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The Role of Business in Identity-Based Conflict
A Case Study of Peace-Building in a Business Context

Abstract

By

WASSEEM ABAZA

This study explores peace-building in identity-based conflict within a business setting, adding to the body of knowledge by seeking to understand the relationship between business and positive social development. Specific emphasis is placed on understanding the aspects of business that foster cooperation among identity groups in conflict. Addressing individual needs as well as creating a safe space for communication and a shared workplace identity that supersedes that of the conflicting identities are required for the peace-building process. This is done by providing economic incentives for rivals to join the company and maintaining organizational norms geared toward mutual understanding, affirming that business can be used for peace-building by addressing both economic and identity issues associated with violent conflicts. Utilizing an Appreciative Inquiry influenced methodology; this study focuses on a successful case study in order to learn how this has been achieved and how this can be applied elsewhere. The final outcome is a generalizable model, with some noted limitations, of how corporations can promote peace in identity-based conflicts.
Chapter 1: Introduction

There are good men and bad men of all nationalities, creeds and colors; and if this world of ours is ever to become what we hope someday it may become, it must be by the general recognition that the man's heart and soul, the man's worth and actions, determine his standing.

-Theodore Roosevelt

Human systems have a tendency to evolve in the direction of positive images that are the brightest, the boldest and that focus on visions of a desired future (Cooperrider, 1999; Fry et. al, 2002; Watkins, Mohr & Kelly, 2011). Ethical values and powerful images together are influential in shaping collective consciousness (Broms & Gahmberg, 1983; Cooperrider, 1999; Fry et. al, 2002). Positive psychology holds that human nature tends toward positivity, which implies at some level that conflict is created and is not an intrinsic aspect of being human (Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2005). As such, conflict could be conceptualized as a stumbling-block for natural human activity so studying how to resolve it is in some ways studying how to return to the path of 'natural' human development. It is this idea that forms the foundation for this study; understanding how business is used to foster peace-building by bringing rival members of identity-groups together by supporting factors that lead to the formation of a new workplace identity that fosters cooperation, as a way to restore 'humanity' or peace to a system.

Past attempts at mediating conflict through government or NGO's have had various degrees of success, however, the private sector has become an influential player in many conflict areas, proving more adequate to facilitate
peace-building because of dramatic political, socio-economic and technological developments that have changed both the context of business and the nature of conflict (Nelson, 2000). Jane Nelson (2000) states that “violent conflict is becoming an unavoidable business issue” (pg. 5), which cannot be overstated enough since the costs of conflict is so high. According to the 2013 Global Peace Index, the global cost of containing violence is about $9.46 billion annually. This more than the annual value of global agricultural production and is equal to about 11% of global gross domestic production. Further, 51% of the cost of containing conflict is just on military expenditures or $4.8 billion annually. The next largest portion of the total cost is from homicides, which accounts for 15% of the total annual expenditures or $1.42 billion annually. That is $1.42 billion annual financial loss due exclusively to the loss in life (Institute for Economics and Peace, 2013), which can crudely translate into the loss of a potential labor force. As such, it is clear why the private sector has a vital role in wealth creation and promoting socio-economic development (2000).

Such development also comes with job opportunities, leading to the assertion that groups in conflict will be willing to work with each other in a company when the need for employment outweighs the perceived gains from participating in the conflict. This does not necessarily mean that they have given up the conflict but that the need for gainful employment and sustenance has reached a point where working in the same physical space as a rival is acceptable if the company requires it. While doing so, they can form a new, shared identity that can supersede the separate identities in conflict, which has
the potential to lead to a lessening of conflict if not resolution in part or in whole. More precisely, this study seeks to understand the aspects of an enterprise that bring two groups in conflict together and promote alternative concepts of identity that lessen or replace the identities fueling the conflict. I further contend that this peace-building process can be replicated among multiple types of identity-based conflicts.

This study explores the use of business for conflict resolution and/or peace-building with a specific focus on identity-based conflicts. An abundance of research has studied the relationship between economics and social decay (Collier, 2000; Luckham et al., 2001; Cramer, 2002; Humphreys, 2003; Collier, 2006; Kim & Conceicao, 2009). However, these studies look at how the lack of economic prosperity leads to societal problems. This study adds to the body of knowledge by seeking to understand the opposite side of the relationship: how economic development leads to social development, and more specifically, how business can be used to promote peace while maintaining profitability.

Purpose

Of primary concern to this study is (1) the use of business to promote peace between groups involved in an identity-based conflict and (2) the development of a model for how this is done that can be applied to any region experiencing identity-based conflict. Conflict in this study is defined as an “intense disagreement process between... independent parties when they

---

1 By type of identity-based conflict I mean the various forms of identity that are the basis for conflicts. For example, conflicts between religious groups or conflicts between ethnic groups, etc.
perceive incompatible interests, viewpoints, processes, and/or goals” (Ting-Toomey, 1994; Ting-Toomey et al., 2000). Thus, I define Identity-based conflicts as situations where this animosity exists between groups when the perceived incompatibility is based on differences in identity and misconceptions of what the other identity represents. This occurs because identification with a group, referred to as group membership (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), means the promotion of that group and the demotion of the other.

Group membership is drawn directly from Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and Social-Categorization Theory (Brewer, 1979), both viewing identity as an inherent categorization of people into distinct groups through a socialization process. However, research has shown that multiple identities can exist for individuals and resolving conflict based on identity can be done by reprioritizing identities in conflict by creating a new shared identity that is relatively stronger than the pre-existing identities (Huddy, 2001). Here I contend that the shared goal of financial stability and the promotion of dialogue, through colocation of opposing group members within a business setting, fosters the creation of a shared-identity, which can then lead to peace-building. The theoretical underpinnings of this idea are explained further in chapter 2.

There is little research that has sought to explain the influence that the private sector has on conflicts (Nelson, 2000), however, some anecdotal evidence would suggest that corporations are generally perceived negatively because many times they monetize ethical obligations, eroding the morality behind them in favor of economic gains (Korten, 2007; Sandel, 2012). Later, the
link between economics and social decay will be discussed but as will be shown most research links social health and wellbeing to the lack of economic development, not to its abundance. Because of the increasing social significance of corporations and business in many regions of the world (Nelson, 2000), the focus here is how business can be used in a positive way to promote resolution and peace, initially in the workplace but with a future outlook of extending into the community. In this way, business is viewed merely as a tool that can be used for good or bad and that, with the tremendous influence the private sector has, a great deal of good can be done through business, not in spite of it. As such, the guiding principle of this research is an appreciative one looking at business as an agent for peace.

For business to promote peace it is important to understand what is meant by peace. Most definitions of peace in literature are based on a depreciative view of peace similar to definitions such as “the reduction of violence, unrest, and war” (Fort & Schipani, 2002; Spreitzer, 2007). While the lack of violence is a significant aspect of peace, it does not encompass the full extent of peace. For example, outside of a series of proxy wars, the cold war between Russia and the US was still plagued with antagonism, mistrust and mutual hostility without direct engagement (Sandy & Perkins, 2002).

A proper definition encompasses both what is absent as well as what is present. Since this study seeks to understand the elements of business that lead to peace-building, what is required is a definition that includes what form that peace takes, an inherently appreciative and tangible outcome that can be
observed. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, Peace is defined as the absence of any form of violence and bloodshed and the presence of “positive factors that foster cooperation among human groups with ostensibly different cultural patterns so that social justice can be done and human potential can freely develop…” (Sandy & Perkins, 2002).

The aim of this study is to identify elements of business that work toward the goal of building peace in order to create a model for other businesses to follow. The following diagram [see Figure 1] outlines the proposed framework for how this process could look. To understand how this is done, this study addresses three key questions:

1. What external conditions facilitate the use of business for peace-building?
2. What internal processes within a business promote peace-building between members of conflicting identity groups within an employment context?
3. Can the process for peace-building in business be applied to other businesses?

Question one refers to the need to understand the context in which the corporations operate. It is significant because it addresses the need for an environment conducive to the normal functioning of business as a base-line requirement before any concern for promoting peace can be undertaken. In this sense, the external conditions in which a company operates function as a screening process for corporations and a necessary step to include in a model for other corporations involved in conflict resolution. The significance of understanding the context will be discussed further in chapter 2.
The second question is really the heart of the study where elements of business tied directly to peace-building are explored. Here, four elements are sought related to the creation of a shared-identity, the foundation for building peace in identity-based conflicts. These four elements will serve as the research questions guiding the data collection as described in Chapter 3. They are:

1. Will the economic gain through meaningful employment increase the willingness to engage in communication with those on the opposite side of an identity-based conflict?

2. Will communication at the workplace between employees on opposite sides of an identity-based conflict lead to mutual understanding?

3. Will mutual understanding between groups in conflict lead to the creation of a shared workplace identity?

4. Will the creation of a shared workplace identity promote cooperation and peace-building?

As can be seen, the four link together and form an interwoven line of thought or a proposed process, leading to a shared identity and the resultant peace-building outcomes. As will be shown in chapter 2, a shared identity is crucial to peace-building. It is possible that a shared identity is formed from different elements and this very point is why the study proceeds as an exploration. If all four questions are answered affirmatively, then it is contended that individuals, out of a desire for employment and financial wellbeing, will be willing to work for companies hiring members of both sides of a conflict and then, through a process while there, fostered by creating a certain level of intentional interdependence, end up creating a shared-identity based on mutual understanding that can then be taken back to their respective groups. Figure 1
below outlines this proposed process. These four elements are described further in chapter 3.

Figure 1: Proposed Process for Peace-Building in a Business Context

The third question goes to the overall purpose of the study and that is the creation of a model for the use of business in promoting peace. This study is an exploration into the elements of business that work toward creating conflict resolution but it is meant to be prescriptive. That is, the final outcome is to be a generalizable outline, with defined limitations of what corporations can do or put in place to promote peace in identity-based conflicts. As such, while the
preliminary outcome of conducting this study is a descriptive understanding of how businesses contribute to peace, the overall intention is to be prescriptive. The last point is important to keep in mind as this proposed process only exists within a business context. It is intentionally micro focused on employee relations and not group relations in general. This study is meant to be a first step toward understanding the role of business in peace-building in that it looks at how it is done within a company. Further research is planned for expanding the focus to a societal level by studying the influence the internal process has on the external conditions of the conflict. In that way, the findings from here will link to a macro level understanding of the use of business for peace-building.

Case Study: Homeboy Industries

Using Appreciative Inquiry as a guide, this study attempts to uncover best practices of a company that have worked to reduce violence and promote cooperation among highly contentious identity groups. This, by definition, requires the study of a business enterprise that has found success in promoting peace-building between identity groups in conflict. As such, an in-depth case study approach is taken to understand how successful processes have led to cooperation and from this is distilled a model for testing and application in other regions experiencing identity-based conflict, such those found in the Middle East or South Asia.

Fostering cooperation within a business context is the main focus of this study but not without consideration of the business concerns of any company.
For a company to be considered as a case study it must create sustainable value, that is, it must create value for stakeholders while also creating value for shareholders (Laszlo, 2003). Value for shareholders is important as this will maintain the going concern of the company. Value for stakeholders is the important aspect that this study seeks to understand as this value comes in the form of peace-building by creating a new identity. Here, stakeholders include members of rival identity groups within a violent conflict. To this end, the choice of company is crucial and so three attributes for inclusion in this study have been identified based on the study parameters.

First, the business must have economic or some demonstrated business benefit. The usual measure for this is profitability but any measurable economic benefit to the business is acceptable. The point of this attribute is that the company is functioning and benefiting as a business. This is significant because the business side must be maintained so that the company can continue to operate into the future, without exclusive dependence on charity as is the case with some non-profit organizations. Without this, the social benefit the business creates would not continue either so it is important that the business can sustain itself as a business.

Second, the business must create positive social value in the form of fostering cooperation. This is the stakeholder value creation that allows the economically viable business to create sustainable value. The social value of the company is what this study seeks to uncover in terms of the internal processes that lead to cooperation among identity groups in conflict. In this sense, the
company must go beyond just operating as for company benefit but must also include some social value creation. As will be discussed, this does not necessarily have to be the purpose of the company. It just has to happen as a result of the business.

Lastly, the business must be willing to hire employees who are members of opposing identity groups. This may seem redundant with the social value creation above but it is meant to focus the social benefit specifically to peace-building among identity groups inside the business. Cooperation may be created by a company through external processes that do not involve employees at all. However, this study seeks to explore cooperation across identity groups within business, not just as a result of business.

As per the focus of this study, one such company fulfills all three criteria and served as a feasible location for a case study: Homeboy Industries in Los Angeles, California. Homeboy is a company providing employment and social services to inner city populations that are former gang members. In the Los Angeles area, gang activity is very high and, according to employees of Homeboy, at one point Los Angeles was dubbed the “Gang Capital” of the world. Located just north of downtown in gang neutral territory, Homeboy serves as an exemplar organization that hires employees from rival gangs and neighborhoods, which are often times synonymous, providing needed employment to individuals where the alternative is often to seek sustenance through illegal means.

Homeboy Industries was founded by Father Greg Boyle in 1988. Before then, Father Greg, as he is often referred to by employees, provided small, side
jobs for gang members as an alternative to gang life and help them transition to non-gang members of society. Over the years, this evolved into forming Homeboy Industries and growing it to be the source for employment and rehabilitation for those seeking to leave the gang life and become productive members of society. To do this, Homeboy provides social services where employees have access to counseling, developmental life classes such as proper parenting and money management, tutoring for those seeking degrees (i.e. GED's), tattoo removal, drug/alcohol counseling and other ancillary social services all of which is provided free of charge. Homeboy also operates profit generating businesses where employees have access to gainful employment and it is these businesses that is the focus of the data collection and analysis as per the requirements described above.

There are four profit generating businesses: The Homeboy Bakery, Homegirl Café, Homeboy Silk-screening and Homeboy Diner. Even though Homeboy Industries is officially a non-profit organization, it acts as a coordinating umbrella organization that directs and supports the profit generating businesses. Each "Social Enterprise" as they are referred to at Homeboy acts as a free standing business, with their own managers and, in essence, are viewed as independent businesses operating under the name of a non-profit. Just as retained earnings are used to reinvest in a company, Homeboy Industries uses the profits from the businesses as a way to help fund the operations of the non-profit. Currently, the profit-generating businesses account for about 40% of the funding for all of Homeboy Industries.
For this reason, they are referred to as profit-generating businesses and, for the purpose of this study, were initially treated as independent companies. I say initially because the focus of the study was limited to profit-generating enterprises but as was discovered during data collection, the profit-generating businesses would not operate properly without the social services. This is specifically due to the nature of the services and how they support each individual employee by means of a case worker who helps develop employees and ensures they are able to maintain their employment at Homeboy by learning the necessary work and life skills that they would not have learned on their own. These services helped employees stay motivated, productive and helped distance themselves from their gang lives, which helped ensure a reliable workforce. This point was repeated multiple times in the interviews and will be revisited in chapter 4 where results will be presented. However, there was no indication in any of the findings that the non-profit designation was required to provide these social services. There was no unique aspect of Homeboy that emerged in interviews claiming that a for-profit designation could not provide the same services.

Economics of Conflict

Since the mid-1940’s, there has been a rise in violent conflict across the globe and studies have shown conflicts have also become longer in duration (Fearon, 2004). The economic ties to these conflicts have been studied for several decades and strong links have been found between economic factors
and violent conflicts such as low income, slow growth and sever economic downturns (Collier & Hoeffler, 2002; Kim & Conceição, 2009). What is most notable is that wealth actually reduces the risk of conflict even though it is counterintuitive because one would think that the wealthy have more to fight over or would be more protective of what they have (Fearon & Laitin, 2002). However, economic development has been shown to reduce conflict while recession actually increases it (Humphreys, 2003) but it is important to understand that it is not just wealth alone but how that wealth is created.

A new body of empirical research shows a causal relationship that poverty is one of a number of factors that actually create conflict (Goodhand, 2003). More specifically, it is uneven development that leads to inequality, exclusion and poverty and is only made worse when it coincides with ethnic and religious boundaries (Goodhand, 2003; Glinkina & Rosenberg, 2003). Further, economic growth, when done equally between and among the conflicting groups, is associated with lower levels of conflict (Humphreys, 2003). World Bank econometric models show that countries with greater inequality in terms of wealth, most relevant among poorer nations, have a higher likelihood of having a civil war (Collier & Hoeffler, 2002).

Economic development programs are thought to be contributing factors to conflict resolution (Humphreys, 2003). The economic equality between groups, however, tends to have a more important role to play than just blanket economic development. This is best seen in the fact that the economic development of the past few decades has also coincided with an increase in violent conflict but
global growth has been unbalanced (Humphreys, 2003). Qualitative studies have shown that violence is related more with inequality between regions or groups, what is called “Horizontal Inequality” (Humphreys, 2003).

Since economic development is significant in resolving conflict it is important that companies take into account the environment in which they operate, especially in regions that have experienced conflict (Hettiarchchi et. al, 2009). There is a symbiotic relationship between business and its context. On the one hand, you have the influence of the environment on the company. That is, to function adequately enough to pursue peace-keeping, the economic environment must be conducive to facilitate company operations. Therefore, in the prescriptive sense, corporations looking to operate in conflict areas need to take into account the context in which they operate (Hettiarchchi et. al, 2009). Otherwise, they would threaten the shareholder benefit necessary for doing business.

However, at the same time, business has an influence on the environment in which it operates. If corporations only sought to operate in areas that are conducive to business than this would undermine the great benefit that business has on communities and businesses would presumably be foregoing profit opportunities in higher risk areas (Tobin, 1984). As previously stated conflict is reduced in areas where there is economic development but companies must be willing to take on some responsibility in aiding in this development if they are to create stakeholder benefit necessary for promoting peace. At the same time, there are potential profits that can be made in these areas other than those associated with negative social consequences such as arms sales or funding
warlords (Nelson, 2000). These profits can come from positive investment opportunities, relocation of state expenditures or reallocation of international funding to social development that is both lucrative for private enterprise and promotes peace (Nelson, 2000). In this sense, there is a two-way street of influence that needs to be present for business to take on the role of peace-building: they must operate in environments favorable for business but they can also help to foster economic development, which would further the peace process within conflict areas.

In some ways, there is a gradient scale for operating in conflict areas. If economic factors conducive to companies are present then it would make it easier for companies to function. If they are not present then it would make it harder and everything in between is at varying levels of ease in terms of business operating. What should be avoided is the idea that companies undertaking peace-building should only operate in areas where economic development is ideal since, as stated above, these areas are less likely to need peace-building. Companies can provide necessary economic development in the pursuit of peace. However, this brings up the issue of intentionality.

A certain level of intentionality is necessary for a company to be involved in peace-building on any level. As will be described in the next chapter, two forms of value are needed for a win-win situation to occur for companies and society, what is known as Sustainable Value. Companies need to create value for both the shareholders and stakeholders. If a
company was solely dedicated to the cause of peace then profits would be absent or an unintentional consequence, which is possible but not very sustainable.

When the sole concern is profits then there will be no intention of building peace between identity groups even if such peace was created. That is, the peace-building within a company would be an unintentional consequence of normal business operations. However, even if peace-building is unintentional, I would argue that it is impossible for owners and managers of companies that operate in conflict areas to ignore the potential issues that may arise among their workforce when they hire employees from both sides of the conflict. Companies may need to take into account the potential animosity among their workforce if they expect their employees to work productively and in harmony with each other. In fact, there needs to be a middle ground where companies are concerned with both profits and peace. As such, companies must have duel purposes when it comes to conflict resolution; they must create shareholder value (profit driven focus) and create stakeholder value (a desire to create peace) with the understanding that creating stakeholder value and/or peace is good for business in a world of radical transparency and rising expectations (Laszlo & Zhexembayeva, 2011).

In this sense, hiring from both sides of a conflict serves the purpose of both peace-building (stakeholder value) while also creating more stability in the region, which is good for business (shareholder value) so there may be some economic grounds for the intention for companies to bring rival identity
groups together. Companies have the option to pull out of such regions but closing operations, moving and reestablishing operations in another region can be costly in terms of the physical aspects of moving, the cost of training a new work-force and the time lost due to inactivity during the moving process. Peace-building thus becomes in-line with a profit motive as it would save time and money by continuing already established operations while also creating stability that allows for the continued operations.

With this understanding, a further exploration of what forms business and peace-building concerns take is possible. This begins with the idea of a competition for resources. The competition for resources is probably the most cited reason behind violence and it is suggested that theories on identity-based conflict may in fact favor the concept of competition (Dion, 1997). The first cause of violence comes from the distribution of resources from the political leadership of a nation. Whether it be democratic or autocratic, a nation has limited resources and sometimes the distribution of those resources is unequal. Furthermore, when there are limited resources to be distributed, identity groups are more likely to revolt and start seeking an autonomous region of their own (Mousseau, 2001). Often times, scarcity leads to migrations that result in identity group conflict (Homer-Dixon, 1994).

However, the general competition for resources where the state is not necessarily distributing them is an explanation for identity-based violence that has achieved widespread acceptance (Mousseau, 2001). Identity groups find themselves coming together to gain collective control of resources and, if
need be, violence is used to gain access to these resources. People are less willing to resort to violence when they are satisfied with a higher level of economic well-being. The pursuit of resources and the opportunity that comes with it is a tremendous rally call for an identity group and serves to increase solidarity (Mousseau, 2001). The struggle for the competition of resources in this case becomes a zero-sum game where by what one identity group has is at the expense of what another has (Glinkina & Rosenberg, 2003). It is in this situation that violence is most likely to occur because identity groups will try to take from others since they no longer have any means of attaining resources on their own (Mousseau, 2001).

The logic from this is then that if economic factors lead to these types of conflicts then addressing these economic factors should reduce or resolve them. More specifically, addressing the apparent inequalities between groups would have the largest affect since these seem to be more directly associated with conflict (Humphreys, 2003). This feeds into the above mentioned intentionality of owners and managers in that, even if motivated exclusively by profits, they must take into account the potential issues with a workforce made of identity groups in conflict. It becomes important to take steps toward promoting equality between these groups if employees are to be productive because it ensures they will focus on the job and not their animosity towards each other. At some point in the conflict resolution process there needs to be a focus on social reconstruction, often involving labor and human capital (Humphreys, 2003).
This idea is integrated into this study through the use of equal employment. It is possible to overcome identity-based conflicts if the reward for cooperation is greater than the reward for conflict (Glinkina & Rosenberg, 2003). If members of two conflicting identity groups have equal access to employment, not only will this contribute to the overall economic growth, but it will also undermine the need for fighting over economic resources or opportunities. Employment also contributes to resolving the identity component of conflict by having members from either side occupy the same space, allowing for communication and potential creation of a shared identity. In this way, employment helps resolve two aspects feeding identity-based conflicts. This is the jumping off point for where this study intends to go. To better understand the phenomena, three theories of social-psychology are explored providing an overall guide for this study. They are Social Constructionism, Social Identity Theory and Appreciative Inquiry.

Guiding Theories

Social Constructionism

The way people construct knowledge, referred to here as sense-making, is very significant when discussing conflict resolution because to go from violent conflict to peace because it is ultimately behavior that needs to change. To do this, people have to change their mind frames surrounding the conflict and the part they play in it promoting or resolving it. Social constructionism is used as a guiding theory for this study for two reasons. First, the type of conflict is inter-
group conflict, as opposed to interpersonal conflict, and therefore a theory guiding how sense-making is done as a group is more relevant, though as will be discussed later, both individual and group sense-making can be linked with each other and with the formation of identity.

Second, social constructionism is a view of sense-making that does not presuppose a given reality but rather sees reality as created through context and social interaction and therefore can be reinterpreted or even recreated (Gergen, 1994a). The central proposition of this study is that a process by which one identity can be made more significant than another exists within business. To do this, however, it is important that given identities are not assumed to be the only possible identities groups can hold. Social constructionism sees knowledge and sense-making as dynamic processes that can change, which means the way people make sense of the world can change from one in which they are in conflict with another group to one in which they are at peace with that same group.

In Psychology and Sociology, a distinction is made between Constructivism and Social Constructionism. Constructivism is a theory of learning based on the works of Jean Piaget. It refers to how knowledge is constructed within an individual’s mind from the individual’s experiences (Piaget, 1953, 1955). Because it refers to an individual’s structuring of knowledge, it is sometimes referred to as a psychological description of knowledge (Hruby, 2001). Since the theory is primarily concerned with the way knowledge is created, it can be thought of as a process of sense-making. In other words, how do individuals
make sense of the world in which they live, or more importantly, how individuals make sense of themselves within the world.

Piaget believed this was done completely within an individual’s mind and therefore, adopted a rationalist view of sense-making where an internal coherence test was sufficient for validating ideas (Prawat, 1996). The final outcome is then a scheme with which an individual mediates between the mind and the world (Prawat, 1996). Seymour Papert expands on this concept in his theory of learning, which refers to the way knowledge is created by individuals through an active process of constructing mental models (Papert, 1980). A form of constructivism known as Social Constructivism, sees the world as a source of raw information (i.e. objects, conversations, etc.) but actual sense-making still takes place within the individual mind. The main focus for both forms of constructivism is on the individual as the unit of analysis.

Social Constructionism on the other hand, is the idea that what we know is created through the relationships and interactions between people and thus is sometimes referred to as a sociological description of knowledge creation (Hruby, 2001). It refers to the way knowledge of the world is created among and between people or collectively as a group/society (Gergen, 1985). This is different from social constructivism in that interactions actually produce knowledge rather than just provide more information for sense-making to be done after the fact.

Social Constructionists intend to describe and understand common forms of understandings of the world, which also includes themselves (Gergen, 1985).
In this way, it is similar to constructivism in that it involves sense-making about the world and about the individual, ultimately forming a model for understanding. Social Constructionism, however, looks at the construction of these models through interactions or through a social process between two or more individuals and not localized exclusively within the individual’s head (Gergen, 1985; Prawat, 1996). Again, social constructionism is the primary guiding theory on knowledge creation because of the view of sense-making and knowledge as dynamic rather than static, thus can be changed, and the social aspect of sense-making important to forming a group identity as is introduced with the second guiding theory, Social Identity Theory.

Social Identity Theory

In focusing on identity-based conflict it is important to understand what an identity is and more importantly where it comes from. In order for groups who are in conflict over identities to resolve their differences, a shared identity has to be created that is stronger than the identities in conflict. Therefore, knowing how identity is created within groups can provide a guiding principle for understanding how the original group identities came to be in conflict (context and basis for mutual understanding) and how a shared identity can be formed. The belief that a new, shared identity can actually be formed comes from social constructionism’s view that sense-making is dynamic and can change. As will be discussed in chapter 2, identity is a means to understanding oneself in the context of others. In other words, it is a means for sense-making.
Social Identity as a theory was first introduced by Henri Tajfel and John Turner. Their research developed from looking at intergroup behavior and, most notably here, searching for explanations for intergroup conflict (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; 1986). The primary concern of the theory is an explanation of human behavior based on perceived membership in and status of groups with which people are affiliated (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Identity can be thought of as the personal coherence developed over time as individuals take on roles that reflect cultural and social expectations or requirements (Hoare, 1991). It thus provides a means for making sense of the world and the individual’s place within it, as described by social constructionism.

However, to understand the uniqueness of individual identities, people need a template to compare against. This template is provided by members of their own group (Taylor et. al, 2003). Culture plays a significant role in providing a means for comparison since it is the essential influence on all domains of the individual (Taylor et. al, 2003). In this way, the collective identity of the group actually directs the individual identity toward conformity. From this comes group membership and group acceptance.

In contrast to interpersonal behavior where interaction is solely determined by individual characteristics and individual relationships, Social Identity Theory is concerned more with the social categorization of membership within different groups interacting (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In this way, individuals’ characteristics are minimized by the group’s identity and thus, behavior is determined through the social interaction of group members (Turner, 1978). Identities are then born.
from social constructions deeply shaped by culture, families, social networks and societal norms (Cheldelin, 2006a).

Social categorization, which forms the basis of Social Identity Theory, is simply grouping people in some way through social processes, often involving perceptual distortions of groups (Brewer, 1979; Tajfel, 1981, Eiser, 1996). The idea involves finding some basis to group people and then creating preference for certain groups, the latter serving as the basis for membership decisions. This process inherently creates borders around group identities as this is where group members know their affiliation ends and those viewed as outsiders begin. An important aspect of social identity is then the maintenance of an identity at the group’s borders (Cohen, 1986).

Social Identity Theory is used as a guiding theory in this study because it provides an explanation for what identity is. Further, since the focus is on identity-based conflict, Social Identity Theory also provides a basis for how antagonism is created based on identity. According to the theory, it is possible for a coherent group identity, one in which the perceived identity is strong and unified among members, to take a moral high ground and view another group unfavorably when attributions of the other are negative (Cheldelin, 2006). Creating dichotomous situations that separate identities into groups reinforces the differences between groups (Okin, 1998) and reinforces the need to protect boundaries and identity groups against outsiders (Maalouf, 2003). As described in the next chapter, the creation of a shared identity dispels the need to protect ones identity group from a perceived negative other.
Both Social Constructionism and Social Identity Theory explain how people come to understand their world and how forming an identity influences that understanding both within a group and between groups. However, they do not presuppose a normative stance on the creation of that knowledge or the identities. That is, neither theory states that a positive understanding of the world or a positive creation of an identity is inevitable. They only serve to provide an understanding of the process of creating knowledge and identity. For Social Constructionism, that knowledge can be either a negative or a positive understanding or world view. For Social Identity Theory, as stated, the internal view of identity is positive but the view of the other group’s identity can be either negative or positive.

The issue of conflict naturally lends itself to a negative outlook for both theories; a socially constructed view of negativity and a negative view of the opposing identity. As Anastasia White (2004) claims, conflict plays a role in creating and sustaining narratives of the self and the group which facilitates sense making that creates parameters for action. In the context of conflict, this action often comes from an interpretation of the need for violence against the other group because one’s sense making of the world includes an antagonistic understanding of the other. It does so because for conflict to exist there needs to be some level of antagonism between the groups. Here, narrative plays a role in sustaining and maintaining conflict (White, 2004).

So, in order to study and understand how peace can be created it is important to understand a more positive view of knowledge and identity. For this
reason, in order to direct the normative nature of this study and provide a naturally positivistic methodology needed for the study of peace creation, Appreciative Inquiry is used as the third major guiding theory since it draws upon positive psychology as well as provides a method for study. The next section provides an overview of pertinent information related to positive psychology. In Chapter 3, an overview of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) will be provided before explaining the methods used to conduct this study.

Positive Psychology and Appreciative Inquiry

Little about organizational development is preprogrammed or deterministic but rather, future reality is emergent and open to the mind’s influence (Cooperrider, 1999). This is true because organizations are the products of human interaction, not blind expressions of an underlying order. Therefore, people can create positive imagery on a collective basis if their aim is to create a positive and humanly significant future (Cooperrider, 1999). This idea is what the overall intention of this study is; to discover a means by which a positive outcome can be achieved in violent conflict through the use of business.

The underlying images held by a culture can have enormous influence on its fate (Cooperrider, 1999). Fred Polak explored this idea and believed that positive imagery is the single most important factor in explaining cultural evolution (1973). His work produced five conclusions as to how positive and negative imagery influences cultures. First, he believes that positive images emerge in atmospheres that value creative imagination and philosophical
questioning (Cooperrider, 1999). These atmospheres must value both positive emotional states and the freedom to express them for consideration.

Second is the significance of the emotional aspect of the imagery. That is, an emotional and/or spiritual force driving the imagery is greater than the intellectual one producing it (Cooperrider, 1999). Third, the potential strength of a culture can be measured by the intensity, energy and belief in its images of the future (Cooperrider, 1999). Fourth, images of the future are self-propelling in that they promote the fruition of such images making them self-fulfilling. Last, he concludes that if the positive image of the future is gone than the culture will die out (Cooperrider, 1999). This has significance to this study because conflict can cause the loss of hope and thus the loss of utopian aspirations for a culture, which would only serve to undermine the culture. However, a process to restore that hope for the future can serve to save a culture. Here, business is seen as being able to facilitate that process and a shared identity can provide the means toward that end.

This concept is at the heart of the Appreciative Inquiry theory and its application for conducting research. Appreciative Inquiry is a generative theory meant to stimulate normative dialogue to produce alternatives for social action (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). That dialogue is stimulated through questions meant to invoke positive imagery of what is an ideal outcome. Thus the term “Inquiry” in the name of the theory. Companies that are committed to peace and ethical behavior will create a foundation for dialogue and the common building of that foundation will enhance the likelihood of peace (Fort, 2008).
It focuses on how to improve or build off of what already exists in the system rather than focusing on removing something negative. The latter does not build the system but only returns the system to its original state without any forward motion or gains. The reason for focusing on improving or building is that human nature tends to naturally gravitate toward positive imagery and positive affect, which “draws us out of ourselves, pulls us away from self-oriented preoccupation, enlarges our focus on the potential good in the world, increases feelings of solidarity with others, and propels us to act in more altruistic and prosocial [sic] ways” (Cooperrider, 1999).

In the case of this study, what is sought is knowledge on peace-building within a business context. Organizations can create their own realities to a far greater extent than is normally assumed (Cooperrider, 1999). To do this, managers must understand that organizations are free to seek changes in convention by replacing conventional images with better images of the future (Cooperrider, 1999). While this is true in pursuing just organizational goals it can also serve to replace conventional images of identities in conflict with an image of identity in cooperation. In other words, the process organizations can use to re-evaluate and replace their business structure and practice can, either on its own or concurrently, also serve to create a shared identity of cooperation between identity groups previously in conflict. This process is explored using an Appreciative Inquiry influenced approach since this approach naturally lends itself to such development (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999).
Appreciative Inquiry is meant to be a whole system approach. It’s a theory of collective action, whether that involves a group, organization or society as a whole (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). It involves interviewing and storytelling to bring out the best of the past, to understand what one wants more of and to set the stage for a future goal to attain (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). It is ideal for the type of research into peace-building because peace between identity groups cannot be sustainable on a small scale. Identity encompasses societies and so to truly bring about peace, a whole system change needs to happen. Starting in the realm of business is a first step that is explored here. All theory is morally relevant and has the ability to affect the way people live their lives in relation to others (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). As such, the creation of a prescriptive model is meant to be the next step toward a societal level change.

The next chapter explores the theoretical underpinnings for this study and provides further details on the theories guiding this research and their significance to the study. Chapter 3 describes the methodology of this study with greater explanation of Appreciative Inquiry as a research method as well as how the research was conducted. Chapter 4 provides the major findings of the interviews and Chapter 5 integrates and synthesizes these findings into a potential model for implementing peace-building through the use of business in regions of identity-based conflicts.
Chapter 2: Review of Guiding Literature

But war will only end after a great labor has been performed in altering men’s moral ideals, directing them to the good of all mankind and not only of the separate nations into which men happen to have been born.

-Bertrand Russell

Chapter 1 introduced the focus of this research and provided a brief introduction to the main theories guiding this study. The purpose was to present the idea of the study, present the reason for conducting such a study and provide the framework within which it is conducted. It was purposely made general in order to give the reader an outline of the issues and questions this study seeks to address as well as introduce the schema used to guide the study by means of introducing the three main theories forming the backdrop with which the study proceeds.

In this chapter, that schema is explored in greater detail in order to layout the motivation for addressing the issue and questions introduced in the previous chapter. The first two theories, Social Constructionism and Social Identity Theory, are described in greater detail in this chapter in order to give the reader an understanding of how they pertain to the study of conflict resolution as well as the influence they have in understanding the phenomenon. They will be supplemented with a section on the use of business to bring about peace, adopting a more holistic understanding of business value known as Sustainable Value. The last theory, Appreciative Inquiry, will be explained further in Chapter 3 as it is used as a guiding methodology as well as a guiding theory.
Identity and Conflict

Knowledge Creation

Immanuel Kant believed that human consciousness had an amazing ability to be self-reflective. Humans can step back and reflect on various desires that produce normative questions (Tiffany, 2006). This is a direct result of the autonomy of reason that formed the basis for Kant’s work. For Kant, an autonomous person is a one who has the freedom to make use of their own mind without relying on the direction of others and holds themselves morally obligated to the public (Jackson, 2007). Kant (1898a) argues that knowledge comes from the social processes of critique so in order for critical knowledge to come from social interaction, individuals must have autonomy in order to freely interact. Further, he acknowledges the individual differences that people bring to knowledge in that one’s own experiences play a role in their understanding of the world (Jackson, 2007).

In chapter one, two main theories of knowledge creation, among many others, were introduced: Constructivism and Social Constructionism. Both describe ways in which people make sense of themselves and the world. The former sees sense-making taking place exclusively within the mind while the latter sees sense-making taking place between people. While advocates of each would argue so, the two do not have to be mutually exclusive. Sense-making may involve both a sociological and a psychological process. Sense-making can be done through a social process where groups create knowledge among themselves but for that knowledge to be accepted by the individuals making up
that group, another internal process would need to take place for that knowledge to become embedded within them.

While Kant emphasized an individual freedom to critique, he limited the extent of that freedom to the point of differing from the community interests, that is individuals should not behave outside the parameters of what the community collectively agrees is acceptable. Creating knowledge was a social service dependent on collaboration within today’s society and future societies (Kant, 1993). Confirmation of knowledge then is done through a process of public submission and critique. Autonomy of reason is dependent upon a shared sense of right and wrong (Kant, 1898b). A form of social constructionism called Symbolic Interactionism actually addresses this. Though not widely accepted, this approach accounts for how a group of individuals interacts and produces meaning while also taking into account the fact that individuals will have a personal interpretation of aspects of that meaning (Prawat, 1996).

This is interesting to note because it suggests that there is still a level of individual thought involved when groups make sense of themselves and their place in the world collectively. However, with the understanding that the two are connected, Social Constructionism is still the primary, but not exclusive, theory of knowledge creation guiding this study because what is sought after is an understanding of peace-building within identity-based conflicts. Individual and group identities are related, as will be described in the next section, but the form of conflict focused on is inter-group conflict, as opposed to interpersonal conflict. The reason is that inter-group conflicts tend to be much more violent, often
escalating to the point of war, and thus promoting peace is much more challenging (UN Report, 1999). As such, a social understanding of sense-making and identity is more pertinent keeping in mind that the social processes of both do have some connection to individual level processes. For this reason the following review will focus on Social Constructionism.

Social Constructionism as a theory was first introduced by Kant (Jackson, 2007; Kant 1898a; Tiffany, 2006) but the two researchers most known for their work with Social Constructionism in modern times are Kenneth Gergen and Karl Weick. Gergen has melded the fields of Psychology and Sociology in that he believes in order to understand the characteristics of knowledge one must participate in social inquiry (1985). For him, social inquiry encompasses both epistemological inquiry and the philosophy of science itself (Gergen, 1994a). Thus social constructionist inquiry is interested in explaining the processes by which people account for the world in which they live. This includes understanding and explaining oneself within that world (Gergen, 1985). Further, Weick (1995) argues that sense-making occurs as a result of group interaction, so group identities can play a major role in the sense-making of individuals.

It is precisely this reason that Gergen and Weick are the main sources chosen for Social Constructionism theory in this study. Group identity heavily influences the world view of individuals and thus their understanding of themselves within the world (Cheldelin, 2006b). As will be described in greater detail in the next section, identity is a socially constructed concept meant to help individuals understand themselves in relation to others (White, 2004; Cheldelin,
Individual identity is a form of self-conceptualization and is directly linked to group identity and membership. Further, group identity is socially constructed itself and also provides a basis for group membership as social processes dictate who is a member and who is an outsider (Cheldelin, 2006b).

Gergen describes several general characteristics of a socially constructed world view, of which the pertinent ones are described here. First is that what humans experience as the world is not itself a direct description of the world (Gergen, 1985; 1994b). Rather, Social Constructionism is a shared understanding of the world as well as the process used to generate, stabilize and change that understanding (Gergen, 2000). This is a concept at the core of Social Constructionism and the ultimate reason why it is used as a guiding theory. It is the belief that an understanding of the world can be changed that guides this study as it is argued that a change in the understanding of the relationships between identity groups in conflict will lead to peace.

This assumption means that there is no objective world in which we live but rather everything we understand to be the world comes from our social processes of inquiry and thus our understanding of the world is highly subjective and individualistic. (Gergen, 1985; 1994b). There is no independent representation of reality that humans can observe uniformly. What people use to describe the world are not products of the natural world but rather are simply constructs created from social interaction (Averill, 1982; Coulter, 1979; Gergen & Davis, 1985; Gergen, 2000). This suggests that the taken-for-granted need for conflict and negative attributes of the opposite side are not absolute truths.
Rather, they can be questioned and changed through altering the social interactions between the two groups.

Second, Gergen (1985) states that the terms people use to understand the world are “social artifacts,” created in historical contexts. Historical knowledge can be revisited and understood in terms of the historical contexts in which it was created because knowledge is culturally and historically contingent (Mannheim, 1951). Further, since the social construction of knowledge is an active process, it can be recreated through modern contexts thus giving it new meaning. This relates to the idea above regarding the changing of how people understand the world. Conflict can be historically rooted but recreating the meaning of the relationship in a modern context is significant to peace-building. In this case, the modern context for recreating this knowledge in in a business setting.

Third is that the degree to which a given form of understanding is prevalent is not dependent on empirical validity but on the interchange of social processes (Gergen, 1985, 1994b). Thus, interpretations of a given event can be plentiful as each person can interpret things differently; connecting back again to constructivism described earlier. More importantly, Gergen asserts that interpretations can change with the change in relationships as they unfold over time (Gergen, 1985). This is of importance because it implies that changing a hostile relationship between groups in conflict by giving them the experience of cooperating may change the way they interpret the relationship and their identities in relation to the other side (Fort, 2008).
Working with each other in a corporation could then in theory change the relationship from an antagonistic one to one of mutual dependence or mutual understanding. As Timothy Fort states, “…business does possess the ability to reach across borders and get people who may not otherwise work together to do so, even if the only common goal is profitability” (2008: 119). In the process, attitudes and interpretations of why the two groups hate each other could also change. Changing the relationship between conflicting parties could occur through any process but, as described previously, economic reasons can promote conflict so it would make sense to seek this change by addressing economic concerns. Business can alleviate the propensity for violence by providing economic opportunity (Fort, 2008).

In doing so, both the economic underpinnings of the conflict as well as the antagonistic relationship between groups can be addressed together, something that can best be done within a business context. The economic incentive of gainful employment motivates rivals to work tougher while the process of working along-side one another is what transforms their view of the other, thus fostering a peace-building process. It is business’ ability to address both concerns, economic and relational, that may make it best suited for peace-building.

Fourth is a way to understand the reasoning behind action. For Gergen, any action can be observed and objectively agreed upon that it indeed took place (Gergen, 1994b). However, what Gergen (1994b) and other social constructionists are interested in is the meaning behind the action. Traditionally, science attempts to look for an objective truth behind action but, through a Social
Constructionism lens, the world is contextual and the meaning behind action is created by social interaction (Gergen, 1994a). Therefore, there is no absolute truth but there is a truth we create and believe amongst ourselves.

Social constructionists tend to use the truths that are sought in traditional sciences as a starting point by questioning the accepted meanings within it and change the way humans understand those meanings (Gergen, 1994a). As such, the process for constructing theory and conducting human affairs depends on the meaning of actions. This is critical for conflict resolution because it means social interaction can have a powerful effect in reinventing how parties in conflict view each other. The purpose of this study is to see if and how business can facilitate the social interaction that leads to this change in view, again because business can address the relational aspects of conflict as well as the economic aspects.

The search for meaning behind action can be seen as an expansion of what Karl Weick spoke of in his book The Social Psychology of Organizing. Weick was principally interested in a new way of understanding organizations but he included a great deal on how sense-making takes place within organizations. He first questions the assumption that organizations are rigid, solid and static. Rather, he sees them as continual processes where meaning is made more clear through coordinated actions of the individuals working within them (Weick, 1979).

The actions of individuals are not taken as given either but are actually a series of actions and reactions. That is, actions are dictated by the individual and by the response of others to those actions (Weick, 1979). In essence, people are constantly readjusting themselves due to social interactions with others within the
organization and that constitutes sense-making forming the basis for organizing (Weick, 1995). Weick’s criticism of taken-for-granted assumptions of organizations rest primarily on what he refers to as ambivalence. This is somewhat similar to Gergen’s point that it is impossible to have an objective reality.

Ambivalence for Weick is recognition that one does not have a complete picture of an event, but rather that the world exists in a continual process. Ambivalence allows a person to separate themselves from a situation and allows for more diversity of thought among members of an organization (Weick, 1979). By doing this, multiple “templates” for action can manifest. It is possible that employees working in a corporation can have an opportunity to create this ambivalence toward the conflict by refocusing on something else such as the job itself (Fort, 2008). In this way, the system of action and reaction between individuals and groups in conflict can change from being antagonistic in nature to cooperative and positivistic.

Action within organizations is a process of determining what to act on and what meanings are given to the results of those actions. For Weick (1979), this process is complicated by the multitude of opinions and varying interpretations and a great deal of time in organizations is spent on consensus building. This is similar to the idea that Gergen uses in his discussion of the social aspect of knowledge creation. In an organization that attempts to build bridges between groups in conflict, it is possible that a recreation of knowledge and meaning of action can occur toward conflict resolution rather than conflict escalation.
Finally, Gergen emphasizes the power of language in the creation of knowledge. Words are granted meaning through their use in social contexts (Gergen, 1994a). Language is highly subjective in that what one word means to one person may mean something completely different to another. As such, humans must collectively agree on a language and a meaning for the words in that language (Gergen, 1994b). Language is used in discourse to convey ideas but the use of language is dependent upon the social agreement on what language represents (Berger & Luckman, 1967). To some degree, this agreement may have a unifying property as it requires congruence and collective action. Since a large degree of knowledge is transmitted linguistically, it is inherently a social phenomenon, not an objective truth. Weick touches upon a similar idea. For him, sense-making requires a frame of meaning, something that is large and lasting (Goffman, 1974). A person’s understanding of organizational processes comes from and is shaped by these frames.

One type of frame he mentions is an inherited vocabulary used by society. In an organization, it is important to agree on a common language for the simple fact that it facilitates the daily activities of employees and has implications on the capabilities of the organization (Grant, 1996). Since language plays such a large role in knowledge creation and understanding, having a common language used among conflicting parties may facilitate understanding by ensuring everyone involved agrees on the same meaning of words and may also take away one divisive element of differing languages, hopefully moving towards removing more. Language constrains the meaning behind knowledge creation because
agreement on the meanings of words is restricted to the language conventions of a particular group (Gergen, 1994b). Overcoming this by means of sharing a common language among conflicting groups may pave the way for mutual understanding.

Burger and Luckman (1967) further this idea with what they call signification or the use of symbols with the explicit intention to serve as an index of subjective meaning. The emphasis is on the explicit intention of these symbols to create meaning or a symbol of something a person intends to convey even if the object as it was originally intended may not have that meaning. A perfect example in conflicts is the use of flags. A flag is simply a way to identify a group but in conflicts it can be used as a symbol of one’s superiority or a rallying tool towards the “cause” (i.e. a dividing symbol) (Bryan & Gillespie, 2005). Business may be able to replace dividing symbols with unifying ones such as the corporate logo (assuming strong employee loyalty) or maybe the job itself as the mutual pursuit of livelihoods can be a source of bridging conflict.

Language for Burger and Luckman is a signification that is used to maintain the reality of everyday life (1967). Language is used to not only accumulate and store information but to transmit it to future generations. It is inherently reciprocal and facilitates the synchronizing of intentions between individuals (Berger & Luckman, 1967). Language was socially constructed to facilitate the construction of knowledge. Thus, not only is knowledge socially constructed but the tools used for constructing are also socially constructed.
Burger and Luckman also take this concept into the realm of human development. Because our knowledge of the world is dependent upon the language used in the community we live in then our development from childhood is dependent upon the context in which we grew up in. Therefore, humans’ ways of becoming and being human are as numerous as the cultures that exist (Burger & Luckman, 1967). According to this view, there cannot be a universal human nature or what Gergen would refer to as an objective truth existing outside of social interaction (Gergen, 1994a; 2000). To understand a person or be understood by another is impossible if one ignores the context in which they exist (Gergen, 2000).

The implications of this are significant for groups in conflict. Often identity-based conflicts are generational or historically rooted, which means it is inherited by a people’s children and their children’s development is then defined by the conflict; the context in which they grow up. In order to resolve differences and create mutual understanding, knowledge of the other group’s context is crucial. Conflict arises because people believe they are correct and others are wrong (Fort, 2008). Because social constructionism assumes no one viewpoint is correct, a process of understanding others’ beliefs forms the basis for peaceful resolution. It’s no longer that the “other” is given a negative attribute just for holding different beliefs. Parties may still think the “other” is wrong, after all if they believed the other was right then they would have joined them, but violence is kept at bay by at least understanding why they believe what they do (Fort, 2008). This is what business can facilitate by employing groups together within a
corporate setting allowing them to interact and understand each other on the way to forming a shared identity as described next.

**Identity-Based Conflict**

The above discussion on Social Constructionism ties in directly to identity and Identity-based conflict. This study focuses on group identity and group membership but the origin of group identity is linked to personal identity. Sandra Cheldelin explains this well when she states:

> [P]ersonal identity – a sense of who we are as individuals – emerges and solidifies. Not in isolation though, it is in constant negotiation with collective, cultural identities. These negotiations reflect cultural and social changes, and role requirements over time, and provide templates to understand individuals’ uniqueness and similarities with members of their own groups (Cheldelin, 2006b).

Here, she claims that personal and group identity are negotiated and feed into each other. Further, she believes that personal identity involves socially constructing roles and social constraints to identify who does and does not belong with us (Cheldelin, 2006b). Identity for her is thus a social construction that is connected to group identity. Taylor et al. (2003), take this one step further by claiming that collective identities, specifically cultural identities, actually shape individual identities by establishing norms, values and goals.

Since, identity is based on social interaction, either individual or group identity, it is important to look at Social Identity Theory, especially since research has shown a link between social identity and intergroup conflict (Tajfel, 1981; Turner et al., 1987). Classical theories on identity view it as a fixed, predefined concept (Huddy, 2001). This traditional notion has been challenged by more
modern concepts of identity that view individual identity as fluid and socially constructed (Vaillancourt Rosenau, 1992; Young, 1997; Novotny, 1998). The fluidity of identity also suggests that identities are subject to change (Monk, 1997).

Group identity as a concept itself is based on the notion that inclusion in a group creates in-group favoritism. Favoritism is, in essence, a preference choice: which group does one prefer. A socially constructed identity is simply one that creates these preference choices through social interaction (Huddy, 2001). A social identity is the part of a person’s self-concept created from perceived membership in a relevant group (Hogg & Vaughan, 2002).

The notion of group preference relates directly to in-group favoritism, which comes from a need to create a positive social identity among members of a group where members are motivated to differentiate their group in a positive way (Turner et al., 1987). In fact, according to Tajfel, positive distinctiveness is the driving force behind social identity (1981). It can even occur under minimal conditions of identification with a group (Brown, 1995).

It is not a strong leap to see that if one views their own group positively then it is easy to view other groups negatively. Turner himself alludes to this in his original work on social identity when he claims that in order to achieve a positive social identity, group members do not create a positive, in-group image independently but actually differentiate their groups positively from others (1987). In fact, much research has shown that a strong, internalized, subjective group identity (i.e. a socially constructed one) actually has a strong effect on the
development of out-group antipathy (Cannover, 1988; Sidanius et al., 1997; Huddy, 2001). Further, ample empirical evidence shows that group membership can even lead to intergroup conflict (Huddy, 2001; Janis, 1972).

This stems from characteristics and beliefs attributed to groups of people. Aggregating people into groups promotes dichotomous relationships so that out-groups are created inherently different from in-groups, creating divided societies (Cheldelin, 2006b, Baumann, 2009). This is what Susan Okin refers to as “categories of differences” (1998: 116). These relationships serve to reinforce the dissimilarities of the out-group, which only deepens the divide between them. The frames used for understanding are organized into two distinct groups that are not absolute categories but are regarded as dichotomous (Cheldelin, 2006b).

Once people are grouped, characteristics are attributed to the members of each group that dictate expected behavior and qualities of each group (Reimann, 2001). Stella Ting-Toomey underscores this when she defines conflict as a tension or antagonism between interdependent parties based on perceived incompatible values, beliefs or attitudes (1985). When attributions of identity are negative it intentionally allows the in-group to take a moral high ground, placing the out-group unfavorably (Cobb, 2006).

In a situation of conflict, it becomes definitive to view the “other” as inherently negative in order to reinforce the positivity of the in-group (Cobb, 1993). Since identity is socially constructed, in a conflict situation an in-group identity is created through the internal social interactions of members and through the, often negative, social interactions with out-group members (Monk et
al., 1997). Lack of interaction makes it easier to assume negative things about out-group members and scapegoat them when things go wrong (Fort, 2008). Monk et al. describe this as giving others a part in a narrative that makes a subject position for them and influences each other’s identities without a conscious intention to do so (1997). They also view this process as a manifestation of a power relationship where one side perceives themselves as above the other (Monk et al., 1997).

The implications for conflict resolution or mediation are significant. The conflict between groups can be mitigated by unweaving the negative image associated with the out-group by replacing it with a more positive image that highlights similarities rather than differences. This process is most often advocated through dialogue between the groups (Rothman, 1997; Cheldelin, 2006b). There are two parts to understanding this. First, since identity is socially constructed, dialogue early in the conflict can serve to construct an image of the out-group that is more positive and mutually dependent; what would be a preventive process (Cheldelin, 2006b).

Second, in more established conflicts, a process that undermines differences and supports a shared identity between groups can reduce conflict (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). Here, undermining differences is done by creating a shared identity, which is different from removing old identities because the latter is almost impossible and not necessary (Huddy, 2001). The minimization of differences is the same as process as reducing antagonism surrounding identities, which is why it is done through creating a shared identity. It is the
creation of that new identity that constitutes the beginning of a peace-building process. This will be discussed in greater detail next under the title heading: “Conflict Resolution.”

Conflict Resolution

Conflict Mediation

In the broadest sense of the word, one can view mediation as simply any attempt to bring two conflicting groups together through the use of a third party to resolve the conflict. With such a definition, it is possible to view corporations as mediators if they undertake the social responsibility of peace-building. The purpose of mentioning the political science literature on conflict mediation is that it provides a frame of reference for understanding what goes into peace-building in a general sense and influences the structure of this study. One can draw direct parallels from the model of conflict mediation discussed below to the topic of this dissertation as business is viewed as a mediator between groups in conflict (Nelson, 2000). Two frameworks in particular relate to the role of business in peace-building. The Contingency Model and Marieke Kleiboer’s model of conflict mediation.

The Contingency Model is based on an underlying assumption that mediation is a social process in that it is grounded in the need for communication and sense-making, in terms of the conflict itself, among groups involved (Jackson, 2000). Further, it gives equal weight to both contextual factors and process factors. Richard Jackson notes that the Contingency Model
is predicated on the notion that conflict management is a social process whose outcomes are dependent upon, or contingent on, aspects of the structure and process of the conflict. That is, outcomes are determined by the interaction of certain input variables mediated through the structure and actual situation of the conflict management (Jackson, 2000: pg. 327).

The Contingency model recognizes a reciprocal relationship between the nature of the conflict and the mediation process used to manage it (Bercovitch and Houston, 2000). It is important to note that the Contingency Model [see Figure 2] is not a theory or a tool for predicting specific outcomes. Rather, it is meant as a guide for the development of research designs and for the generation of theories, which is why it is used here.

![Figure 2: The Contingency Model of Mediation (Bercovitch and Langley, 1993)](image)

The Contingency Model begins with an analysis of the context of the conflict. This includes an assessment of two environmental factors: (1) the nature of the dispute and (2) how the parties involved relate to the nature of the dispute and themselves (Bercovitch et al., 1991; Jackson, 2000). The second part of the model is the process implemented by the mediator. Here, strategies and
techniques are analyzed and from these emerges the outcome. Due to the generality of this model it has a wide range of applications by creating generalized categories then leaving it up to the researcher to apply the model to specific types of conflicts (Fisher and Keashly, 1991).

This study is adapted from the Contingency Model in that the three research questions flow from the steps of the model. Question one, what external conditions facilitate the use of business to promote peace-building, refers to the context in which companies operate. Question two, what internal processes within a business promote peace-building between members of conflicting identity groups within an employment context, refers to the process implemented within the company to facilitate peace-building. Question three, can the process for peace-building in business be replicable, refers to the development of a model that is the outcome of the previous two questions.

Understanding context is critical to any conflict mediation process but is more important when looking at identity-based conflicts. This is often overlooked by conflict resolution scholars who view identity only superficially (Oetzel et al., 2006). In order to move peace-building forward, mediators must understand the culture the conflicting parties exist in and take that into account as a crucial factor in the conflict (Oetzel et al., 2006). Large-scale violence often occurs in complex systems, which further emphasizes the need to understand context first (Suarez-Orozco & Robben, 2000). For this reason, the Contingency Model provides a great deal of explanatory power to understanding the case study as well as the significance of identity in the conflict.
Further, the process portion of the model is directly related to the characteristics that lead to mutual understanding and resolution within a business context. Chapter 3 provides more detail in the proposed process for how this takes place and forms the heart of this study in terms of uncovering the strategies and techniques of a successful peace-building effort within a business. The direct parallels drawn from the Contingency Model lend themselves to understanding the framework for the design of this study.

Marieke Kleiboer (1996) offers further insight into mediation with her framework by presenting two criteria that divide the field of analysis into what she calls four “Proto-theories”. The first criterion is the ontological characteristic of conflict and the implications for theorizing. Here, there is a question of whether one is objectivist or subjectivist in one’s approach to the conflict. If one is an objectivist then he or she approaches the conflict as an outside participant that believes the conflict can be viewed independent of contextual factors. An objective mediator treats the disputing parties as independent actors in need of an outside authority to provide order (Kleiboer, 1996).

If one is a subjectivist then he or she takes a stake in the conflict by understanding the contextual factors involved, viewing the conflict as unique to the situation. Subjective mediators act as an intermediary between the disputing parties rather than a temporary umbrella of authority. As can clearly be seen, a subjectivist perspective toward conflict mediation falls in line with a socially constructed view of reality because it assumes contextual factors serve as the driving force for the conflict (Kleiboer, 1996). In some ways, the conflict itself can
further influence the identities of the participants, meaning people can use the conflict as a means to understand themselves. Their understanding of the world becomes based in the conflict itself (White, 2004). Unlike the objectivist perspective, a subjectivist mediator does not presuppose a given understanding of conflict but rather understands that each conflict must be viewed through the lens of the groups involved. An understanding of the people and their social norms is inherent to the ontological approach to mediation (Kleiboer, 1996).

The second criterion is the nature and “valuation” of the conflict. This is an important dimension because it refers to how conflict is viewed by the researcher; whether it is seen as a problem of order or possibility for change (Kleiboer, 1996). The significance here is the link to the Appreciative Inquiry influence on methodology. An Appreciative Inquiry approach looks toward the positive possibilities available in a given situation and taps into the creative potential of those directly involved (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). With this criterion, Kleiboer has accounted for researcher bias in the model so that theory and application are not absent of the researcher’s own framing of conflict, which also falls in line with a Social Constructionist view of research. Figure 3 below shows the two criteria and how they break down into the four proto-theories.
As mentioned above, the objectivist ontology is not appropriate for conflict in which identity is a driving force because contextual factors are ignored. Both proto-theories under the objectivist ontology, Domination and Power Brokerage, approach conflicts as endemic to the system and therefore require imposed strategies from parties outside the conflict. The subjectivist ontology includes contextual factors and thus would not assume conflict as inevitable but rather as a product of the specific differences between groups in conflict.

The two proto-theories under the subjectivist ontology each have a different view of the nature of conflict. Viewing conflict as a problem of order suggests conflict is based on disagreement over the functional relationship between the groups, thus the proto-theory under this ontology is called “Political Problem Solving”. Resolution is a matter of resolving the underlying disagreement using systematic efforts. However, this view is simply taking a bad situation and restoring it back to the way it was; an inherently problem solving method that an Appreciative Inquiry approach would disagree with. Restoring a
situation to its original state does not fall in line with peace-building because it only recreates the context in which the conflict started in the first place.

Viewing the nature of conflict as a possibility for change opens avenues for creating new relationships that build off of what was already there but in a healthy way. There is then a potential for changing the social structure in a way that could possibly prevent future hostility (Kleiboer, 1996). This proto-theory relates concepts from the guiding theories of this study by combining the belief that situations can be changed through social processes (Social Constructionism), that shared identities can be created from the mutual understanding found in establishing social relationships (Social Identity Theory) and that positive images of the future can occur through reimagining the possibility for change (Appreciative Inquiry), forming a theoretical foundation with which this dissertation moves forward.

**Mutual Understanding and Conflict Resolution**

To explore the way change processes can take place I borrow from interpersonal conflict, which offers great insight into the resolution process for inter-group conflict. Some research on interpersonal conflict discusses inter-workgroup conflict (see Hinds & Mortensen, 2005) and so it is possible to extrapolate what is learned from interpersonal conflict to group level processes. From that it is possible to find equity with larger, societal level intergroup conflict.

Further, according to Taylor et al. (2003), personal identity is the core of the self while collective identity is created through the context within which the
individual develops a sense of self. As such, the individual and collective identities are influenced by each other and are not completely separate. Members’ behaviors, norms and values are articulated by their culture (an aspect of collective identity) making it an essential influence on all domains of the individual (Taylor et al., 2003). Since interpersonal and intergroup conflicts are identity-based, it is possible to link them through the connection between individual and group level identities.

In interpersonal conflict literature, the idea of a shared identity is presented as a moderating factor for conflict (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). Since identity is socially constructed it is logical to view conflict resolution as a process by which the identities in conflict are reoriented into a shared identity; namely a shared work identity as it manifests in companies working toward creating economic and social value. In fact, individuals can hold multiple identities and the one that is most salient is the one that influences behavior the most (Huddy, 2001). If the in-group identity is most salient then it is possible that the processes described previously regarding positive in-group and negative out-group perceptions will lead to conflict. In this instance, the in-group/out-group identities are the most salient, superseding other identities that may exist, and since in an identity-based conflict identity is the driving factor, reconciling identity becomes a significant focus for peace-building However, over time one can change the relative strength of their identities without losing any of them altogether (Huddy, 2001). This is significant in resolving conflict because it suggests that it is
possible to create a shared identity that is stronger than the individual identities that formed the basis of the conflict.

If identities involved in conflict are socially constructed it would make sense that creating a shared identity would also be a socially constructed process. In other words, it is a process that minimizes differences in groups and supports the discovery of commonalties that form the basis for a new, shared identity (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). In essence, for groups in conflict to begin peace-building, a social reconstruction of the antagonistic narratives and out-group antipathy that serves as the basis for the two identities in conflict is needed (White, 2004). Anastasia White (2004) suggests that peace can be achieved by replacing the conflict as the central organizing principle for identity, which is in line with the idea of creating a shared identity. The latter creates a new organizing principle for identity, one that is premised on cooperation and commonality as opposed to differences without necessarily replacing the previous identities, only replacing the relative strength or salience of those identities.

A shared identity is important for corporations as well because in work teams it has been shown to reduce interpersonal conflict (Jehn et al., 1999). This is enhanced when individuals are working within the same physical space as conflict is more extreme with geographically distributed employees (Hinds & Bailey, 2003; Mannix et al., 2002). This is not to say that differences are completely extinguished as this may lessen the value of having multiple
perspectives. It only means that differences are lessened in favor of a common workplace identity.

In the absence of a shared identity, individuals are more likely to view the behavior of others as negative (Jehn et al., 1999). This can surface as relational conflict where disagreements can occur over interpersonal interactions. These disagreements are typically over non-work issues, which relates to larger societal issues (Jehn et al., 1999). Jehn et al. (1999) include religious preference as one such example, which serves to further underscore the significance of a shared identity on larger, intergroup conflicts. When a shared group identity is salient, members are more inclined to be loyal, trusting and concerned with supporting the welfare of the group (Brewer & Miller, 1996).

Marks et al. (2001) bring up a second moderating factor of shared context. While not as influential on identity-based conflict (it moderates task conflict more), it does have a place in conflict resolution as they view it and shared identities as emergent states of groups. A shared context is an informational factor and seems to be a next generation emergent property of groups meaning it manifests after a shared identity (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). It’s important to note because it signifies the incorporation of larger, system level congruence between groups where information sharing and creation takes place, suggesting groups in conflict reached a level where they create new norms of behavior (Hinds & Bailey, 2003). Unfortunately, Marks et al. (2001) and Hinds & Mortensen (2005) are somewhat vague on the definition of a shared context.
beyond the sharing of tangible resources (thus its moderation of task conflict) so more focus will be placed on shared identity from this point on.

It is valuable to understand a shared identity but, to take it a step further, it is also important to understand the process for creating one. In some ways, this study looks to test how such an identity is created as well as if business is capable of facilitating it. Before a shared identity can be created, there needs to be some understanding of the out-group’s perspective. Galinsky et al. (2011) believe that a clear understanding of an opponent’s motives and behaviors is necessary for success in managing conflict situations. In what they call mixed-motive situations such as negotiations or conflict management, understanding interests and motives is advantageous (Galinsky et al., 2011).

Two social competences motivate social understanding, perspective taking and empathy (Galinsky et al., 2011; Graf et al., 2007). Perspective taking is the ability to consider the world from the other’s view and empathy allows a person to feel what the other person feels in a way that connects the two. Both facilitate interpersonal relationships and concern for other’s experiences, especially if the other person is suffering (Galinsky et al., 2011). Through understanding the perspective of the other side, parties in conflict deconstruct the realities that they have created for what the out-group represents, what their behavior means and what their values are (Graf et al., 2007). Mediation efforts that undertake this critical step identify disparate realities which serve to maintain the conflict (Winslade & Monk, 2000).
At the heart of this process is the development of new patterns of meaning for events and stories pertaining to both the in- and out-groups (Cheldelin, 2006b). This is by definition a form of social constructionism as meaning and understanding are created rather than accepted as given. More practically, being a socially constructed process, groups in conflict have to be brought together in order to interact in a positive context (Amir, 1976; Amir & Barnea, 1982). One way of doing this is through spontaneous communication (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). Spontaneous communication not only facilitates the creation of a shared identity but does so by first identifying the conflict then helping to handle it (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). Plus, it builds social ties (Festinger et al., 1950), increases awareness of other people’s moods (Olson et al., 2002) and strengthens interpersonal bonds (Nardi & Whittaker, 2002).

Hinds and Mortensen (2005) discuss the significance of communication and the form of communication they advocate is informal and unplanned showing that any communication is helpful even if it lacks intentionality. At the core of this study is the exploration of how business can be used for conflict resolution, incorporating social value citizenship into corporate strategy, which is fostered through the use of discourse or dialogue to promote mutual understanding, whether it is intentional or not (Baumann, 2009).

Martin Buber’s seminal work *I and Thou* (1970) explored the use of dialogue to bring about reconciliation between two groups in conflict. His philosophy on interpersonal dialogue claims that it moves individuals from an initial “I/It” relationship, where one considers members of the out-group as
objects of one’s own personal experience, to an “I/Thou” relationship (Buber, 1970). The latter relationship is characterized by genuine engagement in mutual, open and authentic conversation (1970). The foundation for this kind of dialogue is trusting that sincere individuals talking about beliefs openly can find common ground, which exposes misconceptions so they can be addressed (Fort, 2006).

As stated earlier, establishing a new shared identity requires that the new identity is made stronger than the old identities that formed the basis for the conflict, an inherently social process. In order to do this, it is important to deconstruct the original understanding of the out-group before being able to move toward a mutual understanding of each other (Gurevitch, 1989; Baumann, 2009) that forms the basis of a shared identity. For this reason, there should be opportunities for communication where prior rivals are able to reframe their understanding of their own identity and the identities of the rival group (Rothman, 1997). In so doing, misconceptions and assumptions are removed from the table and an almost clean slate is created to produce new forms of understanding (Gurevitch, 1989). This can only occur deliberately as it requires recognition of the real fear, anger and pain of the other and ignore how one’s own actions caused them (White, 1977).

To clarify, this only requires a recognition of the fear, anger and pain of the others but not directly focusing on removing these. This is simply coming to realize that these feelings exist in the out-group; negative emotions associated with the conflict inherent in an in-group/out-group context. In line with an Appreciative Inquiry approach, the negative emotions are not addressed directly
(i.e. a problem-solving schema) but rather a focus on creating a new shared identity with positive emotional attributes (i.e. a positive psychology schema) take the place of the negative emotions, which effectively addresses without focusing on them. The mutual understanding sought in this process is one where these negative emotions are discovered to exist within both groups; it is an understanding of the other’s situation, which emerged in the findings of this study through communication between rivals. Thus signifying the importance of dialogue in creating mutual understanding.

John Winslade and Gerald Monk (2000) have found that the use of group dialogues, sometimes referred to as Narrative Therapy (White & Epstein, 1991), between groups in conflict can be successful in mediation efforts. Winslade and Monk (2000) is a departure from the problem-solving approach to resolving conflict, a departure shared by Appreciative Inquiry, in favor of narrative mediation. This form of mediation encourages conflicting parties to share their personal stories of the conflict and thus reach resolution through an understanding of each other’s contexts, in other words, mutual understanding. In doing so, groups in conflict develop a new relationship based on understanding, respect and collaboration (2000). Dialogue is often used to improve communication, build trust, increase mutual understanding and find common meaning (Bohm, 1995). One aspect of note in the use of dialogue or discourse is that it lacks any outside “expert,” that is, the participants drive the process and seek understanding with each other rather than have someone lecture to them what they need to understand (Lederach, 1995).
Discourse is obviously significant in the process of creating shared identity because identity cannot be dictated and one cannot be told to create a new identity. A space for dialogue must be provided and the participants have to form their own identity among themselves (Graf et al., 2007). Benjamin Hu (2006) even believes that the purpose of a dialogue is to change attitudes and behaviors in those involved with the specific expectation that the same change will follow in their respective communities. The idea behind this is that if individuals in the discourse are willing to change then they will impact the environment with which they engage; a significant outcome for peace-building (Cheldelin, 2006b).

Two forms of dialogue exist: Common and Strange (Gurevitch, 1989). Common dialogue is a way where “participants gear themselves toward forming a shared world of meanings through which they connect with one another and assume mutual existence” in a common world (Gurevitch, 1989:161). The strange form of dialogue focuses on distancing the other and assumes they cannot be reduced to a common understanding (Gurevitch, 1989). It is evident that the strange form of dialogue is what tends to lead to conflict because it creates an obstacle to mutual understanding (Gurevitch, 1989). Between these two forms of dialogue, the common form is what is needed to reconcile and resolve conflicts between groups because it allows for the formation of shared meaning between rivals and highlights and the need for rivals to exist in cooperation. A shared identity comes from a shared world of meaning and the mutual existence in a common world is what fosters cooperation, both of which relate directly to this study.
Zali Gurevitch describes the importance of having a common dialogue when he states:

Dialogue is deemed crucial for negotiation and for opening productive communication channels between alienated and adversary identities. The unique problem of dialogue in a state of conflict is that in that situation the element of the common has been severed. The parties have disengaged and enclosed themselves in alienated negativity toward each other. In extreme cases, relationships between enemies of difference races, genders, ages, religions, or political convictions are governed by the notion that the existence of one implies the outright denial of the other’s right to exist (Gurevitch, 1989:162).

Opening up a common form of dialogue in the situation of conflict can then restore a common frame of meaning, which can restore order and balance (Gurevitch, 1989). In talking with each other through dialogue, groups in conflict can gain a better understanding of the psychological environment and internal structure of the adversary’s society. Thus, they become better able to take into account not only each other’s actions, but also each other’s purposes, perceptions, intentions, structural constraints, and particularly, each other’s fundamental concerns (Kelman, 1979:115).

The emphasis is on understanding and shared meaning (Gurevitch, 1989), which can pave the way for a shared identity.

In order for groups in conflict to partake in a discourse, they first have to establish the will to sit down and talk with each other. Both have to demonstrate a willingness to speak with the other and acknowledge out-group members as equals worthy of respect (Gurevitch, 1989). Agreeing to speak, however, offers a unique difficulty for groups in conflict because it threatens their strong identity which was in conflict. The in-group identity served as a justification for a closed
understanding of the conflict and of the self that denied the legitimacy of the other (Gurevitch, 1989). In order to agree to speak to the out-group, the groups have to come to an agreement that shows their willingness to listen (Gurevitch, 1989).

Business can provide this minimum requirement for dialogue by creating space for groups to communicate (Fort, 2008). The need for overcoming the threat to their identity can be created through the use of employment. The basic need for work coupled with the opportunity to work can potentially create the initiating impetus for interaction among conflicting groups, especially when the company embeds a commitment to the goal of sustainable peace (Fort, 2008).

In this case, individuals seeking employment will know upon entering the company that they will be interacting with members of the opposite side of a conflict simply on a task-related level but may still be willing to work there because of the desire for employment. Being located in the same physical space day-in and day-out, a person from the opposite side of the conflict is given a human face and differences are refined by understanding (Fort, 2008). Dialogue can be fostered without the opportunity for friction or as Thomas Fort states, “...conflicts can be resolved when individuals with differing beliefs engage in something of a peace process that give them time and space to sit and to listen. Business is a place where that can happen” (Fort, 2008:89).

This point is an echo of one aspect of George Homans' model of group interaction (1950). Homans’ believed that the frequency of interaction between individuals, when neither initiates the interaction, increases the liking for one
another if there is a positive sentiment inherent in the task associated with the interaction. Working side by side in a business requires a certain level of interaction initiated by the company, not the individuals performing the work task. Further, as will be shown in the findings of this study, employment at a company that intentionally addresses violent conflict requires a level of attention to individual development of employees that has a positive emotional attribute associated with the employment. This means that individuals are positively influenced by the company when it take on the role of developing employees and improving their individual situations; financially, socially and psychologically. The findings suggest that a positive physical and emotional space are required within a model of peace-building, inducing a positive sentiment into the work tasks being performed, thus falling in line with Homans' theory of creating cooperation within groups (1950). Business thus takes on the role of institutionalizing a shared identity in “terms of peace through commerce” (Fort, 2008:116). It is this very idea that is explored in this study.

Business and Peace

Sustainable Value

Often times, business is ignored as a crucial factor in peace processes (Charney, 1999). The reason is possibly that most believe that business has no place in the problems of society. This view of business dictates that the sole purpose of companies is to increase shareholder wealth and all else is secondary or even a distraction (Hart, 2007). The so called “Trade-off Illusion” is
increasingly becoming anachronistic as the role of business in the world is becoming more and more influential (Nelson, 2000; Hart, 2007).

The private sector has been involved in areas of conflict since international trade began but has played a more prominent role with changes in political, socio-economic and technological development (Nelson, 2000). As such, ethical business practices can provide common ground for more peaceful elements of conflicting groups to present themselves and may reduce violence (Fort, 2008). Businesses hold the potential to bring about sustainable change but it is more than just holding the potential for change (Laszlo & Zhæxembayeva, 2011). With an ever changing external business environment, managers can no longer decide whether or not they want to engage in creating social value. Rather, market factors have made it a necessary part of operating a business (Laszlo & Zhæxembayeva, 2011). Business has no choice but to integrate societal and environmental stakeholders or risk a declining position in the global market.

In their book, *Embedded Sustainability: The Next Big Competitive Advantage*, Chris Laszlo and Nadia Zhæxembayeva (2011) have identified three new trends in the global marketplace influencing the way all corporations conduct business. These trends, declining resources, radical transparency and increasing expectations, are market forces at work requiring a shift in the way business is conducted through creating sustainable value. They are not meant to be fear inducing forces for change but rather they create new opportunities for
competitive advantage if corporations are able to capitalize on them properly (Laszlo & Zhexembayeva, 2011).

Declining resources is something we all have to deal with on a daily basis. Gone is the notion that there is an unlimited supply of raw materials and environmental capacity to fulfill the needs of an ever-growing global population and there is research to support this notion (Laszlo & Zhexembayeva, 2011). Due to limited resources, business needs to find new ways of being profitable while also being sustainable if they are to survive into the future (Laszlo & Zhexembayeva, 2011). Declining resources create a destabilizing environment in which violence can thrive. When people do not have enough food, clean water or safe housing, they will do what is necessary to survive including turning to violence (Spreitzer, 2007). The opportunity for business is to find a way to be profitable while also making available those resources that can reduce the need for violence.

Radical transparency is a trend associated with the widespread use of information technology and social media-based behaviors and desires. Business tends to be a target for those dedicated to measuring, recording and exposing any act working for or counter to social and environmental concerns. This is made even more possible with the availability of information and low-cost communication (Laszlo & Zhexembayeva, 2011). The change in technology has created new market opportunities and competitive pressures (Nelson, 2000). In essence, this is making all corporations, governments and NGO’s operate with
the entire world watching the impacts of their actions on both society and the environment.

Whether managers like it or not, they have little or no control over the flow of information so they have to either work within this reality or be consumed by it (Laszlo & Zhembayeva, 2011). The implications on conflict are direct as well. Operating in a way that promotes conflict will cause a corporation to be put under public scrutiny. However, working toward building peace will also be present in the public, which can offer competitive advantages in both marketing and recognition that would work to enhance business.

The final trend, increasing expectations, goes hand-in-hand with radical transparency. With the increased availability of information, consumers and customers are much better informed and thus have greater expectations of corporations to be agents of positive change (or at least to do less harm) as well as to be held more accountable for their actions (Nelson, 2000). This means consumers and customers are demanding new relationships with providers of services and products (Laszlo & Zhembayeva, 2011). As such, corporations must shift to a strategy that incorporates this change in expectations since customers and consumers are the driving force behind sustaining business.

Further, commitment to social and environmental performance impacts employee engagement. High engagement leads to increased self-efficacy and increased work-related performance (Luthans & Peterson, 2001). The implications of this are significant as this is an internal aspect of operating a business. Employee engagement can be a critical competitive advantage as it
can increase customer loyalty, a boon to revenues, and employee retention, a potentially large cost reduction (Laszlo & Zhemebayeva, 2011). Further, research has shown that when a company adopts good corporate citizenship behavior, or at least the company’s leadership seriously commits to social responsibility, employees tend to be more engaged, are more creatively involved in the company and develop higher quality relationships (Glavas & Pideret, 2009).

For conflict resolution, this is key because a commitment to creating peace among employees is a commitment to social responsibility and so can also be associated with increased engagement, thus using business for peace can potentially create a competitive advantage for corporations (Fort, 2008). Undertaking corporate responsibility to reduce conflict and bring about peace can be beneficial to corporations in other ways as well. Business has an interest in fostering intercultural dialogue and understanding given their role in building economies and the increasing interconnectedness of commerce (UN Report, 2009). The relationship between business and peace is reciprocal in that business needs peace to thrive and a thriving business promotes peace (Fort, 2008). Over the long-term, peace provides a basis for developing new markets and healthy economies. This in turn leads to new customers, qualified employees, local suppliers and investors (Nelson, 2000; Ben-Porat, 2005). Other benefits include increased goodwill and reputation, both of which have market value (Fort, 2008).
Business’ role in peace-building comes from its strategic commitment to corporate responsibility and peace, including an alignment of vision, goals and strategies (Hart, 2007). This requires an embedded value within the corporation toward peace and building bridges between groups in conflict, not simply a “bolt-on” strategy of including it among many different initiatives. To do this, corporations must create shareholder and stakeholder value simultaneously or what is known as Sustainable Value (Laszlo & Zhexembayeva, 2011). The following paragraph summarizes the argument for Sustainable Value.

Sustainable value is becoming indispensable in business operations because it takes advantage of new market realities. In creating sustainable value, corporations can reap the benefits through gaining competitive advantage if they are able to respond to increasing sustainable pressures. To do this, corporations have to integrate both shareholder value and stakeholder value into their strategies. The benefit to doing this is that the marketplace has changed to the point that both values are mixed. Focusing only on shareholder value, as is most commonly associated with the purpose of business, will no longer provide any competitive advantage as the demands of civil society have become internalized by the market. Stakeholder value is increasingly becoming a driving force for economic development and thus needs to be integrated with shareholder value in corporate strategy (Laszlo & Zhexembayeva, 2011). Figure 4 shows the model for sustainable value that Chris Laszlo and Nadya Zhexembayeva use as the foundation for their argument.
In peace-building, stakeholders include not only the employees of the corporation but their respective societal groups as well. Integrating societal stakeholders in promoting peace creates a more stable economy for which business to thrive (Fort, 2008), which increases the job market, the consumer market and the socio-economic status of both identity groups. Stakeholder value here is thus a means to promoting peace, which is then a means for promoting shareholder value. Creating value for all identity groups will reduce the need for violence and creating value for shareholders will ensure a sustainable future for that peace, possibly also creating new business avenues among the stakeholders (Laszlo & Zhexembayeva, 2011). This interdependence of business and social concerns requires incorporating corporate strategy with a responsible strategy.

Jane Nelson provides a model highlighting three levels of strategies for corporate responsibility: compliance, risk management and value creation. The ideal for any corporation embedding a responsible strategy is to create value (Nelson, 2000). Compliance is the very minimum a corporation can do. It is
simply complying with regulations, laws and standards. In this level, a corporation can function within a society in conflict without having any influence. However, as Nelson puts it, “failure to play a proactive role in this process positions business as part of the problem rather than part of the solution” (Nelson, 2000:19). In other words, if they are not helping then they are hurting.

Risk Minimization is when a corporation tries to minimize risks and harm from their operations (Nelson, 2000). Here, corporations simply try not to make things worse but again they are not making things better either. There is no active engagement or sense of responsibility to promote peace or resolution of any kind. The final level, Value Creation, is where companies can do the most good in promoting peace within identity-based conflicts. At the level of Value Creation, corporations are proactively creating societal value and enhance shareholder value at the same time by optimizing their positive impacts on society (Nelson, 2000), which agrees directly with an embedded strategy because it includes both shareholders and societal stakeholders.

In the case of this study, societal value can directly be peace and prosperity for groups in conflict. The value created through corporations can be the promotion of peace and economic value for those within the company and within the society it operates. However, it requires engagement with all stakeholders and, by taking shareholder value into account, a more sustainable system is created with potentially larger impacts (Nelson, 2000).

Business’ ability to promote and build peace comes from working toward achieving hegemony in the regions they operate (Ben-Porat, 2005). Hegemony
here does not refer to power or authority within a given region. Rather, it refers to a corporation’s ability to be a leader in pursuing its own interests when those interests serve the greater society as well (Arrighi & Silver, 1999). Here, corporations convince society of the merits of peace and help develop an agenda for it (Guy-Porat, 2005). To do this, Thomas Fort (2008) advocates the use of Mediating Institutions. A Mediating Institution is where individuals learn to see their interdependence with others. Further, he states:

The moral rationale for an approach grounded in mediating institutions is that it is through those intimate societies that one learns social responsibility. It is through watching the results of one’s actions on those one can actually see and touch that one develops the sensitivity to be responsible for one’s actions. Those lessons of social responsibility – of ethics and morality – teach us how to limit our own acquisitiveness and how to be responsible for the pains and problems of those around us (Fort, 2008:145-146).

Fort believes that corporations are the most neglected example of Mediating Institutions (2008). Companies committed to using the power and responsibility they have to build peace will create a foundation for dialogue and build common foundations in the form of shared identities, enhancing the likelihood for peace (Fort, 2008).

Summary

The above theories form as a guide for how this study is framed. First, in order for conflict to transform into peace-building, a change in the mindset of those involved needs to take place. Social Constructionism is used here as way of understanding how the change in mindset can occur. Social Constructionism holds that knowledge, ideas and conceptual understandings of the world can be
changed through social processes. The questions guiding the methodology of this study were developed through this lens in that they ask how these social processes, more specifically verbal communication, lead to a reframing of how groups understand each other (i.e. mutual understanding). The study is guided by the idea that how rival groups view or understand each other can be changed through verbal communication.

The sense-making specific to this study is an understanding of the identities within a conflict. Social Constructionism provides a general, conceptual understanding but to apply it specifically, Social Identity Theory is used to hone in on the topic of identity-based conflict. Similar to how Social Constructionism is used to inform the reframing of how groups in conflict view each other, Social Identity Theory is used to support the notion of creating a shared identity. The questions guiding the methodology begin with inquiry into how groups begin to change their view of the other and this then leads into an inquiry into how that understanding creates a new, shared identity. The former guided by Social Constructionism, the latter by Social Identity Theory.

Finally, Positive Psychology/ Appreciative Inquiry serves to inform two aspects of this study. First, it guides the above two theories into further specificity in that it helps direct the shared identity concept as a means of peace-building. Having a shared identity is what produces cooperation among former rival groups and is thus a significant step in the peace-building process. Second, Positive Psychology/AI guides the entire study in a more general way in that it frames the normative quality of the research. What is specifically sought is an understanding
of the process of peace-building, not an understanding of conflict. In this regard, the guiding, methodological questions focus only on positive imagery and positive outcomes for study. As such, the interview protocol described in Chapter 3 was adapted from and influenced by an Appreciative Inquiry approach.

As stated previously, the purpose of this study is to understand the elements of business that promote peace-building between conflicting identity groups. This is meant to produce a model for peace-building in business; something that can both promote social benefit as well as business benefit concurrently without sacrificing one for the other. Towards this goal, this dissertation addresses three key questions:

1. How do the external conditions facilitate the use of business for peace-building?
2. What internal processes within a business promote peace-building between members of conflicting identity groups within an employment context?
3. Can the process for peace-building in business be applied to other businesses?

From these questions, a set of sub-questions were developed from existing theories, to assist in formulating a potential process for how peace-building takes place within a business and to act as guides for the collection of data.

Question one comes from the need to understand the context in which the company operates. This is drawn directly from the Contingency Model described above (Bercovitch & Langley, 1993). In order to frame the context, the UN Resource Pack was used as it provides a guide for companies operating in
foreign countries. The general areas of concern outlined in the resource pack led to the formulation of working questions 1a and b.

Q1a: How do the Social, Political, Economic, Security and Environmental context in which a company operates have an effect on its peace-building ability?

Q1b: How does a company that facilitates peace-building positively affect the Social, Political, Economic, Security and Environmental context in which it operates?

Question two is intended to understand the internal processes of a company that are directly related to peace-building. While no single theory drives this question, a number of ideas and concepts described in chapters 1 and 2 are used to formulate the working questions. The first being the influence poverty and economic development have on conflict (Goodhand, 2003; Glinkina & Rosenberg, 2003). Second is the significance of communication (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005) and the mutual understanding that comes from it (Galinsky et al., 2011). Third, is the creation and importance of a shared identity in facilitating cooperation (Jehn et al., 1999), which draws from both Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986) and the relative salience of multiple identities (Huddy, 2001). When combined, the following working questions form the basis for the proposed process of peace-building within a business setting:

Q2a: Will the economic gain through meaningful employment increase the willingness to engage in communication with those on the opposite side of an identity-based conflict?

Q2b: Will communication at the workplace between employees on opposite sides of identity-based conflict lead to mutual understanding?
Q2c: Will mutual understanding between groups in conflict lead to the creation of a shared workplace identity?

Q2d: Will the creation of a shared workplace identity promote cooperation and peace-building?

Question 3 refers to the building of a model based on the analysis of data derived by answering questions 1 and 2. As such, there are no foundational theories or concepts underlying this question. Rather, this question is driven more by theory-building than the application of existing theory. As such, the overarching guide for this study is as follows:

1. How do external conditions facilitate the use of business for peace-building?

   Q1a: How does the Social, Political, Economic, Security and Environmental context in which a company operates have an effect on its peace-building ability?

   Q1b: How does a company that facilitates peace-building positively affect the Social, Political, Economic, Security and Environmental context in which it operates?

2. What internal processes within a business promote peace-building between members of conflicting identity groups within an employment context?

   Q2a: Will the economic gain through employment increase the willingness to engage in communication with those on the opposite side of an identity-based conflict?

   Q2b: Will communication at the workplace between employees on opposite sides of identity-based conflict lead to mutual understanding?
Q2c: Will mutual understanding between groups in conflict lead to the creation of a shared workplace identity?

Q2d: Will the creation of a shared workplace identity promote cooperation and peace-building?

3. Can the process for peace-building in business be applied to other businesses?
Chapter 3: Methodology

A good head and a good heart are always a formidable combination.

-Nelson Mandela

A significant aspect of this study is the use of qualitative methods, specifically an Appreciative Inquiry based methodology, in order to discover the phenomenon directly from those who live it while also maintaining a positive, or appreciative, view towards both the phenomenon and towards the research itself. There is neither an attempt to hide the normative quality of this study nor the intended practical application of its outcome. As such, a distinctly qualitative and appreciative method is used as they account for the human element of peace-building and focuses this research on best practices that inform what can be done rather than what should be avoided. The latter is particularly important as the final outcome of this study is a prescriptive model that is intended to be applied in other regions experiencing conflict.

Chapter 1 discussed the underpinnings and purpose behind this study and chapter 2 provided details on the theoretical framework guiding this research. In this chapter, an explanation of the methods used to collect data and analyze it toward the ultimate production of a model is provided. Before this is a description of why a qualitative method is used including the benefits of conducting interviews and the use of Appreciative Inquiry as the primary influence on the method of research in this study.
Qualitative Methods

Qualitative Nature of This Study

This study purposely uses a qualitative methodology instead of a quantitative methodology for several reasons. First, as described in the previous chapter, identity is a charged aspect of human organizing and is particularly significant in feelings toward in-group and out-group members. Due to the nature of the topic, these emotions cannot be viewed as confounding but rather must be seen as significant components of the data. For this reason, the data cannot be void of the emotions of the respondents as is the case sometimes with quantitative research. In the latter, emotion is seen as introducing bias but in some qualitative research, it is an important factor that needs to be captured. The best way to capture this is through interviews rather than questionnaires.

Second, this study is normative in nature so no attempt will be made to hide or remove the inherent bias of the researcher. In fact, according to Denzin and Lincoln (2000), all research is based on what they call the researchers “interpretive paradigm” consisting of the belief systems the researcher holds regarding his or her research. This includes their personal beliefs about ontology, epistemology and methodology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). What is sought in this study is an understanding of how to resolve conflict and not an understanding of conflict in general, which would not advance the normative goal of this study. Qualitative research takes the researcher’s bias into account as the researcher is an active participant in the research. As such, this study would fall in line with Denzin and Lincoln’s view of the relationship between research and researcher.
Last, qualitative research supports the exploratory nature of this study by uncovering ideas and descriptive data. It is appropriate because it “can be used to uncover and understand what lies behind any phenomenon about which little is yet known” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990: 19). The data sought in this study is deeply ingrained in the lives of the participants. This cannot be discovered using quantitative methods where human phenomenon is sometimes reduced to a numerical outcome. Qualitative research:

provide(s) bases for understanding social processes that underlie management. Qualitative research provide(s) memorable examples... and has potential to rehumanize [sic] research and theory by highlighting human interactions and meanings that underlie phenomena and relationships among variables that are often addressed (Gephart, 2004: 455).

To this end, this research method consists of in-person interviews focusing on bringing out positive, or appreciative, information on the phenomenon. Here, interviews of individuals working together but from rival sides of a conflict are conducted to discover and understand the peace-building process within organizations. Further, personal observations will also be included during data collection because symbolism can play a large role in transforming conflict (Schirch, 2004), especially in identity-based conflicts since symbols are closely attached to identities (Carlie, 2002; Taylor et al., 2003; Bryan & Gillespie, 2005). Here, personal observations will be collected of both symbols at Homeboy as well as rituals, which also play a symbolic role in transforming conflict (Schirch, 2004).
Aside from the above advantages of conducting a qualitative study in general, in-person interviews offer several unique advantages specifically. First, personal interviews can provide depth to the data that comes from description and narrative associated with holding conversations. This is because most people are willing to cooperate, most likely because of the one-on-one interaction (Miller, 1977). Second, the information gathered is more likely to be correct than that collected by other methods because the interviewer can clear up seemingly inaccurate answers by explaining the questions to the interviewee (Miller, 1977; Trochim, 2000).

The language of the interview can be adapted, before the interview is conducted, to fit the ability or educational level of the person interviewed as well (Miller, 1977). This can help prevent further misinterpretations or misleading questions. Interviewees also have the opportunity to ask clarifying questions, something they would normally be unable to do in a written questionnaire. Also, related to this, if the interviewee attempts to falsify information, the interviewer can be trained to spot these cases and take steps to get the truth (Miller, 1977).

All the above is possible because the information is gathered live and the interviewer can react to each interview on the spot instead of looking at the data after the fact and thus need to adjust for anomalies retroactively (Alderfer & Smith, 1982; Trochim, 2000).

Third, the interviewer can return for secondary visits to complete items on the schedule or to correct mistakes usually without annoying the interviewee. This can aid in yielding greater numbers of usable interviews and improve data
reliability (Miller, 1977). They can also control who responds to both ensure that the actual person desired is answering the questions and that only a single person is responding as opposed to conferring with others. Interviewers can also hold group interviews if they so choose (Miller, 1977). Fourth, the interviewer may catch the interviewee off guard, which can be helpful as it secures more spontaneous reactions that offer “real” experiences and stories. When a questionnaire is used, respondents have time to think about their responses and may subject responses to social desirability rather than authentic answers (Miller, 1977).

Lastly, personal interviews can take long enough, provided the interview has an open time-frame, to allow the interviewee to become oriented to the topic enough to recall relevant material (Miller, 1977). In essence, it allows for interviewees to be psychologically present in the interview long enough to actively engage with the topic of study rather than passively answer questions in a survey. Further, questions can be organized to fit the interviewee so that sensitive questions can be mixed in with others to avoid rebellion by the interviewee. Interviewers can change the subject or explain the topic further if necessary if they notice discomfort or displeasure on the part of the interviewee in order to put them at ease. Delicate situations can be dealt with more effectively in person whereas if such situations come up with a survey, the respondent can simply choose not to fill it out or pass over the question when it can provide significant information (Miller, 1977; Trochim, 2000).
Unfortunately, with the above advantages come several disadvantages to conducting interview research, two of which are relevant to this study. First, the human factor may distort the data so that interviewee’s responses can inadvertently reflect the views of the interviewer (Miller, 1977; Trochim, 2000). To address this, interviewees were asked about their own experiences, which ensured the emergent nature of responses preventing questions from leading respondents to a specific answer. From stories of experiences, themes will be taken across responses after all interviews are completed. As stated previously, this study is normative in nature and using Appreciative Inquiry as a method is meant to introduce this positive view and to explore it so the questions themselves are meant to solicit appreciative responses. This does not mean that the questions are meant to influence responses in anyway. Rather, the questions only solicit information on what has worked and what are the respondents’ positive images of the future.

The reason questions are formulated to solicit positive information is that the Appreciative Inquiry approach purposely focuses on what works since understanding what does not work only helps in understanding what does not work. The latter does not provide any prescriptive information on how to accomplish desired outcomes, only what actions to avoid. This mirrors the attitude of the researcher and, as such, the questions themselves purposely take into account the bias of the researcher. As a researcher, I do not have any prior knowledge of how gangs function but I am familiar with identity groups from previous research involving identity-based conflicts. This provides an advantage
in that there is familiarity with the overall concept of identity-based conflict but no preconceived notions about the specific type of conflict addressed in this study. To further account for this, however, explicit mention of the nature and purpose of the study will be made before interviews so that interviewees understand why questions are asked and to establish a trusting relationship with the interviewer (Alderfer & Smith, 1982; Trochim, 2000). Questions will also be asked exactly as written without any coloring of the wording to ensure no additional bias is introduced (Trochim, 2000).

The second disadvantage is less of a research issue and more of a feasibility issue. Interview research tends to cost more in terms of transportation and time (Miller, 1977). To reduce this, a single interviewer will conduct all interviews, removing the cost of hiring and training multiple interviewers. Further, interviews were limited to half an hour so as to reduce the time requirement as well as to reduce any potential disruption of normal business operations. Overall though, it is clear that there are many more advantages to in-person interviews than there are disadvantages. For this reason, along with the topic of study, interviews were the best option for collecting information and were able to provide useful data.

This dissertation follows a classical case study approach where "researchers tend to focus on comparisons within the same organizational context (Dyer & Wilkins, 1991:614). While multiple organizational cases would be preferable for theory building, the feasibility of such a comparison was not possible for this study because of the minimal number of organizations
undertaking such criteria suited to this study, which is in line with the exploratory nature of the topic. It is because of the feasibility that an internal organizational comparison was chosen so as to have some level or reliability. Further, a good case study comparison usually has between 4 to 10 cases with fewer than 4 making it difficult to generate much complexity “unless the case has several mini cases within it” (Eisenhardt, 1989:545). The four profit generating businesses each act as a case within a case and so are in essence four cases themselves but within the same framework of a business working toward peace-building.

This study benefits from a single case study approach because this method is most conducive to exploratory studies (Guba & Lincoln, 1993) and for theory building rather than hypothesis testing (Dyer & Wilkinson, 1991). As an exploratory study in the use of business for peace-building, it was important to choose a method that uncovered information on a phenomenon rather than making claims based on existing theory to be tested. The reason for this is because existing theory is related but not directly applicable to this avenue of research as it has not been studied in this way or with the rigor this study attempts to create. While there may be some shortcomings in these attempts here, the intention was to produce research on the role of business in peace-building beyond just anecdotal information. This is not to say that significant work cannot be done with anecdotal data but that the intention of this study is to take the great work identifying such phenomenon (see Nelson, 2000) and exploring it methodically.
Further, there is an explicit desire to produce a model for peace-building within a business context out of the findings of this study. This is driven more by theory building than theory testing as it relies on emergent data to be shaped into a potential theory for later testing. For this reason it made more sense to spend more time on a single case in order to uncover deeper social processes rather than gather skimming the surface across multiple cases (Dyer & Wilkinson, 1991). What is needed for model development is a deeper understanding brought about by rich stories (Dyer & Wilkinson, 1991), something in-line with an Appreciative Inquiry influenced methodology (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). This also allows for an instrumental case study where the design is specifically meant to produce insight into an issue (Stake, 2000).

Generalizability is something that requires theory or model testing to see if the phenomenon under study does in fact exist outside of the specific context of the single case study (Yin, 2009). This is a limitation of case studies that prevents definitive claims from being made from the findings. Conclusions must then be explicitly linked to the case since a single case study does not allow for theory or hypothesis testing without further exploration of other cases.

Another limitation of a single case study method is that the nature of soliciting deeper social processes requires acquiring knowledge that is potentially more sensitive than other data collection methods (Langley & Royer, 2006). This brings up the issue of confidentiality. Researchers thus have to take on a greater challenge of maintaining anonymity. This also adds a level of difficulty in
reporting findings as the more rich the case material the harder it is to conceal the identities of individuals (Langley & Royer, 2006).

Along with this is the nature of controlling all variables. A case study is done in the field where not all variables can be accounted for (Guba & Lincoln, 1993). This is made more difficult with a single case study because some variability in the data can be accounted for with multiple case studies. A single case study does not have this ability, which is why conclusions must be validated through further ‘testing’ in other cases.

**Appreciative Inquiry**

To review what was discussed in chapter 1, Appreciative Inquiry, both as a methodology and philosophy, is based on the premise that the search for the best in individuals and organizations will result in discovering and leveraging positive potential (Cooperrider et al., 2008). Its intention is to discover, understand and foster innovations in social organizational arrangements and processes (Cooperrider et al., 2008). Thus, it is both a search for knowledge and a theory for collective action designed to evolve the normative will and vision of a group, organization or society as a whole (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). Appreciative Inquiry promotes alternative understandings of social and behavioral science in terms of their generative capacity by questioning assumptions and belief systems to produce new ways of thinking and new alternatives for action (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999).
The first part of Appreciative Inquiry, appreciation, refers to the philosophical underpinnings of the theory. Appreciation is the art of discovering and valuing factors that give life to a system (Cooperrider et al., 2008). It focuses not just on the positive but on past and present assets and ‘victories’ to better understand how they occurred and how to build off of them. It is a forward looking process that is driven by images of the future characterized by what is ideal and what will drive people forward (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999).

The significance of using an Appreciative Inquiry view is that it naturally lends itself to the study of peace because peace is an image of the future characterized by what is ideal. In this sense, peace is seen as the appreciative future for any identity group, which assumes conflict to be emergent and not intrinsic to humanity (Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2005). This view of conflict, one adopted in this study, would see a need for promoting a positive image of cooperation and trust and then working towards those ideals. Appreciative Inquiry is tailored for just such a process and for that reason the method for conducting this research is heavily influenced by it.

As an added benefit, Appreciative Inquiry is oriented toward action-research. This approach goes beyond problem-solving, which often requires strict separation and objectivity by the researcher. Instead, it takes bias into account going as far as embracing the normative stance of the researcher (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). This goes to the core purpose of this study, which is to promote peace with an explicit disregard for studying what promotes conflict. In this sense, this study adopts the same belief found in Appreciative
Inquiry that human systems are heliotropic toward what is good, that is; they naturally and automatically evolve toward anticipatory views of the future (Cooperrider, 1999).

The second part of Appreciative Inquiry, inquiry, goes more toward the practical aspect of the theory. The process involves interviews meant to draw out the best of the past to understand what people want more of and what visions they have for the future (Cooperrider et al., 2008). For this reason the data collection phase of this study utilizes interview questions that are appreciative in nature, as described later in this chapter. The art of inquiry moves in the direction of evoking positive images that lead to positive action (Cooperrider et al., 2008). It is the use of inquiry to discover the positive core of an organization and the potential future of an organization or society. To do this, Appreciative Inquiry asks two fundamental questions: what gives life to a system and what are possibilities for more effective forms of organizing (Cooperrider et al., 2008).

The first question is what this study seeks to understand in terms of organizations that participate in promoting peace-building between identity groups in conflict. The aspects of these organizations that promote peace-building are in essence the aspects that give it life. This is because, by promoting peace-building, the organization is promoting alternative futures for the members of the identity groups that are hopeful and include positive images of prosperity, safety and potential development brought about by peace.

The second question, while meant to be specific to the organization, is intended to be constitutive of a model to apply in other conflict areas. The
possibilities for more effective forms of organizing, while often referring to effective business practice, here are taken as effective forms of relating to opposing identities through the use of business operations. In fact, action-research is meant to bring to light factors involved in organizing that nourish human spirit (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). Effective forms of organizing, for the purpose of this study, are thus taken to mean cooperation between members of groups in conflict since this is the operational definition of peace-building used here. Given this understanding, effective organizing is interchangeable with peace-building because cooperation is inherently a form of effective organizing when it comes about through the creation of a shared identity within the organization.

These two questions are mostly referring to aspects of the same system but are used in this study on a more macro-level. The first question, what gives life to a system, is explored in a case study but instead of limiting it to a specific context, generalizable themes will be developed for the purpose of building a model. This model, meant to answer the second question, a possible alternative for more effective organizing, is not meant to be applied to the same case but to be used in promoting effective organizing and/or peace-building in other regions experiencing identity-based conflict. This study seeks the exceptional “what is” of a case study where business is used to promote peace in order to imagine “what might be” for other conflicts (Cooperrider et al., 2008).

In order to understand how this will be done, it is important to understand the process outlined by Appreciative Inquiry. There are 4 stages in the
Appreciative Inquiry cycle, of which only the first two apply here because they are more research oriented. The second two stages deal with taking the next steps after gathering information and thus are more geared toward practice. The 4 stages are: Discovery, Dream, Design and Destiny (Cooperrider et al., 2008).

Discovery is where individuals engage in dialogue and sense-making. It is referred to as the data collection phase of the cycle. Through discourse and conversation, individual appreciation, will and vision becomes a shared appreciation, will and vision (Cooperrider et al., 2008). It is in this stage that inquiry is most prominent because individuals are most interested in learning about the best experiences, best practices and visions of the ideal future. It is crucial that questions are crafted carefully to capture this information (Cooperrider et al., 2008). It is this process that is adapted for data collection in this study. In the case, the experiences and visions for the future that will be captured are those surrounding peace-building within the organization. The interviews are meant to gather the relevant information pertaining to the aspects of the business connected to promoting cooperation between identity groups in conflict.

In the Dream stage, the stories from the Discovery stage are analyzed and themes are found to create a practical image for the future. Here, what might be a better organization or better world is explored but is grounded in the experiences brought up in the previous stage (Cooperrider et al., 2008). It is generative at the same time, seeking to expand on “what is” in order to imagine full potential. The possibilities of what could be or what might be are sought in
this stage. Again, Appreciative Inquiry is not a problem-solving method so even though the term analysis is used it is not a traditionally analytical process in that the ultimate goal is a “correct” idea. Rather, the process focuses on finding broad themes that contribute to an organization’s success (Cooperrider et al., 2008). These themes, however, are derived from the analysis of interview transcripts and not directly identified by interviewees as is the case with a typical Appreciative Process.

The themes found from the interviews are what will become the model for promoting peace in business. Organizational success then is seen as the company’s ability to promote cooperation among the conflicting identity group members (Cooperrider et al., 2008). Studying a company that has met with such success is key to this whole process because it allows for discovery of the aspects of the company that have led to peace. In the Dream phase of this study, themes will be uncovered leading to a model for other organizations in other conflict areas to reach their potential.

The last two stages, Design and Destiny, deal with the action steps to bringing this potential to fruition. Design refers to leveraging past and outside successes to create a strategic intent for moving toward the future vision found in the first two stages (Cooperrider et al., 2008). This is a step beyond this study as it requires that the model be created in order to produce a means to apply it in other arenas. Destiny refers to taking the design and acting on it. Here, the ideals from the previous stages are grounded in reality to provide empowerment to make this happen (Cooperrider et al., 2008). Again, this is beyond the scope of
this study as well because it requires a model to be created before it can be acted on. This stage would be more applicable when the model developed in this study is taken into the field with an actual attempt at applying it.

Appreciative Inquiry is one of the overarching philosophies of this study but since it is also the theory used to guide the methodology of the study, it is important to understand the four underlying principles of how the Appreciative Inquiry theory believes research should be conducted. First, research should begin with appreciation. This means that the researcher must first assume the social system actually works (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). This is a guiding concept for this research paper as the case study is purposely chosen to show a system that has worked in order to understand how it has worked. Inherently normative, the intention is to produce a model for building peace that is prescriptive and so it would not make sense to study a case in which violence was created. There is a moral stance taken here that, and I believe hardly arguable, learning how to promote violence is not a productive endeavor.

Second, research should be applicable in that theoretical knowledge should be created to be applied and validated through action (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). While a theoretical contribution will be the final outcome of this dissertation in the form of a model for peace-building in business, the intent is to create a prescriptive means for actual, real-life conflict resolution. It is one thing to discuss how to reduce violence but in the end that does not help save lives. Actual practice using the model is purpose behind conducting this research study.
Third, research should be provocative. This does not mean that it should illicit an emotional response as much as it means that research should generate images of realistic developmental opportunities (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). Appreciative knowledge of what actually exists is suggestive of what might be (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). The provocative nature of research is meant to generate open avenues of thought to potential possibilities of future systems that are more than they currently are; that are better by some collective and subjective measure. In this way, Appreciative Inquiry can be both pragmatic and visionary (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). An image of peace between identities in conflict is exactly what this principle suggests. When in the midst of violent conflict, participants are unlikely thinking of peace: it’s probably the last thing they think about. But through a process found in business it may be possible to open their minds to the possibility and potentially provide a road to making it a reality. It is that process that I seek to understand.

Fourth, research should be collaborative. In this sense, there is no separation between the researcher and the organization, but rather there needs to be an interactive relationship in order to fully understand the processes at work (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1999). This will be done through the use of interviews where the researcher, in this case myself, will actually be embedded in the process of understanding and sense-making. Due to the normative nature of the study, that peace-building is better than conflict, this last principle should come as no surprise as both I and the employees of the organization should presuppose the potential for peace beyond the confines of the organization.
In the next section, an overview of the nature of this study is provided in order to understand the use of qualitative methods and why they were chosen for the topic of this study. The specifics of the Appreciative Inquiry process will be revisited at the end of this chapter when the interview protocol is introduced after the working questions are described and the logic behind them is explained.

Research Context

Site Description and Data collection

One of the most immediate forms of identity-based conflict in the United States is that of gang violence. Gangs constitute identity groups that closely resemble that of cultural or ethnic identities. In fact, gangs are cultural groups themselves as they often share common languages, beliefs, values, symbols and artifacts (Carlie, 2002; Taylor et al., 2003). A culture is defined as “the totality of learned, socially transmitting customs, knowledge, material objects, and behavior” (Schaefer, 2001: 65). Gangs fit this definition because they claim territory, are self-supporting, have their own language and customs, and establish their own rules and codes of conduct. Their customs are passed to new members by rites of passage from generation to generation, thus ensuring the continuance of the gang (Etters, 1998).

Gangs often act similar to tribal groups (Etters, 1998), and along with their cultural status, are defined as identity-groups just like any other traditional identity-group based on culture or ethnicity.

No more is this true than with the use of Tattoos, which are a significant form of symbolism for gang membership, often used for the specific purpose of
identifying in-group or out-group affiliation (Riley, 2006). While this is the primary purpose of a gang tattoo, they can also be used to convey status, rank or personal accomplishments (Phelan & Hunt, 2011). Tattoos are also used to convey a person’s beliefs or lifestyle to others (Mallon & Russell, 1999), incorporating a symbolic self-completion into an individual’s identity (Phelan & Hunt, 2011).

Further, Gangs fulfill needs of individuals when they cannot find them in society (Gardner, 1992). These needs include economic and ethnic marginality, material gain and support from peer groups among others (Gordon, 2000). Thus, they operate as an extension of an individual’s self-definition and their place within the group (Phelan & Hunt, 2011). In line with Social Identity Theory, gang identity is based on the internal recognition of membership and in-group favoritism (Huddy, 2001). This comes from the need to create positive images of in-group affiliation (Turner et al., 1987).

For gang members, this is a need fulfilled by positive support of peers often sought after such support is not found outside the gang (Gordon, 2000). Thus, a person’s membership provides a sense of belonging and relates to a sense of who the individual is as a person (Cheldelin, 2006b). If gang membership “stands for a person’s whole sense of self, then everything he has, wears, or says is colored by gang identity” (Gardner, 1992: pg. 41).

Further, positive in-group identities are reinforced by strong out-group antipathy, which can lead to intergroup conflict (Huddy, 2001). For gangs this is no different. If gang membership gives individuals a sense of self then “any insult
to even the trappings of gang identity is ground for battle” (Gardner, 1992: pg. 54). Because gangs are a form of identity group, a business that hires former gang members, creating stakeholder value by promoting cooperation between them while also creating shareholder value, would be an appropriate site for a case study.

It is for this reason that Homeboy Industries was chosen as an exemplar case of the use of business for peace-building within an identity-based conflict. Homeboy employs former gang members from inner-city Los Angeles, many of whom are former members of rival gangs. Homeboy has been operating since the mid-1980’s under the founder, Father Greg Boyle, as a means of addressing gang violence through social services and ad-hoc job placement. This means that Father Greg helped gang members to locate employment on an individual basis or in small groups when the jobs made themselves available. He grew his project into to where Homeboy Industries actively worked to provide social services such as emotional and addiction counseling, education tutoring and GED classes, legal services and many more. However, the job placement and employment aspects of Homeboy have always remained a vital part of the overall answer to violent gang conflicts in the LA area.

Homeboy operates four profit-generating businesses that serve to provide jobs for gang members as well as revenues for the company. Officially, Homeboy is a 501c3 non-profit but the four profit-generating businesses provide operating revenue for the company to offset the need for donations. Homeboy’s website states that the profits from the four businesses account for 25% of the total
operating revenues. However, in an interview with one of the managers, this number was amended to 40%, meaning revenues from the four businesses was increasing and covering more of the operating costs. It was suggested that the next benchmark Homeboy is looking for is to have these businesses cover 60% of operating costs as a step toward becoming completely self-reliant. On their way to doing this, a fifth profit-generating business was being planned during the time interviews were being conducted.

Given the focus on sustainable value in this study, only employees of the four profit generating businesses were interviewed along with four senior managers of Homeboy. Interviewees were paid employees, meaning no volunteers were interviewed, and all came from services that Homeboy charges for and not from those services provided free of charge (i.e. the non-profit services). This was done to make sure this study focuses on both the stakeholder value and the shareholder value created as both are required for true sustainable value to be created. The other services Homeboy offers may provide value, and as will be seen in the findings do support paid employees, but they do not directly create shareholder value. Given that Homeboy’s profit-generating businesses are increasing the retained earnings of the company in the form of revenue contribution toward operating costs, it was necessary to focus the exploration of stakeholder value on those parts of Homeboy that are creating shareholder value as well.

Six employees were interviewed from each of the four businesses for a total of 24 employee interviews. Each business varied in size from the largest,
the bakery, with over 15 employees to the smallest, the diner, which had only 6. However, the number 6 was chosen before due to feasibility and access granted by Homeboy itself. A workable number of interviews from each business was needed in order to prevent any undue strain on the normal operations of each business as the management expressed concern over the time employees were taken from working.

Participants were recruited independently from among the four profit-generating businesses. That is, the recruiting was not done through the parent company, Homeboy Industries, but rather through the managers of each business. Participants were required to be above the age of 18 to avoid at-risk populations and to have an adequate understanding of the English language to facilitate interviewing without the need for an interpreter to maintain confidentiality and for feasibility. Even though the interview protocol focused only on positive experiences and imagery, being that participants are former gang members, many of whom are also former convicts, great strides were taken to ensure confidentiality, something Homeboy management had made a priority when access was first granted.

All interviews were recorded using a personal digital audio recorder. Only the primary researcher had possession of the recorder for the duration of the study. Within one week of the interview, the digital file was saved to the researcher's personal computer. No identifying information was used to label files and the master list of identifying codes was not stored with the audio files. All files will be stored on the personal computer of the researcher for a period of less
than three years from the study dates. On or before that time, all interview files will be destroyed. Individual interview files were labeled with non-identifiable information, however, information such as voice recognition or story-content cannot be removed. For this reason, great care was taken to protect interview files. All participation was voluntary and none of Homeboy’s management or employees was given access to the audio files or transcripts.

The four profit-generating businesses act as cases within a case in that they function independent of each other but still operate under the same principles of the company as a whole. In this way, each individual business could be evaluated separately in terms of the themes found amongst its employees and then the themes from each business could be compared against each other to address internal reliability. As such, even though only 6 interviews came from each business, a total of 24 interviews are used for analysis of the same phenomenon including some level of internal reliability within a small total sample size. This process follows a classical case study approach where “researchers tend to focus on comparisons within the same organizational context” (Dyer & Wilkins, 1991:614). Further, the depth and open-ended nature of the interviews provided rich and thick descriptions which also allowed 24 interviews to be sufficient. Figure 5 below provides an organizational chart of Homeboy’s structure.
While any research would benefit from more interviews, 24 were done for the reason above, to minimize the disruption to normal business operations. However, 24 interviews are still deemed adequate for this study, both because of the four cases within a case approach that adds internal reliability and because qualitative research, in general, can still produce quality outcomes with smaller sample sizes.

For example, Tina Jaeckle and Alexia Georakopoulos (2010) conducted a qualitative, interview study looking at the social constructions of identity, trauma and transnationalism, a topic not too far from this study. They were able to publish findings that include the impacts on cognitive structural features, such as frames, beliefs, rules, etc., which allow for a deeper understanding of the construction and interpretation of interpersonal conflict analysis and resolution (2010). These finding came after conducting only 10 interviews. Kirsty Tumes
(2007) conducted a study where she looked at non-violent conflict within the recreational space where two groups were required to share the same, protected space but for different uses. While not an emotionally charged conflict, except for those involved, the point of the study was not to discover ways of resolving conflict but rather was to employ qualitative methods to understanding conflict. The findings highlight the complexities and subtleties of such conflicts and provide insight for more comprehensive model building and she only conducted 6 interviews, all of which were from one side of the conflict and not the other (2007).

While both these studies are not meant to inform the topic of this study, they highlight the ability to produce quality research using interviews with sample sizes much smaller than the one used here. In this study, it was important to have a single case study in order to uncover “deeper social dynamics” often found from a focus on a single case (Dyer & Wilkins, 1991: 615). However, dividing the single case into a cases-within-a-case format provided added benefit. The four profit-generating businesses within the same organization would meet the four cases minimum for a good comparison (Eisenhardt, 1989), allow for internal reliability and has a multiplicative effect in that a total of 24 interviews act as a total sample size for overarching theory building within which some structure exists to strengthen the research (i.e. 4 mini cases for comparison and internal reliability).
Interviews

As mentioned earlier, three questions form the heart of this study. They are:

1. How do external conditions facilitate the use of business for peace-building?
2. What internal processes within a business promote peace-building between members of conflicting identity groups within an employment context?
3. Can the process for peace-building in business be applied to other businesses?

These questions also provide the structure by which the study is designed. Question one refers to the contextual influences on and from Homeboy and so working questions 1a and b were limited to just the manager interviews as they were better suited to understand and inform on the context of Homeboy Industries since this requires a larger, macro view of the company that only managers may have. Further, they were better suited to understand the outside influences on Homeboy and to see the influence Homeboy has on the greater community. This became especially relevant when managers described the relationship of Homeboy with the government and with overall assessments of things such as the number of volunteers and where they work as well as local factors such as crime statistics and community engagement, that employees had a very limited view of. The four managers interviewed were: The Director of External Affairs, The Chief Financial Director, The Executive Administrative Assistant and The Executive Director and Founder of Homeboy, Father Boyle.

Question 2 refers to the inner workings of the company and, even though managers may understand these inner workings, employees were better suited
to provide the deep and rich explanations of the day-to-day activities at Homeboy. It is for this reason that working questions 2a, b, c, and d were limited to just the employees and not managers. Employees interviewed were ‘line’ workers who performed the daily functions of each of the four profit generating business but were limited to employment within each. That is, they did not have any managerial knowledge of the other profit generating businesses.

Of greater importance is that these employees are either current or former gang members. Managers at Homeboy were not affiliated nor have been affiliated with gangs as they came from professional backgrounds, or in the case of Father Greg, from a clergy background. Therefore, there was no reason to interview them regarding their experiences, interactions and sense-making in regard to the peace-building process taking place at Homeboy. Many employees are also former convicts, some even violent offenders, however, no questions were asked about their past lives as gang members. This was because of the agreement with Homeboy for access and because this study is influenced by an Appreciative Inquiry methodology, which means it is purposely normative in that it focuses on the positive experiences of interviewees to understand peace-building and not on their past negative lives that would only provide information on how to become a gang member or create conflict.

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, the third question is a theory-building question and does not have a foundation in any existing literature. As such, question three will be researched through a content analysis of the outcomes from questions one and two, which include observation and employee
interviews. These outcomes will be in the form of a series of propositions regarding how to build positive institutions meant for further hypothesis testing. This is also the reason why working questions are proposed and not hypotheses. For hypotheses to be formed and tested properly, a theorized model must be constructed based on initial research and exploration, which this study intends to do. In this way, this study can be viewed as an interpretive study. The first two questions, however, are drawn from existing theories and concepts that have been combined to form the working questions outlining this study.

Chapter 2 offered a review of the conflict mediation literature in international relations. A model of conflict mediation, the Contingency Model, was introduced that placed explicit emphasis on the context of a conflict as the starting point for any mediation effort (Bercovitch & Langley, 1993). Given the significance of understanding the environment in which mediation takes place, a similar idea is included in this study in understanding the context in which companies operate that allow them to address peace-building within their businesses. For this reason, question one is asked in order to set the contextual stage for understanding the internal aspects of peace-building within a corporation.

While the Contingency Model prescribes an understanding of the context before undertaking any form of conflict resolution (Bercovitch & Langley, 1993), here a different understanding of context, similar but different, is advocated. Rather than the nature of the parties or dispute, an understanding of the external environment that is conducive to the operations of the company will be explored.
This context is drawn from the United Nations’ International Alert Sustaining Business and Peace resource pack because, even though it is purely conceptual, it offers some guidance on corporate citizenship and responsibility (Hettiarchchi et. al, 2009). The five contextual areas identified in the resource pack are: Social, Political, Economic, Security and Environmental.

The resource pack does not identify specific requirements needed to conduct business in each area. Rather, it suggests businesses understand that these five areas will influence and be influenced by company operations (Hettiarchchi et. al, 2009). To this extent, it is not a matter of testing specific actions within each area but that all five are areas of concern. As such, the following working question is asked to identify how these areas influence Homeboy rather than mentioning specific actions within each area:

Q1a: How do the Social, Political, Economic, Security and Environmental context in which a company operates have an effect on its peace-building ability?

The significance of seeking if an effect exists rather than what that effect is comes from the ultimate goal of this study to produce a generalizable, prescriptive model. There may be specific aspects of each area that are conducive in one setting but not in another, making the context of any company too specific to reproduce elsewhere. For this reason, a balance is needed between including the context because of its importance and avoiding radical specificity in reducing the model to the point that it can no longer be prescriptive in other regions.
To this end, interviews will be conducted with executives and senior managers as they will be better suited to provide information on the context of the company. These interviews will focus directly on working questions 1a and b, preceded by a set of questions to solicit general information about the company and the managers as well as set the stage for the interview. A summary of the manager specific protocol is provided at the end of this section. The first set of introductory questions is:

- To begin, please share the story of how Homeboy Industries first started.
- What was your vision of Homeboy when you first joined? What purpose did you hope it would serve?
- Think of a moment when Homeboy Industries best lived up to this purpose. Describe what happened.

Following these is the set of questions specifically addressing working question 1a. They are:

- What aspects of the community helped bring your vision to life?
- How do the community, city and state currently support your vision for Homeboy? Be as exhaustive as you can.

As stated in chapter 1, there is a symbiotic relationship between business and the context in which it operates. According to the UN International Alert resource pack, if any business is to set up operations in an area where conflict once existed then it must understand both the impact of these five areas in terms of risk to the business and the potential benefit the business can create in each of these areas (Hettiarchchi et. al, 2009). Further, since economic development has been shown to reduce conflict and recession increase it (Humphreys, 2003) than the following working question is proposed:
Q1b: How does a company that facilitates peace-building positively affect the Social, Political, Economic, Security and Environmental context in which it operates?

The protocol addressing working question 1b is:

- Can you think of a specific story where Homeboy made a positive impact outside the company? What happened?
- In what ways has Homeboy Industries contributed to the communities in which employees live?
- How do you envision Homeboy Industries in the next 5 to 10 years? What positive contributions do you foresee in the future?

From the contextual factors listed above comes the next stage in the contingency model, which explores the process used for peace-building (Bercovitch & Langley, 1993). For the purpose of this study, the process is the internal factors of a company that promote peace-building between members of conflicting identity groups. The benefit of the model for the purpose of studying processes is that generalized categories of processes are sought in order to better apply them to multiple contexts (Fisher & Keashly, 1991); the same purpose of producing a model from this study. Thus, question two asks: what internal processes within a business promote peace-building between members of conflicting identity groups within an employment context?

The general competition for resources is becoming an accepted explanation for identity-based conflicts (Mousseau, 2001). Violence occurs when one identity group tries to take from others because they have no other means of attaining what they need, placing the blame for this on the out-group due to the negative perception they have constructed for them. This suggests that fulfilling
economic needs will open the door to peace-building (Mousseau, 2001) if conflict resolution is integrated into the economic and social realities of people’s lives (Paz, 2000). Specifically, addressing labor and human capital is necessary toward achieving peace (Humphreys, 2003). Because of this, the following is proposed:

Q2a: *Will the economic gain through employment increase the willingness to engage in communication with those on the opposite side of an identity-based conflict?*

The protocol addressing working question 2a is:

- What attracted you to working at Homeboy? What were your initial impressions?
- What do you value most about working at Homeboy?
- Can you describe a high point moment for you while working here?
- Describe a typical interaction you have while at work. Are there interactions that are not work related?

The importance of communication is that it can create mutual understanding in the form of shared meaning and understanding (Gurevitch, 1989). These questions are meant to engage interviewees on their reasoning for joining Homeboy in order to better understand their motivations for joining Homeboy. The last question is meant to solicit from the interviewee information on whether or not they communicate at work before asking the next set of questions regarding specifically communicating with members of a rival identity group. Business can create a space for groups to communicate by providing the opportunity to work, facilitating interaction and mutual understanding (Fort, 2008). Dialogue and discourse are important steps in working toward peace because in
the situation of conflict they can restore a common frame of meaning which can restore order and balance (Gurevitch, 1989). Dialogue is so crucial because it is believed to change attitudes and behaviors in those involved (Hu, 2006) because negative assumptions of the other group are easier when there is a lack of interaction (Fort, 2008).

For mutual understanding to take root there needs to be direct human contact (Gurevitch, 1989; Paz, 2000). However, individual efforts to reduce assumptions and negative perceptual distortions are often hindered by institutional norms and settings that are less conducive to this change (Aram, 1999). Business settings, however, are naturally conducive to facilitating communication because employees are expected to cooperate to accomplish tasks. This can set the bare minimum of cooperative communication that opens doors for reducing perceptual distortions, leading to mutual understanding. For this reason the following working question is proposed:

Q2b: Will communication at the workplace between employees on opposite sides of an identity-based conflict lead to mutual understanding?

The protocol addressing working question 2b is:

- Can you think of a positive relationship you have with someone who you initially didn't think you would have a relationship with? Can you describe it for me?
- What similarities have you discovered from this relationship?

Peace will grow from conditions in which there are deepening mutual understanding and knowledge (Paz, 2000). The enhancement of knowledge of
the other comes from moving from the dehumanizing of the other to giving them a human face (Paz, 2000). This deconstruction of the old, negative image of the out-group and the reconstruction of a new, positive image of the out-group comes from understanding the motivations and values of the other group (Baumann, 2009). This is based on the idea that sharing beliefs can foster common ground, allowing misconceptions to be addressed (Fort, 2006). By eliminating previously negative images of the out-group, the door opens for the creation of a new image of the out-group that highlights commonalities (Cheldelin, 2006b) and by undermining differences, a new identity based on those commonalities can be formed. From this the following working question is proposed:

Q2c: Will mutual understanding between groups in conflict lead to the creation of a shared identity?

The protocol addressing working question 2c is:

- Think of a time you and your fellow employees felt a sense of shared commitment to Homeboy. Why did you feel such commitment? What about Homeboy helped create it?

A process that fosters mutual understanding is one that undermines differences and supports a shared identity between groups, which can reduce conflict (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). The absence of a shared identity can lead individuals to become more inclined to view members of the out-group as negative (Jehn et al., 1999). A shared identity can moderate conflict in a way that minimizes differences in groups and supports commonalities (Hinds & Mortensen,
Since it is possible to hold multiple identities with different levels of saliency, a shared work identity can be created without replacing the previous identities, something that members may be reluctant to give up (Paz, 2000; Huddy, 2001). This shared workplace identity fulfills both the economic need to work, which brings groups in conflict together, and the creation of a new identity by providing a space for human contact where it is possible for group members to share beliefs and values. In so doing, groups should be more likely to cooperate, both for work tasks and non-work tasks, extending to elements of the conflict (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). Given the definition of peace as a reduction in violence, through reducing differences and antipathy, and the promotion of cooperation, through mutual understanding and a shared identity, the following is proposed as leading to peace-building:

Q2d: Will the creation of a shared workplace identity promote cooperation and peace-building?

The protocol addressing working question 2d is:

- What is the core factor of Homeboy that facilitates cooperation among employees?
- Imagine it is 10 years in the future. What is going on in your life? In your community?
- How has working at Homeboy influenced your vision for your future?

To reiterate, the definition of peace used in this study is the absence of violence and the presence of positive factors that foster cooperation so that there is social justice and the free development of human potential. Hence, the four parts of question 2 are meant to be connected and each part is meant as a step
towards fostering cooperation among groups in conflict. Specifically, the use of
business to do this is emphasized because employment can bring opposing
group members together, provided the organization has such intention, and gives
a space for communication, the two first crucial steps toward cooperation and
peace-building.

The final question asked is in regards to being able to replicate this
process in multiple contexts and conflicts. There are purposely no working
questions for this question as it is meant to address the ultimate creation of a
model from what is learned from questions 1 and 2. It is important to note that it
is possible that the proposed process (Q2a through d) is not the process that
leads to peace but rather some other element or elements of business serve to
facilitate peace-building. Even though the parts are linked, discovering one or
more to be not true is not meant to discredit the others. The working questions
are drawn from literature but used as guiding elements for conducting the study.
There is still an exploratory nature that serves to welcome any new information
discovered, as is the case with any qualitative study. The full protocol can be
found in Appendix A.

Data Analysis

Using the interview protocol described in the previous chapter, interviews
were conducted over a period of a week and a half in Los Angeles, California.
Employees and manages were informed of the research study ahead of time and
all self-selected to participate. This was necessary due to the sensitive nature of
the respondents’ personal situations and done at the request of Homeboy. As
was explained upon arrival, some employees are not open to discussing their lives with others due to fear of reprisal, either because they feared the other members of their gang would think they were trying to leave, which they often were, or because they were on probation and so feared information could be used to put them in jeopardy with the corrections system of LA county. Given the topic of the study, this was deemed an acceptable method for respondent volunteers and further supported the need for confidentiality.

Interviews were conducted onsite at each of the four profit generating businesses. The bakery and café were both located at Homeboy’s headquarters, the silk screening business was located in a separate facility and the diner was located in LA city hall. Manager interviews were conducted within their respective offices. Each interview was allotted half an hour but with enough flexibility to allow for longer interviews in order to fully capture stories and rich explanations. As stated before, interviews were recorded using a personal audio recorder. No video recording was conducted so as to protect anonymity.

After all interviews were done, audio files were transcribed using a two-step process. First, a straight run through of the audio files were transcribed and wherever necessary, incomprehensible words or phrases were bolded and marked with a time stamp. Next, the audio at those time stamps were reviewed with greater attention to discern what was said. Audio quality was of good enough quality that this did not present a major issue in transcription.

Once all files were transcribed, the process of code development and thematic analysis began. The bakery interviews were used for code development
as these were the first interviews conducted and the bakery is the first profit generating business Homeboy started. Transcripts were read and coded for relevant information using the guiding questions for reference. The entire coding process was done manually in order to ensure the rich information provided by interviewees was properly captured and understood, something that I did not feel comfortable accomplishing otherwise. Theme notes were kept during the entire process of code development and refinement, which included the theme title and a series of bullet points describing the theme in light of what was found in the interviews. These bullet points were then organized and synthesized into the theme definitions listed in Tables 1 and 2 in the next chapter.
Chapter 4: Findings

Somewhere old heroes shuffle safely down the street
Where you can speak out loud
About your doubts and fears
And what’s more no-one ever disappears
You never hear their standard issue kicking in your door.
You can relax on both sides of the tracks
And maniacs don’t blow holes in bandsmen by remote control
And everyone has recourse to the law
And no-one kills the children anymore.

-“The Gunners Dream” by Pink Floyd

Context of Company

The context of Homeboy Industries was analyzed based on interviews of Homeboy managers. Context here is defined as the external environment that is conducive to the operations of the company. This definition presupposes an understanding of context as a state and not a process. Contextual factors are those characteristics of the setting in which Homeboy operate that influence and are influenced by Homeboy, meant only to provide background information. While any context can be dynamic, of interest to this study is a snap-shot of the external conditions that facilitate the use of business to promote peace-building in order to understand the context in which Homeboy Industries currently operates. For this reason, the process of analyzing these interviews was similar to those of employees but with some variation.

First, interviews were conducted with only four managers; the executive director, executive assistant, chief financial officer and director of external affairs. This was because only factors of the context were needed and not information on
processes. As can be seen from the contextual protocol described in chapter 3, questions were more focused and directed at descriptions of fact and less about process and meaning as was the Appreciative Inquiry influenced, employee interview protocol. As such, only four interviews were to confirm facts rather than develop a model for behavior. Second, information gathered from managerial interviews will be used to describe the context of Homeboy Industries so a detailed code development was not necessary. A simple listing of factors sufficed for understanding the context. Again, as described in chapter 1, research question one, what external conditions facilitate the use of business for peace-building, is an exploratory question meant to set the stage for understanding the process of peace-building.

Lastly, the categories used for analysis of interview responses were taken directly from the guiding questions and not developed from the interviews. Since interviewees were asked directly to provide contextual factors, there was no need to create new categories to organize the results of these interviews. Instead, the categories listed in the guiding questions were adhered to except in the cases where a category did not apply or no information on a category was provided in any of the interviews. These categories are the Social, Political, Economic, Security and Environmental influences both on and from Homeboy (Hettiarachchi et. al, 2009). The following analysis will begin first with the contextual results and follow with the internal process so as to follow the order prescribed by the Contingency Model as stated previously (Bercovitch & Langley, 1993). The findings for working questions 1a and b are summarized in table 1 below.
Following the procedure described above, several interesting results emerged that suggest Homeboy has more of an influence on its context than the context has on it. This suggests that, as mentioned in interviews, Homeboy's
existence is not only beneficial but necessary in terms of peace-building and conflict resolution within the Los Angeles area. However, this does not mean that it can operate independently from its community as there are some inputs from the company’s external environment that are required for operations. Following the order of the working questions, findings from the managerial interviews are summarized below beginning first with the external influence on Homeboy followed by the influence of Homeboy on its external environment.

Contextual Influence on Homeboy

Working question 1a, will the Social, Political, Economic, Security and Environmental context in which a company operates have an effect on its peace-building ability, provides a guiding for exploring the contextual influence on Homeboy. Interviewees were asked to provide information on how the community supports Homeboy to first know if the context does influence Homeboy and how that influence manifests. To answer question 1a, the context in which Homeboy operates does have an influence on its ability to operate and on its peace-building capabilities. However, the ways that influence manifests were somewhat limited.

Social Influence: To start, the social influence on Homeboy came in two forms. One is the community support from volunteers. A large portion of the social services offered by Homeboy are provided through volunteers who are professionals that donate their time, either by coming to Homeboy or when
appropriate through their own offices. For example, when asked what kind of outside support Homeboy receives, one manager responded:

Volunteers. We have over 150 volunteers a year. We have 30 volunteer positions alone in tattoo removal. We have another 40 volunteer licensed clinical therapists for our mental health and substance abuse program. We have volunteer educators who run GED preparation and tutoring.

Other volunteers mentioned by managers include attorneys and nonprofit legal entities for legal services and educators for tutoring and education services. These services are vital to the peace-building process as they contribute to the individual improvement of employees, which proved to be a significant aspect as described later under the internal process section.

Along with volunteers, another social influence on Homeboy is the professional training that has been provided to employees. One interviewee mentioned that there have been cases where a community business owner has provided training for individuals at Homeboy to help develop work skills outside the scope of those that Homeboy teaches. For example, in the early days of Homeboy, a local contractor built a childcare center for the original church out of which Homeboy, at the time called Jobs for Future, was run. Mothers within the community could not afford childcare and thus could not go to work. So the contractor “gathered 12 to 15 of the guys that were already involved in gangs and needed jobs.” He then trained them to do construction work and together they made a day care center that not only allowed the mothers to work but also gave the gang members skills they could use for working in construction.
Political Influence: The next contextual influence on Homeboy, Political, was not mentioned as a supporting factor from the community and so was not originally going to be included as a result. However, after reviewing interview transcripts, it seemed that the lack of political support for Homeboy actually served as a benefit rather than detriment. Managers stated that the city of Los Angeles did not provide much in the way of support, especially financially as will be described next, but what was mentioned was how Homeboy served as one of several organizations addressing the gang violence problem and one that is necessary within the community. One manager stated:

Well, I think HomeBoy has become in fact one of the entities, I think there are five of them in LA County that if it didn’t exist, you would imperil public safety. People don’t realize that about this place. But you know, LAPD, Sheriffs, probation department, the detention facilities in this county and HomeBoy Industries. So if you took any one of those entities and just say, “Well, we’re going to not do this anymore,” first off your imagination wouldn’t allow you to do it with those four things. Even if you didn’t like how probation was run or what happens in detention facilities you still wouldn’t say, “Well, let’s just cancel it out and let’s not have it anymore.” Your imagination would not allow you to do it. But we’re in the same situation at HomeBoy, that if this place didn’t exist, the county wouldn’t manage. The reason is because it didn’t manage before this place existed.

Thus, it was inferred that the lack of political support actually contributed to the necessity of having Homeboy in the community and the need for it to continue for the contributions discussed in the next section.

While the political context does not offer any concrete support, the city of Los Angeles, and by extension the state of California, does not get directly
involved in Homeboy, which means Homeboy can operate with a certain level of freedom and independence within the laws of the state of California. This proves beneficial as it is not subject to government oversight and can choose how it operates and what services it can provide. While this was not directly stated in the interviews, it was implied in how managers saw Homeboy fit into the larger context of the gang issue in Los Angeles. Further, as an officially 501c3 non-profit organization, it also benefits from this legal status within the United States in terms of tax breaks.

**Economic Influence:** Even though Homeboy has the benefit of politically independence, this does create an economic problem for them as the government, specifically the city of Los Angeles, gives very little financial support to Homeboy and it was mentioned in the interviews that what they did receive is very little and reducing. However, outside the city of Los Angeles, the community does provide Economic influence on Homeboy in the form of donations. The director of External Affairs stated “most of our funding comes from private foundations and individual donors. That's about 60% of our revenue which is significant and we are a 13 million dollar operation.” This excludes the financial savings from utilizing volunteers as described above. This allows Homeboy to provide its social services for free, which is important to the rehabilitation of its employees and to the community.

As a reminder, even though Homeboy is officially a non-profit business, this study focused just on Homeboy’s profit-generating businesses, which provide the remaining 40% of Homeboy’s funding for operations. The director of
external affairs mentioned, however, that the next milestone she sees for Homeboy is a reverse of these numbers; that the profit-generating businesses provide 60% of the funding while donations would provide the remaining 40%. In this way, the majority of Homeboy’s operating budget would be based on the profit-generating businesses, a goal they are currently looking forward to achieving in the future.

Security Influence: Another important influence on Homeboy is that of security. Since Homeboy’s headquarters are located in a gang neutral location there is not much need for security, however, one manager mentioned the support Homeboy received from the police chief of Los Angeles. In the past, police chiefs were not very supportive of Homeboy because they did not understand what the purpose of it was, feeling it was too protective of criminals. Because of this, the LAPD saw Homeboy as a detrimental organization and harassed employees and anyone who might be wearing clothing with the Homeboy logo on it.

This changed when the immediate past chief of police, who came to understand the role Homeboy plays in the community and so fostered a supportive attitude among police officers. The Executive Administrative Assistant described this when she said:

…when Chief Bratton came into town and became Chief of Police, one of the first things he did was to come to Greg’s office. ...he listened to everything and had a very open mind about the whole thing. And actually they became friends. That’s when we started seeing things change with the police department… In fact, Chief Bratton for the time that he was
here used to have this Tuesday morning staff meetings in the café.

This positive change has contributed to the security of Homeboy by making it more acceptable among law enforcement and this manager even stated that it has drastically reduced the harassment of Homeboy employees. This has continued with the current chief of police as well. As such, Homeboy employees, often former convicts themselves, currently enjoy a level of security and safety from a supportive police chief and law enforcement in general. This positive influence on Homeboy Industries was not considered a political benefit because the interviewee that described this benefit described it as a security issue and did not attach any political motivation to it.

**Environmental Influence:** The last contextual influence on Homeboy is the environmental influence. There was no direct mention of an environmental influence on Homeboy’s ability to operate and promote peace-building. However, one interviewee did mention the physical location of Homeboy’s headquarters provided benefit in the form of easy access to all arteries of transportation. One of the managers mentioned:

> what was brilliant about this lot of dirt was the fact that it’s connected to all arteries of transportation. We have the metro. We have the bus. You can drive. You can walk. And it’s gang neutral. There are no neighborhoods.

This proves significant as many employees of Homeboy cannot afford to own a car and more often than not rely on public transportation to come to work every
day. Outside of this, however, no other environmental influence emerged from the interviews.

Homeboy’s Influence on Community

While the influences on Homeboy from the external context do aid its operations, Homeboy manager interviews suggested that Homeboy provides many more benefits to the community in which it operates than its external environment provides it. The influence of Homeboy Industries on its external environment refers to working question 1b, how does a company that facilitates peace-building positively affect the Social, Political, Economic, Security and Environmental context in which it operates. The answer to this question was made apparent very early on in the interviews and, as stated above, revealed that Homeboy is more influential in that the benefits it provides far exceed the benefits it receives from the community.

Social Influence: The area of most impact coming from Homeboy is that of social influence. Several forms of social influenced emerged from the interviews, the first of which is hope. Managers described Homeboy as a place where gang members could find an outlet from the violence and gang lifestyle. The founder and executive director of Homeboy Industries, Father Greg Boyle, describes the entire purpose of Homeboy as:

…the largest gang intervention rehab and reentry program in the world. So we want to offer hope to folks with whom hope
is foreign. So if this whole gang thing is about a lethal absence of hope, this is a chance to infuse a sense of hope.

He goes on to state that Homeboy is a way to change the paradigm of gang violence response by investing in individuals rather than incarcerating them. This new view of how to deal with gangs is centered on hope and has influenced the communities of Los Angeles by being a “beacon of hope” as the director of external affairs describes it.

Another social benefit Homeboy provides is education. Homeboy has GED and academic tutoring programs to help educate former gang members in order to advance their knowledge and in so doing, allow them to be more attractive to job recruiting and to become contributing members of society. Further, Homeboy Industries also operates an independent, charter school on gang neutral territory that allows young children to continue their education without fear of having to enter “enemy” territory to go to a public school. This further influences the community because it prevents these children from entering gangs in the first place and so plays a preventive function.

One of the areas of social benefit that was emphasized by all the managers is that of public health. Homeboy provides several services aimed at improving health and wellness of its employees and community members. Among these services are a number of classes on making better health choices for individuals and children. One manager describes Homeboy’s contribution in this way:
We are helping them make better decisions that relate to their being, better decisions as it relates to parenting to child development. We’re teaching them how to navigate the medical system. That’s something that I can barely do because it’s so complicated.

The same manager later describes how classes on proper nutrition and better eating habits for employees and their children addresses issues surrounding obesity within the community, an education that is foreign to many who grow up in the gang culture.

Further, as mentioned above, Homeboy has many volunteer therapists who provide mental health services. The counseling and related services offered serve to help former gang members with anger management, child abuse and trauma recovery, a significant service given the gang lifestyle. In doing this, Homeboy has a tremendous influence on the community because addressing mental health issues serves to improve the mental state of individuals so they are less inclined to be violent, including violent behavior in the form of child abuse, thus breaking the cycle of gang involvement and the negative consequences of gang involvement. In addition to these major public health services, Homeboy also aids in child development and child care as well as helps individuals navigate the medical system, ensuring adequate access to greater health services outside of Homeboy, among other services.

The last form of social influence Homeboy has on its external environment is that of diffusion. A Manager described how some employees and new members of Homeboy were referred to Homeboy by someone already at Homeboy. In this way, the positive benefits that Homeboy provides individuals
are spread to the community by way of bringing in new recruits for rehabilitation and thus reducing the number of active gang members in the community. Similar to this, Father Boyle, also stated that Homeboy has consulted with other regions experiencing gang violence to help develop programs there based on ideas they receive from Homeboy and in so doing, contributes to the greater external environment by sharing information that can benefit other societies.

**Political Influence:** Similar to the Political influence of the context on Homeboy, Homeboy’s influence on the political arena is limited. Homeboy is able to provide services that the city cannot and so works as part of a whole response to gang violence, which includes the LAPD, Sheriffs, Probation Department and Detention facilities. In this way, the city almost relies on Homeboy because the four agencies the city operates to combat gang violence are reactive agencies. They deal with the consequences of gang activity, whether it is violence or illegal activity. Homeboy is preventive in that it helps combat the underlying reasons for gang membership while also providing rehabilitative services the city cannot such as employment and education development. As the executive director mentions, before Homeboy the county did not manage gang violence but with Homeboy, the model for how to deal with gang violence changed and so LA county has seen the need to have Homeboy included with the government response.

The chief financial officer stated that Homeboy is able to show authorities that approaching the problem with a positive alternative in providing hope had a positive impact on gang violence. While this did not translate into policy changes, it did contribute to city officials being hands-off with Homeboy and allowing them
to operate without changing their method of delivery. He states: “since we were able to provide hope and show the authorities that by providing hope and changing the method in which people were receiving hope, that it would provide an impact…” On a micro level, there is a change in attitude regarding former gang members among individual city officials.

This is largely due to the Homeboy Diner as it is located within City Hall. While the managers did not mention this individual contribution, an employee of the Diner did talk about how they have multiple conversations a day with city employees. She stated:

But a lot of people have learned from the Home Boy than the home boy has learned from them. We have had more people come into the diner and tell us, “You know what? I was estranged from my sister, my brother, my aunt, my cousin because they were in the same type of lifestyle that you were in, but because I see you every day, I have contacted them.” That’s pretty fulfilling.

Through conversations like this, Homeboy employees have changed those individuals’ perceptions of gang members by humanizing the issue and sharing their struggles both while they were gang members and while leaving the gang lifestyle through Homeboy.

**Economic Influence:** Homeboy has two economic influences on its external environment. The first is a trained workforce. Homeboy has undertaken some job placement activities for its employees where they transition out of working at Homeboy and enter the larger workforce of LA country. For this to work, individuals need to gain necessary skills that are attractive to employers,
ranging from learning to be reliable to learning trade skills, such as solar panel installation that is taught outside of Homeboy but that Homeboy helps fund individuals interested in taking the courses. In so doing, Homeboy is providing an eager, trained workforce to the surrounding community.

The second economic influence Homeboy has on its context is a large financial benefit in the form of reduced taxes. Homeboy helps save the community a lot of money by reducing the amount of tax dollars needed for incarceration and related criminal justice expenses. The director of external affairs provided the actual figures that show the tax savings. She stated:

What we also do for the community is we save them a lot of money. It costs $127,000 to keep somebody in jail a year. It costs us $30,000 to train somebody for one year. It’s crazy, absolutely crazy. Here’s this public safety realignment “California at Crossroads,” it was put together by the ACLU. $100 a day to keep somebody in jail while awaiting trial. $100 a day. So as a tax payer, [we’re the] place they come for because you want to stop paying all this money to send people to jail and keep them in jail.

This means that spending $30,000 will reduces the likelihood of recidivism because they have a job to turn to for money rather than illegal activity and it puts a trained individual into the community as a productive member of society. The work that Homeboy does saves the county $127,000 a year per person, which can add up to millions in tax savings plus the savings from individuals awaiting trial and at the same time creates a trained labor force that pay taxes themselves.
**Security Influence:** Probably the most significant influence Homeboy has on its external environment is that of security. By having rival gang members work side by side, Homeboy employees learn to understand each other, for reasons outlined in the next section, which reduces the likelihood of violence between them. On a larger scale, Homeboy has been able to address the underlying reasons for gang violence, including monetary, educational and psychological. In doing so, public safety has increased by reducing the amount of violence found in the community.

According to Father Boyle, up until 1992, LA County had around 1,000 gang related homicides per year. He stated:

Home Boy tries to do that, but additionally tries to reeducate and provide hope to gang members so that they’re not continuing to do the gang things that they were doing. Over the 25 years we’ve seen the number of gang related homicides reduce by 50% and then reduce by 50% again. Is that solely the responsibility of Home Boy? No, but it’s certainly one of the things that without Home Boy we don’t anticipate would have happened... back 25 years, the way that the government, in other words the police department felt that the way to solve this was let’s be tough on crime. That didn’t work. Not only did gang violence get worse in the early 90s it reached a boiling point.

He further said that the number is coming close to being cut in half yet again. This was echoed by the other managers as well but they do not attribute it entirely due to Homeboy. As the chief financial officer states, this reduction in gang related violence is not uniquely through the work of Homeboy but, in his and Father Boyle’s opinion, it would not have been anticipated without the
presence of Homeboy. This supports the assertion that the private sector is more suited to promoting peace-building in conflict areas than government agencies (Nelson, 2000).

Related to the changing opinions on how to approach public safety in terms of the gang issue in Los Angeles, Homeboy’s Director of External Affairs added that doing things to help develop gang members into productive members of society, such as tattoo removal which helps self-esteem by reducing the stigma associated with them, Homeboy changes the conversation on how to address gang violence. She states, “…if you keep looking at people like monsters, people will behave like monsters.”

Environmental Influence: Unfortunately, no environmental influence was mentioned in any of the interviews and so it is assumed that none exist. As a purely humanitarian organization this would make sense and if any influence were to exist it would more than likely be a secondary or tertiary consequence of Homeboy’s work. As such, it would not be something that would readily emerge in an interview as all four managers focused on things they knew personally to occur and so any possible influence explored here would be purely speculation and not based on any data gathered in interviews or direct observation.

Internal Process

Code Development

In conducting the analysis of interviews, a code was developed to examine themes across the profit-generating businesses and across employee
interviews in order to understand the internal, peace-building process. Again, this study seeks to understand how economic development leads to social development, more specifically, how business promotes peace-building while maintaining profitability. Because of this, interviews and coding were limited to employees of the four, profit-generating businesses of Homeboy.

The code consists of a list of themes that, for the purpose of this study, are simply patterns found that describe and organize observations (Boyatzis, 1998). To create a code, a representative sample of interviews is required for the initial development and refinement. For the peace-building process, the interviews conducted at the Homeboy Bakery were used simply because these were the first interviews conducted and because the bakery is the oldest, profit-generating business at Homeboy. The logic behind this is that the employees of the bakery will have the best understanding of Homeboy and the peace-building process that takes place there because they have been working there the longest. This ensures that the code is a strong representation of Homeboy Industries and the internal, peace-building process.

Using the inductive, data-driven method (Boyatzis, 1998), the code was formed from a series of iterations of analysis and content review of the interviews whereby themes were flagged following the concepts of the guiding questions described in chapter 3. The guiding questions were used to organize information originally but were used as guides, just as the name suggests, and were not meant to be rigid categories so as to open the data analysis up to exploration and potential new possible processes for peace-building. This proved useful as
there was variation in the proposed process as will be described in the next chapter when formulating a proposed model for peace-building in business.

A simple example of the iterations can be seen in one of the two themes that linked categories: Linked to Peace-Building. This theme, described below, manifested first as just a Peace-Building theme. For example, when asked about the nature of his relationship with a former rival, one employee responded:

I would say we’re friends. I’m friends with a lot of them. We’re all, we left our past behind us, you know.

This was coded as a “Change in Rival Relationship.” However, another quote that was coded the same way originally was later changed because of the addition of one significant aspect. This employee stated:

I learned to get along with my rival gang members - people I used to shoot at and people I used to hate. Now we talk together, we get along.

In refining the code, some of the “Change in Rival Relationship” quotes were attached to or directly stated as a result of communicating with the rival and some were not (i.e. “now we talk together”). There were enough instances where this was the case to warrant refining the code to include a theme called “Linked to Peace-Building” under the Communication with Rivals category. The reason was that the peace-building demonstrated, in the case above a Change in Rival Relationship, was actually a result of communicating as stated by the
interviewee. As a result, in order to capture this point, a new theme was created during a later iteration of coding to further refine the code.

As themes were found and refined, they were organized into clusters along similar concepts forming 7 categories of themes; Motivation to Join, Individual Improvement, Shared Identity, Communication with Rival, Peace-building, Characteristics of the Organization and Organizational Norms. Through open-coding, the code was further refined during the process of analyzing interview transcripts (Boyatzis, 1998). The process of coding consisted of reading through each interview transcript using the code as a guide to tag themes as they are found. A note identifying the theme was taken and once the coding of the entire interview transcript was complete, themes were recorded according to category.

A single coder was used for three reasons. First, only a single interviewer conducted interviews for feasibility reasons. Second, since this study is exploratory, the code was only meant to be used in this study. Further hypotheses and model testing in future studies will likely require a refinement of the code at which point inter-rater reliability may be required. Lastly, given that this study is a single case study, the richness of the case material collected is potentially more sensitive than other study designs (Langley & Royer, 2006). The nature of the individuals being former gang members made the interview responses even more sensitive. As such, greater lengths had to be taken to maintain confidentiality, both for the nature of the study and as a prerequisite for
gaining access by Homeboy itself. Thus, coding was limited to a single individual to better ensure confidentiality.

For example, the below excerpt was taken from an interview with an employee of the bakery. The items in bold indicate phrases signifying information used in the coding of this story.

So that’s what this place is about. I love coming here. **Now I pay bills. I never paid bills in my life before. But if felt good to pay that bill with clean money. We earn that money to pay that bill.** I could be broke, have no girlfriend, but I’m happy. That’s all that matters, **I’m happy. I’ve never been happy. I never thought I would smile again when I got here. I learned how to smile.** I learned how to share stories and to understand people and understand myself.

The first bold phrase, “now I pay bills. I never paid bills in my life before…”, is an indication that the employee has accomplished something and not just talked about what they want to do or wish to do and so would be marked as “Actualization.” The second bold phrase, “That’s all that matters, I’m happy. I’ve never been happy, I never thought I would smile again…,” is an indication of a change in attitude because the employee is mentioning an internal, positive difference in the way they feel. Thus, this was marked as “Positive Change in Attitude.” Because both phrases are internally focused, that is they are both in regard to the employee personally and not anyone else, a relationship with anyone else or a description of the company, they fall under the category of “Individual Improvement.” Table 2 provides the code for the peace-building process within Homeboy Industries organized by category along with the definition of each theme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Join</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Joining out of a need for work or money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Family Situation</td>
<td>Joining out of a need to provide for or improve family situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Self</td>
<td>Joining out of a desire to improve self directly tied to wanting to join organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Improvement</td>
<td>Learned Self-Improvement</td>
<td>An improvement in self by having learned or been taught skill or ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actualization</td>
<td>An individual accomplishment or an improvement in situation tied to working at organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Change in Attitude</td>
<td>Having an internally focused positive future outlook or seeing self in new light due to being at organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linked to Shared Identity</td>
<td>Desire to give back to organization for what individual received, a connection to the organization (requires expression of giving back to organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Identity</td>
<td>Dedication to Job</td>
<td>Dedication self to working (staying late, helping to improve organization, wanting it to succeed) or representing of organization in positive way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Commitment</td>
<td>Recognizing others at organization there for the same reason or doing the same thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling of Inclusion</td>
<td>Feeling like individual is a part of something larger, part of a team or member of a family at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Rival</td>
<td>Realization of Similarities</td>
<td>Being able to relate to others through conversation but must be linked to self and not just a realization of who they are absent of comparison to self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Other’s Situation</td>
<td>Having knowledge of others through conversation with no link to self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linked to Peace-Building</td>
<td>Specific connection between talking with rivals and either a positive relationship with them or cooperative behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace-Building</td>
<td>Change in Rival Relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being friends, getting along, having a positive relationship with a former rival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed View of Conflict</td>
<td>Realization that conflict and/or past was wrong way to live or led to negative outcomes but must be externally focused (as opposed to an internally focused positive change in attitude above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Influence on Others</td>
<td>Contributing to the well-being of others, improving someone else’s situation, helping others gain perspective, modeling behavior or introducing organization to others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of Organization</td>
<td>Provide Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving opportunity for those who want it that would not be available elsewhere or empowering employees by giving them responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>Organization helps individuals to improve as people or employees such as classes or retreats or purposely institutes structural aspects to ensure norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Norms</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizing the value of others or showing no disrespect or insult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Expressing a welcoming attitude or demonstrating an openness to others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Disregarding differences, treating everyone the same way or maintaining gang neutrality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Demonstrating an understanding of others or showing sympathy or compassion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivation to Join

Motivation to Join refers to the reason for which individuals decided to become a part of Homeboy Industries. Working question 2a, will the economic gain through employment increase the willingness to engage in communication with those on the opposite side of an identity-based conflict, refers to the significance of employment for individuals when they are involved in conflict. Since Homeboy is known as a gang neutral place for employment, employees know that they can work with other individuals from rival gangs. This notion was mentioned in several interviews. However, before knowing the effect on engaging in communication with rivals, it is important to know if economic gain is a motivation to begin with.

This category revealed three themes for why individuals joined Homeboy. The first falls in line with working question 2a; a need for employment. The “Employment” theme is characterized by simply a need for work or an improved financial state. It is important to note that this had to be mentioned independent of others, meaning it could not be meant for the purpose of improving one’s family situation as will be discussed below. Individuals simply had to say that they had a desire for employment alone. The following example is from an employee of the bakery.
...when I got out of jail I was looking for a job. I went to different places. Then as soon as they see [my tattoos], they always look at me like, “No.”

In this example, the individual was answering the question ‘what attracted you to Homeboy’. The specific mention that they were “looking for a job” is what highlights the need for employment as the motivation to join Homeboy. Another interviewee who worked in the Silk-Screening business had this to say regarding why rivals would cooperate at Homeboy:

I want to work and I want to make money. So I’m not going to come here and start looking for problems with you or somebody else because it don’t make no sense. I want money, he wants money. So we just kind of work. And we’re going to do our things.

This was given as a response to how Homeboy creates cooperation but it relates directly to the motivation for joining Homeboy and provides a connection between the need for work and the willingness to cooperate with rival group members. Here, the interviewee clearly states that their desire for employment makes him willing to cooperate with rivals. In another part of this interview this person mentions the significance of communication as a means toward a civil relationship with rivals. While this was the expected or proposed reason for joining an organization that hires from opposite sides of a conflict, two other themes that motivated employees to join also presented themselves.

The second theme for why individuals joined Homeboy Industries is the “Improve Family Situation” theme, characterized by a need to improve the living situation of the interviewee’s family or to improve the lives of family members
through being employed and providing for them. This theme originally fell under
the above theme of just the need for employment with the idea that improving
one’s financial situation also falls in line with improving their family situation.
However, after several interviews it became clear that improving one’s family
situation went beyond just the financial aspect and that the opportunity to work at
Homeboy Industries also provided opportunities to improve one’s family such as
setting an example for children or being present for their family by avoiding
returning to prison. The following example is from an employee of the bakery.

Well, my family, it’s up to me to make something out of
myself. I have six kids - five girls and a boy. So that’s all up
to me. I’m a single father. So that’s why I left the streets and
I left all that behind because to me I’m their future. If I end up
in prison, I don’t know what will happen to them. So I have to
leave all that behind so they can have something to look
forward to and an example for them, especially my son.
Because we live in the projects, so I have to set an example.
I get myself better so we can move out and they won’t have
to grow up in an environment like I did, you know?

The need to improve one’s family situation proved to be an important
aspect of why individuals joined Homeboy and may even prove a stronger
influence on them personally than the conflict itself. The above quote shows that
this employee felt he had to leave the gang life behind in order to provide for the
future of their family and to set a good example for his son. In another interview,
an employee mentioned growing up and having to take care of his family meant
he had to move beyond the gang life. This was not specifically mentioned as a
reason for joining Homeboy so it would not be coded under this category but it
does provide some insight into the significance of family. Unfortunately, no other
interviewee brought up this idea outside of joining Homeboy and so it was not pursued as a theme.

The last theme highlighting the motivation for joining Homeboy is that of a need to improve oneself as an individual. Unlike the need for employment and the need to improve one’s family situation, the “Improve Self” theme is characterized by a desire for self-improvement and is not tied to a financial need, to one’s family or to their situation. It is an internally focused theme whereby the interviewee felt a need to change their life in some way other than for monetary gain and they attached Homeboy to the opportunity to change. The following example is from an employee of the café.

…what attracted me to work here was the fact that I needed a chance to change. I wanted a chance in making something of my life.

The key to this example is that the motivation was to make something of their life but that was not attached to financial improvement. The interviewee did not say that making something of their life meant moving on to a better job or having more money but rather attached it to wanting to change themselves, not their situation. Again, this was not attached to one’s family situation. If the interviewee had said they wanted to improve themselves so that their family could have a better life than this would have fallen under the theme “Need to Improve Family Situation,” not the theme “Need to Improve Self.” This theme links the motivation to join to a desire to change on a personal level, which
relates to the next category of themes regarding the significance of individual improvement.

This category of themes is paralleled by John Burton’s (1990) Human Needs theory of conflict resolution. Burton asserts that conventional theories of conflict resolution are too simplistic and one sided and thus are better served by uncovering the underlying reasons for conflict. He identifies meeting basic human needs as a means toward resolving conflict. In this category, themes do not just identify the motivation behind wanting a job. The themes specifically identify reasons for joining Homeboy given that employees may know that rivals are also doing the same. That is, the motivation to join specifically connects back to guiding question 2a; that the need for gainful employment will motivate individuals to work alongside rivals.

In this way, the satisfying of basic needs, described by each of the three themes, gave individuals incentives to agree to work in a place where they could potentially work alongside rival gang members. Burton advocates designing resolution methods around meeting basic human needs and given the economical influences on conflict (Collier & Hoeffler, 2002; Kim & Conceição, 2009), providing gainful employment or a chance to improve one’s family or personal situation as Homeboy does is a way of kick-starting a peace-building process in line with Burton’s Human Needs theory for conflict resolution (1990). It is important to note that the basic needs associated with this category are not those Burton identifies as basic needs. His list of basic human needs is: identity, recognition, security and personal development (1990). The latter would most
closely relate to this category but as will be seen, relates directly to the next category.

**Individual Improvement**

While some interviewees mentioned that their motivation to join Homeboy came from a desire to improve themselves, this was not the motivation for everyone. However, whichever motivation of the above three they had for joining Homeboy they all agreed that once they already joined, some individual improvement took place. Due to the emphasis that all interviewees placed on individual improvement, a category of themes was found to encompass the significance Homeboy played in their individual lives. Their relationships with others, most notably with their rivals, are captured in a later category of themes. This category only highlights themes regarding their individual and personal improvement.

The first theme under the Individual Improvement category is “Learned Self-Improvement.” For this theme, individuals had to express having learned something or been taught something that either made them a better person (i.e. anger management) or that gave them a new skill or ability (i.e. how to bake bread). Employees have to mention having learned or been taught and not just that they have them. This is important because this links the self-improvement back to the organization as it was there that employees learned how to be better people or new skills for their lives. The following two examples highlight how this theme emerged. The first is from the Silk-Screening business.
I know Homeboy Industry is a stepping stone for me to get on my feet... so it’s helping me build work skills and communication skills and it’s giving me the sense of this is what I need to be doing...

This second example is from a former bakery employee that now works at the Diner.

The biggest [experience] was working in the bakery. That was the biggest experience... because I didn't know anything. I've learned a little bit of everything. I learned, well it's simple to dip strawberries in chocolate but somebody that never had a job or anything like me, I think that was the best.

In both these examples the interviewees are discussing having improved as individuals in some way by having learned or been taught something while working at Homeboy Industries. The first example is more general in that they mention categories of skills (work and communication skills) but still conveys how Homeboy helped them build these skills and doesn't just state that they have them. The second example provides a very specific skill the individual learned while working in the bakery and also conveys the significance of having learned it. Again, it is not just a statement of having a skill but rather than they learned it while working in the bakery.

The second theme under the Individual Improvement category is one that is more of a statement of what the individual accomplished. This theme is called “Actualization.” Here, the interviewee states that they have achieved a tangible outcome or accomplishment, including any mention of how their situation improved. This theme also often comes with some reference to how the
accomplishment is connected to being at the organization, even if it is a passing or vague reference that does not provide specifics as to how Homeboy actually helped them achieve it. Many times this was not specifically stated either but can be inferred from the question asked and the story shared.

The following example illustrates personal achievements of an employee of the bakery with a quick reference to how they connect to Homeboy.

…God put me in this path back at Homeboy. There’s three years I’ve been here I’ve accomplished a lot of stuff… I’ve been through so much but these three years I’ve been out of prison, that’s the longest I’ve been out. Been sober three years. That’s the longest I’ve been out being sober.

Here it can be seen that the individual is making a statement of achievement. They state that they are sober and out of prison as opposed to having learned how to be sober or to stay out of prison. Further, they credit these accomplishments to their time at Homeboy even going so far as to imply that God had sent them to Homeboy in order for these accomplishments to be achieved.

The significance of stating an actual achievement is that it marks a milestone for the employees of Homeboy Industries. Further, learning important life and personal skills works toward an expression of their individual improvement in tangible ways. The next theme in this category refers to an internal, psychological improvement that is probably the most often found individual improvement from the interviews and that is a “Positive Change in Attitude.” This theme is characterized by either a self-actualization, such as
seeing oneself in a new light or realizing an ability or value in oneself that was not seen before, or a positive outlook for their current situation or their future. Similar to the above theme, this theme is linked to being at the Organization either explicitly or implicitly from the story shared or question asked. The following are two examples of this theme, the first from an employee of the Silk-Screening business.

I see myself getting my GED, finishing my thing at LA Trade Tech, finishing my schooling. Possible getting a good solid job with job security, benefits. Something I see myself retiring from and turning into a career. I see myself getting reunited with my daughter and just living a clean, sober, good life – the best to my ability. My future look kind of bright. I stay focused on things that I need to do in life in order to move ahead. One thing I’ll never forget where I come from because that keeps me focused.

This second example is from an employee of the café.

I see myself in my own place. I would like to sit down in my living room and see my kids in a better future, that regardless no matter what I went through with them, how hard our situation was, thanks not just to Homeboys, to other family I have here, but thanks to myself that I committed to change, that I believed in myself that I could do something.

In both examples the interviewee has a positive outlook for their future, not just believing that it will be better, but actually dreaming of concrete outcomes, which is something they did not see for themselves before joining Homeboy. Further, the second example highlights a change in the attitude they have toward themselves. They state that they now believe in themselves and believe that they can actually have a better life than what they knew before. This signifies a real,
positive change in attitude. This theme was also supported through personal observations of employees.

Everyone working at Homeboy had a very positive and personable attitude when you meet them. They greet you with a smile and a hello or good morning. This attitude does not match the stereotypical expectations of individuals coming from the gang lifestyle, especially with the stigma associated with tattoos. Everyone at Homeboy has tattoos ranging from a few on their arms to several individuals who have tattoos covering their face and scalp. One such individual, who wore tattoos like a beard and mustache, was one of the nicest people working at Homeboy.

This individual further exemplified the attitude everyone had regarding communicating their stories. Everyone seemed to be willing to share their story of living in a gang and how they were able to leave the lifestyle through the help of Homeboy. This was indicative of a positive change in attitude in that individuals were willing to open up and share stories of hope and positive change. Unfortunately, this seemed confined to Homeboy’s headquarters, where the Bakery and Café were located, and Homeboy’s Diner. Employees of the Silk-Screen business seemed a little more guarded but still willing to speak. This was explained in one of the interviews as due to the older generation having more of a stigma to share gang related stories. The employee implied that the Silk-Screen business had an older average age than the other Homeboy businesses.

The last theme under the category Individual Improvement is meant to act as a bridge between two different categories. In analyzing interview transcripts
there were many instances when interviewees linked their individual improvement to a sense of shared identity. That is, one of the themes from the next category, Shared Identity, was cited in relation to or having come from the result of an individual's improvement, regardless of which of the above three themes. This seemed to significant of a link to ignore because of the importance of a shared identity as described in Chapter 2 and the emphasis interviewees placed on their personal development. It further showed a deviation in the proposed model as will be discussed in Chapter 5.

As such, a fourth theme was identified under the Individual Improvement category titled “Linked to Shared Identity.” This theme is characterized by an expression of dedication or commitment to Homeboy Industries because of what it has given or taught the individual. However, it goes beyond just being thankful but also includes a sense of giving back to the organization. The following two examples highlight this theme and how it links the two categories.

There was this one time when I really felt like I was committed to this because we had to stay an hour more. My shift was over and I wanted to go home. But then my friend told me, “Hey, I’m going to stay to help out this hour.” I just told him, “Yeah, sure, me too”… Because one hour compared to our whole two week paycheck is nothing. How are you going to compare [sic] two week check to one hour? You can’t sacrifice one hour of your time?... So that’s when I realized that, too. I’m not the type of person to walk away. I was going to stay regardless. But with that, it showed me, yeah, we are committed here. I like that my older friends, they tell us these kinds of stuff to stay. To stay, what’s one hour? If you come in 20 minutes early it’s all good. You’re just giving back the favor.
This quote shows how the employee was willing to give back to the organization that had given him a job and a paycheck. The key link here is that the employee had a change in their attitude toward working that was positive. In this sense, the individual saw themselves in a new light in realizing they were the type of person who is grateful enough to have been given a job that they were willing to give back to the organization by staying late. At the same time, this demonstrated a dedication to the job, which signifies a commitment to Homeboy as will be described below. Another employee from the bakery states:

They gave me a lot of... They showed me how to do stuff. They put me in charge of things that I wouldn't have imagined I could do. So I had to be committed to that. It feels good to be part of something that I never thought I would be.

This example demonstrates how the employee has learned something while working for Homeboy, expressing a positive change in attitude in recognizing they never imagined they could do what they learned, and then connects that with a feeling of inclusion in Homeboy, another theme described in the next category. This is a significant theme because it provides a connection between the individual and the organization, explaining how the betterment of an individual translates into a commitment to the organization. In Chapter 5, this will be described further in terms of the logic behind this connection in the larger context of the proposed model for Peace-building in Business. The next category will provide more detail on the themes to which this theme is linked.

As previously mentioned, this category of themes is directly related to Burton’s basic human need of personal development (1990). As such, by
focusing on the individual, Homeboy is in essence providing a basic human need that Burton lists among those most salient to understanding violent conflicts (1990). Further, Anastasia White (2004) argues that conflict resolution requires there be a focus both on the individual and the structural level. She believes that a social reconstruction of narratives that lead to conflict must occur within the group and the individual but combining her concept of an individual focus along with a group focus with Burton’s basic human need of personal development further supports the findings at Homeboy for providing means toward individual improvement that emerged as the specific themes of this category.

An added dimension to this category is the positive emotional valence that it created among interviewees. That is, the improvement that the individuals experienced through being at Homeboy created a positive emotional response that served to both grow and enhance the remainder of their progress at Homeboy. Frank Barrett touches upon this notion with his Aesthetic Dimension concept. Barrett treats the aesthetic component of transforming conflict as not just a means of improving one’s state of emotional well-being but of paving the way for a peace-building process (Piderit et al., 2007). The positive emotional response to the social services Homeboy provides is key to both improving relations among employees and producing better employees. Barrett associates cultivating positive emotions with producing optimal functionality for transformative development; broadening and building people’s modes of thinking, making relationship and people more flexible, empathic and creative (Piderit et al., 2007)
This was mostly apparent in the “Positive Change in Attitude” theme as there was clear evidence from the interviews that the focus on developing the individual was life giving. Connected with a sense of self-confidence, the positive change in attitude described by employees falls in line with Barrett’s notion of improving effectiveness as this theme was associated with a sense of self-actualization. As the quote above says, the individual states that they have actual positive visions for the future because the individual believed in him/herself that they could do something. Of the emotions Barrett mentions (2007); the individual improvement category seemed to produce a sense of wonderment in Homeboy employees, especially from another of the themes, “Actualization”. In seeing an actual outcome from their actions, they are given a sense of wonderment in that they now have proof that they are capable individuals. This connects to the next category of themes, which comes as no surprise since there was enough evidence of a theme to link the two categories, “Linked to Shared Identity” described above, that emerged from the interviews.

**Shared Identity**

The Shared Identity category comes directly from working questions 2c, will mutual understanding between groups in conflict lead to a shared identity, and 2d, will the creation of a shared workplace identity promote cooperation and peace-building. Both these working questions place an emphasis on the potential and value of a shared identity as described in Chapter 2. Further, it begins to move beyond the individual by beginning to look at organizational level
phenomena. For this reason, the themes in this category relate to how a shared identity actually manifests. Three such themes were found.

The first theme in this category is the “Dedication to Job” theme. This theme highlights a basic commitment to working at Homeboy and connecting oneself to the job. It is part of a shared identity because it indicates a growth beyond the desire to improve the self and moves toward a view of the self in relation to the organization. This theme is characterized by an individual dedicating themselves to the organization completely by wanting to see the organization succeed, helping to improve it or viewing themselves as representatives of the organization. On a very basic level, the individual displays some notion of viewing themselves in terms of the organization rather than just an individual that happens to work at Homeboy. An example of this is from an employee of the café.

Committed to Home Boy? It’s probably when they’re doing really bad like money wise, when they start laying off a lot of people because there’s not money for workers and sometimes you see them, some people start coming in, they start volunteering even though they’re not getting paid. That’s what I see.

As can be seen in this quote, there is no notion of reciprocity. This theme on its own does not include a desire to give back to the organization because of a benefit that the individual received from Homeboy. For this reason it is coded under the Shared Identity category as the “Dedication to Job” theme. If the interviewee indicated that employees volunteered out of appreciation to Homeboy then this would be coded as the “Linked to Shared Identity” theme.
under the Individual Improvement category as described previously. The two themes are related as they both express a dedication to the job, however, the difference is simply if that dedication was mentioned as being out of appreciation for what the employee received from Homeboy. This is the same for all the Shared Identity themes; if they emerge with an expression of giving back to Homeboy than they were coded as the “Linked to Shared Identity” theme from the previous category.

This theme was also bolstered by the connection made to the physical space of Homeboy. Every new recruit to Homeboy is first placed in maintenance, which requires the up-keep of the physical appearance of Homeboy. All day long you can observe individuals cleaning the building, including washing all the windows inside and out. The reason for starting individuals in maintenance is to teach them how to be reliable and trustworthy, which they did not learn on the street. However, it may have a secondary benefit of creating an attachment to the physical space of Homeboy, giving them respect for the organization on a very basic level. Combined with learning reliability, individuals may gain a sense of dedication by instilling a sense of pride in the maintenance of Homeboy.

The second theme relating to a shared identity is a sense of shared commitment. The “Shared Commitment” theme is characterized by statements of similarity between the interviewee and others within the organization. Specifically, this theme relates to how others at the organization are there for the same reason or are there doing the same type of work. This theme is focused within the working context of the organization as opposed to viewing factors
outside of the work environment. The following from a Café employee demonstrates this theme.

We’re all here for hope. We’re all here for, most of us, for the same dream – growing as a person, providing for not only ourselves but providing for other people.

This example is an explanation of what this person believes is the reason for why everyone is working at Homeboy. It highlights a common purpose among employees rather than singularly just for this individual. Further, this purpose is focused on Homeboy itself, meaning the interviewee does not just say that everyone is trying to grow as a person, provide for themselves and for others but specifically links these to being at Homeboy by saying the key phrase “We’re all here for…” It’s conveys the idea that all employees have come to Homeboy for these things and so everyone that works there are connected through similar purpose. This is distinct from the Motivation to Join category above because this theme does not attach itself to what drew individuals to Homeboy originally but why they are there now.

The final theme in this category is the “Feeling of Inclusion” theme. This theme captures feelings of being a part of a group specifically attached to the organization. Related to Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) discussed in chapter 2, this theme refers directly to in-group membership but in this case the group is Homeboy Industries. The “Feeling of Inclusion” theme includes feeling like the individual is part of something greater or part of a team or viewing
employees at Homeboy as a family at work. An employee of the Café had this to say:

It’s amazing that all my teammates that I work with, they’re like sisters for me. They’re like brothers for me. We come here, we work together. It’s amazing to get paid, get your stress out, and then at the same time you’re surrounded by all these local family, your own family.

This employee does not refer to co-workers as co-worker but naturally refers to them as “teammates.” They go on to describe them as sisters and brothers, a very strong indication of close ties with other employees beyond just a mention of being a family at the end of the quote. This is an indication that this employee feels a strong bond with fellow employees but expresses that bond not in terms of one-on-one relationships that are significant to them but rather in terms of a larger, group level identity in the form of a family. This last point is significant in its indication of a shared identity of which this employee feels is a member.

Again, personal observations support the underlying shared sense of attachment associated with this theme. Homeboy’s headquarters has multiple physical attributes that feed in to a sense of belonging and family. On most of the walls are photo collages of individuals working at Homeboy and of events Homeboy has sponsored for employees. By seeing these, one gets a sense that these are commensurate to family photos you might find hanging in someone’s home.
Further, the Homeboy logo can be seen everywhere; from a t-shirt collage hanging in the lobby to posters hanging on the walls and in offices to the windows facing the street corner. Having the logo always visible give a sense of unity, that everyone belongs to the same organization. This was no more apparent than with the dress code, which was placed on the wall just outside the employee bathrooms. The dress code requires that employees where Homeboy t-shirts and if you do not own one, requires a collared shirt or nice sweater. The dress code forces everyone to maintain some uniformity in their physical appearance, thus underscoring the feeling of inclusion. Along with the required attire, clothing with any other logo or design is not permitted at any time, which supports inclusive behavior by forcing distance from outside attachments.

Probably the most significant observation of the sense of family created by Homeboy is that of the morning meetings. Every morning, employees at the headquarters, which include Homeboy staff, Bakery and Café employees, all gather in the lobby to hold a 15 to 20 minute meeting. The morning meetings are run by Father Boyle who has a list of individuals who would like to speak that day. One person will announce the visitors coming in for tours that day, another from the Café will announce the day’s specials. Yet another person may offer inspirational words or a quote of the day. Father Boyle will offer some words as well before handing the mic over to someone who will offer the morning’s prayer.

This ritual is done every morning and is how everyone at Homeboy starts their day, even going as far as announcing it on the PA system so that everyone knows to gather, similar to church bells calling people to prayer. The purpose of
these morning meetings it seems is to have everyone know what is going on in the organization and remind them of why they are at Homeboy as a way of building community. Of all the personal observations of Homeboy, this ritual seemed to be the most significant means of creating a sense of family and a shared identity.

An employee of the Silk-Screening business further demonstrates the feeling of inclusion but with an added level of in-group membership. They state:

What do I value the most? The respect that we have for one another. How tight we are, we’re like family right here – small community within itself.

This employee refers to co-workers as family as well but they highlight that the family they refer to is a smaller subset of a larger family. This employee says “right here” to signify the Silk-Screening business specifically, describing the employees of this business as the family to which they feel they belong. They then describe this family as a community within the larger context of the Homeboy community when they say “small community within itself.” The reason for this were not indicated in the interview but it may be because the Silk-Screening business is off site at a different location from the headquarters and so employees there have created a smaller family but, as this quote indicates, still connected to the larger family of Homeboy Industries.

As part of this, the physical space of the Silk-Screen business may play a role in the sense of a community within a community. The Silk-Screen is in an older, industrial building that Homeboy bought rather than built like the
headquarters and so does not have the same physical image as the headquarters. The outside has been painted but because the location is in an older part of Los Angeles and not as safe as the location of the headquarters, the main entrance is not off the main road, is accessed through a fenced in parking lot and consists of a black, iron gated door that is constantly locked. The inside is decorated with murals that seem to represent hope and faith but there are no photo collages like at the headquarters. The logo is present but not as diffuse as it is at the headquarters, giving the sense that the Silk-Screen is connected but somewhat distinct at the same time.

As stated previously, aesthetics play a role in this category too. While the previous category, Individual Improvement, seemed to produce a sense of wonderment, the positive emotional response to themes in this category fall more in line with a sense of appreciation (Piderit et al., 2007). Here, the wonderment felt in improving oneself is built upon to create a shared identity through the feeling of appreciation to the company that provided that self-improvement. This also agrees with Barrett’s assertion regarding the positive affect of such experiences. He believes that the experience of aesthetics leads individuals to transform their beliefs in ways that permit more cooperation. In the case of Homeboy, the positive emotional affect associated with experiences of self-improvement leads to more collective thinking found in the themes that emerged within the Shared Identity category. Having a shared workplace identity is a step toward cooperative behavior because of the collective commitment individuals have toward the company.
Communication with Rival

This category of themes relates to working question 2b; will communication at the workplace between employees on opposite sides of identity-based conflict lead to mutual understanding? Communication plays such a significant role in this study because of the foundation in both Social Constructionism (Gergen, 1994a) and Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) as described in chapters 1 and 2. Specific to peace-building, communication between rivals was an important focus of the interviews in order to understand the nature of that communication, which helps to understand how it leads to peace-building. Interviewees described their communication with rival gang members that they work with, from which three themes emerged.

The first theme describing the communication between rival gang members is the “Realization of Similarities” theme. For this theme, interviewees had to mention that, while communicating with a rival, they discovered the two were alike in some respect. This could be shared values, life experiences or current situations. The interviewee could not just come to learn something about their rival without specifically acknowledging a similarity or that they can relate to their rival in some way. The following two quotes show how this emerged in the interviews.

…there’s so many people trying to change their life and trying to go somewhere that just by coming to Homeboy’s like damn, you need somebody that wants to do something like you want to do, so you guys talk it up. And you guys understand each other… and he might have similarities to you, too. Like, “Oh, I’m trying to do the same thing.” The next thing you know, you guys are boys.
This is a quote from an employee of the Silk-Screen business. The next is from an employee of the Diner.

I [have] been through a lot. Girls that I talk to they share kind of the same story as me and I can relate to them. That makes me go, you know, we’re going to be alright. We’re going to walk through it. I can relate because a lot of us girls went through a lot.

Both quotes highlight the connection that they were able to create with others through discovering a similarity with them. In the second quote, the Diner employee expresses how relating to a now former rival allowed them to reach a level of civility, as indicated by saying “we’re going to walk through it”, meaning they are going to work through their differences. The realization that the rival had been through similar life events allowed this employee to believe that there was not going to be animosity with their rival, as indicated by the realization expressed in the statement “we’re going to be alright.”

The next theme, “Understanding Other’s Situation,” is similar in that it highlights knowledge of a rival through communicating with them but unlike the above theme, this one does not have a specific connection back to the interviewee. Understanding another’s situation is simply gaining knowledge about a rival or coming to understand a rival without expressing a link back to themselves. It is meant to be a subjective understanding of the rival’s personal life, not knowledge that provides the interviewee with purely work related
information. The following employee quote describes relationships with rivals at the Silk-Screen business.

We’re all from different neighborhoods and us here, we’ve been here for a while, so we have a pretty good rapport even though we all come from different little parts of the city and stuff. So there’s no animosity here or anything like that…. Here it’s pretty cool. There’s no tension like that. We’re all good with each other… We all pretty much know each other’s story.

In this quote, the interviewee is connecting the positive relationships and lack of tension among employees of the Silk-Screen business with the fact that everyone there knows each other’s stories. They do not attribute the lack of animosity to a shared history or similar situations but just the fact that they all know about each other’s life experience. This quote from a Café employee further highlights this theme.

It’s crazy. I never would have thought I would have ever talked to her. We would have never been like, [pause] but now we just like hang out together. She’s really cool. I got to know her. We clicked.

In this quote, the interviewee connects talking with a rival and getting to know them with a positive relationship with them where they not only “hang out” but they actually became friends, as indicated by the phrase “we clicked.” However, the interviewee does not mention any similarities they discovered or links what they learned about the rival with something in their own lives.

Along with the idea of improving relationships through the above two forms of communication with rival, the third theme in this category connects the
idea of communication with Peace-building. Much like the earlier theme, “Linked to Shared Identity” that connected two categories, this theme, “Linked to Peace-Building,” connects the communication with rival category to the next category, Peace-Building. The “Linked to Peace-Building” theme emerged from the interviews when interviewees seemed to specifically connect a form of peace-building, which are described below, to communicating with their rivals.

This idea emerged frequently and proved to hold some significance in the interviews and so warranted being a theme itself. Further, this theme is meant to capture the relationship explored in working questions 2a through d. In these working questions, communication was viewed as the first step in a process that leads to mutual understanding, a shared identity and eventually peace-building. However, as is apparent from this theme, the actual results of the interviews did not follow this path as interviewees tended to connect communicating with their rivals directly to peace-building. For example, an employee of the Silk-Screen business said this when describing a relationship with a former rival:

…I've been working here as the years went by with rivals. The relationship with me and him it just totally like, completely like, “Damn you my enemy, dog. Damn. You’re cool. You’re cool people. If we would have never really sat down and came here and talked about it, like forget about the neighborhood stuff” …I mean, you're not going to just talk to them from one day to another. Eventually you guys going to get to know each other. You guys going to have to talk to each other when working out there in the field. Everybody got to communicate. It's weird because like, damn, I'm over here working side by side with a guy that we were just shooting at.
It is clear that the interviewee has a changed relationship with their rival, which would have been coded as a Peace-Building theme on its own. They also mention that through the communication they got to know each other, which on its own would have been coded as “Understanding Other’s Situation” because there was no mention of a similarity, only an understanding of each other. However, this interviewee specifically says that the change in the relationship would have never happened if the two of them had not communicated. Because of connection, this quote was coded as “Linked to Peace-Building” due to the specific link between communicating with their rival and the positive relationship that that communication ended up creating. Another example of this comes from a Bakery employee.

We understand each other. Say whatever happened, happened. We talk about now. So I always got issue or he got issue because of time. We sometimes we go out… And we talk a lot. We just talk, clown, [and] joke around. We go eat together. And he show[s] me where he live[s] at. I took him home; I show him where I live at. We just kick it.

In this quote, the employee specifically mentions talking with their rival and how the relationship has changed because of it. Not only has the relationship turned positive but they are now close friends. The specific mention of going to each other’s houses is significant in a gang related conflict because informing an enemy of where you live invites violence as gangs can target homes. So, for these two to open their homes to each other demonstrates a major shift in the rival relationship. However, this interviewee specifically attributes this to having
talked with his rival, which is why it was coded as “Linked to Peace-Building” rather than as a theme under the Peace-Building category as described next.

**Peace-Building**

The Peace-Building category is a significant category because it goes toward the heart of this study in trying to identify first, if peace-building has taken place at Homeboy and second, what form it has taken. Homeboy Industries was chosen for the case study because it is considered an exemplar of the use of business for peace-building. Because of this, it is important to show that peace-building, as expressed in employee interviews, so as to provide evidence that the assumption that peace-building does actually occur at Homeboy is in fact correct.

Almost every interview has referenced peace-building having taken place in the form of at least one of three themes. The first, “Change in Rival Relationship,” is somewhat straightforward and probably the most cited form of peace-building. This theme was indicated if interviewees express some positive change in their relationship with a rival or former rival gang member. This could be a mention of getting along with them, being friends with them or any other expression of a relationship with them either within the context of Homeboy or outside of Homeboy. This is best exemplified by the following quote.

There’s one guy I shot maybe two times back in the 90s. Now, he’s my motivation. I look up to him. I look up to him. I could trust him with my stories and tell him my problems... Not my worst enemy, but one of my enemies that we shot. Now he will tell me, “You know what? What happened in the past is in the past. It’s about you. It’s about us. It’s about working with each other and motivating each other to make it.”
This individual clearly changed the relationship they have, not just with a member of a rival gang, but with a specific individual that they engaged in violence with from the rival gang. The relationship they have now is very positive, even stating that the interviewee looks up to the former rival as a mentor because of the trust that now exists between them. This trust is a direct indication that the relationship has changed for the positive. The quote does include mention of communication but it was not coded as “Linked to Peace-Building” from the previous category because even though there is mention of communication, there was no mention of a similarity nor was there mention of an understanding of the other’s situation from that communication with each other.

The next theme is less about a change in a relationship with a specific individual rival but rather is about a change in the personal view of the conflict as a whole. The “Changed View of Conflict” theme is coded when an individual expresses a realization that the conflict or their own past was wrong or led to negative outcomes. It is externally focused in that it does not reflect any direct relationship with a rival, just a changed attitude toward the conflict itself. This allows this theme to indicate more conceptual changes in a person’s attitude toward the conflict rather than concrete changes in behavior. An example of how this theme emerged from a Café employee who states:

…it's like those things in the past, it's like you don't see any worth to it anymore. I think a lot of us did back then because we didn’t have nothing positive in our lives. So those little things, we would just grasp onto it because it was something. But now that we have positive, the negative is nothing.
As can be seen from the quote, this employee expresses how the life they used to lead as a gang member provided worth for them in the past but has since been shown the negative value of that lifestyle while working at Homeboy. It is a retrospective look at the past in light of the present where they have been shown a positive alternative for their life that has changed their view on the life of a gang member. The next theme takes this a step further by turning this attitude into providing something positive to others.

The “Positive Influence on Others” theme indicates a positive contribution that individuals provide to those other than themselves. This theme is less about a change in a relationship with a rival or a change in attitude as the above themes indicate. It is more about concrete changes in behavior, specifically in trying to help others achieve the outcomes of the above two themes. This is characterized by contributing to the well-being of others, improving someone else’s situation, helping others gain perspective or modeling behavior. Included in this theme is also the idea of diffusion, that is, sharing what one learns at Homeboy Industries with their community or bringing outsiders into Homeboy. Below is an example of a Silk-Screen employee who describes how they approach a new employee starting at Homeboy who has yet to go through the transition from being a gang member to someone who’s left the past behind them.
So when we get new people, I kind of embrace them and share my life story and my testimony about things that I went through. I kind of let them know that things are different now. You have a job. You have people depending on you to be here every day, show up and do what you have to do to get the job done. As far as where this guy comes from and where he from, it doesn’t matter. You’re here to do your job and to embrace the next person to make them feel comfortable working here.

This employee is describing the first steps toward helping a new hire transition from a mindset of gang identification and gang behavior to becoming a responsible person that is dependable and dedicated to the job. Further, they take the next step and have the new hire begin to think about their future at Homeboy as someone to pass on the behavior to the next new hire to help them transition as this new hire will. The interviewee is making strides to ensure that new employees are not only productive but are dedicated to the process of changing their lives for the better. The same interviewee goes on to say later in the interview:

As far as the communication when we’re out there [on the silk-screening floor], we probably talk about things that we went through in the past and probably talk about things that we see now with some of our homeys that’s in the neighborhood and what they’re going through and just trying to figure out a way to get to them to change their lives.

Here, the interviewee expresses an explicit intention of trying to help others transition out of the gang lifestyle, not just by themselves but with other Homeboy employees, an indication of diffusion. It is this specific intention that highlights the desire to be a positive influence on others and help others improve their situation.
This theme was included under the Peace-Building category because it is an indication of a transition in the individuals from someone who is only interested in gang related activity, often illegal or with negative consequences for themselves and their community, to someone who is now interested in using their life to make a positive contribution to others and their community. Aside from building positive relationships with rivals, a significant finding for peace-building itself because it is arguably the hardest hurdle for individuals to overcome, and changing their view of the conflict, an internal change in perspective, this theme indicates a change in an individual’s view of themselves within the context of conflict. That is, they view their role in the conflict as a positive influence on reducing it and actively promoting peace-building, albeit not an explicit intention. Those that undertake a positive influence on others are spreading positive alternatives to violence and conflict and thus, in essence, are promoting peace-building in general. This clearly came as a result of the efforts of Homeboy Industries and the next category of themes shows the characteristics of Homeboy that allowed this to occur.

**Characteristics of Organization**

This category of themes came from an exploration into what Homeboy Industries does to help create a space for all the above themes to emerge. One thing about this category is that it shows an intentionality on the part of the organization. Many of the benefits both to the individuals working at Homeboy and to the larger picture of the conflict came from some intention of Homeboy to
address societal issues outside of the business concerns of running a company, which suggests that there is more than just an awareness of the conflict at Homeboy. The interviews produced two significant themes that were mentioned by almost every interviewee that highlight this intentionality.

The first theme, “Provide Opportunity” is one that indicates Homeboy’s desire to give options to individuals that they would not be able to find elsewhere. Here, Homeboy acts as a service for those who want it and is always present for those who desire employment or a change in their lives, that is, if an employee leaves for any reason, either to try something else or because they temporarily returned to the gang lifestyle, and wants to return they will not be turned away. Further, this theme also encompasses opportunities provided within the organization such as giving individuals responsibility or empowering them in some way. For example, a Bakery employee said:

> We just got this cookie machine donated, a $50,000 machine, and they put me in charge of that. They showed me how to run it and I learned within a week how to operate the machine. I’m the only one that can touch it. I was surprised myself.

This example of empowerment shows the responsibility that Homeboy provides employees that, more than likely, they would not have been given at another company. Further, this employee of the Silk-Screen business expressed just the opportunity to have a job that Homeboy provides. They state:
I would say like within the first year I was here I did get arrested. I think I lied to them that I was in jail. But just the fact that I was able to come out and have my job back was good.

At any other company this employee would probably not have a job waiting for them but at Homeboy, they seem to be dedicated to providing employment, which is an opportunity to work that many would not have. This opportunity, however, is fostered and supported by non-work related opportunities as captured in the next theme.

With the significance found in improving individuals in the process of peace-building within a business, there also emerged a theme that captured how the themes in the Individual Improvement category above are possible. This theme, “Social Support,” encompasses Homeboy’s ability to provide support in order to help individuals improve themselves, such as providing classes on good parenting or counseling. The theme also includes structural aspects of the organization that are meant to ensure organizational norms, such as the orientation where norms and values are expressed, and certain rules that everyone must adhere to while working. Two examples of this come from a Diner and Café employee. The Diner employee states:

They help you with financially and mentally [sic]. They got AA classes, therapy classes, anger management classes to help if you need. Whatever problems you have, struggles, they try to help you.
This quote highlights some of the classes Homeboy offers to support employees individually. The Café employee, while answering a question about what Homeboy does to create cooperation, had this to say:

It probably is the morning meetings because every morning they have a meeting, so all Homeboys goes into the office and then you see Father Greg speaking and you hear everybody giving their thought of the day. So I guess everybody hears somebody speak every day. I think that gets everybody closer because everybody starts hearing what’s going on at Homeboys and the Home Girl Café and the bakery, all these.

In this quote, the employee highlights a structural aspect of Homeboy, the morning meeting, which works as a support for the organization and the employees as a group. Another important thing to note from this quote is the mention of the founder of Homeboy, Father Greg Boyle. Almost every interview included some reference to him as a major source of support, both spiritually and emotionally. As part of Homeboy, he acted as a champion within the organization, often keeping close ties with each individual employee regardless of which business or job they had. His vision also established the norms by which Homeboy operates that serve a major purpose in facilitating peace-building.

Organizational Norms

During the interview process, many employees mentioned aspects of Homeboy that created a sense of community and cooperation that were structural such as the morning meetings and orientation. However, many times they also expressed a sense of how people behaved or the general attitude of
Homeboy as an organization. This was repeated in almost every interview and was emphasized as a significant aspect of Homeboy. Due to the importance placed on these by employees, the last category of themes was created to capture what will be referred to as Organizational Norms. Six such norms emerged as themes from the interviews.

The first norm is that of respect. Respect was expressed as a norm through recognition of the value of others, demonstrating basic courtesy and not insulting others. Respect was talked about in interviews as an important aspect of Homeboy because often times pride plays a major role in the gang lifestyle. So working at a place where respect is given and taught is important because often times a basic level of respect for others helps in the rehabilitative process. For example, this Bakery employee describes behavior they learned while working at Homeboy.

It’s just basic manners, too. Of course I’m not going to go and grab…let’s say I’m working in maintenance or whatever, I’ll grab a bottle from somebody’s hand and just take it. You know, you say, “How’s it going? Can I please borrow that? Alright.”

While the example this employee provides may seem small it is actually an important example of the basic level of behavior Homeboy tries to instill through the norm of respect. Other interviews bought to light the idea that if one gives respect than one will receive it, a basic norm that Homeboy tries to teach its employees.
The norm of acceptance is one indicated by having or expressing a welcoming attitude and a willingness to help anyone who needs it. For this theme, Homeboy demonstrated openness to others by not judging individuals based on their past gang activity, criminal records, appearance or behavior. Similar to respect, this norm emphasizes that anyone who wants help is welcome without conditions. A clear example of this is from this Café employee who describes their initial impressions when first starting at Homeboy.

So I come in here and socialize with a lot of people the same as me. It was very amazing to see how we love each other here. Once you come here, they receive you with their arms open and they give you the warm, they give you the support that sometimes you don’t even think you can find out here.

The same employee goes on to say later in the interview:

We’re all here for hope. We’re all here for, most of us, for the same dream - growing as a person, providing for not only ourselves but providing for other people. For them not to judge us because either we have a tattoo or because we have a record or because we have a background. Because everybody needs a second chance.

Both examples show the sense of acceptance and safety Homeboy creates for its employees. This particular employee connected the idea of non-judgment at Homeboy to communicating with rivals and how they felt comfortable talking with others because of it. The welcoming atmosphere that everyone feels allows for an environment where individuals feel safe and secure in communicating with each other, especially rivals. This organizational norm also relates to the next, which also contributes to creating a safe environment for former gang members.
Equality is an important norm that Homeboy establishes but unlike the norm of acceptance, a norm that focuses on individuals, the norm of equality is a group level norm in that Homeboy does not favor any group, ethnicity or, most importantly, gang within the organization. Equality helps create a sense of security because it firmly establishes Homeboy Industries as a gang neutral organization and so does not allow any outside animosity to surface within the organization. A Silk-Screen employee describes it in this way:

Like you know how I could be out there in the streets and I see my enemies, I’m already out trying to kill this food or trying to beat him up or do something. But when you go to Homeboy’s it’s just more calm [sic], like a different vibe. Everybody’s not worries about gang banging and where you from or none of that. It’s just like you feel love or peace. You feel good.

While living the gang lifestyle, former gang members had a constant awareness of the conflict and of members of other gangs, as described in the above quote. By removing that fear, Homeboys creates a safe space. The equality theme is characterized by a disregard for differences and treating everyone the same way. In a conflict where neighborhoods and gang affiliation fuel violence, leveling the playing field is a critical step in building cooperation and promoting peace because it suspends the negative aspects of in-group favoritism (Turner et al., 1987) and allows for interaction on equal footing among employees.

The acceptance and equality norms exhibited at Homeboy also seem to relate to another organization norm, Empathy. Empathy is a theme characterized...
by displaying an understanding of others and showing sympathy or compassion. This theme emerged from individuals who felt a sense of emotional safety while working at Homeboy, sometimes even mentioning that they received a level of emotional support they never had before, which contributed to their gang lifestyle. This Café employee describes this norm when discussing the best thing about working at Homeboy.

The best thing about working here is, you know how you show up to work and you’re going through your problems, whether it’s personal at home, they’re very understanding here. It’s just not like, “Oh well, just leave your problems at home. This is work.” I’m not saying I don’t work, because I do work, but at the same time my manager cares. I get advice here from my coworkers. I get support. If I come in crying, I’ll get hugs. And I don’t have to be embarrassed of what I’m going through at the time because I know people understand here.

Having a caring and compassionate atmosphere is something that employees appreciated since it is something they lacked growing up in their home lives. Being able to experience it at Homeboy contributed to the openness they were able to have with rivals and to their ability to explore their own selves, aiding in the rehabilitation process.

Along those same lines, Homeboy did not just create a safe space for former gang members to work together but also encouraged individuals to move forward and improve themselves, as evident by the Individual Improvement category discussed earlier. This encouragement was expressed in another organizational norm, Growth. This theme emerged through Homeboy expressing value in learning and improving. For instance, while explaining how Homeboy
has helped develop work and life skills, this Silk-Screen employee describes what Homeboy does to promote growth.

We have case managers that come here every now and then and talk to us and they kind of encourage us to do certain things, as far as, “You need to go to school and work on your GED. What are you plans for this? Have you talked to your kids? How’s things at home?” So they check on us. For some of us, it makes us feel good and it’s like it’s inspiration and motivation knowing that they’re on us to get on our stuff. We get our stuff together.

The case manager in this example demonstrates Homeboy’s value in developing individuals and pushing them to improve themselves. In this case, through encouraging this employee to finish their education and then to pursue further goals in life. As such, Homeboy does not just foster a place of safety to help overcome past negative relationships and negative attitudes but also provides motivation to take what is learned to move forward in life. As a very appreciative norm, this theme pushes individuals to work towards something rather than sitting still in the safety of Homeboy.

The last theme and another appreciative organizational norm is that of Hope. This theme was not one of the original themes outlined in the original code development process but as coding progressed through the rest of the interview transcripts, this theme emerged as a significant aspect of Homeboy and what it does to promote peace-building. The organizational norm of hope is characterized by creating a sense of a positive future or an opportunity to live a better life. It is related but differentiated from the “Positive Change in Attitude” theme described earlier in the Individual Improvement category in that the Hope
theme is indicated by an expression of Homeboy instilling a belief that the employee can have a future or believes that a positive future is possible. One Cafe employee shows how this theme manifests in describing what Homeboy has done to help them create a vision for their future. They state:

...they show you that there’s a future out there... there’s always somebody there... when you say ready to give up, like [expletive deleted] this. I’m gone... they keep you going.

This employee did not have a concrete vision for their future but they emphasized the fact that they know they will have a positive future because of the encouragement Homeboy provides. Along with encouraging employees to take steps to move forward as described above with the norm of growth, Homeboy also has a norm of encouraging positive outlooks for the future, of always looking forward and believing that a positive future is possible. This is significant as having hope is the first step to creating a positive image of the future for which employees can work toward. Much like Fred Polak’s (1973) assertions regarding creating an image of the future, positive emotions play a significant role in building images of the future. Hope is one such emotion that Polak mentions as of particular note as it is coupled with a free and creative imagination. Barrett’s views on aesthetics (Piderit et al., 2007) also agrees with Polak when the latter asserts that aesthetics are the medium of expressing a hopeful future, or a utopian one as Polak puts it (1973). By maintaining an organizational norm of Hope, Homeboy is allowing employees to freely imagine a
positive future, which in turn creates a self-reinforcing trajectory of positive affect (Piderit et al., 2007).

While all the above findings are significant in their own right, combined they show a potential process for peace-building. The order and connections between the themes, given how they were described in interviews, will be described, including contextual factors, in the next chapter when a model for peace-building in a business context will be proposed.
Chapter 5: Model Building and Conclusions

The secret of change is to focus all of your energy, not on fighting the old, but on building the new.

-Socrates

Model for Business and Peace

As interview transcripts were analyzed and coded following the procedure described in chapter 4, connections were found among themes and categories of themes. Some of these connections were found retrospectively, that is after the coding process was complete and results were being written, but some were discovered during the coding process when certain concepts seemed to link to one another. The latter was mostly captured in two themes, “Linked to Shared Identity” within the Individual Improvement category and “Linked to Peace-Building” within the Communication with Rivals category, both also described in chapter 4.

After further review, several connections were found between themes in different categories, linking categories together to form a proposed model for peace-building in business. The reason for framing the proposed process in the form of working questions, described in chapter 3, proved useful as it allowed for individual analysis of the parts and freed the research for exploration into potential, unexpected outcomes. Below is the process as it was originally proposed in chapter 1.
As mentioned before, employee interviews did not support this proposed process for how peace-building takes place within a business context as a whole. However, some of the pieces of this process were supported while unanticipated aspects emerged, which added complexity and additional information that was not captured in the proposed process. This proved advantageous as complexity and new information actually created more specificity and captured aspects of peace-building in a business context that allow for a more comprehensive model that can be used for further testing.
The linkages between themes emerged from the data in the form of three process clusters, organized below by the outcome of each: Space for Communication, Shared Identity and Cooperation. All the clusters are related and connected to one another producing an overarching model of the peace-building process. Each cluster will be presented below as individual pieces before being combined into a single, proposed model. From this, proposed future research and limitations will be presented in the Conclusions section.

**Space for Communication**

This cluster links themes in a process of creating a safe space for employees to communicate. As described in chapter 3, communication is a significant aspect of peace-building because it facilitates the sharing of information that leads to mutual understanding, which undermines false assumptions and negative attributions of out-members (Fort, 2006). It plays a key role in building social ties (Festinger et al., 1950), increasing awareness of other people’s moods (Olson et al., 2002) and strengthening interpersonal bonds (Nardi & Whittaker, 2002), all of which were mentioned in the interviews in one way or another. Figure 6 below shows the progression of the process outlined by this cluster.
The process that emerged from analyzing the results of interviews starts at the beginning with employees' motivation to join Homeboy. The interviewees described three reasons they first joined Homeboy, employment, improving their family situation and improving themselves, which were the three themes in this category. The Motivation to Join category was directly connected to one of the characteristics of Homeboy; that they provided opportunity. This theme, under
the Characteristics of Organization category, was characterized as offering a chance or an option to individuals when they might not be able to have one elsewhere. This proved fortuitous for many seeking employment or to improve their families or themselves. It made Homeboy a match for their needs. Interviewees described a demand that Homeboy supplied in the opportunity they provided in terms of employment and self-improvement.

At the same time, the opportunity that Homeboy provided required an adherence to the organizational norms that are set out immediately when individuals joined. The orientation individuals go through when they first join Homeboy, part of the Social Support theme, is a structural aspect of Homeboy meant to ensure norms and inform individuals of the rules of working at Homeboy, such as the dress code and expected behavior (i.e. no tolerance for fighting, etc.). Norms such as equality and respect are of most significance because they are the norms that help create a level of civility within Homeboy.

With this civility comes a sense of physical safety within Homeboy, where individuals are not worrying about whether or not their personal safety will be threatened. Coming from a culture of gang violence, this is an important factor for employees of Homeboy. While working at Homeboy, morning meetings, company picnics and other structural aspects of the organization promote the acceptance, empathy and hope norms. Combined, these norms create a sense of psychological safety as well, which then opens the door to growth, the last theme in this category to emerge from the interviews. This observation falls in
line with the use of ritual and symbolism to create bonds among adversaries (Schirch, 2004).

The safe space that was created at Homeboy was both safe physically and psychologically and together lead to the positive atmosphere of peace-building. However, being that the conflict was and is still very violent, the physical safety is emphasized equally with psychological throughout the remaining process. In some ways, both can be considered necessary prerequisites for creating that atmosphere and both need to be maintained equally. Together, Homeboy’s organizational norms create a safe space to facilitate communication among rivals because there is sufficient social support for individuals to feel comfortable should they choose to communicate with members of opposing gangs.

Shared Identity

The second cluster describes the process of how a shared identity is created starting with the individual and growing to the group level. As stated previously, a shared identity is important in peace-building because it acts as a moderating factor for conflict (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). Further, a collective identity is believed to be created through the context within which an individual develops their sense of self and by extension their personal identity (Taylor et al., 2003). In the original model shown above, it was proposed that communication among employees would allow rivals to discover commonalities and dispel
misconceptions of each other, leading to a mutual understanding which when done would lead to a shared identity.

However, the way in which a shared identity is created at Homeboy did not follow this process. After analyzing and coding interviews, results suggested that a very different process takes place where individual factors play a major role in the development of a shared identity. At Homeboy, this process begins with a concerted effort to specifically develop the individual, which lays the foundation for them to integrate into an organization level identity.

White (2004) would concur with this conceptualization as she agrees with Burton (1990) that conflict comes from the frustration of basic human needs. However, she believes these needs are articulated by the individual through their group membership and are located within the systems and structures meant to satisfy these basic needs. Therefore, Homeboy as a company can be seen as a systematic approach that fosters peace-building by providing for the need of individual improvement as a first step toward creating a shared identity on a path toward peace-building. Figure 7 provides an outline of the process at Homeboy leading from providing a means for self-improvement to the creation of a shared identity.
This cluster begins with the Social Support theme that captures the various structural aspects of Homeboy that are meant to develop individuals and encourage their personal process of self-improvement. Homeboy provides this support in the form of self-improvement classes, therapy, case management and professional services. What these do is allow individuals to improve their personal situations both in a tangible way, such as teaching them how to take
care of their families, and a psychological way, such as managing their anger. This is further supported by the organizational norms of Growth, where Homeboy has an implicit expectation that each employee should be striving to improve themselves, Empathy, where compassion and sympathy are given to provide positive emotional support, laying the foundation for a psychologically safe space, and Hope, where employees are shown the possibility for positive futures and the opportunity for better lives, which serve to further motivate employees toward self-improvement.

The services provided under the Social Support theme facilitate and promote all the themes found in the Individual Improvement category of themes; Learned Self-Improvement, Actualization and Positive Change in Attitude. As employees learn and grow as individuals they attached this back to Homeboy. It was not that they just improved on their own but that Homeboy had helped them and it was Homeboy that provided them the tools to become better individuals. Many interviews connected an individual’s improvement with a sense of owing Homeboy for helping them improve.

By attributing their personal development directly to Homeboy and feeling that they owe such development to Homeboy, each employee feels a connection to the organization that translated into a sense of commitment to the company. This point emerged and was captured in the last theme under the Individual Improvement category, Linked to Shared Identity, as described in the previous chapter. Interviewees linked their individual improvement as a reason for their dedication to the job or linked the individual development of employees in
general to a shared commitment or a feeling of inclusion, themes under the Shared Identity category. This manifested through a desire to do more and give more to Homeboy because of what they individually received from Homeboy. Here it is clear that peace-building is a developmental process. A strong emphasis is placed on the personal development of individuals within the organization before entering into a process of mutual understanding and

It is important here to revisit the fact that this study focuses on the profit-generating businesses within Homeboy. The individual improvement employees received came from the non-profit portion of Homeboy, those aspects of the organizational structure that provide social support such as therapy and self-improvement classes. However, even though the individual improvement serves an important function, there was no indication that the social support found at Homeboy requires that it be a non-profit. It just so happens that Homeboy began as a non-profit charity and so kept its legal status as a 501c3. The economic development realized from Homeboy that serves to house the peace-building process is found mainly in the profit-generating businesses, which is why interviews were focused on employees of these parts of Homeboy. In this way, the non-profit side supports the employees of the profit-generating businesses and so works in reverse of an outstanding philanthropy model.

Further, interviewees also expressed how as individuals, everyone is at Homeboy to receive the same individual benefit, which shows a higher level view of these benefits in that interviewees recognize that others are sharing in the same development process as they are. This idea is an indication of moving
beyond an internal, singular view of one’s place at Homeboy to the recognition of others who are there for the same purpose. It’s the recognition that even though they are receiving the social support individually, employees other than themselves are also in need of and receiving the same support, meaning others are committed to Homeboy for the same reason, a concept captured in the Shared Commitment theme.

The sense that everyone is in the same situation extends further to the Feeling of Inclusion theme. That is, viewing everyone being at Homeboy for the same reason, a shared commitment, also lent itself to a feeling of belonging to a place where people come to improve themselves, of being a part of something greater than the individual, which was captured in the Feeling of Inclusion theme under the Shared Identity category. The organizational structures within the social support theme, such as orientation and the morning meetings, also serve to ensure organizational norms. Some of these norms link directly to supporting a shared identity as well.

Several interviewees mentioned how the norms of Respect, Equality and Acceptance all helped them feel welcomed and included, fostering a communal nature while working at Homeboy that serves to enhance in-group favoritism (Huddy, 2001). In this case, the in-group favoritism is for Homeboy as opposed to employees’ former gangs (Monk, 1997; Huddy, 2001). In this way, organizational norms set forth by aspects of the social support offered by Homeboy also serve to positively influence the creation of a shared identity.
In moving from a commitment to Homeboy to a shared identity, individuals indicate a growth beyond just the desire to improve themselves toward a view of the self in relation to the organization. On a very basic level, the individuals displayed some notion of viewing themselves in terms of the organization, rather than just an individual that happens to work at Homeboy, and this notion originated from self-improvement, coming from the social support provided, which created a commitment to Homeboy that allowed individuals to view themselves as in-group members of Homeboy. This is key to peace-building because it signifies that the shared workplace identity starts to become or becomes more salient than the gang identity within individuals. By viewing themselves and others as members of Homeboy rather than just employees working for a company, the Homeboy identity becomes salient and supersedes that of the gangs.

This is both deliberate and unintentional on the part of Homeboy. It is deliberate in that Homeboy does not allow employees to wear clothing with any symbols, including corporate branding, other than Homeboy attire and they ask employees to utilize the tattoo removal services that Homeboy provides, which removes gang symbols used for identifying gang affiliation. It is unintentional in that, while Homeboy fosters a sense of family, there is not a direct intention to create a uniquely Homeboy identity to overcome gang identities. That is, the Homeboy identity that the company strives for is not intentionally meant, at least not explicitly, to supersede gang identities, only to provide a welcoming atmosphere for those seeking help.
Further, since former rivals now see themselves as in-group members of the same group, Homeboy employees, it made communicating with each other easier because they could now communicate with the same identity rather than before when it was more taboo to communicate with a member of an outside identity. Thus, employee behavior is most influenced by their identity as a member of Homeboy as this identity becomes more salient than their gang identities (Huddy, 2001).

Cooperation

The last of the three clusters outlines the remainder of the entire process of Peace-building within a business context. This is where, even though there is some deviation from the proposed model, the peace-building process outlined in this cluster mostly follows what was anticipated to occur. The original model proposed in chapter 1 held that a shared identity, created through mutual understanding, is what leads to peace-building. Here, communication and the mutual understanding that comes from it lead the process of peace-building, meaning the only deviation is with the shared identity. This will be discussed further in the next section. Figure 8 below shows the path leading to peace-building.
The cooperation cluster begins with communication. Under the Communication with Rival category are two themes describing ways in which interviewees interact with their rivals: Realization of Similarities and Understanding Other’s Situation. Specifically, these two themes highlight the positive outcomes and benefits interviewees gained from communicating with their rivals and both demonstrate how dialogue created a greater understanding of out-group members. These themes are characterized by perspective taking and empathy, social competency that allows one to consider the world from the other’s point of view and feel what the other person feels (Graf et al., 2007;
Galinsky et al., 2011) and sets the stage for “we-feeling” in the sense that groups realize they share the same feelings regarding the conflict (Rothman, 1997).

As explained in chapter 2, these social competences serve to undermine the negative associations in-group members have created for out-group members, facilitating the peace-building process (Graf et al., 2007). At Homeboy, interviewees described this very process when discussing their communication with rivals. Both the Realization of Similarities and Understanding Other’s Situation themes emerged as characterization of how interviewees described their interaction with rivals and how they came to a mutual understanding.

The mutual understanding that came from the two types of communication with rivals leads into the peace-building that takes place at Homeboy. While the originally proposed model had included an intermediate step of creating a shared identity, results of the analysis of interview transcripts suggests that there is no intermediate step. In fact, several interviewees mentioned a direct connection between communicating with their rivals and one or more forms of peace-building found within the Peace-Building category of themes.

This direct link between communication and peace-building was captured in the theme Linked to Peace-Building under the Communication with Rivals category. This theme was characterized by a mention of how either realizing the similarities with a rival or understanding their situation allowed the interviewee to have a positive relationship with their rival, a changed understanding of the conflict in general (outside of the individual relationship) or a desire to make a positive impact on others rather than continue making a negative one through the
gang lifestyle. As such, creating a shared identity was not an intermediate step between communicating with a rival and the change that took place for individuals in how they approached rival relationships and gang violence in general.

In the next section, this point will be discussed further as a shared identity is still created but at a different point in the process than originally expected. Interestingly, the peace-building that is a result of mutual understanding also has generative qualities that serves to feedback and support the shared identity of being an in-group member of Homeboy. Employees described their positive attitudes toward rivals or their changed view of the gang lifestyle as being connected to in-group membership at Homeboy. This makes sense since a changed view of the conflict weakens previous ties to gang membership, making it easier to adopt new identities. Further, because the positive change in rival relationships is associated with working at Homeboy, a sense of in-group membership is produced as employees hold a positive affinity for the organization that facilitated the change and thus creates a new shared identity for employees to adopt.

The cooperation cluster is so called because it by itself does not lead to peace-building but the final state of this cluster is where rivals no longer hold animosity towards each other and begin to display cooperative behavior with one another. In a sense, this is peace-building behavior but on its own, this cluster does not describe the entire process of peace-building as so is simply called the cooperation cluster. When combined, all three clusters together, as will be
described in the next section, form the entire process of peace-building within a business context as developed from studying Homeboy.

Model for Peace-Building

Each of the three clusters of processes link together to produce an overall model of how peace-building takes place within Homeboy. This model is facilitated and supported by characteristics of the organization, most notably the organizational norms as described earlier. These same norms also open a space for understanding, individual growth, learning, changes in attitudes and changes in the way individuals view their situation and the conflict. The themes under the Characteristics of Organization category serve to ensure these norms are maintained while also creating structural aspects of Homeboy, as described in the Social Support theme, that help individual improvement. By providing opportunity, Homeboy attracts employees as they are given the chance to fulfill the needs that serve to motivate them to join the organization: gainful employment, improving their family situation and improving themselves. Further, Homeboy offers opportunities that not only fulfill needs but that also empower employees, giving them responsibilities that lift their self-esteem, support a positive emotional state and keep employees at Homeboy to continue their process of self-improvement.

This proves important because interviewees seemed to imply an emotional connection to Homeboy because of the opportunity it gave them, both initially and in empowering and trusting them with responsibilities that may not be
offered them elsewhere, as described in the previous chapter linking to Barrett’s positive emotional affect from aesthetics. Through these characteristic of Homeboy, providing opportunity, empowerment and social support, a space is created for a shared identity to manifest because the emotional connection to Homeboy is not limited to select individuals but rather was found in most interviews. Numerous interviewees even suggested that such a feeling was shared by most employees. The shared connection to Homeboy serves as the foundation for the shared identity as an in-group member of Homeboy. Explicitly, this emotional connection to Homeboy manifested in the desire to give back to Homeboy, which was captured in the Linked to Shared Identity theme.

A significant finding is that the first two clusters, or branches of the overall model, occur concurrently. That is, at the same time a space for communication among rivals is created, the individuals are working on themselves on the way to forming a shared identity. This suggests that an individual or personal level of focus is required alongside an organizational level focus. This falls in line with Jay Rothman’s theory regarding a micro level change in the individual’s own beliefs and values. Rothman believes each group must work separately on their own understanding of the part they play in contributing to the conflict. In essence, he suggests that individuals critique themselves and their own group’s values and beliefs as a step toward transforming the terms of the conflict (1992). In so doing, the rival groups address key identity issues within themselves before coming together to address the relationship between them.
The model for peace-building within a business seems to highlight this theory in that the process at Homeboy requires an individual focus. Employees first focus on themselves and on their own development before the shared identity can even be created. The interesting deviation from Rothman’s theory, however, is that the individual improvement occurs within an environment where organizational norms foster a psychologically and physically safe space for rivals to exist together and eventually communicate. The implications of both these happening at the same time is that the sense of safety, of communication among rivals and overall civility in dealing with one another becomes integrated in the individual’s own development so that when the time comes to communicate with rivals, the stage is set for mutual understanding and peace-building.

The shared identity as an in-group member of Homeboy also feeds into the willingness to communicate with rivals and thus the peace-building cluster actually begins where the other two clusters leave off. In the first cluster, Space for Communication, organizational norms create a physically and psychologically safe space for communicating with rivals. Having a shared identity seems to make communication easier as it weakened the previous identities in conflict by introducing one that is relatively stronger because of its connection to employees’ individual improvement as described in the second cluster. From this, an overall model for peace-building at Homeboy can be developed as shown in Figure 9 below.
As can be seen in the model, the first two clusters form two branches of the primary pathway leading to peace-building within Homeboy, indicated by the bold arrows. These clusters operate concurrently but do not operate independently of each other. The shaded boxes of the model are secondary characteristics of Homeboy that facilitate processes of both initial branches.
These characteristics serve facilitative functions and, while they are not major points along path toward peace-building, they emerged in interviews as significant, supportive aspects of the overall process and thus it would seem that without them it would not operate properly or efficiently. For this reason it is important to review them and what they mean in relation to the process leading to peace-building.

The first of these characteristics of the organization is the opportunity provided theme. As explained above, this theme is what allowed individuals to join Homeboy as it fulfilled the desire they had to want to join. Individuals’ motivations found a place at Homeboy because the organization offered them the opportunities they were seeking. This same theme also connects to the Commitment to Organization point along the concurrent cluster process because individuals were given more than just an opportunity to join an organization that fulfilled the desires fueling their motivations but also were given opportunities while already working at Homeboy that empowered them. This empowerment translated into a commitment to the organization because individuals were grateful for the empowerment Homeboy provided and were thus attached to Homeboy with a sense of wanting to give back to it.

The second characteristic of the organization that links the two concurrent clusters encompasses structural aspects of the organization that served to ensure the organizational norms. Captured in the Social Support theme, these structural aspects of Homeboy, such as the morning meetings and dress code, also ensured that individuals adhered to the organizational norms, thus
supporting the process of creating physical and psychological safety. This flows into the last characteristic of the organization that links the two concurrent branches, the norms themselves.

Three norms in particular seem to stand out as significant links across each cluster process; Respect, Equality and Acceptance. These three norms link the Social Support theme to a sense of Shared Identity as described above but this would not be possible if there was no adherence to them to begin with. For this reason, these organizational norms actually have a multi-faceted benefit in that the structural aspects of the organization captured in the Social Support theme create and ensure adherence to these norms but the norms also feed into the creation of a shared identity, which serves to further bolster the norms.

The two branches of the overall process created by the first two clusters of linked categories and themes connect to one another by supporting communication among rivals. Obviously, the Space for Communication cluster naturally connects to the last cluster, Peace-Building, since the latter requires a safe space for communication to take place before individuals feel comfortable enough to open dialogue with rivals. However, the creation of a shared identity also supports communication with rivals because creating a safe space for dialogue by itself is not enough. Having a shared identity emerged almost as a means to encourage dialogue among rivals because it erodes the rivalry and division in favor of cooperation and integration and for this reason the arrow from shared identity goes toward communication with rivals. From that point, the
process outlined in the third cluster takes over and leads to peace-building within the organization.

It is important to note that this model was developed from a single case study and so is currently limited to Homeboy. Thus, this overall process of peace-building outlined in the above model is, in fact, the overall process of peace-building at Homeboy. As stated previously, this study is exploratory in nature and seeks only to develop theory for how peace-building could take place within a business context using a real-world example for information on how it is being done with an exemplar organization with a distinctly appreciative influence to the research study. The next section describes the limitations of this study further and offers suggested next steps for further developing this line of research.

Conclusion

Implications

From the study several implications can be deduced based on the Homeboy Industries case. While generalizability to all cases is impractical, several important findings can be concluded from this study. These concluding findings are meant for both prescriptive purposes for those interested in addressing issues surrounding conflict or specifically identity-based conflict and for areas of focus in further research and model testing.

The first significant finding is that business can indeed be used to facilitate peace-building while also being profitable. Here the Sustainable Value concept is found to be true in the case of Homeboy Industries. Shareholder value was
created in terms of the profits generated by the four businesses operated by Homeboy. These profits were used initially to offset 25% of the operating expenses for the entire business but have since grown to offset 40% of the operating expenses. While still not covering all the expenses, the ability of these businesses to offset a greater percentage of Homeboy’s costs suggests they are successfully creating shareholder value for Homeboy and growing as businesses themselves.

The profits of the businesses operating under Homeboy are reinvested into the company in the exact same way that retained earnings are reinvested into any for-profit company. As such, the fact that Homeboy is legally a non-profit corporation is irrelevant as the profit structure and reinvestment of profits from these businesses follow the same process that for-profit corporations do when reinvesting earnings. Further, there was indication that the operating expenses of Homeboy were actually increasing, not decreasing, which means the profits of these businesses are growing more than the percentages would indicate. No actual revenue figures were provided for confidentiality reasons.

At Homeboy, stakeholder value is also created in the form of peace-building as described in the model above. This shows that Homeboy has proven it is capable of facilitating cooperation and peace-building among rivals of a violent, identity-based conflict, in this case Gang violence, while also generating profits and growing the businesses they operate that are generating those profits. This means that business can and does facilitate peace-building and is profitable while doing so. An additional, theoretical contribution from this finding is that it
shows the Sustainable Value concept can be expanded to include addressing violent conflicts.

Second, companies that address violent, identity-based conflicts by facilitating peace-building have a greater impact on the community they operate in than the community does on them. This finding has two important implications. One implication is that such companies provide benefits ranging from increasing public health to the most important which is increasing public safety. Along with the above findings, this shows that businesses can successfully address several social issues surrounding violent conflict while also remaining profitable.

Another implication of this finding is that since the influence of context on the company is less than the influence of the company on the context, businesses seeking to facilitate peace-building do not have as much to worry about in regards to starting operations within these violence conflicts. As long as there is a certain level of community support, it is possible, as Homeboy demonstrates, to operate with relative security in regions of conflict and be successful at doing so. It is important to note, however, that the contextual evidence provided by Homeboy is anecdotal so actual contextual impacts on Homeboy or by Homeboy were not measured. What was clear though is that Homeboy worked alongside the public agencies addressing gang violence and together was able to successfully increase public safety. This suggests that gaining public support not only helps the company but further facilitates peace-building in the community.
The third finding is that in order to address violent, identity-based conflicts, business must include a focus on the improvement of individuals. As stated previously, this was an unexpected finding from this study but proved to be an important aspect of the entire peace-building process. Further, the focus on individuals also benefits the whole process and the company when done concurrently with the process of creating a safe space for communication. The psychological and physical safety needed for communication to take place is created through an adherence to organizational norms that create that are meant to create that safe space, specifically Respect, Equality and Acceptance. When these norms are ensured concurrently with the process of creating a shared identity, based initially on development of employees individually, they become integrated into the individual’s process of reconstructing meaning. Thus, when individuals communicate with their rivals, they are already primed to do so by having the idea of respect, equal treatment and acceptance of others engrained into their new way of sense making, which together forms the foundation for a shared identity within the individual.

The fourth significant finding is that a shared identity is created before rivals communicate with one another. In the initial proposed process, communication with rivals led to a shared identity because this communication was thought to allow rival identity group members to discover commonalities that would form the basis for a shared identity. However, the findings of this study suggest that a shared workplace identity is actually required before any communication among rivals takes place. This proves a potentially powerful
characteristic of business in promoting peace-building because the identity as an employee of the company supersedes the identities in conflict, which then allows for communication to take place.

Further, this finding has a secondary finding attached to it; that mutual understanding is what directly leads to peace-building. Mutual understanding did in fact come from communication between rivals but this then led to peace-building and cooperation without any intermediate steps. Both the creation of a safe space to communicate in and a shared workplace identity to instigate communication together are prerequisites for rivals to communicate. This is an important ability of business in peace-building because it creates the foundations for rivals to communicate. Business offers the economic motivation for employees to be at the company in the first place, building the psychological and physical safety and creates a workplace identity that supersedes rival identities. The creation of a shared identity still played a vital role in the peace-building process, just at an earlier stage.

The final significant finding of this study is the important role that organizational norms play in facilitating the process of peace-building within a business context. As previously stated, adherence to the norms of Respect, Equality and Acceptance were needed to create a safe space for communication. Norms of Growth, Empathy and Hope were needed for individuals to develop on their way towards being committed to the organization and having a sense of a shared workplace identity. This the important role of the organizational norms goes beyond just having them but constantly ensuring and reinforcing them as
these norms need to be maintained for current and new employees. This was captured in the Social Support theme where structural aspects of the company existed that ensured norms and ensured adherence to these norms.

Together, these findings can be combined into a general prescriptive outline for what businesses can do to promote peace-building within violent identity-based conflicts. While peace-building does not require intentionality on the part of a corporation, if the intention to address violent identity-based conflicts is present than the below provides a prescription for what should be done based on the Homeboy Industries case.

1. Must implement and ensure org norms from the beginning
   a. These need to be present before employees join so they can be assimilated at the beginning of the process
   b. These need also be maintained over time to ensure they are integrated into employees’ process of development

2. Must have a focus on improving the individuals concurrently with adherence to organizational norms
   a. Any program or attention placed on providing individual needs/social services
   b. Does not need to be non-profit to provide these as no indication was present that Homeboy’s non-profit status was a pre-requisite for such services

3. Must ensure a workplace identity is present
   a. This not only helps facilitate communication among rivals but also ensures organizational commitment by employees, which promotes business interests as well as social interests (i.e. peace-building)

4. Must ensure business focus along with social focus
   a. Adherence to a Sustainable Value idea critical as this ensures both shareholder value is created to sustain the company’s operations while also addressing the conflict
   b. Stakeholder value also aids in the profitability of the company

5. Must be willing to operate in conflict areas
   a. Doing so actually serves to improve the community in which the company is operating
   b. Will be impacted by region of operations less than will impact region so long as there is some level of community support, which together will potentially prove profitable for the company
Limitations

As with any study, there are some limitations that should be addressed. The limitations of this study are mostly based on the exploratory nature of the study. Much of what was done here are first steps in an attempt to bring Sustainable Value and Appreciative Inquiry influenced methods to the area of identity-based conflict research in order to understand the role business can play in peace-building. Due to this exploratory nature, caution was taken not to overstate both the reach of the study nor the outcomes. It is for this reason that the limitations of this study are important to understand and further research is required to address them as will be described in the next section.

As stated above, this study is based on data collected from a single case. This has major significance for the findings because it makes generalizability more of a challenge. The results of the thematic analysis and the ensuring model for peace-building are limited to Homeboy and so cannot be said to describe peace-building in every business and organization. The intent was to use an in-depth case study to develop a model for peace-building, not the final model for peace-building, as a jumping off point for further research. With this outcome, it is possible to conduct model testing to further refine it and to support future claims for generalizability.

Further, being an in-depth case study on peace-building in identity-based conflicts, this study is also limited to a single type of identity-based conflict. Homeboy Industries is a company that specifically addresses gang violence,
making it difficult to claim that the above model is generalizable to other types of identity-based conflicts. In other types of identity-based conflicts, such as religious or ethnic conflicts, there may be different contextual factors or variables involved not captured in this study.

Lastly, even though the protocol was influenced and inspired by Appreciative Inquiry protocols and methodology, it was specifically developed to capture evidence in line with the proposed understanding of how peace-building could be promoted within a business context. However, as the final outcome shows, other factors played a role in the facilitation of peace-building within Homeboy, most significant of which is the focus on individual development. While this factor did emerge in interviews, it was more of an unintended discovery and so the interview protocol was not comprehensive enough to explore it further. Any further research will need to have a protocol that includes questions on the individual development of employees in order to provide a more directed understanding of this aspect of peace-building in business. In this way, a comprehensive approach to data collection will be possible.

**Future Research Avenues**

The outcome of this study is a model for how business can be used for peace-building in an identity-based conflict, but, as stated above, it is based on a single case study operating in within a setting of gang violence. Thus, the first avenue for future research is to test this model in other regions and other types of identity-based conflicts. Model testing would require using similar methods
with an improved protocol that would be more focused on following the model for peace-building developed in this study. The methods used in this study were broad in order to accommodate an exploratory study in that the protocol was open to emergent and unexpected themes and followed guiding questions. Future research will focus more on testing outcomes rather than exploring phenomenon using hypotheses developed from the results of this study.

Model testing in other regions and identity-based conflicts will also allow for generalizability of the model. In this way, larger claims to the reliability of the model can be made outside of the specific context of Homeboy, thus avoiding radical specificity. Doing this will also provide an opportunity for further refining the model by removing aspects that only apply to Homeboy while also adding more information or explanation for those aspects that apply in any setting. Further, conducting research studies in other conflicts and companies will also support a prescriptive application of the model as described in chapter 1.

Other avenues for this type of research also exist beyond just model testing. Further research into the influence of an individual’s external context on their personal development and on their personal change in terms of the conflict is needed to account for micro-level variables that may play a role in peace-building. An individual’s context outside of the company may influence how they participate in the conflict and also offers insight into what their personal situation and interaction with the conflict brings to the company. This also offers an opportunity to study how the company handles such outside influences and accommodates them in the overall process of peace-building.
The last avenue for further research relates to the above but in the opposite direction. This study explored how peace-building takes place within a business setting but this does not account for peace-building within the larger context of the conflict in general. Thus, further research is needed in studying the diffusion of the peace-building process in the greater community. Diffusion is a significant step toward understanding how business can be used to promote peace outside its walls. A larger application of the role of business in peace-building, the notion of diffusion shares the normative quality of this study in that it is hoped that business can resolve conflict and bring about cooperation among all those involved in an identity-based conflict, beginning with employees and moving to the identity groups themselves. In this way, a study of diffusion will provide information on how business can be used to change the conception of out-group antagonism and create mutual understanding among larger groups in conflict.

Oh Mankind. Verily we have created you from a male and female and made you into nations and tribes so that you may know one another. Verily the most honored of you in the sight of God is the most righteous.

-Qur’an, 49:13
Interview Protocol

Question 1: What external conditions facilitate the use of business for peace-building?

- To begin, please share the story of how Homeboy Industries first started.
- What was your vision of Homeboy when you first joined? What purpose did you hope it would serve?
- Think of a moment when Homeboy Industries best lived up to this purpose. Describe what happened.

Q1a: Will a context in which company operates have an effect on its ability to promote peace?

- What aspects of the community helped bring your vision to life?
- How do the community, city and state currently support your vision for Homeboy? Be as exhaustive as you can.

Q1b: Will a company’s positive effect on its context help facilitate peace-building

- Can you think of a specific story where Homeboy made a positive impact outside the company? What happened?
- In what ways has Homeboy Industries contributed to the communities in which employees live?
- How do you envision Homeboy Industries in the next 5 to 10 years? What positive contributions do you foresee in the future?

Question 2: What internal processes within a business promote peace-building between members of conflicting identity groups within an employment context?

Q2a: Will employment increase the willingness to communicate with those on the opposite side of a conflict?

- What attracted you to working at Homeboy? What were your initial impressions?
- What do you value most about working at Homeboy?
Can you describe a high point moment for you while working here?
Describe a typical interaction you have while at work. Are there interactions that are not work related?

Q2b: Will communication between employees on opposite sides of a conflict lead to mutual understanding?

- Can you think of a positive relationship you have with someone who you initially didn't think you would have a relationship with? Can you describe it for me?
- What similarities have you discovered from this relationship?

Q2c: Will mutual understanding between groups in conflict lead to a shared identity?

- Think of a time you and your fellow employees felt a sense of shared commitment to Homeboy. Why did you feel such commitment? What about Homeboy helped create it?

Q2d: Will the creation of a shared workplace identity promote cooperation and peace-building?

- What is the core factor of Homeboy that facilitates cooperation among employees?
- Imagine it is 10 years in the future. What is going on in your life? In your community?
- How has working at Homeboy influenced your vision for your future?
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