12-2011

A Phenomenological Study of "Organizational Development Targeting Diversity" in a Nonprofit Human Service Organization

Christopher Henry Hinesley
St. John Fisher College

A Phenomenological Study of "Organizational Development Targeting Diversity" in a Nonprofit Human Service Organization

Abstract

This study explores the experiences of non-profit human service staff members engaged in "organizational development targeting diversity" (ODTD) for two years or more. This term was adapted by combining concepts in workforce diversity management (Cox, 1993; Ely & Thomas, 1996) and intra-organizational oppression (Fine, 1996; Hyde, 1998). Drawing upon Crenshaw's (1989) theory of intersecting oppressions stemming from race, class, and gender stratification, the experiences of staff members in a nonprofit human services organization provided a window into an organization attempting to address its use of power and how to model empowerment for a disempowered clientele. This study was conducted using interviews, documents, and field notes in a phenomenological design. It was found that perceptions of power sharing within the organizational setting are shaped by participant identities. It is recommended that organizational diversity efforts openly address issues of power and strive to understand member perspectives for organizational practices and policy formation.

Degree Type
Dissertation

Degree Name
Doctor of Education (EdD)

Department
Executive Leadership

First Supervisor
Jeannine Dingus-Eason

Second Supervisor
Arlette Miller Smith

Subject Categories
Education

A Phenomenological Study of "Organizational Development Targeting Diversity" in a

Nonprofit Human Service Organization

By

Christopher Henry Hinesley

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Ed.D. in Executive Leadership

Supervised by

Dr. Jeannine Dingus-Eason

Committee Member
Dr. Arlette Miller Smith

Ralph C. Wilson, Jr. School of Education
St. John Fisher College

December 2011

Dedication

This research is dedicated to all who feel excluded because of their identity. I wish to thank my family and friends who have been affected by my absence from their lives or activities during my doctoral studies. My daughter Maia has inspired me with her love and playfulness. My partner Val has supported me in too many ways to count. I cannot measure the love and gratitude I feel for both of them, nor imagine how to repay the debt. My parents, brothers, and sister have been inspirational through their assumption that I will succeed in what I set out to do.

All along the way, many people have assisted me with this work, and several people stand out. Betty Garcia-Mathewson has shown me how genuine partnership is possible in organizations by modeling it for me in every interaction. Kathy Castania encouraged me to re-imagine power and to understand that we only glimpse our ability to truly share it. My colleagues, known as Six Degrees of Determination, have shown many more than six degrees of grinding effort, consideration for each other, and passion to achieve their dreams. Mary, Linda, Bob, Paul, and Silvia, you are all heroes in the work you do and in the way you live. I appreciate the members of Cohort 4, who have challenged me to think beyond myself in so many ways, and made humor our trademark.

I wish to thank my dissertation committee, Drs. Dingus-Eason and Miller Smith for allowing me to enter and benefit from their world of experience and understanding. Each of the Executive Leadership program faculty and staff members left an imprint on

me and shared freely of their talent. The short time I spent with Dr. Walton is time that I treasure. Betsy Christiansen is one person on everyone's 'must thank' list, mine included.

The study participants gave their time and honest reactions to my questions. I am deeply appreciative of their bravery and of the work they do every day. I have no way of thanking those without a voice in this research, the migrant farm workers and their families. They deserve our deepest respect. I hope I have assisted organizations that strive to meet their needs.

Finally, this list of acknowledgments must include the cohort member we lost, Jimmy Jones, III. Jimmy towered over us with his stature and integrity. His truncated life is a haunting reminder of our duty to lift as we climb. I am grateful for his lesson and for the memory of his smile.

Biographical Sketch

Christopher (Henry) Hinesley is currently a lecturer in the Women and Gender Studies Department and the coordinator of the GLBT Center at the Rochester Institute of Technology. Mr. Hinesley attended Ball State University from 1987 to 1991 and graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in 1989 and a Master of Science degree in 1991. He came to St. John Fisher College in 2009 and began doctoral studies in the Ed.D. Program in Executive Leadership. Mr. Hinesley pursued his research at the nexus of organizational development, social identities, and critical theory under the direction of Drs. Jeannine Dingus-Eason and Arlette Miller Smith and received the Ed.D. Degree in 2012.

Abstract

This study explores the experiences of non-profit human service staff members engaged in "organizational development targeting diversity" (ODTD) for two years or more. This term was adapted by combining concepts in workforce diversity management (Cox, 1993; Ely & Thomas, 1996) and intra-organizational oppression (Fine, 1996; Hyde, 1998). Drawing upon Crenshaw's (1989) theory of intersecting oppressions stemming from race, class, and gender stratification, the experiences of staff members in a non-profit human services organization provided a window into an organization attempting to address its use of power and how to model empowerment for a disempowered clientele. This study was conducted using interviews, documents, and field notes in a phenomenological design. It was found that perceptions of power sharing within the organizational setting are shaped by participant identities. It is recommended that organizational diversity efforts openly address issues of power and strive to understand member perspectives for organizational practices and policy formation.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

In the past few decades, the need for organizations to effectively include and manage people of diverse backgrounds and social identities within their workforces has become a preeminent challenge (Denson, 2009; Mor-Barak, 2005). Organizational leadership has been confronted with workers' desire for input and control over their workplace destinies, as well as increasing evidence that stifling individual differences and forcing assimilation leads workers to feel that they do not fit within the organization (Cox, 1993). The response has come in the form of more collaborative of leadership structures, however, these structures may accomplish what amounts to replacing one assimilation strategy with another (Kezar, 1998). Workplace collaboration between diverse people has proved difficult due in part to individuals' bias and lack of understanding when confronted with differing social identities across race, class, gender, and other characteristics (Smith, 2010). In addition, people in organizations are often uncomfortable discussing the sharing of power in the workplace, ignoring the power asymmetries that are at the root of intergroup conflict (Cohen, 1998; Cox, 1993). Emergent research has produced models suggesting a more complex approach is required for long-term organizational change that targets diversity (Cox, 1993; Ely & Thomas, 1996; Hyde, 2004; Kezar, 1998).

Organizational Development Targeting Diversity

For the purposes of this study, the term organizational development targeting diversity (ODTD) is used to describe a long-term organizational development strategy to address and manage workforce diversity while addressing intra-organizational systems of power and oppression. Rather than being conceived of as a program or as equal policies for all members, the process of ODTD is described as a long-term undertaking to provide a baseline understanding of what changes are needed. This systemic approach and long-term commitment would occur in the integration phase of Brazzel's continuum.

While the literature documents the efforts of human service organizations to engage in organization development targeting diversity (ODTD) with the goal of improved client services, the literature offers very little empirical data which examines staff outcomes (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). Specifically, the literature does not address experiences of organizations engaged in sustained diversity and multicultural training and ODTD, or what happens when that training is turned inward towards examining organization's institutionalized biases and structural inequality. Put another way, though diversity initiatives have received much attention (Cox, 1993; Denson, 2009; Kalev, et al., 2006; Kezar, 2001), strategies that include an examination of intra-organizational issues of oppression have not been adequately studied within a human services setting or from the employees' point of view (Dovidio, Gluszek, John, Ditlmann, & Lagunes, 2010; Hyde, 1998). This oversight in how staff members perceive the diversity initiatives might explain the failure of many approaches. The effects of ODTD on staff members are not well understood. More specifically, when applied to a human services environment, the focus on integration of diverse and intersecting social identities

aligns with the non-profit organizational mission to value diversity as suggested by Capek (2006). However, the examination of this concept seems to represent a gap in the literature.

Other authors have used the terms multicultural organization development and social justice leadership to describe diversity initiatives and structures that accommodate the sharing of power in organizational structures and pluralistic or participative leadership to name structures that encourage the sharing of power (Fine, 1996; Hyde, 1998; Kezar, 1998, 2010). However, ODTD is used here to include both the use of an organizational structure to facilitate intra-organizational power sharing and attention to workforce diversity. ODTD has become operationalized in human service organizations out of the recognition of the need to be effective in providing services for increasingly diverse populations (Hyde, 2004). Cohen (2007) adds that this is made more effective as a means of client empowerment if issues of power within the organization are simultaneously addressed. Though organizations have engaged in various strategies for advancing ODTD and building an effective and diverse workforce, comprehensive achievement continues to be elusive (Hyde, 2004). Perhaps a complicating factor is that when attempting to understand how an organization is doing with its efforts to manage diversity and create an inclusive culture, two major elements are at play within its organizational structure, the leadership model and the stage of development in implementing a diversity initiative. For example, the pre-eminent form of leadership today is a participatory form of leadership. This includes participation in decision-making as a means of sharing power with workers at all levels, and has been embraced by some organizations as a means of building cohesion and consensus (Kezar, 1998). However,

with this focus on consensus, participatory models may be simply creating another dominant culture similar to hierarchical models (1998). Kezar continues by suggesting that emerging pluralistic leadership models show promise by emphasizing self awareness of identity, beliefs, and issues of perspective, power, and difference ignored by participatory models of leadership.

While for-profit organizations are confronted by workforce diversity initiatives as "a primary challenge to successfully leverage an increasingly diverse population" (Mor-Barak, 2005), non-profit social service organizations look to empowerment models of worker-client interaction, requiring relevant skills across multiple social identities (Capek & Mead, 2006; Cohen, 1998). Collaboration and inclusion are highly valued, particularly in human services (Capek & Mead, 2006; Smith, 2010). Social service workers in non-profit settings strive to perform empowerment-based practices, but they have been found to be challenged by power disparities in their organizational structures (Cohen, 1998).

Rather than the for-profit focus of managing the legal liability accompanying discriminatory practices or the imperative of building a "business case" for diversity in organizations (Noon, 2007), social service organizations have become concerned with building cultural competency to meet the needs of a diverse client population. Much of the literature focused on workforce diversity programs, training, and organization development strategies targets the opportunity to improve the bottom line, which is less relevant to non-profit organizations concerned with providing a public good (Salamon, 2003). Some research has shown that by more effectively targeting diverse markets through improving representation of diverse groups in the workforce; the business becomes more successful (Mor-Barak, 2005). In the non-profit setting, however, building

an inclusive workplace for diverse people while simultaneously building skills to meet the needs of clients is the focus (Cox, 1993; Denson, 2009; Ely & Thomas, 1996; Kalev, et al., 2006; Miller & Katz, 2002).

Noon (2007) points out that the original reason for building a diverse workforce, the social justice premise of putting an end to employment discrimination, may be lost to for-profit businesses in the pursuit of increased profits. The social justice foundation of diversity efforts may be more neatly tied to non-profit organizations which exist to serve communities rather than operating with a profit motive. Therefore, non-profit organizations may logically require a different approach to diversity from that of for-profit organizations (Hyde, 1998).

With the contemplation of a new model for non-profit organizations comes cautionary tales from the for-profit sector. Despite the best of intentions and resource allocation, many diversity efforts do not materialize or are not sustainable (Miller & Katz, 2002). There are multiple reasons cited for the failure of diversity initiatives including a failure to fully address issues of discrimination and marginalization; failure to view diversity as organizational change; and, failure to address systemic issues including power and control in the organization (Metzler, 2003). Further, there is a call for more research focusing on employees' experience of diversity initiatives to add to the lopsided approach of studying diversity from only a leadership or organizational perspective (Tran, Garcia-Prieto, & Schneider, 2011; Zanoni, Janssens, Benschop, & Nkomo, 2010).

Though Denson's research on diversity programs shows efforts to reduce intergroup bias are generally effective, changing organizations to sustain a diverse workforce requires more than bias reduction in group members (Cox, 1993; Ely &

Thomas, 1996; Miller & Katz, 2002). By incorporating bias reduction as one element of a much larger scheme, Cox (1993) describes an approach of system-wide examination of structural integration, including all policies, practices and structures within an organization that goes beyond individual bias to examine structural biases. This kind of full-scale approach to addressing oppressive intra-organizational power structures is unusual (Kalev, et al., 2006; Mor-Barak, 2005). Rather, organizations that are engaged in diversity initiatives often treat efforts to build a diverse workforce as a discrete program that nibbles at the edges of organizational oppression and disempowerment of staff rather than addressing root causes. Systemic causes include, for example, cultural dominance and power asymmetry (Mor-Barak, 2005).

Unfortunately, most of the research on diversity program effectiveness targets the for-profit sector, so it is difficult to discern the relevance of these data for non-profit organizations. Non-profit human service organizations, primarily through research done on education systems, are beginning to find a place in the literature on equity initiatives (Capek & Mead, 2006). However, the experiences of smaller non-profit human service organizations are nearly non-existent in the relevant research.

Given that human service agencies are providers of services to and advocacy for diverse and marginalized populations, these non-profit organizations would seem to be the most likely leaders of movement toward social justice within their organizational cultures and in the delivery of services (Salamon, 2002). Indeed, human service non-profit organizations have a long and rich history of being at the forefront of social movements including, "antislavery, women's suffrage, environmental conservation, antiwar, populist, progressive, civil rights, women's, gay rights, and conservative

movements" (Salamon, 2002). Salamon asserts that non-profits provide a critical role as a "safety valve" to help people find redress and focus public attention on inequities and societal abuses in hopes of improving their circumstances. Social justice, in the context of non-profit organizations, may be viewed from both the services an organization is delivering and the dynamics that occur within the organization and its staff (Brazzel, 2007). If clients are seeking redress for societal abuses by an organization rife with institutional bias, the staff members of the organization may be unable to deliver services in a culturally competent or empowering way (Hyde, 1998). Said otherwise, the clients receive services from staff members who are affected by the institutional structures and policies within the organization.

As non-profit organizations, human service organizations have a different purpose than for-profit businesses, one in which the "shareholders" are community members (Salamon, 2003). Some researchers argue that as communities have changed over time, human service organizations have become out of touch with the "dire needs" of community members (Hanlin, Prilleltensky, & Evans, 2007). Since 80 percent of services to individuals and families in areas such as social services, low income housing, advocacy and community development come from the non-profit sector, human service organizations are a valuable and sizable sector to consider when examining the performance of diversity initiatives (Salamon, 2003).

The poor performance of diversity initiatives to address structural inequality and institutional bias (Kalev, et al., 2006), when combined with an implicit imperative to serve vulnerable and diverse populations by human service organizations leaves staff members in a difficult position with regard to delivering empowering services from a

potentially disempowering organizational position (Wing, Roeger, & Pollak, 2010). This

presents an interesting opportunity for research.

Statement of the Research Problem

      Human service organizations: a different case requirement for diversity and

inclusion. In the United States there are over 1.5 million non-profit organizations

registered with the IRS, and in 2008 these organizations reported more than $6 trillion in

income and assets (Wing, et al., 2010). Of these 1.5 million organizations, over 118,000

are human services organizations which serve the needs of people in a wide range of

ways. The non-profit or independent sector is said to fill the gap between the needs of

citizens and the services provided by the government (Wing, et al., 2010). With such a

large number of non-profit organizations and a more than 73 percent increase in their

numbers since 1998, non-profits are a major force in the nation's economy and

workforce. Because these organizations exist for the purpose of providing a broad public

benefit to the community, a purpose distinct from government and for-profit entities, the

Internal Revenue Service provides them with tax-exempt status. These organizations are

often referred to as "charities" or 501(c) 3 organizations (Sector, 2010). They provide a

vast array of benefits to the public and employ approximately 13 million individuals,

constituting nearly 10 percent of the U.S. workforce. Non-profit organizations employ

more people than industries such as finance, insurance and real estate. Additionally, the

billions of hours spent by volunteers of non-profit organizations is equivalent to nearly

seven million full-time workers. As a subset of non-profit organizations, human services

organization deliver services to meet human needs, while other non-profit organizations

serve purposes such as providing funding to human service organizations, housing

community events, serving as a conduit for community development or tourism, or sheltering abandoned animals.

In a human services organization the purpose of the organization is not to benefit shareholders but to meet human needs with effective services. These services are meant to empower clients to overcome personal and societal obstacles, escape poverty, gain education and skills, and gain a variety of other outcomes (Salamon, 2003). In the pursuit of meeting these needs then, non-profit human service organizations must reframe the business case of for-profit companies to better fit their mission. Some researchers (Bitonti, Albers, & Reilly, 1996) argue that the need for a diverse workforce in a non-profit human service setting comes from the needs of the clients to receive culturally competent services from workers who better reflect their own background. Further, Cohen (1998) finds that client-staff relations require challenging the hierarchies that house them. Put another way, workers in social services must break down the hierarchies to better serve clients. Cohen's research shows a need for improved staff empowerment and the reduction of power disparities in agency bureaucracies as staff members endeavor to practice a client-centered empowerment approach.

Within the non-profit sector, organizations are classified into several categories used by the IRS and the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS), a project of the Urban Institute. Human services organizations represent 33.7% of all 501(c) 3 organizations in the United States that with budgets over $25,000, or large enough to file an IRS Form 990 (Salamon, 2005). The category of human services, as defined by the taxonomy of the NCCS, is an organization with a broad scope of services, creating a diverse clientele for many organizations (Grønbjerg, 2001). Human service organizations

are defined here as organizations with a mission to deliver services to people, and to respond to unmet human needs. As non-profit agencies, human service organizations are caught between bottom-line concerns and meeting the needs of clients. These often contradictory concerns create a tension "between the inherent public service motives and market-like survival impulses" (LeRoux, 2009). These services are often intended for the most vulnerable people in society (Salamon, 2003). They have been described as the "quintessential expression of the nation's benevolent spirit," and provide services such as housing, food, job skills, English as second language training, and other vital resources to individuals and families (Boris, Leon, Roeger, & Nikolova, 2010).

Human service organizations, then, must balance the needs of clients, or the expression of an organizational mission, with the demands of raising funds to stay afloat. Researchers cite concerns about whether organizations are so concerned with funding their mission that their mission gets pushed aside (Boris, et al., 2010; Grønbjerg, 2001; LeRoux, 2009). In this environment, funding for diversity initiatives is difficult to allocate or sustain (Bitonti, et al., 1996; Hanlin, et al., 2007; Hyde & Hopkins, 2004). This could help to explain why so few non-profit organizations engage is sustained diversity initiatives (Capek & Mead, 2006), which may have severe implications for the provision of culturally competent client services.

In New York State, for example, over 24,000 non-profit organizations generated $132.9 billion in revenue, provided 1.2 million, or 17 percent of the state's workforce in 2006 (Comptroller, 2010). Within the non-profit sector, human service organizations provide services to socially and economically marginalized populations, and emerging research suggests effort is needed to address cultural competency issues within its

workforce (Bitonti, et al., 1996; Hanlin, et al., 2007; Hyde & Hopkins, 2004). A different

approach is called for to address issues of power and difference, or diversity and

inclusion (Capek & Mead, 2006; Cohen, 1998; Kezar, 1998; Salamon, 2003).

Contemporary diversity paradigms. For decades, non-profit organizations, along

with their private and public sector counterparts, have been mandated by law to end

discriminatory hiring, promotion, and treatment of employees (Nichols, Ferguson, &

Fisher, 2005). The Civil Rights legislation passed in 1964 made it illegal to discriminate

against employees or applicants based on race, sex, family status, and military affiliation.

Later, persons with disabilities were added with the passage of the 1990 Americans with

Disabilities Act (EEOC, 2011). Organizations have responded with measures to show

they are making an effort to diversify their work force (Mor-Barak, 2005). Diversity

initiatives have evolved as an antidote, and have been undertaken by all sectors including

public, private, and non-profit organizations (Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2003). The effort

to manage diversity in organizations originated in the field of organizational

development, but has been embraced by multiple fields of study and practice, and has

crossed into virtually every type of organization including the public, for-profit, and non-

profit sectors (Cross, 2000). Indeed, professions have emerged to help meet this

challenge (Loden, 1996).

Some organizations have moved beyond basic legal requirements to initiate their

own voluntary initiatives aimed at changing their organizational culture to become more

pluralistic, or inclusive in practices, policies, and even structure (Cox, 1993; Mor-Barak,

2005). Reasons for expanding diversity efforts range from a belief that it is the right thing

to do to the understanding that many grantors request and review staff and board member

demographic data as a prerequisite for a successful funding proposal (Capek & Mead, 2006). With such a range of underlying beliefs about why to build a diverse and inclusive organization, efforts seem to be built upon one of only a few models or paradigms. These paradigms provide a context from which an organization responds to the changing workforce demographics, and form a continuum from basic compliance with employment laws, to a strategic, structural, and values-based focus.

Building diversity and inclusion in organizations. Brazzel's Continuum of Inclusion Practices (2007) provides a simple framework for conceptualizing the progression of diversity initiatives through time and sophistication. This three-stage model begins with assimilation which describes an environment with ideal characteristics that leaders both possess and look for when making hiring and promotion decisions. The assimilation stage involves a focus on visible symbols of diversity used to show representation of people from the legally-protected classes of race, ethnicity and gender (Loden, 1996). The dominant culture reinforced by leadership is designed to maintain power for those already possessing power, regardless of whether or not they are aware of it. As McIntosh notes, privilege and power are not always apparent to those who possess them (2009). The desire for visible diversity for the assimilationist is largely symbolic (Loden, 1996). In an assimilation environment, the organizational culture is established and maintained to benefit the leaders, and the expectation is that followers strive to conform to a "cookie cutter" model of behavior and appearance in order to succeed (Smith, 2010). The ideal characteristics of individuals who are promoted and hired carry standards reflected in the identities of members of the organization's leadership, such as being White, college-educated, and male. This carries with it a double bind for those who

do not look like the dominant culture. Assimilation requires changing people to fit the

culture, but there are some things that individuals cannot or do not wish to change about

themselves (Loden, 1996). For those who cannot or do not wish to manage this, they feel

as though they do not fit in the organization (Cox, 1993).

In the second stage of the model, differentiation, the organization does recognize

differences among its members, and these differences are acknowledged but not

necessarily valued. The differentiation mindset does not provide recognition or

encouragement for the "subtle, stylistic differences that are an inevitable by-product of

increased diversity" (Loden, 1996). The differentiation stage of development allows for

and recognizes differences across group members, but is concerned only with recognizing

difference, not in finding ways to leverage or incorporate differences in a positive way.

With a lack of recognition that diversity is a process an organization implements diversity

as a single or shot-term program (Miller & Katz, 2002). This mindset fails to understand

that rather than implementing a program or a day of awareness, achieving an inclusive

culture is more accurately viewed as a process that is not achieved in a one-shot program

or session (Gonzalez, 2010). Further, the understanding of diversity at this stage is known

as the "colorblind" approach to managing difference. Colorblind policies maintain the

privilege of those in the dominant culture by failing to take into account the differences

that require consideration (Smith, 2010). For example, an organization may offer free

leadership training to all of its staff members but only those in white collar positions have

the flexibility in their schedules to take advantage of the benefit. By offering a benefit

that treats everyone in the organization the same, the organization can say it is treating

people equally. However, the lack of consideration for diverse circumstances represents a

failure to achieve equity for all members because some of them, by no fault of their own, cannot access or receive the benefit of the training.

Alternatively, in the third stage, the goal is to incorporate individuals' differences across the organization, and diverse group members are sought not for the sake of their difference, but with the understanding that differences add value to the whole of the organization. In the *integration* phase, multiple social identities are acceptable and encouraged in the pursuit of success in the organization, such as being Hispanic, female, or differently abled. In the integration phase, fundamental and subtle changes in organizational culture are required to achieve the more difficult goals of building a diverse staff and sustaining that diversity while building a culture in which members feel included in decision making, perceive fair policies, and feel safe to state their opinions (Cox, 1993). Katz and Miller (2002) make this point, stating, "Diversity without inclusion does not work." Diversity initiatives have evolved to address the need for building and sustaining a diverse staff, and have entailed successively more complex objectives with multiple means of meeting these objectives.

Across the continuum of diversity practices, each level represents an increasing value placed on the identities and experiences of the staff members. If an organization progresses through each of the stages of development, cumulative advances toward fairness and inclusion occur for members who do not in some way look or act like the leaders (Loden, 1996; Mor-Barak, 2005). The model implies that as an organization moves toward inclusion, benefits accumulate for the organization, its staff members, and presumably its service recipients and stakeholders (Ely & Thomas, 1996). Indeed, it would seem there are multiple benefits stemming from fair policies, practices, and

structures residing in an organizational model that naturally engenders a diverse workforce and an inclusive organizational culture (Miller & Katz, 2002). These benefits include better decision making in diverse teams, improved rates of retention and morale, and improved levels of cultural competency (Nai-Wen & Tzu-Shian, 2008; Pelled, 1996). Perhaps due to the increasing complexity in the differentiation and integration stages of the model, the empirical research shows mixed results for organizations engaged in any type of diversity initiative (Denson, 2009; Kalev, et al., 2006).

The research literature speaks to efforts among human service organizations to provide on-going diversity training for the purpose of improving staff member cultural competencies for improved client services. Because each staff member possesses a unique combination of identities these efforts may be best understood through the theoretical lens that takes intersections of identity into account. Intersectionality theory, as explained in the next section, provides a lens of understanding personal awareness of socially constructed identities and the ways in which these identities interact with ODTD.

Theoretical Framework

Intersectionality was the theory chosen for this study because of its focus on social identities and the use of power in response to them. Rooted in Black feminist theory, intersectionality clarifies the connections between systems of power and how they function in relationship to intersecting social identities. McCall (2005) argues that intersectionality is the most important theoretical contribution that women's studies has made to date. Crenshaw (1989) is credited with originating the term, but others have also articulated the complex nature of multiple social identities such as race, class, and gender (Staff, 2010). Intersectionality is described as a "dynamic and complex framework" that

adheres to several principles. These principles of intersectionality include: a) resisting models that are additive, parallel categories, and focusing instead on the intersecting nature of categories; b) insisting upon anti-essentialism and variation within categories; c) understanding the shifting of the nature of categories over time; d) embracing the coexistence of power and oppression; and, e) working to change societal conditions "such that power hierarchies are dismantled in efforts to build a more just world" (Staff, 2010).

Crenshaw (1989) uses an analogy for intersectionality, describing it as an intersection with traffic flowing through it. She pictures discrimination flowing from multiple directions at different times or simultaneously, with accidents happening from impacts from any or all of the directions. In this analogy it would seem that some "hits" may have a comprehensible level of hurt or impact, while multiple crashes may cause a more immeasurable, or cumulative degree of harm. Arriving on the scene after the "accident," observers may have a difficult time sorting out how the damage occurred, particularly if multiple "crashes" took place. Intersectionality seeks to address the complex and cumulative effects and the nature of possessing multiple social identities within inequitable systems of society. The value in using intersectionality as a research tool is to further the understanding of the "multidimensional nature of oppression," thus creating the potential for creating social change, or perhaps to effect positive change in an organizational culture (Petersen, 2006).

As is the case in society, each member of an organization possesses a unique combination of qualities that may affect their experience of organizational structures and strategies (Kezar, 2000). A major criticism of diversity initiatives is that they seek to merely help participants understand the experiences of "the Other" or people who they

perceive as different from themselves, rather than to change the underlying dynamics of power and oppression (Collins, 2000). In addition, Collins argues, the goal should be about understanding the ways in which various categories of identity (race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and religion) frame people's lives. This examination of intersectionality seeks to deepen and broaden our understanding of "the Other" while refraining from describing them ["the Other"] based on the mainstream version of what is normal.

Intersectionality scholars have focused on the three identity factors of race, class, and gender, and the ways in which these categories can mutually reinforce each other (Winker & Degele, 2011). Identity, as defined by Kezar and Lester (2010), involves the distinguishing characteristics of an individual" which include race, class, or gender, but may also include other features, such as language, job status, or cultural experience. For the purposes of this study, race, gender, job status, and languages spoken are examined. The applicability of intersectionality theory for use in understanding organizations is not well developed, however, it may offer a substantial area of opportunity to discover the ways that diversity efforts are received and affected by the intersecting identities of employees within an organization.

Research Questions

Though much documentation exists of organizations failing to achieve inclusive culture characteristics, as well as many ideas for improving the diversity climate within organizations, less is known about people in non-profit human service organizations engaged in long-term intra-organization development strategies that address power and oppression (Hyde & Hopkins, 2004). When examining an inter-group effort such as

17

ODTD, Smith (2010) uses the phrase "fundamental asymmetry in perception" to describe the difference in perspectives found between those with and those without power. Said otherwise, the meaning placed on an organizational change process depends on positionality and identity of the participants or observers. If participant identities matter when studying a change process, then taking them into account within the theoretical framework of the study is critical to understanding the various meanings placed on it. Centered on individuals' intersecting identities, intersectionality theory provides a lens through which to view individual perspectives on a process or event.

With intersectionality theory as its theoretical framework, this study examined experiences of human service agency employees engaged in organizational development targeting diversity through the lens of each individual's social identities. Two questions guide this research:

1.   How do staff members in a non-profit human service organization make meaning of ODTD?

2.   How do staff member social identities affect their experiences of ODTD in the organizational context?

Examining participants' experiences of an ODTD that is designed to address power and difference within an organization may expand our understanding of how participants experience its implementation.

Glossary of Terms

Cultural competency describes skills specific to a population, such as learning American Sign Language in order to appropriately serve clients who are deaf and hard of hearing (Cook-Daniels, 2008).

18

Diversity includes more than human differences. It is intended to "describe an institutionalized diversity that has been imbedded into an organization's DNA in a way that goes wide as well as deep." The width includes the "breadth and depth of differences" within organizations, such as "gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, class, disability, geography, age, learning styles, and other physiological, social, cultural, and economically defined differences that categorize groups of individuals" (Capek & Mead, 2006).

Intersectionality is a theoretical framework originating from Black feminist theory. Developed by Crenshaw, intersectionality is generally concerned with the combination of the social identities of race, class, and gender, and the ways in which combinations of oppressions build and multiply for individuals (Crenshaw, 1989).

Multicultural Organizational Development, rooted in the field of organizational development (OD), is a strategy to create long-term organizational change that includes celebrating differences, but is more broadly concerned with reducing patterns of racism, sexism and other oppressions that prevail in most institutions and organizations (Hyde, 2004). In contrast to OD, MCOD explicitly focuses on power and oppression dynamics in an organization.

Organizational Development Targeting Diversity is an intra-organizational strategy employed to address issues of power and control, taking into account multiple social identities.

Oppression traditionally has meant tyranny by one group over another group. Its elements are structural, and may or may not be obvious to members of either group. One group benefits from its existence while another group is harmed (Adams et al., 2010).

Organizational culture is a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group has learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (Schein, 2004).

Organization development (OD) is a term associated with the theory and practice of change management in organizations (Rees, 2007). OD is often used interchangeably with the term organization effectiveness (Bradford & Burke, 2005).

Power asymmetry is intended here to mean an inequality or imbalance between people or groups associated with position within the social and organizational hierarchy of race, class, and gender. Asymmetry has been defined as inequality (Smith 2008). Power is defined as access to or control over resources, or the ability to achieve a desired outcome (Kanter, 1981).

Social identity may be described as part of a person's self concept that comes from a particular group membership. Further, there is significance in the value and social significance inherent to it (Tajfel, 1981). Identity, as defined by Kezar and Lester, is the distinguishing character or personality of an individual (Kezar & Lester, 2010).

Social justice is used here as defined by Rawls (1971) as the pursuit of ensuring that "each person possesses inviolability…that even the welfare of society as a whole cannot override." Principally, individuals must be ensured freedom without regard to a greater good shared by others if that freedom is denied.

Workforce diversity is defined as the composition of cultural or demographic characteristics possessed by workers that are salient and symbolically meaningful in the relationships among group members in the organization (DiTomaso 2007).

Chapter Summary

In pursuit of delivering relevant and culturally competent services, organizational development targeting diversity represents a strategy within the larger category of diversity initiatives for nonprofit human service organizations. Chapter two will present a selected review of the literature concerning intra-organizational strategies that address power and oppression as they relate to issues of diversity in non-profit human service organizations. Chapter Three will detail the methodology for the study, and Chapter Four presents the study findings. Chapter Five provides recommendations and concluding remarks.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction and Purpose

      This chapter includes a review of the relevant research used to support the theoretical framework and the research problem for this study. Background information on organizational development and the use of interventions targeting diversity in organizations is provided, as well as a discussion of the ways in which institutional bias, power, and oppression affect organizations. An explanation of why the method of inquiry used for this study was chosen is followed by a chapter summary.

Diversity and Empowerment

      Workforce diversity encompasses characteristics among staff members such as religion, national origin, sexual identity, race and ethnicity, differing physical and mental abilities, and many other distinguishing dimensions that form subgroups within organizations (Cox, 1993; Harvey & Allard, 1995; Parasnis, Samar, & Fischer, 2005). Achieving a diverse staff and board of directors may be an imperative for living a stated mission to serve a diverse population of clients. Evans, et al. suggest that this is particularly relevant for nonprofit human service organizations serving populations in search of services from people who are in some way similar to them (2007).

      Research has emerged suggesting an imperative for non-profit organizations, in particular those considered human service organizations, to become culturally competent with the services they offer and representative of the clients they serve (Bitonti, et al.,

1996; Hyde, 2004; Sumter, 2006). Cultural competency requires both skills for and knowledge of the needs of diverse groups (Nyatanga, 2002). Representation requires an organizational culture that invites members of diverse groups to feel comfortable working there (Ely & Thomas, 1996).

The link between employee empowerment and a diverse workforce is beginning to become established, and threads of empowerment run through the diversity literature (Chemers, Oskamp, & Costanzo, 1995; Cox, 1993; Thomas, 1991). Since 1974, mentions of the word *empowerment* have grown in the psychology literature from near zero mentions to thousands of articles and books (Perkins & Zimmerman, 1995). As a theory, empowerment was introduced in the field of psychology as a way of understanding how to improve mental health and wellness. Specifically, "empowerment theory, research, and intervention link individual well-being with the larger social and political environment" (Perkins & Zimmerman, 1995). A model of empowerment was proposed by Kieffer that includes three key elements: (a) a more potent or efficacious sense of self, (b) more functional strategies and resources for social and political action, and (c) more critical understanding of social and political relations (1981). Offerman (2004) suggests that the four components that determine whether people feel empowered are: a) meaning (consistency with values or ideals; care about the work), b) self-determination (behavioral choice or autonomy), c) self-efficacy (self-confidence about one's ability to perform well on a task), and d) the belief in the prospect of significant impact on the work or organization. This model fits well with the concepts in several of the studies that examine transformational leadership and employee well-being in the next section.

Empowerment, in an organizational context, has been described as the sharing of power or expanding the sphere of influence of the subordinate (Offermann, 2004). Within a hierarchy, this means giving authority and expanding decision-making. Empowerment may be thought of as both a process and an outcome (Rivera & Seidman, 2004). The outcomes of empowerment are self-confidence, skill development, or awareness. As a process, empowerment is more likely to manifest as effective participation or engagement.

According to Kanter (1981), at the core of empowerment is power, as she describes power as "the capacity of an individual or group to mobilize resources and get things done." Further, she explains the benefits of sharing power as giving subordinates the ability to be more effective in their jobs, and to provide them with the tools and the ability to act flexibly and accomplish more. Of particular interest is her description of the cycles of power and powerlessness. As power accumulates for an individual or group, they become more comfortable and flexible as the feeling of freedom increases. This creates increased effectiveness, and they begin to look as though they deserve more power. On the other hand, powerlessness is associated with a lack of flexibility, increased pressure to perform, and more resistance from surrounding people. With a sense of powerlessness comes ineffectiveness and controlling behaviors. Behaviors fostered by powerlessness tend to reinforce the perception that a powerless person does not deserve to have power, and thus the situation is worsened.

Another way to examine power is that it is difficult to see in the positive but easy to see in the negative (Rappaport, Swift, & Hess, 1984). Further, these researchers assert that the absence of empowerment is powerlessness, as does Kanter. Their description of

this status involves a learned helplessness, a sense of alienation, and the perceived loss of control over one's life. In the positive, the assertion is that empowerment is represented differently in each individual, depending on each person's status or position.

Envisioning empowerment as effective participation links the concept to the study of management and leadership. This connection opens the door to questions about the ways in which organizations, particularly organizations espousing values of inclusion, social justice, democracy, pluralism, or diversity, are interacting with clients and employees. For example, Kezar (2001) describes the lack of true participatory leadership on college campuses by pointing to the failure of leadership to address power imbalances. In the meantime, however, the stated emphasis on empowerment for today's leaders is found easily in the literature (Evans, 1997; Jogulu & Wood, 2007; Kanter, 1981; Kezar, 2008). It could be argued that much of the literature on issues of diversity and inclusion makes the case that empowerment in the workplace is a critical need, rather than a current reality (Blackmore, 2006; DiTomaso, Post, & Parks-Yancy, 2007; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998; Iverson, 2007; Kezar, 2008; Kezar & Eckel, 2008).

Empowerment has been studied for decades, and ample research suggests its value (Evans, 1997; Muller, 1994). Its study has been so successful, in fact, that its popularity has expanded beyond the psychological literature into management studies, as will be discussed below in several forms, such as a feeling of social support, a sense of well-being in the workplace, and the perception of feeling a part of decision making on the job.

Empowerment theory provides insight into the power dynamic and participation process, or lack thereof, of marginalized members of organizations' constituencies.

However, other theories may be helpful in understanding why full participation, effective communication, and access to services often do not occur.

Empirical Research

The studies reviewed fall into several categories. The primary categories are leadership as it relates to diversity or equity initiatives; diversity training and initiatives in organizations; the imperative, ethical or strategic, of equity initiatives; issues surrounding diversity or equity initiatives (such as organizational fit problems, intergroup conflict, communication, etc.); power, power sharing, and empowerment, and; the critique of current management or leadership practices as related to equity and equity initiatives or diversity. Each review that follows includes a discussion of the focus of the study, the sample used, the method or methods of inquiry employed by the researchers, the findings of the research, and the limitations of each study. An analysis of the gaps in the literature and a conclusion will follow this review of the literature.

Because of the dearth of research on non-profit organizations' methods for addressing diversity, power, and oppression within their ranks, other types of organizations may provide insights as to how ODTD is being used. Kezar and Eckel (2008) interviewed current college and university presidents to determine whether transactional, transformational or a combination of these leadership strategies enhance the leader's ability to advance a diversity agenda on their campus. In a qualitative study in which 27 presidents of elite colleges and universities were interviewed, the researchers determined that both styles of leadership are effective, used by most presidents, necessary, and appropriate for different audiences. Choice of transactional or transitional leadership style by the presidents was impacted by their race and leadership style

preferences. Cultural competency of the presidents was not examined and may have provided additional helpful clues.

Continuing the leadership theme, Kezar (2001) examined the problems associated with organizational fit and the introduction of participatory leadership strategies in a case study within the higher education environment. The method was an in-depth study of one campus based on data from 36 positioned informants across the demographic groups within the faculty and administrators. The data from these interviews was triangulated through document analysis, observations, and an analysis of the physical environment. Data analysis was done using categorical and componential analysis to reveal trends across differing background characteristics among participants. Four primary themes were found within an institution deemed representative of institutions adopting a servant leadership model: a) emergence of a singular leadership approach; b) assimilation of a 'participatory,' or inclusive, leadership style; c) coercing people to fit; and d) lack of awareness about power. The researcher encourages institutions to adopt inclusive leadership models with a better understanding of their own power and the ways it can undermine the process of achieving participation.

Without the understanding that a new form of leadership, including participatory models, may result in coercing people to conform to it, the strategy may alienate members who do not feel they fit within the new structure. Shortcomings of this study are its limited scope of one university, the time already spent in developing the model (eight years), the lack of observation of the environment before the new model was adopted, and the sample size. The case study is a snapshot of the participatory model eight years

after its inception, so it may be, for example, that the old method of hierarchical leadership had already taken the place of the participatory leadership model.

Rogers-Sirin and Sirin (2009) examined the effects of a cultural competency workshop with 95 pre-service educators in a private, urban university. The aim of the study was to determine whether an increase in cultural competence occurred as a result of a workshop. With the goal of teaching educators to recognize ethical dilemmas in relationship to bias behaviors, a program intervention called the Racial and Ethical Sensitivity Training KIT, or REST-KIT was delivered to groups of 5-12 participants at a time. Measures of cultural competence and ethical sensitivity in 5-point Likert scale survey format were given in a pre-test post-test design. Repeated measures, with a within-subject *t* test were used to examine changes in cultural competence. Eighty-seven prospective teachers completed the surveys, and a significant change score was observed: *t* (86) =2.33, *p*<.005. Post-test scores (M=79.66, SD-7.26) were significantly higher than pretest scores (M-77.32, SD=6.34). Cohen's *d* was used to estimate the magnitude of the improvement in ethical sensitivity toward issues of racial intolerance depicted in the program videos. The result was a small to medium effect size of .32, showing participants' sensitivity to ethical dilemmas related to intolerance significantly increasing post-workshop. Limitations include the problem of generalizability to rural or suburban settings.

Nembhard and Edmondson (2006) examined the effects of leader inclusiveness behaviors, or deeds or words indicating an invitation and appreciation for others' contributions, on worker psychological safety. The method of inquiry was a three-part process of site visits and interviews, the development and piloting of a survey and the

28

eventual inclusion in the survey of 1440 health professionals across 23 neonatal intensive care units (NICU) involved in quality improvement projects conducted over 11 months. Measures included professional status, unit team membership, psychological safety, leader inclusiveness, engagement in quality improvement work, and control variables of gender, years working in the current NICU, and hours per week in the NICU. The control variables were considered potential predictors of psychological safety for individuals. The researchers used six hypotheses, and tested one through four with a univariate general linear model (GLM), while using a regression analysis on the group-level dataset for Hypothesis 5. To test for Hypothesis 6, that psychological safety mediates the relationship between leader inclusiveness and engagement in quality improvement work, the researchers found that results supported all three mediation conditions studied. Conditions included: a) leadership inclusiveness predicts psychological safety ($B = 0.53$, $p < 0.001$); b) leader inclusiveness predicts team engagement at the group level ($B = .41$, $p = 0.004$); and c) when included in the same model, leader inclusiveness becomes insignificant ($B = 0.11$, $p = 0.52$), while psychological safety remains significant ($B = 0.57$, $p = 0.03$).

The data, then, support psychological safety as a mediator of the relationship between leader inclusiveness and team engagement in quality improvement work. Limitations include the exclusive use of NICU workers in the sample, suggesting generalizability may be limited. Further, due to the highly status-oriented nature of the health care field, perceptions of leader inclusiveness may be particular to the health care field.

Brown (2006) took a more preventive approach to inclusive leadership issues by studying the effects of an alternative, transformative andragogy designed to assist in the preparation of educational leaders committed to social justice and equity. The sample included 40 graduate students from two cohorts in educational administration programs. The survey instrument used was Pettus and Allain's (1999) Cultural and Educational Issues Survey to measure participants' attitudes about cultural and educational issues. Version B of the survey was used due to its inclusion of a sexual orientation attitudes measure. The survey questions were rated on a 5-point Likert scale. Two segments of coursework were used as an intervention over the course of a year for each cohort. Both of the segments were taught by the researcher. Data analysis consisted of three readings of all 800 journal entries from both segments and all participants. The researcher asserted that a decrease in pretest, posttest scores over time, with a difference of -13.925 where p <.001 indicated an improvement in transforming learning strategies and attitudes toward issues of diversity. This research was limited by the small sample size and the single instructor providing the intervention. The researcher was heavily embedded with the participants throughout the course of the project and seems to have revealed biases up front.

From the perspective of both leaders and followers, shared leadership as a strategy for advancing inclusion in urban high schools, Rice (2006) conducts a qualitative case study of a large, Midwestern, urban school. The school is comprised of 877 students, with 98% African Americans. 68% of students qualify for a free or reduced-price lunch, and 21.6% of students have an Individual Education Plan (IEP). The school is designated as "in need of improvement" by Federal guidelines. Inclusion as a goal of the school was

focused on policy and philosophy regarding the levels of ability or disability of the student population. Data were collected via observation, participation in meetings, informal meetings, and interviews, resulting in 763 pages of typed notes. The notes were analyzed for themes in the following areas: a) legal, b) ethical, c) pedagogical, and d) procedural. Teachers responding to the questions in these areas interpreted their answers in one of the following ways: a) lack of professionalism, b) lack of competence, or c) lack of respect. Results showed that teachers and administrators tended to shortchange each other's questions and responses due to a preconceived idea of assigned meaning based on a lack of trust and role expectations. Communication between ranks was shown as clearly problematic. Ineffective communication was seen as a barrier to change. In an environment lacking trust and effective communication, the process was ineffective. Suggestions by the researcher include involving the school community in determining the vision for change, goal setting, problem solving, task completion, and the celebration of successes. Limitations of this study weigh heavily on this study, as it includes one school engaged in the process of change. Many factors are at work in the environment, though the researcher may have established some of the key barriers.

To understand barriers to inclusion, Denson's (2009) study reviewed other research to ascertain whether bias can be mitigated via intervention. She conducted a meta-analysis of 27 studies concerning diversity-related activities and racial bias outcomes to determine their effect of on students in higher education. After defining qualifications for inclusion into the study and the search terms used to identify appropriate studies, she provided a detailed categorization of the studies and their types. The dependent variable was the standardized mean difference effect size. Independent

variables were classified as study characteristics, student characteristics, or institutional characteristics. Cohen's kappa was used for categorical variables and Cronbach's alpha for continuous variables to determine interrater reliability. The results showed .80 to 1.00 for Cohen's and .95 to .99 for Cronbach's, or a high level of reliability for both. A hierarchical linear modeling random effects model was used to show the findings may be generalized beyond the specific studies in the sample.

By schematically plotting the 30 standardized mean difference effect sizes, the researcher shows that interventions that utilize both awareness building, or content-based knowledge; and contact, or cross-racial interaction, have larger effects than those using awareness alone. The results show that the treatment effect of participation in a diversity-related activity on racial bias is larger ($d = .90$) in those studies with an intervention including both content and contact than the effect when awareness only was used ($d = .50$). When controlling for the number of students of color in the study, an increase in the effect of contact and a decrease in the standard deviation in content was seen. The researcher asserts there is a moderate effect of racial bias reduction related to these diversity-related activities. Of the original 27 studies identified for use in this study, 11 were eliminated due to missing information. Descriptive findings in these studies were not sufficient to allow for admission into this meta-analysis. When reached for the information, the researchers who conducted studies with descriptive analysis either could not provide the missing data or were not responsive. A major limitation of this meta-analysis seems to be the heterogeneity of the studies reviewed.

Cunningham (2009) examined the diversity-related change process within a university athletic department using an organizational diagnosis approach with data

collected from internal documents, semi-structured interviews, websites, press releases, and other documents. Participants included athletic department administrators and representatives from each of the four cultural organizations on campus. The raw data were coded based on the major themes of the theoretical framework. Two coders and peer debriefers were used. Results showed a lack of structural diversity and the lack of a shared vision for the diversity initiative. Though positive indications were present early in the process of change, major barriers existed in the peripheral nature of the proposed changes, rather than a fundamental or deep structural change. The change was not written into the core mission or strategy of the department. Further, key power holders in the department did not internalize the goals of the change process. A key limitation of this study was a lack of student participation and participation by members outside the target department. Conducted during the summer, the researcher was unable to include key stakeholders such as the athletes within the department, for example.

Longerbeam, Sedlacek, Balon, and Alimo's (2005) examination of 33 Multicultural Program Organizations (MPO) with primary responsibility for delivering diversity-related programs on campus within three public universities may add insight into the way in which even program designed specifically to reduce bias can be co-opted by issues of power. An assessment tool, the Multicultural Program Organization Assessment Instrument (MPOAI) was created by the researchers for use in this study. Pilot testing with four reviewers was used to determine content validity. Participants received the assessment in both hard copy and electronically with precautions taken for anonymity of responses. Cronbach's alpha to determine validity averaged .93. Construct validity was tested with intercorrelations of item scores, with a median item

intercorrelation of .44. Themes of reluctance to acknowledge prejudice, limits on

socializing outside of work, disempowerment of support staff and student staff were

taken from the data. Participants reported a strong reluctance to acknowledge their own

prejudice, admitted that they generally did not socialize with each other outside of work,

and had concerns about marginalization. Limitations of this study are primarily due to the

newly developed instrument and the sample size. Additionally, it did not measure the

perceptions of persons using the services provided by the MPO in the sample.

Iverson (2007) used a line-by-line analysis of data collected from 20 land-grant

universities to identify images, problems and solutions of diversity and diversity plans as

represented by action plans through a 5-year period. In her discourse analysis, the

researcher found four dominant discourses that shape the images of people of color,

including: a) access, b) disadvantage, c) marketplace, and d) democracy. These

discourses painted people of color as outsiders, at-risk victims, commodities, and change

agents. The results indicated, through the framework of critical race theory, that

inequality is reproduces through policies in education. To select the sample, 50

universities were screened for keywords diversity and diversity plan and those with

diversity committees were chosen for the study. NVivo software was used to conduct a

qualitative analysis, with line-by-line evaluation of each university's report or action plan

for addressing issues of diversity on campus. Reports were created for the categories of

images, problems, and solutions across all action plans. The reports were analyzed using

both deductive and inductive methods. Themes were created using the clusters generated

by the analysis which were used to find identity positions from the images found within

the data. Four predominant discourses, listed above, emerged. The researcher proposes

the discourse uncovered, though well-intentioned, be replaced with a position of equity rather than disadvantage, that the process of counter-storytelling be used in place of the acceptance of existing assumptions and statements used as the basis or underlying framework from which to begin a diversity or equity initiative.

San Antonio and Gamage (2007) used mixed research methods, including an intervention, interviews, surveys, and document analysis to examine the impact of a program called Participatory School Administration, Leadership and Management (PSALM) as it relates to building a participatory model of management in high schools in the Philippines. The two variables measured were trust and academic achievement. One of the Department of Education's 185 school divisions was chosen without randomization to experience the intervention. The sample included 735 individuals of the 836 self selected to participate. Trust was measured using a tool with a validity measure of .701 using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy; approximately chi-square (d.f.) 21 = 934.189, $p<.001$ in Bartlett's test of sphericity; a Cronbach's alpha of .708 and factor loadings in the principal component analysis with varimax rotation ranging from .533 to .868. A pre-test post-test was used. Interviews were conducted with 40 individuals, with follow up interviews with six administrators used for clarification.

Researchers reported positive results such as an increase in trust associated with the implementation of PSALM; however, they admit no significant academic improvement is found. Limitations included problems associated with self reporting of data, as well as an underrepresentation of urban versus rural schools.

Similar to Longerbeam et al., Pewewardy & Frey (2002) used climate study data at a predominantly White land-grant university to examine the perceptions of

multicultural services and campus racial climate. 412 undergraduates were surveyed using 33 questions generated by undergraduates in a multicultural education course. The questions were tested and changed based on feedback from a pilot survey. The intention of the survey was to understand the students' perception of race relations and access to services on campus. Perceptions of Institutional Support were significantly different between students of color and White students, t (401) = 10.48, $p < .0001$, as students of color (M = 7.15, SD = 2.96) showed stronger belief than White students (M = 10.58, SD = 3.37; with lower means showing a stronger belief) that there should be greater institutional support for students of color on campus. Though results seem to mirror those of earlier studies, limitations include a lack of reliability for the survey, a lack of generalizability, and self-selection by participants.

Nishii and Mayer (2009) tested group level effects of leader-member exchange (LMX) as a moderator between demographic diversity and group turnover. The combined hypotheses could be stated as groups with high LMX would have lower turnover than groups with low LMX in relationship to the group leaders' ability to influence inclusion and status differentials within their groups. The study sample was 4500 employees from 348 departments of a national supermarket chain in the U.S. The research method was a survey which collected demographic data and tested LMX with the LMX-7 adapted version from Scandura (1984), with reliability of α =.94. Moderated regression was used with mean-centered variables. Simple slopes representing the relationship between diversity and turnover at high and low values below the moderator were used. The two hypotheses were supported in the results with demographic diversity (β = -.11; ΔR^2 = .01; $p \leq .01$) and for tenure diversity (β = -.14; ΔR^2 = .02; $p \leq .01$). Limitations begin with an

admitted homogeneity of the sample. Additionally, mediating variable data was not collected. If the results are generalizable, the case may be made for a financial incentive for inclusive leadership.

Though the study took place in Israel, a study by Findler, Wind, and Mor Barak (2007) is useful in its alignment with ODTD. Their study examined the relationship between diversity, organizational culture, and employee outcomes. Organizational culture variables included fairness, inclusion, and stress. Employee outcomes included well-being, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The researchers tested their hypotheses in three stages, adding an element as they progressed. Hypothesis one stated that individuals within diverse groups, such as women, older workers and immigrants, experience greater levels of exclusion and unfairness, receive less social support at work, and experience greater levels of job-related stress. Hypothesis two suggested these factors are correlated with employee well-being. The third hypothesis added job satisfaction and organizational commitment to all earlier variables. The study sample included 250 employees of a high-technology company in an urban Israeli area, and five demographic characteristics were used. Surveys were first developed in English and later translated into Hebrew using a back-translation method. Diversity characteristics included gender, race/ethnicity, age, level of education, and job categories. Each was defined in a measurable way. Other measures included the use of an inclusion-exclusion scale developed, by Mor Barak, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.81; a social support measure, developed by Caplan et al, with an alpha coefficient of reliability of .82. Additionally, a combination of stress scales by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) with alpha coefficients ranging from 0.70-0.83; a job satisfaction scale by Quinn and Staines (1979)

with a reliability estimate of 0.92; and a measure of organizational commitment called the Affective Commitment Scale, developed by Allen and Meyer (1990), with a Cronbach's alpha of .81. Results of the first stage of analysis showed the hypotheses proposed by the researchers were supported by the data, with each variable combining to complete a theoretical model. In stage two of the analysis the relationships between demographic characteristics, organizational culture, and employee well-being were examined to determine whether employee diversity characteristics, perception of fairness, inclusion/exclusion, receipt of social support, and job stress level were related to employee well-being. Each of these variables was shown to be correlates of employee well-being. In fact, employees reported a greater sense of well-being who experience less job stress, a greater sense of social support, and held a perception of the processes within the organization as being fair. In the third stage of analysis the research model explored relationships between participants' diversity characteristics, the experience of job-related stress, the perception of fairness, inclusion, social support and general well-being and job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The hypothesis that these variables led to greater well-being, job satisfaction and greater organizational commitment was supported by the data. Limitations include a 40 percent response rate, the use of a single company for the sample, and the use of a shorter version of the survey tool on the advice of an advisory team. This version may have limited the researchers' ability to uncover the multitude of relationships attempted by the three complex hypotheses. The survey contained multiple layers of tools of measurement, creating a highly complicated set of data. Finally, the use of a survey originally written in English for a Hebrew-speaking sample may have been problematic.

Zimmerman, Israel, Schulz, and Checkoway (1992) extend the understanding of psychological empowerment (PE), or perceived control. The factors examined include both behavioral and intrapersonal variables. Three questions are asked by the researchers: a) whether three measures of perceived control combine to form an intrapersonal element of PE, b) whether participants more actively involved in community organizations and activities score higher on the PE scale, and c) whether differences between African American and White participants are found. The study sample included a stratified random sample of residents of housing projects in a three-county, Detroit, Michigan area. Raw data included 916 participants but was reduced due to missing data. Number of organizations, leadership, amount of organizational activity, and community activities were the four independent variables, and personal and community control, perceived effectiveness, and perceived difficulty were the three dependent variables used in the study. Analysis included Ward's method for clustering, with a mean of n=896, 98% of the sample, and the study showed all correlations as significant at the .01 level. A multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) showed participation group main effects of F $(6, 1272) = 5.94$, $p < .01$. Univariate analysis of variance results for the participation group main effect a different result across all groups for personal and community control, $F(2, 637) = 6.92$, $p < .01$, perceived effectiveness, $F(2, 37) = 8.22$, $p < .01$, and perceived difficulty, $F(2, 637) = 4.67$, $p < .01$. Each of the cases showed participants in community groups and activities scoring higher than nonparticipants. The interaction effects between race and participation for perceived control measures was reportedly stronger for African Americans than for Whites in the study. Limitations of this study include the absence of variables between the organizations participants reported for community involvement,

and geographic, cultural, or other variations among the three counties from which the sample was drawn were not considered. Researchers admit that race and social class may have been too closely related in the study, though efforts were made to control for these variables.

Kalev, et al. (Kalev, et al., 2006), describe three approaches to building a diverse workforce, and build their study around understanding the effects of each approach. They use a fixed-effects analysis of data spanning from 1971-2002 to review the composition of the national workforce composition of 708 organizations and their adoption of up to seven diversity practices. Using a random sample from the EEO-1 database, organizations were chosen to survey. Using log odds, or undefined values of 0 and 1as dependent variables, the study measured the odds of managerial positions with representation of White men, White women, Black women, and Black men and managerial jobs. These representations were then compared with the use of the seven diversity practices. The seven diversity practices measured were: a) Affirmative Action plan, b) diversity committee, c) diversity staff, d) managerial diversity training, d) managerial diversity evaluations, e) networking programs, and f) mentoring programs. The study found that participation in Affirmative Action alone does not improve diverse representation at the managerial level, while training alone can decrease the representation of White and Black women in management. White women are the primary beneficiaries of Affirmative Action alone, while diversity training, evaluation mechanisms, networking groups, and mentoring programs are more effective in organizations with responsibility structures in place that hold managers accountable for

diverse representation. The main limitation of this study is its narrow focus on race and gender representation.

Hyde's study holds a more inclusive perspective of diversity, and takes place within a human service organization (Hyde, 2004). Her examination of 40 experienced multicultural organizational development practitioners and consultants aimed to find the common challenges and the resulting solutions in use for sustaining what she terms comprehensive multicultural organizational development. Through a qualitative exploratory strategy using interviews, participants were asked to describe challenges and the solutions they employ for "conceptualizing and implementing" their services. The results of the study were four main challenges: a) sociopolitical environment, b) organizational dynamics, c) conceptualization of the change effort, and, d) consultant competence. The solutions identified included: a) collaborative environmental relations, b) leadership development, c) assessment and planning, and, d) consultant selection. A limitation of this study includes a lack of triangulation with documentation from the organizations that have worked with the practitioners and consultants who were interviewed.

Organizational Development Targeting Diversity

Organizations across all work sectors in the US and abroad have begun to address the biases that individuals bring to the workplace (Miller & Katz, 2002). From simple, one-time diversity training for employees to full-scale attempts at organizational change, the practice of acknowledging and attempting to manage diversity in the workplace has become commonplace (Cross, 2000; Fields, 2005; Miller & Katz, 2002; Mor-Barak, 2005). Most diversity training programs focus on individuals and their understanding of

people different from themselves, or bias reduction, but organizational barriers in policy and practice must be addressed or they may prevent the realization of the full benefits a diverse staff has to offer (Chan, 2005; Denson, 2009).

Building on Hyde's concept of MCOD, a specific type of diversity initiative defined for the purpose of the current study is ODTD. It is termed differently to add Capek and Mead's (2006) concept of "deep diversity" but continues to be aimed at changing both organizational culture and structure to build sustainable and inclusive environment, policies, and practices for a broad range of staff members (2004). The following description shows a framework of organizational development targeting diversity (ODTD) in use in several organizations in the Northeast. This model aims to address the root causes of institutional or organizational bias simultaneously, a feature not shared by many other diversity initiatives (Mor-Barak, 2005). Placing focus on developing a shared group vision for change is a collaborative feature of the model. In practice, this concept is known as "the way out" and holds a shared vision for how things "can be" as opposed to how things currently are. By creating this shared vision, this model is intended to produce increased participation and "buy in" from each group member.

Implementation of the model has three major components: a) a three-day intensive retreat focused on power and difference, b) on-site training for effective shared-power and shared accountability in communications and work relationships, and c) on-going coaching on group conflict issues as they arise in the organization. Each employee group, as well as employees with a working relationship with each other, creates working agreements to share assumptions and build trust with one another. Working agreements

also set the bounds of the relationship and how work will be managed between the group members. With mutual consent, the agreements may be changed at any time.

Qualitative Inquiry

The phenomenon being examined in this study is represented by the experiences of staff members who participate in ODTD and is dependent upon their ability and willingness to articulate their perceptions of it. Creswell suggests that complex meaning that individuals place on their experiences is best understood through the use of qualitative methodologies (2007). Additionally, Creswell defines a phenomenological study as reporting on the lived experiences of several individuals, and what they have in common in relationship to the phenomenon they have all experienced.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter the relevant research was presented to support the notion that power in organizations is intertwined with efforts to attract, sustain, and manage a diverse workforce. In light of the literature that has been presented it is clear that this area of inquiry does not show an understanding of the needs of a diverse workforce. Yet, this understanding is a requirement in today's organizations due to the diversification of the US population and the need for clients of non-profit human service organizations to find relevant and competent services. As research begins to reveal how to effectively manage intergroup relationships, more questions also emerge. Significant gaps remain in the efforts to understand the ways in which shared power works to mitigate intergroup conflict, increase a sense of control or empowerment, and reduce the negative effects of dominance in positional authority. Further study is indeed needed to understand how to remove barriers to access, experience of exclusion, and a lack of support and access to

decision making for a diverse workforce. A particular challenge will be to isolate the key behaviors linked to power sharing in organizations, across hierarchies, and within diverse work groups. The literature presented provides support for the study of organizational development targeting diversity from the perspective of the staff members experiencing the process. Chapter 3 details the methodology for this study.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

      This study examined the experiences of non-profit human service agency employees engaged in a longitudinal organizational development targeting diversity (ODTD), a strategic intra-organizational effort to increase employees' sense of inclusion across various spheres of demographic differences such as race, class, and gender. This study aimed to understand the participants' experience with and perceptions of ODTD. The theoretical framework of intersectionality provided a means of taking the multiple social identities of each participant into account. Therefore, this study used a qualitative phenomenological method of inquiry because of its focus on the experiences of participants within a specific setting who have experienced the same phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). In this methodological framework the focus was on the meanings placed on the phenomenon by participants and how those meanings related to their multiple social identities. Merriam (2009) suggests that a phenomenological study is best used when participants have all experienced an event or process. The study phenomenon was the experience of engagement in an ODTD as delivered to a non-profit human service organization from the staff members' perspective.

Study Setting

      The ODTD model examined in this study was implemented at a non-profit organization in the Northeast U.S. over the past seven years. Access was gained for this

study through an internship at the organization responsible for developing the ODTD

model and introducing to human service organizations. That organization was given the

pseudonym Pathways to Partnership (PIP). The ODTD model developed by PIP for non-

profit human service organizations and was aimed at addressing intra-organizational

issues of power and oppression such as institutionalized bias. The pseudonym

"Gateways," was assigned to the three organizational sites throughout the Northeastern

US chosen for the study. The ODTD initiative was put into place to address the need for

managing intergroup conflict that was occurring within its staff and client populations.

To address these issues, Gateways turned its focus onto staff members by putting training

and supports in place designed to build their ability to manage bias, conflict, internalized

oppression, and systems of power both inside the organization and with clients.

The mission of Gateways was to provide literacy and vocational services to

socially and economically disadvantaged people. Gateways hired PIP in 1998 to support

its staff in providing strategic planning, staff and leadership training, leadership coaching,

staff workshops and staff development services, all of which were part of the ODTD

model. The setting for this study, therefore, was within the Gateways organization.

As long-term clients of PIP, the staff of the Gateways regional sites underwent

similar trainings, coaching, workshops, and processes over three or more years. Each of

the Gateways sites was located in a rural setting in the northeast US, and served

economically and educationally marginalized migrant farm workers and their families.

Within the sites selected for the study, the process of ODTD had been underway for three

to seven years. Each full-time staff member was on a rotation to be trained, and took part

in workshops over the course of the first year of employment.

ODTD Implementation Context

  The core training component for ODTD was a three-day intensive retreat designed to develop the knowledge base and skills required to implement the ODTD model. This included deconstructing social identities in the context of the use of power in interpersonal and work team dynamics. Each staff member was required to attend the retreat within the first year of employment, and then received additional workshops and coaching incrementally throughout their employment. The training was designed to provide opportunities to interact with members of social identity groups the individual was not typically in contact with; to examine one's own social identities; and, to explore the ways in which these identities impact the use of power in intergroup and interpersonal interactions.

  Each of the organization's regional sites had a similar staff size and organizational structure with similar pay scales and benefit programs. For the purposes of this study, three of Gateways regional sites were selected with similar demographics, programs, and engagement with ODTD. These sites provided an ideal participant pool from which to study the experiences of participants within organizations that have implemented the same ODTD over a similar period of time.

  Three sites were selected based on three criteria. First, multiple years of continuous participation in the ODTD model ensured that sites selected for the study had long-term exposure to the process. Second, rural settings were chosen because they reflected the most common setting for sites in the organizational network. Third, year-round staff members with at least one year of experience with ODTD were preferred. The following table represents the three sites and their corresponding staff members.

Table 3.1

ODTD Study Site Composition

	Site A	Site B	Site C	PIP
Length of ODTD implementation	7	5	6	13
Number of staff members	5	6	10	5
Number of staff members engaged in ODTD >1yr	4	4	7	5

Note. Pathways to Partnership (PIP) is the consulting organization that provided the sites with the ODTD model, training, and implementation support.

Each site varied in its years of participation with ODTD, however, all had more than three years of experience with the initiative. Site A participated in the ODTD process for seven years and had five employees. Four of the five employees at Site A were engaged in the ODTD process for more than three years. Site B participated in the ODTD process for five years and had six employees. Four of the employees at Site B were engaged in the process for more than three years. Site C participated in the ODTD process for six years and had ten employees. The ten employees at Site C had engaged in the process for a varying number of years. The same PIP staff members have been delivering the ODTD training and implementation support for the entirety of the seven years, and each of the three sites received the same components of training and coaching.

Study Participants

Participants in this study were chosen from the three selected Gateways regional sites through purposeful sampling. This technique is described by Creswell (2007) as the selection of participants based upon their knowledge of and experience with the central phenomenon under study. Participants were chosen using the following two criteria: a) half-time or full-time status at the chosen site; and, b) a year or more of participation in the ODTD. At least half-time status was advantageous because these participants were likely to have more experience with and exposure to the ODTD model. A year or more of experience with ODTD ensured that participants were well grounded in using the ODTD model. Representation from each of the organizational levels at each of the three regional sites, including participants with workplace supervisory responsibilities and participants without workplace supervisory responsibilities, ensured that power differences within the organization were examined from multiple perspectives. Diverse representation based on a diversity of race, gender, level of education, country of birth, and other factors was present in the participant pool. This diversity was critical to understanding the experiences of the participants as it relates to the theoretical framework of the intersectionality of social identities.

Participant Selection and Recruitment

The demographic data forms completed by participants were consolidated into the following Participant Demographic Information, Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

Participant Demographic Information

#	Name	Site	Title	Gender	Race/Eth	Lang.	Age	Years	Educ.
1	Elena	A	Tutor	F	H	Bilingual	45-49	>4	2-yr
2	DJ	A	Tutor	F	W	Bilingual	<25	<2	4-yr
3	Laura	A	Coord.	F	W	English	45-49	>4	5+yr.
4	Larry	B	Director	M	W	English	45-49	>4	5+ yr.
5	John	B	Tutor	M	W	Multi-lingual	25-34	>4	4-yr.
6	Sharon	B	Tutor	F	W	English	45-49	>4	4-yr.
7	Linda	C	Coord.	F	W	English	45-49	>4	4-yr.
8	Jim	C	Director	M	W	English	45-49	2-4	5+yr.
9	Jill	B	Educator	F	W	English	35-44	>4	4-yr.
10	Angela	B	Educator	F	W	English	25-34	>4	5+yr.
11	Rob	C	Coord.		W	English	45-49	2-4	4-yr.
12	Ana	C	Mgr.		H	Bilingual	35-44	>4	2-yr.

Note. Participants are listed in chronological order of interviews. Information collected includes work site, abbreviated title, gender, race, language(s) spoken, age category, number of years in the organization, and level of higher education. Each participant identified and recruited was assigned a pseudonym by the researcher that was then used in all notes and documents other than the demographic data sheets.

Each selected participant received an email request from their site director and the researcher to participate in the study, was provided the information in Appendix A, and was asked to meet for an interview. Site directors helped to coordinate the schedule for interviews. Study participants received an informed consent form, found in Appendix B, at the start of their interview, which was then signed by both the researcher and the participant. The consent form provided a full disclosure of the research process and allowed participants to opt out at any time. Once the consent form was signed the interview commenced.

Data Collection Sources

The aim of the data collection process in this study was to take advantage of the strengths of qualitative data. These strengths are described by Miles and Huberman (1994) as allowing the researcher to gain a good sense of what "real life" was like for the study participants. Further, qualitative data provided a richness of understanding, and the ability to find the complexity of the experiences of the participants in relation to ODTD. Participants' experiences provided a rich description of what ODTD has meant to them (Geertz, 1973).

Individual Interviews

The first round of interviews took place in the conference room or office space of the three Gateways sites, with one exception. One interview took place in a public mall. The first round of interviews was tape recorded. The second round of interviews took place over the phone and via email. In the second round the researcher took notes during the phone calls and used printed emails.

The interview protocol, located in Appendix C, gained detailed descriptions of participants' experiences with the ODTD at their organization. Questions probed the central ideas of the ODTD training to find reactions to participants' perceptions to the model that was implemented. Each interview took place in the conference room, office space, or other convenient area for the participants, and lasted from 45 minutes to an hour and a half. This round of interviews was audio-taped and transcribed by the researcher.

Within three weeks, a second interview for clarifying and follow-up questions was requested of participants. These interviews took place by phone with typed notes taken by the researcher during the calls. The combined data was then uploaded to Atlas.ti research software and coded. The electronic and paper files were locked in a file cabinet and/or password protected.

Document Collection

Documents collected from each site included site-specific mission statements and working agreements. Mission statements and working agreements were created by staff members collaboratively. Mission statements set forth a shared purpose, while working agreements were the rules used in team interactions. Viewing both the working agreements and mission statement documents from each site allowed the researcher to contextualize and triangulate the information provided by study participants. The "partnership" mission statements from each site aided in the understanding of how the ODTD model was operationalized. Additionally, all participants described working agreements. Having access to the working agreement documents from each site provided a more complete picture of what was included in a working agreement. The documents collected also verified the information provided by the interviewees.

Demographic Data

Information about each participant was collected prior to each interview, as shown in Appendix D. This information included race, gender, birth country, languages spoken, age, job title, and level of education. The purpose of gathering demographic data was to further illuminate data collected in the interviews, the documents from each site, and the field notes. This information assisted in the understanding of where each interviewee fits within the organization, what education and background they bring, and the social identity groups with which they identify.

Field Notes

Field notes were written by the researcher throughout the study and included sensory observations. The researcher observed auditory and visual cues, both inside and outside the office spaces, as well as the behaviors of staff members and clients before, during, and, after the interviews. Though these were not the focus of the study, they played a role in contextualizing, reinforcing or contradicting other data. This information was also invaluable in uncovering connections between the intersections of the social identities and the experiences of participants, and helped to show basic similarities and differences of the participants. Field notes were also used to connect interview and document data for cross-site analysis.

Data Analysis

Data analysis began with field notes completed following each interview session. Interview data were coded at the conclusion of each day that interviews were conducted. Site-based documents were coded once received. Coding was based on Miles and Huberman's definition that coding involves finding the smallest unit of meaning the

researcher ascribes to data (1994). Fereday and Muir-Cochrane's six stage data coding scheme was followed in this analysis. The six stages include: a) developing the code manual; b) testing the reliability of codes; c) summarizing data and identifying initial themes; d) applying the template of codes and additional coding; e) connecting the codes and identifying themes, and, 6. corroborating and legitimating coded themes (2006). In this study, the code manual included both inductive and descriptive coding, with reliability tested across cases. If a code did not appear in more than one case, it was felt to be of little value. A back and forth process of coding, combining codes, and finding relationships between codes led to initial theme ideas. The process of summarizing initial themes uncovered general theme ideas which were developed, narrowed, or scrapped in the pursuit of stronger, more descriptive themes. Corroborating themes involved the use of cross case comparisons and member checking. Once themes were corroborated across multiple cases, their relative strength was determined. In some cases, stronger themes were indicated by a higher number of cases. In other cases, themes were indicated by multiple layers of perspective by multiple cases involving the same concept. This was critical to the application of the theoretical framework of intersectionality, and of understanding the phenomenon from the intersecting identities of the participants in the study.

Developing themes, as recommended by Ryan and Bernard (2003), came from both the data and the researcher's prior theoretical understanding of the phenomenon being studied. This approach to theme development brought together shared understandings from the data collected, the relevant literature, common knowledge, and practice. These authors provide 12 methods for finding themes in written text and four

techniques for manipulating, or processing texts which were used as a guide for theme development. Techniques used included finding metaphors, noticing co-occurring words, finding repetition, noticing similarities and differences, and connecting the data to theory-related material. Each of these techniques was used in varying degrees. The goal of building themes was to develop many themes and then to reduce the number based upon their relative strength. Throughout the data collection process, the interview transcripts were coded and themes developed, however, the final themes were developed using a cross-case analysis.

Cross-case analysis is described as a means by which to, "not only pin down the specific conditions under which a finding will occur," but also to understand the more general categories of how the conditions under study may be related (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Said another way, by comparing cases with and across sites, if became possible for each individual to be examined for similarities with other cases. This process helped to illuminate the conditions within various categories under which the experiences occurred.

Data Management and Storage

As recommended by Creswell (2007), the participants' identities were protected through the use of pseudonyms, with the key and all electronic data stored in password protected files. Hard copy files for this study were protected via storage in a locked cabinet and made available only to the researcher. Transcription of audio files from each interview was completed by the researcher. Qualitative data analysis software, ATLAS.ti, was be used to manage and code documents once they were uploaded and/or scanned into

the computer. All data was stored on a password-protected laptop computer, with the researcher as the only person with access to the data.

Credibility and Trustworthiness

Efforts were made by the researcher to build the credibility of the study findings by examining each data source (Marshall & Rossman, 2011) to illuminate the others. Rather than triangulation which suggests a fixed point of reference, the goal was to find individualized meanings through the lens of each participant. Understanding the meaning placed on the phenomenon by each participant brought an inherent constellation of meanings, each put forward in the context of the others. For example, within the interview transcripts, each participant's statements were analyzed in relationship to the documents, demographic data, field notes, and data provided by other interviewees. Working agreement and mission statement documents provided added detail to the interviews.

Marshall and Rossman suggest that researchers employ peer debriefing as another way to ensure findings are complete and credible (2011). In peer debriefing, the researcher made use of knowledgeable colleagues for their reactions to the collected data and findings throughout the study. This was accomplished through informal conversations with peers who are conducting similar research methodology. Sharing raw data from several participants and explaining the interpretation of its meaning was helpful in processing the information as well as developing an understanding of nuanced phrases used by participants.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided the methodological rationale for this qualitative phenomenological study. The study was conducted across three regional sites of the Gateway organization using semi-structured interviews, field notes, documents, and demographic forms. Data was analyzed using multiple rounds of coding, by finding patterns across codes, and themes derived from these patterns. Credibility was heightened through second-round interviews to ask clarifying questions of interviewees.

Chapter 4: Findings

Introduction

This chapter reviews theoretical framework as well as the phenomenon that was the focus of the study. Then, it presents the findings as three themes, and finishes with a chapter summary.

Viewed through the theoretical framework of intersectionality, the findings from this study were drawn from one-on-one interviews, training documents, site-based documents, and field notes. Across the three study themes, participants described the ways that sharing power in the workplace improved or limited group communication, trust, and empowering practices with clients. Diverse identity factors were found to serve as both barriers and assets to participants.

For participants, identities of race, class, gender, and language in relationship to power dynamics were articulated in ODTD training. Building skills to recognize the ways that identities influence interpersonal and intergroup power dynamics allowed participants to understand themselves in relationship to their co-workers and clients. These perceptions impacted their experiences of ODTD implementation. The four strategies of implementation of ODTD in the organization examined for this study were a) a three-day intensive training retreat for staff members, b) facilitated sessions for work groups to develop mission, vision, and working agreement documents, c) the use of working agreements at every meeting, and, d) on-going leadership coaching for site leaders. The three-day retreat was facilitated by an outside agency, and provided

participants with an understanding of the role of power between both their own social identities, and those of others. Following this training, the staff members participated in facilitated sessions which included all employees. The purpose of these sessions was the review, editing, and the implementation of working agreements. Working agreements were read aloud at each staff meeting with the intention of creating an environment for shared, values and goals, and a framework for symmetrical work group power dynamics (Mathewson, 2009). On-going leadership coaching was provided to supervisors as a means of reinforcing and troubleshooting the ODTD implementation strategies.

Study Themes

The central concern of this study was to understand how staff members in a human service organization made meaning of and used the Organizational Development Targeting Diversity (ODTD) model. Referred to by participants as "partnership," the purpose of ODTD implementation was to foster an inclusive work environment through shared power and understanding diverse social identities. This initiative was particularly relevant for the organization due to the race and class differences between staff members and clients. In the ODTD training, diversity was explored through multiple group identities, showing participants the effect of differing identities on interpersonal relationships (Mathewson, 2010). These identity differences included status variations which were rooted in job responsibilities, race, gender, class, language, and other characteristics. Findings are presented in three themes.

The first theme, *Identities Matter in ODTD Implementation*, deals with the explicit ways in which participants perceived that their identities and those of clients and co-workers affected their work. Theme two, *Language as a Tool to Build Client*

Relationships, showed that race and language were intertwined and important as ODTD was implemented as a tool for empowering co-workers and clients. The third theme, *Working Agreements as a Means of Building Trust,* demonstrates participants' understanding and valuing of the practical application of workplace contracts to set boundaries, build trust, and find collective wisdom with their co-workers. The three study themes are followed by a chapter summary.

Across the three study themes, the use and sharing of power in the organization was influenced by identity factors. Participants explained how their positions within these categories influenced their interactions among co-workers and clients over the course of ODTD model implementation. Building an understanding of the variety of social identities present among team members was the ODTD strategy used to build inclusivity in the organization and better outcomes with clients.

Identities Matter in ODTD Implementation

Participants' experiences of ODTD implementation and their interpretation of the basic concepts of the ODTD model varied based on their diverse identities. West (1993) claimed that while we work to create a more equitable society, race still matters. This tension between what was set forth as a model, that all group members were equal regardless of their identities, and a current state not reflective of that model, that power differences do exist between group members, was a finding of this study.

For example, some female staff members reported an awareness of gendered power asymmetry at their site. As highlighted in the three-day training, participants noted the ways in which self-awareness of identity helped to filter their interactions with coworkers. Some participants, for example, focused on their gendered identities as a

means of describing organizational interworkings. Specifically, female participants who saw that males had more power in the organization described a situation contradictory to the intention of ODTD implementation, and were reluctant to discuss the existence of these power differences.

Sharon, a White, mid-level employee, explained, "I know we have a lot of different identities at work…[but] we're mostly female. I do see that the male identity is a little bit more, has a little bit more power in the workplace." This gender-based power differential was difficult for her to disclose as evidenced by her visible nervousness and requests for assurances of confidentiality.

While training staff to share power and to make decisions within work groups is part of the ODTD process, many female staff members felt that males exerted more power in the organization. A central feature of the ODTD model, however, was treating each group member as equal to the others. No member of the group was exempt from the responsibility of group outcomes, such as problem solving. One participant described how she perceived females as being, "set up" by the expectations placed on them. Females, she noticed, were expected to behave in an empowered way, only to have that power withdrawn afterwards. Jill, a White staff member from Site B, described her experience:

When we have meetings, we try to all discuss things and all try to figure out things instead of just having [male supervisor] telling us what we're supposed to be doing. You know? And sometimes we figure out things and [male supervisor] puts the kibosh on it.

Female participants, like their male counterparts, were requested by organizational leaders to solve problems. Their solutions, however, were frequently scrapped leaving a few female participants disempowered. In describing her situation, Jill saw her gender and that of her team members as the reason for her male supervisor's dismissal of the team's ideas. Females drawn in to the promise of empowerment had their expectations for ODTD raised by the rhetoric used in training and working agreements, then felt disillusioned when organizational practice proved that the traditional way of operating with males dominating the group dynamic was still firmly in place.

Other female participants expressed their belief that male dominance was inevitable. Angela, a White staff member at Site B, stated, "I think in general you see that typical White male boss." This comment points to her belief that males in leadership positions are the norm and that, from a female perspective, this was the expectation of what a leader in her organization would look like. In the ODTD model, this sense of inevitability showed a lack of faith that its implementation was likely to create significant systemic or structural change beyond any that had already occurred.

While female participants questioned the implementation of the model, most notably the concept of empowerment, their comments were cautious and measured. They were careful to sandwich such comments between positive statements. For example, Sharon, who was also from Site B, followed her earlier statements in which she noted that males in the organization have more power with a statement affirming that the male leader was trying to share power. She says, "I really think we're working toward the partnership but I think we got a ways…but [our leader], he's committed to it. I really think that he tries. You know…[he] tries to make it work for us." Some female

participants witnessed male dominance in the organization while simultaneously hearing that the organization was committed to the sharing of power as articulated through ODTD training and materials. Therefore, after having hopes raised that power would be shared, and feeling appreciative that the effort was made to neutralize the power imbalance, these women saw that gendered power differences were still intact. Non-White females, however, were less concerned with males dominating the organization and more concerned with finding their source of power in other ways.

For example, Ana, who described herself as Hispanic, was raised to be a caretaker of the males in her Spanish-speaking childhood home. She explained how she used her Hispanic and female identities to empower herself in her work:

I was in that position where my mom and dad didn't know any English so I have a different perspective so I would try to share with them that I know, kids will try to get away with things because they think that you don't know.

Ana understood that clients may speak Spanish at home and English in school, creating an opportunity for these students to fool their parents. With this understanding, as well as the linguistic tools to help parents manage it, Ana found her gender, race and bilingual education an asset and a source of power in the workplace. Feeling empowered, she praised her White, male supervisor and expressed her gratitude to have found a work environment invested in sharing power. She described her current situation as better than her earlier experiences. She stated, "It's [my supervisor] not at all like, like you have in the private sector, you just, you don't uh, this is like a goldmine here, for me, anyway." Ana's perception of her supervisor was influenced by her upbringing in a culture that caters to males, as well as her private sector experience. She felt that having a supervisor

who attempted to facilitate power sharing between himself and staff members was a major leap forward as compared to other males she had worked with. This was a perception not shared by White female participants with male supervisors. Ana's comment spoke to the issues raised in ODTD training, such as the importance of one's perspective and self-awareness of identities in the understanding of power and privilege. Ana's perspective, in this example, placed a heavier emphasis on race than of gender as she examined her experience of her race and gender in the workplace. While the White women were not without a race, they did not see their race as a barrier to power, and thus, felt they should be on par with White males. This difference of perspective on the phenomenon of identity as it relates to power points to the need for further training on privilege.

Alternatively, in their experiences, the male participants felt they were sharing power equally with co-workers. John shared his perspective as a White male working in the organization, "I never feel like I'm being treated unfairly because of that [being male]." Though in the minority within the organization and the pool of study participants, male participants displayed less hesitation in sharing their thoughts, took more time in the interviews, often talked over the interviewer, and provided longer, more detailed descriptions of their experiences. All of the male participants perceived their gender as their dominant identity in the context of the organization. They ascribed that awareness to the ODTD training they received, and displayed an understanding that being male was a different experience than being female in the work environment.

The male experience of power differed from that of females, as males reflected on power and how it was used in the organization, they turned to the strategies they used

with other team members. Conversely, women related scenarios that depicted the ways the others used power with them. The perception was, by women, that men held more power. John seemed to gain a new awareness of this difference as he was describing his experience with gender in the workplace. John reflected, "I don't know if I see that [sexism] other than the interoffice rumors or that kind of thing but, maybe that's because I'm the dominant…right." By concluding that he was "in the dominant" John put together two ideas: a) that he holds the dominant identity as it relates to sexism and, b) that he does not see sexism as it is taking place. In this eureka moment, John realized that he did not see sexism because it was not directed toward him. Other male participant descriptions of their experiences showed how men viewed their behaviors as they implemented ODTD. Larry, a White, English-only speaker, described how he changed his behavior as part of ODTD. He stated, "I try to get people to come to their own conclusions but sometimes it's like it's a fine line. We're doing this and you try to get buy in and you get push back." What he described here was how he attempted to share power by helping people come to the conclusion he wanted them to, rather than to trust that the process of collaboration and power sharing would produce an appropriate outcome. His other idea for getting the result he wanted was to involve people in decision making earlier, which he described as, "… try[ing] to get more people involved in the front end." But his reason for involving people earlier in the process was not to produce a good decision. Rather, it was to avoid "push back" if they did not like the decision. This same type of manipulation was described by another White male participant. Jim, an English-only speaker, provided a detailed description of his co-workers as having one of five personality types ranging from "early adopters" to recalcitrant people who must be

pushed to adopt an idea until they comply or leave the organization. His strategy for using shared power was to define how much value he placed on a particular decision and then to manage the process based on this relative value. For example, some decisions were not as important to him and so he would relinquish his power to influence those outcomes. Other decisions he felt he needed to influence, so he would take measures to ensure that the outcome he wanted was achieved. He explained that one way of getting people to agree with a position was to use the "back door" approach, much like the television detective Lieutenant Columbo might employ. He felt that this approach had the added benefit of helping to ensure compliance by co-workers. He explained this method:

If you come at it from the back door, what I call the Columbo approach, people are allowed to think that, wow, like this is their idea and then they…come to embody it and…it will become ingrained and will continue whether you are monitoring it or not.

In his "Columbo approach," he saw himself as making the decision while making a co-worker believe that, a) the decision being advocated was a good one, and b) they thought of it themselves. The game playing he described was a tool to get the decision he wanted while making people believe they were influencing the outcome of that decision. They were involved, yes, but they were led to believe they had more power and input than they actually did have.

Contrasting these male and female experiences of ODTD showed that women were embracing of its power-sharing goal, but saw that this goal was not being reached. Meanwhile, men had developed strategies to get the outcomes they wanted, and so were satisfied with their experiences. They viewed themselves as being treated equally in the organization and advocates for ODTD implementation.

Language as a Tool for Building Client Relationships

The ODTD training emphasized shared language as a means of addressing power inequities, and participants described how this became part of their discourse on empowerment in the sense that people who do not speak English were, in this situation, marginalized. But, language or linguistic diversity was not treated in the ODTD framework as an important facet of identity contributing to empowerment in the sense that it was playing out in the organization. Said otherwise, native English speakers were, at times, disempowered by their lack of Spanish-speaking skills while bilingual staff, including non-native English speakers, found empowerment in speaking their first language, Spanish.

Race and language were passionately discussed by participants, and seen as critically important to understanding and empowering clients. This theme explored the ways that race and language were intertwined, and how they were experienced by participants as they worked to form trusting relationships and positive outcomes with their clients.

Elena, a bilingual staff member at Site A, described how her identity as a Latina was reinforced through her self-described kinship with the migrant client population. As a former migrant farm worker herself, Elena reported that her experiences allowed her to develop trust with clients while English-only speaking staff members were unable to foster these relationships. In her discussion of interacting with clients, she described their reaction to her, "I can tell my parents [clients] that I've been there I've done that. We moved around too. They think, you know, she's one of ours." Elena was easily accepted by clients while her White, English- speaking co-workers found it took them much longer

to build trust with clients. This gave her power and expert status in her work group. She felt important as a group member due to her ability to be a bridge between clients and team members. Because of her race, language, and cultural background, Elena found a way to leverage her identities and feel a sense of pride and power, rather than marginalization. Her empowerment stemmed not from the ODTD training directly, but from her ability to draw upon her self-identity as a Hispanic former migrant farm worker. Feeling empowered by her ability to relate to clients, Elena was then able to build bridges between clients and staff while other coworkers struggled to do so. She explained, "Sometimes I go out with my coworker who's Anglo and [clients] look at me. I say, 'It's okay; she doesn't understand much Spanish, but you can feel free to tell us about what you're going through.'" In this instance, Elena's empowerment was connected to her ability to authenticate Anglo coworkers with Latino clients, who without her validation would be challenged in their attempts to communicate openly with clients. Elena further described the empowering aspects of being bilingual when she noted, "Maybe my coworker who doesn't speak much Spanish and I can go in and [I can] help her with her home visits." Language, she felt, allowed her to be a helpful team member and allowed her to form relationships with her clients.

While language was important to Elena, she did not lose sight of how race and experience were also relevant. Her intersecting oppressed identities, being a Hispanic woman with English as a second language living in a culture that values being White and speaking English without an accent, became an asset. Another example was from Ana, who described herself as the only bilingual person in the office, Site C. She had the experience of growing up as a Hispanic girl in a predominantly White high school.

"Being in the school system, there wasn't [sic] many Hispanics. So I felt like I was lower than the White girls. You're in a different category, so I felt like I was oppressed in that way." This experience of oppression helped Ana feel an affinity with her clients and a commitment to the organization. She was enthusiastic about the power sharing aspect of the ODTD framework. Ana stated, "It's wonderful," because she had found a way to turn her oppressed identity into a source of power that she could share with co-workers.

White bilingual participants felt that being bilingual and learning about their clients' cultures were of particular importance to building trust with non-English-speaking clients. Some participants felt the need to maintain an awareness of the privilege borne out of being White with English as their first language. DJ explained:

I'm an English speaker and I think that's gotta be [my] number one [identity]…in my work the identity that comes across the most is the idea of being American born, citizen, White…that gives me so much more power than the parent [client] can possibly have.

Maintaining the awareness of her privilege as a White English speaker was the strategy DJ used to remember the need to share power and build relationships with clients.

But not all participants reported this level of awareness of power imbalances between staff members and clients, and the value of understanding the language and identity differences of co-workers and clients. Indeed, some participants were frustrated by their co-workers' apathy toward building competency with their clients' cultures. John, a White male staff member at Site B, explained, "If I work with one of our families, understanding that they have as much to offer and teach me as I do to them makes the

relationship much more successful." By empowering clients to teach him as he taught

them, John created a shared power arrangement, implementing ODTD at the client level.

He described that a modest attempt to understand the clients' cultures or languages

produced a positive outcome, "If you are willing to learn some phrases in their language

or sit down with them and ask questions about their culture, those families will embrace

your presence." In this example, John demonstrates that in addition to race, language was

very important to clients as race. Language allowed him to overcome resistance from the

families which typically stemmed from being White. Thus, in this instance, language

trumped race allowing him, as John described, to better connect with clients.

In addition to navigating language differences with clients, participants also

experienced dynamics associated with language with each other. At times it was a source

of contention between co-workers. Linda, a White supervisor at Site C, shared that she

had felt judged by her co-workers for not being fully bilingual. She explained,

"Sometimes I feel like I'm not seen as…being capable enough in my position, not being

bilingual." Rather than learning the language, Linda's strategy was to overcome this

perception of others by showing she was effective in her position. She stated:

I just try to prove myself that I am, you know, that I can do it. I try to translate

whatever I can. When I disperse…information to parents I make sure it's translated in

English and Spanish and check those translations now.

Linda saw her work output, as opposed to her gender or race, as the most relevant

factor in how she would be perceived by others while her co-workers saw her lack of

Spanish-speaking skills as a problem.

The sentiment of Linda's co-workers was shared by John at Site B, who saw that not finding a means of entering the clients' culture affected his co-workers' ability to work with them. John explained how clients perceived his co-workers who did not understand their clients language or culture, and stated, "It for sure shows when the Hispanic people would call to ask who's going to pick us up and I would tell them and they would say, 'Oh, she hates us. She looks at us like we're dirt.'" Like Elena, John was caught in the middle between clients and co-workers. He responded to the client gently but without saying she was wrong about his co-worker. Instead, he hedged, "I'd say, 'I don't know if she feels that way.'" John exposed the privileged position of his White English-only speaking co-workers who did not make an effort to show respect their clients by learning their language or accepting their offers of food. Instead, the entire onus of responsibility for communication was left to the disempowered, marginalized clients, who were expected to access services from people who, aside from one employee, did not speak their language or show any interest in learning about it. John was interpreting the clients' reactions to English-only staff members while Linda, as one of the English-only staff members, was unable to see these client reactions due to the different quality of her client relationships.

Explaining how he wished that all his co-workers would fully engage in the ODTD principles, he stated, "I hope people like that [co-workers] take that training [ODTD] to heart." But some clearly did not. Instead, they chose to rely on him to smooth things over with clients while they remained apathetic toward them. Though no one mentioned themselves as being unreceptive to learning about other identities, a key feature of ODTD training, some participants discussed ways in which their co-workers

71

failed to engage with people having identities they were not accustomed to. John explained what happened when a new population of migrant workers arrived in the area:

When the revelation of all these refugee kids [occurred]…I said, 'Oh great, new people and new language, new food, new culture. I'll go to all their houses.' And I did. Everybody else kinda just doesn't really have any interest.

The disinterest, and possibly fear, that John points out was endemic to some co-workers, while it was of concern to others. Laura believed that she had to determine whether job candidates would be able to work with clients at her organization. Underlying this ability, to Laura, was gauged by whether or not she could detect fear in their questions during an interview. "You cannot work with clients you are afraid of," Laura said. John did not assume fear or apathy as reasons for why his co-workers did not visit the new client families, but he was frustrated that they were avoiding what he saw as a great opportunity to experience a new culture. Despite apathy on the part of some of his co-workers, John felt good about his own relationships with clients, and found a way to use his intersecting identities as a multilingual male with low job status into an asset in the organization. Larry, a White, English-only speaker at Site B, believed the lack of engagement in ODTD implementation of some staff members was related to their identities, and perceived that there were different levels of acceptance of ODTD based on a person's individual identity and background. He explained why some people might be more successful with ODTD, "You know their past experience, their background…cultural experience. When you take people's background…you know I think, at times, certain people are far more receptive than other people." This receptivity

was present with both White and Hispanic, male and female participants, with some standing out as far more engaged than others.

Race and language, then, were interconnected and when this intersection was examined, produced a powerful example of how some participants were able to gain entrance into the clients' culture and trust. In some cases, however, learning their language or being the same race was not always necessary. Entering a client's home with a sincere concern for their children and a welcoming attitude was enough for some participants to be successful in building client relationships. Laura, a White leader at Site A, described how she experienced breaking through cultural barriers with clients:

…it's amazing to me how quickly they see how much I care about their kids…how it doesn't matter to me what their house looks like, if they have furniture, don't have furniture. Their children become the real connection.

Her desire to help her clients' children, along with her non-judgmental attitude came through to her clients as genuine, allowing her to form trusting relationships. She felt that applying the principles learned through the ODTD process were instrumental in helping her navigate cultural barriers because it heightened an awareness of herself as a raced, gendered person. But at the same time she knew that there were limits to being trusted by her clients. She stated, "When I walk into a home I know that that's [race] what they see first. When I go make a home visit." Race was highly relevant to Laura, who felt conflicted about being a White person in a position designed to work with primarily Hispanic clients. She explained how she became familiar with migrant farm workers. As a White person, Laura's sensitivity toward migrant farm families came from having them humanized for her at an early age. Laura's background of spending time

with a particular migrant family who worked her family's farm over the course of several years helped her develop an appreciation for their work, their struggle, and their culture. Extending beyond appreciation is her sense of guilt for not realizing her privilege until attending ODTD training. Laura explained:

I grew up on a farm. Although we didn't have migrant farm workers living on our farm, we did have migrant farm workers that worked on our farm…It fit perfectly for what my dad's needs were for picking tomatoes.

Laura's sense of being hired when she felt she should not have been gave her a sense of humility and guilt as she recognized her privilege as a White, educated person born in the US. She stated:

I was also thinking when they hired me for this position that they shouldn't have hired me…because I'm not bilingual and I'm as White as White can be…they should probably be hiring someone that was more reflective of the population that we work with.

Laura's discomfort with being chosen for a job she thought was better suited to a person more closely identified with the client population helped her to clarify her own identity and positionality within the organization. She was forced to see herself in a new light by, "acknowledging how much privilege and power that I have as a White person, and English speaking person." Situated as a White woman in an organization serving primarily poor Hispanic people, Laura came to terms with her family's history of using members of this population to make a living. She continued:

Until I started the [ODTD] diversity training I didn't think of myself every day as being White. I didn't think about all the privilege that I walked around with. I grew up thinking that I grew up with less than the people that I spent time with.

Laura felt she had failed to recognize the fact that she grew up with race and class privilege until entering into ODTD training. Though she had experienced short-term poverty in her life, she drew a distinction between her short-term and the long-term poverty experienced by her clients. Laura said she understood a part of what her clients experienced because, "[She faced] situational poverty and doing whatever it takes to make sure your kids have food that day and a place to sleep that night and somehow heat the house when there's no heat." She drew upon this experience when working with clients by understanding that they would respond to becoming empowered if given the tools, just as she had. ODTD training prepared her by showing her the way to empower others. She explained, "I think that those experiences have also helped me tremendously to understand somewhat of [sic] the things that people go through, and to respect their strength and their ability to figure it out." This mindset furthered her ability to relate to and appreciate the challenges of her clients. She had learned that being poor did not mean being incapable, and she noticed that the migrant families she knew growing up were resilient survivors.

How Power Can Work to Marginalize People

Participants described other experiences in which they saw other professionals, such as school administrators, teachers, and interpreters, fail to acknowledge the presence or agency of clients because of their race and language. Overt racial overtones were present in situations with other non-Hispanic, English-speaking professionals, such as teachers and administrators, from other organizations. Jill explains her experience:

If I go to a parent meeting or like a CSE meeting cause there's [sic] a lot of people there. Let's say the mom's Hispanic, and even if she speaks perfect English, the teachers and everybody will talk to me instead of the parent, and I'm like okay talk to *her*.

Professionals outside the organization charged with helping these clients were dismissive of their ability to speak on their own behalf. Sadly, once participants understood and broke through cultural barriers with clients, they were still faced with overcoming overt prejudice from professionals outside of their organization. These other professionals showed race and class bias toward migrant workers and their children, and expected their prejudice to be acceptable to the professionals who were sitting across the table as migrant family advocates.

In addition to barriers from outside the organization, barriers inside the organization occasionally blocked the development of cultural competency among staff members. One of the three sites was unique in that most of the staff members were bilingual, speaking both Spanish and English. This presented an occasional power sharing issue because being an equal member of the group would seem to include being able to understand the language being used by co-workers. However, this was not always the case at Site A. DJ explained how having a mostly bilingual staff could present a challenge to ODTD implementation:

Half of us are all speaking in Spanish. I mean, everybody speaks English and we could just converse in English but half of the staff is conversing in Spanish and that's excluding a few of those members who are supposed to be equal at our table.

She explains that it can be difficult for the English-only speakers. She says, "Sometimes it maybe rubs a little bit that way." By excluding some of the staff members,

the bilingual members undermined the goal of ODTD but simultaneously produced a powerful example of exclusion to otherwise privileged White English speaking staff members. These members did not appreciated feeling excluded and failed to see that what they were experiencing was the exclusion felt every day by their clients and Hispanic co-workers. This situation could produce a learning environment to show privileged staff members that they possess privilege and how it feels to clients to be unable to understand English.

In summary, White participants described breaking through racial and language barriers with clients to form trusting relationships. In viewing ODTD implementation through a racial and linguistic lens, participants were able to see differences in how they were treated by co-workers and clients. Language was interwoven with race in the organization due to differences in languages spoken by staff and clients as well as between some of the staff members. Though most of the clients were Hispanic and spoke Spanish, most of the participants were English-only speakers. This dynamic played out in different ways for each participant depending on the participants' race, language(s) spoken, class or job status, and gender.

The experiences of those participants who achieved trusting relationships with clients were able to overcome racial barriers by learning the clients' language and understanding their cultures. At times, this put them at odds with co-workers who were not taking the time to or did not have the ability to do this. In some cases, though, participants used identity differences as a means of building a bridge between clients and co-workers.

Working Agreements as a Means of Sharing Power and Building Trust

Each site had its own set of working agreements which served to form boundaries within which staff members functioned together. Participants described working agreements as "the rules," an en vivo code used across the three sites. The agreements, participants explained, became a consensus document developed as a formal part of the ODTD process, were read at the beginning of each staff meeting, and were reviewed periodically. Working agreement items made explicit the expectations staff members had for each other, such as to trust the best of intentions, to be cooperative, and to come to consensus on an issue before moving on. A sample working agreement document is found in Appendix E.

As a counterpoint to the barriers to ODTD implementation discussed in the first two themes, this theme demonstrates the value participants perceived in using working agreements for sharing power in work groups, a key element of ODTD implementation. Participants viewed the agreements as foundational. For example, Elena, at Site A, stated:

We have a set of rules that we've all agreed on and follow. Basically working agreements [are] how to work with each other's strengths and that we're all in a partnership team and not just one in the dominator [role] telling everyone what to do.

Elena perceived that working agreements transformed the idea of power sharing into a reality in her organization. Other participants explained that having their working agreements in place created a sense of safety for speaking out and sharing ideas through the establishment and maintenance of group trust and boundaries. Jim, a leader at Site B, explained that working agreements created a shared purpose within the team, "You have a collection of individuals sitting around the table who are guided by the same principals

and operate by the process of mutually agreed-upon established working agreements focused on a common good or a common goal." Jim's rhetoric showed his desire that staff members work together and stay focused on the goal, and the feature of working agreements as a consensus document.

The agreements, then, set the stage for how team members operated in staff meetings, providing them with a roadmap and behavioral boundaries. DJ explained, "At the beginning of any partnership you need to set ground rules for how your meetings and how your interactions are going to be." In the ODTD model, working agreements are agreed to and followed by all members with the expectation that any member who observed that the working agreements were not being followed should voice that concern. Jill, a staff member at Site B, believed that repeating the working agreements before meetings provided reinforcement of the rules. She stated, "We always have to read them, every time [we meet]…it is…a good reminder of things that you're supposed to do." While visibly annoyed by the thought of reading the agreements at every meeting, Jill also stated support for using them. The reading of working agreements on a regular basis, though not enjoyed by all participants, seemed to be valued as an important part of partnership implementation. John, also at Site B, valued the trust that was established through working agreements, and related that reading them before meetings was helpful. He said, "The thing that we lose track of all the time, and I'm just as guilty of all the time is the whole 'trusting that everybody has the best intentions.'" As John suggested, the working agreements helped team members maintain their focus on shared values and expectations of each other.

The importance of trust building as a feature of working agreements was a common understanding across participants. Jim represented most participants when he explained that trust was an important part of the working agreements. He stated, "As we sit around the table everybody knows that we trust in the good intentions of others." DJ echoed Jim's comment, and described how she was trusting of other group members. She stated:

Having...working agreements we can…express ourselves without feeling like 'Oh, my God! …Am I going to lose my job?' You can express yourself and laugh at yourself and forgive others. It has really helped us to open up more.

Being able to trust others enough to communicate freely was related to being direct and honest with co-workers. To Jill, this meant to, "tell people directly, like if they're absent don't talk about them." Keeping people informed of what was said in their absence and refusing to gossip were both a part of the trust-building process. Trusting other group members was also important to Angela. She explained what trusting the best of intentions meant to her:

…where I think before the work environment was just kind of gossipy and catty…now people are looking from a different place. So maybe something didn't get done but the person's not being lazy but something happened.

In her example, Angela believed that trust involves withholding judgment until the facts were known. Elena believed working agreements aids in teamwork and communication and summarized, "We're able to speak up more freely." The safety created by the sharing of power and use of working agreements seemed to provide a means for staff members to feel valued and effective while working in groups. Ana,

whose immigrant parents spoke Spanish, was an administrative staff member. She described how having working agreements in place helped her overcome 'swallowing her feelings' and holding onto resentments by striving to communicate about things as they were happening rather than waiting. She explained:

…if we have something to say we wanna' say it to them [coworkers] and basically clarify, clear the air, so that way there's no misunderstanding, well, what did you mean by that? Or, maybe I misunderstood that.

Ana felt that working agreements helped to manage and even prevent conflicts before they happened. She continued, "…and I really like that if I upset you, I apologize and just clear the air and work on it right then and there." DJ, a newer staff member at Site A, agreed that communication was aided by using working agreements. She felt it created a safe environment for better communication:

…if you deviate from those rules that you've all agreed on then, you know, somebody can no longer feel included and safe in the process. The agreements do help our group to connect on some level.

DJ restated her belief that psychological safety was important for good communication several times, using similar language to her co-workers. Similarly, Laura, who is a leader at Site A, explained her version of how trust and safety were built through working agreements. She stated, "we've gotten to the point where people just walk in with a number and they'll just say, 'I need number eight today,' [which is] forgiving ourselves and others.' The working agreements were used so consistently that members memorized and used them as a central part of their daily work.

In summary, participants felt that working agreements held value. Ana has worked in the organization both before and after partnership implementation, and noticed that beforehand there was, "tension between everybody that you can cut at the meetings. The meetings were not productive, and you felt like you couldn't [speak up] because you could be attacked or somebody [would get] defensive." Her feelings after its implementation were quite different. She stated, "I can say that from before to after the working agreement has been phenomenal." Her enthusiasm was not shared by all participants; however, each participant placed some degree of value on the use of working agreements as a means of reinforcing shared values, building trust, and sharing power.

Conclusion

Each of the themes in this chapter brought to light participant perspectives on ODTD implementation, each shaped by their individual, intersecting identities. The first theme, *Language as a Tool for Building Client Relationships,* demonstrated that the identities of group members produced a lens from which each person developed a unique perspective. Each of these perspectives represented an individual experience of the intersection of race, class, language(s) spoken, and gender. Theme Two, *Language as a Tool for Building Client Relationships,* exposed the critical nature of language as a tool for client relationship development. Whether or not a participant or their co-workers were bilingual had a dramatic effect on the experience and perception of ODTD implementation. The final theme, *Working Agreements as a Means of Sharing Power and Building Trust*, revealed the value placed on working agreements. Working agreements, used as a tool for setting the parameters of how group members make explicit and follow

their agreed-upon rules for how to work together, were valued overall by all participants.

The repetition of reading the working agreements at the beginning of each meeting

served as a reminder to focus on shared values.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

In the research on leadership and diversity in organizations there is a dearth of data that, a) is from the staff member perspective, b) targets non-profit human service organizations, and, c) is concerned with addressing power asymmetries through attending to intersecting social identities of staff members. Through the lens of intersectionality, this study provides insight into the ramifications, from staff members' perspectives, of implementing a pluralistic/participatory leadership approach that acknowledges difference and openly addresses power and positionality (Kezar, 1998). This chapter provides study implications and the limitations, as well as recommendations for members of human service organizations, their funders, and policy makers. The above information is followed by a chapter summary.

Implications of Findings

The organizational development targeting diversity (ODTD) framework addresses power and difference in the non-profit, human service organization workplace through its attention to power asymmetries accompanying the diverse social identities within work groups (Mathewson, 2010). Thus, the exploration of diversity coupled with tools to openly address power and status differences in the workplace is the basis of the ODTD model. In this study, it was found that participants assigned meaning to the use of power, at least in part, based on their individual and unique combination of identity and status in the organization. Results of this study support Kezar and Lester's (2010) observation that

identity differences and positionality of individuals affect their perceptions of power sharing and power use in the organization.

This study explored the experiences of ODTD implementation as seen through the lens of the intersecting identities of participants. The findings of this study show that participants' experiences of ODTD implementation and the meanings they placed on those experiences of ODTD varied in accordance with their intersecting identities of race, class, gender, as well as language competencies. For example, while some participants perceived the achievement of power sharing, those members were part of the dominant culture. Participants who did not perceive equality of power sharing viewed male leaders as leveraging more power than females. Noticing a power imbalance between genders was not the experience of males, but as McIntosh notes, privilege and power are not always apparent to those who possess them (2009).

Examples of male dominance may not necessarily be a refutation of the effectiveness of the ODTD model. Rather, they may extend Brazzel's (2007) contention that changing an organization to support inclusion and diversity is complex and occurs across a continuum, and provide support for Hyde's (2004) assertion that comprehensive achievement of an inclusive workplace is elusive. Further, the study findings that show power imbalances may be more similar to a dimmer switch than to an on-off switch. As participants were performing empowerment-based practices with clients they were, as Cohen (1998) similarly noticed, challenged by power disparities in their organizational structures. Power asymmetries may be best thought of as openly acknowledged and managed by group members, rather than assuming they can be eliminated. Or, as Kezar (1998) warned, participatory models of leadership may simply replace one dominant

culture or paradigm with another, and again force assimilation to that new culture or paradigm.

Though the ODTD model is concerned with balancing power across the organization, not all participants perceived that this was taking place. This discomfort supports Cohen's (1998) assertion that discussing power within organizations is difficult but necessary to the process of balancing it. Participants who noted power asymmetries did not experience this dynamic enough to feel as though they did not fit in, which Cox (1993) asserts, would be a symptom of an organization which does not embrace diversity. Put otherwise, assimilation is just the first stage of the three-stage continuum of inclusion set forth by Brazzel (2007) and would represent a setback to an organization focused on later stages. This study found that the three sites were attempting to move toward the third stage, integration, but all three sites were at various points within the middle stage, differentiation.

The mission of participants was to empower migrant farm worker families who speak languages other than English as their first language. Bilingual staff members noticed a lack of attention on changing the dominant culture to include learning clients' language, while English-only participants did not see a need for becoming bilingual. It was found that no focus from the organizational leadership was placed on learning to speak the language of the clients. Instead, it was assumed that interpreters could solve this problem until clients learned English. However, some participants were puzzled to see co-workers had no interest in or intent learn the language of nearly all of their clients. Language competency, however, was a central feature for some participants who explained the challenges of getting co-workers to understand and care about clients'

culture and needs. The burden of communication was placed on the clients and front-line workers, and each interaction that English-only participants had with clients required an interpreter. English-only participants voiced no feelings of their own language deficiency. Rather, they described their efforts to teach English as a second language to clients. This expectation that clients would assimilate to the dominant culture was precisely the concept that the ODTD model was attempting to upend.

The failure to institute language requirements of staff members who work with non-English-speaking clients was an example of a colorblind practice and a failure to take differences into account, which Smith described as maintaining privilege for those in the dominant culture (2010). These findings were consistent with Capek and Mead (2006), as well as Cohen's (1998) suggestion that organizations must work to become culturally competent to work with diverse client populations.

A shortcoming of the intersectionality framework seems to be that job status, or context, is not emphasized. In this study it was found that power was relative and situational. The theory of positionality extends intersectionality as a framework to include context, or position and status as an important feature of the experience of power (Kezar & Lester, 2010). As staff members moved between work situations and took note of who was in attendance, power and status shifted. Some participants with low status in a work group setting found a high sense of status with clients. Power that participants found in client relationships was due to positional or to earned status with clients that relied on cultural background and languages spoken. Participants used cultural status that, while in some situations functioning as a barrier to achieving status or being seen as legitimate, was used as a leveraging point in other situations. Indeed, through the eyes of

participants, power was found to be situational and dependent upon which identities came into play in relationship to those around them. As individuals discussed their work, they described an ebb and flow of power that was related to their intersecting identities and the context in which they were working. Indeed, identity was at the core of how they were perceived by co-workers, clients, and outside professionals. As Crenshaw (1989) noted, the intersection of identities is cumulative, not additive, so identities matter in work relationships, in spite of what might be considered a marginalizing characteristic in other environments. Adding Kezar's contextual feature to that combination of identities brings a more complete picture of participants' experiences of ODTD.

Limitations

Three factors in the research methodology in this study may limit the findings. This study was conducted at three sites in the Northeast engaged in an ODTD framework that was implemented in similar, but not identical ways across the sites. Participants were chosen using criteria designed to find a representative sample, with each site director having the ability to "cherry pick" to some degree. They were asked to choose participants using the study criteria, so site directors chose participants they believed would best represent the implementation of the ODTD model. The small staff size at each site meant that participants represented a substantial portion of the staff. For example, the Site B staff size was 10 and the participant size was five. It is unclear what, if any, effect this may have had on the results.

Recommendations

Six recommendations from this study are set forth in this section. The following is a discussion of each recommendation. These recommendations are followed by concluding remarks.

The findings of this study showed that participant perceptions of the ODTD training and implementation were rooted in their identities and the identities of their co-workers and clients. Perceptivity of the use of power was keen regardless of whether those individuals lacking or possessing less power than others voiced disapproval. Therefore, for leaders, it is recommended to make clear their intent and extent to share power. If power sharing is their intent, then make clear how accountability will be established and communicated. With that said, a leader cannot expect a staff member to speak out if they do not feel safe in the environment. Surprisingly, disempowered staff members may find a power base in unexpected places. Fortunately, this can be an asset to the organization. Assisting similarly-identified (i.e. similar with respect to race, gender, class, or language) disempowered clients and assisting culturally incompetent co-workers was a strategy used by participants to find meaning in their work. These efforts should be supported by leaders in order to both retain a diverse staff and to more effectively serve clients. Through mentoring, work shadowing, and being treated as in-house experts with commensurate compensation, group members with high cultural competency can be used as assets by bringing group members their skills and knowledge of client populations.

For organizations using an ODTD model to increase inclusion and build cohesive teams, it is recommended to build cultural competency both within the organization and with clients. The findings of this study revealed a mixture of competencies present and

lacking in each of these areas. Addressing both cultural competency and the use of working agreements to build trust and share power proved a useful pairing. Additionally, building cultural competency for improved staff interactions may simultaneously improve cultural competency with clients and vice versa (Cohen, 1998; Hyde, 2004). For staff members having shared identities with clients, a power-leveraging effect may occur putting in place the dual effect of strengthening client relationships while bridging relations between clients and other staff members, and staff member to staff member relationships. A danger was found to exist, however, of an over-reliance on staff members with deep cultural competencies with clients by staff members with inadequate cultural and/or language skills. As stated in above, rather than becoming a crutch these competencies can be used as a training asset to group members in need of additional skills.

The findings of this study showed that some staff members were more receptive than others to the principles of the ODTD framework. Rather than force the framework onto staff members who hold negative feelings or even hostility toward such a model, pursue a means of determining receptivity prior to hiring new staff members (Nai-Wen & Tzu-Shian, 2008). Making such a determination may be as simple as asking relevant questions during an interview, reviewing resumes with an interest in finding examples or lack of examples of a candidate's working with diverse groups, and asking references for their opinion of the candidate's work with diverse teams and/or clientele. Further, asking a candidate whether they feel they have any sort of privilege and how they have managed it in a work environment may provide helpful information (McIntosh, 2009). At a minimum, ascertaining whether or not fear of potential client and co-worker identities

exists would prove useful in finding employee-organization fit. This front-end hiring focus is a long-term strategy requiring an organization to reflect on what qualities it values most when making hiring and promotion decisions. If one of those values is the ability to share power and work as an equal in a non-traditional way such as in the ODTD model, then it is critical to determine how to ascertain those qualities in applicants and current team members.

Working agreements were artifacts of ODTD implementation. As teams engaged in efforts to share power and building inclusivity within the team, working agreements became a concrete representation of that intent. Working agreements were said to be 'the rules' as the organization implemented the ODTD model. Leveling the playing field, the working agreement provided a means for participants to make explicit their needs and values as they worked with team members. Outcomes of using working agreements included increased trust levels, collaboration, inclusivity of diverse team members, collective wisdom, and shared power.

Because working agreements were an effective means of determining the rules, building trust, and sharing power among team members, it may follow that using working agreements to build trust and share power might be helpful to forge shared understandings between collaborating agencies. For example, as organizations and foundering organizations work collaboratively toward shared goals, working agreements may elicit shared wisdom and trust. As funding organizations wish to diversify their recipient base, both funders and grantees may appreciate the utility of working agreements in building relationships with people and organizations holding vastly different identities from their own. Through building a consensus document aimed at

making explicit what is often an opaque funder-recipient arrangement, working agreements may provide a means of building long-term, open relationships. In addition, sharing power with staff to model shared power-empowerment principles for client organization may be an effective means of building true partnership and collective wisdom.

As funders and policy makers control resources and agendas, working with human service agencies to incorporate these recommendations may substantially change the power dynamic, and thus, the outcomes of funder-recipient and policy-maker-stakeholder relationships. The study findings hint that when staff members are empowered to share in decision making and policy formation, clients benefit through transference of these principles. It is logical, though not proven, that this same transference may occur if funders and policy makers similarly share power with recipients and stakeholders. This dynamic presents an area for further research.

Each participant viewed power and its uses from their own unique perspective. Intersections of identity and the position occupied within an organization impacted how each person viewed the use of power by others. A key finding was that these perceptions were not held by the person who was being discussed by the participant, so the target of the discussion was unaware of how he or she was perceived by others. It is recommended, then, that members of organizations, particularly leaders, understand that regardless of their intentions, perceptions by others of their use of power may be quite different from their own. Indeed, each person in the organization will have a different perception based on their own intersecting identities and status within the organization (Kezar & Lester, 2010). Surprisingly perhaps, leaders may find that building consensus

without taking power and difference into account may have the unintended consequence of the assimilation of group members (Kezar, 1998).

Shared power in an organizational structure seems to be transferred from staff member to client, in at least some cases. If an organization holds client empowerment as a value, implementing a pluralistic leadership structure with shared power and attention to intersecting identities of staff members may serve as a means of modeling empowerment practices. This serves to model this value internally so that staff members may perform externally in a similar way. Though it was not the focus of this study, this finding was supported by other researchers (Cohen, 1998; Hyde & Hopkins, 2004).

Conclusion

A common criticism of diversity initiatives is that they seek to merely help participants understand the experiences of "the other" or people who they perceive as different from themselves rather than to change the underlying dynamics of power and oppression (Collins, 2000). Efforts such at ODTD implementation go beyond sensitivity training by attending to structural equity issues across the organization. The idea that successfully leveraging the rewards of a diversified workforce requires more than bias reduction in group members (Cox, 1993; Ely & Thomas, 1996; Miller & Katz, 2002) was supported by the complexity and systemic nature of the phenomenon in the study findings. Mor-Barak's (2005) assertion that a diversity initiative must be more than a program was also found to be supported by the ODTD model implementation in the study. Indeed, Hyde's (1998) finding that long-term structural attention must be paid to build inclusion is supported by the many years of engagement in ODTD implementation reported by participants.

Reasons for the failure of diversity initiatives cited in the literature include a failure to fully address issues of discrimination and marginalization, a failure to view diversity as organizational change, and a failure to address systemic issues including power and control in the organization (Metzler, 2003). The findings show that in the ODTD framework, each of these three concerns were addressed, however, there was more to be done to overcome them. There was a long-term and focused effort in place, ODTD implementation. Attempts to neutralize or manage power and difference in organizations require a long-term commitment, as well as an effective structure. ODTD addresses both, and recipients note that developing working agreements as a tool for establishing behavioral expectations and boundaries is the glue that holds the structure together.

The findings indicate that when viewed through Brazzel's (2007) Continuum of Inclusive Practices, the participants seemed to be most rooted in the differentiation phase of the three-stage model because of the value placed on understanding difference and attempting to share power across the organization. Further, as participants of this study reported and several researchers have found, the organization was achieving better decision making and morale (Nai-Wen & Tzu-Shian, 2008; Pelled, 1996).

In light of the study findings, the factors that were the most difficult to overcome were negotiating power asymmetry across the organization, understanding how power is perceived when used by others, and genuinely taking differences into account when expressing the values of the organization through practices. The positive outcomes of long-term engagement in ODTD implementation were significant to participants. They included psychological safety in work groups which more fully engaged members in

open discussion. It was perceived by participants that this led to collective wisdom and increased comfort and feelings of inclusion by group members. Working agreements played a major role in maintaining an environment in which power sharing was attempted and in many cases perceived to be successful. In cases where the ODTD implementation failed to adequately address power asymmetry, participants valued the attempts made to create a more equitable arrangement. Cultural competency, unfortunately, became more of a burden for those possessing it rather than a structurally recognized, leveraged asset. The privilege of a White, English-speaking identity appeared to inhibit recognition of the need to develop new language skills needed to best communicate with clients

References

Adams, M., Blumenfeld, W. J., Castaneda, C., Hackmen, H. W., Peters, M. L., & Zuniga, X. (Eds.). (2010). Readings for diversity and social justice (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63, 18.

Antonio, D. M. S., & Gamage, D. T. (2007). Building trust among educational stakeholders through Participatory School Administration, Leadership and Management. Management in Education, 21(1), 15-22.

Bitonti, C., Albers, E., & Reilly, T. (1996). Multicultural competence in Nevada Human Services: A statewide survey. Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 4(4), 67-83.

Blackmore, J. (2006). Deconstructing Diversity Discourses in the Field of Educational Management and Leadership. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 34(2), 181-199.

Boris, E. T., Leon, E. d., Roeger, K. L., & Nikolova, M. (2010). Human Service Nonprofits and Government Collaboration: Findings from the 2010 National Survey of Nonprofit government contracting and grants. Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Bradford, D. L., & Burke, W. (Eds.). (2005). Reinventing organization development: New approaches to change in organizations (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Brazzel, M. (2007). Deep diversity, social justice, and organization development. Paper presented at the Organization Development Conference.

Brown, K. M. (2006). Leadership for Social Justice and Equity: Evaluating a Transformative Framework and Andragogy. Educational Administration Quarterly, 42(5), 700-745.

Capek, M. E., & Mead, M. (2006). Effective philanthropy: Organization success through deep diversity and gender equality. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Chan, A. (2005). Policy discourses and changing practice: Diversity and the university-college. Higher Education, 50(1), 129-157.

Chemers, M. M., Oskamp, S., & Costanzo, M. A. (1995). Diversity in organizations (Vol. 8). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cohen, M. B. (1998). Perceptions of power in client/worker relationships. Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 79(4), 433-442.

Collins, M. H. (2000). Race, class, and gender: An anthology (4th ed.): Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Comptroller, N. Y. S. (2010). New York State's Not-for-Proft Sector.   Retrieved July 1, 2011, from http://www.osc.state.ny.us/reports/economic/nfp2010.pdf

Cook-Daniels, L. (2008). Transforming Mental health services for Older people: Gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) challenges and opportunities. Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 4(4), 469-483.

Cox, T. (1993). Cultural Diversity in Oganizations: Theory, Research & Practice. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist criticque of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 139-167.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (Second ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cross, E. (2000). Managing diversity: The courage to lead. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Cunningham, G. B. (2009). Understanding the diversity-related change process: A field study. Journal of Sports Management, 23, 21.

Denson, N. (2009). Do Curricular and Cocurricular Diversity Activities Influence Racial Bias? A Meta-Analysis. Review of Higher Education, 79(2), 805-838.

DiTomaso, N., Post, C., & Parks-Yancy, R. (2007). Workforce Diversity and Inequality: Power, Status, and Numbers. Annual Review of Sociology, 33(1), 473-501.

Dovidio, J. F., Gluszek, A., John, M.-S., Ditlmann, R., & Lagunes, P. (2010). Understanding bias toward Latinos: Discrimination, dimensions of difference, and experience of exclusion. Journal of Social Issues, 66(1), 59-78.

EEOC. (2011). Titles I and V of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Retrieved from http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/ada.cfm.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. Harvard Business Review, 74(5), 79-90.

Evans, M. (1997). Shifting the leadership focus from control to empowerment--a case study. School Leadership & Management, 17(2), 273.

Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5(1), 11.

Fields, C. (2005). Summers to Improve College Climate. Change, 37(5), 7-7.

Findler, L., Wind, L. H., & Mor Barak, M. E. (2007). The challenge of workforce management in a global society: Modeling the relationship between diversity, inclusion, organizational culture, and employee well-being, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Administration in Social Work, 31(3), 63-94.

Fine, M. G. (1996). Building successful multicultural organizations: challenges and opportunities. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gonzalez, J. A. (2010). Diversity change in organizations: A systemic, multilevel, and nonlinear process. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 46(2), 197-219.

Grønbjerg, K. A. (2001). The U.S. nonprofit human service sector: A creeping revolution. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 30(2), 276-297.

Gurin, P., Nagda, B. R. A., & Lopez, G. E. (2003). The Benefits of Diversity in Education for Democratic Citizenship. Journal of Social Issues.

Hanlin, C. E., Prilleltensky, I., & Evans, S. D. (2007). Blending ameliorative and transformative approaches in human service organizations: A case study. Journal of Community Psychology, 35(3), 329-346.

Harvey, C. P., & Allard, M. J. (1995). Understanding Diversity: Readings, Cases, and
Exercises. New York: Harper-Collins College Publishers.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing
Campus Climates for Racial/Ethnic Diversity: Educational Policy and Practice.
The Review of Higher Education, 21(3), 279-302.

Hyde, C. A. (1998). A model for diversity training in human services agencies.
Administration in Social Work, 22(4), 19-33.

Hyde, C. A. (2004). Multicultural development in human services agencies: Challenges
and solutions. Social Work, 49(1), 7-16.

Hyde, C. A., & Hopkins, K. (2004). Diversity climates in human service agencies: An
exploratory assessment. Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work,
13(2), 25-43.

Iverson, S. V. (2007). Camouflaging Power and Privilege: A Critical Race Analysis of
University Diversity Policies. Educational Administration Quarterly, 43(5), 586-
611.

Jogulu, U., & Wood, G. (2007). Power struggle [staff empowerment]. Engineering
Management, 17(3), 36-37.

Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the
efficacy of corporate Affirmative Action and diversity policies. American
Sociological Review, 71(4), 589-617.

Kanter, R. M. (1981). Power, Leadership, and Participatory Management. Theory Into
Practice, 20(4), 219.

Kezar, A. (1998). Exploring new avenues for leading community colleges: The paradox of participatory models. Community College Review, 25(4), 75.

Kezar, A. (2000). Pluralistic leadership: Incorporating diverse voices. The Journal of Higher Education, 71(6), 722-743.

Kezar, A. (2001). Investigating Organizational Fit in a Participatory Leadership Environment. Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management, 23(1), 85-101.

Kezar, A. (2008). Understanding Leadership Strategies for Addressing the Politics of Diversity. The Journal of Higher Education, 79(4), 406-441.

Kezar, A. (2010). Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development. Journal of Higher Education, 81(5), 670-671.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2008). Advancing diversity agendas on campus: examining transactional and transformational presidential leadership styles. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 11(4), 379-405.

Kezar, A., & Lester, J. (2010). Breaking the barriers of essentialism in leadership research: Positionality as a promising approach. Feminist Formations, 22(1), 163-185.

Kieffer, C. (1981). The Emergence of Empowerment: The development of participatory competence among individuals in citizen organizations. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

LeRoux, K. (2009). Managing stakeholder demands. Administration & Society, 41(2), 158-184.

Loden, M. (1996). Implementing diversity. Chicago, IL: Irwin Professional Publishing.

Longerbeam, S. d., Sedlacek, W. E., Balon, D. G., & Alimo, C. (2005). The multicultural myth: A study of multicultural program organizations at three public research universities. Journal of College Student Development, 46(1), 11.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). Deisgning qualitative research (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Mathewson, B. G. (2009). Interview. In C. H. Hinesley (Ed.). Rochester, NY.

Mathewson, B. G. (2010). Opening Doors Diversity Project: What makes Opening Doors different?   Retrieved September 1, 2011, 2011, from http://diversity-project.org/openingdoors/different.html

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. Signs, 30(3), 1771-1800.

McIntosh, P. (2009). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In A. L. Ferber, A. O. R. Herrera, C. M. Jimenez & D. R. Samuels (Eds.), The Matrix Reader: Examining the dynamics of power and oppression. New York, NY: MacGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation. San Francisco, CA: Lohn Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Metzler, C. J. (2003). Ten reasons why diversity initiatives fail. The Diversity Factor: Diversity in practice, 11(2), 5. Retrieved from http://www.afpvancouver.memlink.org/presentation/Ten-Reasons-Why-Diversity-Initiatives-Fail-pdf.pdf

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Miller, F. A., & Katz, J. H. (2002). The inclusion breakthrough: Unleashing the real

    power of diversity. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Mor-Barak, M. (2005). Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace.

    Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Muller, L. E. (1994). Toward an understanding of empowerment: A study of six women

    leaders. [Article]. Journal of Humanistic Education & Development, 33(2), 75.

Nai-Wen, C., & Tzu-Shian, H. (2008). Exploring the linkages between formal ownership

    and psychological ownership for the organization: The mediating role of

    organizational justice. Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology,

    81(4), 691-711.

Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Making it safe: the effects of leader

    inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement

    efforts in health care teams. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27(7), 941-966.

Nichols, J. C., Ferguson, F., & Fisher, R. (2005). Educational Pluralism: A Compelling

    State Interest. Journal of College Admission(189), 21-28.

Nishii, L. H., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Do inclusive leaders help to reduce turnover in

    diverse groups? The moderating role of leader–member exchange in the diversity

    to turnover relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(6), 1412-1426.

Noon, M. (2007). The fatal flaws of diversity and the business case for ethnic minorities.

    Work, Employment & Society, 21(4), 773-784.

Nyatanga, B. (2002). Culture, palliative care and multiculturalism. International Journal

    of Palliative Nursing, 8(5), 240.

Offermann, L. R. (2004). Encyclopedia of Leadership: Sage Publications.

Parasnis, I., Samar, V. J., & Fischer, S. D. (2005). Deaf College Students' Attitudes Toward Racial/Ethnic Diversity, Campus Climate, and Role Models. [Article]. American Annals of the Deaf, 150(1), 47-58.

Pelled, L. H. (1996). Demographic Diversity, Conflict, and Work Group Outcomes: An Intervening Process Theory. Organization Science, 7(6), 615-631.

Perkins, D. D., & Zimmerman, M. A. (1995). Empowerment Theory, Research, and Application. American Journal of Community Psychology, 23(5), 569-579.

Petersen, A. (2006). An African American woman with disabilities: the intersection of gender, race and disability. Disability & Society, 21(7), 721-734.

Pewewardy, C., & Frey, B. (2002). Surveying the Landscape: Perceptions of Multicultural Support Services and Racial Climate at a Predominantly White University. [Article]. Journal of Negro Education, 71(1/2), 77.

Quinn, G. L., & Staines, R. P. (1979). Quality of employment survey, 1973-1977: Panel/principal investigator. Paper presented at the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Rappaport, J., Swift, C. F., & Hess, R. (1984). Studies in Empowerment: Steps toward understanding and action: Routledge.

Rawls, J. (1971). A theory of justice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard College.

Rees, C. J. (2007). Organization development in the 21st Century, 21st Century Management: A Reference Handbook: Sage Publications.

Rice, N. (2006). Opportunities Lost, Possibilities Found: Shared Leadership and Inclusion in an Urban High School. Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 17(2), 88-100.

Rivera, A. C., & Seidman, E. (2004). Encyclopedia of Applied Developmental Science: Sage Publications.

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15, 13.

Rogers-Sirin, L., & Sirin, S. R. (2009). Cultural competence as an ethical requirement: Introducing a new educational model. [doi:10.1037/a0013762]. Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2(1), 19-29.

Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2003). Techniques to identify themes. Field Methods, 15(1), 24.

Salamon, L. M. (2002). The state of nonprofit America. (June 13, 2011). Retrieved from http://www.netlibrary.com/urlapi.asp?action=summary&v=1&bookid=91982

Salamon, L. M. (2003). The resilient sector: The state of nonprofit America. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Salamon, L. M. (2005). Strengthening Transparency Governance Accountability of Charitable Organizations: A final report to Congress and the Nonprofit Sector. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector.

Scandura, T. A., & Green, G. B. (1984). The moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of leadership intervention. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 8.

Schein, E. H. (2004). Organizational Climate and Culture, Encyclopedia of Leadership: Sage Publications.

Sector, I. (2010). What is a nonprofit?   Retrieved 1-2-2011, 2011, from http://www.independentsector.org/nonprofit

Smith, D. G. (2010). Diversity's promise for higher education: Making it work. Baltimore, MD: John's Hopkins University Press.

Staff. (2010). Intersectionalities of Race and Gender and Leadership. Gender and Women's Leadership: A Reference Handbook. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage Publications.

Sumter, M. (2006). Domestic violence and diversity: A call for multicultural services. Journal of Health & Human Services Administration, 29(2), 173-190.

Tajfel, H. (1981). Intergroup behavior. In J. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), Intergroup Behavior (1981 ed., pp. 144-167): Oxford: Blackwell.

Thomas, R. (1991). Beyond race and gender. New York, NY: Amacon.

Tran, V., Garcia-Prieto, P., & Schneider, S. (2011). The role of social identity, appraisal, and emotion in determining responses to diversity management. Human Relations, 64(2), 17.

West, C. (1993). Race matters. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Wing, K. T., Roeger, K. L., & Pollak, T. H. (2010). The Nonprofit Sector in brief: Charities, giving and volunteering, 2010. Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute, Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy.

Winker, G., & Degele, N. (2011). Intersectionality as multi-level analysis: Dealing with social inequality. European Journal of Women's Studies, 18(1), 51-66.

Zanoni, P., Janssens, M., Benschop, Y., & Nkomo, S. (2010). Guest editorial: Unpacking diversity, grasping inequality: Rethinking difference through critical perspectives. Organization, 17(1), 9-29.

Zimmerman, M., Israel, B. A., Schulz, A., & Checkoway, B. (1992). Further explorations

    in empowerment theory: An empirical analysis of psychological empowerment.

    American Journal of Community Psychology, 20(6), 20.

Appendix A

Participant Invitation

Dear Staff Member:

Congratulations! You have been selected to participate in a 30-60 minute

interview as part of a research study to document your experiences with the "partnership"

process. The purpose of the research is to understand your perceptions of the training and

coaching you have received and to find similarities across multiple sites like yours. If

willing, you are asked to respond by email to Christopher (Henry) Hinesley at

CHH04448@SJFC.EDU by May 12, 2011 to schedule your interview. At that time you

will be sent a consent form that will explain the process and provide you with the

opportunity to choose whether or not to enter the study.

Your participation is fully supported by your supervisor and the organization, and

your time will be treated as regular work time. The information collected in the study

will be anonymous. No part of the findings will provide information that is particular to

any one person, and multiple sites have been selected to take part in the study in order to

further protect the study participants. If you request a copy of the findings a copy will be

made available to you. You may be contacted a second time if the researcher needs to ask

clarifying questions. Additional information, as well as an informed consent form

detailing your rights as a participant will be provided prior to your interview. Your input

is extremely valuable to this process, so I hope you will consider taking part in this study.

Sincerely,

Christopher Henry Hinesley, Doctoral Candidate
St. John Fisher College

Appendix B

Informed Consent Form

Title of study: A Phenomenological Study of "Organizational Development Targeting Diversity" in Nonprofit Human Service Organizations

Name of researcher: Christopher (Henry) Hinesley

Faculty Supervisor: Jeannine Dingus-Eason, PhD.   Phone for further information:

585-414-9979

Purpose of study: To understand the experiences of staff members in a non-profit human services organization who have been engaged in organizational development targeting diversity.

Approval of study: This study has been reviewed and approved by the St. John Fisher College Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Place of study: participants' work site

Length of participation: 30-60 minutes

Risks and benefits: There are no known physical risks to participation in this study. Some participants may experience mental aggravation at recalling difficult circumstances or experiences within their organization.

Method for protecting confidentiality/privacy: All data collected will be made anonymous through coding of names and demographic information. The researcher will password protect electronic files, as well as physically locking paper files in a secure cabinet.

Participation: Your role in this study is to describe your experiences related to your training and involvement in the "partnership" process. You will be asked a variety of questions, and you will be asked to answer them as best you can. No one other than the researcher will have access to the information you provide, however, the information you provide may appear in the text of the findings. All responses will be made anonymous in the findings, with every possible effort made to protect individuals from being identifiable.

Your rights: As a research participant, you have the right to:

1.   Have the purpose of the study, and the expected risks and benefits fully explained to you before you choose to participate.

2.   Withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

3.   Refuse to answer a particular question without penalty.

4.   Be informed of appropriate alternative procedures or courses of treatment, if any, that might be advantageous to you.

5.   Be informed of the results of the study.

I have read the above, received a copy of this form, and I agree to participate in the above-named study.

Print name (Participant)   Signature   Date

_____   _____   _____

Print name (Investigator)   Signature   Date

Christopher (Henry) Hinesley   _____   _____

If you have any further questions regarding this study, please contact the researcher listed above. If you experience emotional or physical discomfort due to participation in this study, please contact the Office of Academic Affairs at 385-8034 or the Wellness Center at 385-8280 for appropriate referrals.

Appendix C

Interview #1 Protocol

Q1   As we begin, I'd like to understand a little about you. Tell me about your
      background, specifically, what information about your neighborhood and the
      schools you attended.

Q2   Describe your job. What led you to working here? What is important or
      interesting to you about your work here?

Q3   As I explained earlier, I am interested in the training you have received on
      "partnership". Please tell me about it.

Q4   Why do you think the training about power and oppression is needed? What
      elements of the training seem important to you?

Q5   In the retreat there is a focus on dominant and oppressed identities. Why do you
      think there is a focus on examining identity?

Q6   How you think your identities influence your work, specifically, how do your co-
      workers react to your identities?

Q7   What, if any, identities of your co-workers or clients that you find challenging to
      deal with? How do you handle that?

Q8   How would you explain how the "partnership" idea works here, to someone new to
      the organization?

Q9   What connections do you find between "partnership' and how power is used? How
      do you feel the principles are playing out here?

Q10   Has your experience with "partnership" affected the way you feel about your job?
      How?

Q11   How do you use working agreements called for by the "partnership" model?

Q12   How do you think your co-workers feel about "partnership"?

Q13   What changes do you suggest, if any, to the training or the way you receive it?

Q14   Is there anything else you think I should know about your experience with the
      "partnership" process?

Appendix D

Demographic Data Checklist

Name/Pseudonym

Age   ___under 25   ___25-34   ___35-44   ___45-59   ___60+

Gender   ___Female   ___Male   ___Other   ___Transgender

Sexual orientation ___heterosexual (straight)
                  ___gay or lesbian
                  ___bisexual
                  ___other
                  ___I choose not to provide this information.

Race/Ethnicity   ___Hispanic

(Check all that   ___African American   ___Pacific Islander
apply.)
                 ___White/Caucasian   ___Asian

                 ___Other   ___Native American/First Peoples

Years at   ___<2 years   ___2-4 years   ___more than 4 years
organization

"Partnership"
Training (Please   ___month/year of attending 3-day
check all that   retreat_____
apply)
                 ____power and difference
                 workshops_____

                 ___ diversity leadership coaching
                 _____

                 ___strategic planning
                 _____

                 ___strategic diversity recruitment workshop
                 _____

                 ___managing diversity skills training
                 _____

                                       _____other (please name)

Years in
current position   ___<2 years   ___2-4 years   ___more than 4 years

Job title   _____

Formal education   ___Completed high school/GED   ____Some college

(Check all that   ___Associate's degree ___Completed college

apply.)   ___Graduate degree ____Ph.D. or Ed.D.   ___Military

experience ___Other

Appendix E

Working Agreements (sample)

1. Submit paperwork in a timely way.

2. Cooperation

3. Give a reason when you can't fulfill a request.

4. Live by our goals and mission.

5. Commit to communicate at a high level.

6. Balance time effectiveness and skill when making and completing

   assignments and meeting goals.

7. Uninterrupted staff meetings

8. Announce to the group if you have a crisis that requires you to keep your

   cell phone on in meetings.

9. Plan ahead.

10. When planning, document the process, define next steps, assign tasks and

    communicate it.

11. Trust, understanding, cooperation

12. Trust the best of intentions.

13. Create buddy system to connect with people absent from meeting before

    and after.

14. Have FUN.

15. In our meetings we agree to clarify and come to resolution on all

    issues/topics before moving on.