employees used the grapevine as a communication source more than any other vehicle [300]. Not only that, but the grapevine has been shown to communicate information far more rapidly than formal systems of communication. The result is that the grapevine has communicated information to employees before managers have even begun the process of activating the formal system of communication. Estimates of accuracy of the information transmitted on the grapevine range from 75-90%, but that 10-25% of inaccurate information can cause an organization a great deal of trouble.[300].

Within every organization there is a formal and an informal communication network and the amount of information going through these two channels is frequently inversely proportional – the less people are informed about what is happening by management, the more likely it is that uncertainty

and anxiety will mount and the informal communication network – “the grapevine” – will buzz with sometimes accurate, but frequently distorted or inaccurate information. Studies have shown that employees are most likely to rely on the grapevine when issues are perceived as important but ambiguous, when they are threatened, stressed, or insecure, when there is impending change, and when they feel that management is not communicating [300]. As one investigator put it, “*Rumor defines a thin line between impression and reality*” (p. 14) [301].

The commonly accepted understanding of rumor is that it is talk that is unsubstantiated by authority or evidence [302]. Rumors represent hypotheses about how the world works and are therefore attempts to make sense out of uncertain situations [301]. Four different types of rumors have been described as: 1) the pipe dream expressing what those circulating the rumor hope will happen; 2) the anxiety rumor which is driven by fear and unease and often represents the ‘worst-case scenario’; 3) the anticipation rumor which is usually precipitated by ambiguous situations where people are not sure what to expect; 4) the malicious or aggressive rumor which is motivated by an intention to harm others [303].

Rumors fill in the gap where facts are absent. Rumors frequently represent at least a ‘kernel’ of truth. Rumors are most likely to occur when something is happening that is particularly relevant to people’s existence but they do not feel they actually have control over events. This is why rumors are particularly likely to escalate when some organizational change is taking place. This is particularly true when the change itself challenges established beliefs or practice, but before the change has actually taken place and demonstrates the nature of the new reality. In contrast with gossip, the primary role of the rumor is to help people cope with uncertainty [302].

Gossip comes from the combination of God and sibb that was used to refer to the sponsorship of a child at its baptism and evolved into “godparent”. One of the functions, then of the original gossip was to convey the news of the birth to people who were not present. By Elizabethan times the term had been expanded from the context of family relationships to individual relationships more generally and had begun to acquire negative connotations [303]. Traditionally gossip has been defined as idle chatter, chitchat, or the evil tongue [304].

In the workplace setting, gossip has been defined as, “*the process of informally communicating value-laden information about members of a social setting*” (p.25) [305] or “*informal and evaluative talk in an organization, usually among no more than a few individuals, about another member of that organization who is not present*” (p.429) [304]. The basis of a rumor is unsubstantiated information. Gossip need not have anything to do with fact. Gossip typically occurs in a context of privacy and intimacy, and tends to be chatty and conversational unlike rumors which tend to spread universally and carry a sense of urgency. Rumors are underpinned by a desire for meaning or clarification to cope with uncertainty, while gossip is primarily stimulated by ego and status needs in a social context [301, 302]. Although gossip can be cruel and malicious, not all gossip is negative. It may promote social bonding and serve as another important route of communication. The function of gossip has been described in a number of ways. Gossip may be an attempt by an individual to broadcast a judgment to a wider group, to achieve personal gain in a play for more power of some sort; as a form of social trading; as a source of entertainment. Gossip in groups is seen as a process by which groups maintain themselves by conveying the values of the group and a standard for comparison with others. Gossip may be used by a group as a way of sanctioning anyone that does not comply with the group norms [305].

In looking at gossip within an organization, most efforts have been made to suggest that managers should eliminate gossip which implies that managers can eliminate gossip. Therein lies the problem as one investigator has noted, “*gossip plays a vital role in group formation, regulation and perpetuation, so the removal of gossip from any social setting is not feasible unless there is a complete ban on all forms of communication*” (p. 32) [305]. Instead, managers may be able to appreciate that gossip can perform some useful purposes – the communication of rules and values; the diffusion of organizational tradition and history; the strengthening of interpersonal relationships; as a way of providing influence for those who have little voice in the organization; and as a vehicle for change [305].

So although gossip occurs in virtually every group and workplace setting, in times of uncertainty and chronic stress – usually a time of increased interpersonal conflict - negative gossip is likely to increase. In a work setting, negative gossip enhances the gossiper’s coercive power over the recipient of the gossip and the more accurate the gossip, the greater their power [304]. The grapevine becomes poisonous when dysfunctional relational styles learned in the troubled family are brought

into and played out in the workplace, as when bosses engage in gossiping and backbiting in order to maintain control, power and security [306]. Managers may gossip with subordinates about other employees or clients and play one employee off against another. The supervisor may make disparaging comments about one employee to another. All of this lends itself to the promotion of a toxic environment.

---

## **Organizational Trauma, Grief and Change**

---

An organization, or an entire system, can be traumatized by acute events – collective trauma - or by chronic conditions. Kai Erikson has defined a “chronic disaster” as one that:

*“gathers force slowly and insidiously, creeping around one’s defenses rather than smashing through them. People are unable to mobilize their normal defenses against the threat, sometimes because they have elected consciously or unconsciously to ignore it, sometimes because they have been misinformed about it, and sometimes because they cannot do anything to avoid it in any case” (p.21). In individuals this manifests as “a numbness of spirit, a susceptibility to anxiety and rage and depression, a sense of helplessness, an inability to concentrate, a loss of various motor skills, a heightened apprehension about the physical and social environment, a preoccupation with death, a retreat into dependency, and a general loss of ego functions” (p.21) [117]*

Deaths by suicide or homicide are acutely traumatic, particularly to a mental health or social service setting where the fear of recriminations for a failure to anticipate or prevent the deaths may be a major component of the event as it is experienced by the members of the organization. Sudden firings or other departures of key personnel may be experienced as organizationally traumatic, as may the sudden death of a leader or otherwise influential employee.

The effects of downsizing, mergers, hostile takeovers, cuts in program funding, changes in roles, increased and burdensome demands of insurance companies all may be experienced as examples of more “chronic disasters” that insidiously impact and change a system. The losses associated with organizational change are significant and impact the lives of the individuals within the organization as well as the organization-as-a-whole.

When individuals become a member of an organization, the individual surrenders some of his or her own individuality in service of the organization. As a result, losses to the organization are likely to be experienced individually as well as collectively [307]. For the same reason, failures of the organization to live up to whatever internalized ideal the individual has for the way that organization should function, is likely to be experienced individually and collectively as a betrayal of trust, a loss of certainty and security, a disheartening collapse of meaning and purpose. As workers in this field have determined, *“the relationship between employee and organization are: deep-seated; largely unconscious; intimately connected to the development of identity; and have emotional content”* (p. 429) [307]. Because of this connectedness between individual and collective identity, and because all change involves loss, organizational change and grieving tend to go hand-in-hand [307].

The result of this identification is strongly felt when interpersonal bonds are broken as a result of downsizing, which has been called *“a pervasive form of organizational suicide”*. According to previous research, 80% of the organizations studied that were involved in downsizing suffered morale problems. People feel insecure and their organizational commitment is decreased. They fear taking any risks and thus innovation is dampened. They have to work harder for the same pay or frequently, pay cuts. Anger over the loss of colleagues may lead to grieving with possibly a false sense of hope that the lost co-worker will eventually come back or will be rehired. The emotional toll is high on everyone [73]. As one executive reported, *“while layoffs may provide a short-term boost to profits, over the long run downsizing begins a cycle in which companies falter because of loss of talent and a decay of morale that constrain economic performance for years afterwards (p.32) [308].*

It is clear that the ways in which grief, loss, and termination are handled have a significant impact on employee attitudes. There is evidence that when employees are given permission to grieve for the “end of what was”, the readjustment to new conditions is likely to be less problematic [309]. The stages of mourning have been applied to organizational change as a useful way of understanding

what has been perceived as resistance to change. At first the change is denied or rejected and people cling to the “lost object”. Then they adopt an air of resignation, work through despair, and finally come to accept the loss, while eventually adapting to life as it has changed. When the losses are traumatic, when they are disenfranchised, or when they are stigmatized, the process of successful grieving is not likely to be completed. This can have as many negative outcomes for an organization as unresolved loss has for the individual [310].

## **Disenfranchised Grief**

Disenfranchised grief has been defined as grief that is deemed as inappropriate, that cannot be publicly acknowledged, openly mourned, and socially supported and which is thereby refused the conditions for normal resolution through the work of grieving. Examples of disenfranchised grief include examples such as when someone has been involved in what is considered an illicit affair and the lover dies, or in many cases, when a homosexual partner dies [311]. The term has been extended to apply to the workplace in general, serving to indicate that any loss becomes disenfranchised if we are not allowed to express grief in the one place where most of our waking hours during the week are spent – on the job. This is particularly important since at any point in time, 16% of the workforce experiences a personal loss within a given year. Grieving in the workplace represents decreased individual productivity and anything that inhibits the grieving process and thus causes the mourning period to be lengthened, more severe, or entirely postponed, is likely to negatively impact the organization. Nonetheless, little attention has been paid to this issue [312].

Grieving in the workplace has been actively discouraged. Typically, the amount of grieving in the workplace that is “allowed” is determined by the perceived closeness of the relationship. On the average, organizations give employees about three days off to grieve for the death of a loved one and after that time they are expected to get back to work and resume normal activity. And the amount of allowable grief may be determined by the person’s role in the organization. Leaders are expected to go on working as if nothing had happened in their private lives. People who deal with life and death issues all the time are expected to keep tight control in their workplace and this of course includes physicians, nurses, and social workers [312]. Perinatal deaths or the deaths of the elderly are often easily dismissed. Grieving over the loss of someone who is still alive but is no longer the same person they once were may be minimized. Losses that are a result of abortion, Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, suicide, homicide, AIDS, or “preventable” accidents may be stigmatized [312].

The problem, of course, is that grief often refuses to comply with the organizational timetable. Grieving is not linear and does not decrease steadily over time. The more normal grief is inhibited and the longer the grieving process is postponed, the more likely it is to become problematic and even pathological. When this happens and performance is affected, corrective measures are often directed at the symptom rather than the cause and the individual may become increasingly alienated from the organization [312].

Unresolved grief can result in an idealization of what has been lost that interferes with adaptation to a new reality. Individual employees and entire organizations may distort memories of the past as individuals can. Organizations may selectively omit disagreeable facts, may exaggerate or embellish positive deeds, may deny the truth and engage in what has been termed “organizational nostalgia” for a golden past that is highly selective and idealized and when compared to the present state of affairs, surpassingly better. It is a world that is irretrievably lost, with all of the sense of inexpressible grief associated with such loss and the present is always comparably poorer, less sustaining, less fruitful, less promising. In this way the organizational past – whether accurately remembered or not – can continue to exert a powerful influence on the present. The failure to grieve for the loss of a leader may make it difficult or impossible for a new leader to be accepted by the group. In fact, one author has noted that “*Nostalgia is not a way of coming to terms with the past (as mourning or grief are) but an attempt to come to terms with the present*” p. 132 [313] [104]. And reenactment is a way of “never saying goodbye”.

## Systemic Reenactment

The great American poet, W. H. Auden, has pointed out the importance of enactment in human functioning, *“Human beings are by nature actors, who cannot become something until first they have pretended to be it. They are therefore to be divided, not into the hypocritical and the sincere, but into the sane, who know they are acting, and mad who do not. We constitute ourselves through our actions”* (as quoted in Driver, 1991) [314]. We were actors long before we were talkers in our evolutionary history, and enactment remains a nonverbal form of communication with others of our kind.

Traumatized individuals frequently are subject to “traumatic reenactment”, a compulsive reliving of a traumatic past that is not recognized as repetitive and yet which frequently leads to revictimization experiences. Reenactment is a sign of grief that is not resolved and instead the trauma and the losses associated with it is experienced over and over relentlessly. An organization that cannot change, that cannot work through losses and move on will, like an individual, develop patterns of reenactment, repeating past strategies over and over without recognizing that these strategies may no longer be effective. This can easily lead to organizational patterns that become overtly abusive. Corporate abuse comes in many forms including discrimination, demotion without cause, withholding of resources, financial manipulation, overwork, harassment, systematic humiliation, and arbitrary dismissal [315]. With every repetition there is further deterioration in functioning. Knowledge about this failing is available but it tends to be felt before it is cognitively appreciated, but without the capacity to put words to feelings, a great deal of deterioration may occur before the repetitive and destructive patterns are recognized. Healthier and potentially healing individuals enter the organization but are rapidly extruded as they fail to adjust to the reenactment role that is being demanded of them. Less autonomous individuals may also enter the organization and are drawn into the reenactment pattern. In this way, one autocratic and abusive leader leaves or is thrown out only to be succeeded by another, while those who have been involved in the hiring process remain bewildered by this outcome [104].

Reenactment patterns are especially likely to occur when events in the past have resulted in behavior that arouses shame or guilt in the organization’s representatives. Shame and guilt for past misdeeds are especially difficult for individuals and organizations to work through. The way an organization talks to itself is via communication between various “voices” of the organization. If these voices are silenced or ignored, communication breaks down and is more likely to be acted-out through impulse ridden and destructive behavior [104].

Human beings historically have used ritual and social support to work through the process of loss toward recovery. Scheff has defined ritual as the *“potentially distanced reenactment of situations of emotional distress that are virtually universal in a given culture”* [316]. Indigenous healing groups deal with the experience of suffering, misery, and healing through staged reenactments of the traumatic experience and a reenactment of the great myths of the tribe. The healing ceremony is almost always a public and collective procedure involving family, tribe, and members of a special healing society. In tribal cultures these ceremonies are often quite large and may involve the entire social group. They are publicly open and often egalitarian, reflecting the traditional ethos of foraging societies. They tend to be repetitive and ongoing, occurring often throughout the year. The participants in the group use techniques designed to greatly increase the level of emotional arousal and alter consciousness. In such states, the participants are permitted the leeway to say or do things that under normal social conditions would be prohibited. In most healing groups, the healed are expected to become healers. The reliving of the traumatogenic situation occurs in precise detail, and the pain is integrated into a meaningful whole by giving it a meaning in a larger mythical system. There is a relabeling of the complaint, a reduction in fear through the ability to maintain some degree of control while social relations and subjective experience are brought into harmony [140, 316-318]

For human beings, grieving clearly is a social experience. It would appear, that on an evolutionary basis we are set for reenactment behavior and that this behavior has important signal importance to our social support network. The nonverbal brain of the traumatized person signals through gesture, facial expression, tone of voice, and behavior, that something is amiss, that there is some rift in the social fabric that connects the individual to the social group, a rift that must be healed. The behavior of the individual triggers a ritual response in the group in order to help the individual tell the story, re-experience the affect, transform the meaning of the event, and reintegrate into the whole,

while simultaneously the group can learn from the experience of the individual. The amount of social support that is offered is often enormous, with an entire tribe participating in escorting the injured party back into the fold through any means necessary to do so [140].

But in the workplace - although employees may indeed be constantly reliving the losses they have experienced - there is likely to be little time or attention given to the need to provide individual employees the sustained social support they require. Nor is it likely that a stressed organization will pay attention to the losses it sustains and allow any natural ritualized forms of working through organizational loss to unfold. The mental health system has sustained enormous losses over the past decade as leaders and staff have left, programs have been dissolved, communication networks destroyed, and meaning systems abandoned. Yet there has been little discussion of the unrelenting signs of unresolved grief that now plagues the system. Instead what remain visible are abundant signs of organizations in decline.

## **Organizational Decline**

According to a worker who wrote about the issue of organizational decline forty years ago, organizations attempt to anticipate and adapt to environmental changes but the larger, more rapid, and harder to predict the changes are, the more difficult it is for the organization to adapt. This failure to adapt then leads to organizational decline and possibly, dissolution. *“Decline begins when an organization fails to anticipate or recognize and effectively respond to any deterioration in organizational performance that threatens long-term survival”* (p.94) [319].

One of the most pronounced effects of decline is to increase stress and under stressful conditions, managers frequently do the opposite of what they need to do to reverse decline: relying on proven programs, seeking less counsel from subordinates, concentrating on ways to improve efficiency, and shunning innovative solutions. Their causal explanations for what is causing the problem dictate their response alternatives and their causal explanations are likely to be incorrect or inadequate because the causes are frequently so complex. Just when people need to be pulling together, interpersonal and intraorganizational conflict increases and becomes difficult to resolve and thus goal-setting, communication, and leader-subordinate relationships decline [320].

Critical events and organizational failure change us and change our organizations, but without memory we lose the context. Some modern philosophers believe that all memories are formed and organized within a collective context. According to them, society provides the framework for beliefs, behaviors, and the recollections of both [170]. Later, present circumstances affect what events are remembered as significant. Much of the recording and recalling of memories occurs through social discussion. This shared cohesiveness of memories is part of what defines a culture over time. Shared language also helps a society organize and assimilate memories and eventually, forget about the events. Similarly, there is reason to believe that maintaining silence about disturbing collective events may have the counter effect of making the memory even more potent in its continuing influence on the organization or society much as silent traumatic memories continue to haunt individuals [104] [180].

Studies have shown that institutions, like individuals, have memory and that once interaction patterns have been disrupted these patterns can be transmitted through an organization so that one “generation” unconsciously passes on to the next, norms that alter the system and every member of the system. But without a conscious memory of events also being passed on, organizational members in the present cannot make adequate judgments about whether the strategy, policy, or norm is still appropriate and useful in the present [172]. This process can be an extraordinary resistance to healthy organizational change [104]. Organizational decline is said to be caused by a dysfunction in organizational learning and organizational learning is seriously impaired by failures of organizational memory as discussed earlier. Regression may occur so that previous levels of achievement, knowledge, training, and service delivery are no longer remembered and appear to play little if any role in the organizational culture.

Many dysfunctional behaviors characterize organizational decline. Increases in conflict, secrecy, scapegoating, self-protective behaviors, loss of leader credibility, rigidity, turnover, decreases in morale, diminished innovation, lowered participation, nonprioritized cuts, and reduced long-term planning are common problems associated with periods of decline [321]. All of these behaviors can be

seen as inhibitors of organizational learning and adaptation – both necessary if the decline is to be reversed [322].

### **Successful or Permanent Failure**

As has been pointed out earlier in discussing organizations as living systems, “*theorists are preoccupied with when organizations are “born”, what species they are (their forms), and when they have changed enough to be termed dead*” (p.52) [26]. Organizational death can be more difficult to define than biological death. It may come when an organization ceases to operate, when it loses its corporate identity, when it loses the capacity to govern itself, or it experiences any combination of these situations. An organization may die when it successfully merges with another organization, so that organizational death may not be equated with failure [26].

On the other hand, some organizations seem to be “permanently failing”, yet continue to operate for years on end [323]. And many of these can be considered “successful failures” meaning that “*the objective is to keep a troubling issue out of the public eye and create the illusion that something is being done*” [141]. It is this kind of “successful” and “permanent” failure that best defines large components of the existing mental health and social service system. The mentally ill, the poor, the homeless all bring up distasteful reminders of what is wrong in our present social system and arouse anxiety about life’s uncertainties.

It is this unseen but real “successful” failure that most confounds people who dedicate their lives to the mental health and social service professions. When young professionals first enter the helping professions, they are motivated by a desire to serve, a willingness to sacrifice financial gain for the satisfactions they assume to be found in helping other people get well, seeing people change, and bettering the lives of suffering humanity. What they frequently find instead are bureaucratic systems designed to “control the behavior” of children and adults rather than systems designed to facilitate healing and empowerment.

Kai Erikson sums up what that can feel like to the people involved “*the mortar bonding human communities together is made up at least in part of trust and respect and decency and, in moments of crisis, of charity and concern. It is profoundly disturbing to people when these expectations are not met, no matter how well protected they thought they were by the outer crust of cynicism our century seems to have developed in us all....The real problem in the long run is that the inhumanity people experience comes to be seen as a natural feature of human life rather than as the bad manners of a particular corporation. They think their eyes are being opened to a larger and profoundly unsettling truth: that human institutions cannot be relied upon* (p. 239) [117]

---

### **Loss of Meaning & Demoralization**

---

The most commonly accepted version of burnout is comprised of three components: 1) *emotional exhaustion* – a lack of energy and a feeling that one’s emotional resources are used up; 2) *depersonalization* (also known as cynicism) – marked by the treatment of clients as objects rather than people; detachment and callousness toward clients, cynicism toward clients, co-workers and the organization; 3) *diminished personal accomplishment* – tendency to evaluate oneself negatively [324].

The burnout concept began being actively discussed and evaluated in the late 1970’s and 1980’s but initially was viewed as a problem of particular individuals. Now, it is becoming increasingly clear that burnout is not a problem of individuals but of the environments within which people work. Burnout occurs in ‘normal’ people who have no previous history of psychopathology. Recent research has also differentiated burnout, which is related to work content, from depression which is multifaceted. It is also clear that burnout negatively impacts effectiveness and work performance [325].

Burnout has a negative effect on worker performance including: absenteeism, job turnover, low productivity, overall effectiveness, decreased job satisfaction, and reduced commitment to the job [326]. Some research has also indicated that burnout may also have a negative effect on people’s home life as well. And burnout has been associated with heart attacks, chronic fatigue, insomnia,

dizziness, nausea, allergies, breathing difficulties, skin problems, muscle aches, menstrual difficulties, swollen glands, sore throat, recurrent flu, infections, colds, headaches, digestive problems and back pain. The Japanese even have a word, *karoshi*, for sudden death that results from overwork [325].

Researchers have begun to investigate the organizational components that contribute to burnout. Building on the established three-component partition of burnout - emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment - a group of investigators have been looking at North American companies and organizations around the world. They describe phases of burnout as an organization becomes increasingly compromised and the quality of life in those organizations deteriorates: Job involvement and all facets of job satisfaction decrease. Turnover increases as more people develop an intention to leave and many actually do depart. Group cohesion decreases while physical and emotional symptoms increase generally. Features of family life deteriorate and performance indicators fall, while the costs of medical insurance rise significantly. The authors claim that “so many people fall in advanced phases that the term ‘pandemic’ seems no overstatement: Phases VI, VII, and VIII contain 41.8% of all respondents in public-sector work sites in Canada, 44.1% in the U.S. sites, and 60% in the 10 available global public-sector work sites”(p.61) [327]. Six problematic work domains have been described: work overload, lack of control, insufficient reward, breakdown of community, absence of fairness, and conflicting values [325]

It is of interest to note that although there are numerous references to the effect burnout has on mental health professionals in published articles over the last five years, most come from England, Wales, Australia, Japan, Canada, Ireland, China, Sweden, Norway, Greece, the Netherlands, and very few from the United States, despite the enormity of the changes that have impacted mental health care here and the crisis in mental health care that has frequently been cited.

## **Factors That Lead to Burnout**

**Work Overload.** Due to restructuring and downsizing, work is more intense, more complex, and more demanding of time. To compensate people are working longer hours with greater effort. They are being asked to fill in multiple roles in organizations and engage in ‘multitasking’. What that means is that one person is likely to be doing the job that used to be filled by two or three people. Additionally, to make ends meet, many people are compelled to work more than one job [325].

**Lack of control.** Many organizations have policies that inhibit individual problem solving or participation in decision making and this promotes burnout. Worker’s health and productivity suffer dramatically when high demand is combined with low control [325]

**Insufficient reward.** Money, prestige, and security are some of the rewards received from a job. But people also want job satisfaction and with the decrease in teamwork, problem solving and creativity that makes work rewarding, job satisfaction plummets. As stress increases and authority becomes more centralized, workplaces become more polarized. Relationships deteriorate, social support wanes and this contributes to emotional exhaustion [325].

**Breakdown of community.** High rates of turnover destroy community within the workplace. People are less connected to each other and teamwork has suffered. “The loss of community is evident in greater conflict among people, less mutual support and respect, and a growing sense of isolation” (p. 49) [90].

**Absence of fairness.** The key elements to a fair workplace are trust, openness and respect and when a community fails, trust, openness and respect go out the window. When all that matters is short-term gain, employees know that they cannot trust their managers to operate in any way other than in their own self-interest [325]. This becomes a general social attitude that even gets played out in non-profit and social service settings where profit-making is not even possible.

**Conflicting values.** In the corporate sector, the driving need for profits and short-term gain frequently compromises values [325]. In the nonprofit sector, the emphasis on the bottom line may be just as demanding, but more carefully hidden from view

## **Conflicting Values for Mental Health & Social Service Professionals**

An important review of research studies has demonstrated that no therapy technique is better than any other but that they all work. As a result, investigators have been distilling the necessary

elements that go into a good outcome [5]. There are four [5, 328-330]. The first is related to what the client brings into the setting: how severe their problems are (related to chronicity and complexity of symptoms), their degree of motivation, their capacity to relate, their ego strength, their psychological mindedness and their ability to identify a focal problem. This is said to account for 40% of treatment outcome.

The second common therapeutic element is the therapeutic relationship. It is clear from decades of research that client improvement depends on the nature of the therapeutic relationship. The therapeutic alliance is one best characterized by the establishment of accurate empathy, positive regard, non-possessive warmth, and genuineness. This factor is said to account for 30% of client improvement.

The third common factor is expectancy or placebo effects that are said to account for 15% of client improvement. Basically, this is about restoring hope. This is incredibly important for very disturbed children and adults because by the time they get to treatment settings, they are likely to have given up hope that anything about them or their lives can substantially change. It is important to enhance positive expectations about getting over one's problems and feeling better. That means treatment must be focused on the future, particularly on the person's ability to overcome what has happened to them in the past.

The fourth common factor that all successful therapies have in common is an explanatory system that guides healing rituals. The notion of traumatic stress provides this rationale, offering an explanation for the individual's difficulties while putting those problems within a much larger context of meaning.

What this work concludes is what therapists have known all along – it's the *relationship*. But managed care has most impacted on the quality and nature of exactly this – the therapeutic relationship. Patients are being limited to less and less treatment and steered toward short-term, often drug-related forms of intervention. Privacy has almost entirely disappeared, despite increased regulations that do little but sabotage communication, and confidentiality can no longer be assured. In most cases neither the client nor the therapist know whether or not their relationship will be able to run its course or will be prematurely terminated by an agent on the telephone who has never met or even spoken to the client. Dependability and continuity, in many cases, is no longer assured [331]. These factors, among others, can create significant ethical conflict for mental health workers as they struggle to fulfill their professional responsibilities and survive in a challenging economic climate.

---

## *The Result*

---

Ultimately, if this destructive sequence that has been described is not arrested, the organization begins to look and act in uncannily similar ways to the traumatized clients it is supposed to be helping. Only half tongue-in-cheek I call this, ORGANIZATIONAL COMPLEX STRESS SYNDROME.

We now know a great deal about what clients with complex, trauma-related problems require in order to recover. Perhaps as organizations struggle to become more helpful to their clients by becoming trauma-informed, this metaphor can provide us with guidelines for a “trauma-sensitive” method of simultaneous system recovery, applicable to all of the health, mental health, and social service systems that are designed to assist people who struggle with life's difficult journey.

In the final section, we will summarize the findings and suggest some implications for a creating, sustaining, and living Sanctuary® – a Parallel Process of Recovery.

---

## ***Creating Sanctuary: A Parallel Process of Recovery***

---

At this point in time, there is little we can do immediately about many of the chronic stressors plaguing the mental health and social service systems. The only solution to these problems is organized, coordinated and mutual activism on the part of people who use these services and those who work within these sectors. Judging from the state of fragmentation, in-fighting, and apathy of many organizations that represent these sectors, this may be some time yet in coming. So in the meantime, if you have read this paper and recognize some or all of the ways your own organization is functioning, how can you help be an agent of positive change?

It is useful to think about parallel processes of recovery because in reality, we cannot stop the systems from functioning in order to fix what is broken. The flow of clients who need services has not and will not stop in any world that we can realistically anticipate today. So we have to mend our broken systems at the same time that we are providing services to the people who need them. As daunting a process as this may seem it is consistent with both the recovery movement and the drive for trauma-informed care. What needs to be added is a heightened awareness of the interconnected, living nature of all of our systems and a recognition that significant changes in one part of the corporate “body” can only occur if the whole body changes as well. Let’s briefly summarize what a parallel process of recovery needs to include.

### **Recovery from Chronic Stress and Collective Trauma**

The ability to respond to chronic stress and collective trauma is significantly improved if a group of people can pull together and move in the same direction. The only real buffer against overwhelming stress is social support. But to achieve unified action on a consistent basis, people have to be on the same “page”. Getting on the same page, despite the diversity of experiences, education, culture, ethnicity, gender and age in every setting requires universal training in psychobiology; therapeutic relationships; individual, group and organizational dynamics; attachment theory; trauma theory; and knowledge creation.

### **Commitment to Basic Safety**

Organizations-as-a-whole and every individual working within the organization must make a wholehearted commitment to nonviolence – physical, psychological, social and moral safety. Every staff member needs to develop a safety plan for staying safe, even under stress. The traumatic origins of the clients’ histories must be kept in the forefront of treatment planning and day-to-day interactions and discussions. Organizations must also attend to the disturbing effects this attention to trauma may evoke in staff members and create the social supports necessary to contain these experiences. This includes taking concrete steps to build a sense of community and shared social responsibility in staff and clients together. Since building and sustaining trust is such an important aspect of developing health relationships, previous breaches of trust between management and staff, members of staff, and staff and clients must be addressed in a constructive way that provides community members with opportunities to restore relationships. The physical plant reflects the attitudes people have toward each other and the work they are doing together so the environment must be assessed, not just for physical safety concerns but for psychological, social and moral safety as well.

### **Development of Emotional Management Skills**

There is no avoiding the need for time, time, and time. Organizational healing *cannot* occur without devoting time and resources to allowing management and staff to reconnect with the organizational history, losses, and mission. Leadership must make a clear and non-negotiable commitment to reducing every kind of violence within the organization, including the counter-

aggression that masquerades as “treatment” and results in physical and psychological injuries to staff and clients, as well as social and moral injuries to the therapeutic community as a whole. To do this, however, it is not enough to tell staff to simply stop whatever behavior is problematic. Management must recognize the legitimate fears that are aroused by this kind of work and find ways to support and sustain significant change while still affording the staff a sense of safety and mastery that is reflected in the way the staff consistently treats the clients and each other. This requires sufficient conversation, discussion and dialogue so that all members of the community have a voice, and learn together how to manage intense and distressing emotions that are inevitably aroused in helping injured people to heal from their injuries. Secret relationships or destructive behaviors in the past or the present, on the part of anyone, must be brought to light, aired, and breaches in trust repaired. Meetings must be guided by the notion of constantly creating a learning organization that demands a ever-increasing level of emotional intelligence.

### **Reintegration of Function**

Getting everyone on the same theoretical “page” makes meaningful dialogue and planning more possible because everyone is “speaking the same language”. This reduces the fragmentation that is so currently symptomatic of our helping systems. Recovering lost knowledge is vitally important but can be difficult once significant numbers of people have left an organization, taking with them the tacit wisdom they carry about the system, about former ways of working together, and about therapeutic wisdom that has been lost from the system. Nonetheless, with time and effort most systems are able to recapture and honor their lost history which enables them to make new attempts to incorporate what was valuable from the past into the needs and constraints of the present.

### **Opening Up Communication**

Managers recognize that communication along the grapevine will never disappear, but they can make efforts to make information that travels the grapevine more accurate and less malicious by providing abundant and accurate information to people, as early as possible. Managers set an example for open communication and staff can observe in practice that there are few subjects that are “undiscussable”. Managers and staff make efforts to insure that the system remains flexible and responsive to individual needs, while still guaranteeing fair treatment for everyone in the system. They do this by focusing less on making new rules for every new situation and instead commit themselves to engaging in processes that examine, assess, and evolve adequate responses to complex individual and group situations. In this way, the organization remains open to new information- to learning – and it can readily and spontaneously engage in processes of information sharing and knowledge creation that allow it to mobilize complex responses, even in emergency situations.

### **Redefining Authority Relationships**

Organizational leaders discourage authoritarian structures and teach the skills necessary for responsible, more democratic participatory structures. After assessing one’s own leadership style, managers and supervisors make efforts to develop different styles of leadership to match different situations. There are many different ways of describing ideal leadership attributes but one that most adequately fits the social service and mental health sectors is called “authentic leadership” The four basic dimensions of authenticity include self-awareness; balanced processing of information that considers the perspectives of others and is free from distortions, denials or ignorance; relational transparency, and behavior that is aligned with one’s values, needs and preferences [333]. Authentic leaders choose authentic behaviors even when strong external pressures and incentives exist to act inauthentically. Their authenticity is a response to internal desires to behave with integrity, not to societal pressures to conform to certain standards [334].

## **Improved Problem-Solving and the Welcoming of Dissent**

Organizational learning improves as routine participatory processes are put into place. The increased diversity of opinions requires more thoughtful and meaningful conversations and debates over tasks. Consensus is sought because it is seen as demanding the most complex, although challenging, group decision making abilities. Dissent from the majority opinion is actively solicited and encouraged in order to minimize groupthink, conformity, and group polarization effects. Even under stress, the organizational norm is to deliberately maintain the same participatory processes that are effective under less stressful conditions.

## **Cultivation of Relationships**

There is a general recognition that it is the responsibility of every member of the organization to resolve interpersonal conflict in service of the greater good. The organization adopts methods that enable members to utilize clear guidelines in the routine resolution and transformation of conflict. There is also a general understanding that groups function on both conscious and unconscious levels and therefore the organization is able to recognize and respond to collective disturbance as *collective*, not individual, disturbance. Transparency exists at all levels and although all members of the organization respect individual privacy, there is a universal awareness that secrets spell trouble for the safety and well-being of the organization.

## **Empowerment and Mastery**

Staff members realize that the only time that people - and systems - are incapable of change is when they are already dead. They recognize that their previous cynicism and helplessness about the possibility of individual and organizational change was actually a refusal on their part to take charge of their work lives and to become "part of the solution instead of part of the problem". They realize that only when each one of them follows Ghandi's prescription to "becomes the change you want to see" will the organization be fully empowered to bring about change. They also recognize that change always involves risk and that although through careful processes of collaboration, knowledge creation, integration, and synthesis they can minimize the risks, life and people always remain ultimately unpredictable and life offers few guarantees.

## **Nonviolence and Social Responsibility**

Organizations recognize that a fixed system of rewards and punishments may inadvertently keep organizational members functioning at a lower moral level of development than is demanded by an organization seeking authenticity. As a result, the organization takes very seriously any rupture in the organizational fabric caused by individual or group dysfunction, but deals with it through a process that guarantees physical, psychological, social and moral safety to the best of its abilities. Individuals recognize they are role models for others, that they must "walk the talk" if the organization is to truly enable transformative change.

## **Griefwork**

In reviewing their own past, staff members recall all of the losses that have been experienced over the last two decades and honor what has been lost in the process. In working through the loss of what has been, organizational members become capable of reconsidering what is and what still carries on despite the changes that have occurred. Members are able to review the ways in which the organization has been failing to motivate change and has instead been repeating failed strategies while at the same time developing methods for honoring successes. The system begins to ask itself

repeatedly, “is what we are doing working? Are we bringing about change in our clients and ourselves?”

### **Hope and Restored Meaning**

Through processes of participation and engagement, staff and management have co-evolved a vision of where they want to go together into the future. They fully recognize that the organization they are co-creating with their clients will never be perfect but they understand that it is up to each and every one of them to keep it alive, to work toward authenticity and integrity together. They have put in place hiring, training and orientation systems that introduce new members of the community to the organizational norms and expectations. They continue to embody their growing knowledge base in written archives and daily practice. They are “Creating Sanctuary” together.

---

## ***The Sanctuary Model***

---

Judging from the extent of exposure to childhood adversity, it is no longer acceptable to believe we can consign some special treatment programs to the alleviation of trauma-related problems. Every service agency, every educational institution, and every workplace needs to be trauma-informed and trauma-sensitive. It must be possible for injured people to enter any environment and have experiences that are potentially healing, rather than experiences that compound their injuries as so often happens today.

As mental health professionals, as social service workers, in the end, what is our mission? Is it simply to contain society’s mentally wounded and prevent them from doing further harm? Is the mission, “recovery” as the consumer movement urges? Our helping systems have several important social roles. Yes, we must reduce harm where we can by helping people commit to nonviolence, by increasing emotional and moral intelligence, by improving relationships, and by being catalysts for the journey of recovery. We must create systems where emotionally injured people are offered realistic opportunities to achieve their maximum level of function.

But our role is larger than that. It is clear that there is no subset of traumatized people for whom we can build new structures, new institutions that will more adequately suit their needs. The world is a traumatized place and underlying what we now consider “normal” society are basic assumptions, beliefs, policies and behavior that if not transformed, are certain to doom the entire species – and very possibly all living things – to utter annihilation. Like it or not, the coming years will determine whether or not reason can harness our biological urges with sufficient power to curb the self-destructiveness that threatens our very survival. System transformation urged upon the mental health system, therefore, is not just about the mental health system. Since mental health encompasses the whole realm of what it means to be a human being, transforming the mental health system may create a proving ground for much wider system transformation.

The total-systems approach referred to in this paper is called “The Sanctuary Model. Sanctuary is a repackaging of an enormous amount of tacit clinical wisdom that has been slowly draining out of the mental health system and its “sister” social service systems, while integrating within it the new trauma-informed knowledge that is so vital if we are to make progress in improving the overall health and well-being of the nation. This model expands the idea of “trauma-informed” care to include the individual staff members of our systems of care as well as each organization and the system-as-a-whole. It is based on the parallel process notion that analogous relationships exist between each organizational level and that therefore the maximum gain and the potential for true transformation lies in instituting individual and systemic change simultaneously.

It is not a trauma intervention by itself, or a trauma-specific treatment. It represents the necessary framework of the “house” – the roof, the ceiling, and the frame – within which must be built the array of treatment methods, approaches, policies and procedures that represent the rooms of the “house” and the “furniture” in the rooms. Like the homes we live in, every program must have its own unique identity, its own character and personality, its own methods for accomplishing its mission. But every program – being alive – must carry the characteristics of living systems.

So perhaps a better metaphor is the body. Each of us has a head, and a heart, arms and legs and eyes and all the other parts, but we are not any of those parts – we are each of us bigger than the sum of our parts. We are emergent. We organize all the work we do together, from looking at our own system, to managing our individual stress responses, to treatment planning, goal-setting and our daily interactions with clients using the map of recovery we call “S.E.L.F.” – an acronym representing the four key domains of recovery: Safety, Emotions, Loss, and Future. This paper has extensively explored the parallel process notions relevant to Safety, Emotions, and Loss, so to finish this journey for now, consider Future. Chronically traumatized people are described as having a foreshortened sense of future. There have been many accounts, for example, of urban youth, raised in neighborhoods where shootings are a daily occurrence, who when interviewed express the sentiment that completing high school is irrelevant to them because they do not believe they will live past their teenage years anyhow.

This foreshortened sense of future represents a failure of the imaginative capacities. Imagination is what propels us through our lives. Our daily work schedule is an act of imagination. We anticipate and plan because we imagine ourselves into our lives. But for many people who have experienced repetitive terror, pain, and horror, opening the door to imagination only lets in monsters. So they shut those doors and seal them tightly. The end result is that they must live in the present moment, haunted by the past, and unable to plan for the future. Thus they live without hope. Healing requires opening those doors, unsealing the amazing human imaginative power that determines what comes next. Healing requires beginning to hope for something better and then working to make that hope come alive.

Chronically stressed organizations also stop imagining a better future for themselves. They live only in the present, coping with each new stress using the strategies of the past, without planning, anticipation, or hope. Creating Sanctuary is about opening up that capacity to imagine a better future, to move in the direction of creating the kinds of environments that we dream about instead of settling for the ones we have.

Sanctuary is what can emerge when groups of people come together, create community, engage in authentic behavior, share common values and make seven specific cultural commitments: Commitment to Nonviolence, Commitment to Emotional Intelligence, Commitment to Social Learning, Commitment to Open Communication, Commitment to Democracy, Commitment to Social Responsibility and Commitment to Growth and Change.

In Sanctuary we are endeavoring to describe what it means for a system to be alive, growing, changing, learning, and even reproducing. We are together discovering the day-to-day “technology” that is necessary to maximize systemic health. I believe that the only way to remove barriers to trauma-informed care delivered to individual trauma survivors is to become “trauma-sensitive” to the ways in which managers, staff, groups, and systems are impacted by individual and collective exposure to overwhelming stress. Ultimately, the goals of the Sanctuary Model are to improve clinical outcomes, increase staff satisfaction and health, increase leadership competence, and develop a technology for creating and sustaining healthier systems.

---

## References

---

1. Bentovim, A., *Trauma-Organized Systems: Physical and Sexual Abuse in Families*. 1992, London: Karnac Books.
2. Schein, E.H., *The Corporate Culture: A Survival Guide. Sense and Nonsense About Culture Change*. 1999, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
3. Haines, S., *The Manager's Pocket Guide to Systems Thinking and Learning*. 1998, Amherst, MA: HRD Press.
4. Jervis, R., *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life*. 1997, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
5. Ackoff, R.L., *The Democratic Corporation: A Radical Prescription for Recreating Corporate America and Rediscovering Success*. 1994, New York: Oxford University Press.
6. Levey, J.a.L., M., *Corporate culture and organizational health: A critical analysis of the reasons why investing in people is a wise business investment*. 2005, The Center for Corporate Culture and Organizational Health. p. <http://www.wisdomatwork.com/BUSINESS/center/report.html>.
7. Pfeffer, J., *The Human Equation: Building Profits by Putting People First*. 1998, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
8. Nitsun, M., *The Anti-group: Destructive forces in the group and their creative potential*. 1996, London: Routledge.
9. Fromm, E., *The Sane Society*. 1956, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
10. Merry, U. and G. Brown, *The Neurotic Behavior of Organizations*. 1987, New York: Gardner Press.
11. Kets de Vries, M. and D. Miller, *The Neurotic Organization: Diagnosing & Changing Counterproductive Styles of Management*. 1984, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
12. Schwartz, H.S., *Narcissistic process and organizational decay: The theory of the organization ideal*. 1990, New York: New York University Press.
13. Schaefer, A.W., *The Addictive Organization*. 1988, New York: Harper & Row.
14. Ryan, K. and D. Oestreich, *Driving Fear out of the Workplace: Creating the High Trust, High Performance Organization*. 1998, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
15. Lipman-Blumen, J., *Allure of Toxic Leaders: Why We Follow Destructive Bosses and Corrupt Politicians - and How We Can Survive Them*. 2004, New York: Oxford University Press.
16. President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health, *Interim Report*, [http://www.mentalhealthcommission.gov/reports/Interim\\_Report.htm](http://www.mentalhealthcommission.gov/reports/Interim_Report.htm), Editor. 2002.
17. Hubble, M.A., B.L. Duncan, and S.D. Miller, eds. *The Heart and Soul of Change: What Works in Therapy*. 1999, American Psychological Press: Washington, D.C.
18. Gray, P.H., *Mental health in the workplace: Tackling the effects of stress*. 1999, Mental Health Foundation, [http://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/html/content/mh\\_workplace.pdf](http://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/html/content/mh_workplace.pdf): London, UK.
19. Cooper, C.L., P.J. Dewe, and M.P. O'Driscoll, *Organizational Stress: A Review and Critique of Theory, Research and Applications*. 2001, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
20. Collie, D., *Workplace Stress: Expensive Stuff*, <http://www.emaxhealth.com/38/473.html>. 2004, July 7.
21. Wolfe, I.S., *The Truth about Employee Stress: Bleeding at the Bottom Line*. Business 2 Business, 2004. **October** (<http://www.super-solutions.com/TheTruthaboutworkplacestress.asp>).
22. Luthans, F. and S. Sommer, *The impact of downsizing on workplace attitudes: Differing reactions of managers and staff in a health care organization*. *Group and Organization Management*, 1999. **24**: p. 46-70.
23. Vahtera, J., et al., *Organisational downsizing, sickness absence, and mortality: 10-town prospective cohort study*. *British Medical Journal*, 2004. **328**(7439): p. 555-.
24. Hobbs, T. and G. Gable, *Coping with litigation stress*, in *Physician's News Digest, January* <http://www.physiciansnews.com/law/198.html>. 1998.
25. Jenkins, R. and P. Elliott, *Stressors, burnout and social support: nurses in acute mental health settings*. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 2004. **48**(6): p. 622-631.
26. Cheng, Y., et al., *Association between psychosocial work characteristics and health functioning in American women: prospective study*. *British Medical Journal*, 2000. **320**(7247): p. 1432-1436.
27. Peterson, D., *The relationship between ethical pressure, relativistic moral beliefs and organizational commitment*. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 2003. **18**(6): p. 557-572.
28. Watt, J.W. and G.L. Kallmann, *Managing professional obligations under managed care: A social work perspective*. *Family and Community Health*, 1998. **21**(2): p. 40.
29. Cable, D.M. and T.A. Judge, *Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry*,. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 1996. **67**: p. 294-311.

30. Judge, T.A. and G.R. Ferris, *The elusive criterion of fit in human resource staffing decisions*. Human Resource Planning, 1992. **15**: p. 47-67.
31. Caldwell, D. and C.A. O'Reilly, *Measuring person-job fit using a profile comparison process*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1990. **75**: p. 648-756.
32. Furman, R., *Frameworks for understanding value discrepancies and ethical dilemmas in managed mental health for social work in the United States*. International Social Work, 2003. **46**(1): p. 37.
33. Alleman, J.R., *Personal, Practical, and Professional Issues in Providing Managed Mental Health Care: A Discussion for New Psychotherapists*. Ethics & Behavior, 2001. **11**(4): p. 413-429.
34. Backlar, P., *Managed mental health care: Conflicts of interest in the provider/client relationship*. Community Mental Health Journal, 1996. **32**(2): p. 101-106.
35. Wolff, N. and M. Schlesinger, *Clinicians as Advocates: An Exploratory Study of Responses to Managed Care by Mental Health Professionals*. Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research, 2002. **29**(3): p. 274.
36. Braun, S.A. and J.A. Cox, *Managed Mental Health Care: Intentional Misdiagnosis of Mental Disorders*. Journal of Counseling & Development, 2005. **83**(4): p. 425-433.
37. Gibelman, M. and S.E. Mason, *Treatment choices in a managed care environment: A multi-disciplinary exploration*. Clinical Social Work Journal, 2002. **30**(2): p. 199.
38. Gabbard, G.O., in *Allies and Adversaries: The Impact of Managed Care on Mental Health Services*, R.K. Schreter, S.S. Sharfstein, and C.A. Schreter, Editors. 1997, American Psychiatric Press: Washington, D.C.
39. Ware, N.C., et al., *Clinician Experiences of Managed Mental Health Care: A Rereading of the Threat*. Medical Anthropology Quarterly, 2000. **14**(1): p. 3-27.
40. Bloom, S.L., *Neither Liberty Nor Safety: The Impact Of Fear On Individuals, Institutions, And Societies, Part I*. Psychotherapy and Politics International, 2004. **2**(2): p. 78-98.
41. Bloom, S.L., *Neither Liberty Nor Safety: The Impact Of Fear On Individuals, Institutions, And Societies, Part I I*. Psychotherapy and Politics International, 2004. **2**(3): p. 212-228.
42. Bloom, S.L., *Neither liberty nor safety: The impact of trauma on individuals, institutions, and societies. Part III*. Psychotherapy and Politics International, 2005. **3**(2): p. 96-111.
43. Bloom, S.L., *Neither liberty nor safety: The impact of trauma on individuals, institutions, and societies. Part IV*. Psychotherapy and Politics International, 2005. **3**(2): p. 96-111.
44. Bloom, S.L., *Societal trauma: Democracy in danger*, in *The Politics of Psychotherapy*, N. Totten, Editor. 2006, Open University Press: New York. p. 17-29.
45. McNeill, B.W. and V. Worthen, *The Parallel Process in Psychotherapy Supervision*. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 1989. **20**(5): p. 329-333.
46. Smith, K.K., V.M. Simmons, and T.B. Thames, *"Fix the Women": An intervention into an organizational conflict based on parallel process thinking*. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1989. **25**(1): p. 11-29.
47. Felitti, V.J., et al., *Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults. The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study*. Am J Prev Med, 1998. **14**(4): p. 245-58.
48. Marks, M.L. and P. Mirvis, *Merger syndrome: stress and uncertainty*. Mergers & Acquisitions, 1985. **Summer**: p. 50-55.
49. Lawrence, W.G. *The presence of totalitarian states-of-mind in institutions*. in *Paper read at the inaugural conference on 'Group Relations', of the Institute of Human Relations, Sofia, Bulgaria*, 1995. Accessed November 23, 2006 at <http://human-nature.com/free-associations/lawren.html>. 1995.
50. Pyszczynski, T., *What Are We So Afraid Of? A Terror Management Theory Perspective on the Politics of Fear*. Social Research, 2004. **71**(4): p. 827.
51. Pyszczynski, T., S. Solomon, and J. Greenberg, *In the Wake of 9/11: The Psychology of Terror*. 2003, Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
52. Appelbaum, S.H., et al., *Anatomy of a merger: behavior of organizational factors and processes throughout the pre- during and post-stages (part 2)*. Management Decision, 2000. **38**(10): p. 674-684.
53. Erikson, K., *A new species of trouble: The human experience of modern disasters*. 1994, New York: W.W. Norton.
54. Menzies, I.E.P., *A case study in the functioning of social systems as a defense against anxiety.*, in *Group Relations Reader I.*, A.D. Colman and W.H. Bexton, Editors. 1975, A. K. Rice Institute Series: Washington, D.C.
55. Bloom, S.L., *Every Time History Repeats Itself the Price Goes Up: The Social Reenactment of Trauma. Sexual Addiction and Compulsivity*, 1996. **3**(3): p. 161-194.
56. Seibel, W., *Successful failure: An alternative view of organizational coping*, in *When Things Go Wrong: Organizational Failures and Breakdowns*, H.K. Anheier, Editor. 1999, Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks. p. 91-104.
57. de Geus, A., *The Living Company: Habits for Survival in a Turbulent Business Environment*. 1997, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

58. Work & Family Newsbrief, *Fortune's "100 Best" have cultures of trust, pride* (February), <http://www.workfamily.com/>. 1999.
59. Occupational Safety and Health Administration, *Guidelines for Preventing Workplace Violence for Health Care & Social Service Workers*. 2004, United States Department of Labor: Washington, D.C. p. <http://www.osha.gov/Publications/osha3148.pdf>.
60. Bureau of Justice, *Violence in the Workplace, 1993-99: Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*, <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/vw99.pdf>. 2001, Bureau of Statistics, U. S. Department of Justice.: Washington, D.C.
61. Bostock, W.W., *Atrocity, Mundanity and Mental State*. Journal of Mundane Behavior, 2002. **3**(3): p. <http://mundanebehavior.org/index2.htm>.
62. Pekrun, R. and M. Frese, *Emotions in work and achievement*. International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1992. **7**: p. 153-200.
63. Boal, K.B. and J.M. Bryson, *Charismatic leadership: A Phenomenological and structural approach.*, in *Emerging Leadership Vistas*, J.G. Hunt, et al., Editors. 1988, Lexington Books: Lexington, MA. p. 5-34.
64. Jick, T.D. and V.V. Murray, *The management of hard times: Budget cutbacks in public sector organizations*. Organization Studies, 1982. **3**(2): p. 141-169.
65. Hatfield, E., J. Cacioppo, and R.L. Rapson, eds. *Emotional Contagion*. 1994, Cambridge University Press: New York.
66. Bloom, S.L., *Neither liberty nor safety: The impact of trauma on individuals, institutions, and societies. Part I*. Psychotherapy and Politics International, 2004. **2**(2): p. 78-98.
67. Hirschhorn, L., *Reworking Authority: Leading and Following in the Post Modern Organization*. 1997, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
68. Janis, I.L., *Decision making under stress.*, in *Handbook Of Stress: Theoretical And Clinical Aspects*, L. Goldberger and S. Breznitz, Editors. 1982, Free Press: New York. p. 69-87.
69. Forsyth, D.R., *Group Dynamics, Second Edition*. 1990, Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
70. Othman, R. and N.A. Hashim, *Typologizing organizational amnesia*. The Learning Organization, 2004. **11**(2/3): p. 273.
71. Crossen, M.M., H.W. Lane, and R.E. White, *An organizational learning framework: From intuition to institution*. Academy of Management Review, 1999. **24**(3): p. 522-537.
72. Lahaie, D., *The impact of corporate memory loss: What happens when a senior executive leaves?* Leadership in Health Services, 2005. **18**(3): p. xxxv-xlvii.
73. Conklin, J.E., *Designing organizational memory: Preserving Intellectual Assets in a Knowledge Economy*, <http://www.touchstone.com/tr/whitepapers.html>. 2001, Touchstone Consulting: Washington, D.C.
74. Walsh, J.P. and G.R. Ungson, *Organizational Memory*. Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review, 1991. **16**(1): p. 57.
75. Scheff, T.J., ed. *Labeling Madness*. 1975, Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
76. Scheff, T.J., *The Labeling Theory of Mental Illness*, in *Labeling Madness*, T.J. Scheff, Editor. 1975, Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ. p. 21-33.
77. Scheff, T.J., *Being Mentally Ill: A Sociological Theory, Second Edition*. 1984, New York: Aldine.
78. Halbwachs, M., *On collective memory*. 1992, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
79. Weick, K.E., *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. 1979, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
80. Menzies, I.E.P., *A case study in the functioning of social systems as a defense against anxiety.*, in *Group Relations Reader I*, A.D. Coleman and W.H. Bexton, Editors. 1975, Rice Institute Series: Washington, D. C.
81. Kransdorff, A., *Corporate Amnesia: Keeping Know-How in the Company*. 1998, Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heineman.
82. NewsBriefs, *More Knowledge; Song strikes chord*. Computing Canada, 2000(May 12).
83. Cole, R., *Learning from learning theory: Implications for quality improvement of turnover, use of contingent workers, and job rotation policies*. Quality Management Journal, 1993. **1**: p. 9-25.
84. Hazell, J.E., *Private sector downsizing: Implications for DOD*. Acquisition Review Quarterly, 2000(March 22).
85. Kransdorff, A., *Fight organizational memory lapse*. Workforce, 1997. **76**(9): p. 34.
86. Frost, P.J., *Toxic Emotions At Work: How Compassionate Managers Handle Pain and Conflict*. 2003, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.
87. Pennebaker, J.W., D. Paez, and B. Rimé, eds. *Collective Memory of Political Events*. 1997, Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ.
88. Weick, K.E., *Making Sense of the Organization*. 2001, Malden, MA: Blackwell.
89. Marcus, A.A. and M.L. Nichols, *On the Edge: Heeding the Warnings of Unusual Events*. Organization Science: A Journal of the Institute of Management Sciences, 1999. **10**(4): p. 482.
90. Kanter, R.M. and B.A. Stein, *The Challenge of Organizational Change: How Companies Experience It and Leaders Guide It*. 1992, New York: The Free Press.
91. Fulk, J. and S. Mani, *Distortion of communication in hierarchical relationships.*, in *Communication Yearbook 9*, M. McLaughlin, Editor. 1985, Sage: Newbury Park, CA. p. 483-510.

92. Stohl, C. and W.C. Redding, *Messages and message exchange processes.*, in *Handbook of Organizational Communication*, F.M. Jablin, et al., Editors. 1987, Sage: Newbury Park, CA. p. 451-502.
93. Kassing, J.W., *Development and validation of the organizational dissent scale*. *Management Communication Quarterly* : McQ, 1998. **12**(2): p. 183.
94. Ewing, D., *Freedom Inside the Organization*. 1977, New York: Dutton.
95. Sanders, W., *The first amendment and the government workplace: Has the constitution fallen down on the job?* *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 1983. **47**(253-276).
96. Adorno, T.W., et al., *The Authoritarian Personality*. 1982, New York: Norton.
97. Sanford, N., *Authoritarianism and social destructiveness.*, in *Sanctions for Evil: Sources of Social Destructiveness*, N. Sanford and C. Comstock, Editors. 1971, Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
98. Milgram, S., *Obedience to Authority*. 1974, New York: Harper Colophon.
99. Altemeyer, B., *The Authoritarian Specter*. 1996, Cambridge, Mass. ; London: Harvard University Press.
100. Salin, D., *Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment*. *Human Relations*, 2003. **56**(10): p. 1213.
101. Namie, G. and R. Namie, *The Bully at Work: What You Can do to Stop the Hurt and Reclaim Your Dignity on the Job*. 2003, Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks, Inc.
102. Einarsen, S., *The nature and causes of bullying at work*. *International Journal of Manpower*, 1999. **20**(1/2): p. 16.
103. Millar, M., *NHS could save millions by tackling workplace bullying*, in *Personnel Today*, 09595848, 9/27/2005. 2005: Reed Business Information, Fifth Floor, Quadrant House, The Quadrant, Sutton, Surrey SM2 5AS.
104. Brodsky, C.M., *The Harassed Worker*. 1976, Toronto: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company.
105. Leymann, H. and A. Gustafsson, *Mobbing at work and the development of post-traumatic stress disorders*. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 1996. **5**(251-276).
106. Ashforth, B., *Petty Tyranny in Organizations*. *Human Relations*. 1994. **47**(7): p. 755-778.
107. McGregor, D., *The human side of enterprise*. 1960, New York: McGraw-Hill.
108. Haney, C., C. Banks, and P.G. Zimbardo, *Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison*. . *International Journal of Criminology and Penology*, 1973. **1**: p. 69-97.
109. Kipnis, D., et al., *Metamorphic effects of power*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1976. **61**(127-135).
110. Rahim, M.A., *Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict*. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 2002. **13**(3): p. 206.
111. Mellers, B.A., A. Schwartz, and A.D.J. Cooke, *Judgment and decision making*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 1998. **49**: p. 447.
112. Iannello, K.P., *Decisions Without Hierarchy: Feminist Interventions in Organization Theory and Practice*. 1992, New York: Routledge.
113. Stohl, C. and G. Cheney, *Participatory processes/paradoxical practices*. *Management Communication Quarterly* : McQ, 2001. **14**(3): p. 349.
114. Harmon, F.G., *Future Present*, in *The Organization of the Future*, F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, and R. Beckhard, Editors. 1997, Jossey-Bass: San Francisco. p. 239-247.
115. Pasmore, W.A., *Creating Strategic Change: Designing the Flexible, High-Performance Organization*. 1994, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
116. Kerr, N.L. and R.S. Tindale, *Group Performance and Decision Making*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 2004. **55**: p. 623.
117. Sunstein, C.R., *Why Societies Need Dissent*. 2003, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
118. Moscovici, S. and M. Zavalloni, *The group as a polarizer of attitudes*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1969. **12**: p. 125-135.
119. Janis, I. and L. Mann, *Decision Making: A Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choice and Commitment*. 1977, New York: Free Press.
120. Kassing, J.W., *Articulating, antagonizing, and displacing: A model of employee dissent*. *Communication Studies*, 1997. **48**(4): p. 311.
121. Kassing, J.W. and T.A. Armstrong, *Someone's going to hear about this*. *Management Communication Quarterly* : McQ, 2002. **16**(1): p. 39.
122. Kassing, J.W., *From the looks of things*. *Management Communication Quarterly* : McQ, 2001. **14**(3): p. 442.
123. Morrison, E.W. and F.J. Milliken, *Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world*. *The Academy of Management Review*, 2000. **25**(4): p. 706.
124. Finet, D., *Sociopolitical consequences of organizational expression*. *Journal of Communication*, 1994. **44**(4): p. 114.