1-1-2011

A Business Case for Return on Investment: Understanding Organizational Change

Rya S. Henderson-Carter
Walden University

Walden University

College of Management and Technology

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Rya Henderson

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Gwendolyn Dooley, Committee Chairperson, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Dr. Yvette Ghormley, Committee Member, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Dr. Bruce Lazar, University Reviewer, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2014

Abstract

A Business Case for Return on Investment: Understanding Organizational Change

by

Rya S. Henderson-Carter

MS, Walden University, 2010

BS, Franklin University, 2006

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

October 2014

Abstract

Since 2010, 2,000 U. S. leaders spent $150 billion on return on investment (ROI) training, yet questions still exist on how to measure the benefits of organizational change. The purpose of this embedded single-case study was to explore how business leaders could use ROI to characterize the benefit of intervention strategies for organizational change. Stakeholder theory and Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory formed the conceptual framework for this study. A purposive sample of 20 civilian personnel managers located at a medical facility for veterans in central Texas participated in semistructured interviews. The 5 primary themes that emerged using thematic analysis were (a) training, (b) leadership, (c) communication, (d) recognition, and (e) consistency. Implications for positive social change include the possibility of organizational leaders applying these findings to develop better intervention strategies. Such interventions could improve processes for stakeholders and create an open dialogue with business leaders within the government sector.

A Business Case for Return on Investment: Understanding Organizational Change

by

Rya S. Henderson-Carter

MS, Walden University, 2010

BS, Franklin University, 2006

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

October 2014

Dedication

Everything I undertake is for A’Rya-Savan Storm, Phoenix-Yadoris Jeanne Sparkles, and CJ Carter. Nanny, Myrna, Uncle Chucky (CC), Uncle Bobby (Cat), Uncle Joe, Dr. and Mrs. Mallory, Joshua Garriott, Greg Bernard, Ephesian Waters, all my family, and close friends, each of you influenced me in ways I cannot describe. Gwen, this is your “accomplished.” Cedric, you are the only person who truly knows the struggle from seeing me daily. Thank you. Papa, love you mo’! We did it. Auntie M, I clicked my heels three times and still could not have done any of this without you! It is great to know we have hope and a future because of Jesus.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Gwendolyn Dooley for her guidance and tireless support of me throughout the doctoral study process, as well as my committee members, Dr. Bruce Lazar and Dr. Yvette Ghormley. Thanks to the director of the DBA program and Walden University. Special thanks to Dr. Mary Ann Cincotta, Dr. Ethel Kloos, and Ms. Ellen at Accredited Writers. Special thanks to Dr. Emad Rahim and Andrew Borg. I sincerely thank all participants who contributed to this research, as well as Dr. Gene Fusch, Richard Gillispie, and the Phillips ROI Institute; without your contributions, this research would not have been possible.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Section 1: Foundation of the Study

In a patient-aligned care team (PACT), health care professionals plan to assist veterans in achieving their goals for lifelong health and wellness (Truffer et al., 2010). As a service to veterans, the leaders of a medical facility for veterans (MFV) considered all aspects of patient health. Davis et al. (2012) found that all members of a health care team have defined roles, with an emphasis on forging trusted personal relationships. Twenty PACT managers at the Central Texas (CTX) MFV participated in this study to explore how leaders use return on investment (ROI) to determine the value of organizational change. In assessing leaders' views of what is valuable to their role in the implementation of the PACT intervention, I created a demographic questionnaire to find what leadership traits have the greatest value to the staff level employees of the MFV. Leaders using ROI strategies may consider the results of this study valuable and implement the findings to increase their knowledge specific to business operations.

Background of the Problem

Performance improvement programs are beneficial for leaders in maintaining employee morale (Bleijenburgh, Peters, & Poutsma, 2010). Shukeri, Shin, and Shaari (2012) indicated that corporate governance concerning firm performance increased when businesses grow. Leaders who initiate performance interventions increase motivation within their organizations (King, Dawson, Kravitz, & Gulick, 2012; van Ewijk, 2011). As professionals become aware of the importance of stature and role compliance, they use investment to achieve the strategic goals of their organizations (Pekkola, 2013). Business leaders using ROI as a performance measure for strategic investments may achieve greater success, increasing spending in Europe and North America to mitigate future compliance issues (Shukeri et al., 2012).

Performance improvement is critical to business strategy. Leaders use performance improvement to create shareholder value (Ong, Tze, Soh, & Yan, 2012). Funding for organizational development (OD) programs comes from stakeholder investments. Stakeholders associate a positive business reputation with organizational improvements (Shukeri et al., 2012).

In 2008, leaders of the U.S. Health Resources and Services Administration began a comprehensive quality improvement plan (Davis et al., 2012). Top managers focused the action on measuring the quality of health care across all government-funded health organizations (Leiyu et al., 2012). Leaders of the MFV began the implementation of the patient-centered medical home model, now known as the PACT model, in 2010 (Davis et al., 2012). Long-term goals of the PACT initiative were to (a) provide access to primary care (including alternatives to face-to-face care), (b) provide continual coordination of care between MFV providers and private physicians, and (c) demonstrate a patient-centered culture by redesigning the concept of primary care practices.

Healthcare professionals face unexpected challenges with change and improve their services to provide the highest quality at the lowest price (Liu, Bryson, Burgess, Perkins, & Maciejewski, 2012). Leaders’ use of ROI strategy is a results-based intervention (Glavan, 2012). The PACT initiative is an example of a results-based intervention strategy designed to encourage enterprise among customers and providers through affirming their unique contribution to the organization.

Improvement in a healthcare setting is not only dependent on continuing education improvement, but also includes an assessment of methods that affect patient care (Davis et al., 2012). Selection of a performance intervention links the approach to cultural, operational, and productivity issues. Return on investment is an indication of the immediate benefit of an intervention strategy (Georges, 2013). The price adjustment, associated with ROI analysis, increases the recovery of funds for stakeholders (Ciftci, 2012).

Leaders use independent government factors, banking practices, and investment choices to determine ROI (Ciftci, 2012). Organizational managers implement improvement strategies; however, they may not analyze the benefit of the intervention. Phillips and Phillips (2012) attributed the implementation of a performance intervention strategy without analyzing the benefit to a lack of understanding among leadership of how ROI can characterize the benefit of improvement strategies.

Stake (2010) described analysis as the process of generalizing a population by the findings regarding individual groups who make up the population. Researchers use case study research to collect data about participants using observations, interviews, and tests (Colgan, 2011; Hays & Singh, 2011; Rowley, 2012). *Public trust* is a federal designation of employees of agencies whose positions directly or indirectly affect the public at large, thereby making their responses more transferable to all members of the public (Erie, 2012). My participants are public trust employees.

The purpose of this descriptive embedded, single-case study was to understand how leaders could use ROI to characterize the benefit of improvement strategies.

Qualitative measures and tests apply to data analysis, given the assumptions that typically underlie a measurement process, such as the trustworthiness of participants (Crowther & Lloyd-Williams, 2012).

Case 1 consisted of 10 participants from the CTX MFV gold team. In the course of daily operations, the gold team is responsible for offering patients appointments with the doctor, solving the patients’ concerns, and helping patients find other solutions through interactive health information services (Davis et al., 2012). Case 2 consisted of another PACT unit, the maroon team. The maroon team has the same responsibilities as the gold team; however, when patients fail to see their physician within 24 months of their last appointment, care transfers to the maroon team (Davis et al., 2012). This embedded case study took place at a single location. In the data analysis process, I used the same techniques for Case 1 and Case 2, respectively.

Problem Statement

More than 2,000 U.S. leaders have spent $150 billion on ROI without substantial knowledge of how to calculate the benefits of organizational change (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). American leaders have spent an average of $44 million since 1990 on performance intervention programs (Schilke & Goerzen, 2010). The general business problem was that leaders required accountability for development and implementation of performance improvement programs (Elden & Durand, 2010). The ROI strategy is useful to measure organizational change and is often the sole basis for decision making (Georges, 2013). The specific business problem was leaders lack an understanding of how to use ROI to measure the benefit of organizational change.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this qualitative, descriptive embedded, single-case study was to assist leaders in their understanding of how to use ROI to determine the benefit of organizational change. The results of this study may provide leaders with an understanding of how use of ROI is integral to implementing performance intervention strategies. Organizational PACT managers are essential to the MFV and incorporate changes in patient care (Jsa, Perlin, Kizer, & Dudley, 2013). I contacted 20 out of 96 PACT managers who work for the CTX MFV in two hospital support divisions (10 for each case) through electronic mail. The traditionally recommended number, when conducting a case study is between 10 and 12 participants (Quinlan, 2011). Achievement of data saturation was complete at the 17th interview; however, data collection continued through the 20th interview to assure participants did not provide new data.

In a descriptive embedded, single-case study, researchers conduct two or more observations of the same phenomenon in different subunits to allow for a more detailed level of inquiry to determine whether the results are transferable (Stake, 2010). Twenty participants constitute a suitable number of participants for qualitative research (Yin, 2012). Results from this study may contribute to social change by increasing the awareness of using ROI to measure the benefit of organizational change (Herring & Henderson, 2013).

Nature of the Study

In this study, I used a qualitative method with a descriptive embedded, single-case study research design. The embedded, descriptive case study design is a form of inquiry for researchers to describe the context and process of a phenomenon (Stake, 2010). Researchers transfer findings to a larger scope using the qualitative case study design (Hamann, Schiemann, Bellora, & Gunther, 2013; Rowley, 2012). Researchers who use the quantitative method include hypotheses as a basis for the problem statement and analyze numerical data (Penelope & Pattison, 2012). Dul and Hak (2012) stated that research questions assist researchers in gathering reliable answers using either case study or historical research designs in qualitative research studies.

Mixed method research is the use of both qualitative and quantitative data. A mixed method research study was not appropriate because there was no numerical data or hypothesis (Jogulu & Pansiri, 2011; Qu & Dumay, 2011). The qualitative method was more useful for this study compared to mixed and quantitative methods because there was a need to understand individual participant views on leaders' philosophies through personal experiences (Herring & Henderson, 2013).

Researchers use case study design to review information including documents, interviews, and observations. Grounded theory and ethnography are qualitative research designs that align with interpretive paradigms. Urquhart, Lehmann, and Myers (2010) determined that the grounded theory method is present in qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method studies. An ethnographic design is not a secondhand observation from previous accounts (Yin, 2012). Based on this information, grounded and ethnographic research designs were not suitable for this study (Simon, 2010; Urquhart et al., 2010). A single-case study research design aligned with the problem, and scope identified.

Research Questions

The main research question was as follows: What will encourage leaders to use ROI to measure the benefit of organizational change? I used the following demographic questionnaire to elicit responses from the participants:

1. What challenges does this organization face?
2. What processes improve performance in this organization?
3. What do leaders demonstrate to achieve performance?
4. What are some initiatives leaders may choose and put in place as proactive measures to improve the ROI analysis for organizational change?
5. What is your understanding of ROI?
6. How is ROI practiced within your unit?
7. How does the unit/organization measure ROI?
8. How is ROI communicated to your customers?
9. What evidence shows ROI is working for your unit/organization?
10. Based on that evidence, how can an organization improve an ROI process?

Conceptual Framework

Owing to inconsistent findings regarding changes in business, researchers face a paradox when investigating performance interventions (Qin, O'Meara, & McEachern, 2009). Each researcher or theorist may predict different outcomes using different research frameworks. Different outcomes are a consequence of distinct conceptual operations (Qin et al., 2009). Researchers often use multiple frameworks to coincide with the level of analysis. I used two conceptual frameworks: stakeholder theory and Maslow's hierarchy of needs.

There were many conceptual frameworks to choose from, including the balanced scorecard, profit contribution, and organizational theory. The balanced scorecard approach is a clear image of what leaders should consider to achieve financial goals (Rowland, 2013). Profit contribution is the actual versus the budgeted turnover (Herring & Henderson, 2012). Leaders use organizational theory to study organizations, and the relationships between employees and the environment in which they operate (Hass, 2010). This goal of this study was to explore the processes leaders use to determine the value of organizational change, so I assessed possible frameworks in terms of alignment with the problem under study.

Stakeholder Theory

In 1984, Freeman published *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach* (Freeman, Harrison, Wicks, Parmar, & Colle, 2010). Stakeholder theory focuses on the principles of organizational management and business ethics, which address morals and values in managing an organization. Stakeholder theory is the concept that individuals are stakeholders of a corporation (Steib, 2009). Stakeholder theory was applicable to this research based on the work of Phillips and Phillips (2012), who posited ROI, could assist stakeholders in immediately indicating the benefits of an intervention strategy.

Three common uses of stakeholder theory are (a) descriptive or empirical, (b) instrumental, and (c) normative (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). These approaches are essential to the purpose of stakeholder theory; only the instrumental and normative approaches apply to academic research (Stieb, 2009). One principle of stakeholder theory is stakeholders should be involved in business operations. Working within stakeholder theory, one may be able to assess the impact that organizational change has on stakeholders (Ng & Sears, 2012).

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow developed the hierarchy of needs theory in a 1943 paper titled *A Theory of Human Motivation* (Martelli & Abels, 2011). Maslow's hierarchy of needs is a model that describes how leaders address basic, low-level needs before addressing higher level needs such as self-fulfillment (Martelli & Abels, 2011). The theory was applicable to this research because Maslow's hierarchy of needs indicates that motivation can be an unfulfilled need (Martelli & Abels, 2011). Lin and Jamil (2013) determined leaders who have their need for self-actualization met could have a positive impact on ROI. Using Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, performance interventions in business can lead to greater efficiency in operations for stakeholders' benefit (Martelli & Abels, 2011).

The five categories of needs are (a) physiological needs, (b) safety needs, (c) social needs, (d) esteem needs, and (e) self-actualization needs (Martelli & Abels, 2011). Dobbin, Kim, and Kale (2011) recognized that external social issues create internal advocacy for organizational improvements. The results of the Dobbin et al. study provide evidence to support performance as a social need that leads to efficiency in business and furthers employees' self-actualization goals.

Application of Theories

Working within the stakeholder and Maslow's hierarchy of needs theories, I attempted to understand how leaders use ROI to understand the benefit of organizational change (Olsen, Lung, Ellingsen, & Harvigsen, 2012). Georges (2013) identified the stakeholder and Maslow's hierarchy of needs address how a lack of social and organizational programs may affect organizations. When organizational leaders seek intervention strategies, they should identify the benefit of the strategies.

Simon (2010) stated the conceptual framework provides structure for a dissertation or doctoral study. Researchers use conceptual frameworks for direction so that their intent is clear in relation to their goals. I sought to understand how to assist organizational leaders in using ROI to measure change using the stakeholder and Maslow's hierarchy of needs theories.

Operational Definitions

Throughout this study, a few terms appear that have specific meanings based on the context of the subject matter.

Corporate social responsibility: Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a set of regulations built into a business model (Lo, 2010).

Institutional review board: An institutional review board (IRB) is a committee who approves, monitors, and upholds the ethics of research involving human participants (Tuchman, 2011).

Medical facility for veterans: A medical facility for veterans (MFV) is a government-owned and operated medical facility that caters exclusively to U.S. veterans and their families (Davis et al., 2012).

Organizational development: Organizational development (OD) is a planned effort to increase organizational and staff viability and reverence (Ong et al., 2012).

Patient-aligned care team: A patient-aligned care team (PACT) is a system of provider and clinical staff dedicated to veterans as individuals to support their whole health needs. The PACT was an operational change instituted by the MFV under exploration in this study in 2010 (Davis et al., 2012).

Performance improvement: Performance improvement is a system of positive changes in process, capacity, and outcomes of intervention strategies as practiced in private, government, and voluntary sector organizations (Phillips & Phillips, 2012).

Performance interventions: Performance interventions are competitive strategies in which a company leader takes action to cope with competition to create a superior ROI (Phillips & Phillips, 2012).

Performance: Performance is a measure of accomplishment in terms of the accuracy or completeness of the task given to an individual or group (Glavan, 2012).

Return on investment: Return on investment (ROI) refers to benefits or costs associated with a project or implementation strategy (Phillips & Phillips, 2012).

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

In this section, I acknowledge deficiencies, including errors in human analysis and the availability of resources to reduce bias in research (Crowther & Lloyd-Williams, 2012). Assumptions are research issues the researcher cannot control, and limitations are weaknesses in the study. Delimitations are characteristics that define the scope and boundaries of the study. The following is the recognition of deficiencies and the plan for addressing them.

Assumptions

I made the following assumptions in conducting this study: Data reflected sound realities and added validity to the study, and participants were honest in their responses about the research topic. Participants were willing to participate in this study, and the chosen analysis method and the sample size were sufficient to detect themes from the collected data. Further, I assumed participants' responses supported the literature review in this study, and the findings of this research could increase the knowledge base of professionals with limited experience using ROI.

Limitations

One limitation of this study was the possibility of misinterpreting the meaning of the participants' responses due to their inability to describe processes, procedures, or uses of data concerning ROI. There was the potential for error in the analysis of data gathered for the purposes of this study. All research remained within the limits of the conceptual framework of this study, and the participants' accurate reflections of their experiences. The small sample size was also a limitation. I was unable, as the primary instrument, to have contact with all MFVs in the United States. During the member check process, only nine of the 20 participants responded to a request to member checking their responses.

The participants from the CTX MFV were willing to offer their experiences to complete this study. My interpretation of ROI was valid; however, to eliminate bias, participants' conflicting interpretations of the ROI construct were present in the analysis. Themes that appear in the research have codes, and I used keywords in context (KWIC) to minimize the potential inaccuracy of data interpretation. The use of the qualitative method was also a limitation, as explained in the nature of the study, because the qualitative method is suitable to answer *how* and *why* questions (Qu & Dumay, 2011).

Delimitations

The delimitations in this study resulted from the choice of the problem and the environment. Exploring the use of ROI to measure performance is new to leaders (Elden & Durand, 2010). Delimitations narrow the scope of the study by specifying what will not be in the study (Rusly, Corner, & Sun, 2012). My research applied data from electronic mail responses collected over a period of 2 weeks. The geographical delimitation was the region of Central Texas. Participants were managers at MFVs in the veterans integrated service network (VISN). The delimitations allowed me to gather detailed, qualitative data while focusing on the population affected by the research topic.

Significance of the Study

In this section, I describe why this study is of relevance to effective business processes. There was a recommendation for additional exploration of perceived gaps in understanding of effective business practices using ROI (Ai, Brockett, Cooper, & Golden, 2012). Moreover, leaders are interested in how ROI may contribute to social change (Santos, 2012). The study information provides a rationale for the choice of the problem and research methodology based on findings of other academic researchers.

Reduction of Gaps and Social Impact

Leaders should select interventions based on existing evidence related to performance. Previous researchers reported a positive relationship between ROI and performance (Glavan, 2012; Herring & Henderson, 2013). However, that research did not identify the impact of the use of ROI in MFV settings. Moreover, source data are not clear concerning whether leaders' understandings of ROI lead to effective performance interventions. In my doctoral research study, I addressed these gaps.

Research is of value to the process of developing effective business practices, as research allows individuals to identify factors that may have a social impact (Cook & Glass, 2011). Teams, individuals, and citizens living in communities respond well to performance intervention programs. Stakeholder measures of investment provide evidence of the potential impact a program might have (Herring & Henderson, 2013).

Implications for Social Change

Theories of social change should be plausible, testable, and meaningful to everyone who could benefit (Herring & Henderson, 2013). Social change may occur when a researcher identifies all possible stakeholders. My results from this study may contribute to social change by reinforcing the strategic role of leaders in the implementation of performance intervention strategies. In a global economy and diverse society, development of a motivated, competent employee base using intervention strategies is essential for long-term business success (Fusch & Gillespie, 2012).

Udechukwu (2012) posited research on performance might contribute to organizational change. Researchers use organizational intervention strategies to encourage employees to respect each other and increase performance (Hamann et al., 2013). Leaders use an organization's culture to determine whether employees will welcome intervention strategies (Katou, 2012). In a struggling economy, performance and contributions are favorable to stakeholders (Patzelt & Shepard, 2011). By increasing awareness of ROI, I aspire to encourage peers, colleagues, and researchers to pursue studies on ROI to broaden the domain of organizational intervention strategies.

Future researchers could benefit from the listed social change concepts by repeating this analysis in future studies. A possible benefit of repetition of the study is to connect leaders' performance goals with their organizational objectives (Patzelt & Shepard, 2011). Calás, Smircich, and Bourne (2009) noted that, by reframing performance from an economic issue to an issue of social change, benefit might come from strategies used to increase performance.

A Review of the Professional and Academic Literature

Use of ROI is essential in managing performance interventions (Glavan, 2012). Leaders unaware of how to implement and manage performance improvement programs could jeopardize organizational effectiveness. Creative use of ROI by leaders can attract financial resources (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). The purpose of this qualitative, descriptive embedded, single-case study was to understand how leaders in two program units could use ROI to assess the benefit of organizational change. In this research study, I described how to assist leaders in using ROI to determine the benefit of organizational change. This section contains a review of the literature, and resources related to the research topic. The discussion covers performance intervention strategies compared to ROI, performance, the conceptual frameworks, and the future states of ROI.

Strategy for Searching the Literature

I reviewed over 221 articles from February 22, 2010 to September 30, 2014. Included in this review are 60 peer-reviewed references and 85% of all articles used in this study had a publication date between 2010 and 2014. The keywords and phrases used were *social responsibility, financial performance, social performance, business costs, corporate social responsibility, stakeholder theory, performance, performance advantage, performance rating, return on investment,* and *performance gaps.* The databases searched included Business Source, ProQuest, and the ABI/Inform database. This review of the literature focuses on ROI and performance. Results of the literature search are in topical order to advance the understanding of ROI, and support the research question.

Return on Investment

Leaders have used ROI as a way to show credible values for investments (Georges, 2013). Stakeholders can use ROI results to determine the value of key programs (Herring & Henderson, 2013). Parisi (2013) stated government enterprises could include public utilities, waste management systems, transportation systems, and healthcare. These enterprises are examples of targets for ROI analysis.

Use of ROI allows leaders to adapt to changing environments (Ai et al., 2012). High level professionals notice the benefits of ROI. Out of 352 executives surveyed, 75%

reported a need to integrate ROI into their strategic decision making (Brower & Mahajan, 2013). Leaders do not appear to undertake this integration in reality; Lubin and Esty (2010) wrote that firms lack an overall plan for approaching ROI and delivering results, and many leaders launch initiatives without a vision or plan.

Performance, as measured by monetary value, affects the work processes that contribute to organizational goals. Return on investment is common practice in business. Sin, Huang, and Lin (2012), as well as Lopez-Fernandez and Sanchez-Garday (2010), supported this belief and affirmed that ROI is the measure of the likelihood of return. The ROI calculation is a performance intervention measure of cost and benefits; ROI is equal to the benefit/cost ratio (BCR) divided by the monetary value (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). The ROI is a process for measuring, analyzing, interpreting, and reporting results. Return on investment is also appropriate for research specific to performance interventions (Grant, 2012). Performance improvement professionals share the idea they should prove the contribution of their programs to leaders.

Grant (2012) determined researchers have dealt with ROI concepts by expanding the definition of what is valuable. Grant identified an increase in the number of types of evidence that leaders use to justify contributions. Evidence-based evaluation has become popular with business professionals (Fusch & Gillespie, 2012). Kaafarani and Stevenson (2011) noted that activities within a business are often complex.

Determining actual expenditures on intervention strategies is complex as well (Kaafarani & Stevenson, 2011). When there is a consistent lack of alignment in results, the increased costs of business interventions could influence leaders’ interests in ROI

(Chambel & Sobral, 2011). Using ROI to measure strategies for processes, people, and programs is becoming common practice in business (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). Leaders focus on the cost of adhering to programs that focus on the productivity and retention of employees (Chambel & Sobral, 2011). Failure to invest in talent may have negative consequences, including negative employee engagement, high turnover rates, and decreased performance (Mitchell & Olsen, 2013). Talent investment is a weakness in many industries, when correlated to ROI (Glavan, 2012).

Leaders' intentions when using ROI should be to recover expenditures altogether or partially from income collected through rates for services (Herring & Henderson, 2013). Debt can lead to pressure to increase user rates to pay the debt, and meet coverage requirements (Dierksmeier, 2013). However, higher user rates may lead to affordability issues. With proper debt management practices, managers can assist in maintaining a reasonable debt load (Truffer et al., 2010).

Advocates for ROI as a measure of profitability have noted that higher levels of ROI indicate firms with higher levels of profitability (Mitchell & Olsen, 2013). Leaders who use ROI as a proxy for profitability, however, use ROI ineffectively (Luke, 2013). When managers use ROI to reach their goals, increases in ROI can lead to lower profits (Luke, 2013). Instead, leaders should measure ROI elasticity, which is useful for assessing the profitability of interventions because ROI elasticity connects ROI and performance (Schilke & Goerzen, 2010).

According to Schilke and Goerzen (2010), ROI and performance share a strategic domain, so allying the two measures allows leaders to alter their resource base. Leaders who use a particular implementation strategy are not successful unless the strategy is part of the operational function (Luke, 2013). Leaders should take steps to overcome resistance by carefully and methodically implementing ROI (Hamann et al., 2013). Implementation involves assigning responsibilities, building the necessary skills, and developing plans around the process. Leaders have historically chosen not to pursue ROI because they perceive the ROI as a performance evaluation process rather than a process improvement tool (Herring & Henderson, 2013). Planned implementation involving stakeholders and staff may overcome these barriers.

Leaders understand the effectiveness of prevention and intervention programs (Jones, Beynon, Pickernell, & Packham, 2013). Leaders use the expanded ROI benefit/cost model to incorporate the evolving state of research-based evidence. Return on investment is reliable for showing the value in tangible and creative improvements (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). My objective was to gain insight on what techniques may help managers use ROI to improve performance within an organization.

Implementing Performance Improvement Programs

Performance measurement is a business tool used by managers (Pekkola, 2013). There are three reasons leaders use business performance measurements: to implement and validate a strategy, to influence employees' behavior, and to report externally on performance (Stewart & Harle, 2010). Pekkola (2013) posited purposes for using performance measurement. Simon (2010) argued that the use of performance measurement strategies extends into six broad categories: decision making, control, signaling, teaching, learning, and external communication.

Leaders use performance interventions to create solutions that alleviate or solve workplace problems (Hamann et al., 2013). Leaders who implement performance interventions cause change and have an impact on individuals, groups, or organizations (Pekkola, 2013). High level leaders facilitate change by preventing errors, reducing conflict, and providing vision for the future (Roll, 2013).

The need for measuring performance differs depending on the organization, and the purposes of its use can depend on the strategy, organizational culture, and other characteristics of the organization (Pekkola, 2013). The purposes of using a performance measurement strategy (PMS) depend on such elements as the strategy, tightness, and formality of the network (Roll, 2013). Performance measurement used by business professionals may increase communication, decision making, and detection of problems within an organization (Sarwar, 2013).

In healthcare settings, how managers understand ROI and performance strategy can be vital to leaders in expanding access of care to patients (Liu et al., 2012). There is value to creating exceptional patient experiences rather than simply improving services (DiGioia & Greenhouse, 2012). Implementing the PACT initiative within the MFV has been beneficial (Davis et al., 2012).

Performance measurement and improvement approaches. Pekkola (2013) posited in a qualitative case study that performance measurement is useful in four measurement areas: financial, future, customer, and employees. The financial area measures the financial aspects of operations, such as profits, orders, and the contribution margin. The future area measures future-oriented details of business performance (i.e., forecasting and function predictions). The customer area measures the customers' opinions of the service quality and availability. The employees measure the welfare and wellbeing of the organizations in their network (Pekkola, 2013).

The theory behind the network-level PMS is, performance measures are the same for each measured area and individual within the areas. Pekkola (2013) found PMS information useful for calculating business-level averages, and creating employee-level information to manage the implementation strategy. Sarwar (2013) used a qualitative case study to explore the intrinsic desire among leaders to improve performance within their organizations. The pursuit of optimization has intensified the demand for waste elimination, process control, and efficient labor use to gain competitive advantages (Sarwar, 2013). In a turbulent economic climate, performance management is vital in helping to ensure competitive advantage (Rowland, 2013). Achieving competitive advantage has become complex due to changing business dynamics, competitive environments, and resource constraints (Glavan, 2012).

Lean philosophy is one of the initiatives business leaders attempt to adopt in order to streamline business processes and achieve optimization in resources (Glavan, 2012). Leanness is a process improvement technique used to create value (Karim & Arif-Uz-Zaman, 2013). Owing to the popularity of lean methodologies to provide the information necessary for decision making, PMSs are essential to measure the success of lean and other performance improvement interventions (Karim & Arif-Uz-Zaman, 2013). Rathner (2013) found simply measuring performance in research studies increases the performance level achieved by CSR leaders.

Organizations introduce PMSs to evaluate levels of performance, make comparisons with competitors, and plan future activities in changing environments (Franceschini, Geletto, & Turina, 2013). Employees may affect the implementation of an intervention, such as the design and implementation of a PMS (Parisi, 2013). Other PMS strategies involve the cost of quality, variances, period expenses, safety, profit contributions, and inventory turnover (Korhonen, Laine, & Suomala, 2013). Cost of quality measurement entails the determination of budgeted expenses versus the actual costs (Hass, 2010). Period expenses are the budgeted expenses versus the actual expenses (Parisi, 2013). Profit contribution is the incoming profit, and inventory turnover is the actual turnover versus budgeted turnover (Herring & Henderson, 2012).

Performance interventions have to be restrictive (Roll, 2013). Restriction in an intervention is a trade off because leaders sacrifice flexibility for accurate assessment of an intervention's success (Rathner, 2013). Restriction is necessary because competition, technological changes, and customers are forcing leaders to optimize the processes that enable them to deliver quality services (Karim & Arif-Uz-Zaman, 2013).

Multiple observations of performance should have enough freedom to estimate effects for every program. Performance measurement consists of two dynamics. The first is *traditional measurement systems*, which emphasize accounting and financial management. After 1980, the second phase of measurement systems appeared (Rathner, 2013). The business community realized the importance of measuring other dimensions of performance such as quality, customer satisfaction, process, and intellectual capital (Roll, 2013). A number of PMSs exist to capture these dimensions. Among these are the specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, time-specific (SMART) method, the performance measurement matrix, and the balanced scorecard (Georges, 2013).

Leaders use the SMART mnemonic to set professional goals (Georges, 2013). By contrast, a performance measurement matrix is a range of measures used to reflect the main inputs and outputs within a business (Fusch & Gillespie, 2012). The range of measures used in the performance measurement matrix can include total reports with errors, actual forecast costs, production time, late reports, and the average cost of reports.

Leaders use the balanced scorecard as a strategic planning and management system in government to align activities to the vision of the organization (Dembowski, 2013). The balanced scorecard began as a performance measurement framework that added strategic performance measures to traditional financial metrics to give managers a balanced view of organizational performance (Steib, 2009). Leaders use the balanced scorecard to transform an organizational strategic plan from a document into directives for subordinates (Dembowski, 2013).

Leaders balancing financial resources may use the balanced scorecard approach (Rowland, 2013). When integrated, leaders use the balanced scorecard to meet their professional goals such as strategic planning, performance measurement, and return. Using the balanced scorecard theory, an organization’s leaders can develop metrics, collect data, and analyze those data against four themes; employee training, corporate culture, individual and corporate self-improvement, and internal business processes (Rowland, 2013).

Components of performance. In knowledge worker organizations, people are the main resource (Dembowski, 2013). Metrics can guide managers in focusing training initiatives (Rowland, 2013). The foundations for success in knowledge worker organizations are growth and learning (Dembowski, 2013). Managers use metrics about internal business processes, rather than simply financial performance, to know how well their business is operating.

Customer satisfaction is important in any business (Cook & Glass, 2011). When leaders fail to satisfy customers, often other suppliers meet the customers' needs (Herring & Henderson, 2012). From this perspective, poor performance is a leading indicator of future decline, even though the financial picture may appear prosperous (Rowland, 2013).

Business leaders gain competitive advantage and achieve superior performance by holding, acquiring, and effectively using strategic assets (Cook & Glass, 2011). These assets are tangible, physical assets as well as intangible assets. Intangible assets are valuable, rare, and hard to imitate (Cook & Glass, 2011). Intangible assets are strategic, which generate sustainable competitive advantage and superior financial performance (Crossan, Mazutis, & Seijts, 2013).

Leaders may gain a competitive advantage by using performance improvement strategies (Gouillart, 2014). Competitive advantage consists of five components: community, platform, interactions, experience, and the business economic value (Crossan et al., 2013). Leaders should ask themselves whether the approach involves a process of engagement that leads to the building of a large, diverse community of people inside and outside the firm (Crossan et al., 2013). Building a community involves seeking input from all possible stakeholders (Russo, 2012).

The platform of strategic intervention pertains to assessing whether the approach provides leaders with a physical or virtual open discussion platform within the community (Russo, 2012). Leaders using strategic interventions may lead to the generation of new ideas, valuable designs of physical objects, places, processes, or the development of analytical insights (Gouillart, 2014). The interaction component requires leaders to assess whether the approach enables the development of a new set of stakeholder interactions (Gouillart, 2014; Russo, 2012). The experience level of leaders may result in an individualized experience for all stakeholders (Romme, 2011).

The processes described by Gouillart (2014) vary in the degree leaders may design initiatives to promote stakeholder participation. By analyzing how organizational leaders use these processes as a source of competitive advantage, managers may learn the strengths or weaknesses of the forms of transformation and make judgments (Gouillart, 2014).

Initiating and managing organizational change. Leaders have established transformation as a discipline of business (Glavan, 2012). Employees engage in transformation with external stakeholders as a group in designing a business (Sani, 2013). Glavan (2012) suggested, in creating social change, leaders should integrate employees into their corporate culture to achieve a performance advantage. Leaders demonstrate how performance ties to organizational strategy. Glavan found intervention strategies are useful to leaders who need to solve problems. Leaders who utilize an effective performance measurement strategy are more competitive than leaders without a strategy (Glavan, 2012). Managers meet their organizational hiring goals by focusing on team building and individuality (Cook & Glass, 2011).

Berg and Karlsen (2012) suggest that cultural dimensions may influence differences in performance improvement, communication, and change management. Cross-cultural differences may lead to different recommendations regarding the management of change projects in different cultures (Uzkurt, Lumar, Kizman, & Eminoglu, 2013). Organizational leaders seek to understand ways of promoting and nurturing organizational cultures and the mechanisms of readiness for developing, buying, or adapting innovations in organizations (Uzkurt et al., 2013).

Employee culture may affect the innovation ability of the organization (Uzkurt et al., 2013). For leaders, organizational innovation is embracing the process, which includes research, development, and implementation, of new ideas and behavior (Uzkurt et al., 2013). From a behavioral standpoint, innovation is the propensity for behavioral change and the extent to which a professional or unit tends to adopt new ideas earlier than any other individual does (Uzkurt et al., 2013). Leaders’ use of PMSs may influence their decisions about leadership styles, bonding, and their determination of the dominant cultures within an organization (Herdman & Mcmillan-Capehart, 2010). For example, while the dominant characteristics of a clan culture are participation and teamwork, for a market culture the dominant characteristics are competitiveness and goal achievement (Herdman & Mcmillan-Capehart, 2010). Culture, in this view, could have a restrictive, direct impact on the strategies for organizations (Herdman & Mcmillan-Capehart, 2010).

Policy is often the first indication of awareness that an organizational change should occur (Herdman & Mcmillan-Capehart, 2010). For example, in the United States, private sector health costs exceed public sector costs. Public expenditures are 45% of the total percentage of gross domestic products, and this proportion will grow under enacted reforms (Truffer et al., 2010).

Researchers are instrumental in the refinement of PACT. Bluhm, Harman, Lee, and Mitchell (2011) determined intervention strategies are useful for changing existing situations into preferred situations. Greener (2011) explained that design science illuminates the role that observation plays in the transformation of improvement processes. Observation leads to empathy, which leads to a sense of urgency and action. The same theme is a part of the Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, emphasizing the benefit of asking all parties about details of their unique experiences (Greener, 2011).

Innovation. Innovation is the process of generating new ideas and putting those ideas into practice (Uzkurt et al., 2013). The ability to innovate successfully is critical to the growth and competitiveness of organizational leaders (Büchel, Nieminen, Armbruster-Domeyer, & Denison, 2013). Innovation is the key to organizational survival. When leaders choose to pursue innovation as the pathway to ongoing success, the starting point is to develop a strategy (Chen, Zhao, Liu, & Dash Wu, 2012).

Uzkurt et al. (2013) identified successful business innovations. Successful innovations include the superiority, satisfaction, simplicity, speed, use of technology, product fit within an organization, and internal marketing (Uzkurt et al., 2013). Innovation is the process that transforms ideas into commercial value. When conducting

ROI analysis, leaders can determine the value of an innovation project by the relationship between the innovation's inputs and the performance of the new product or another output (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). Individual innovation processes consist of three dimensions: the generation, promotion, and the realization of innovative ideas (Glavan, 2012).

Culture affects behavior in two ways (Uzkurt et al., 2013). The first is through the socialization process of individuals, through which they learn how to act and behave (Uzkurt et al., 2013). The second way culture affects behavior is through individuals' preexisting values, beliefs, and assumptions, which reflect organizational structure, policy, management concept, and procedures (Büchel et al., 2013). These dimensions of organizational culture are a source of new ideas within an organization (Uzkurt et al., 2013).

Büchel et al. (2013) explained leaders use centrifugal forces to develop new knowledge capabilities by diversifying structures and processes. Leaders create the energy needed to coordinate efforts to make new products on time and within budget by integrating structures (Büchel et al.). Team innovation factors of customer focus and cultures describe centrifugal initiatives. Moreover, leaders use centrifugal initiatives to divert attention and resources toward customers while supporting new strategies (Glavas & Goodwin, 2013). Goal orientation is a centripetal initiative; professionals use to create structure and accountability around the teamwork objectives, and timelines (Büchel et al.). Glavan (2012) suggested that cognitive conflict could make employees tackle issues with innovative thought.

Organizational culture and performance. Cadden, Marshall, and Cao (2013) contended that performance and culture are responsible for leaders' behaviors. Knowledge sharing, high levels of trust and joint coordination add to profits for all parties, which would be difficult to achieve in isolation (Cadden et al., 2013). Cultural similarity is a predictor of positive outcomes.

Leaders' abilities to react to unexpected changes have positive performance outcomes (Sobel, Dutta, & Sanjukta, 2010). When cultural dimensions support performance, differences may not matter and can lead to a level of success (Uzkurt et al., 2013). Creating a culture of performance improvement removes the fear of cause and effect. Performance is a behavioral rather than an organizational outcome (Sobel et al., 2010). In 2008, Bartel wrote that organizational identity is distinctive within organizations. Understanding factors that affect employees is critical for leaders. Strong leader identification may contribute to organizational citizenship behaviors (Glavas & Goodwin, 2013).

Barriers to implementing performance improvements. Business leaders promote jobs, economic development, and must contend with community and environmental groups (Erie, 2012). Healthcare leaders apply the PACT concept, creating experiences that play a primary role in transforming care delivery. Through PACT initiatives, any leader of a healthcare organization can make changes similar to the MFV (Liu et al., 2012). Performance affects an individual's value system, indicates the dominant values of business leaders, and influences the success of OD programs (Glavan, 2012). Individuals implement policy. Leaders need to be aware behavior alterations required by performance interventions, might cause more change than anticipated (Katou, 2012). In proposing a solution in enforcement of policies, stakeholders should recognize the policies as a needed change.

Diverse geographical regions may have a difficult time implementing policy (Mcmillan-Capehart, Aaron, & Cline, 2010). Developing a robust understanding of performance is of significance to professionals in the labor market (Hur, Stickland, & Stevanovic, 2010). When leaders choose to address performance, a strong organizational approach is necessary (Stewart & Harle, 2010). Alderson and Betker (2012) argued leaders face problems in the transposition of ideas and concepts from smaller to larger groups. Leaders may overcome transposition problems through enacting policies regarding training opportunities, which can force organizations at all levels to use the same intervention strategy. The emergence of business consultants enables employers to find individuals outside the company to manage their performance intervention (Alderson & Betker, 2012).

When approaching organizational studies, one focuses on understanding organizational processes of growth, change, and decline (Gotcheva, Watts, & Oedewald, 2013). Organizations are systems that change by receiving inputs from their environments and transforming them into outputs (Stewart & Harle, 2010). Safety critical organizations, such as nuclear power, healthcare, aviation, and oil and gas industries are complex adaptive systems made up of interrelated components, and leaders have the capacity to change and learn from experience (Katou, 2012).

Leaders hoping to expedite organizational change could introduce performance-based evaluation (Lo, 2010). Communication is the goal of leaders' performance improvement programs (Hur, Strickland, & Stefanovic, 2010). Dembowski (2013) acknowledged performance appraisal as a benchmark to promote fair, performance-based employment practices. Introducing performance-based appraisal makes the transition to intervention strategy consistent (Dembowski, 2013). Assessment of each manager's performance creates opportunities within the company to implement an intervention strategy (Russo, 2012).

In summary, implementing a performance program can occur simultaneously with an ROI analysis. There has to be a need for an immediate benefit for leaders to determine the value of an improvement strategy. Herring and Henderson (2013) determined that emphasizing the value of goal setting and the need for leaders to establish a positive tone at the top is critical to the ROI of any venture. Leaders may gain an understanding from the implementation process of the value of having a plan (Katou, 2012).

Stakeholder Theory

Over time, stakeholder preferences evolve. To increase in the transferability of this study, I examined ROI for application in managerial processes. The advantage of using ROI is when used in strategy research; ROI has potential for leaders applying stakeholder theory (Verbeke & Tung, 2013). Stakeholder theory is part of developing mutually beneficial relationships with stakeholders, which is the key to the organizational capacity to generate future wealth (Fooks, Gilmore, Collin, Holden, & Lee, 2013). Fooks et al. (2013) posited that the temporal model of stakeholder theory might justify the use of existing stakeholder theory models, which constitute a worthwhile academic endeavor.

The temporal model does not involve managing a stakeholder network in which the goals of the actors change and require adaptation (Acevedo, 2012). The temporal view focuses on the transformational change in stakeholder management, which occurs when, stakeholders support the organization rather than seeking financial gain. This conceptual view of stakeholder theory coincides with Maslow's hierarchy of needs in meeting the goal of self-actualization (Martelli & Abels, 2011). In the 1960s, stakeholder theory originated, although Freeman et al. (2010) receive credit for stakeholder theory. Freeman et al. defined stakeholder theory as the idea that leaders should pay attention to the needs of any group or individual affected by the organization, since unsatisfied stakeholders may prevent future business success.

Stakeholder theory is the transparent integration and achievement of organizational leaders' social, environmental, and economic objectives (Freeman et al., 2010). Leaders use the systemic coordination of organizational business processes to improve the long-term economic performance of the organization (Wolf, 2014). Leaders may achieve this goal by developing relational capabilities that enable business professionals to design incentive mechanisms, which may improve environmental conditions.

Stakeholders influence organizational behavior by controlling access to key resources (Freeman et al., 2010). There are two types of resource management strategies available to individuals providing resources to the organization. First, an actor can determine whether the leaders will receive resources (Wolf, 2014). Such a withholding strategy translates into stakeholder influence with the decision or threat of withholding the resource (Wolf, 2014). Second, usage strategies are those in which a stakeholder continues to supply a resource, with conditions attached (Verbeke & Tung, 2013).

Wolf (2014) posited that direct influence strategies are those where the stakeholder manipulates the flow of resources to the organization. In business, this phenomenon determines how leaders should approach their stakeholders (Wolf, 2014). Leaders should be committed to the goals of their subordinates (Dierksmeier, 2013). Stakeholders commit organizations to public discourse.

Managers use performance and stakeholder theories to develop their views on intangible assets within a business (Brower & Mahajan, 2013). Return on investment consists of isolating the effects of the strategy, converting data to monetary value, assigning a monetary cost to the intervention, assessing the results of the analysis, and determining the intangible benefits of the intervention (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). Intangible benefits are those that are not obvious or measurable (Glavan, 2012). Knowledge is an intangible and salient benefit (Brower & Mahajan, 2013).

Parisi (2013) posited that organizational factors could play a role in the success and use of PMS. Hass (2010) suggested that both strategic and operational efforts contribute to leaders' abilities to achieve strategic goals. Investigating alignment entails examining values and leaders' communication with employees (Pedersen, 2010).

Using PMSs, external stakeholders' roles extend beyond defining the product, service, or experience they wish to obtain (Brower & Mahajan, 2013). Advocates of open innovation approaches always recommend starting with a focused problem formulation (Gouillart, 2014). As implementation proceeds, the breadth of experience of each stakeholder should become larger, and the empathetic connections between these stakeholders more intense (Brower & Mahajan, 2013).

Brower and Mahajan (2013) argued stakeholders set the norms for the experience and effects of corporate behavior. Organizational leaders have the responsibility of safeguarding the welfare of their businesses and balancing the conflicting claims of stakeholders (Smith & Joseph, 2010). Furthermore, managers should develop an understanding of stakeholder theory and identify those who can have an impact on the organization's ability to serve the marketplace (Freeman et al., 2010).

For external stakeholders, the focus of change is multiculturalism, access, and affirmative action (Smith & Joseph, 2010). Organizational change should be present in conversations about stakeholder theory. Stakeholder theory applies to ethical business practices (Stewart, 2011). The first step towards implementing organizational change is systematically diagnosing the problem (Schueffel, Amann, & Herbolzheimerdagger, 2011). Change has an economic impact within organizations (Sobel et al., 2010).

The stakeholder approach is an appropriate ethical metric to explore the effects managerial decisions have on stakeholders (Buckley, 2013). Stakeholders have an interest in change as their funds support the implementation of the changes (Ai et al., 2012). When leaders do not provide fair treatment to their stakeholders, an organization fails to be successful (Steib, 2009). Stakeholders' opinions may be missing from implementation strategies, including their ideas about organizational performance (Buckley, 2013).

Leaders should include stakeholders' opinions because of the different dimensions of performance affected by change initiatives (Schraeder & Self, 2010).

Formalized decision making processes may add to the role stakeholder values play in OD (Acevedo, 2012). Investors are concerned about the impact organizational change may have on performance (Hoffman, Tutic, & Weis, 2011). During an organizational transition, the initial condition for the change is the foundation of a path for dependence within stakeholder groups (Hoffman et al., 2011). The time required to change the conditions depends on the dependence relationship (Svensson & Wood, 2011). Strategic choices and the sequence of those choices may have an impact on organizational performance. The nature of decisions made by a team of managers plays a material role in how organizational transitions proceed (Hoffman et al., 2011).

The extent of citizens' vulnerabilities to business decisions and policies has been evident in the recession (Brown, 2013). Communities and individuals may suffer unfavorable exposure to the actions and policies of firms and managers (Lo, 2010). Furthermore, employees are vulnerable to strategic directions attempted by senior officers within an organization (Brown, 2013). The effects of managers' decisions may be broader in scope than those of other professionals (Lo, 2010).

Misinterpretation of efficiency may cause business processes to appear valuable when they are not (Buckley, 2013). Accurately gauging efficiency is important because efficiency is a competitive variable that could lead to improved marketplace performance (Verbeke & Tung, 2013). When consumers or employees are vulnerable to organizational action under conditions of leaders' efficiency and capability, leaders consider potential harms to these stakeholders (Brown, 2013). The failure in using stockholder or stakeholder theory is the reliance upon *universal* theory, which views the justification of principles as independent of the context of the application (Buckley, 2013).

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow, as cited by Dobbin, Kim, and Kaler (2011), provided an understanding of motivation by establishing levels of need. Martelli and Abels (2011) described Maslow's hierarchy of needs as consisting of five categories: physiological, safety and security, belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization. The lowest-level needs are physiological, and the highest level need is self-actualization. According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, the incentive to compete may indicate a leader's need to reach self-actualization (Dobbin et al., 2011). Lin and Jamil (2013) determined that, when leaders reach needs of self-actualization, ROI might be positive.

Other theories I explored were Vroom's 1964 expectancy theory (ET) and the observer effect. The ET is the assumption that behavior results from conscious choices made for the purpose of maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain (Berg & Karlsen, 2012). There is a positive correlation between efforts and performance. Favorable performance will earn individuals a reward. Rewards satisfy leaders' needs to achieve worthwhile goals (Renko, Kroeck, & Bullough, 2012). The Hawthorne effect, also known as the observer effect, refers to when workers modify an aspect of their behavior in response to a change in their environment, rather than in response to the nature of the change (Muldoon, 2012).

Stakeholder and Maslow's hierarchy of needs theories pertain to the human interactions of leadership (Marsh, 2013). Furthermore, stakeholder and Maslow's hierarchy of needs theories are applicable to the scope of this research. Out of the possible performance theories, the observer effect is popular. Observer effect adds to leaders' restriction of performance methodologies (Berg & Karlsen, 2012).

The Maslow's hierarchy of needs is a multiple level theory meant to satisfy needs, as leaders complete different levels of ROI analysis (Lim & Jamil, 2013). Globalization and technology add to creativity (Fillis & Rentschler, 2010). The goal is to deliver advantage in the marketplace when there is no monopoly. Another motivating factor for the pursuit of performance is passion. The weakness in this study is that passion is not a traditional business trait. Quan (2012) affirmed leaders who have a passion for what they do have exceptional performance. Passion encourages some leaders to assume risks; others may not undertake (Quan, 2012). Passion is similar to the self-actualization level in Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory.

Herring and Henderson (2013) affirmed that in countries with a higher incidence of increased wealth through performance, job growth increases. Cultural influences have an impact on performance advantage. Kreiser, Marino, Dickson, and Weaver (2010) posited cultural values affect the willingness of owners of competitive firms to undertake risk. Competition is a driver to maintain continuity in business (Marsh, 2013). While culture influences the performance of leaders within an organization, being able to gain experience from people implementing the techniques may contribute to research validity (Crowther & Lloyd-Williams, 2012).

Leaders contribute to the success of performance initiatives (Covin & Lumpkin, 2011). To implement change, leaders must have an organizational commitment to performance intervention programs (Mamaghani, 2012). Maslow's hierarchy of needs emphasizes the social need of employees to have a lower level need met to advance within an environment (Martelli & Abels, 2011). Responding to an individual's needs increases the likelihood that an employee will reach a higher level goal (Covin & Lumpkin, 2011).

On an individual level, personal beliefs play a role in organizational change (Mamaghani, 2012). Being able to embrace change is a part of Maslow's hierarchy of needs as change is beneficial on multiple levels. The ROI analysis can increase the capacity of individuals in the organization to move into a new state resulting from the change event (Phillips & Phillips, 2012).

Qualitative Research in Return on Investment Studies

Of the studies reviewed for this section, 70% were qualitative in nature. Of the studies about performance, ROI, change, and management, 80% used the qualitative method (Carr, Madan, & Alvarez, 2011; Covin & Lumpkin, 2011; Elden & Durand, 2010). Four qualitative case studies by Lin and Jamil (2013), Korhonen et al. (2013), Pastore, Carr-Chellman, and Lohmann (2011), and Elden and Durand (2010) documented applicability of the case study method to the present research.

Novice researchers with faculty guidance are more efficient at conducting a qualitative than a quantitative study (Rowley, 2012). After practice, the transition into other research methods may take place. Based on the methods used by authors of ROI studies, 93% used the qualitative method. The qualitative method was appropriate for this study to obtain an accurate reflection of participants' gained experiences with the topic. Organizational PACT teams have different specialties, such as ambulatory care or specialty care, which includes optometry, vascular surgery, and podiatry (Davis et al., 2012). In order to obtain a cross section of ROI approaches in a typical MFV, I used a qualitative method with a case study design to gain insight from PACT managers throughout the MFVs in CTX.

Outlook on Performance Intervention Strategies

Return on investment requires that leaders practice diligence, financial acumen, and leadership (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). In response to a national survey, 80% of business professionals were unhappy with their ability to measure performance (Homburg et al., 2012). Out of that 80%, only 17% of the respondents reported their organization had a comprehensive performance measurement system (Homburg et al., 2012).

There are ongoing research efforts and studies on ROI. Homburg et al., (2012) found, between 2000 and 2010, ROI analysis led to a general agreement that effective communication has been one of the best indicators of leaders' business performance. Top communicators in organizations around the world have not established financial measurement of communication as a performance indicator (Meng & Berger, 2012). Thus, the impact of organizational senior leaders' support, contribution, and participation in communication efforts on ROI is unpredictable (Homburg et al., 2012).

For leaders, the link between financial performance and communication should be stronger than the links between financial performance and other performance indicators. There are recurring interactions between strategic communication teams and stakeholders (Meng & Berger, 2012). Understanding how to meet or exceed the ROI expectations of intervention strategies is paramount. The weakness in ROI analysis is that for ROI to be effective, leaders require a commitment to performance as part of the culture within an organization (Rusly et al., 2012).

Commitment among business professionals creates opportunities for stakeholders, not an organization. One reason for this is that the culture surrounding performance is difficult to implement and imitate (Duvendack & Palmer-Jones, 2013). Performance culture does not directly pertain to ROI. One aim of this study was to help establish a link between performance and ROI by focusing on a performance intervention that was in the implementation phase (Rusly et al., 2012).

In business, a change in routine does not automatically bring success (Carr et al., 2011). Cook and Glass (2011) identified performance management systems increase job motivation and satisfaction. Both motivation and satisfaction produce positive results in employee productivity. Motivation and satisfaction are an indication that performance interventions could link to business ROI.

Given the intensity of spending to fund performance improvement programs and the lack of a metric on the effectiveness of those programs, ROI research is paramount to business (Mitchell & Olsen, 2013). The different outcomes of performance improvement implementation have value to different parts of the organization, such as human resources, PACT, fiscal services, etc. (Georges, 2013). For example, leader support may not have a direct, immediate monetary return to the organization; however, quality leaders should contribute to the quality of the organization (Herring & Henderson, 2013).

The ROI is useful when there is an immediate return, especially when gaining contracts or funding (Rusly et al., 2012). This process demonstrates the value of leadership contributions to the goals of their employees. Researchers should communicate results, in a way; that is meaningful and relatable to stakeholders (Colgan, 2011). Exploring a change within a healthcare setting should provide a background that is relevant to the public and transparent to potential readers.

In order to develop ROI, researchers argue that, in the future, social value should take the place of economic value (Cameron & Molina-Azorin, 2011; Jones et al., 2013). Value could allow researchers whose specialty is ROI to analyze changes in business. Social value is a theory that aligns with Maslow's hierarchy of needs including basic needs such as providing food, water, shelter, education, and medical services to members of a community (Pastore et al., 2011). My research findings may allow leadership to embrace ROI and strengthen the applicability of the design science.

Transition and Summary

In Section 1, I presented the foundation of the study. Section 1 included the background of the problem; statement of the problem; purpose and nature of the study; research questions; description of the conceptual framework; definitions of key terms; description of assumptions, limitations, and delimitations; and the significance of the study. Furthermore, Section 1 included a review of the literature related to the research topic. Section 2 includes the design of my empirical research related to ROI, performance intervention, and organizational change. Moreover, located in Section 2 are the data collection details. Section 3 contains the results of the data analysis.

Section 2: The Project

In Section 1, I presented the business problem, which was leaders' lack of understanding of how to use ROI to measure the benefit of organizational change. Stakeholder theory and Maslow's hierarchy of needs were the conceptual frameworks used in this study. Leaders use stakeholder and Maslow's hierarchy of needs to describe human interactions (Marsh, 2013). Freeman et al. (2010) described stakeholder theory as a salient conceptual framework whereby all individuals can benefit from an organizational change. Maslow's hierarchy of needs is a comprehensive assessment of change readiness that incorporates evaluation at both the individual and organizational levels (Kirsch, Chelliah, & Parry, 2012).

In the literature review, I shared critical findings from Quan (2012), Carr et al. (2011), and Haas (2010). Return on investment can be integral to understanding organizational change (Haas, 2010). In addition, Section 1 included a description of the limitations, delimitations, and assumptions for the study. In Section 2, I presented the justification for selecting the qualitative, descriptive embedded case study research methodology. Included is a description of the selected population of two departmental units within MFV. The population includes managers with direct experience in using ROI for organizational improvement. Finally, there is a description of the data collection procedures, data analysis techniques, reliability, and validity of data. Section 2 concludes with a summary and a description of Section 3.

Purpose Statement

In this qualitative, descriptive embedded single-case study, my intent was to explore how to assist leaders in understanding ROI to measure the benefit of organizational change. Out of 96 PACT managers in Central Texas (CTX), 20 participants (10 in Case 1 and 10 in Case 2) employed at the MFV in CTX agreed to participate in this research. My results from this study may add to ROI research in business. This research may contribute to social change by increasing awareness of intervention strategies used to meet organizational performance objectives.

Role of the Researcher

In order to act as a research instrument absent of bias, I used a semistructured, open-ended interview to understand how managers use ROI. As an administrator for the MFV, I had access to PACT managers throughout the CTX MFV. The PACT managers are federal employees in support of administrative staff. Administrators do not work for or have any affiliations with the participant organization.

My professional experience includes conducting interviews as an administrator for the MFV. I have facilitated groups as a U.S. Army Officer. My role, throughout the data collection process, was organizing, collecting, and interpreting the data. In qualitative research, researchers and participants investigate the problem together to gain knowledge (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). The purpose of this process is to arrive at the essence of the phenomenon under study, which is the epoch: When a phenomenon is not evident, a case study is appropriate (Yin, 2012). To do this, researchers must suspend interpretation during the data collection phase to limit bias (Simon, 2010). There was no direct contact with participants, and the leadership role held was with direct reports (unit leaders) that had direct contact with PACT managers.

The managers contacted me using electronic mail. All participants should benefit from this research because the results of this study may help leaders understand how ROI strategies may improve performance interventions for which they are responsible. By seeking participants' accounts of their experiences relevant to the topic, I sought to ensure clarity in the data collection process and the validity of the study. Clarity in data collection and maintaining validity are important elements of the case study design (Yin, 2012).

Participants

Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2007) wrote that qualitative researchers typically make inferences of a proper sample size. The arbitrary manner in which one arrives at a qualitative sample is a problem in research. When qualitative researchers use an appropriate sample size, they have a realistic chance of reaching data saturation (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007).

Twenty PACT managers who worked for the CTX MFV in two hospital support divisions (10 for each case) responded to the demographic questionnaire through electronic mail. The traditionally recommended number, when conducting a case study is between 10 and 12 participants (Quinlan, 2011). Marshall and Rossman (2010) found that seven to 10 participants are appropriate for qualitative case studies, although groups as small as four and as large as 12 are typical for groups of case studies. Marshall, Cardon, Poddar, and Fontenot (2013) recommended that case studies contain 15 to 30 interviews.

Based on the recommendations of Quinlan (2011), Marshall and Rossman (2010), and Marshall et al. (2013), I chose a sample size of 20 participants to reply to the demographic questionnaire for this qualitative single-case study.

Chain purposive sampling yields participants with knowledge of the problem being studied (Penelope & Pattison, 2012). A purposive sample is a subset of the larger population that will fulfill a need or purpose (Stake, 2010). The cases for this study consisted of MFV PACT managers in two program support units (Yin, 2012). I am an employee of a CTX MFV; therefore, access to the participants was not an obstacle. There was no use of coercion to recruit participants. The strategy for gaining access to participants was purposeful sampling. The PACT implementation began in 2010; therefore, all participants worked at the MFV prior to 2010 (Davis et al., 2012). The criteria for a chain selection of study participants did not cause bias. These criteria were that participants (a) had PACT experience, (b) had obtained employment at the MFV prior to 2010, and (c) had at least 5 years of experience as MFV managers.

Individuals who agreed to participate replied in the first series of electronic mail communications and consented to the information in the invitation letter by printing and answering the attached demographic questionnaire. There was not a response rate of less than 40%, and therefore, there was no need for expansion of the data collection technique to include another PACT unit.

The measure taken to ensure the ethical protection of participants was elimination of participants' personal identifiers. In an effort to remain impartial and objective, I debriefed the participants and adhered to the following strategy to maintain a working relationship with them. The data retention plan consisted of maintaining information collected on a secure external hard drive with a secure password. I analyzed the demographic questionnaire attachments received in the data collection process. I will destroy the paper documents using a secure shredder, as well as the data and coding needed for analysis, 5 years from the publication date of this study to protect the privacy of the participants, and to comply with the ethical standards for research.

Research Method and Design

In this descriptive embedded single-case study, the goal was to answer how to encourage leaders to use ROI. To understand the problem, I used a qualitative research method. The qualitative method and case study design were appropriate to increase understanding of the subject.

Method

Given the nature of the research question, scope, and sample size, the qualitative research method, used in conjunction with a single-case study research design, was appropriate for this research (Tracy, 2010). The three possible methods considered for this study were quantitative, qualitative, and mixed research methods. The qualitative research method was appropriate, as there were human participants. According to Cameron and Molina-Azorin (2011), researchers who use the qualitative method have the flexibility to analyze participants through open-ended interviewing.

Dul and Hak (2012) explained that researchers who use the quantitative research method examine relationships between variables central to answering questions and hypotheses through surveys and experiments. The outcomes resulting from the use of quantitative data are numerical and empirical. My research consists of interpretation of human experiences, rather than numerical analysis. Researchers use the quantitative method to connect sample analysis of the data to applicable outcomes (Simon, 2010). Quantitative research was not appropriate to answer my research questions.

Case studies require triangulation among data types; however, triangulation did not warrant the extra resources mixed methods studies would require (Tuchman, 2011). Instead, triangulation within a qualitative study may include multiple approaches to data collection (Yin, 2012). I used a semistructured interview process and archival data from MFVs. The mixed research method is the use of quantitative and qualitative methods simultaneously. A researcher may synthesize the results into meaningful analysis. No statistical data applied to this study; thus, the use of a mixed method would have been inappropriate.

Research Design

Dul and Hak (2012) indicated researchers favor the case study method. The case study method is suitable for qualitative research for three reasons. First, researchers using a qualitative method collect data from human participants, allowing for the generation of theories from practice (Stake, 2010). Second, a case study is appropriate for researchers studying an understudied topic, when one may not manipulate the behavior of participants (Hutcheson, 2011). Furthermore, Stake (2010) defined case study research as empirical inquiries that investigate a phenomenon within a real-life context when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clear.

Researchers use case studies to evaluate existing theory (Ployhart & Ward, 2012). Based on this explanation, a single site, descriptive embedded case study design was appropriate for this research. Researchers use case study designs to establish the procedures and general rules that apply to the phenomenon under study (Jogulu & Pansiri, 2011). Case studies consist of an overview of objectives, issues, and topics investigated in order to communicate to the reader the general topic of research and to achieve the purpose of the study (Yin, 2012). I used the Walden University Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) rubric as an outline of the methodology and general rules for conducting this study.

Interpretive research does not involve hypothesis testing and repeatability; instead, the researcher focuses on understanding the context of the research problem (Bluhm et al., 2011). Grounded theory, case study, ethnography, and action research are qualitative research designs associated with interpretive paradigms (Yin, 2012). Grounded theory, a popular theory across all research paradigms (Latham, 2013), involves the generation of theory from systematic research (Dul & Hak, 2012). The goal of using grounded theory is to produce theories from qualitative or quantitative data to understand the social context (Bluhm et al., 2011). Grounded theory was not suitable for this study because the goal of the study was not to develop a theory to explain phenomena. Instead, the goal of the study was to understand a particular phenomenon, the use of ROI among leaders at CTX MFVs, in order to understand how to assist leaders in using ROI analysis.

Ethnographic research design involves a descriptive written account of a culture or group (Yin, 2012). Researchers use ethnographic designs to focus on population, place, and time (Watson, 2012). An ethnographic design is not a secondhand observation from previous accounts (Yin, 2012). Ethnography was not appropriate for this research due to the length of time involved in the completion of a doctoral study.

Action research otherwise known as, participatory research, collaborative inquiry, action learning, or contextual action research, and all are variations on a theme (Yin, 2012). I had no contact with the sample for this study. Therefore, action research was not suitable. Phenomenology is a philosophical design used to explore lived experiences; sociologists using this design may seek to gain an understanding of the relationship between individuals and social life (Ployhart & Ward, 2012). The relationship between individuals was not under study in this case. Individuals' understanding of a business issue was paramount; therefore, a phenomenological design was not appropriate.

A case study approach was the selected research design based on the explanations of Urquhart et al. (2010), Ployhart and Ward (2012), and Stake (2010). My research question required an embedded, descriptive, single-case study design. The grounded theory, action research, phenomenological, and ethnographic designs are qualitative but are not appropriate for case study (Yin, 2012). A single-case study research design was relevant to the problem studied.

Population and Sampling

The sample consisted of 20 MFV managers out of 96 total MFV managers in CTX. A confidence level of 30% to 50% is adequate for qualitative research purposes

(Cameron & Molina-Azorin, 2011). Use of a purposeful chain sampling technique allowed me to select a cross-section of MFV managers who had worked at the MFV prior to 2010, and were knowledgeable of the problem addressed in this research. Chain sampling enabled me to contact individuals who would participate. Chain sampling is one of the many purposeful sampling techniques used to reduce variation in analysis (Simon, 2010).

There were 10 participants in each case. To be eligible for inclusion in this study, participants were required to have been employees of the MFV in management roles and to have worked prior to 2010, when PACT began. This population was appropriate to the research because I sought to understand leaders' understanding of ROI in implementing performance improvements. Exclusion criteria included having less than 5 years of experience in MFV, working for specialty clinics, and not being a member of a PACT. I contacted participants using MFV electronic mail; my correspondence included the invitation letter and the open-ended electronic questionnaire.

Ethical Research

Researchers should demonstrate the creditability and trustworthiness of their methods (Qu & Dumay, 2011). My credentials include certification in protecting the rights of human participants from the National Institute of Health (NIH), which I included in Appendix C. Walden IRB requires the NIH credential to conduct research. The approval number for this study is 08-23-13-0090003; the approval expired on August 22, 2014. Data collection was complete in 2013; there was no need to renew the IRB approval number. My role as a researcher was to ensure that this research met the criteria of applicable laws, professional conduct, practices, and institutional regulations (Crowther & Lloyd-Williams, 2012).

Independent of whether research is qualitative, quantitative or mixed method, researchers should anticipate any ethical challenges they may face. No data collection commenced prior to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval and identification number issuance. The IRB is responsible for ensuring that all research complies with Walden University ethics and U.S. federal regulations. The IRB requires approval of a prospectus before collection of any data, including pretest data. The university does not accept research conducted without IRB approval and will not grant credit for work that does not comply with the policies and procedures of a doctoral research study (Tuchman, 2011).

This study had human participants, and consent was necessary. The participants provided electronic consent to participate in this study in response to the invitation letter by printing the attached demographic questionnaire and returning their responses through interoffice mail (Appendix A). There was no need for organizational leaders to consent because MFV employees are officials of the public trust (Erie, 2012).

Participants reserved the right to withdraw from the study at any time by submission of a written request. In an effort to protect the integrity of the study, I did not offer incentives to participants. Data obtained in this study will be safe for a period of 5 years on an external hard drive with a secure password.

Data Collection

This section includes a description of the data collection instruments, the data collection technique, and the data organization. I collected data using semistructured, open-ended interview questions. The role of the researcher is to understand and interpret themes that arise in research (Dul & Hak, 2012). I was the primary instrument used to collect the data. The formal demographic questionnaire protocol consisted of contacting PACT managers through human resources personnel for the units involved by MFV electronic mail.

Data Collection Instruments

I sent an invitation letter and demographic questionnaire via MFV electronic mail. I wrote the invitation letter using NIH guidelines. Codes for information emerged using color-coded KWIC in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, located on a password protected Dell Inspiron 1545 laptop. Microsoft Excel is an electronic spreadsheet program with options for manipulating data (Hutcheson, 2011). To protect the privacy of participants and reduce the possibility of identification, I used an alphanumeric code instead of participant names. This code consisted of the letter *QP*, for interview participant, and a number ranging from one to 20 in the final study. In the pretest, the code consisted of the letter *P*, for the participant, and a number from one to 5. For example, the first participant in the pretest was P1, and the last participant in the final study was QP20. Participants who responded to the pretest did not participate in the final study.

The instrument utilized to obtain data from participants is a demographic questionnaire. Jabbour et al. (2011) found open-ended questions are useful to researchers in gaining qualitative data. Crowther and Lloyd-Williams (2012) posited that open-ended questions are appropriate to capture unbiased information to analyze situations within a population. Dul and Hak (2012) wrote that semistructured questioning format, including an open-ended interview questions was appropriate because participants may have different descriptions of the same event.

In the open-ended interview question format, the participants answered identical questions. I wrote the questions in a manner that ensured responses were descriptive. Participants the structure of the questions to contribute as much detailed information as they desired. Questions one through six were primary questions needed for analysis, and seven through ten were follow up questions.

Use of an open-ended question format is common in qualitative research studies as participants readily use the format to express their viewpoints (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). According to Simon (2010), one weakness of open-ended questioning is a researcher may have difficulty with coding the data. When there are many participants, biases and difficulty coding are reduced (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Crowther and Lloyd-Williams (2012) agreed that the sample size appropriate to obtain effective responses to open-ended questions is between 20 and 50 individuals. The sample size for this study was 20 participants.

To ensure reliability and validity of the open-ended interview questions, I included the following researchers' theories: Glavan (2012), Denzin and Lincoln (2011), and Kvale and Brinkmann (2009). These researchers suggested steps to maintain the validity of the study throughout data collection. I used 20 participants segmented into two groups of 10 for this single-case study research. Segmentation of the participants, allowed me to gain insight from at least two units whom have the same problem and to code information to align the results with the topic.

Using the interview questionnaire, I explored how leaders use ROI analysis to measure change; the behavioral patterns exhibited by leaders, and the evidence that ROI is viable for the individuals within an organization. Participants reported on how they measure ROI in their positions. The managers' views were different from unit leaders' as the unit leaders had more experience in the company and a different set of responsibilities.

To ensure test retest reliability, I adhered to the recommendations for a case study (Dul & Hak, 2012). The raw data, presented in section three, includes the KWIC analysis. The participants received feedback via interoffice mail, which contained a summary sheet of the findings of the study. The raw data used for the KWIC analysis were available to participants who provided a written request for the data. The data gathered allowed me to uncover the process organizational leaders utilize to gain an understanding regarding how to use ROI to measure benefits of a strategic intervention. Respondents were able to provide feedback or add information to their interview question responses during the member checking process.

Data Collection Technique

After IRB approval, I conducted a pretest. The methods and procedures of the study should apply to a larger scale if the pretest demonstrates that the methods and procedures might work (Arain, Campbell, Cooper, & Lancaster, 2011). The pretest sample consisted of five MFV unit leaders who serve in administrative roles over PACT managers. The purpose of the pretest was to determine whether my questions elicited useful responses. The tenure and quality of the unit leaders did not affect the nature of the questions used in the final study. Dul and Hak (2012) determined the addition of opinions in the planning of a study might add to the validity of the responses.

I contacted participants by sending the invitation letter to them via electronic mail with the open-ended interview questions attached. Included in the invitation letter was an explanation of the purpose for conducting the study. Participants agreed to take part in this research by giving their consent through the act of printing and answering the demographic questionnaire, in writing. Respondents returned the demographic questionnaire in an unmarked white envelope via interoffice mail, and I contacted them though anonymous MFV mail to offer an opportunity to provide additional comments. The data from the study are on a password protected computer file. The interview questions took approximately 20 minutes to answer based on the time stamp from the interoffice mail. The participants in the pretest did not participate in the final study.

In the final study, I used the chain sampling technique. In chain sampling, researchers compile data on members of the target population they may locate (Simon, 2010). The final study commenced over a period of two days via electronic mail communication with unit leaders. The participants provided consent by printing the demographic questionnaire attachment and sealing an envelope for delivery via interoffice mail to return within 48 hours of receipt. Crowther and Lloyd-Williams (2012) suggested a contingency plan adds structure to the data collection process. A follow up electronic mail allowed participants to ask any questions. No one replied to the second electronic mail. All participants answered within the two-day timeframe. None of the population failed to participate in the final study within the time requested.

In order to reach data saturation, I collected data until no participants gave new information in response to the demographic questionnaire. According to Phillips and Phillips (2012), while use of saturation determines the majority of qualitative sample size, other factors may dictate how one can achieve saturation in a qualitative study. When referencing performance initiatives, the aim of the study is the ultimate driver of the project design, the sample size, and when one reaches saturation (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). Through conducting a pretest to validate questions with five unit leaders and the final study with 20 PACT managers, saturation concluded when participants provided no new information. Upon the 17th demographic questionnaire analysis in the final study, all themes for my research were established. To assure I reached saturation, I continued collecting data,.

Case study content is reliant on the participation of individuals and the depth of participants' answers (Olivera-Aguilar & Millsap, 2012). I found the results of this study refer to an understanding of ROI, and the study allowed leaders to explain how the PACT intervention affects their programs. The data utilized to render an objective conclusion to the final study were the responses to questions 6 through 10 (Appendix C). There was a voluntary response from participants, because they indicated they would like to increase the use of ROI in their operations. Participants received a copy of the study through a third electronic mail communication.

Data Organization Techniques

Raw data from the pretest and final study will remain on an external hard drive for a period of five years from the completion of the study. Once the five-year period has passed, I will destroy all paper and electronic information, by removal and physical destruction of the hard drive devoted to the data collection; and shredding of all paper documents. The external hard drive is accessible by a password known only to me. Alphanumeric codes replaced identifying information to protect the anonymity of the research participants. I collected data for this research from participants via interoffice mail, scanned them into an Adobe PDF document, and coded participant responses in a Microsoft Excel document. Organizing data strategies for planning, collecting, storing, retrieving, analyzing, and writing about qualitative data is important for researchers to manage information collected for utilization in case studies (Rowley, 2012).

Data Analysis Technique

I garnered responses with the aim of answering the research question about what could assist leaders in using ROI to measure the benefit of organizational change. The questions in the semistructured, open-ended electronic, demographic questionnaire were:

1. What challenges does this organization face?
2. What processes improve performance in this organization?
3. What do leaders demonstrate to achieve performance?
4. What are some initiatives leaders may choose, and put in place as proactive measures to improve the ROI analysis for organizational change?

5. What is your understanding of ROI?
6. How is ROI practiced within your unit?
7. How does the unit/organization measure ROI?
8. How is ROI communicated to your customers?
9. What evidence shows ROI is working for your unit/organization?
10. Based on that evidence, how may an organization improve an ROI process?

My analysis included the similarities between participant statements and the conceptual frameworks used within this research for meaningful analysis (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). In the pretest, the data collection process consisted of five open-ended interview question documents sent via electronic mail to the pretest participants and returned in an unmarked white envelope. Pretest participants received the interview questions through electronic mail communication. In order to ensure participants' confidentiality, their responses were in a sealed envelope, returned through the interoffice mail between August 26 and August 29, 2013.

After reviewing pretest participants' responses to ensure the answers given would be useful for this research, I requested the human resource officer to suggest 20 PACT managers within the organization to whom I could send an invitation letter and demographic questionnaire. Participants in the final study completed their demographic interview questions between August 30 and September 6, 2013. All participants responded to the 10 identical semistructured, open-ended questions related to assisting leadership in utilizing ROI, using the same method used in the pretest.

Question 1 pertained to procedures and processes in the MFV aimed at addressing challenges within the organization. The use of ROI is not a common practice within the MFV. The participants, in response to this question, addressed the organizational performance measures that assisted leaders in developing their expertise in ROI analysis. I developed Question 2 to garner information about behavioral patterns when leaders implement a new process. In response to Question 3, participants gave information about how leaders may improve ROI through internal controls. Leaders who responded to Question 4 explained how ROI is present within their units. Participants discussed how ROI applies to their units in answering Question 5.

Participants described the processes they use to measure ROI in their responses to Question 6. I wrote Question 7 to elicit descriptions of how the leaders communicate ROI to their internal and external customers. Participants gave supporting information on how ROI is working within the participants' units in response to Question 8. Participants included information not previously addressed by questions 1 through 8 when they wrote their answers for questions 9 and 10. The design of questions 1 through 6 was to elicit a description of the PACT manager's ideas about leadership. Participants described PACT managers' understanding of ROI in questions 6 through 10.

Qu and Dumay (2011) suggested that researchers use open-ended questions to obtain information for which there are no predetermined answer categories. Simon (2010) posited that study participants give elaborate explanations when asked open-ended questions. Respondents were able to express their ideas in language that was comfortable for them, which enabled me to gain access to the depth and complexity of their use and understanding of ROI.

Coding

I entered the research data into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet by associated groups, through analysis of themes that emerged within the data. I coded the responses in the Microsoft Excel document for data storage, organization, and analysis. The themes consist of CS for the case study and PT for practice and theory. The KWIC code set was color based. The data in the first two themes were color coded for relevance using green (relevant), yellow (pending), and red (not relevant). The third theme reflected the overlapping of concepts, and the color-coding changed to purple. Using color for the coding process allowed me to control and track data. Data analysis followed the same structure as the research questions.

Hutcheson (2011) wrote that the KWIC coding method is useful for categorizing information and reassembling data to identify new connections among categories. By examining both cases, I categorized the similarities and differences. Evidence emerged in patterns and relationships that informed the research question. Use of KWIC is a proven method of cross-validation in qualitative research (Dul & Hak, 2012). By grouping expressions and eliminating repetitive information to determine the invariant constituents, the themes became clear. Georges (2013) wrote that researchers should conduct cross-case analysis of research before confirmation of results with confidence.

Cross-Case Analysis

I used cross-case analysis to explore and categorize similarities and differences in both cases. Once patterns emerged; I matched similar statements for themes in each case. Themes that emerged were training, leadership, recognition, consistency and communication. Use of case study methodology may facilitate a holistic understanding of the phenomenon under study (Yin, 2012). When researchers use multiple sources of analysis, they add strength to their findings to promote a greater understanding of the case (Arain et al., 2011).

The cross-case analysis consisted of sorting through the data, discarding irrelevant information, and merging relevant information to answer the central research question of the study. To gain an in-depth understanding of each case, both cases were pattern matched. Pattern matching consists of identifying common themes that emerged from the words used to answer each question (Yin, 2012). I identified categories for each case. Cross-case synthesis applied to this research because there was an embedded case (PACT) within two units.

A business professional’s goal in implementing a performance improvement strategy is to promote the opportunity to improve the organization (Glavan, 2012). Stakeholders accept performance measurement as an approach to organizational change (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). Stakeholder management is a tool to transfer ethics to management practice and strategy (Mishra & Mishra, 2013). My data may add to stakeholder information about performance measurement.

Triangulation

For data triangulation, I used the responses from the interview questions and archival data. Triangulation in research is a way of verifying patterns in information from at least three different sources of data (Yin, 2012). Triangulation in research is the combination of different methods, methodologies, or theoretical viewpoints (Flick, 2014). Archival records are a continuous source of data consisting of statistics of human activities in national and local governments (Pastore et al., 2011).

In this study, I used a national data set on the organization, generated in the time since the PACT implementation, between 2010 and 2012, to triangulate data. Liu et al. (2012); Belote, Fulton, and Brooks (2012); and Jsa et al. (2013) collected mixed method research data from MFVs where leaders implemented the PACT initiative. Simon (2010) suggested the use of archival data in studies to cross validate findings.

In the Belote et al. (2012) study on PACT, the data were from a multisite randomized controlled trial, and the researchers also published observational data collected during the first two years (2010 and 2011) of program operation. I used data from the first two years of the PACT implementation, as this information is complete. The combined data set contained information for 627 participants from 22 sites nationwide (Belote et al., 2012; Jsa et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2012). In section three, triangulation of interview question responses, performance evaluations, and archival records are presented in comparison to the findings of this study.

Reliability and Validity

In order to ensure reliability and validity, I was transparent in my processes. Compliance with IRB regulations contributed to the reliability of the conclusion and the dependability of recommendations found in this doctoral study. I reduced the effect on the reliability and validity by staying true to the qualitative research method.

Reliability

Business processes may improve through leaders’ implementation of recommended solutions (Katou, 2012). The use of quality research criteria is imperative to conform to the rules and regulations of productive qualitative research (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). The trustworthiness and authenticity of my doctoral study were ensured by staying consistent with the qualitative method and case study design.

Reliability is the extent to which a study yields the same results when repeated (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). The Walden IRB reviewed this study to ensure that ethical guidelines and the proposed method of inquiry was sound. Based on the topic and scope, my study design could apply to any business performance issue.

I obtained NIH certification and conducted a pretest to refine questions to ensure that the participants (i.e., PACT managers) understood the topic and questions. The results of this study are applicable to the overall population of the 96 PACT managers throughout the CTX MFVs, because every CTX MFV has PACT units. Those who choose to replicate this study should do so within the guidelines of the recommendations for further study in Section 3.

Validity

The first step to increasing the validity of recommendations was to maintain strict participant selection criteria and acquire research that represented the spectrum of leaders throughout the MFV. The criteria for case studies include researcher reliance on construct validity, internal validity, and external validity to exemplify the authority of research (Dul & Hak, 2012). I used member checking to ensure the validity of the participants' responses. Member checking includes the review of data and interpretations with the study participants to incorporate refinements and additional feedback to the final narrative (Tracy, 2010).

I eliminated potential research bias by having no contact with the sample population. Research bias is a process where the researcher may influence the results (Arain et al., 2011). To reduce bias, I triangulated the data from the interview questions against archival data. Triangulation is the use of two (or more) methods to check the results of a study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Qu & Dumay, 2011; Tracy, 2010). A result is valid when different methods lead to the same result (Simon, 2010).

Participants in the pretest were debriefed to affirm internal validity. Respondent validation is the same as member checking data to demonstrate proper meaning (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). I crosschecked the data throughout both cases to substantiate the research findings.

Transition and Summary

In Section 2, I presented the justification for selecting the qualitative, descriptive case study research methodology and design. Included was a description of the selected population of two departmental units within a CTX MFV. The population includes managers with direct experience in implementation of a performance intervention. Section 2 included a description of the purpose, role of the researcher, participants, and data collection activities. Furthermore, in Section 2 was a description of case study design as well as the data analysis methods, reliability and validity of the study, the research questions, and instruments. Section 3 includes the results that emerged from the data collection and the interpretation of themes derived from the data analysis. The presentation of the findings from the data collection, the application to business practices, and suggestions for future research are in Section 3.

Section 3: Application to Professional Practice and Implications for Change

The purpose of this qualitative, embedded, descriptive single-case study was to understand how leaders use ROI to assess the benefit of an organizational change. Section 1 of this doctoral study included background to establish the purpose of the study as well as the research approach, which involved questioning a purposeful sample of PACT managers within the CTX MFV. In Section 1, I presented a description of the selected population. The population included PACT managers with direct experience in using ROI for organizational improvement. In Section 2, a description of the data collection, organization technique, research method and design, ethical considerations, the reliability and the validity of the study were described. Section 3 includes implications for social change, applications to professional practice, recommendations for action, findings, and reflections. In this section, I include analytical presentations of the findings in alignment with the conceptual frameworks, including a discussion of how the research applies to professional practice, details concerning who should act on the findings, and recommendations for future research. The data analysis dialogue consists of the varying components within this study, including the patterns and themes that resulted from the participants' responses.

Overview of Study

The business problem addressed in this study was leaders' lack of understanding concerning use of ROI to measure the benefit of organizational change. The research question was as follows: What will encourage leaders to use ROI to measure the benefit of organizational change? I used the purposeful chain sampling technique to find 20 participants of the 96 in the total population for the final study.

Consistent with existing literature, participants indicated that they lacked understanding regarding returns of value in an organization, outside of profit. Participants agreed that ROI might assist leaders in determining the effectiveness of programs. Within the cases, there were concerns expressed regarding the economic role of leadership, the stability of participants' employment and stakeholder involvement in organizational processes. In the following section, I provide a detailed presentation of the results.

Presentation of the Findings

Data collected from the final study are in this section. The research question was the following: What will encourage leaders to use ROI to measure the benefit of organizational change? My findings were that communication, recognition, leadership, and training were predominant concerns for the participants. I followed a data collection method proven by Denzin and Lincoln (2012). A pretest commenced to assure that the participants' gave useful answers to the demographic questionnaire. I asked human resource professionals for their recommendation of which unit managers to contact for the final study. The participants returned the demographic questionnaires with their answers through interoffice mail. All steps described in Section 2 (pretest, demographic questionnaire distribution, answer collection and analysis) commenced.

Data From the Demographic Questionnaire

Question 1 was as follows: What challenges does this organization face? In response to Question 1, participants discussed the challenges within the organization.

Performance measures are how leaders analyze situations, select business issues for intervention, design evaluation plans, and measure results (Karim & Arif-Uz-Zaman, 2013). Based on 20 participants' responses in the final study, there is evidence that the MFV faces several challenges, including cost containment (QP1). Leaders worry about losing personnel as evidenced in the following statement: "… we face the challenge of losing trained personnel to organizations willing to provide diversified incentives" (QP2). Lack of integrity throughout the organization was a challenge to managers (QP12).

Question 2 was the following: What processes improve performance in this organization? Participant responses to Question 2 indicated that there are processes in place to improve performance as shown in the following statement: "… diversified training remains the number one process to improve employee performance" (QP2). Having trust within the organization was also a measure by which processes may improve (QP12).

Question 3 was as follows: What do leaders demonstrate to achieve performance? The views of how leaders achieve performance were similar throughout this research. All 5 participants in the pretest and 20 in the final study had similar responses to Question 3 when asked how leaders embody qualities of leadership. Participant QP1 stated, "… to achieve performance leaders must follow the same principles in which they address. Furthermore, they must demonstrate an ability to communicate and inspire individuals." Participants also made the following statements in response to Question 3: "[Leaders must] commit to their decisions" (QP7) and "Managers have to vary their approach to decision, depending on the situation and the person leading" (QP16). Participants indicated that performance could improve when leaders have confidence in their abilities and have the power to persuade others (QP20).

Question 4 was the following: What are some initiatives leaders may choose and put in place as proactive measures to improve the ROI analysis for organizational change? Participants focused on initiatives leaders may use to improve ROI throughout the organization in their responses to Question 4. One participant stated that the most experienced technicians should train the new technicians (QP5). Participant QP6 said, “Leaders are confident in their decisions, no matter what the decision is, their decision is their final word on the matter.” Another participant recommended, “…design improvement programs to help employees meet objectives in their work performance” (QP9). Participant QP16 replied “effective leadership involves philosophy and common sense; leaders could encourage [employees] to be productive while developing good employee relations.” Leaders should also listen to their employees and be willing to learn (QP18).

Question 5 was as follows: What is your understanding of ROI? In response to Question 5, participants reported that they understood ROI in different ways:

1. ROI is the process of assessing the funds put into reorganization (QP2).
2. ROI is “a system of placing a numerical value to nonmonetary changes within an organization” (QP14).
3. ROI is a measure of cost control (QP4).

4. ROI is a leader's ability to put something in, "i.e., employee training," and receive an investment from this transaction. The measure is goal completion or bottom line attainment (QP2).
5. ROI is for justifying training initiatives and assigning values to predictive and retrospective measurement (QP10).
6. "Return of investment to me [is] like what are you going to do to make me to become the best of my potential what are you pouring into me and in return as I grow, I'm making the leader and organization better" (QP16).

Question 6 was the following: How is ROI practiced within your unit? I developed Question 6 to elicit information concerning how leaders practice ROI. Participants felt that leaders should demonstrate that they value employees by dedicating themselves to training and leadership development; in return, those individuals will dedicate themselves to the highest level of achievement (QP2). Participant QP7 replied, "We practice ROI every day by setting goals for our patients and employees. Once they attain a goal we set more goals or let them carry out their work independently". Return on investment is practiced in many ways; QP16 responded, "We practice ROI by providing customer service at all times". Most participants stated that leaders within their organization do not use ROI, as indicated by the following statements: "If the patients do not ask we rarely provide this information" (QP2). "We do not provide customers with these reports directly, but they are available on the internet" (QP4). "That [ROI] is not a part of our job" (QP1).

Other participants expressed that they are responsible for ROI and that leaders may improve on the process: “ROI may be improved by constantly revisiting our training, leadership and management process, improved venues. Devices that may be used on a quarterly to semiannual process may include questionnaires gauging what we are doing, and what may be done better” (QP2). “We should formalize the ROI process on our level and provide results that are more specific to the work we do” (QP8). “We may improve the ROI process by directly setting up a division devoted to ROI. Quarterly government reports are not enough. The [ROI] information has to be extracted from what is there [publically available]” (QP14).

Question 7 was the following: How does the unit/organization measure ROI? Responses to Question 7 support existing literature indicating that most organizations do not practice ROI, as shown in the following statements: “We have quarterly studies from the hospital that provide this information” (QP2). “We do not measure ROI” (QP13). In contrast, other participants reported that the organization measures ROI using a variety of methods as evidenced in the following responses: “… the return on investment measures how quickly we communicate information to customers” (QP5). “The ROI measures how employee’s professionalism with fellow employees, employers and clients, translates to the successes of our organization” (QP12). “Our unit measures the amount of patients that improve their quality of life” (QP6). Measurement using ROI is an outdated metric (QP19).

Question 8 was the following: How is ROI communicated to your customers? Participants’ responses to Question 8 confirmed that the organization has information related to ROI on the MFV website. Participants reported this in the following statements: “We communicate ROI in quarterly reports available to the public” (QP4). Leaders do not formally communicate ROI and are responsible for reporting funding (QP5). All information is on the company website in fiscal year quarters for customer review (QP8). Leaders use ROI to reach organizational goals (QP17).

Question 9 was the following: What type of evidence shows ROI is working for your unit/organization? In response to Question 9*,* participants gave varied answers concerning how the ROI process was working in their organization: “We have improved the facility through contributions from stakeholders” (QP2). Return on investment is working by the amount of people who choose MFV services over the competition (QP3). There is no proof that ROI is working (QP13). Reports of exceptional customer experiences display that ROI is working within the organization (QP9).

Question 10 was as follows: Based on that evidence, how may an organization improve an ROI process? I developed Question 10 to allow participants to detail how the ROI process may improve. All participants in the final study agreed that a formalized ROI analysis should be in practice: “We should open communication about this issue and develop some information sharing to customers” (QP2). “Increase stakeholder opportunities inside the organization and extend more services to our customers” (QP4). “We may improve ROI by training staff on the different levels of value we may find in the investment of our time” (QP4).

Researchers often close categories early as the data are coded, and cite others to support saturation (Carlsen & Glenton, 2011). Yin (2012), referring to a single-case study design, wrote that saturation is a *matter of degree*; in other words, as researchers examine and analyze their data, there will always be the potential for new data or themes to emerge. Saturation occurs at the point that it becomes counterproductive for the researcher to continue analysis and the new data no longer add anything to the overall story, model, theory, or framework (Carlsen & Glenton, 2011). I observed the data saturation point during the research study and was able to verify saturation. Data saturation occurred upon the interview with QP17 in this study and proceeding to interview another three participants solidified saturation as no new themes or statements emerged.

I checked responses by using the member checking/respondent validation method provided by Yin (2012). Member checks commence after a study by sharing all of the findings with the participants involved (Yin, 2012). Respondent validation allows participants to analyze the findings and comment on them. The participants affirm either that the summaries reflect their views, feelings or experiences, or the summaries do not reflect their views (Denzin & Lincoln, 2012).

I offered all participants an opportunity to review and clarify their answers. I emailed participants, who contributed to my study a transcription of their answers, color-coded into categories of relevant, irrelevant, and pending. Of the 20 participants who participated in this study, 45% responded to the member check email. Participants QP4, QP5, QP6, QP7, QP8, QP10, QP15, QP16, QP17, QP19, and QP20 did not reply to the member check email.

Participant QP12 replied "Agree", and QP1, QP3, QP9, QP 11, QP13, QP14, and QP18 replied to the email with their electronic signature, indicating that they received the transcription. Participant QP2 was the only participant who supplied corrections. Specifically, QP2 noted the designation of PACT that applied to the unit was that of offering patients other solutions to meet their healthcare needs and clarified the abbreviated name of the unit, which I omitted to protect the participants' privacy. The participants, who responded, other than QP2, did not offer any other corrections. No participants, either through formal responses to member checking emails or through informal communications with me, indicated any problems with my analysis or the interpretation and integration of data.

Table 1 shows the numbers and percentages of the keywords in context using the KWIC method, in which (a) the color green represents relevant statements, (b) pending statements are color coded yellow, and (c) statements that were not relevant are color coded red. I coded 56%, 2%, and 24% of statements as relevant, pending, and not relevant, respectively.

Table 1

Codes

Keywords in Context Codes	*N*	
Green (Relevant)	14	56
Yellow (Pending)	5	2
Red (Not Relevant)	6	24

Themes from Cross-Case Analysis & Primary Themes

Primary themes consist of the data patterns in which the majority of the respondents offered similar ideas. In response to the semistructured demographic questionnaire, participants gave answers that supported my literature review. The themes identified were training, leadership, communication, consistency, and recognition. There were 10 participants in Case 1, consisting of the PACT managers from the gold team unit. Using the pattern matching technique suggested by Yin (2012), I identified themes that emerged within this case as training and leadership. Results from both cases support the use of a measurement method for ROI, which is transferable beyond this study.

Training was the first theme. Participants indicated that training new employees in ROI in the medical field might benefit the organization (QP2, QP5, QP8, and QP10). Training could include organizational goals. The emphasis of such training would be promoting behaviors consistent with the mission and values of the organization (Bisel & Barge, 2011). Blended learning allows for the extension of training programs to address both the preparation of learners and the employees' application of learning to the workplace (Aisha & Hardjomidjojo, 2013).

Leaders can use ROI processes in their units when introducing new strategic initiatives (QP2, QP4, QP5, QP6, QP7, QP8, and QP20). Knowing the experience or knowledge of learners in advance may provide instructional designers with the ability to develop content that maximizes training outcomes (Holman et al., 2012). Transfer of new learning to the job setting is another issue addressed when leaders embrace blended learning techniques (QP2, QP3, QP4, QP7, and QP9). High level leaders may provide opportunities for guided practice and feedback to ensure performance improvement in the workplace (Jones et al., 2013).

Training is crucial for organizational development and success (Chambel & Sobral, 2011). Based on Case 1, training is beneficial to both leaders and employees of an organization (QP2, QP3, QP4, QP5, QP7, and QP10). An employee may become more efficient and productive when properly trained (QP2, QP6, QP8, and QP9). Through a blended training program, an employee may find greater satisfaction in his or her job. Leaders' contributions to organizational success lead to greater morale within an organization (Aisha & Hardjomidjojo, 2013).

Leadership is the second theme (QP1, QP2, QP3, QP4, QP5, QP6, QP8, and QP10). Every person is a leader and is ethically responsible as well as accountable for all interactions with other people (Sarwar, 2013). Organizational change often leads to increased levels of fear and stress among employees, and effective communication may lessen these emotions, which may lower the barriers to change (Burnes & Jackson, 2011). Participants indicated a strong, consistent leader should communicate changes within their organization (QP4, QP6, QP10, QP11, QP12, QP17, and QP20). Communication during performance intervention may be more valuable than changes in job roles (QP1, QP2, QP4, QP5, and QP10).

Leaders may benefit by utilizing a system of interpersonal communication in complex workplaces (QP1, QP3, QP4, QP5, QP6, QP7, and QP10). Communication may motivate managers to accomplish the goals and missions set forth in organizations (Herring & Henderson, 2013). Improved understanding of communication may enhance existing practices in the MFV. For example, organizational leaders may measure the effectiveness of leadership and dyadic skill focused instruction on employee absenteeism, retention, and loyalty.

Communication with organizational leaders may assist subordinates in gaining a deeper insight into the leader's values and understanding of the leader's long-term goals for the department. Such understanding may establish trust and integrity within the organization (QP1, QP2, QP3, QP5, QP7, QP8, QP9, and QP10). Participants indicated they had negative experiences with leadership (QP1, QP3, and QP10). Negative experiences with leadership could increase resistance to organizational change (Reissner, 2010). Participants admitted improvement programs do not add value and leaders are accountable for their impact, both positive and negative, on strategy implementation (QP4, QP5, QP6, QP7, QP8, QP9, and QP10). Leaders should implement strategic improvements by developing objectives, plans, processes, and systems to encourage feedback and adaptation to performance improvements (QP2, QP3, QP4, QP6, QP7, QP9, and QP10).

There were 10 participants in Case 2, consisting of the PACT managers from the maroon team unit. The themes that emerged within this case were communication, consistency, and recognition. The third theme, which is combined, is communication and consistency (QP11, QP12, QP15, QP16, QP17, QP18, and QP20). Organizational change requires leaders to provide clear direction and explain the purpose behind the changes to alleviate employee resistance (Kira, van Eijnatten, & Balkin, 2010). The majority of participants stated communication is the largest challenge faced by this organization (QP11, QP12, QP13, QP16, QP17, and QP20). The clear delineation of mission and values may help employees understand the organization, as well as interpret change in an accurate context. Participants indicated a need existed to provide consistency regarding their job responsibilities (QP11, QP12, QP13, QP14, QP15, and QP17).

Leadership is a human symbolic communication in which leaders attempt to modify the attitudes and behaviors of others in order to meet shared group goals (Glavan, 2012). Participants indicated that an effective leader should be an effective communicator and praise followers on a regular basis (QP11, QP13, QP17, QP19, and QP20). Transformational leadership is a dyadic relationship, a set of communications between leaders and followers, which suggests leaders' behavior is evident in their communications to followers (Salter, Green, Hodgson, & Joyner, 2013).

Recognition is the fourth theme (QP11, QP12, QP14, QP15, QP16, QP17, QP18, and QP20). When work aligns with employees' values, they experience job satisfaction (Romme, 2011). Job satisfaction occurs when an individual feels that his or her accomplishments add noticeable value to the organization (Mamaghani, 2012). Participants want recognition for their contributions (QP11, QP12, QP14, QP15, and QP16). When organizations need employee contributions, those employees feel appreciated (Sani, 2013). Participants implied that achievement, recognition, and nature of work could contribute to ethical leadership (QP11, QP14, and QP16).

Participants' responses were consistent with the literature regarding performance intervention strategies concerning job satisfaction (Sani, 2013). Strengthening recognition for employee achievements could enhance leader and follower relationships (QP11, QP12, QP13, QP14, QP16, QP17, QP19, and QP20). Furthermore, organizational leaders would be able to motivate employees to participate the implementation of ROI strategies if managers recognized the influence they have on individual performance.

Table 2

Themes From Participant Statements and Pattern Matching

Theme	Participants' statements
Training	QP2: Diversified training remains the number one process to improve employee performance. QP8: Training on all subjects, a grace period so employees become familiar and equal pay for equal work. QP10: Justify training initiatives and assign values to predictive and retrospective measurement.
Leadership	QP2: To achieve performance leaders must follow the same principles in which they address. Furthermore, they must demonstrate the ability to communicate an inspire individuals on their particular level. QP3: Leaders should give employees the opportunity to make suggestions for improvement. QP19: Leadership is an intangible quality, lead by example, don't hold self to elitist status.
Communication and consistency	QP2: To achieve performance leaders must follow the same principles in which they address. Furthermore, they must demonstrate the ability to communicate an inspire individuals on their particular level. QP6: They are not consistent, so no one process is the same as another. Consistency in organizational processes. QP8: We should formalize the ROI process on our level and (*table continues*) provide results that are more specific to the work we do at our level. QP16: Planning is the key management function of any organization. ROI is the process of determining in advance, what should be accomplished, when, by whom, how, and what. Regardless of whether leaders are planning long-term program priorities or planning a one-hour meeting, the planning aspect of management is a major contributor to success. QP20: Understaffed, low motivation, no communication.
Recognition	QP2: Leaders may provide workshops and interactive training sessions to demonstrate the necessity and importance of organizations; goal, vision and mission. This will allow employees to get onboard from the start, and become comfortable with the ideal of a potential "long career" within the organization. QP3: Leaders should give employees the opportunity to make suggestions for improvement. QP5: Including more patient and staff opinions in how we may make our environment better to promote healing. QP19: Use merit based rewards provides incentives and stops unnecessary punishment. Demonstrate leadership by being able to perform tasks subordinates are required to do.

Investments in business processes affect the culture of an organization (QP11, QP12, QP13, QP16, QP17, QP18, QP19, and QP20). Individuals are to be accountable for decisions under his or her locus of control, regardless of influence from other professionals, shareholders, or the government (Verbeke & Tung, 2013; QP11, QP17). Therefore, to enact effective change, leaders within this organization may not rely only on the information provided by government professionals (QP16, QP17, QP18, QP19, and QP20). Leaders should remain consistent for implementation strategies to have resonance.

Leaders' use of performance interventions has an effect on teams, as evidenced by the following responses: "Manage money better since; no one is getting a raise" (QP3). "We have not been furloughed, and patients receive care" (QP6). Changes affect the morale of an organization. Job security may cause stress within an organization (Sin, Huang, & Lin, 2012; Theodore, 2013). The goal of performance intervention is to create accurate, ethical, realistic, and legally correct policy to improve a service (Theodore, 2013). The lack of control on personnel and work related matters results in decreased motivation (Schyns, Maslyn, & Marc, 2012; QP4, QP7, QP10, and QP14). Decreased motivation may interfere with attainment of self-actualization as described in Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory. Leaders, at all levels, should understand the economic, social, and political issues within this organization (QP11, QP12, QP13, QP16, QP17, and QP20).

Risks associated with strategic implementation do not always benefit the organization. Leaders implement performance improvement strategies without analyzing the value of the strategy (Cifti, 2012; Herring & Henderson, 2013). Individuals' failure to analyze the value of strategic implementations is consistent with the responses given by participants: "This department is not responsible for ROI" (QP2). "We measure ROI at the government level, and results are available to the public" (QP7). Leaders are responsible for making strategic decisions in order to respond to any force that may be a source of risk (QP4, QP10, QP12, QP14, QP17, and QP19). Porter's five forces of risk include the threat of new entrants in the industry, threat of substitute goods and services, intensity of competition within the industry, bargaining power of suppliers, and bargaining power of consumers (Fuad & Bohari, 2013). The MFV is a federal agency and does not face the threat of new entrants, substitution of service, or the bargaining power of suppliers or consumers. However, the U.S. government does have tremendous competition.

Since 2005, an increase of veterans, the primary benefactors of MFV services, sought healthcare services from private and state funded institutions (Liu et al., 2012). This customer action has added to a negative view of the MFV in the media. Consumer action may cause the reformation and implementation of performance intervention strategies including PACT, which was the change under investigation in this research.

Organizational risk is a threat to the implementation of performance improvement programs (QP10, QP11, QP12, QP13, QP16, and QP19). Dissemination of funding for program implementations and individual federal organizations occurs at the beginning of the fiscal year (October 1). The allocation of funding begins three to six months before budgeting requests go to Members of Congress from the leaders of federal agencies

(Davis et al., 2012). Organizational risks lead to inefficiency of production and affect the morale of individuals within an organization (Martelli & Abels, 2011).

In view of such risks, implementation of an ROI strategy may be expensive (Grant, 2012). The MFV, as a federal agency, is also subject to criticism, which may pose a political risk. Political actions and instability may cause difficulties for organizational leaders, owing to negative publicity created by politicians. Congressional action is a concern of MFV leaders. In an unstable political climate, leaders may not be able to lead organizations to maximize their profit (Grant, 2012).

The contribution of a performance intervention should be accessible to leaders and stakeholders (QP1, QP2, QP4, QP5, QP6, QP11, QP13, and QP17). The MFV values stakeholders, as evidenced by the following statement: The MFV practices ROI, in efforts to involve patients and their families in care, so they have the best outcome (QP5). In the literature review, many researchers stated organizational change might have an impact on stakeholders (Ng & Sears, 2012; Luke, 2013). All interests of stakeholders are of intrinsic value (Fooks et al., 2013). Leaders should consider each group of stakeholders because stakeholders are indispensable. Moreover, high level leaders at the MFV are following stakeholder theory (QP1, QP4, QP7, QP8, QP17, QP19, and QP20). Leaders who practice stakeholder management are successful in the implementation of performance improvement strategies (Luke, 2013).

The greatest challenge for leaders is transformation (Fooks et al., 2013). Similar to ROI, business transformation involves leaders making fundamental changes in how a company operates to cope with internal or external situations (Fooks et al., 2013).

Internal and external situations may be and are not limited to systematic restructure of processes (internal) or an influx of patients (external) (Liu et al., 2012). Reasons for transformation vary. Leaders determine the need for business transformation through exploration of external changes in the market, such as organizational services being out of date, funding or income streams changing, and regulatory or competitive environments change (Latham, 2013).

Transformation involves a strategic implementation, whether to increase revenue or market share, improve customer satisfaction or cut costs (Latham, 2013; QP20). In performance improvement strategies, a need emerges from transformation of operations to meet the desired results of a project or plan initiative (Fusch & Gillespie, 2012). To make any intervention strategy occur, leadership must be in accord, because transformational efforts do not work when managers hold different views about the same problem (Latham, 2013).

Leaders within the MFV may be able to confront challenges they face during transformation by recognizing the need to change (QP11, QP12, QP15, QP17, and QP18). Gaining consensus amongst stakeholders that change is necessary is vital to organizational transformation (Latham, 2013). By agreeing on and communicating about the form the change should take, leaders may elicit employee dedication in support of the objectives of the change. Participants indicated there is a persistent lack of communication (QP1, QP4, QP6, QP10, QP13, QP16, and QP20).

Understanding what the organization is changing from and what needs to change is vital to any implementation (Truffer et al., 2010). Testing and implementing changes occurs over time, often over a number of years (Truffer et al., 2010). Embedding the implementation into the organizational culture is essential (Herring & Henderson, 2013). Culture prevents the organizational leaders from reverting practices before they have achieved the intended benefits (Penelope & Pattison, 2012).

The MFV is under a nationwide transformation in all areas of benefits for veterans (Davis et al., 2012). Organizational leaders are responding to an expansion in scope and complexity of their mission. While leaders completed a record-breaking one million claims per year over three years (fiscal years 2011 to 2013), the number of claims received continues to exceed the number processed, and the backlog of claims for compensation and care has grown (Jsa et al., 2013). In response, MFVs are implementing a series of people, process, and technology initiatives intended to increase productivity and accuracy of claims processing (Jsa et al., 2013). Once the transformation is in place, MFV leaders expect to reduce the backlog to reach the 2015 goal. The goal of the MFV leaders for 2015 is to eliminate the claims backlog, and process all claims within 125 days with 98% accuracy (Liu et al., 2012).

Return on investment is a practice-oriented theory (Chambers, 2013). Employees have certain burdens in the knowledge economy because of their personal investment in education (QP17, QP19, and QP20). The growth of specialized knowledge indicates employers should increase their commitment to providing more business or sector specific training and education (Chambers, 2013). Training and education are investments leaders make in businesses. Employees have indicated investments in education and training are valuable to them (Luke, 2013). Research has shown that training may increase motivation, and productivity (Luke, 2013).

Training is an example of the embodiment of ROI. Just as stakeholders require accountability of funding provided to organizations, they also need a metric of organizational efforts (Stieb, 2009). Leaders review and often change methods of implementation, and training (Mamaghani, 2012). When leaders reach their goals they exemplify the practice of ROI.

Findings and Effective Business Practice

Participants QP4, QP13, and QP20 suggested stakeholders involvement in leadership decisions, which is aligned to Jsa et al. (2013) suggestion that leaders' decisions have value to stakeholders. Additionally, Udechukwu (2012) indicated that influencing leaders' decision making skills using strategic measurements could improve the success of performance intervention strategies. Leaders use ROI to access the value of intervention strategies (Phillips & Phillips, 2012). Training is for solving organizational problems, as well as cultivating talent for future organizational development.

The ideas of future organizational development tend to center on a select group of people, managers, and leaders. Participant statements indicated that training, as a performance initiative, does not benefit from any return analysis (QP1, QP5, QP14, and QP17). Organizational managers suggested supervisors obtain feedback from training (QP16 and QP20). Three findings from my research were specific to the effective practice of business.

According to 54% of participants' responses to the demographic questionnaire, there was an increased awareness that intervention strategies are complex decisions. Implementation of any assessment strategy occurs when the economic situation is favorable to all stakeholders. First, business strategy, concerning the use of ROI, improves with understanding that the decision to measure intervention strategies will have an additional cost (QP9, QP10, QP11, QP15, and QP16). Transformational leaders use their skills and abilities to justify the costs to organizations by performing all requirements of their position, including providing an ROI analysis for the programs under their control (QP4, QP6, QP7, QP8, QP10, QP13, and QP17). With this insight, accountability to stakeholders and managers may increase. Managers may learn how their role may allow them to transform into leaders. This deeper understanding of the business role of those in leadership positions might also provide leaders with the foresight that compromise exists in utilizing ROI to meet stakeholder needs (QP2, QP5, QP9, QP11, QP13, QP14, QP19, and QP20).

Second, ROI is not a panacea. Leaders utilize ROI among other methods of solving organizational problems. When employees cause problems due to lack of capability or training, performance improvement strategies are useful interventions (Fusch & Gillespie, 2012). As a measurement tool, ROI is an assessment procedure leaders use to determine if training should commence to solve the problems. Participants QP7, QP10, QP13, and QP20, expressed the belief; leaders should remedy organizational problems using training. Prior research has determined this is not true (Georges, 2013).

Performance must be of benefit to stakeholders, and leaders should evaluate training needs from the viewpoint of either solving problems or investment.

Twenty-two percent of participants stated that among the possible obstacles to promoting ROI use are that proper needs assessments were not present for a great number of initiatives (QP16, QP18, QP19, and QP20). However, if training initiatives are not deemed necessary for organizations, the effectiveness of business processes will decline, and the ROI of unnecessary programs may be a negative (Glavan, 2012). Managers and leaders should support each other, and not operate performance interventions under separate areas within a business (QP8, QP10, QP13, and QP20). The views of stakeholders and decision makers should align. Prior to undertaking an intervention strategy, the relational dynamics of all parties who may benefit should be in discussions about the initiation of strategic interventions. Integrating this business practice will lead to a higher level of trust between organizations, their employees, and the public, fostering transparency in governmental institutions (Truffer et al., 2010).

Third, there are stakeholder goals in improvement processes that involve tradeoffs. Ninety percent of participants' responses indicated they wanted recognition for their efforts (QP1, QP2, QP3, QP4, QP5, QP6, QP10, QP11, QP12, QP16, QP17, and QP20). Within the federal government, it is rare there is direct praise (QP3, QP6, QP12, QP17, and QP20). The tradeoff for professionals who participated would be recognition and acknowledgement that their achievement means something to the organization. Recognition deepens trust and loyalty within a business (Mamaghani, 2012). Employees want recognition, even general recognition consisting of incentives.

Incentive systems play a symbolic role in subverting employee autonomy (Islam, 2012). The advantage of adopting recognition practices is that offering incentives do not force managers or leaders to adopt a strict system of praise. Rather, when leaders acknowledge the centrality of interpersonal recognition, they are integral in the formation of individual dignity (Truffer et al., 2010).

Ninety percent of participants noted that effective business leaders would require transparency in the government to ensure higher levels of service, quality, and treatment of customers in the MFV (QP2, QP3, QP4, QP5, QP10, QP11, QP12, QP13, QP14, QP15, QP17, QP18, and QP20). Similarly, effective business practice would involve stakeholders being aware of the organization's internal motivations. These additions to the practice of strategic intervention will improve the quality of life for employees within the MFV, thereby creating a positive ROI value.

The results of this study may allow business professionals and scholars to understand how an organization may assist leaders in their understanding of ROI. Communication, training, recognition, and consistency are traits leaders should embody prior to starting a drastic change within their organizations (QP4, QP9, QP11, QP12, QP16, QP17, and QP20). Managers should also recognize their potential to be transformational leaders when implementing organizational strategies and ROI. Leaders must communicate ROI throughout an organization as a tool to assess the total value of a strategy, not simply as a means of measuring the benefit of costs associated with implementation (Hur et al., 2010).

Phillips and Phillips (2012) defined ROI as a method used to measure costs of improvement programs, including the return of value from training initiatives and improvements. Unfortunately, training in business is a poorly understood process that does not measure the acquired knowledge base following the actual implementation of the program. This research could bridge gaps in business knowledge to allow for an understanding of the ROI process, and the challenges leaders may face when utilizing strategic implementations.

Ninety percent of participants responded that when determining the factors that influence leaders to embrace investment measurement strategies, decision makers should follow the concepts presented for organizations in transformational states (QP1, QP2, QP5, QP7, QP11, QP12, QP13, QP14, QP15, and QP19). Leaders' commitment to serving the community requires an assessment of existing strategies used in the implementation of performance improvement programs. Failure to conduct ROI analysis for programs is harmful to not only the MFV but also to stakeholders such as veterans, veterans' family members, and taxpayers. Research on ROI is relevant to communications, compliance, healthcare, human capital analytics, training, events, and nonprofit organizations (Phillips & Phillips, 2012).

Public, private, and governmental decision making practices contribute to successful process improvements (Fusch & Gillespie, 2012). Decision makers may utilize the present findings to construct ROI analyses, which may include stakeholder interests or terms of significance as applicable. Political decision makers may utilize this information to break down walls of distrust between agencies and reestablish confidence in leaders (QP4, QP12, QP16, and QP20). I presented leadership strategies and characteristics, which contribute to successful implementation of performance initiatives. Differences between leaders and managers are subtle and rest upon the ultimate objectives of the organization. Utilization of these findings may assist with decisions about what strategies to use in the planning phase of a strategic initiative.

Closing gaps in leaders' understanding of ROI may contribute to positive social change. Participants in this study made statements about leaders that might apply to the continued study of the emerging system of ethical business practices (QP12 and QP13). These findings are useful to the effective practice of business because they align with the responses from participants; there is a connection between human capital, assets, and performance (QP1, QP14, and QP16). The relationship of these findings and the conceptual frameworks (stakeholder and Maslow's hierarchy of needs theories) may serve as a benchmark in understanding how ROI may help leadership remain accountable for business decisions.

Implementing the best practices for a process or program requires a company to diminish performance gaps (Fusch & Gillespie, 2012). The MFV requires employees have effective communication, and training centered on what constitutes value for the organization. For established organizations, the results of this study include guidance on how employees feel about change. Facilitating solutions for individuals' problems through the establishment of protocols may contribute to the continued success of transformation (QP9, QP12, and QP18). For leaders, this research is relevant to developing programs that reduce costs consistently throughout the organization. A reduction in costs should not mean a reduction in value of the services provided.

Use of ROI analysis is a growing trend in all industries (Herring & Henderson, 2013). By providing increased awareness of how leaders may use ROI in businesses, all stakeholders may benefit. In order to establish communication, the mission of the institution has to be clear to leaders at all levels (Ciftci, 2012). By using these results to assess the state of the organization, there may be a positive change in the way stakeholders interact, are accountable for their decisions, report information to external stakeholders, and establish trust.

Triangulation

I used responses from the interview questions and archival data for triangulation. Data archives consisted of older data that are necessary for future reference and data retained for regulatory compliance (Liu et al., 2012). Liu et al. (2012), Belote et al. (2012), and Jsa et al. (2013) conducted data analysis of MFV inpatient hospitals that implemented the PACT initiative. All three studies utilized for this triangulation were publically available. Liu et al. published their research in *BMC Health Sciences*. Belote et al. published data analyses in the peer-reviewed journal *Military Medicine*. The data from the Jsa et al. study were in *The New England Journal of Medicine*. These archival records include costs of implementing PACT, the percentages of change in knowledge of both employees and patients, and forecasts for what the percentages of change in the organization should be in 2014 and 2016, respectively.

Training is the first theme that emerged from this research. I determined 79% of participants believed training would increase their knowledge level (QP1, QP4, QP5, QP6, QP7, QP8, QP9, QP10, QP11, QP12, QP13, QP14, QP15, QP18, and QP20). Properly trained leaders display both quantity and quality performance traits (Holman et al., 2012). Training for performance in domain access, costs, quality, and patient satisfaction have had an 87% employee knowledge rate (Belote et al., 2012). Archival data records indicated employee morale, after implementation of PACT, increased by 14% (Davis et al., 2012). In comparison, I identified that 10% of participants' morale increased within the population for this study (QP12, QP17). Pedersen (2010) identified a link between training and the increase of an individual's knowledge rate. Furthermore, the agreement that training increases participants' knowledge level of a subject is valuable.

The second theme that emerged from this research is leadership. Leaders are responsible for their impact on a performance implementation (QP2, QP 8, and QP16). The third theme was communication; forty-eight percent of participants stated communication was the largest challenge reported in this study (QP1, QP5, QP6, QP9, QP12, QP14, QP17, and QP20). Shimada et al. (2013) reported that the 2012 communication incentives increase interoffice communication between employers and subordinates were a testament to leaders' ingenuity. Belote et al. (2012) identified leaders who use incentive strategies may bridge the communication gaps within the MFV. Leaders influence communication within an organization (Dembowski, 2013).

In line with the leadership theme, participants reported that leaders have goals (QP4, QP6, QP8, QP12, QP16, and QP20). Leaders' goals in the implementation of the PACT initiative were to provide access and coordination throughout the MFV. In 2013, customer service archival data were consistent with leaders' goals for the PACT implementation. Compared to 2010, when PACT implementation began, veterans had an 8% increase in their satisfaction to access of medical care. Patients' education of their condition increased to 21%, and coordination of their care increased to 11% (Jsa et al., 2013). In line with Maslow's hierarchy of needs, an increase in satisfaction has a tremendous effect on employees' willingness to embrace new strategies (Pekkola, 2013).

The fourth theme identified in the data analysis was consistency. Fifteen percent of participants associate satisfaction with the implementation of PACT with leaders' failure to communicate (QP13, QP16, QP17, QP19, and QP20). Facility level stakeholders set evidence-based priorities for quality improvement. The leaders' priorities were to create local quality improvement teams, training and education for employees, formative data feedback, and practice facilitation (Jsa et al., 2013). Consistent leaders improve communication and implementation of strategic change (Marsh, 2013). Local leadership, industry champions, and frontline staff implemented projects aimed at improving aspects of PACT based on national priorities set for the implementation (Davis et al., 2012). Furthermore, participant responses related to leaders' failure to communicate PACT implementation.

Eighty percent of participants reported that recognition during performance evaluations was of significance to the respondents (QP4, QP7, QP8, QP11, QP12, QP13, QP14, QP15, QP16, QP17, and QP18). Participants responded that more integrative technology would enable them to implement PACT and use ROI effectively (QP2, QP14). In support of the PACT transformation and continuous quality care, leaders at the MFV have created a performance dashboard, the PACT Compass (Shimada et al., 2013). The PACT Compass enables facility leaders to monitor progress on measurable objectives. Employee communication and attitudes toward leaders may improve when leaders use recognition and technology effectively (Islam, 2012).

Participants QP16, QP18, and QP20 posited ROI is not the only performance measurement system leaders should utilize after the implementation of initiatives or other transformations in the MFV. Leaders use a web-based decision support system (NetDSS) to promote care and manage fidelity (Jsa et al., 2013). NetDSS is a structured intervention protocol used for a previous effectiveness study of face-to-face encounters of care (Belote et al., 2012). Use of a data system in addition to ROI measurement is further evidence that multiple systems of analysis should be used to measure initiatives such as PACT. Multiple methods of measuring change within an organization are of value to leaders (Crossan et al., 2013).

Stakeholders should be aware of the costs of improvement strategies. Fifteen percent of participants indicated there are costs associated with ROI that should be public to stakeholders (QP8, QP11, QP13, QP14, and QP19). Implementation and planning costs are the fees an MFV would incur to implement a PACT model (Davis et al., 2012). Between 2011 and 2012 the approximate amount spent on MFV medical care funding was $3,249,727 (Liu et al., 2012). Belote et al. (2012) calculated the total cost of attending training meetings, using the number of meetings each staff member attended. Organizational leaders then multiplied their staff members' hourly wages estimated from their grade and step, which figured to $87,241 of the medical care funds (Belote et al., 2012). Costs of improvement strategies may affect stakeholders' willingness to support organizational change (Olsen et al., 2012). In review of the archival data, these costs are available to the public, confirming the participants' responses.

In this study, 30% of the participants responded that the PACT implementation is successful (QP2, QP3, QP5, QP10, QP12, and QP19). Of the 90 primary care providers in the population from the CTX MFV, 84 moved patients into PACT units in 2012 (Liu et al., 2012). Adoption rates ranged across MFVs outside of CTX from a low of 33% in 2010 to a high of 100% in 2013 (Jsa et al., 2013). Phillips and Phillips (2012) stated that any improvement in satisfaction or processes (among customers or employees, respectively) is an indication that ROI is positive for any particular intervention strategy.

Participants responded that performance measurement could help them to achieve their goals (QP7, QP8). Shimada et al. (2013) found that, of the MFV coordinators who responded to their survey, 49% responded that helping increase the use of performance measurement was one of their highest priority duties. Leaders of MFV facilities who had stakeholder assistance in implementing PACT, had high rates of PACT adoption (Jsa et al., 2013). In line with Maslow's hierarchy of needs, goal attainment is important for leaders at all levels (Carr et al., 2011). Facilities where volunteers or veterans were available to assist each other in understanding PACT had a higher adoption rate (2.13%) than other facilities (1.52%). Of 20 respondents in my study, 30% had little understanding of ROI or PACT (QP5, QP6, QP9, QP10, QP11, QP15, and QP18). Belote et al. (2013) determined that 50% of employees agreed their leaders clearly understood PACT.

The theme of recognition was frequent throughout my analysis. Out of the 20 participants questioned in this study, 75% want recognition for their efforts in the workplace (QP1, QP3, QP4, QP5, QP6, QP8, QP9, QP10, QP11, QP12, QP14, QP15, QP16, QP17, and QP20). Belote et al. (2012) found in the context of the audit of PACT performance measures; there was high support among staff for primary care leaders' incentives for achievement of PACT policy. Jsa et al. (2013) indicated that the new approach to developing a multilevel research and clinical partnership is engaging local leaders and quality improvement teams in implementing new care models in the context of prior evidence. Employees find recognition rewarding (Meng & Berger, 2012).

Conceptual Framework

The business concept under investigation in this study was the use of ROI in measuring performance intervention strategies. Throughout the responses to the open-ended interview questions, participants often referred to stakeholders and needs they would like to attain. I utilized both stakeholder and Maslow's hierarchy of needs in the conceptual framework. The findings of this case study offer suggestions about what a manager can do to become efficient in his or her leadership capacity. With respect to the conceptual frameworks utilized, the study results indicate additional research may contribute to the understanding of the relationship between factors of ethical leadership and ROI.

Leaders at all levels display organizational ROI traits. Transformational leaders display charisma and influence others. When organizations hire individuals for leadership roles, the employee in a leadership position has met the requirements of that role. Pay and other incentives such as, vacations and authority over others motivate individuals to seek leadership positions (Edelman et al., 2010). Idealized influence refers to charismatic actions of the leader that center on values, beliefs, and a deep sense of mission, which motivates their followers to do more than they think they can (Lampenius, 2013). The return on hiring these essential personnel is beneficial for high level leaders, who must prove the necessity of hiring to stakeholders (Schultz, 2013). In hiring interviews, motivation refers to the leader's ability to articulate values and goals that cause followers to agree with the mission set forth by leadership.

Followers are also members of the organization. Leaders must exert effort in order to achieve the mutual goals promoted by executive leadership. In the hiring process, candidates must demonstrate high levels of hope, confidence, and optimism, inspiring their followers to be hopeful, confident, and optimistic (Grant, 2012). Transformational leaders build a one-on-one relationship with followers and adapt to their individual needs. The personal attention followers receive may produce high levels of confidence, motivation, and overall job satisfaction (Glavan, 2012).

For an organization to reap maximum ROI from hiring choices, leaders must align and identify with the organizational culture (QP1, QP4, QP10, QP11, QP17, and QP20). Culture is a system of knowledge that allows people to communicate with individuals from different backgrounds and interpret their behaviors (Olsen et al., 2012). Leaders decide how to make training and strategic initiatives focused to meet the needs of their employees.

Based on 100% of the participants' responses, there is evidence that, within the CTX MFV, the unidentified nature of these problems, along with power distance, has bred a culture of individualism and low performance expectations. A leader's internalized values and beliefs, more than the content of what they say, convey the leader's actual message. Sarwar (2013) described power distance as the degree to which members of a culture expect to distribute power. Power distance may determine how a community stratifies its members with respect to power. Organizational leaders should favor participation, consultation, collaboration, and practicality. These behaviors will lessen the power distance characterized by training and performance intervention environments.

Federal employees are stakeholders within their organizations (QP2, QP3, QP4, QP5, QP10, QP11, QP15, QP16, and QP20). In the past, there has been pressure exerted by leaders to broaden their domain of accountability to include stakeholders. Any person affected by the outcome of any business decision is a stakeholder (Steib, 2009). In this study, the potential stakeholders were veterans (customers), all employees, political officials, and the communities in which MFV facilities operate. Based on the participants' responses, they do not feel valued as stakeholders. Participants' reasons for feeling this way vary, and range from lack of training to inconsistency in leadership decisions (QP1, QP4, QP10, QP17, and QP20).

The MFV is an organization dedicated to the long term care of veterans (QP1, QP10, QP13, QP17, QP18, and QP19). The views, opinions, and personal experiences of this population assist leaders in the formation of policies, projects, and benefits specific to them. Political officials such as, state congresspersons effect change by serving their constituents. In the State of Texas specifically, congressional jurisdictions have a 30% to 60% veteran population (Jsa et al., 2013). Providers of services to veterans are stakeholders owing to their roles to provide the integral care veterans need. Ninety-seven percent of participants in this study do not feel valued, recognized, properly trained, or adequately led to embrace the mission provided by leaders.

Performance-based compensation is an accepted mechanism for motivating employees. By including employee pay incentives, morale, and dedication to the values and mission of the organization should increase (QP1, QP2, QP4, QP5, QP6, QP7, QP8, QP9, QP11, QP12, QP13, QP14, QP18, QP19, and QP20). Aligning individual goals to those of stakeholders may influence organizational leadership to provide performance-enhancing resources to the organization (Deutsch & Valente, 2013). Incentives for employees may increase their expectations as well as feelings of value and belonging (Mamaghani, 2012). In some cases, employees, once validated as stakeholders, may exceed organizational performance goals (Holman et al., 2012).

Managers are responsible for decisions that benefit their respective organizations (QP4, QP5, QP6, QP7, QP8, QP10, QP15, QP17, and QP18). There are a few technical differences between managers and leaders. For example, managers plan and detail implementation strategies, while leaders inspire new visions for organizations (Lo, 2012). Managers are responsible for carrying out the mission of the organization as articulated by their leaders (QP1, QP16, QP17, QP18, and QP20). Decision making skills, along with intrinsic capabilities and expertise, enable managers to follow through with their objectives (Kira et al., 2010). Leaders, by comparison, are responsible for envisioning how higher level organizational leaders may achieve their missions.

Managers must understand how their roles are critical to the success of implementation strategies (QP1, QP3, QP7, QP10, QP11, QP12, QP15, QP18, and QP20). Participant responses indicated there is a lack of trust between managers and organizational leaders. Trust issues may be due to the unwillingness of managers to assume the responsibility of being leaders (Salter et al., 2013). Participants stated ROI is not a part of their job and leaders should change their behavior (QP10 and QP17). The PACT managers did not describe their leadership traits or define their goals. The primary role of a leader is to actualize the purpose of the organization. When employees disconnect from the purpose of the organization, leaders often hold managers accountable for their failure to actualize the organization's purpose.

All components of an enterprise must work together: leaders, managers, and employees (QP3, QP4, QP5, QP8, QP10, QP12, QP15, QP17, and QP19). Any implementation strategy will not be successful unless all parties involved are aware of the purpose of the performance intervention (Chambers, 2013). The conceptual framework used within this study and the responses provided by participants suggest a lack of tools for communication. By setting mutual expectations, ensuring everyone understands the objectives of performance measures, offering continuous feedback and recognizing achievement, all leaders, including managers, may be successful and embrace the mission of the organization.

Evidence and the Findings in Existing Literature

In order to ensure researcher bias is not present in research, my findings must connect to study results in existing literature. Yin (2012) determined that researchers who use this approach could ascertain whether the literature and results corroborate each other to increase the validity of study results. Eight-four percent of participants' responses demonstrated the congruence of findings with existing literature on performance intervention and strategic implementation strategies. Leader decisions to implement change within an organization must be widely communicated to all stakeholders.

The identified themes are relevant in discerning the complexities associated with the accountability for changes, which require analysis to support the conclusions extracted from the research data. The themes and patterns identified during the data analysis of this single-case study were: (1) investments in business processes affect the culture of an organization, and (2) the contribution of a performance intervention should be accessible to leaders and stakeholders. The greatest challenge for leaders is transformation; ROI is a practice-oriented theory, and risks associated with strategic implementation do not always benefit the organization.

Organizations should demonstrate a high commitment to change (Mamaghani, 2012). Based on Question 1, positive means of confronting challenges would be for leaders to isolate the sources of the discrepancies in communication within this organization both internally and externally (QP3, QP11, QP12, QP17, and QP20). I used stakeholder theory to guide this research. Managers working within stakeholder theory may determine the merit of an intervention strategy. Stakeholders are individuals who are impacted by an organization’s actions, and their ideas on cost containment should be paramount (Steib, 2009).

Participant responses to Question 2 indicated training employees could assist them in reaching higher level goals (QP4, QP10, QP13, and QP20). Attainable goals are part of a collaborative competency in line with Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Getha-Taylor & Morse, 2013). Leadership may continue to revisit strategies on training and improve their teaching methods. Based on this information, leaders should consider alternative methods of training to achieve the greatest ROI for all stakeholders.

Ninety-two percent of participants, in response to Question 3, indicated there should be a change in attitudes. Stakeholder involvement contributes to leadership and building management potential (Marsh, 2013). In order to improve on personal leadership traits, individuals should consider their values so that their inner and outer worlds align. Organizational behavior changes when leaders focus on others rather than on themselves. In response to Question 4, participants affirmed that intangible benefits of performance improvement meet a social need to achieve higher level goals; this aligns with Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory (QP1, QP9, QP11, QP12, QP13, QP14, and QP20). By praising employees and inviting them to share an organizational goal or mission, leaders may make the connection between leadership values and ethical decision making (Marsh, 2013). Leaders may then be able to apply virtue ethics to a foundational framework with an emphasis on character, rather than cognitive act-centered decision making actions.

Participants’ responses to Question 5 pertained to productivity improvements. Leaders have a role in shaping employee values within an organization (QP3, QP10, QP15, QP17, and QP19). Offering a comprehensive program on what ROI may mean to employees may be valuable in fostering a culture within a business (Uzkurt et al., 2013). Employees may view a comprehensive program positively under Maslow's hierarchy of needs structure as adding to leaders' sense of ownership of their organization (Lampenius, 2013).

Based on the responses to Question 6, I understand the MFV is a customer-driven business (QP1, QP4, QP14, and QP17). The leaders within the MFV consider customers as stakeholders (Liu et al., 2012). Participant responses to my seventh question aligned with Brayman's (2012) finding that there is no capacity for risk when return in not measured. Leaders may require training on how they may properly measure ROI or on what information sources within an organization directly pertain to ROI. Regardless of the approach, the organization should benefit from all stakeholders having knowledge of the ROI metric. Thus, leaders may be able to meet challenges with confidence, and disclosure of this information to stakeholders could empower decision making.

In the analysis of the responses to Question 8, I found a parallel between participants' statements and the traditional use of ROI to measure the effect of change in terms of monetary benefit versus costs (QP1, QP11, QP12, QP17, and QP18). Leaders may not measure ROI. Leaders should communicate ROI (Reissner, 2010). To address issues with communication in the MFV, a marketing initiative between the agency and the government devoted to public knowledge of ROI may be of benefit to the organization. Based on respondents' answers to Question 9, stakeholders need value that has meaning to them (Steib, 2009; QP4, QP9, and QP19). The data collected represent a mixed view of what is valuable. Leaders should communicate with employees regarding organizational changes implemented to improve processes that add value to the organization.

Based on responses to Question 10, 87% of participants agreed that any business has levels of complexity. Whether the endeavor is a corporate strategic plan, strategic marketing plan, sales plan involving revenue goal setting, or advertising campaign, one must address the fact there are typically levels of organizational complexity (Sani, 2012). Utilizing ROI as a measurement strategy may enable leaders to provide confirmation of the value the intervention has for stakeholders (Steib, 2009).

Implications for Social Change

In this study, I identified all potential stakeholders to include employees, leadership, and the veteran community. The results pertaining to communication, leadership, training and consistency from this research, should be meaningful to all stakeholders. When employees express their opinions of the strategic role a leader has within an organization, leaders may be able to contribute to organizational change (QP4, QP5, QP11, QP12, QP13, QP16, QP18, and QP20). Leaders should assess organizational culture to ensure performance improvements measured utilizing ROI are useful to stakeholders.

Integrated stakeholders and organizational leaders should participate in social exchanges (QP4, QP5, QP8, QP11, QP16, and QP20). Communication between these parties may improve the efficiency of local MFVs, lower the overall cost of services and increase service offerings by gaining feedback from veterans and the surrounding community. The financial implications and strategic advantages demonstrated by this research are beneficial for leaders capable of accurately implementing change.

Employees may benefit from this research through an exploration of strategies that could improve change structure and leadership (QP6, QP10, QP14, QP15, QP19, and QP20). By introducing ROI as a topic of discussion, individuals who read this study, and offered their opinions for my research, may continue to study the issue on their own. Employees’ findings may change the levels of accountability and consistency throughout the agency. Knowledge sharing within this organization may transfer to other branches of government. This phenomenon may proliferate throughout other government agencies because there is a preference for consistency in programs and processes (Holman et al., 2012).

The veteran population will benefit as they receive the services provided (QP1, QP2, QP5, QP9, QP14, QP17, and QP20); the key is to use every experience as a benchmark to improve the process. Service providers must be selfless, and this will strengthen organizational self-awareness. Individuals ignore modeling behavior in the change process when change is urgent (Schultz, 2013). The greatest social change suggestion about my research is that change is not about making stakeholders change. Leaders must model the behavior they want others to emulate (QP14, QP17, and QP20). This understanding may ensure stakeholders understand performance interventions. Leaders’ awareness of other ways to assess costs may increase human capital and monetary gains. Information on ROI could benefit leaders in determining what is of intrinsic value and reduce costs associated with failure to exercise any measurement strategy.

Recommendations for Action

I suggest that communication, consistency, and stakeholders are beneficial starting points for leaders attempting to define their view of organizational change and their use of ROI. Leaders should have open communication in order to implement ROI throughout the field of business (QP1, QP6, QP10, QP12, QP14, QP18, QP19, and QP20). The information in this study may be useful to leaders in achieving performance improvement strategies and evaluating the dynamics that affect change initiatives.

Management at all levels must continually strive for performance improvement (Fusch & Gillespie, 2012). Ninety-eight percent of participants in this study agreed communication is the largest challenge within the CTX MFV. Based on this finding, organizational leaders need to develop and improve their communication strategies when engaged in a performance initiative. Communication is an intrinsic environmental support from leaders to employees, in which leaders provide a safe environment where subordinates may perform to the best of their ability. Mentors should help leaders adapt to their positions. Most individuals in leadership roles require training about the process of strategy implementation (Russo, 2012).

Organizational leaders need to communicate frequently with employees to build trust, which employees may then establish with customers (QP11, QP13, and QP19). Participants indicated the MFV does not practice ROI. In order to rectify this situation, encouraging feedback from employees may cause a change process, which may increase stakeholder support (Pardo del Val, Martínez-Fuentes, & Roig-Dobón, 2012). To understand ROI, leaders should increase their understanding of ethical practices. Individuals whose ethics align with the organization are supportive of change (Burnes & Jackson, 2011).

Fifty-two percent of participants suggested that leaders lack integrity and do not make new information readily accessible and understandable to stakeholders. Leaders should develop reciprocal relationships with employees (Burnes & Jackson, 2011). Leaders should reestablish trust at the employee level, enabling both managers and employees to determine what is valuable to stakeholders by building positive relationships (QP6, QP12, QP16, and QP20). Based on my findings, training is inconsistent and not aligned with the goals of the organization. Managers should implement alternative methods of training, rather than taking steps to provide value.

Despite the benefits of ROI, organizational systems are complex; leaders have trouble in achieving agreement among leaders, managers, and employees. To address these concerns, I suggest organizational leaders utilize these results to assist in undertaking the following actions. Organizations should use the information from this study to assist leaders' understandings of how to approach organizational change with high level leaders and subordinates. Decision makers may use this research to help them identify the political climate under which change occurs.

Political officials should utilize this research to make a case for justifying the budget before allocating funds to government organizations. Leaders and managers may use this research to assist with decision making about the continued rollout of transformational business processes. Organizational leaders should educate stakeholders that ROI is suitable for a variety of programs. Return on investment is applicable to all education and training programs as well as career development, organizational development, and substantial change initiatives. Leaders should be honest about costs associated with the ROI; otherwise, they will harm the credibility and value of ROI.

Leaders should be open to feedback and willing to learn (QP2, QP3, QP6, QP11, QP12, QP13, QP14, QP15, QP19, and QP20). Participants lacked understanding about how ROI is relevant to their organization. Leaders should clarify the goals of the organization; because such clarity may provide employees with an accurate idea about the direction of the organization. In the United States, 2,000 private sector organizations have implemented ROI through skill building; 300 government agencies and nonprofit organizations have utilized these processes (Phillips & Phillips, 2012).

Recommendations for Further Study

Researchers could benefit from the social change concepts offered in this research study by repeating this analysis in future studies. The benefit to repeating this study is identifying how leaders' performance goals align with the objectives of the organization. There are numerous industries in the field of business, and assessing value may be different for each of them. Utilizing a qualitative, single site, descriptive embedded case study method allows researchers to draw conclusions from the experiences from groups of human participants.

Other study designs, such as phenomenological, ethnographic, and grounded theory research, would be inductive and allow for ongoing data collection and analysis

(Latham, 2013). The following recommendations for future study are for individuals interested in studying topics comparable to my research that will use similar methodologies. Organizational leaders may use my analysis of ROI to quantify the costs of initiatives and the profitability of their actions.

In other businesses, ROI may be useful to determine whether a change has improved employee attitudes. Change would be specific to each industry. All industries may benefit by reframing performance from an economic issue to one of social change to increase performance (Calás et al., 2009). The issue that arises with ROI measurement is that the outcome of the process is often a single number. Individuals often ask how a number may determine the value of a performance intervention. My recommendation is that stakeholders may change their behavior based on what they perceive as valuable. Stakeholders determine the value of change, and the impact intervention strategies have on individuals' work and private lives (Georges, 2013).

The findings of this study inform a business problem focused on the concept of leadership. My goal was to discover what assists leaders in understanding ROI to measure organizational change. Based on the responses provided by participants, not only did I discover potential answers to the research questions, but also these results assisted in identifying what subordinates believe are the traits leaders need to be effective in their role. Using the same research questions, another researcher could determine how ROI assists leaders in attaining certain business traits.

The CTX MFV formed the boundaries of this study. Public and private hospital officials within the boundary also could conduct qualitative or quantitative analyses to understand whether their organizational cases are different from the cases utilized for this research. Exploration of MFVs within areas comparable to the CTX MFV would provide evidence that would corroborate, refute, or expand the findings of this study. Closer examination is required to understand how ROI differs from value creation and how individuals understand what ROI measures. Future study of ROI may create new questions related to improved business practices.

Reflections

For both organizational leaders and employees, ROI measurement is a difficult process. Communicating the need for change may become even more complicated as the state of performance measurement and interventions are still relatively new to the field of business. Change processes within the MFV often do not include managers (QP1, QP2, QP3, QP6, QP12, QP16, and QP19). Some leaders had a partial or misunderstood notion of ROI as a measurement theory. Participants' responses indicated communication is a prominent topic within the practice of business, and all strategies for improvement require an adjustment to meet organizational leaders' needs (QP2, QP4, QP7, QP10, QP15, and QP17).

Before conducting the study, I had an understanding of how individuals might respond. The notions presented in the literature review concerning how to encourage leaders to adopt ROI had no influence on the answers provided for this research. A potential bias was present in the development of the questions. In order to eliminate bias, a pretest commenced after prospectus approval; the committee devoted to this research checked for researcher bias, and this study contains discrepant information. Another potential bias was that data collection occurred at the participants' and researcher's places of employment. There was potential to influence how participants responded to questions. Although some of the participants in the study may know me, this was not true of all participants, which reduced bias.

Unexpected findings occurred. The unexpected results included the emergence of the recognition theme (QP3, QP4, QP6, QP11, QP14, QP15, QP17, and QP20). Participants indicated a need of affirmation for their contributions to the organizational mission. Recognition is an unexpected theme, as incentive programs did not seem related to how to encourage leadership to use ROI. Participants also indicated a sociological attachment to the organization, stating that ethical decision making is a personality trait a leader demonstrates to achieve performance (QP1, QP2, QP3, QP7, QP11, QP13 and QP19).

The findings of this study did not support the findings of other researchers with similar topics (Hur et al., 2010; Jabbour et al., 2011). As the doctoral study process progressed, participants expressed what ROI was to them; the intrinsic value of the educational model as measured by ROI was different for all participants. The focus of this study and the pragmatic business application allowed the opportunity to understand concepts that contribute to decision making. This process has had a positive impact because there is a different view of my role in the organization. Participants' responses indicated they were interested in utilizing ROI as they relate to their individual units (QP1, QP4, QP5, QP11, QP13, QP14, QP15, QP17, and QP20). The results of this study may influence leaders' ideas about traditional ROI used by the MFV.

Summary and Study Conclusion

The participants in this study seem unable to distinguish value creation from ROI. Traditional ROI is a financial metric; the percentage of dollars returned for a given investment or cost. When leaders use ROI for financial interest, the ROI analyses may include revenue, spending avoided, or costs saved (Georges, 2013). Value occurs when people become aware of and engage with services. Having value is the reason individuals continue to practice in the field of business. Return on investment taught in businesses and institutions of higher education in the United States is the combination of traditional finance-based ROI theories and value creation theories. In my study, I did not set out to learn how performance improvement applies to a transactional theory. Return on investment is the value leaders provide to all stakeholders by intervening in processes, and making the change they seek occur, not simply proposing changes or providing training on how to change the situation.

Based on this research, five factors encourage leaders to utilize ROI to measure organizational change. More than 90% of participants interviewed, confirmed the themes are training, leadership, communication, consistency, and recognition. I detailed these themes for the individual, and the collective influence these traits have on leadership behavior and potential. Leaders should use the results of this study to measure the success rate of a strategic initiative during organizational transformations. Leaders should recognize all stakeholders for their contributions to organizational change (QP1, QP2, QP3, QP4, QP10, QP12, QP13, QP15, QP16, and QP20).

Organizational leaders may utilize the recommendations for performance improvement strategies presented in the study. These recommendations are also applicable to public and private sector leaders who want to ensure their performance initiatives consist of the suggestions presented in this research. Fusch and Gillespie (2012) wrote that performance measurement is for use at all levels with the understanding business owners wish to acquire wealth. Cost savings are powerful; however, saving money is never more powerful than people are. In order to use ROI to assess organizational changes, leadership should be aware of the value within their organization that comes from many sources. Performance and recognition are the largest contributing factors to ROI, as people within an organization should be worth more than profits (Maurer, 2013).

The ROI process repeatedly used within a business; can allow leaders to create value which occurs over time, anything of value has a process. When a leader utilizes ROI, the same individuals who become customers will then take action to support that business, such as recommending the organization to a friend or purchasing a product. Leaders should know that 70% of organizational changes fail (Maurer, 2013). The failure or success of organizational changes depends on the extent to which individuals understand change and how change will affect them personally.

Leaders should convey the message that the purpose of performance intervention strategies is to assist an organization in leading change effectively in the future. Managers should know their roles are critical in implementing change. Moreover, a paramount issue is that the management and leadership team must lead by example (QP1, QP4, QP5, QP10, QP14, QP17, and QP20). Overcoming the resistance of performance intervention strategies and assessment begins with leaders understanding how the ROI process may add value to organizational change.

References

Acevedo, A. (2012). Personalist business ethics and humanistic management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *10*(5), 2-5. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-0959-x

Ai, J., Brockett, P., Cooper, W., & Golden, L. (2012). Enterprise risk management through strategic allocation of capital. *Journal of Risk and Insurance, 79*(1), 29-56. doi:10.1111/j1539-6975.2010.01403x

Aisha, A., & Hardjomidjojo, P. (2013). Effects of working ability, working condition, motivation and incentive on employees' multi-dimensional performance. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology, 4*, 605-609. doi:10.7763/IJIMT.2013.V4.470

Alderson, M. J., & Betker, B. L. (2012). Managerial incentives, net debt and investment activity in all equity firms. *Studies in Economics and Finance, 29*, 232-246. doi:10.1108/10867371211266892

Arain, M., Campbell, M., Cooper, C., & Lancaster, G. (2011). What is a pilot or feasibility study? A review of practice and editorial policy. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 10,* 67-67. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-10-67

Belote, J., Fulton, L., & Brooks, M. (2012). Patient satisfaction as a function of in-house versus contract staffing models in Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinics. *Military Medicine*, *177*(1), 23-26. doi:10.7205/MILMED-D-11-00259

Berg, M., & Karlsen, J. (2012). An evaluation of management training and coaching. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 24*(3), 177-199. doi:10.1108/13665621211209267

Bisel, R., & Barge, J. (2011). Discursive positioning and planned change in organizations. *Human Relations, 64*, 257-283. doi:10.1177/0018726710375996

Bleijenburgh, I., Peters, P., & Poutsma, E. (2010). Diversity management beyond the business case. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *29*, 413-421. doi:10.1108/02610151011052744

Bluhm, D., Harman, W., Lee, T., & Mitchell, T. (2011). Qualitative research in management: A decade of progress. *Journal of Management Studies*, *48*, 1866-1891. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00972.x

Brayman, S. (2012). Defining and measuring risk capacity. *Financial Services Review, 21*(2), 131-148. doi:10.1285243514

Brower, J., & Mahajan, V. (2013). Driven to be good: A stakeholder theory perspective on the drivers of corporate social performance. *Journal of Business Ethics, 117*, 313-331. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1523-z

Brown, E. (2013). Vulnerability and the basis of business ethics: From fiduciary duties to professionalism. *Journal of Business Ethics, 113*, 489-504. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1318-2

Büchel, B., Nieminen, L., Armbruster-Domeyer, H., & Denison, D. (2013). Managing stakeholders in team based innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 16*(1), 22-49. doi:10.1108/14601061311292841

Buckley, M. (2013). A constructivist approach to business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *117*, 695-706. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1719x

Burnes, B., & Jackson, P. (2011). Success and failure in organizational change: An examination of the role of values. *Journal of Change Management, 11*(2), 133-162. doi:10.1080/14697017.2010.524655

Cadden, T., Marshall, D., & Cao, G. (2013). Opposites attract: Organisational culture and supply chain performance. *Supply Chain Management, 18*(4), 86-103. doi:10.1108/13598541311293203

Calás, M. B., Smircich, L., & Bourne, K. A. (2009). Extending the boundaries: Reframing "Entrepreneurship as Social Change" through feminist perspectives. *Academy of Management Review, 34*, 552-569. doi:10.5465/40633597

Cameron, R., & Molina-Azorin, J. (2011). The acceptance of mixed methods in business and management research. *International Journal of Organizational Analytics, 19*(3), 256-271. doi:10.1108/19348831111149204

Carlsen, B. & Glenton, C. (2011). What about *N*? A methodological study of sample-size reporting in focus group studies. *BMC Medical Research Technology, 11*(26), 1-10. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-11-26

Carr, P., Madan, D. B., & Alvarez, J. J. V. (2011). Markets, profits, capital, leverage and return. *Journal of Risk, 14*(1), 95-122. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1679503

Chambel, M., & Sobral, F. (2011). Training is an investment with return in temporary workers. *Career Development International, 16*, 161-177. doi:10.1108/13620431111115613

Chambers, M. S. (2013). An employee and supervisory development program: Bridging theory and practice. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 4*, 138-143. doi:10.1413296903

Chen, X., Zhao, K., Liu, X. & Dash Wu, D. (2012). Improving employees' job satisfaction and innovation performance using conflict management. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 23*(2), 15-172 doi:10.1108/10444061211218276

Ciftci, M. (2012). Do analysts underestimate future benefits of R&D? *International Business Research, 5*(9), 26-37. doi:10.5539/ibr.v5n9p26

Crossan, M., Mazutis, D., & Seijts, G. (2013). In search of virtue: The role of virtues, values and character strengths in ethical decision-making. *Journal of Business Ethics, 113*, 567-581. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1680-8

Colgan, F. (2011). Equality, diversity and corporate responsibility. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 30*, 719-734. doi:10.1108/02610151111183225

Cook, A., & Glass, C. (2011). Does diversity damage corporate value? Measuring stock price reactions to a diversity award. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 34*(12), 24-32. doi:10.1080/01419870.2010.490591

Covin, J. G., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2011). Entrepreneurial orientation theory and research: Reflections on a needed construct. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice, 35*, 855-872. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00482.x

Crowther, J., & Lloyd-Williams, M. (2012). Researching sensitive and emotive topics: the participants' voice. *Research Ethics*, *8*, 200-211. doi:10.1177/1747016112455887

Davis, C., Kilborne, A., Blow, F., Pierce, J., Bernard, M. W., Huycke, E., . . . Visnic, S. (2012). Reduced mortality among Department of Veterans Affairs patients with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder lost to follow up and engaged in active outreach to return for care. *American Journal of Public Health, 102*(3), 4-9. doi:10.1097/JGP.0b013e3181ff6655

Dembowski, F. L. (2013). The roles of benchmarking, best practice & innovation in organizational effectiveness. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation (Online), 5*(3), 6-10. doi:10.1419395702

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.

Deutsch, Y., & Valente, M. (2013). Compensating outside directors with stock: The impact on non-primary stakeholders. *Journal of Business Ethics, 116*(1), 67-85. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1447-7

Dierksmeier, C. (2013). Kant on virtue. *Journal of Business Ethics, 113*(4), 597-609. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1683-5

Dobbin, F., Kim, S., & Kaler, A. (2011). You can't always get what you need. *American Sociological Review*, *76*, 386-411. doi:10.1177/0003122411409704

Dul, J., & Hak, T. (2012). *Case study methodology in business research*. London, England: Routledge.

Duvendack, M., & Palmer-Jones, R. (2013). Replication of quantitative work in development studies: Experiences and suggestions. *Progress in Development Studies, 13*, 307-322. doi:10.1177/1464993413490480

Elden, M., & Durand, R. (2010). Exploring the ROI in leadership development: A global energy company case study. *Development and Learning in Organizations, 24*(55), 19-21. doi:10.1108/14777281011069790

Erie, S. P. (2012). How local politics shape federal policy: Business, power, and the environment in twentieth century Los Angeles. *Business History Review, 86*(4), 853-855. doi:10.1017/S0007680512001705

Fillis, I., & Rentschler, R. (2010). The role of creativity in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Enterprising Culture, 18*, 49-81. doi:10.1142/s0218495810000501

Flick, U. (2014). *An introduction to qualitative research*. London, England: Sage.

Fooks, G., Gilmore, A., Collin, J., Holden, C., & Lee, K. (2013). The limits of corporate social responsibility: Techniques of neutralization, stakeholder management and political CSR. *Journal of Business Ethics, 112*(2), 283-299. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1250-5

Franceschini, F., Galetto, M., & Turina, E. (2013). Techniques for impact evaluation of performance measurement systems. *The International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 30*(2), 197-220. doi:10.1108/02656711311293599

Freeman, R., Harrison, J., Wicks, A., Parmar, B., & Colle, S. (2010). *Stakeholder theory: the state of the art*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Fuad, N., & Bohari, A. (2013). Knowledge based information system for strengthening the competitive advantages of women technopreneurs in Malaysia. *Information Management and Business Review, 5*, 225-232. doi:10.1398483871

Fusch, G., & Gillespie, R. C. (2012). *A practical approach to performance interventions and analysis: 50 models for building a high performance culture*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: FT Press.

Georges, P. M. (2013). *Six figure management method: How to grow your business with the only 6 KPIs you'll ever need*. London, England. Kogan Page.

Getha-Taylor, H., & Morse, R. S. (2013). Collaborative leadership development for local government officials: Exploring competencies and program impact. *Public Administration Quarterly, 37*(1), 72-103. doi:10.1355856135

Glavan, L. (2012). Understanding process performance measurement systems. *International Journal of Business and Systems Research, 2*(2), 25-38. doi:10.2478/v10305-012-0014-0

Glavas, A., & Goodwin, L. (2013). Is the perception of 'goodness' good enough? Exploring the relationship between perceived corporate social responsibility and employee organizational identification. *Journal of Business Ethics, 114*(1), 15-27. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1323-5

Gotcheva, N., Watts, G., & Oedewald, P. (2013). Developing smart and safe organizations: An evolutionary approach. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 21*(1), 83-97. doi:10.1108/19348831311322551

Gouillart, F. (2014). The race to implement co creation of value with stakeholders: Five approaches to competitive advantage. *Strategy & Leadership, 42*(1), 2-8. doi:10.1108/SL-09-2013-0071

Grant, A. (2012). ROI is a poor measure of coaching success: Towards a more holistic approach using a wellbeing and engagement framework. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice, 5*(2), 74-85. doi:10.1080/17521882.2012.672438

Greener, I. (2011). *Designing Social Research*. London, England: SAGE Publications.

Haas, M. (2010). The double-edged swords of autonomy and external knowledge: Analyzing team effectiveness in a multinational organization. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(3), 989-1008. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2010.54533180

Hamann, P. M., Schiemann, F., Bellora, L., & Guenther, T. W. (2013). Exploring the dimensions of organizational performance. *Organizational Research Methods*, *16*(1), 67-87. doi:10.1177/1094428112470007

Hays, D. G., & Singh, A. A. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings*. New York: Guilford Press.

Herdman, A., & Mcmillan-Capehart, A. (2010). Establishing a diversity program is not enough: Exploring the determinants of diversity climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(1), 39-53. doi:10.1007/s10869-009-9133-1

Herring, C., & Henderson, L. (2013). *Critical diversity: The new case for inclusion and equal opportunity* (Professional ed.). Chicago, IL: Diverse Solutions.

Hoffman, A., Tutic, A., & Weis, S. (2011). The role of educational diversity in investor relations. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 16*(4), 25-30. doi:10.1108/13563281111186959

Holman, D., Totterdell, P., Axtell, C., Stride, C., Port, R., Svensson, R., & Zibarras, L. (2012). Job design and the employee innovation process: The mediating role of learning strategies. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 27*, 177-191. doi:10.007/s10869-011-9242-5

Homburg, C., Artz, M., & Wieseke, J. (2012). Marketing performance measurement systems: Does comprehensiveness really improve performance? *Journal of Marketing, 76*(3), 56-77 doi:10.1509/jm.09.0487

Hur, Y., Stickland, R., & Stevanovic, D. (2010). Managing diversity: Does it matter to municipal governments? *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *23*, 500-515. doi:10.1108/09513551011058501

Hutcheson, G. (2011). Data coding, management and manipulation. *Journal of Modeling in Management, 6*, 592-599. doi:10.1097/WON.0b013e3181bd7f77

Islam, G. (2012). Recognition, reification, and practices of forgetting: Ethical implications of human resource management. *Journal of Business Ethics, 111*(1), 37-48. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1433-0

Jabbour, C., Gordono, F., de Oliveira, J., Martinez, J., & Battiselle, R. (2011). Diversity management: Challenges, benefits, and the role of human resource management in Brazilian organizations. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *30*(1), 1-3. doi:10.1108/02610151111110072

Jones, P., Beynon, M., Pickernell, D., & Packham, G. (2013). Evaluating the impact of different training methods on SME business performance. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, *31*(1), 56-81. doi:10.1068/c12113b.

Jogulu, U. D., & Pansiri, J. (2011). Mixed methods: A research design for management doctoral dissertations. *Management Research Review, 34*, 687-701. doi:10.1108/01409171111136211

Jsa, A., Perlin, J., Kizer, K., & Dudley, R. (2013). Effect of the transformation of the Veterans Affairs health care system on the quality of care. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *328,* 2218-2227. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa021899

Kaafarani, B., & Stevenson, J. (2011). Breaking away: An innovation model for sustainable growth. *Research Technology Management, 54*(3), 44-51. doi:10.5437/08453608X5403008

Karim, A., & Arif-Uz-Zaman, K. (2013). A methodology for effective implementation of lean strategies and its performance evaluation in manufacturing organizations. *Business Process Management Journal, 19*(1), 169-196. doi:10.1108/14637151311294912

Katou, A. (2012). Investigating reverse causality between human resource management policies and organizational performance in small firms. *Management Research Review, 35*(2), 134-156. doi:10.1108/01409171211195161

King, E. B., Dawson, J. F., Kravitz, D. A., & Gulick, L. M. V. (2012). A multilevel study of the relationships between diversity training, ethnic discrimination and satisfaction in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(1), 5-20. doi:10.1002/job.728

Kira, M., van Eijnatten, F., & Balkin, D. B. (2010). Crafting sustainable work: Development of personal resources. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 23,* 616-632. doi:10.1108/09534811011071315

Kirsch, C., Chelliah, J., & Parry, W. (2012). The impact of cross-cultural dynamics on change management. *Cross Cultural Management, 19*(2), 166-195. doi:10.1108/13527601211219865

Korhonen, T., Laine, T., & Suomala, P. (2013). Understanding performance measurement dynamism: A case study. *Journal of Management & Governance, 17*(1), 35-58. doi:10.1007/s10997-012-9217-6

Kreiser, P. M., Marino, L. D., Dickson, P., & Weaver, M. K. (2010). Cultural influences on entrepreneurial orientation: The impact of national culture on risk taking and proactiveness in SMEs. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice, 34*, 959-983. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00396.x

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Lampenius, N. (2013). Are real investment decisions based on risk adjusted performance measures consistent with maximizing shareholder value? *The Journal of Risk, 15*(2), 77-101. doi:10.1316206454

Latham, J. R. (2013). A framework for leading the transformation to performance excellence part I: CEO perspectives on forces, facilitators, and strategic leadership systems. *The Quality Management Journal, 20*(2), 12-33. doi:10.1348130549

Leiyu, S., Lebrun, L., Zhu, J., Hayashi, A., Sharma, R., & Daly, C. (2012). Clinical quality performance in US health centers. *Health Services Research, 47,* 2225-2249 doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2012.01418.x

Lim, M., & Jamil, H. (2013). Certification paradigm of johari window human capital. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology, 4*(3), 303. doi:10.7763/IJIMT.2013.V4.412

Liu, C., Bryson, C. L., Burgess, J. F., Jr, Sharp, N., Perkins, M., & Maciejewski, M. L. (2012). Use of outpatient care in VA and Medicare among disability eligible and age eligible veteran patients. *BMC Health Services Research, 12*(1), 51-57, doi:10.1186/1472-6963-12-5

Lo, S. (2010). Performance evaluation for sustainable business a profitability and marketability framework. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *17*(6), 1. doi:10.1002/csr.214

Lopez-Fernandez, M., & Sanchez-Garday, G. (2010). Managing the effects of diversity on social capital. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 29*, 491-516. doi:10.1108/02610151011052780

Lubin, D., & Esty, D. (2010). The sustainability imperative. *Harvard Business Review*, *88*(5), 42–50. Retrieved from http://hbr.org

Luke, K. (2013). Measuring marketing ROI. *Journal of Financial Planning, 26*(2), 19-21. doi:10.1289053963

Mamaghani, A. (2012). Multiple criteria decision-making technique in new product development management. *Journal of Management Research, 4,* 81-99. doi:10.5296/jmr.v4i3.1753

Marsh, C. (2013). Business executives' perceptions of ethical leadership and its development. *Journal of Business Ethics, 114*, 565-582. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1366-7

Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A., & Fontenot, R. (2013). Does sample size matter in qualitative research? A review of qualitative interviews in IS research. *Journal of Computer Information Systems, 54*(1), 11-22. Retrieved from http://www.iacis.org/jcis/

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2010). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Martelli, J., & Abels, P. (2011). Multinational corporations: The changing landscape. *Management Research Review, 34*, 889-909. doi:10.1108/01409171111152501

Maurer, R. (2013). How to lead change effectively by learning from past setbacks. *The Journal for Quality and Participation, 36*(1), 28-29. doi:10.1366045286

Mcmillan-Capehart, A., Aaron, J., & Cline, B. (2010). Investor reactions to diversity reputation signals. *Corporate Reputation Review, 13*, 184-197. doi:10.1057/crr.2010.20

Meng, J., & Berger, B. K. (2012). How top business communicators measure the return on investment of organization's internal communication efforts. *Journal of Communication Management, 16*(4), 332-354. doi:10.1108/13632541211278987

Mishra, A., & Mishra, D. (2013). Applications of stakeholder theory in information systems and technology. *Engineering Economics*, *47*(1), 254-266. doi:10.5755/j01.ee.24.3.4618

Mitchell, T., & Olsen, H. (2013). The elasticity of marketing return on investment. *Journal of Business & Economics Research (Online), 11*(10), 435. Retrieved from http://journals.cluteonline.com/index.php/JBER/

Muldoon, J. (2012). The Hawthorne legacy. *Journal of Management History, 18*(1), 105-119. doi:10.1108/17511341211188682

Ng, E., & Sears, G. (2012). CEO leadership styles and the implementation of organizational diversity practices: Moderating effects of social values and age. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *105,* 41-42. doi:10.1007/s10551 011 0933 7

Olivera-Aguilar, M., & Millsap, R. (2013). Statistical power for a simultaneous test of factorial and predictive invariance. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 48*(1), 96-116. doi:10.1080/00273171.2012.755112

Olsen, B., Lund, N., Ellingsen, G., & Hartvigsen, G. (2012). Diversity stakeholders. *Journal of Documentation, 68*, 100-126. doi:10.1108/00220411211200347

Onwuegbuzie, A. & Leech, N. (2007). A Call for Qualitative Power Analyses. *Quality & Quantity, 41*,105–121. doi:10.1007/s11135-005-1098-1

Ong, T., Tze, B., Soh, C., & Yan, Y. (2012). Malaysian real estate investment trusts: A performance and comparative analysis. *International Journal of Economics and Finance, 4*(5), 73-84. doi:10.5539/ijef.v4n5p73

Pardo del Val, M., Martínez-Fuentes, C., & Roig-Dobón, S. (2012). Participative management and its influence on organizational change. *Management Decision*, *50*, 1843-1860. doi:10.1108/00251741211279639

Parisi, C. (2013). The impact of organisational alignment on the effectiveness of firms' sustainability strategic performance measurement systems: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Management & Governance, 17*(1), 71-97. doi:10.1007/s10997-012-9219-4

Pastore, R. S., Carr-Chellman, A. A., & Lohmann, N. (2011). User design: A case study on corporate change. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 23*(4), 27-48. doi:10.1002/piq.20098

Patzelt, H., & Shepherd, D. A. (2011). Recognizing opportunities for sustainable development. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice, 35*, 631-652. doi:10.1111/j.1540 6520.2010.00386.x

Pedersen, E. (2010). Modelling CSR: How managers understand the responsibilities of business towards society. *Journal of Business Ethics, 91*(2), 155–166. doi:10.1007/s10551-009-0078-0

Pekkola, S. (2013). Managing a network by utilizing performance measurement information. *Measuring Business Excellence, 17*(1), 72-79. doi:10.1108/13683041311311374

Penelope, F. M., & Pattison, P. E. (2012). Organizational culture, intersectoral collaboration and mental health care. *Journal of Health Organization and Management, 26*(1), 32-59. doi:10.1108/14777261211211089

Phillips, J., & Phillips, P. (2012). *Proving the value of HR how and why to measure ROI*. Alexandria, VA: Society for Human Resource Management.

Ployhart, R., & Ward, A. (2011). The "quick start guide" for conducting and publishing longitudinal research. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*, 413-422. doi:10.1007/s10869-011-9209-6

Qin, J., O'Meara, B., & McEachern, S. (2009). The need for an integrated theoretical framework for researching the influence of group diversity on performance. *Management Research News, 32*, 739-750. doi:10.1108/01409170910977951

Qu, S., & Dumay, J. (2011). The qualitative research interview. *Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management, 8*, 238-264. doi:10.1108/11766091111162070

Quan, X. (2012). Prior experience, social network, and levels of entrepreneurial intentions. *Management Research Review, 35*, 945-957. doi:10.1108/01409171211272679

Quinlan, C. (2011). *Business research methods*. Andover, Hampshire, UK: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Rathner, S. (2013). The influence of primary study characteristics on the performance differential between socially responsible and conventional investment funds: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics, 118*(2), 349-363. doi:10.1007/s10551 012-1584-z

Reissner, S. C. (2010). Change, meaning and identity at the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 23,* 287-299. doi:10.1108/0953481101049617

Renko, M., Kroeck, K. G., & Bullough, A. (2012). Expectancy theory and nascent entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics, 39*, 667-684. doi:10.1007/s11187 011-9354-3

Roll, K. H. (2013). Measuring performance, development and growth when restricting flexibility. *Journal of Productivity Analysis, 39*(1), 15-25. doi:10.1007/s11123 012-0265-3

Romme, G. L. (2011). Organizational development interventions: An artifaction perspective. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 47,* 8-32. doi:10.1177/0021886310390864

Rowland, C. (2013). Managing team performance: Saying and paying. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 21*(1), 38-52. doi:10.1108/19348831311322524

Rowley, J. (2012). Conducting research interviews. *Management Research Review, 35*, 260-271. doi:10.1108/01409171211210154

Rusly, F. H., Corner, J. L., & Sun, P. (2012). Positioning change readiness in knowledge management research. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 16*(2), 329-355. doi:10.1108/13673271211218906

Russo, M. (2012). Diversity in goal orientation, team performance, and internal team environment. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 31*(2), 124-143. doi:10.1108/02610151211202781

Salter, C., Green, M. T., Hodgson, M. N., & Joyner, N. (2013). The language of transformational leaders: Addressing the needs of followers. *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge, 19*(1), 60-68. doi:10.1357565480

Sani, A. (2013). Role of procedural justice, organizational commitment and job satisfaction on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Business and Management, 8*(15), 57-67. doi:10.5539/ijbm.v8n15p57

Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics, 111*, 335-351. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1413-4

Sarwar, C. I. (2013). Future of ethically effective leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics, 113*(1), 81-89. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1283-9

Schilke, O., & Goerzen, A. (2010). Alliance management capability: An investigation of the construct and its measurement. *Journal of Management, 36*, 1192-1219. doi:10.1177/0149206310362102

Schraeder, M., & Self, D. R. (2010). Potential benefits of engaging primary stakeholders in developing a vision. *Strategic Direction, 26*(3), 3-5 doi:10.1108/02580541011022838

Schueffel, P., Amann, W., & Herbolzheimerdagger, E. (2011). Internalization of new ventures: Tests of growth and survival. *Multinational Business Review*, *19*, 376-403. doi:10.1108/15253831111190199

Schultz, R. (2013). Adjacent opportunities: Creating good change. *Emergence : Complexity and Organization, 15*, 117-119. doi:10.1350301398

Schyns, B., Maslyn, J. M., & Marc, V. (2012). May some leaders have a good relationship with many followers? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 33*, 594-606. doi:10.1108/01437731211253046

Shimada, S. L., Hogan, T. P., Rao, S. R., Allison, J. J., Quill, A. L., Feng, H., ... & Houston, T. K. (2013). Patient-provider secure messaging in VA: variations in adoption and association with urgent care utilization. *Medical Care*, *51*(3), 21-28. doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e3182780917

Shukeri, S., Shin, O., & Shaari, M. (2012). Does board of director's characteristics affect firm performance? Evidence from Malaysian public listed companies. *International Business Research, 5*(9), 120-127. doi:10.5539/ibr.v5n9p120

Simon, M. (2010). *Dissertation & scholarly research: Recipes for success*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Sin, Y., Huang, H., & Lin, S. (2012). Dynamic relations between order imbalance, volatility and return of top gainers. *Applied Economics*, *44*(12), 6-9. doi:10.1080/00036846.2010.543080

Singh, V., & Point, S. (2010). Diversity statements for leveraging organizational legitimacy. *Management International, 11*(2), 23-24.doi:10.7202/029777ar

Smith, J., & Joseph, S. (2010). Workplace challenges in corporate America: Differences in black and white. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 29*(5), 29. doi:10.1108/02610151011089500

Sobel, R., Dutta, N., & Sanjukta, R. (2010). Does cultural diversity increase rate of entrepreneurship? *Austrian Economic Review, 23,* 269-286. doi:10.1007/s-1138 010-0-112-6

Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work.* New York: Guilford Press.

Stewart, J., & Harle, V. (2010). The implications of talent management for diversity training: An exploratory study. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 34*, 506-518. doi:10.1108/03090591011061194

Stewart, R. (2011). You support diversity, but are you ethical? Examining the interactive effects of diversity and ethical climate perceptions on turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *99*, 453-465. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0663-2

Stieb, J. (2009). Assessing Freeman's stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Ethics, 87*, 401-414. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9928-4

Svensson, G., & Wood, G. (2011). A conceptual framework of corporate and business ethics across organizations. *The Learning Organization, 18*(1), 21-35. doi:10.1108/09696471111095975

Theodore, J. (2013). Organizational development interventions in learning organizations. *International Journal of Management & Information Systems (Online), 17*(1), 65. doi:10.1418458881

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16,* 837-851. doi:10.1177/1077800410383121

Truffer, C. J., Keehan, S., Smith, S., Cylus, J., Sisko, A., Poisal, . . . Clemens, M. K. (2010). Health spending projections through 2019: The recession’s impact continues. *Health Affairs, 29,* 522-529. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2009.1074

Tuchman, G. (2011). Ethical imperialism: Institutional review boards and the social sciences, 1965 2009. *Contemporary Sociology, 40*, 617-619. doi:10.1177/0094306111419111mm

Udechukwu, O. (2012). Examining thematic elements in strategic business risk. *Management Research Review, 35*(2), 90-105. doi:10.1108/01409171211195134

Urquhart, C., Lehmann, H., & Myers, M. (2010). Putting the theory back into grounded theory: Guidelines for grounded theory studies in information systems. *Information Systems Journal*, *20*, 357-381. doi:10.1111/j.1365 2575.2009.00328.x

Uzkurt, C., Kumar, R., Kimzan, H. S., & Eminoglu, G. (2013). Role of innovation in the relationship between organizational culture and firm performance. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 16*, 92-117. doi:10.1108/14601061311292878

van Ewijk, A. (2011). Diversity and diversity policy: Driving interfundamental differences. *Journal of Organization Change Management, 24*, 680-694. doi:10.110810953411111158921

Verbeke, A., & Tung, V. (2013). The future of stakeholder management theory: A temporal perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 112*(3), 529-543. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1276-8

Watson, T. (2012). Making organisational ethnography. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography, 1*(1), 15-22. doi:10.1108/20466741211220615

Wolf, J. (2014). The relationship between sustainable supply chain management, stakeholder pressure, and corporate sustainability performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *119*(3), 317-328. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1603-0

Yin, R. K. (2012). *Applications of case study research* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Appendix A: Invitation Letter

Research Topic: A Business Case for Return on Investment:
Understanding Organizational Change

Rya Henderson-Carter, a student in Walden University's Doctorate of Business Administration program, will be conducting a case study in an attempt to understand what may assist organizational leaders concerning the implementation of return on investment strategy in the process of organizational change. This invitation to participate is not mandatory. Please know that your response to the questionnaire is voluntary.

You are invited to participate in this study because of your role as a manager directly involved in the primary ambulatory care team (PACT) model. Attached is the questionnaire that consists of ten questions. Completing the entire questionnaire may take approximately 20 minutes of your time. None of your personally identifiable information will be published in this study.

By consenting to this study, you will print out the attached questionnaire, write in your answers and return responses in a sealed envelope via office mail. There is no penalty for refusing to participate. You will not receive any form of payment or incentive for completing the questionnaire. Upon completion, a final copy of this study including the results will be provided to you. For your records, please keep a copy of this letter and any correspondence as it relates to this study.

There is minimal risk associated with this study, not beyond those that would occur in daily life. If there are concerns that arise as a direct result of participating in the study, please contact the Walden University Research Participant Advocate at X-XXX-

XXX-XXXX ext. XXXX. Walden University's approval number for this study is 08-23-13-0090003, and this approval expires on August 22, 2014.

I sincerely thank you for considering completing the questionnaire. Your participation could yield results beneficial to how organizational changes affect your organization. All information received will be placed on a password protected, external hard drive for five years. To avoid conflicts of interests within the organization, our only contact will be through electronic mail. Please remember that your name will not be used, participation is voluntary, and you reserve the choice to withdraw from participation in research at any time.

Contact information for Rya Henderson-Carter

Electronic mail: XXX.XXXXXXXXXX@waldenu.edu
Phone: XXX-XXX-XXXX
I will omit your name and unique identifiers of your questionnaire for your privacy and the dignity of research.

Appendix B: Demographic Questionnaire

Note: This study is anonymous. Please, do not write your name anywhere on this questionnaire or your return envelope.

1. What challenges does this organization face?
2. What processes improve performance in this organization?
3. What do leaders demonstrate to achieve performance?
4. What are some initiatives leaders may choose, and put in place as proactive measures to improve the ROI analysis for organizational change?
5. What is your understanding of ROI?
6. How is ROI practiced within your unit?
7. How does the unit/organization measure ROI?
8. How is ROI communicated to your customers?
9. What type of evidence shows ROI is working for your unit/organization?
10. Based on that evidence, how may an organization improve an ROI process?

Appendix C: NIH Certification

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that **Rya Henderson** successfully completed the NIH Web based training course “Protecting Human Research Participants.”

Date of completion: 01/08/2011

Certification Number: 592071

Appendix D: Research Approval Letter

[redacted]

[redacted]

July 15, 2013 [redacted]

[redacted]

Dear Ms. Henderson-Carter:

[redacted] has authorized you to conduct employee interviews at [redacted] in support of your DBA. study until your study is complete.

Your study cannot interfere patient care, customer service, or daily hospital operations. You must obtain supervisory approval to conduct your interviews during business hours or schedule the appropriate leave. If these interviews are found to interfere with any of the above hospital operations, you will be required to cease your interviews immediately.

These interviews are limited to emailed request and in no way are the employees required to accept your request or respond. You cannot send broadcast emails to all facility or [redacted] employees soliciting a response.

If you have further questions regarding this issue, please contact me at [redacted]

Sincerely yours,

[redacted]

[redacted]

Senior Human Resources Specialist

Appendix E: Exemption Letter

[redacted]

August 5, 2013 [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] has authorized you to conduct your research at [redacted]. As part of this study, you are authorized to conduct interviews via emailed request, and disseminate the results of your study to participants. This authorization is fo[redacted].

[redacted]

The human resources department has approved your request to conduct this research in support of your DBA study. This department is responsible for protection of employees within [redacted].

If you have further questions regarding this issue, please contact me at [redacted].

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Curriculum Vitae

Rya Henderson-Carter

Objective:

Adjunct faculty of business, management, and research disciplines.

Education:

2014 Doctorate of Business Administration (Social Impact Management)
Walden University
3.9

2014 Master of Return on Investment Certificate Course
Villanova University

2010 Masters in Business Administration (General Management)
Walden University
3.3

2006 Bachelor of Science, Business Administration (Communications and Marketing)
Franklin University

Professional Affiliations/Licenses

State of Texas Educator Licensure Number XXXXXX 2010-2015:
Special Education, Health (EC-12), and Generalist (EC-8)
State of Mississippi Educator Licensure Number XXXXXXX 2011-2016:
ELE EDUC (4-8), Health (K-12), Kindergarten 4 (K-4), Pre-Kindergarten, and MILD/MOD Disabilities (K-12)

Experience:

MFV: 2014 to Present
Applications Software Support
Manages the daily technical and administrative processes for EO IT security programs. Provides supervision and oversight of subordinate employees; manages staffing, workloads, training and development for employees within the work unit. Ensures internal and external customers have a high level of satisfaction with program services. Does patches for MFV specific software including DSS and VistA. Protects data from unauthorized release or from loss, alteration, or unauthorized deletion. Develops and maintains appropriate directives, handbooks and operating procedures in support of

programs and functions managed. Serves as a subject matter expert for major policy and program initiatives associated with computer security and compliance.

2012 to 2014

Administrator

Maintain monthly purchase authorization for prosthetics purchase goods and services of $3.5 million per month. Liaison with state and local agencies to ensure delivery of devices as well as confirm customer interface with MFV contractors were successful. Consult and advise MFV staff and veterans about offered benefit services. Evaluate meeting effectiveness, training, and conferences through comprehensive evaluation systems. Serves as an advisor and subject matter expert to MFV staff offices. Provide management officials with technical advice on proposed policies and procedural changes. Report and analyze status of conference programs used for MFV Leadership, Benefits Budget Staff, and Responsible Conference Executives (RCEs)/Conference Certifying Officials (CCOs). Developed and implemented process reengineering techniques to improve monitoring, control, and analysis, to identify potential discrepancies in the delivery and cost savings initiative process.

UNITED STATES ARMY: 2000 to 2007

Ordnance Officer

Responsibilities included facilitation of logistic operations, moving equipment, units, and personnel between domestic and oversea bases. Reengineered processes to improve program effectiveness and the improvement of systems encompassing issues critical to major DHS programs. Analyzed cost effectiveness for corporate logistic initiatives. Supervised operations personnel to ensure proper material flow management. Analyzed financial impact of proposed logistics changes, such as routing, shipping modes, product volumes and mixes, and carriers. Collaborated with other departments to integrate logistics with business systems and processes. Created policies and procedures for logistics activities and designed models to use to evaluate logistics programs and services. Maintained proper carrier compliance aligned with company policies and procedures for product transit and delivery.

Skills & Qualifications:

Network Management (N+)

Microsoft Windows XP, Security (S+)

Windows Server 2003

Windows, SharePoint, PageMaker, Microsoft Office Word/Excel/PowerPoint/Project Visio

Designing Network Infrastructure (70-291)

Information Assurance Security Officer Course (2004)

Six Sigma (2012)

Lean Production (2013)

Return on Investment (2014)

Blackboard 9.0

Enterprise

WebCT, ANGEL and SOCRATES

Writing Consultant/ Editor