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The focus of this dissertation is on the work processes and activities that social justice leaders engage in while creating, managing, and leading social justice organizations. I argue that it is possible to create an overarching process of work processes and activities from the successful experiences of social justice leaders that have created, managed, and led successful social change organizations. This overarching process provides current and future leaders, particularly those leaders new to creating SCOs, a road map for the work processes and activities required to be successful.
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Chapter One
Introduction

In theory, laws and structures distribute benefits and burdens to its citizens; however, in practice, these laws and structures can unfairly distribute benefits and burdens to citizens (Armstrong, 2012). When this unfair distribution is built into the laws and structures of society, it can be hard to identify; however, to make the system fair for all, these laws and structures must be examined. As West (2004) says, “[W]hen visionary and courageous citizens see through the dogmas and nihilisms of those who rule us and join together to pursue democratic individuality, progress can be made in our communities and our society” (p. 103). Social justice is a social phenomenon enacted when a society’s laws and structures are made just by more fairly distributing a society’s benefits and burdens (Armstrong, 2012; Blackmore, 2009; Dantley & Tillman, 2006; Novak, 2000). This is accomplished as individual people observe and interrogate injustices in society and then organize and work together to transform laws, policies, and procedures. As individuals organize into groups with a common goal, they form Social Change Organizations (SCOs). As Social Change Organizations (SCOs) form and pursue social justice, leaders for social justice emerge to lead and manage these SCOs.

Problem Statement

As social justice leaders emerge, development programs aimed at preparing people for the role of social justice leader are researched and created. Research literature exploring social justice leadership primarily focuses on four topics: (1) defining social justice leadership, (2) presenting ways to create awareness or raise consciousness about society’s injustices, (3) defining social justice competencies and development programs,
and (4) identifying the leading practices in which social justice leaders engage. The last has had the least attention in the literature. I take issue with the focus of social justice leadership literature on creating consciousness, defining competencies, and designing developmental program without the knowledge of a social justice leader’s work activities – as a whole or on a day-to-day basis. As Cooper (2000) states, the first step to developing a competency model or a development program is to understand the job and its processes: “Everything starts with well-designed processes. The process determines what skills are required and what knowledge is needed” (p. 8). Before competencies can be defined or a development program for social justice leaders can be created, researchers and social justice workers must understand the processes and activities involved in leading organizations that promote change leading to social justice. Based upon the current research agenda, the expectations for social justice leaders is to be successful in leading organizations for social justice change without the knowledge of the strategies and work processes required to be successful.

**Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this research study is, therefore, to investigate the experiences of social justice leaders and the formation of social justice organizations in an attempt to identify and define the work processes and work activities that social justice leaders engage in when interrogating injustices and attempting to change the laws, policies, and procedures of society’s institutions and structures. In other words, the purpose is to explore the various work processes and activities of successful social justice leaders and to determine whether commonalities exist in the activities they perform. If commonalities do exist, another goal of this dissertation is to organize these work processes and
activities into a process that provides social justice leaders with specific action steps that will enable them to envision, initiate, and manage organizations that promote social justice. This research provides a basis for future research that has the goal to define competencies or development programs. The basis provided is a description, analysis, and interpretation of the job activities of social justice leaders, which is formed grounded theory model.

While recognizing the need for a clearly defined set of competencies (i.e., the knowledge, skills, and attributes) to become a social justice leader, this dissertation thus focuses on the work of social justice leaders, thereby providing the context in which these competencies are applied. Specifically, this study is based on the assumption that to be effective social justice leaders, individuals not only must possess a specific set of required competencies, but also they must set clear goals with knowledge of the specific work processes and activities that lead to the development of organizations that promote social justice.

It is important to note that the purpose of this study is not to label the leadership style of a social justice leader. For example, to label individuals as “distributed leaders” or “transformative leaders” provides insight into leaders’ personality, motives, behaviors, and competencies (i.e., knowledge, skills, attributes), but it does not identify the processes and activities by which leaders implement change. As a result, such labeling provides little insight into the activities used to develop and sustain organizations. To fill this gap, the focus of this dissertation is on the work processes and activities that social justice leaders engage in while creating, managing, and leading social justice organizations. Therefore, I argue that it is possible to create an overarching process of
work processes and activities from the successful experiences of social justice leaders
that have created, managed, and led successful social change organizations. This
overarching process provides current and future leaders, particularly those leaders new to
creating SCOs, a road map for the work processes and activities required to be successful.

Research Questions

The primary research question guiding this study is as follows: When social
justice leaders create and manage organizations for social change, do enough
commonalities exist to be formed into a process?

Subsequent research questions that aid in answering the primary question are as
follows:

(1) What are the stories that social justice leaders tell about their experiences
while creating and leading social justice organizations?
(2) What are the common work processes and work activities across their stories?
(3) What are the processes that social justice leaders engage in while creating and
leading social justice organizations?

Significance of the Study

This dissertation is intended to contribute to two bodies of knowledge: social
justice leadership and the leadership of social change organizations. Little research fills
these two bodies of literature on the work processes and activities of leaders. The
constituents that will benefit from this knowledge include social movement organizers,
social justice leaders, and teachers of organizers and leaders.
Knowledge about social movements and how they are organized is lacking in literature and practice. As Barker, Johnson, and Lavalette (2001) proposed, researchers should more thoroughly investigate the leadership process involved in initiating and sustaining social movements since relatively little theory has been developed in this area. Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) proposed that most of the literature on social movements focuses on political movements rather than community initiatives and organizations. A research project to advance the development of a process for leading a social change organization has not been conducted. This dissertation research identifies the common work processes and activities conducted by social change organizations from the conceptualization of an organization through an organization’s sustainability. This initial process will help current and future social justice leaders establish and lead organizations with a clearer vision of the work processes and activities needed, therein improving chances for success.

Teachers of social justice leaders will benefit from the identification of this initial process, because it completes Cooper’s (2000) first two steps of professional development. The first step is defining social justice leaders, and the second step is defining the work activities of social justice leaders and how their work is different from other leaders. As a result, educational programs will be able to more accurately define competencies and training material for social justice leaders. Although other audiences may benefit from this research, community organizers, social justice leaders, and teachers of social justice leaders are the targeted benefactors of this research.
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this dissertation is based upon Creswell and Clark’s (2007) hierarchy of research design (i.e., methodology, design, method/techniques). The methodology refers to the fundamental assumptions underpinning the reality and knowledge of research, which for this dissertation is based on grounded theory and ethnography (p. 4). The design links the fundamental assumptions to the “plan of action,” and is participatory action research (PAR). The data collection and analysis method is appreciative inquiry (AI). AI is a method of process improvement developed primarily in business consulting. This dissertation does not fully incorporate the full AI’s method; however, AI is used as the method of data collection and analysis to answer the research question. The AI method is discussed in the literature review.

Underlying the conceptual framework are six assumptions derived from the melding of theories, methodologies, and methods. These six assumptions emerged from four literature topics including (1) social justice leadership – definition, behavior, and review of work activities; (2) social change organizations; (3) appreciative inquiry (AI); and (4) grounded theory. I have identified six research assumptions emerging from the four literature topics. These assumptions have implications for the design of the study and are outlined in Table 1. Further discussion of these five topics takes place in Chapter 2, Review of Literature, and Chapter 3, Methodology. Here, I discuss each assumption briefly as they provide background for the research including the research questions, literature review, and research methods.
Social justice leadership.  

*Definition.* From the social justice literature, one assumption emerged as salient to the conceptual framework for developing a process for social justice leaders: Social justice is justice enacted with and for groups of people. (See Table 1.) In other words, the term “social justice” arises because it is justice in a social context whereby people work with others and for others to create justice (Novak, 2000). Social justice is not done in isolation by one person or for one person.

Table 1  
*Conceptual Framework Assumptions Drawn from Literature*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Topics</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social justice leadership – definition, behaviors, and activities | (1) Social justice is justice enacted with and for groups of people, i.e., in a social context.  
(2) Identifying an organization’s job activities places the focus on the change process rather than the leader.  
(3) A social justice leader creates a culture conducive to human development through three leadership behaviors: praxis based on shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-making. |
| Social change organizations (SCO)                     | (4) One overarching process can be developed for organizations with similar missions.                                                     |
| Appreciative inquiry (AI)                             | (5) Change happens through thinking that is positive, forward, and anti-deficit.                                                          |
| Grounded theory                                        | (6) The experiences of participants provide the background for developing knowledge.                                                       |
In the social justice leadership literature, I found ten behaviors of social justice leaders; however, finding participants who exhibit all ten was unrealistic. Therefore, in Chapter 2, I employed Dewey’s (1927) concepts of community and human development to reduce the ten behaviors to three: praxis based on shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-making. (See Table 1.) Many of the SJL authors use Dewey as a foundation for their research; therefore, Dewey’s three behaviors were already a foundation for and found within the ten behaviors identified in the social justice leadership literature. It is important to note: the research to identify the ten behaviors gave me a foundational knowledge of the work activities of social justice leaders. This not only helped me speak their language but also helped formulate questions during the facilitated session.

The first behavior used for participant selection, praxis based upon shared interests, is the leadership behavior of seeking all perspectives and melding them into the change initiative, repeating this process even as the initiative is being planned and implemented. The second behavior is communal dialog wherein a leader must hold being in dialog as a way of being. According to the literature, dialog should be with friend and foe with the purpose of understanding the viewpoint of others as well as being understood. The third behavior is participatory decision-making, whereby a leader fosters a culture of participation as opposed to autocratic decision-making. The literature foregrounds that unwavering convictions, as seen in autocratic decision-making, tend to focus on the “program” and not the shared interest of change. In contrast, social justice leadership must encourage participation in decision-making.
**Work activities.** As is seen in the literature review to follow, professional development programs tend to focus on improving the leader’s attributes as opposed to improving the knowledge of the work required. Social justice leaders teach, lead, and empower themselves and others to interrogate and transform the laws, policies, and procedures of society’s institutions and structures so that they are more just for all groups of citizens. This empowering requires social justice leaders to “enlighten the social actors so that, coming to see themselves and their social situation in a new way, they themselves can decide to alter the conditions which they find oppressive” (Fay, 2014, p. 103). Once the social actors are enlightened, social justice leaders must lead and teach others how to alter the conditions. To accomplish this goal, researchers, social movement organizers, social justice leaders and teachers must understand the work that social justice leaders perform, thereby placing the focus on the change process rather than the leader.

**Social change organizations.**

From the social change organization literature, one assumption emerged as salient to the conceptual framework: choosing the type of organization to study. There are many types of organizations whose mission is to promote social justice. In other words, although organizations have different missions, the overall goal for social change organizations is the same: to improve the social contract for a marginalized group of people. According to Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) social change organizations can be organized into four types based upon the organization’s mission. Their model has two axes, which creates a four-quadrant model. On one end of the first axis are missions that support change of a collective group while the other end of that same axis, missions empower individual to make personal change. On one end of the second axis are missions
that transform the individual while the other end of the axis are missions that will not transform the individual. Therefore, a salient assumption of the conceptual framework is that a social justice process defined by this research can represent social change organizations with similar missions. In other words, social justice leaders who lead organizations that fall within the same quadrant can use the same process for developing social justice organizations. (See Table 1.)

**Appreciative inquiry.**

Also contributing to the development of this dissertation’s conceptual framework is appreciative inquiry (AI). From the AI literature, which is detailed in Chapter 2, one assumption is salient to the study of social justice leaders. This concept is that change process should be from a positive perspective rather than a deficit perspective. (See Table 1.) AI is a philosophy by which to create meaningful changes and is based on the concept of human agency, whereby people are brought together to create meaningful changes in their own organization and in their own lives. AI provides the stage for human agency. Social justice requires human agency, and for this reason, AI methods are used in this project.

The salient concept that AI contributes that the focus of making changes should be on the possibilities for the future and what is currently working (Bunker & Alban, 2006; Hammond, 1998; Whitney, & Stavros, 2012) instead of unproductively rehashing issues of the past. In other words, AI represents the opposite of deficit thinking, whereby the positive processes of an organization are built upon as opposed to focusing on and eliminating the negatives.
Grounded theory.

Another assumption is that the purpose of this research project is to develop a social justice process that generates the work processes and subsequent work activities needed to start and lead a social justice organization. That is, the purpose is to develop a grounded theory. For example, by exploring the experiences of current social justice leaders, one might find that the first step is defining the mission of the organization, and within this step, one might find the activities of understanding what is needed by the community, what skills volunteers bring to the organization, and what resources are available to support the organization. This purpose aligns with grounded theory research, whereby the purpose is “to generate or discover a theory, an abstract analytical schema of a process” that is grounded in the experience of the research participants (Creswell, 2007, p. 63). Theoretical sampling is used in grounded theory research, whereby participants are selected “based on their ability to contribute to the development of the theory” (p. 240). In applying grounded theory to the conceptual framework for developing a process for social justice leaders, this research explored the “processes, actions, and interactions” of experienced leaders of social justice organizations to generate a process for their work starting and leading these organizations. Specific to this research, participants were chosen because they could contribute, i.e., through purposeful rather than random selection. Participant selection had a very specific set of criteria, whereby qualification was determined through an initial interviewing selection process. Once selected, participants attended the AI facilitated session to gather and analyze their experiences leading social justice organizations.
In summary, the conceptual framework for this research is based upon six assumptions. The literature on social justice leadership provided three of those assumptions: (1) social justice is justice enacted with and for groups of people, (2) the focus should remain on identifying and fixing the process of change rather than fixing the leaders, and (3) social justice leaders create a culture conducive to human development through their own leadership behaviors. The literature on social change organizations prompted a fourth assumption: (4) an overarching process can be developed for organizations with similar missions. Appreciative inquiry contributed a fifth assumption: (5) the conceptual framework that to make change, leaders must have the right thought process – positive, forward, and anti-deficit thinking. Finally, grounded theory provided the sixth assumption: (6) through analysis of shared experiences, theoretical knowledge can be developed. These six assumptions inform the research for this dissertation including the research questions, literature review, and research methods. These concepts also have implications for the research as discussed in Chapter 5.

**Research Design**

Research design includes the methods, site and participant selection, data collection, management and analysis, delimitations, positionality of the researcher, limitations, definitions, and a general overview of how the remainder of the study is organized.

**Methods.**

The blending of methodological approaches is discussed in detail in Chapter 3. The research blended grounded theory and an ethnographic perspective to form the
methodological approach. Coupled with this blended methodology were the research design of participatory action research (PAR) and the data collection and analysis method of appreciative inquiry (AI). To accomplish group inquiry and social change, many researchers have turned to alternative approaches to research and data gathering (Minkler, 2000). To achieve the end goal of identifying a process for creating sustainable social justice organizations, this dissertation used PAR, which is an “overarching name for orientations to research practices that place the researcher in the position of co-learner and puts a heavy accent on community participation and the translation of research findings into action for education and change” (Minkler, 2000, p. 192). In the case of this research, the “community” was created when social justice leaders were identified and invited to become part of a research community that had the goal of defining a process for developing organizations for social justice. In addition to using PAR, this dissertation also used AI as a method for data gathering and analysis. For the purposes of this study, “community” consisted of a group of social justice leaders from multiple but similar social change organizations.

**Research site and participant selection.**

To understand the research site and participant selection, a foundational knowledge of AI is needed, and will be developed further in the Review of Literature. Developed in the field of business primarily for the use of process improvement, AI is grounded in the processes of organizational development in which organizations are examined as systems with history, and this history influences future outcomes (Bunker & Alban, 2006; Weisbord, 1987). Therefore, if leaders desire to influence change within organizations, they must bring together all the stakeholders who make decisions about the
future and thereby create a stage for human agency (Hammond, 1998; Weisbord, 1987). Bringing stakeholders together increases the understanding of how all the parts work individually and together (Bunker & Alban, 2006; Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008), thus enabling the creation of a comprehensive process for the organization that accounts for all known parts.

Although Cooperrider originally developed AI as a change management process to use in corporate organizations, it has been successfully employed in non-profit organizations as well, such as churches, schools, and national organizations (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008). Cooperrider’s AI approach uses the experiences of people within the organization to identify what processes and activities work. The group builds new processes based upon the best of the best processes and activities already in use. With this said, the purpose for using AI in this research was to collect four social justice leaders into a room, invite them to share their experiences and the lessons they have learned including their best practices based on their experiences, and then formulate those experiences into a reproducible and systematic process of work processes and activities that could be used by participating leaders as well as future leaders.

As Merriam (1998) has proposed, “Once the general problem [of the research] has been identified, the task becomes to select the unit of analysis, the sample” (p. 60). For this dissertation, the selection criteria included defining the mission of the social change organization as well as ensuring that the leaders and organizations were available and within reasonable proximity to the research team. The participant selection was a three part process: (1) prequalification was through review of websites, Facebook pages, brochures, and newspapers; (2) qualifying interview were in-person or by phone
interviews to ask questions pertaining to selection criteria; and (3) analysis of interviews was the comparison of each candidate’s data with the qualifying criteria to identify qualifying participants. Qualifying participants met the following criteria: (a) participants were a primary leader for a successful organization, which was defined as meeting its mission and goals, (b) participant leaders demonstrated the three behaviors identified as conducive to human development including praxis based on shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-making, (c) Participants demonstrated an AI thought process that is positive, forward, and anti-deficit.

**Data collection, management, and analysis.**

**Data collection.** The approach to research used in this dissertation is PAR (Merriam, 1998), and the data collection method is AI. The AI data collection method is the best approach to help answer the research questions and meet the goal of this dissertation, which is to identify and create a process. To create a process requires collective construction of best practices by people with successful experiences (Cooperrider, Whitney & Stavros, 2008; Creswell, 2007). AI uses facilitated sessions consisting of experienced people to identify the best practices as a foundation for defining an entire process. Through facilitated questioning, each participant shares his or her experiences, and then as a group, participants analyzed their experiences in order to identify commonalities across experiences. The AI method allows researchers to identify successful activities and methods, which are then formed into an entire overarching process.

**Data management.** Data were managed in three phases: prior to the facilitated session, during the facilitated session, and after the facilitated session. Prior to the
facilitated session, the facilitator secured university laptops on which the knowledge workers captured session data. During the facilitated session, knowledge workers transcribed verbatim the participants’ data from flip charts, whiteboards, and in chosen conversations. The also managed the audio recording of the facilitated session. At the end of the session, I transferred all electronic files and data (i.e., flip charts, whiteboards, etc.) from the laptops to my laptop. The files on the university laptops were deleted. After the facilitated session, the audio data required transcription and further analysis, which I did based upon grounded theory’s analysis process. All data were kept in a secure location to protect the identities of participants.

**Data analysis.** At the analysis stage, the approach shifted from AI and PAR to grounded theory. Typically in grounded theory, the researcher gathers data from participants and then single-handedly analyzes the data to produce findings and conclusions. However, the facilitated session is designed to gather information from individual social justice leaders, facilitate analysis of the information as a group, and collectively construct a process as a group. Although some solitary analysis is required to create the final formatted process, the goal of AI is for participants to analyze the data themselves to create an initial overarching process. Asking participants to analyze data is where this data analysis procedure departs from the traditional model of grounded theory.

**Delimitations**

To provide a manageable and appropriate scope for this dissertation, five delimiting factors were identified. First, this research restricted the types of organizations from which social justice leaders were selected. The social change organizations from which participants were recruited include only those whose primary
goal is to facilitate meaningful changes at the individual level by transforming and empowering the individual. Of the four types of organizations outlined in the Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) model, this type of organization is chosen because of its characteristic smaller scale and local origins.

Second, this research focused on developing an initial overarching process for developing and sustaining this type of organization, as opposed to the many individual designs that could fall within this process (Creswell & Clark, 2007). Specifically, the goal of this dissertation was not to create designs for each type of social justice organization that focuses on individual change (e.g., homeless organizations, anti-violence organizations, educational organizations, etc.), but rather to create the overarching process that these designs might fall within.

Third, this research explored the work processes experienced by social justice leaders as they create and manage organizations for social change. If participants found commonalities across their organizations’ work experience, then a second goal was to form these experiences into a process for current and future leaders to use. Developing processes for creating or improving organizations is an iterative practice, meaning this research created an initial draft of the process for developing a social change organization. After this research, the process must be applies and enhance before a final version is created.

Fourth, the number of purposefully selected participants is four and the number of days for the facilitated session (one) restricts the data collected for this dissertation. Since it is difficult to have people volunteer their time for more than a day, having four participants ensured the research had enough time to fully discuss each participant’s
experiences of successful work processes and activities. As discussed later, the facilitated session consisted of three participants with a fourth participant providing their data separately after the session. The depth of the four participants’ shared experiences enabling the development of a usable process; however, as discussed in the previous delimiting factor, the process is an initial draft and requires further research to complete.

Fifth, social justice and democracy are interrelated; however, the language and literature of each is distinct, so this dissertation is limited to social justice language. These four delimiting factors set the parameters for the data collected, and therefore, they set the parameters for the research methodology as well as the process created from the data.

**Positionality of Researcher**

Within PAR the researcher becomes a participant, and as such, it is necessary for me to account for biases in my expectations of the data gathering and process development as well as in my understanding of concepts of social justice leadership. First, I have 14 years of experience as a consultant in a professional services firm, and I am highly familiar with the leadership processes required to implement organizational change, develop organizational processes, develop competency models, implement learning curricula, and create AI processes. This knowledge and background enabled me to ask appropriate questions of the participants during the data collection phase of this study, but it also biased my thought processes and questions to participants. Having created and improved many organizational processes for service delivery for organizations, I have preexisting knowledge about the factors that make a process usable; however, I had to remain open to the ideas of participants and be willing to shed my
preconceptions. This positionality was a challenge but was overcome, I hope, through active listening and soliciting feedback on the process from my dissertation advisor, the knowledge workers, and the participants.

Secondly, as a doctoral candidate in the field of social foundations of education, I have certain biases about the meanings of social justice and leadership. I have outlined these assumptions in the conceptual framework for this dissertation; however, the meaning of these concepts and others is continuously developing, which required ongoing recognition on my part. Additionally, the meaning that I place on these and other concepts might differ from participants’ meanings; therefore, to minimize differences in meaning, time was spent in the facilitated session to discuss assumptions including meaning of terms.

**Limitations**

Two main limitations were identified for this study: positionality, and participant selection. The first limitation was my positionality. Although my experience allowed me to have more exploratory dialog with the participants than would a researcher without my professional and academic experience, it also created bias in the methods used and the anticipated outcome expected.

The second limitation was the purposefully selected participants, which included the number of participants as well as the selection process. As an exploratory qualitative analysis, I chose to include four participants. The number of participant was chosen because it would enable the management of time allotted and supporting resources for the facilitated session. With four participants enough time was allotted that each participant was able to fully express his or her successful experiences. However, four participants
cannot be considered representative of all social justice leaders and the successful paths leaders may follow in developing and sustaining social justice organizations. With only four participants, the generalizability of the finding is limited; however given the purpose of the research, to investigate the experiences of social justice leaders and the formation of social justice organizations, this limitation was appropriate.

In addition, the second limitation of the purposefully selected participants also pertains to the selection process. The participants selected in the research met several criteria. Two criteria pose limitations to the research: Participants with Appreciative Inquiry (AI) thinking and participant leaders of organizations between the age of one and five years. The participants had AI thinking, and therefore, the process they developed is based on successful work experiences of successful AI leaders. More research is needed to identify if leaders can be successful without an AI thought process, and if so, what are the differences between the two processes. Additional research is needed to define the work process and activities for organizations beyond the first five years.

Two general actions were taken to manage the two limitations of this study. The first was to consult with the dissertation advisor for her observations and input. The second action was to document the limitations, thereby enabling future researchers to see the influence of these limitations on the study.

Definitions

The following are definitions of important terms used in this dissertation.
Appreciative inquiry

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) is a collaborative and group based approach to collecting data, analysis, and synthesis for the purpose of defining and improving the processes within the organization.

Development process.

A development process is a framework for completing work with a specific purpose. It defines what needs to be done, when to do the work, and how to do the work. A development process segments the work into smaller more manageable work efforts to accomplish a larger purpose.

Social change organizations.

Social change organizations (SCOs) are organizations whose mission is to make social change in support of social justice. An organization is very broadly defined for this research as an established (1-5 years) group of people organized to function and meet a common goal of social justice. This dissertation seeks input from leaders of organizations, because the goal is to understand the process from conception (most likely as an initiative) to sustainability of an organization. Legal stature is not necessary for this research.

Social justice.

Social justice is the process of interrogating and transforming laws, policies, and procedures within society’s institutions and structures so that they are more just for all groups of citizens.
Social justice leader.

A social justice leader is a person who leads, directs, or guides a social justice organization with a mission to enact change leading to social justice.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

To provide background and context for the research questions in Chapter 2, the literature review has been divided into several sections: Social justice leadership, social change organizations, appreciative inquiry, and grounded theory.

Chapter 3 provides supporting literature for the research methodology used in this dissertation and lays out that methodology in the research design. The chapter starts by connecting the research purpose to the applied qualitative research methodologies (i.e., grounded theory and ethnographic) and the research methods (i.e., PAR and AI). PAR is the focus of this chapter including the appropriateness of facilitated group methods for data gathering and assimilation of data into a work process for social justice leaders. Also discussed in this chapter are the research site, participant selection, benefits and limitations of the researcher’s role, data collection procedures, data management procedures, and data analysis procedures. As Minkler (2000) noted, research aimed at making social change requires alternative approaches to research; as such, Chapter 3 discusses in detail the alternative research methods.

Chapter 4 includes a description of the participants’ selection process and the research findings. The research findings include a brief narrative of each participant’s experiences and a narrative of the common activities and methods identified across their
work. It should be noted that the data from the participants’ selection process is not used
to generate the research finding. This is explained in Chapter 4.

Chapter 5 includes a discussion of the findings and how the common activities
and methods were shaped into a social justice process. Chapter 5 also discusses the
connections between existing literature and current findings and presents implications for
research and practice.
Chapter Two
Review of Literature

This literature review provides background information and a research context that support the need for further investigation of the ways in which social justice organizations are developed and sustained. Therefore, I begin with a brief conceptual framework of social justice. At the core of social justice is the concept of distributing benefits and burdens within a society (Armstrong, 2012). The benefits bestowed upon people within a society consist of entitlements and rights, where clean water might be an entitlement and non-discriminatory hiring practice might be a right. The burdens within a society correspond to the burdens of membership and might be the responsibility to vote or pay taxes. To understand the distribution of benefits and burdens, Western philosophers theorize ways of distributing benefits and burdens in an attempt to define a society that provides justice for all. Nussbaum (2004) discusses two dominant categories for the theory of justice: social contract theories and realization-focused theories. Social contract theories “sees principles of justice as outcomes of a contract people make… to govern themselves” (p. 4). This philosophy of social justice believes that society’s “institutions distribute fundamental rights and duties and determine the division of advantages from social cooperation” (Rawls, 1971, p. 7). Stated another way, change the laws, policies, and procedures of society’s institutions to be more just and the outcome will yield a just society for all. The focus of this theory of justice is on inputs, meaning righting institutions will yield a more just society. The realization-focused theories are more focused on the yield than the input, meaning these theories are “outcome-oriented approach[es]” (Nussbaum, 2004, p. 12). These theories “propose of social co-operation as
that of establishing principles and institutions that guarantee that all human beings have
the capabilities” and “the realization of fully human lives” (Nussbaum, 2004, pp. 12-13).
Both categories (i.e., social contract and realization-focused) have multiple theories
within of justice. While the many theories of social justice are not the focus of this
research, the two dominant categories for the theory of justice (i.e., social contract
theories and realization-focused theories) are briefly mentioned in the following literature
review. As I have found in literature and practice, organizations for social change
frequently pull ideologically from both theories, as did this research, which is discussed
throughout the paper.

The topics contained in the literature review include social justice leadership,
social change organizations, appreciative inquiry, and grounded theory. The research
methods for this project were founded on these three topics. For example, the literature of
social justice leadership behavior and activities as well as social change organizations
contributed to defining the participant section criteria, while all four topics contributed to
defining the agenda for the facilitated session to gather data and analyze the work
process. These four topics provide the background and context for this research project.

Social Justice Leadership

This section provides a starting point for research by extracting from current
literature the existing definitions, behaviors, and work activities of social justice leaders.
The definition, behaviors, and work activities found in the social justice leadership
literature contribute three salient assumptions to the conceptual framework, as introduced
in Chapter 1. The three assumptions for developing a process for social justice leaders are
as follows: (1) social justice is justice enacted with and for groups of people, (2)
identifying organizations’ work processes and activities places the focus on fixing the social injustice as opposed to fixing the leader, and (3) a social justice leaders create a culture conducive to human development through three leadership behaviors – praxis based on shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-making.

This section is organized into three parts: (1) definitions of social justice leadership, (2) work activities of social justice leaders, and (3) behaviors of social justice leaders. A definition of social justice leaders was built from the literature on social justice leaders, i.e., the definition of leadership in the context of social justice. Following the definition of social justice leadership is literature on the work activities of social justice leaders. The work activities described within the literature include dialog, reevaluating the organization, conducting equity audits, building alliances, and forming support groups. Following the literature on work activities, I provide an outline of the social justice leadership behaviors from the research, because the research purpose of most of the literature was not to identify behaviors; rather, the behaviors were ancillary finding to the main research purposes. I identified ten behaviors and placed them into two categories: intrapersonal leadership behaviors and interpersonal leadership behaviors. The intrapersonal behaviors include tenacious commitment, emotional muscle, examining habitus, and anti-deficit thinking. The interpersonal leadership behaviors are praxis based on shared interests, examining habitus, structure and culture, communal dialog, participatory decision-making, and continuous education. The definition, the work activities, and behaviors of social justice leaders provided a starting point for developing a process defined by the experiences of current social justice leaders in social change organizations.
Social justice leadership – definition.

An underlying concept to this research was social justice, and specifically, social justice leadership. Since the purpose of this paper is to identify the work processes and activities that social justice leaders engage in to create and lead social change organizations, the literature review to understand and define these terms only included literature on social justice leadership, meaning literature on social justice was not reviewed. Stated another way, I wanted to understand social justice in the context of social justice leadership of social change organizations; therefore, to achieve this context, I focused on the social justice leadership literature. In the review, I revealed that researchers and theorists have rarely agreed about the definition of “social justice” or of “social justice leadership” (Hayek, 1978; McKenzie, Christman, Hernandez, et al., 2008; Shoho, Merchant, & Lugg, 2005); therefore, in order to define social justice leadership, I reviewed definitions of social justice and social justice leadership from the social justice leadership literature.

While many researchers published peer-reviewed articles about social justice leadership without defining social justice or social justice leadership (Brown, 2004; Kose, 2009; Rapp, 2002), other researchers proposed that social justice has multiple meanings and is being used as an “umbrella” term (Furman, 2012, p. 193). Some researchers assumed that readers will know social justice when they see it (Hayek, 1978), while other researchers have suggested that “current writing on social justice... is based on a conception of social justice as plural... with having a variety of facets” that include the “distribution of material goods and resources” and “valorization of social collectivities and cultural identities” (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2002, p. 499). Using the term both as a noun
and as a verb has further complicated the lack of agreement among researchers about how exactly to define “social justice” (Goldfarb and Grinberg, 2002). The grammatical use of the term social justice is important, because when the focus of these definitions is on the \textit{existence} of inequalities and injustices, the term “social justice” has been used primarily as a noun; however, when the focus is on the \textit{action} to right the inequalities and injustices, the term has been used as a verb (Furman, 2012). This dissertation placed the focus of social justice as an action towards righting inequalities and injustices.

Martusewicz, Edmundson, and Lupinacci (2011) proposed that there are different foci for the meaning of justice, noting, “When we focus on justice related to human life, we use the term social justice” (p.27). Novak (2000) suggested a second perspective of why “social” is compounded with the word “justice.” In a free civil society, he noted, citizens exercise self-governance by working \textit{with} others to give back or change society, and secondly, citizens band together to improve society \textit{for} others, i.e., groups of citizens as opposed to individuals. Consequently, the change agents and change recipients are both groups of individuals, hence the use of “social” to describe this form of justice (p. 6). The concept of social illuminated the first salient assumption that underlies the dissertation’s conceptual framework: social justice is justice enacted with and for groups of people. (See Chapter 1, Table 1.) However, when defining social justice leadership, researchers placed varying emphasis on the concept of social.

Blackmore (2009) suggested, “[T]he notion of social justice encompasses a range of terms – some more powerful than others – such as equity, equality, inequality, equal opportunity, affirmative action, and most recently, diversity” (p. 6). McClellan and Dominguez (2006) suggested that social justice is “the individual’s obligation” to take
action, “to evaluate systems for unequal distribution of power and to initiate reform prescribed by the inequities, and to uphold the diverse needs of a pluralistic society” (p. 202). Everson and Bussey (2007) suggested that social justice is the “quality of fairness” within a community or society and that the quality of fairness that exists is the responsibility of the leader. McClellan and Dominguez (2006) defined social justice differently, suggesting that “to place the focus on the individual is to turn the focus from the inequalities in the systems onto the ability and responsibility” of the leader (p. 228), implying that if inequities and injustices exist, it was not the fault of the system but rather the inability of the leader to make change. From this concept emerged the second salient assumption, whereby the focus must remain on fixing the social injustice and not fixing the leader. (See Chapter 1, Table 1.) For purpose of this dissertation, the focus of social justice remained on the inequalities and injustices in our structures and institutions (i.e., laws, polices, and procedures) and not on the ability of the leader.

When researchers used the term “social justice” as an action, it demonstrates that individuals have been instilled with the agency to change the inequalities and injustices. Goldfarb and Grinberg (2002) proposed that social justice is an action: “Social justice is an exercise of altering these [institutional and organizational] arrangements by actively engaging in reclaiming, appropriating, sustaining and advancing inherent human rights of equity, equality, and fairness in social, economic, educational, and personal dimensions” (p. 162). Miron and Elliott (1994) also defined social justice as an action, stating that it “is a deliberate intervention” (p. 140). Wosonga (2009) built upon the definition that social justice is a deliberate intervention by suggesting that social justice interrogates policies and procedures. Wosonga’s definition was based on Dantley and Tillman’s
(2006) definition of social justice, which is to interrogate “policies and procedures that shape schools and at the same time perpetuate social inequality and marginalization” (p. 19). Therein as Goldfarb and Grinberg (2002) proposed, when the definition focuses on action, social justice is the interrogating and changing of inequalities and injustices, placing a social justice leader’s focus on processes of change. Conversely, a definition focusing on an object tends to just interrogate inequalities and injustices, which focuses on blaming. I proposed that blaming is deficit thinking, because it focuses on what is wrong and not the possibilities for change.

In addition to defining the term “social justice,” many authors provided definitions of the term “social justice leaders,” suggesting that these leaders are transformative, rely on praxis, and advocate changing marginalizing conditions. Furman’s (2012) review of the social justice leadership literature concluded, “despite the ambiguities and critiques, a common understanding among many leadership scholars is that social justice focuses on the experiences of marginalized groups and inequities in educational opportunities and outcomes,” and that “leadership for social justice involves identifying and undoing these oppressive and unjust practices” and that social justice must be “action oriented and transformative” (pp. 194-195). In her social justice leadership development model, Furman proposed the concept of leadership as praxis, whereby social justice leaders must have both “reflection and action” (p. 202). More specifically, she suggested, “Reflection without action is worthless” (p. 202). Shields (2004) also indicated that leadership should be transformative in order to “enhance equity, social justice, and the quality of life...” (p. 113). Kose (2009) suggested that social justice leaders are transformative and outlined five roles of social justice leaders:
transformative visionary, transformative learning leader, transformative structural leader, transformative cultural leader, and transformative political leader (p. 639). Zembylas (2010) combined several definitions and described social justice leadership as “leadership that disrupts and subverts unjust teaching practices and policies and promotes inclusion and equity for all students” (p. 611). (See the following authors for similar ideas: Gewirtz, 1998; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; Marshall, 2004.) Theoharis (2008) described a social justice leader as one who “advocates, leads and keeps at the center of their practice and vision issues of race, class, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and other historically and currently marginalizing conditions” (p. 5). These definitions suggested that a basis for defining social justice leadership includes advocacy, transformation, and praxis aimed at eliminating marginalizing conditions.

Therefore, blending Dantley and Tillman (2006), Goldfarb and Grinberg (2002), and Theoharis’s (2008) definitions, the working definition of social justice for this research was interrogating and transforming the laws, policies, and procedures of society’s institutions and structures to be more just for all groups of citizens. Social justice leaders are individuals who lead, direct, or guide a social justice organization. As McClellan and Dominguez (2006) proposed, the focus should remains on the action for change and not on an individual leader or on the state of inequality and injustice.

The purpose of this research was to investigate the experiences of social justice leaders and the work processes and activities they perform when creating social change organizations. The social justice leaders I studied created organizations within their community. These organizations are institutions that distribute society’s burdens and benefits to people within a community. Organizations for social change frequently pull
ideologically from both of the theories of justice discussed earlier: social contract theory and realization-focused theory. The organizations in this research were in the early stages of their creation, and based on the data, I hypothesize that at this early stage, the creators had to focus on the politics involved. This political approach included developing allies with society’s institutions and structures and working with local government to make aware the impact of existing laws, policies, and procedures. Therefore, the definition for social justice and social justice leadership for this research correlates to the social contract; however, at the same time, the organizations studied were dedicated to transforming and empowering individuals, which is aligned with human development and realization-focused theory. Thus, both theories of social justice underlie this research.

**Social justice leadership – work activities.**

The following discussion outlines the five work activities in which research has suggested most social justice leaders engage. It is important to make a distinction between work activities and competencies. This literature was reviewed not to identify the knowledge, skills, or attributes (competencies) of a social justice leader as many authors have described (Blackmore, 2002; Kose, 2009; Rapp, 2002; Theoharis, 2008), but rather reviewed to define the work activities of a social justice leader. Most social justice leadership research was conducted within the education arena, and has explored ways that school principals can be and should be leaders who advocate for social justice by describing additional tools and techniques that principals can use to make their schools more socially just. The work activities reported most frequently in education’s social justice literature include dialog, reevaluating the organization, conducting equity audits, building alliances, and forming support groups.
**Dialog.** Three authors proposed dialog as a role/work activity of social justice leaders. Bogotch (2002) provided a framework for social justice, which is based upon Dewey’s concept of temporal and Feire’s concept of continuous reconstruction and has applied it to educational leadership:

(1) There can be no fixed or predictable meanings of social justice prior to actually engaging in educational leadership practices;

(2) The center or unity of purpose of any educational reform effort is so dynamic that it cannot hold together without our [society] beginning to see the need for reconstruction;

(3) Thus, following from the previous point, the results of our work in education, just and unjust, are generational (i.e., temporal), always fragile, and fleeting; and

(4) Therefore, all social justice/educational reform efforts must be deliberately and continuously reinvented and critiqued. (Bogotch, 2002, pp. 153-154)

Bogotch’s framework added to the understanding of social justice leaders in two ways. First, Bogotch (2002) suggested that the needs of the marginalized should be frequently reassessed, and second, she asserted, “to generate this understanding, social justice leaders need to create forums for dialog for all voices to be heard” (p. 140).

Although most of Shields’s (2004) model was based upon changing individuals so that they become social justice leaders, it also proposed that social justice leaders should be catalysts for dialog both within organizations and within the community at large; therefore, “dialog is a central task” of social justice leaders (p. 115). Brown’s (2004) model for developing social justice leaders drew upon concepts found in the work of
Freire and Macedo (1995) and also emphasized the importance of dialog both within groups and between groups to “dismantle oppressive structures” (p. 383). Brown (2004, 2006), discussed the importance of engaging in dialog with “the people from underrepresented groups”; otherwise, social justice leaders might become “technical drifters,” a concept she leveraged from Scott and Hart (1979) and which she defined as those who possess “a commitment to emphasize and act on the technical components of one’s work above the moral” (p. 96). Aspects of the work activity, dialog, may be specific to social justice leaders such as the audience, content, and emotional charge of the dialog.

**Reevaluate the organization.** Several authors discussed the second work activity, reevaluating the organization; these authors described what it means to reevaluate an organization, who should be involved in this process, and how often it should be conducted. According to McClellan and Dominguez (2006), “Social justice is an obligation to evaluate systems for unequal distributions of power and to initiate reform ... and uphold the diverse needs of a pluralistic society” (p. 228). Their article focused on a framework for developing principals with praxis for social justice, meaning it focused on developing individuals to become social justice leaders; these authors provided insight into potential work activities of social justice leaders, which include evaluating systems in order to identify and eliminate inequalities. As McKenzie and Scheurich (2004) noted, leaders must “dignify the culture” (p. 611) of those they are trying to help, which suggests that those being helped should be involved in the process of determining areas for improvement as well as reevaluating the effects of change initiatives. Bogotch (2002) suggested that this evaluation should be completed on a continuous basis, suggesting that
“it’s not a one and then you are done” approach (p. 138). Wasonga (2009) presented a framework within which social justice leaders (principals) are able to synthesize the elements or forces that contribute to student learning. A hybrid of this framework was used to assist social justice leaders in defining the elements or forces they must manage: the missions of organizations are influenced by the integration of social justice, democratic communities, and leadership practices. In this framework, student learning is replaced with a more generic term: “organizational mission.” Reevaluating means to reevaluate continuously the needs of the constituents that organizations are assisting to ensure that the mission statements and objectives are aligned. The authors cited above provided insight into the work activity of reevaluating organizations, which enables and encourages dialog around this activity.

**Conduct equity audits.** The third work activity and method (i.e., tool) identified within the literature was conducting equity audits. Conducting equity audits is the measurement of an organization meeting its goal and mission statement. An equity audit measures the attainment of the goal (i.e. mission) while the reevaluation of the system reevaluates the goal (i.e. mission). Skrla, et al. (2004) suggested using equity audits in schools; Equity audits began with “civil rights enforcement” and were conducted in such fields as business, healthcare, politics, and education to measure progress towards equity of outcomes. These authors presented a seven-step process for conducting equity audits, which included forming a committee, graphing the data, discussing meanings as group, discussing solutions, implementing solutions, evaluating results, and celebrating successes. This method of measuring an organization’s progress towards meeting its
mission requires resources, which many organizations do not have for these types of activities.

**Build alliances.** The fourth work activity identified within the social justice leaders’ literature is building alliances. In Gewirtz and Cribb’s (2002) six-dimensional model of social justice, they presented the need for future research to help social justice leaders manage the tensions among the dimensions. According to these authors, praxis (reflection and action) of these six dimensions led social justice leaders to a better understanding of the most appropriate constituents with whom to build alliances. For instance, combining this model with Chetkovich and Kunreuther’s (2006) four types of organizations might result in other organizations with different missions (i.e., targeting different levels to change in society) contributing towards meeting that same overall goal. For example, one organization might advocate for individuals to obtain financial aid for college whereas another organization might provide emotional support and tutoring for non-traditional college students. The primary goal of both organizations is to help marginalized people enter and succeed in college. The work activity to build alliances with other organizations might improve the success for each.

**Form support groups.** A final work activity frequently reported in the research literature was forming support groups, proposed by two authors, Theoharis (2008) and Zembylas (2010), whose focus was on the emotional stress that social justice leaders encounter. According to researchers, building alliances takes place at the organizational level and has the purpose of coordinating the efforts of organizations, whereas forming support groups is an activity that takes place on an individual level and has the purpose of supporting individuals as they encounter the emotional stress of the social justice leader’s
role. Theoharis (2008) created a framework for responding to the resistance social justice leaders face and outlined strategies for managing this resistance. He identified three sources of resistance: “resistance enacted against historically marginalization of particular students; resistance faced as a result of their social justice agenda; and resistance developed to sustain their social justice agenda in the face of resistance” (p. 238). In addition to coping strategies, he proposed establishing a supportive network of social justice leaders. Zembylas (2010) supported the need for emotional tools among social justice leaders due to the internal and external pressures placed upon them in the sociopolitical context of social justice work. Both authors agreed that unlike other organizational leadership roles, the role of social justice leaders is both emotionally and physically exhausting and requires dedicated attention.

Although the social justice leaders literature was more focused on competency development than identifying work activities of a social justice leader, I identified the five work activities within the existing literature. It should be noted that these five work activities could not be formed into an overarching process for the work of social justice leaders. However, an understanding of these activities provided me with a foundation for structuring dialog, constructing questions, and facilitating discussion with the research participants. Since little literature specifically focused on identifying the work activities of social justice leaders, I propose that the activities that I have extracted from the literature on social justice leadership are not a complete or validated list of activities.

**Social justice leadership – behaviors.**

Since the focus of this paper is social justice leadership in community organizations, it is important to make a distinction between community leaders in social
justice organizations versus those in community organizations without a social justice mission. While the purpose of this dissertation to identify and define the work processes and activities that social justice leaders engage in when creating, managing, and leading community organizations, the literature on behaviors contributes to an important step in this dissertation, which is identifying the distinguishing behaviors of social justice leaders necessary for participant selection. Another reason for me personally to review this literature and identify the behaviors was to learn and become more familiar with social justice leaders as the researcher and facilitator of data gathering. Behaviors were identified as ancillary findings while conducting social justice leadership research for other purposes. In this section, I have identified ten social justice leadership behaviors from the social justice leadership literature.

The process for identifying the behaviors was to review existing literature on social justice leadership. From the social justice leadership literature, I identified and categorized ten behaviors of social justice leaders. Only Theoharis (2007) specifically studied the behaviors of social justice leaders in schools; from his research in school leadership, I propose that three of Theoharis’s behaviors as applicable in other types of organizations. Many of the behaviors he identified in his study are specific to the leadership of primary and secondary school organizations. The research purpose for the remainder of the social justice literature included identifying the dilemmas that exist for social justice leaders, defining social justice leadership, identifying the work activities of social justice leaders, and educating social justice leaders. This body of research discussed the behaviors identified while conducting research with different purposes. I identified reoccurring themes of behaviors and categorize them into ten behaviors. These
ten behaviors overlapped to include the three identified by Theoharis (2007), meaning these three behaviors identified by Theoharis are supported by other literature. Discussions of these three behaviors (i.e. emotional muscle, anti-deficit thinking, and communal dialog) are included within the corresponding discussions that follow. However, prior to discussing the ten behaviors, I first define a behavior and the categories (i.e. intrapersonal and interpersonal) in which it resides.

A behavior is the response by an individual or group to its milieu, i.e., the way one functions or operates in a given physical or social setting or situation (Merriam-Webster, 2004). Behaviors were categorized as either intrapersonal or interpersonal behaviors. Social justice leaders exhibit certain intrapersonal behaviors, behaviors that occur within an individual’s mind and behaviors one uses to manage the conduct of self (Merriam-Webster, 2004). From the literature to be reviewed, the intrapersonal behaviors identified include tenacious-commitment, emotional muscle, examining habitus, and anti-deficit thinking. Social justice leaders also exhibit interpersonal behaviors, behaviors that exist or happen between people or behaviors one uses to manage the conduct of others (Merriam-Webster, 2004). The interpersonal behaviors of a social justice leader identified from the literature include praxis based on shared interests, examining habitus, attention to structure and culture, communal dialog, participatory decision-making, and continuous education. The discussion that follows is the extraction of behaviors from the literature.

**Intrapersonal behaviors.** Intrapersonal behaviors are behaviors that persons use to manage their own conduct; for social justice leaders, the literature showed these behaviors to include tenacious-commitment, emotional muscle, examining habitus, and anti-deficit thinking. Each behavior is described below with reference to the literature.
Tenacious-commitment. Theoharis (2008) first used the term “tenacious-commitment to activism”; however, many authors before and after have described this behavior and have proposed that social justice leaders have a rebellious and resistant nature to society’s hegemonic dogma, which propels social justice leaders to challenge as opposed to compromise to social inequities (Rapp, 2002; Brown, 2004; and Capper, Theoharis, and Sebastain, 2006). Radd (2008) tempers this idea of tenacious social justice leaders, proposing that they must exhibit tenacious-commitment without rejecting other people. Radd supports Shoho et al.’s (2005) statement, “If social justice is to be true to its guiding principles, then advocates must create an inclusive environment where all relevant stakeholders are invited to participate, even those who may be perpetrators of injustices” (p. 61). Without tempering, tenacious-commitment could appear as intellectual superiority, which resembles the hegemonic dogma already within society (Radd, 2008).

Emotional muscle. Brown (2004) leveraged the term “emotional muscle” from Harrison and Hopkins (1967) and applied it to social justice leaders. Social justice leaders experience threats to their “psychological security as they challenge comfortably established beliefs and values” (Brown, 2004, p. 88), as well as threats to their psychological security by others who resist and work to keep the status quo of inequities. Social justice leaders experience “feeling isolated, without models of how to do their social justice work, … and persistent discouragement” (Theoharis, 2007, p. 240). Social justice leaders must develop behaviors that create emotional muscle such as developing understanding of one’s own emotions, maintaining support networks, retaining agency as a leader and individual, seeking professional development for self and others, and seeing
that social justice leadership “is not an individual but a communal effort” (Zembylas, 2010, p. 620; also see Brown, 2004; Theoharis, 2007; Rapp, 2002; &; Furman, 2012). While Brown (2006) used the term emotional muscle to describe a larger umbrella of behaviors, many authors have focused on developing and retaining agency by social justice leaders. Radd reported that the effective social justice leaders in her study “had the capacity for personal sustainability in their work. They did not see themselves as victims but as leaders with agency” (2008, p. 281). Brown (2006) noted that “Freire’s process of developing conscientization means that through dialogue, students can begin to understand themselves as active agents, enabling them to identify and create conditions for the possibility of change in oppressive sociopolitical constructs” (p. 711). Both Brown (2006) and Radd (2008) proposed that agency is developed in part through reflection and action: “When their initiatives did not produce the desired outcome, they did not blame others; instead, they engaged in cycles of inquiry” (Radd, 2008, p.282) that led them to discern and use more successful strategies. While most authors have discussed praxis as an interpersonal behavior, several authors have also presented it as an intrapersonal behavior, whereby social justice leaders develop emotional muscle in the form of agency through applying praxis to their intrapersonal behaviors (Brown, 2004; Radd, 2008; McKenzie, et al., 2008; Furman, 2012).

Examing habitus. Habitus can be applied at both the individual level and the societal level; here habitus at the individual level is discussed. At the individual level, Brown (2006) proposed, “Scholars and researchers have long suggested that beliefs mediate knowledge, expectations, and actions. They have claimed that it is through reflection and challenge that individuals evaluate and adjust their thinking and turn from
what is subjectively reasonable for them to believe to what is objectively reasonable for them to believe” (p. 703). While subjectively reasonable is based upon a person’s internal feelings and perceptions of their world, objectively reasonable is based upon the facts without distortion from personal feeling and perceptions. She further discussed epistemological awareness, which “means that adults possess a self-conscious awareness of how it is they come to know what they know – an awareness of the reasoning, assumptions, evidence, and justifications that underlie our beliefs that something is true” (Brown, 2004, p. 83). Many other authors refer to this self-awareness of one’s own beliefs and biases as critical consciousness (Brown, 2004; Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastain, 2006; Everson & Bussey, 2007; Radd, 2008; MacKenzie et al., 2008; Zembylas, 2010; and Theoharis & Haddix, 2011). Everson and Bussey (2007) proposed that leaders of social justice must exhibit habitus at the individual level through developing “habits of service, habits of inquiry and research, and habits of self-examination and reflection” (p. 183). McKenzie et al. (2008) proposed that leaders for social justice must “realize their unevenness” (p. 114) in the understanding of the impact of social forces on habits of thinking and habits of assumptions about groups of people.

Anti-deficit thinking. Emerging from intrapersonal behavior of habitus are deeply embedded assumptions and evaluations that people hold towards each other, which is referred to as “deficit-thinking relational ontology” (Shields, 2004, p. 112). Buber’s (1987) relational ontology made a distinction between people’s orientation towards others as either I-Thou or I-It, where a person with an I-Thou orientation towards others sees the other person as an end deserving respect for being a subject or moral being. The I-It orientation sees the other person as a means or an objective. Shields (2004) built upon
Buber’s relational ontology in the form of “pathologizing, which denotes a process of treating differences as deficits” (p. 112); therefore, those leaders who see others with an I-It orientation pathologize or have deficit thinking about others who do not look, act, or think as they do. Deficit thinking is a natural relational ontology given people’s propensity for habitus. Meaning a person’s thoughts and behaviors tend to be influenced by their internal system of beliefs and personal motives. Many authors have supported Shields’ (2004) assumption that leaders for social justice must have anti-deficit thinking towards others, which is shown through “dignifying the culture of others” (McKenzie et al., 2008, p. 115) and not viewing “human differences in terms of deficiencies [nor] labeling these differences as genetic or moral failings” (Karpinski & Lugg, 2006, p. 281; Gaetane, Normore, & Brooks, 2009). These authors’ assumptions correlate with the first behavior that Theoharis (2007) identified as the difference between the good leader and a social justice leader: Social justice leaders not only connect with the community but also place value and respect on the diversity and cultural differences within and across communities.

**Interpersonal behaviors.** Interpersonal behaviors are behaviors that exist between people or with others. Review of the literature showed interpersonal behaviors to include praxis based on shared interests, examining habitus, structure and culture, communal dialog, participatory decision-making, and continuous education. A description of each interpersonal behavior follows.

*Praxis based on shared interests.* Praxis based on shared interests combines two behaviors that were discussed in tandem throughout the literature: praxis and sharing of interests. Many authors have proposed that social justice leaders must exhibit the
“capacities for reflection and the capacities for actions” (Furman, 2012, p. 204), the combination of which is known as praxis (Bogotch, 2002; Brown, 2004; Brown, 2006; Radd, 2008; Mackenzie et al., 2008). The application of praxis is at both the intrapersonal and interpersonal levels of behaviors, with most of the literature focusing on praxis at the interpersonal level of behaviors. At the interpersonal level, leaders seek to understand social justice issues, define common interests, and develop strategies for change at the community and organizational levels. This process is continuously repeated. Several authors referred to Dewey’s (1916) proposal that social justice is a continuous process wherein groups (old and newly defined) emerge to have their interests represented in the laws and structures of society and its organizations (Bogotch, 2002; Brown, 2004; Radd, 2008). Gross and Shapiro’s (2005) finding on leaders echoed Dewey’s (1916), wherein Dewey proposed that leaders have a “sustained process of open dialogue, right to voice, community inclusion, and responsible participation towards the common good” (p. 1).

Many authors saw the solutions or work of social justice leaders as dynamic and temporal, meaning that as one injustice is resolved other injustices may emerge (Dewey, 1916; Bogotch, 2002; Radd, 2008; Mackenzie et al., 2008). Bogotch (2002) concluded, “Therefore, all social justice/educational reform efforts must be deliberately and continuously reinvented and critiqued” (p. 154). Praxis based on shared interests requires continuous communication of interests including the similarities and differences of interests.

Examining habitus. At the societal level, Bourdieu (1980) defines habitus as “a system of circular relations that unite [sic] structures and practices; objective structures tend to produce structures subjective dispositions that produce structured actions which,
in turn, tend to reproduce objective structure” (pp. 52-53). Shields (2004) explained, “Habitus thus constructs that persistence of deficit thinking not simply as an individual problem but as a structural societal one” (p. 112). Leaders must develop a heightened and critical awareness of oppression, exclusion, and marginalization in both themselves and others, both within and outside their organizations in order to break the circular nature of habitus (Shields, 2004; Capper, Theoharis & Sebastain, 2006; Stevenson, 2007; Radd, 2008; Furman, 2012). Leaders must develop skills for analyzing social, political, and economic contradictions and organizing action to change injustices (Rapp 2002; Brown, 2004). West (2004) proposed that social analysis is not easy, because of the “dogmas and nihilisms” within society (p. 103); therefore, examining habitus is a critical behavior for social justice leaders to understand the underlying injustices within society.

Structure and culture. Changing societies’ and organizations’ laws, policies, and procedures can change injustices. As several authors noted, a social justice leader leads in “evaluating systems for unequal distributions of power and to initiate reform prescribed by the inequities, and to uphold the diverse needs of a pluralistic society” (McClellan & Dominguez, 2006, p. 228); therefore, social justice leaders need to use “policy as lever to confront social justice” (Everson & Bussey, 2007, p. 180). The structures and culture that social justice leaders are to leverage and influence are in both societies’ organizations as well as their own organization. Social justice leaders create a structure and culture within their own organization of social justice. As many authors discussed, social justice leaders need to lead by example through their ethical, value-driven, or moral purposes, which are seen in their leadership behaviors (Blackmore, 2002; Everson & Bussey, 2007; Stevenson, 2007; Theoharis, 2007). Stevenson (2007) proposed moral purpose as a key
factor in sustaining effective leadership, and that moral and value-driven leadership is pivotal in shaping an organization’s culture, because leaders enact “social justice through their professional practices and were able to operationalize their values through their institutional frameworks,” specifically through the organization’s policies and procedures (p. 774). He further noted that each leader within his study “operationalized the concept of social justice in very different ways” (Stevenson, 2007, p. 776). Nonetheless, he and other authors have proposed that social justice leaders must use policy as a lever to address issues of social justice both external and internal to their organizations.

Communal dialog. A fundamental behavior of social justice leaders is dialog. “Dialogue may be either convergent or divergent. It may seek some sort of agreement or it may simply focus on increasing understanding of the different perspectives held by members of the community” (Shields, 2004, p. 116). For this reason, I have labeled this behavior communal dialog – relating to dialog within and between communities. Dialog in its role to develop understanding enables communities to break the habitus barriers, therein seeing the injustices within society and organizations. Bogotch (2002) asserted that leaders at a minimum should “create and support forums for all voices to be heard” (p. 140). Dialog should be with both friend and foe. Dialog with friends (i.e. those who see injustices) enables the leader to leverage others and to “realize that social justice leadership is not an individual but communal effort” (Zembylas, 2010, p. 620). Dialog with foe means discussion with those holding differences of opinion, which helps leaders to inquire and build their own understanding of opposing arguments as well as to see the “other” in an “I-Thou” “anti-deficit” manner (Shields, 2004; Karpinski & Lugg, 2006; Capper, Theoharis & Sebastain, 2006; Radd, 2008). Leadership that does not respect all
people, including those who disagree, cannot meet the moral obligations of justice (Wasonga, 2009, p. 214). Dialog for the purpose of decision-making includes, in Theoharis’s (2007) observation, that at the core of a proactive strategy for social justice is communication, which enables relationship and network development, and agreement on work strategies and priorities. Additionally, through dialog with groups affected by injustices (i.e., both beneficiaries and victims), social justice leaders can avoid Shields’s (2004) concept of “pathologies of silence”, which may lead to “misguided attempts to act justly,” (p. 117) but in reality, actions that do not address the causality of the injustice. Whether dialog is for understanding or decision-making, leaders’ dialog must be “a way of being” for social justice leaders (Shields, 2004, p. 115).

Participatory decision-making. Participatory decision-making is not a unanimous agreed upon behavior. The social justice literature has two camps of thought about decision-making. One camp sees social justice leaders as more autocratic with “unwavering convictions” (Rapp, 2002, p. 233). Rapp (2002) and Shields (2004) use the term “get-it-ness,” whereby when other people do not see an injustice in the way the leader does, the leader’s leadership style turns autocratic and unwavering. In this camp, social justice leaders see the end and not the means as important, and they focus “more on the program than on people, more on reforms than on relationship” (Shields, 2004, p. 114). The other camp sees social justice leaders as having a participatory decision-making style of behavior. Wasonga (2009) interviewed leaders who integrated social justice and democratic community in their leadership practices, and found “shared decision-making was the most common leadership practiced” (p. 209). Shared decision-making was demonstrated through behaviors of “combining ideas and interests, adjusting
decisions or actions based on other’s input, and collective data analysis” (p. 209). Based on interviews with social justice leaders, Theoharis (2008) described these leaders as “embodying a mix of arrogance and humility, lead[ing] with intense visionary passion, and nurtur[ing] and empower[ing] their staff” (p. 12); however, these leaders “are [not] autocratic and [do not] lead in a top-down manner” (p. 18). Radd (2008) found that leaders for social justice must use multi-perspective decision-making to resolve inevitable differences. Theoharis (2004) proposed that leaders for social justice create structures for shared decision-making (Theoharis, 2008). Zembylas (2010) cited participants as saying, “Social justice leadership is not an individual but a communal effort” (p. 620), and argued social justice leaders must include others in envisioning the process of changes as well as in the work to make change. Two themes related to decision-making emerge from the literature: autocratic and participatory. Although both themes emerged, more authors saw participatory decision-making in alignment with social justice leadership.

*Continuous education.* Kose (2009) proposed that leaders for social justice must practice learning and teaching at the individual, organizational, and community level. At the individual level, authors have proposed that leaders must increase their emotional muscle, critical consciousness, and knowledge about social justice through education (Brown, 2004; Shields, 2004; Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastain, 2006; Everson & Blussey, 2007). At the organizational level, social justice leaders must develop their staffs’ knowledge about social justice and leadership (Karpinski & Lugg, 2006; Theoharis, 2007; Stevenson, 2007; Kose, 2009). Education encompasses three aspects: creating a culture of development, developing one’s own and others’ knowledge about social justice, and building the competencies required to make change.
The foregoing section was organized according to ten leadership behaviors I extracted from the literature. These behaviors were classified into two groups: intrapersonal leadership behaviors and interpersonal leadership behaviors. Intrapersonal leadership behaviors included tenacious commitment, emotional muscle, examining habitus and anti-deficit thinking, while the interpersonal behaviors included praxis based on shared interests, examining habitus, structure and culture, communal dialog, participatory decision-making, and continuous education.

The purpose of understanding the social justice leadership behaviors in literature was to identify participant selection criteria; however, further research is needed to confirm these ten behaviors are the differentiating leadership behaviors for social justice leaders. Since it is unclear that these ten behavior are the differentiating behaviors and it is unlikely that leaders of small community organizations would exhibit all ten behaviors, I employ Dewey’s philosophy of community and human development to reduce the number of behaviors for the participant selection process from ten behaviors to three.

Many of the authors cited in the social justice leadership literature the use of Dewey as foundation to their research; therefore, the process for reducing the number of behaviors used in the selection process of social justice leader was grounded in Dewey’s philosophy on community and human development. In addition, his philosophy was chosen because of the type of social change organization which participants lead, i.e., Chetkovich & Kunreuther’s (2006) Human Development of the Individual Quadrant, meeting basic needs and skill-building for individual empowerment and transformation. (See Chapter 2, Figure 1.) That is, the purposefully selected participants for this research
led organizations that empower and transform individuals through education (i.e., human development) and therein aimed to build a stronger community.

In identifying the critical behaviors for participant selection, Dewey’s philosophical conceptions provided guidance; several of the authors cited also looked to Dewey for philosophical guidance. John Dewey’s philosophy influenced these cited authors’ framework for analysis and interpretation of findings: Bogotch, 2002; Brown 2004; Furman and Shields, 2005; Brown 2006; Everson and Bussey, 2007; Radd, 2008; and Woods and Gronn, 2009. For example, Bogotch (2002) leveraged Dewey’s theoretical framework to make linkages between educational leadership and social justice by reviewing the leadership paths of educational leaders for social justice. She proposed two conclusions. The meaning of social justice is not “fixed or predictable” and leadership must bring together multiple interest to “construct a meaningful consensus” (Bogotch, 2002, p. 138), which requires continuous and participative decision-making and communication. Radd (2008) examined educational leaders for social justice from the viewpoint of multiple theorists including John Dewey. Through the lens of Dewey, she revealed that leaders for social justice approach their work using a “broad anti-oppressive frame, inclusiveness in decision-making, and a sense of agency” (p. 281). However, the purpose of their research included identifying the dilemmas that exist for social justice leaders, defining social justice leadership, and educating social justice leaders; therefore, these researchers used Dewey’s concepts for these purposes of analysis and interpretations of findings and not for analysis and interpretation of social justice leadership behaviors. This research uses Dewey’s concepts on education and community
to narrow the number so social justice leadership behaviors found in the literature to just three behaviors.

To assist in applying Dewey as a framework for analysis and interpretation of findings in this paper’s literature review on social justice leadership behaviors, I referred to Snauwaert’s (1993) presentation of Dewey’s concepts of community and human development. Snauwaert (1993) identified three behaviors that are required for human development. He asserted that Dewey (1927) “maintains that optimal human development can only take place in social arrangements that possess a variety of common interests; free and extensive communication; and participation in the decision-making processes of group life” (Snauwaert, 1993, p. 51). I proposed that if the environment to aid in human development required these three behaviors, then the leaders of these environments should also possess these as leadership behaviors. Dewey’s three behaviors corresponded to three behaviors referenced in the social justice literature (e.g., Bogotoch, 2002; Furman, 2012; Shields, 2004; Theoharis, 2007). The three behaviors are praxis based upon shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-making. These three behaviors are discussed further in the participant selection section of Chapter 3.

Conclusion.

From the social justice literature, social justice leaders explored three sub-topics including the definition of social justice leadership, the work activities that social justice leaders perform, and the behaviors exhibited. While little literature was available on any one of the three, the existing literature provided a starting point for this research and its underlying assumptions.
To recap, the definition of social justice for this research is interrogating and transforming society’s institutions and structures to be more just for all groups of citizens. Social justice leaders are individuals who lead, direct, or guide a social justice organization. These definitions hold the focus of justice in the social context; meaning social justice is enacted with and for groups of people, an underlying assumption to this research’s conceptual framework (Table 1, assumption 1). Also from the literature for defining social justice leadership, the second salient assumption was identified: identifying an organization’s job activities places the focus on the change process rather than the leader. This assumption was further supported by the literature when defining the five work activities, which included dialog, reevaluate the organization, conduct equity audits, build alliances, and form support groups. These work activities hold the focus on the activities of change rather than the leaders’ performance; this was an underlying assumption for this research (Table 1, assumption 2). The social justice leadership literature that identified the ten possible social justice leadership behaviors included the intrapersonal behaviors (i.e., tenacious-commitment, emotional muscle, examining habitus, and anti-deficit thinking) as well as the interpersonal behaviors (i.e., praxis based on shared interests, examining habitus, structure and culture, communal dialog, participatory decision-making, and continuous education). Using Dewey’s theory, these ten behaviors were then narrowed to three leadership behaviors that are used for participant selection: praxis based on shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-making. These three behaviors contributed to the conceptual framework of assumptions. (See Table 1, assumption 3.)
Social Change Organization

Social change organizations (SCOs) are organizations whose mission is to make social change in support of social justice. The discussion on SCOs begins by discussing the various models for SCOs as found in the literature. These models differ from each other based upon classification of the organization’s size, alliances, and mission. Size and alliance are vague methods of classifying SCOs since a scale has not been created to define size or alliance. The two models were created for classifying SCOs based upon the organization’s mission. This research used one of these two models to classify and categorize SCOs. The mission statement of an organization influenced this research’s participant selection, because the mission impacts an organization’s structure, resources, and “theory of change” (Chetkovich and Kunreuther, 2006, p. 9). Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) argued that understanding the social change orientation is required when conducting meaningful and transferable research on organizations as well as valid analysis of the management and performance of organizations (p. 27). Therefore, to fully understand the work of social justice leaders, one must understand the organizations that they lead. This understanding leads to the fourth assumption underlying the conceptual framework: An overarching process can be developed for organizations with similar missions (Table 1, assumption 4).

The two models for SCOs based upon their mission statements were reviewed: (1) *The Forms of Community Organizing* (Bobo et al., 2010), and (2) *The Work of Social Change Organizations* (Chetkovich and Kunreuther, 2006). Bobo et al.’s (2010) model features a continuum consisting of five types of organizations. On one end of the continuum is “accepts existing power relationships.” On the other end of the continuum is
“challenges existing power relationships.” The model classifies SCOs into five types of
organizations using a one-dimensional scale, which creates dualistic categorizations.
Chetkovich and Kunreuther’s (2006) model is two-dimensional with the first axis
categorizing SCO’s missions by supporting group change verses empowering individual
change. The second axis categorizes the organization’s mission based on creating
individual transformation verses not creating individual transformation. For this research,
I used Chetkovich and Kunreuther’s (2006) social change organization model.

The following section outlines Chetkovich and Kunreuther’s (2006) model, which
consists of two intersecting axes that form quadrants (see Figure 1). The vertical axis
describes the target of change – either change that “supports collective action” or “change
that empowers individuals to take action in their own lives” (p. 26). The horizontal axis
targets the transformation of the individual – yes, the individual is transformed, or no, the
individual is not transformed. The two upper quadrants make collective change that
affects large numbers of people – society, community, and so forth, whereas the lower
two quadrants make change at the individual level. The right two quadrants assume a
change orientation of doing it “to” people, and the left two quadrants assume a change
orientation of doing it “with” people. Each of these four quadrants depicts a different type
of organizational mission based on different theories of change (e.g., collective or
individual).
Each quadrant represents “a social change orientation or enacted theory of change” that organizations occupy (Chetkovich & Kunreuther, 2006, p. 9). The authors asserted that all the quadrants are required in order to create meaningful social change and that the quadrants support and complement each other as opposed to simply providing “alternative approaches.” The following is two examples of how organizations cross quadrants to more fully realize human capabilities and to change the social contract.

The first example, Saul Alinsky is one of the great American social change organizers. He formed an organization, Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), whose mission was to develop community organizers through education and networking (Alinsky, 1971). While his organization most likely fell in quadrant 4, “providing groups
with information, analysis, and networks to motive and inform action”, he was training social change leaders to function in quadrant 1, “dismantling formal barriers” (Chetkovich & Kunreuther, 2006, p. 26). Alinsky primarily based his social justice work on the social contract theory of justice, meaning he saw justice as an outcome of the contract between people and their government. One must change the system to create a more just system for all. This example stays on the right side of the model, the political side, while the next example crosses from the lower left quadrant to the lower right as explained as below.

The second example, research has indicated that if parents attend even one semester of college, their children are more likely to go to college (Choy, Horn, Nunez, & Chen, 2000). Using this knowledge, coupled with the knowledge of the university cohort and financial aid system, one university professor started an initiative to attract and guide parents into college (Hamer et al., 2011). This initiative started in the lower right quadrant by “dismantling formal barriers that prevent individuals from accessing needed services” (Chetkovich & Kunreuther, 2006, p. 26). Organizations that fall in this quadrant empower individuals but do not transform individuals. However, the initiative also functions in the lower left quadrant, because it improves the knowledge and skills of parents in an effort to improve their job marketability and income potential. This corresponds to the lower left quadrant “meets basic needs and skill-building for individual empowerment” (Chetkovich & Kunreuther, 2006, p. 26); it empowers individuals and transforms individuals. It is the hope these authors (Hamer, 2011) that by eliminating barriers for parents to enter college and by transforming and empowering
parents through a college education, they in turn will support and encourage their children’s education.

These are two examples of how organizations cross the quadrants to both realize human potential as well as to change the social contract of how benefits and burdens are distrusted. The crossing of quadrants does not negate the validity of Chetkovich and Kunreuther’s (2006) model, but rather demonstrates the complexity of seeking social justice and the need for all four types of organizations to make social change. Therefore, knowledge of the work processes and activities of all four quadrants is needed. This research sought to gain the knowledge of one quadrant as discussed below.

Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) asserted that an organization’s change orientation (i.e., quadrant) influences its mission and its structure; as a result, different processes of work for each quadrant are likely, thereby reducing the likelihood for one overarching process to encompass all social change organizations. For the purpose of this research, I used Chetkovich and Kunreuther’s model for understanding and categorizing the missions of organizations that social justice leaders create and lead. Specifically, the quadrant investigated and the organizations from which research participants are pulled are the lower left quadrant, wherein the organizations that participants create and lead “meet the basic needs and skill-building for individual empowerment” (Chetkovich & Kunreuther, 2006, p. 26). The organizations’ mission was to both transformed and empowered the individual to make personal change. Chetkovich & Kunreuther (2006) did not name the model’s quadrants, so for purposes of this research, I am giving the quadrant of focus, Quadrant 2, the label of “Human Development of the Individual.” This label captures the empowerment and transformation through skill-building of the
individual. As discussed in the social justice leadership section of the chapter, the empowering and transforming of individuals through basic needs and skill-building correlates with Dewey’s philosophy of community and human development, hence the title of human development.

Before leaving the SCO discussion, I want to come back around to the concept of social justice and the two dominant philosophies of justice: social contract theory and realization-focused theory. As discussed earlier, this research pulled from both philosophies. For this research’s definition of social justice and social justice leadership, I chose to use definitions that are based upon the social contract theory; because these leaders are creating community organizations, and they, as the leader, must instill into these institutions a just system of distributing benefits and burdens. In addition as many of the cited authors have proposed, leading a social change organization is political in nature as seen by the literature’s work activities of building allies, meaning working with others (i.e., people and organizations) outside your organization and within the community. However, the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant from which I chose to select participants is the realization-focused theory, meaning these organizations seek for the people they serve the “realization of fully human lives” (Nussbaum, 2004, pp. 12-13). These organizations seek to transform and empower the people they serve and therein giving these people the agency to create a better live for themselves. Therefore, this research pulled from both philosophies, wherein the social justice leaders are working to realize human development for the people they serve as well as change the social contract with institutions within the community.
With my background in process improvement and professional development, I chose to define the process for creating and managing social change organizations, therefore I chose leaders from the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant, because I was attracted to the idea of empowering and transforming other so that they can improve their own lives. In other words, organizations work “with” individuals as opposed to doing “to” individuals, thereby assuming the individuals have agency and are capable of making change in their own lives. When I started this research, I did not know the extent of the political nature of being a leader of an organization from this quadrant. As discussed in Chapter 5, future research should replicate this study for organizations that fall within the other three quadrants.

**Appreciative Inquiry**

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) is a collaborative and group based method of collecting data to make change within organizations. This method is based upon looking at what is working as opposed to seeking out problems (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008). AI contributes an assumption to this dissertation’s conceptual framework. This assumption is that change happens through thinking that is positive, forward, and anti-deficit (Table 1, assumption 5). With this assumption, AI focuses efforts to make meaningful changes based upon strategies and activities that have worked. According to Cooperrider, Whitney, and Stavros (2008), “Every organization has something that works – things that give it life when it is not alive, effective, successful, and connected in healthy ways to its stakeholders and communities. AI begins by identifying what is positive and
Choosing AI.

There are many theories of social and organizational change in which this research could have been grounded. Theories can be divided into two research areas: content and process. Content research theories focus on precursors to and consequences of change, while process research theories focus on the responsibilities of managers in change (Rajagopalan & Sprieter, 1997). For the purposes of this research, I focus on the latter, the process of change. Process theories vary in attributing the causes of change, the process of change, and the role of individuals managing change. For example, some theories place a higher significance on human agency as an impetus for change, while other theories emphasize environmental factors as a more prominent impetus for change (Fernandez & Rainey, 2006). The cause of change and how to manage change has been explained through a number of conflicting theories; however, a large body of research has credited managers with the ability to influence and manage change in their organizations (Fernandez & Rainey, 2006; Rajagopalan & Sprieter, 1997; Kotter, 2012). Most models of the process of change are based upon Lewin’s (1947) three-phase process to change – unfreezing, moving, and refreezing (Cooperrider, Whitney, Stavros, 2008; Fernandez & Rainey, 2006; Sashkin, Morris & Horst, 1973). Several prominent theories of change include but are not limited to the following: systems theory, complexity theory, action research, and AI. Systems theory and complexity theory focus on environmental factors as the
impetus for change (Amagoh, 2008), whereas action research and AI focus on human agency as an impetus for change (Hammond, 1998; Sashkin, Morris, & Horst, 1978). Since this research focuses on organizations with a mission towards empowerment of individuals, AI and its focus on human agency as the impetus for change are more in alignment than the other theories of change; therefore, AI is chosen as the theory of change.

**AI as a theory of change.**

Thus the theory of change on which this research is based is AI. The originator of AI is David Cooperrider, whose area of research at Case Western Reserve University is organizational development, and although AI originated in the business environment, Cooperrider has used this theory of change in non-profit and other types of organizations. AI is based on social constructionism, which emphasizes the role of people using culture to impose meaning on the world. Since humans impose meaning, humans can change that meaning. In traditional change philosophies, individuals seek to change meaning and solve problems by focusing on and diagnosing a problem. This approach has caused individuals to try to improve organizations based upon deficit thinking (i.e., “What can I fix?”) (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008). Cooperrider has suggested that it is more effective to employ an appreciative approach to improving organizations whereby change starts with inquiring about methods, strategies, concepts, and ideas that currently work. Stated another way, AI is an approach to studying an organization’s “life-giving forces – its positive core” and defining possibilities “for more effective (value-congruent) forms of organizing.”
(Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008, pp. 4-5). Hammond (1998) has described AI as follows: “We envision the future that is a collage of the bests” (p. 46). This positive, forward, and anti-deficit thinking is the assumption that AI contributes to this dissertation. That is, this dissertation is based on the assumption that the participants who will contribute most to our understanding of the SCO are those social justice leaders who have an appreciative approach rather than a deficit approach to change.

**Assumptions underlying AI.**

When taking an appreciative approach to identifying strategies and methods that work within organizations, a set of assumptions emerges. Hammond (1998) has outlined these assumptions as follows:

- It is important to value difference.
- In every society, organization, or group, something works.
- The act of asking questions of an organization or group influences the group in some way.
- What we focus on becomes our reality.
- Reality is created in the moment, and there are multiple realities.
- The language we use creates our reality.
- People have more confidence and comfort to journey to the future (the unknown) when they carry forward parts of the past (the known).
- If we carry parts of the past forward, they should be what are best about the past (p. 20).
The AI method.

Since AI provides the foundation for the research methods, including participant selection, data gathering, and data analysis, I will discuss the five-phase cycle of the AI model at length. These phases include: topic, discovery, dream, design, and destiny. (See Figure 2.) Some portions of the method varied in use from Cooperrider’s ideal AI model; however, the critical aspects of the model influenced decisions as they arose in defining and implementing the methods. For example, the two phases above the line (i.e., Destiny-sustaining and Topic-selecting focus) were not completed as a part of this research process. As opposed to having the participants chose the topic, I chose the topic to discuss. In addition, the SCO Development Process has not yet seen its destiny of being applies. During the facilitated session the participants completed the other three phases below the line: Discovery, Dream, and Design.

Figure 2: Appreciative Inquiry Method for change. Adapted from Cooperrider, Whitney, and Starvos (2008).
Cooperrider, Whitney, and Stavros’s (2008) AI model has a five-phase cycle consisting of topic, discovery, dream, design, and destiny. The following is background on each phase as Cooperrider and others present it. The background includes the phase’s purpose, process, and outcomes, which are based on the following four basic principles of Appreciative Inquiry (AI):

- Inquiry into ‘the art of the possible’ in organizational life begins with appreciation.
- Inquiry into what is possible yields information that is applicable.
- Inquiry into what is possible is provocative.
- Inquiry into the human potential of organizational life is collaborative.

(Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008, p. 4)

These principles have provided a foundation that has enabled researchers and stakeholders collectively to use AI as a method for studying organizations, and AI highlights the “life-giving forces” that create the “positive core” of organizations (Hammond, 1998, p. 46). With AI, any proposed changes to organizations are based upon this “positive core.”

**Topic – selecting focus.** Through the mid-1990s, the implementation of most change management theories devoted enormous amounts of time to diagramming the current state of the organization and diagnosing all the specific problems that exist within an organization, its departments, or its functional areas. However, through the AI approach, facilitators work with managers to define broad areas that can use improvement, such as customer service, inventory control, etc. These areas needing
improvement are typically identified through feedback from suppliers, customers, or employees.

**Discovery – appreciating.** In AI, discovery is the initial phase of inquiry into the strategies and procedures that are effective within organizations. It starts with the broad topic from the previous phase, topic-selecting focus. The purpose of this discovery-appreciating phase is to inquire and explore the topic, appreciating its “positive exceptions, successes and most vital life forces” (Hammond, 1998, p. 6). Appreciation is generated through dialog between all the appropriate participants during an in-person facilitated session. The facilitated session takes on many forms and uses a variety of group process techniques (e.g., interviews, focus groups, small-group discussion, etc.); however, the final data gathering and synthesis for each phase occurs in the larger group sessions. There are two primary outcomes to this phase (Hammond, 1998): The first outcome is identifying the “best of what is” and documenting it in some format, such as lists, short stories, diagrams, etc. The second outcome is the transformation of participants through a positive and supportive environment to share, collaborate, and create a vision for change within the organization. From this experience, participants start to feel the power of group engagement and excitement as well as the liberation that comes from exploring organizational assumptions (Hammond, 1998).

Assumptions exist within every organization, which can be defined as the “beliefs shared by a group, that causes the group to think and act and certain ways” (Hammond, 1998, p. 13). Within AI, identifying organizational assumptions plays an important role in the process of discovering and appreciating “the best of what is” within the organization. Identifying assumptions is important because assumptions place blinders on individuals,
groups, and organizations. Blinders prevent employees from considering information from different perspectives; as a result, blinders inhibit and prevent changing current ways of thinking or acting. Stated another way, assumptions allow for “shorthand” thinking and behaviors among and within groups and thereby eliminate the possibility of meaningful and effective change. Specifically, AI defines organizational assumptions as follows:

- Statements or rules that explain what a group generally believe;
- Explanations for the context of the group’s choices and behaviors;
- Not visible to or verbalized by the participants/ members – rather they develop and exist; and
- Require visibility and discussion before anyone can be sure of the group’s beliefs (Hammond, 1998, p. 15).

Although the participants for this research came from different organizations, research suggests there tends to be a common set of assumptions made by social justice leaders. For example, as discussed in the work activity identified within the social justice leadership literature, Theoharis (2008) has discussed how social justice leaders assume either that no one understands the stress they experience, or that others believe the leader is the cause of their own stress. To understand these sort of assumptions, two approaches are taken during the facilitated session: time is allowed for specifically asking about assumptions, and session observers document assumptions as they hear them. An organization’s assumptions are a major source of blinders when it is trying to define the
best of what is; therefore, it is important for the facilitator to spend time exploring an organization’s assumptions prior to and during the discovery phase.

**Dream – envisioning.** In AI, moving from the discovery phase to the dream phase, the group uses the documented “best of what is” to envision new possibilities by exploring themes that cross participants’ stories (Hammond, 1998; Hammond & Royal, 1998; Cooperrider, Whitney & Stavros, 2006). These themes are the “best of what is” in the organization and are identified as areas of opportunity for improvement. This suggests that organizations begin with what works – their strengths – and build upon these strengths to create their dream organizations. In a series of small- and large-group facilitations, these opportunities for dreams are identified and a vision created for the future based upon the “best of what is,” thereby making today’s exceptional tomorrow’s ordinary (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2006, p. 162).

**Design – co-constructing.** In AI, the purpose of the design phase is to transition the process from dream-envisioning the strategic intent to co-constructing an organizational structure that supports the vision. This phase bridges the “best of what is” with “what might be” through the use of “provocative propositions.” A provocative proposition “re-creates the organization’s image of itself by presenting clear, compelling pictures of how things will be when the positive core is fully effective in all of its strategies, processes, systems, decisions, and collaborations” (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2006, p. 162). Hammond (1998) has described provocative propositions another way. According to Hammond, provocative propositions “describe an ideal state of circumstances that will foster the climate that creates the possibilities to do work” (p. 39) within the new vision for an organization.
Destiny – sustaining. In the final phase of AI and of this dissertation’s method, stakeholders are allowed to create the organizations that they have envisioned. In AI this creation and transformation takes on two forms. The first form is “aligning the actual organization with the provocative propositions created in the design phase and building AI learning competencies into the culture” (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2006, p. 200). “Appreciative learning cultures nurture innovative thinking by creating a positive focus, a sense of meaning, and systems that encourage collaboration” (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2006, p. 204). In a usual AI interaction, to accomplish this phase, action plans are created and implemented, and the core team as well as the stakeholders measure progress. As Hammond (1998) has noted, “The idea behind the group creation of propositions is to move the individual will to group will. Group will creates the synergy... [and] occurs when the group shares a clear goal that all members believe will happen... and the entire group is a part of the process” (p. 47). In AI, by being part of the creation of the vision and action plans, participants are better able to respond to change. For example, from participating in this dissertation, participants will be able to take what they have learned back to their organizations.

The key to the AI model is the concept of including participants from various areas of the organization to generate the vision and create an action plan that enables participants to play the role of change leadership as opposed to change management (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008). Kotter (1995) explains that change management is a set of tools or structures designed to control or manage change initiatives or organizations; therefore, change management is a tactical process of eliminating and controlling the chaos surrounding change. Change leadership is based on
large-scale transformations whereby leaders do not attempt to control or eliminate chaos
but rather respond to “the driving forces, visions, and processes that fuel large-scale
transformation” (Kotter, 1995, p. 61). For the purposes of this dissertation, change
leadership played a central role. That is, the AI process was used to bring together social
justice leaders involving them in identifying the driving forces, visions, and process that
they use when leading a social change organization.

    The AI model was the foundation for designing the data gathering and data
analysis facilitated session to be elaborated upon in Chapter 3. The facilitated session
followed the AI model; it began with the discovery phase, continued through the dream
phase, and concluded with design phase. For this reason, a detailed understanding of the
AI approach, including assumptions, principles, and the model, was provided.

**Grounded Theory**

    Grounded theory provided the last assumption that underlies the conceptual
framework for this dissertation: the experiences of participants provide the background
for developing knowledge (Table 1, assumption 6). The purpose of this research project
was to develop a social justice process that generates the work processes and subsequent
work activities to start and lead a social justice organization. This purpose aligned with
grounded theory research, whereby the purpose of grounded theory is “to generate or
discover a theory, an abstract analytical schema of a process” that is grounded in the
experience of the research participants (Creswell, 2007, p. 63). As detailed in Chapter 3,
theoretical sampling is used in grounded theory research, whereby participants are
selected “based on their ability to contribute to the development of the theory” (Creswell,
2007, p. 240); the use of experienced social justice leaders was the last conceptual
framework assumption. In applying grounded theory to the conceptual framework for developing a process for social justice leaders, this research explored the “processes, actions, and interactions” (Creswell, 2007, p. 240) of experienced leaders of social justice organizations to generate a process for their work starting and leading these organizations.

Since the purpose of grounded theory research is to generate knowledge grounded in the experience of participants, I reviewed several qualitative research designs and techniques and found little support for collaborative analysis and synthesis in the literature until I came across a proposed new synthesis technique for qualitative meta-analysis: Participatory Action Synthesis (Wimpenny & Savin-Baden, 2012).

One criticism of qualitative research is the researcher produces “tentative findings” (Wimpenny & Savin-Baden, 2012), while Statham (1988) termed the act of qualitative researchers not fully interrogating their data as analytic interruptus. Wimpenny & Savin-Baden (2012) proposed that one reason for this underdeveloped analysis is that the researcher(s) separate themselves from the participants and in many cases from each other to perform data analysis. These authors presented a new data analysis technique for qualitative meta-analysis research called Participatory Action Synthesis. “Participatory Action Synthesis is a collaborative approach to data analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and knowledge construction, which enables data generation and its analysis to be used for communal analysis” (Wimpenny & Savin-Baden, 2012, p. 692).

Wimpenny and Savin-Baden (2012) proposed a synthesis technique in which, researchers “synthesize, interpret, and construct greater meaning from qualitative data
sets in a participatory process, to maximize knowledge production, dissemination, relevance and scientific knowledge” (p. 689). They proposed this communal approach enables researcher to delve deeper into the meaning of the data from a “social-constructionist paradigm in that its focus is on the co-creation of knowledge, as the research team shares their understandings and experiences of the issues under investigation with this relativist ontology, the theoretical, practical, and experiential knowledge of the team members has bearing upon the construction of the findings” (p. 691). They also proposed that a communal approach enables “critical self-reflection and action” as team members co-jointly analyze and synthesize the data moving from “interpretation to knowledge construction” (p. 691). This data synthesis technique was created and implemented on a qualitative meta-analysis. I proposed that this technique closely aligns with the AI data analysis and synthesis technique that the current project used: first, each participant presents the steps they used to create their social justice change organization, and second, in a communal process, all worked together to analyze and construct an overarching process of work processes and activities, which was accomplished with non-researchers through the use of an experienced facilitator.

There are differences between researchers communally synthesizing meta-research projects and this research: social justice leaders as participants synthesizing their own data. On the meta-analysis project the obstacle to overcome was a researcher delving deep enough into the data to fully understand, analyze, and synthesize as to prevent analytic interruptus. In this research, the participants and their work processes were the objects of study and the participants performed the analysis and synthesis of their data, which provided them with in-depth knowledge of the data. The participants’
contributions and analysis of their own experiences could have created two issues. Issue one was ownership and the egoistical drive for one’s own data to be prominent in the defined process. Issue two was the tendency to focus on the past and rehash what happened. To manage these differences, I used an AI approach to data analysis and synthesis, whereby the focus is on “dialoguing ‘what should be’ and innovating ‘what will be’” as described in the literature review for AI process (Hammond, 1998; Hammond & Royal, 1998). This approach helps participants manage their egos and focus on what might be in the future.

**Conclusion**

In addition to reviewing literature on social justice and social justice leadership, this literature review provided information about topics that directly affect the assumptions of the conceptual framework underlying the development of a process of work for social justice leaders. The literature on social justice leaders and SCOs applied to the participant section and the facilitated session agenda. For example, from existing research, as will be explained in Chapter 3, three behaviors were used in the initial interviews with potential research candidates to determine if they were social justice leaders or just “good leaders.” Additionally, several identified work activities as have been reviewed in this chapter and were included as topics for discussion on the session agenda to be detailed in Chapter 3. Literature on SCOs provided a foundation for the participant selection criteria. Finally, the AI approach to process change provided the foundation for the research design, including participant selection, data gathering, and data analysis. The four literature topics (social justice leadership, SCOs, AI, and Grounded Theory) contributed to the methods of the research as discussed in Chapter 3.
Chapter Three
Methodology

A conceptual framework consisting of six assumptions emerged from a review and synthesis of existing literature on social justice leadership, social change organizations, appreciative inquiry, and grounded theory. Resulting assumptions are presented in Table 1, Chapter 1. This conceptual framework also had implications for the research design, as presented in Table 2 of this chapter. In this chapter, the impact of these assumptions on the research design is threaded through the discussion of the genesis of the research topic as well as the justification for the qualitative research philosophy, design, and data gathering techniques.

A reintroduction of Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) SCO model may be helpful (see Figure 1 in Chapter 2), as this model played a large role in the research’s design and specifically in participant and site selection, defined by the type (i.e. mission) of social change organization from which leaders were selected. The social change organization literature contributed an underlying assumption to participant selection: one overarching process can be developed for organizations with similar mission. For this dissertation, a process was created for organizations whose missions focus on both transforming and empowering the individual, therein “meeting basic needs and skill-building for individual empowerment” (Chetkovich and Kunreuther, 2006, p. 28), which aligns with the bottom left corner quadrant (Human Development of the Individual Quadrant) of Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) model of work done by social change organizations. (See Chapter 2, Figure 1, Human Development of the Individual Quadrant).
Table 2.

Assumptions Impact on Research Design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Topics</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Impact on Research Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social justice leadership – definition, behaviors, activities</td>
<td>(1) Social justice is justice enacted with and for groups of people (i.e., social context). (2) Identifying an organization’s job activities places the focus on the change process rather than the leader. (3) A social justice leader creates a culture conducive to human development through three leadership behaviors: Praxis based on shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-making.</td>
<td>Research design. Participant selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social change organizations (SCO)</td>
<td>(4) One overarching process can be developed for organizations with similar missions as proposed by Chetkovich &amp; Kunreuther’s (2006) model outlined in Figure 1, Chapter 2.</td>
<td>Participant selection. Project delimitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciative inquiry</td>
<td>(5) Change happens through thinking that is positive, forward, and anti-deficit.</td>
<td>Participant selection. Data collection, management, and analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounded theory</td>
<td>(6) The experiences of participants provide the background for developing knowledge.</td>
<td>Research design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 outlines the research assumptions and their impact on research design. I more clearly articulated the impact of these assumptions on the research design by threading the assumptions throughout this chapter’s discussion of the research genres and rationale, site and participant selection, data collection, management, and analysis, and finally, the benefits and limitations to the researcher’s role.
Genres and Rationale

The genesis of this dissertation followed Marshall and Rossman’s (2006) proposed process for developing a research topic and research questions, whereby the researcher encountered a “troubling or intriguing real-world observation”; I then created a personal theory to help “reduce ambiguity and explain the paradox”; and through review of the literature, I created “formal theory, concepts, and models” – the research questions (p. 31). Based on work with community Participatory Action Research (PAR) projects, I became intrigued with the lack of literature on the leadership of community organizations. This intrigue led to the research topic of exploring the work activities and processes that social justice leaders perform while creating, managing, and leading community organizations for social justice from conception of the organization through established sustainability of the organization.

Since little research had been conducted on the work experience of social justice leaders, and since their work varied based upon the organization’s mission, context, and setting, a qualitative approach to “explore and describe” the work experience of social justice leaders was used to gain knowledge about social justice leaders’ lived experiences (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 54). To accomplish the goals of this research, a mixture of qualitative research philosophies was chosen: grounded theory and ethnographic. To design the project, PAR was used, and data were collected using Appreciative Inquiry (AI), a method used with some regularity in the business world, but not found to have been used prior to this dissertation in academic inquiry. This combination of philosophies, designs, and methods was used to capture both participants’ culture and their lived activities. Analysis led to creating a process of work processes and activities
for social justice leaders as they create, manage, and lead social change organizations from conception to sustainability. The following discussion outlines the rationale for the chosen philosophy, design, and method.

**Approach.**

The research goal was to identify the work processes and activities that social justice leaders engage in while creating, managing, and leading social justice organizations. To meet this goal, I chose to use a mixture of qualitative research approaches: grounded theory and ethnography. Grounded theory provided a basis for inquiry first by dictating selection of participants “based on their ability to contribute to the development of the theory” (Creswell, 2007, p. 240). In applying grounded theory, this research explored the “processes, actions, and interactions” of experienced leaders of social justice organizations with the goal of abstracting a theory grounded in the data.

One of the ten assumptions underlying this dissertation’s conceptual framework aligns with Creswell’s definition, which is that the experience of participants provide the background for developing knowledge of a process; therefore, the participants were selected based upon their lived experiences and knowledge about the “processes, actions, and interaction” (p. 240) as social justice leaders leading community organizations.

Coupled with grounded theory was the ethnographic method of inquiry, which involves studying a group of people and documenting their culture and lived activities (Merriam, 1998). According to Creswell (2007), ethnographic research is “appropriate if the needs are to describe how a cultural group works and to explore the beliefs, language, behaviors and issues such as power, resistance, and dominance. The literature may be deficient in actually knowing how the group works, because the group is not in the
mainstream” … [typically,] this group is one that has been together for an extended period of time” (pp. 70-71). Social justice leaders are not in the mainstream and are not necessarily a geographical group, but rather a group based on roles and responsibilities. As such, very little research has been conducted on social justice leaders; therefore, this research pulled together participants who met the research definition of social justice leaders as a community to describe their work, roles, and responsibilities. This research was ethnographic in that it focused on the culture of a group and used methods of ethnography, but it is not a full-fledged ethnography, since no one group’s culture was comprehensively documented.

With the goal to define the work processes and activities that social justice leaders engage in while creating and managing social justice organizations, an ethnographic approach was used to document the everyday work experiences of individuals. Wolcott (1999) proposed that ethnographic research consists of three general procedures: (a) data are gathered in the form of a detailed description of the group being studied; (b) analysis derives key themes or perspectives; and (c) findings are interpretations and generalizations about the “social life of human beings” by the researcher. During a facilitated session, to be described below, a detailed description of each participant’s social justice leadership experience was gathered. As a group, participants analyzed the experiences for key themes and perspectives of social justice work. Once the participants identified the key themes and perspectives, they formed their themes and perspectives into a rough draft of a process. I further analyzed their data to create more complete and useable process. In this way, a blended methodological approach was used to develop a
process social justice work. The blended methodology used an ethnographic approach for
documenting the work and a grounded theory approach for analyzing it.

**Design.**

Within the ethnographic approach, there are various designs. Participatory action
research (PAR) was chosen as the design for this research for three primary reasons: its
existence in community, the cyclical process used, and the freedom to create a process for
making social change based upon the situation. First, PAR exists in community in which
knowledgeable stakeholders come together as a community of experienced and
successful change agents to build a process. In this way, PAR is activist research in
contrast to conventional research. Most commonly within the social sciences of
academia, research is conducted to produce knowledge for the “discipline of objective
facts” (Baritz, 1960, p. 17). Baritz (1960) proposed that research for any other reason
turns academia into “Servants of Power” (p. 17). In other words, in conventional
research, academia must do research to provide objective facts to society without an
agenda from business or government influence. However, as Kelly (2005) explained,
“PAR changes the relationship between theory and practice by producing knowledge not
only for its own sake but also to produce change” and “to directly empower community
members to create social change” (pp. 65-66). Therefore, I propose that PAR does not
make academia a “servant of power” but rather it empowers the people and society – the
usual objects of social science studies. PAR is “often explicitly ideological and
emancipatory, [and] intends to critique and radically change fundamental social
(2006) explained, it provides “an approach to social investigation” (p. 1) that enables
researchers to increase their knowledge of the community including issues of injustice
and then to work with community members to change their conditions (Abraham & Purkayastha, 2012; Kelly, 2005). This research worked with a community of social justice leaders from Social Change Organizations (SCO) to gain knowledge of their experiences, and through working together, attempted to change their condition and that of others in their group for the better by creating a process to lead more effectively community organizations for social change.

Second, PAR is the design of this ethnographic study because PAR links the research assumptions to the plan of action. PAR creates a cyclical link between research and action (Creswell, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Park, 1992; Sashkin, Morris, Horst, 1973; Stringer, 1996), which aligns with the cyclical process of creating an overarching process of work based on the participatory experience of those involved. Different authors define the cycle between research and action differently. For example, Stringer (1996) proposed that the cycle consists of “planning, acting, and review” (p. 41); Park (1992) asserted that the researcher and community members work together to define problems, implement action for change, and evaluate effectiveness of change; and Sashkin, Morris, and Horst (1973) asserted that it consists of two-step cycle of research and action, whereby “data gathering, analysis, and diagnosis” (p. 516) is the research phase, which leads to action planning and action implementation, the action phase. Sachkin et al. (1973) propose the cycle is closed by the evaluation, which includes data gathering, analysis and diagnosis forming the “basis for planning and taking further action” – the research phase (p. 516). In applying these various cyclical approaches of research and action, the current research incorporated the data gathering, analysis and diagnosis of the research phase and the action planning from the action phases. What was
not incorporated in the current research was the action implementation and evaluation. Specifically, this research design created a development process for social change organizations by completing the cycle of PAR from data gathering, analysis, and process generation, but did not include the implementation, evaluation, or modification of the PAR design. In linking this research’s assumptions to the action plan, PAR enabled the researcher to create an initial process for future research to improve upon through implementing, evaluating, and modifying this initial process for social justice leaders.

Finally, the third general purpose of PAR is to be an enabler of social change. PAR provides a high level design for research (i.e., research, action, research) but does not provide a specific process for making change within a community. Researchers have asserted that PAR must remain flexible in design in order to address the vast number of communities and project designs (Abraham & Purkayastha, 2012; Kelly, 2005). This assertion made adapting AI as a research method appropriate in that I was able to use applicable cycles of PAR and not the full process. In addition, PAR has a temporal element meaning it is dependent on time, place, and people with the objective to address particular social injustices, hence the “considerable variation on what constitutes knowledge production, action, levels of participation, types of collaboration, and effective practice” (Abraham & Purkayastha, 2012, p. 125). Therefore, a major consideration in using PAR was that PAR allows academia to reach into communities and have dialog. While other research designs may provide ways to have the dialog, they provide less guidance on how to make the desired change (Kelly, 2005). A social justice process based on PAR provides a series or work processes and activities by which to make change.
Method.

Following Creswell and Clark’s (2007) hierarchy of research design (i.e., philosophy, design, method/techniques), the method (technique) of data collection was Appreciative Inquiry (AI), which was chosen for its affinity with and as an appropriate data collection and analysis for fulfilling the PAR design. Social constructionism proposes that people within a social context create an organization, and an organization’s laws, policies, and procedures are created by countless human choices influenced by the social context. The key is the idea of humans having choices, which is the foundation for human agency. As elaborated in the literature review in Chapter 2, AI is a human agency approach developed within business consulting to creating change that builds upon the positive workings within an organization. The focus of AI on positive working aligns with this research’s conceptual framework, because the mission of participating organizations is to empower and transform individuals. AI’s assumption of human agency, positive-forward thinking, and responding to change further links this research’s assumptions to the plan of action by providing a data gathering and analysis technique that ties together the literature of social justice leadership and social change organizations with the research design.

Site and Participant Selection

Site selection.

The site selection for this project was unlike most research projects, because the sites of the selected participants are the organizations with like mission, which the social justice leaders lead. I pulled participants from many different social change organizations and types of social change organizations, thus from many sites. The organizations ranged
from churches, to small community organizations, to university initiatives. The mission of the organization was the common defining factor that made it a potential site. The sites from which participants were selected were various social change organizations whose mission was to transform and empower individuals within the community, therein “meeting basic needs and skill-building for individual empowerment”, which is the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant from the Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) social change organization model. Social change organizations with the mission for Human Development of the Individual were the site selection criteria, which are defined in detail in the participant selection criteria.

**Participant selection.**

Since this research was not based on any one organization or institution, it was based on the experiences of leaders from four organizations whose mission was to make social change; the method of participant selection was a mixed approach combining the “positioned-subjects approach” and “snowball approach” (Conrad, Haworth, & Millar, 1993). A positioned-subjects approach assumes that research participants respond to questions based upon their position within an organization or society. It is through this positionality that people examine and create the meaning of their work. With the goal to create a social justice process for current and future social justice leaders, the research used the AI data collection and analysis approach, which required bringing together participants with the knowledge and position to make change (Hammond & Royal, 1998). The participants in this research were social justice leaders who were effective at leading community organizations. Random selection of social justice leaders would not necessarily provide research participants who were effective in their efforts to make change; therefore, this research purposefully selected participants using a positioned-
subject approach, which was based on leaders of successful social change organizations. In combination with a positioned-subjects approach, participants were identified using the snowball sampling technique (Marshall and Rossman, 2006), which means people within the researcher’s social network refer candidates (i.e. leaders of community organizations with a mission to transform and empower individuals), and in turn, those candidates identified other potential candidates in their social network. Since social justice leaders of organizations were not well organized across a city or location, this sampling technique enabled the researcher to find this hidden population. As the snowball technique revealed candidates, the candidates were vetted through a positioned-subjects approach, which consisted of three steps: prequalification, qualifying interview, and analysis of data.

The ideal number of participants for this study was four to six. It was thought that more than six participants attending the facilitated session might require more than a one-day facilitated session. Six were confirmed for attending the session with the hope that four would attend. Unfortunately, this Midwest region experienced a major snowfall the night prior to the session, and therein this study is comprised of four purposefully selected participants. Three participants attended the facilitated session and the fourth participant was led through the session’s questions separately.

**Positioned-subjects approach.**

To find effective social justice leaders, the participant selection had three criteria, which grew from the dissertation’s conceptual framework, specifically the social change organization, social justice leadership, and appreciative inquiry literature. The first criterion was defining the organizations from which social justice leaders were gathered.
As discussed in the site selection section, the second criterion was defining the distinguishing characteristics of a social justice leader, included behaviors specific to social justice leaders. The final criterion was identifying social justice leaders with an AI view for change, meaning exhibiting the belief that change happens through thinking that is positive, forward, and anti-deficit. (Appendix A provides the qualifying interview’s questionnaire, which has sample questions for gathering data about the participant selection criteria.) The qualifying interviews elicited information about the potential participant’s organization, their role within the organization, their leadership behaviors, and their AI thinking.

**Social Change Organization.** The SCO selection criteria for participants included the following: first, the organization that the social justice leader started and was leading fell within Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) lower left quadrant (see Figure 1, Human Development of the Individual Quadrant). The focus of the organization was to empower and transform individuals. The second criterion was that the research candidate was the primary leader or one of the primary leaders of the social justice organization. The primary leader was defined as a person who has made decisions or led the decision-making process from the starting of the organization. In many community organizations, this role may be shared between multiple people. The final criterion was that the organization was operating successfully for more than one year but less than five. Operating successfully is defined as meeting the originating mission or goals for the organization.

**Social justice leadership behaviors.** The second facet of the participant selection was the behaviors that distinguish social justice leaders from good community
organization leaders. In Chapter 2, ten social justice leadership behaviors were identified from the literature; however, for purposes of this research and participant selection, the ten behaviors found in the literature were reduced and simplified, because it was unlikely that any single social justice leader would exhibit all ten behaviors, meaning without reducing the number of behaviors in the selection criteria, this research would have had no participants. Since no social justice leadership research has identified the key behaviors required to successfully create and lead social change organization, I employ Dewey’s philosophy on community and human development to help identify key behaviors for the selection process.

This research focused on social change organizations from the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant. These organizations met the basic needs and skill building for individual empowerment and transformation. Participants led organizations for human development within communities. Dewey’s philosophy on community and human development aided in narrowing the ten social justice leadership behaviors to three behaviors: Praxis based upon shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-making. The qualifying interview questionnaire and measurement criteria for these behaviors are outlined in Appendix A. After the prequalifying process, the candidates were interviewed and asked questions from the questionnaire. (The data were analyzed according to the criteria provided in Appendix A.)

Appreciative inquiry (AI). The third criterion for participant selection was from the AI literature. Leaders of social change organizations make change happen through thinking that is positive, forward, and anti-deficit. According to AI literature, participants with AI thinking about social change see change as necessary and possible. They see the
past, but focus on the possibilities of the future, meaning these leaders focus on the “positive core” on which to base change. According to Hammond (1998), this thought process enables participant leaders to move more easily than other participants through each phase of the AI method (i.e. discovery, dream, design, and destiny) by focusing on the driving forces, visions, and processes that have led to their success in leading a social change organization, as opposed to focusing on the negative events in the past and not seeing a way to make change in the future. The qualifying interview elicited an understanding of the potential participants’ thinking. (See Appendix A for the interview’s questionnaire.)

Snowball technique.

The four purposefully selected participants were from a Midwest region. Within this area there were many organizations whose purpose was to transform and empower individuals; however, finding these community organization required networking with professionals in the nonprofit sector. Therefore, the snowball technique started with my request from two associates familiar with local social justice and nonprofit organizations for the contact information for local nonprofit organizations that either help other nonprofits or might meet the study’s criteria. Within the region, there are roughly six well-established organizations, whose purposes are to assist and enable the success of smaller community organizations through such services as, but not limited to, financial assistance, training and development, and networking. Examples include the United Way, the local universities, and area foundations for distributing local philanthropic funding. Two are nationally based organizations, and four are locally based organizations. The initial two contacts provided contact information for candidates within the six
organizations as well as other community organizations of varying size and mission. (See Appendix B for The Snowball Technique and Qualifying Process.) Through emails and conference calls with initial contacts (Level 2 of Appendix B) additional names and contact information of coalitions and community organizations were obtained (Level 3 and Level 4 of Appendix B). Coalitions are the collaborative uniting of several community organizations either based upon neighborhood or mission. For example, there was a coalition for organizations that help the homeless as well as a church-based coalition for a specific neighborhood. Although no coalition qualified for this study, the representatives were able to provide names of other community organizations both within and outside of their coalition. These smaller community organizations were also a good source for names of candidate organizations as seen in Level 3 and 4 of Appendix B. An unexpected snowball assist came from social media and specifically Facebook. As I reviewed and “Liked” Facebook pages of local community organizations, Facebook offered “Suggested Pages.” This unexpected source of potential participants provided three of six participants. As a reminder, four participants were desired; however to ensure four participants, six were invited to the facilitated session. To find the six needed participant organizations, the snowball technique required communications with 52 organizations. All 52 organizations were vetted through a qualifying process.

Qualifying process. The qualification process consisted of three steps: prequalification, qualifying interview, and analysis of qualifying interview responses.

Step 1: Prequalification. This step of the qualifying process started with a request from two people within this researcher’s network of nonprofit organizations (A and B in Level 1 of Appendix B) for the names of representatives in large organizations that have
contact with social change organizations, for example, university professors, United Way professionals, and local philanthropic organizations. These two initial contacts provided candidates of several small organizations whose mission was to empower and transform individuals. With the leader and organization name, I prescreened potential participants to confirm that the organization’s mission fell within Human Development of the Individual Quadrant criteria via electronic media and paper materials. Not all websites or Facebook pages contain the organization’s mission or leader; therefore many organizations were contacted to learn of their mission, age, and leader. Twenty-four of the 52 organizations were identified as not meeting the study’s participant selection criteria in the first step of the qualifying process. If an organization was identified as not qualified, contact was still made in an effort to obtain names for other candidate organizations. The information found in this step was confirmed in the next step, qualifying interviews.

**Step 2: Qualifying interview.** I conducted the qualifying interview via phone or face-to-face to elicit information to determine if the potential participant met the selection criteria set forth in the conceptual framework: the social change organization, the social justice leadership behaviors, and the appreciative inquiry (AI) thinking. From social change organization criteria, this step confirmed the mission, age, and the role of the leader within the organization. It also determined if the organization was successful, meaning the organization met its mission or goals. From social justice leadership behavior criteria, I analyzed the interviews and extracted information to determine if the social justice leader created a culture conducive to human development through three behaviors: praxis based on shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-
making. The qualifying interviews stimulated information to determine the final AI criteria, which was that the leader’s thinking was positive, forward, and anti-deficit. Therefore, the qualifying interviews were to confirm information about the organization and its leader as well as to acquire the necessary data to analyze candidates’ leadership behaviors and AI thinking.

The purpose of the sample qualifying interview questionnaire was to provide an exhaustive list of questions for the situation that a candidate answers an open ended question with a closed ended response meaning multiple detailed questions would be needed to solicit the data required for analysis and decision-making. Therefore, not all of these questions were asked. I moved to the next group of questions when there was enough data to analyze the candidate. Questions were open-ended to generate dialog. Since it was unlikely that participants used terms featured in the literature to describe their organization or behaviors (i.e., praxis, participatory decision-making), the objective of these questions were to encourage candidates to describe and provide examples of their organization and behaviors in their own words. Two of the four participants (P1 and P3) did not have enough time for the full interview and instead submitted their answers to a small subset of questions by email. The responses for all four participants are outlined in the next section under analysis of interview. In the sub-section below is the analysis of the interviews of the four candidates that became participants. (See Appendix C for a description of the qualifying process for the four participants in the research.)

**Step 3: Analysis of Interviews.** For the three social justice leadership behaviors, the measures were not precise, meaning that what I sought to understand about the leader’s behavior was tendency. Does the leader tend to display the desired behavior?
The leader may not behave as desired in every situation display, but was more likely than not to display the desired behavior. To determine eligibility for participant, I took notes and analyzed criteria using the following measures:

- **Praxis based on common interests** – the leader seeks the input and interests of others; the leader is willing to change the goal or activities of initiatives and the organization as the interests change; and the leader seeks to understand viewpoints, which are different from his or hers.

- **Communal dialog** – the leader frequently communicates with his or her staff and those outside the organization. There are routine communication structures established (i.e., team meetings, news letters, town meetings, coffee and chats) for both inside and outside the organization. The communication is two-way verses one-way, meaning the leader seeks information verses just disperses information, respectively.

- **Participatory decision-making** – the leader includes others in the decision-making process. The leader does not seek the input of others and then makes the decisions singularly or without considering input. The leader seeks to understand the viewpoints different and opposing to his and her own.

To measure AI thinking as positive, forward, and anti-deficit, the dialog was analyzed for how the leader approached a solution to a setback the organization experienced. Specifically, to have AI thinking, the leader saw the possibilities of the situation verses seeing the situation as unsurpassable.
Since the purpose of this research was to explore the various work processes and activities of successful social justice leaders to determine whether commonalities exist in the activities they perform, I proposed that as the questions and measures stand, they provided an understanding of the potential participants’ leadership tendencies for or not for the three behaviors and AI thinking. Tendencies towards these behaviors indicated a tendency towards a social justice leadership style. (See Appendix C for a description and analysis of the participants’ qualifying process.)

Data Collection, Management, and Analysis

This research’s data collection, management, and analysis were grounded in PAR and AI approaches. (And, I followed IRB guidelines.) PAR influenced the design by defining the collaborative collection of data from the community, the role of the researcher, and the finding being turned into action (Minkler, 2000). AI influenced the methods (or techniques) by which data were collected, managed, and analyzed. Specifically, AI influenced the agenda, the type of data collected, and the group data analysis.

Data collection.

To collect data, I used the group facilitation technique of AI. In using this technique, I focused the group on “appreciating and valuing the best of what is, envisioning what might be, and dialoging what should be” (Hammond, 1998, p. 24). In addition, a supportive environment was encouraged and was necessary for open discussion between participants. As detailed in Chapter 2, AI comes from organizational change literature and is similar to focus groups. Marshall and Rossman (2006) explained the rational for using focus groups is that “an individual’s attitudes and beliefs do not form in a vacuum: People often need to listen to others’ opinions and understandings to
form their own” (p. 114). AI similarly values positive interactions between positive people; however, AI differs from focus groups in that it is a multi-phase, dialog interaction, which I presented in detail in Chapter 2.

The one-day session took place in a large room that provided a whole-group area and a working area for the facilitator (myself) and two data workers. The facilitator created the agenda for the session; it was important that facilitator and agenda remain flexible as group dynamics are unpredictable, and exactly what data the participants would present was unknown (Bunker & Alban, 2006).

The general flow of the one-day session was as follows:

1. Presentation to welcome and outline the session purpose and process.
2. Level setting knowledge such as what is a process and what activities are found in the literature;
3. Introductions which included a brief description of each leader’s organization;
4. Participants documented their work processes and activities from the moment they knew they needed to make a change in society to the point that the organization was sustainable;
5. Participants presenting their steps (i.e., four participants yield four rows); and
6. The group looked across each other’s processes and activities to group and define the commonality and ultimately the phases of the process;
7. The group then moved all their Post-its containing their work processes, activities, steps and work products to the corresponding phase;
8. Additional data were gathered detailing and outlining the work activities, steps, and work products.
This facilitated session enabled data collection and analysis at both the individual and group levels, thus capitalizing on the effect of synergy from focus group while maintain the integrity of individual contributions. (The detailed agenda is in Appendix D.) Although the visual of the Post-it notes was important and enabled tactical forming of the initial process, the dialog during the session was as or even more important, because the dialog included the assumptions, enablers, barriers, and the opportunities to provide future social justice leaders with a rich and meaningful process (Bunker & Alban, 2006).

During the facilitated session, two data gatherers were present to document the output of the session into MS Word. The output, including any written (Post-it, white board, paper-based) or verbal (whole-group or breakouts) forms of data presented by either the researcher or the participants were scribed verbatim by a team of two trained and supervised by the facilitator. As backup and supplemental resource, the facilitated session was audio taped. After the session, I reviewed and corrected the written script based upon the audiotape. Conducting facilitated sessions required experienced data gatherers; losing data is not only a costly and timely mistake, but is often not reproduced effectively (Bunker & Alban, 2006; Hammond & Royal, 1998).

To increase accuracy and validity of data collected, I used “member-check” and “thick description” techniques (Creswell, 2007). During the facilitated session the facilitator restated, summarized, and paraphrased the information provided by the participants. At the end and beginning of each agenda item, the preliminary findings were summarized, and critique and confirmation were requested from the participants. Validity was also increased through the use of individual and group exercises. For example, individuals were asked to provide their experiences as individuals. Then, initial analysis
of their experiences was done in groups, and I did a final synthesis after the one-day session. A member-check took place at the conclusion of the one-day session, which was a detailed review and description of the process to ensure accuracy that what the participant meant was what was presented.

**Data management.**

In PAR, the researcher is an “integral part of the setting,” meaning that the participants and researcher work together to frame questions, gather data, and analyze the data (Abraham & Purkayastha, 2012; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). “Participatory action research brings the individuals being studied into the research process” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 166); however, it was the responsibility of the researcher to manage the data.

Typically, qualitative research is not linear, meaning the collection and analysis of data was an iterative process over a long period of time, thereby creating increased issues for organization of data as well as protection of identifying information (Marriam, 1998); however, in using the AI facilitated session, the data collection and analysis cycle were condensed into a one-day facilitated session, making it important to capture the data and analyze it in a meaningful way. Therefore, prior to the session, the facilitator and data gatherers reviewed the session agenda and created protocol for gathering data and analysis, including the software used, version control procedures, pseudonyms of participant names, a file structure, and a flip-chart manipulation sequence. Data collection was both electronic and paper-based (i.e. flip-chart and Post-it). On completion of the session, the electronic materials were transferred to a memory stick; all materials (paper and electronic) with identifying information were stored in a locked filing cabinet. The identifying information, stored separately from the data and also in a locked cabinet,
included a “pseudonym to participant name” matrix, letters of consent and information rights, and any venue documentation with names or identifiers. These measures ensured that only those with IRB approval have electronic or paper copies of the data.

Data analysis.

As Saldana (2013) proposed, coding and analysis of data are best accomplished through a two-cycle approach and each cycle’s method can be divided into subcategories, which have a different purpose and process for coding and analysis. The participants completed first cycle coding and analysis during the facilitated session. This first cycle included two subcategories: descriptive coding and theme coding. During the facilitated session, the participants completed the first cycle coding and analysis, and then, they were asked to discuss and expand more detail their work activities (i.e., Post-its). I used these expanded descriptions in the second cycle coding and analysis, which had two subcategories: axial coding and process coding.

The participants’ first cycle coding and analysis process was completed as follows. Data were initially collected from participants by asking them to brainstorm by themselves about the successful work processes and activities that they and their organizations had taken thus far in leading their organization. Participants wrote a few words to describe their work processes and activities on large Post-it notes. Saldana (2013) referred to this subcategory as descriptive coding wherein “a word or short phrase” describes and represents the essence of a larger body of data (p. 88). Participants were then asked to present their Post-it notes and expand upon the few words therein, providing addition data for the second subcategory of the coding process.
Once all participants had presented their information, they were asked if they saw any commonalities, if those commonalities could be grouped, and if they could be grouped, could they be put into a sequential order? Participants discussed the commonalities and grouped the Post-its into five sequential categories. Saldana (2013) referred to this second cycle subcategory of coding and analysis as creating focused coding, which creates salient categories from coded data by grouping those conceptually similar. The participants reviewed their Post-its as a whole and grouped them into five sequential phases of successful work processes and activities that they had performed to date. For this group of participant leaders, these were as followed: Defining the need, engaging the public, telling your story, building allies, and taking action. After grouping into phases, the participants reorganized all the Post-its to fall under one of the five phases. Then, they were asked if there were additional successful work processes and activities to be added. At this point in the facilitated session, the participants identified five phases, and at a high level, they described 36 sub-work processes and activities.

With the overarching process identified and the Post-its (i.e., work activities) placed within each phases, participants were asked to give more detailed descriptions of each Post-it as well as to identify work products. (Work products are used to gather and organize information for analysis as well as to present information.) Participants determined that not all the Post-its required additional discussion; however, many Post-its did. (Explained further in Chapter 4.) From this pool of additional data, I conducted the second cycle coding and analysis using two subcategories: axial coding and process coding. Saldana (2013) proposed that axial coding “explores how categories and subcategories relate to each other. Properties and dimensions refer to such components as
the contexts, conditions, interactions and sequence of a process.” (p. 261). Since an assertion of this research was that the data can be transformed into a format that current and future social justice leaders can use as they create SCOs, axial coding enabled the formation of a hierarchy of codes based upon “importance and dominance” of the codes and data. Axial coding created a format for the data to be presented in a process with sequential and hierarchical phases, activities, and steps. This coding process also helped identify a sixth phase, “Funding the Organization” that the participants frequently talked about as the responsibility of the board, hence its absence in their development process.

After axial coding, I used the raw data presented by participants during the second half of the facilitated session to perform the second cycle subcategory coding, process coding. Process coding the data expanded upon the participants’ codes by turning them into actions, there in making them more explanatory and understandable for users to apply in the Social Change Organization Development Process. Work processes involved actions “intertwined with the dynamics of time, change, or become strategically implemented through time” (Saldana, p. 96, 2013). Process coding was used when searching for actions in “response to a situation, problem, often with purpose of reaching a goal or handling a problem” (Saldana, p. 96, 2013). Process coding enabled both the wording of activities and steps as well as assisted in identifying when work products were drafted, enhanced, and implemented throughout the six phases of the Social Change Organization Development Process.

**Benefits and Limitations to Researcher’s Role**

Through the use of PAR and AI, this research took a nontraditional approach, meaning the researcher worked “with” the research participants rather than “on” or “to”
participants (Chetkovich & Kunreuther, 2006; Kelly, 2005). Working with the participants required complete transparency, meaning as a researcher I had to be open about the methods used. Many of these issues were introduced in Chapter 1; however, since they were central to the development of the research design, I again elaborate on their role in the development of the process.

My role included taking on several strategies to include the participants in the research process. As Sashkin, Morris, and Horst (1973) proposed, I took on three roles: consultant, trainer, and researcher. In fulfilling all three roles, I included the participants in the research process. In the role of consultant, I transferred knowledge from myself to the participants. This knowledge included process change and content from existing literature. In the role of researcher, I transferred knowledge of assessing the effectiveness of the change and proposing future change organizations; and in the role of trainer, I taught the participant to be self-sufficient in future change organizations through shared experience of the change process. Using these roles and knowledge of facilitation and process development, I helped participants transform their experiences and knowledge into a process of work for leading social change organizations that transform and empower individuals. This transformation of their knowledge into an overarching process happened through the PAR approach, whereby in a joint venture between the researcher and participants, they [we] together “determine how, when, and whether research information is used” (Kelly, 2005, p. 69). Therefore, through this facilitated process, participants learned about the processes they had experienced, as well as about the experiences and knowledge of other social justice leaders, therein transforming them and empowering them to improve their own organizations.
To all these organizations, I was an outsider, which may have affected how I was seen; however, I encountered little to no resistance from participants as they shared and analyzed their experiences. However, as Chambers (1983) stated, "much of the rhetoric changes to participation, participatory research, community involvement and the like, at the end of the day there is still an outsider seeking to change things... who the outsider is may change but the relation is the same. A stronger person wants to change things for a person who is weaker. From this paternal trap there is no complete escape" (p. 141).

Although I did not see the relationship in terms of stronger verses weaker, I approached community of social justice leaders with existing knowledge about leadership and process development; therefore, my goal was to appear humble with a desire to learn from them about their knowledge and experiences in leadership and processes for creating, managing, and leading social justice organizations. As discussed in Chapter 2 my positionality may have caused filtering the literature, experiences, and knowledge with a bias. To manage this bias, I sought to manage the process of data collection and not the content, and I asked the session’s data workers to listen and bring to my attention ideas and statements that I did not attend too, perhaps due to my bias.

Conclusion

The methodology used in this research design was a combination of an ethnographic approach and grounded theory. Supporting this methodology was a PAR design and AI method for data collection and analysis. This research design supported the ten salient assumptions of the conceptual framework, which were threaded throughout the discussions on the research’s genres and rationale, site and participant selection, data collection, management, and analysis, and finally, the discussion of the benefits and limitations to the researcher’s role. The implications of the conceptual framework’s
assumptions were presented in Table 2, and the implications of the assumptions on the selection of participant were presented in Table 3.
Chapter Four
Analysis

The purpose of this research study was to explore the successful work processes and activities of social justice leaders of SCOs and to determine whether commonalities in work processes and activities exist. If commonalities existed, which they did, another goal of this dissertation was to organize these work processes and activities into an overarching process that provides social justice leaders with the knowledge of the successful work processes used to create community organizations. The output from this research is the SCO Development Process. This research followed three phases, which are used in this chapter to describe how the SCO Development Process was created. In this chapter, I present the three phases of this research: (1) Selecting and describing the participants (i.e., prior to the facilitated session), (2) Describing the participants’ process for data collection, coding, and analysis (i.e., during the facilitated session), (3) Describing how I enhanced the participants’ draft SCO Development Process (i.e., after the facilitated session).

This chapter starts with selecting and describing the participants. In this section, I describe the participants and their organizations. In the next section, describing the participants’ process for data collection, coding, and analysis, I describe the AI facilitated experience of the participants for data collection, coding, and analysis. The participants’ data collection, coding, and analysis during the session resulted in a draft version of the SCO Development Process. (See Figure 4.) This draft version of the process as seen in Figure 4 is the participants’ creation. After presenting the participants experience during the facilitated session and the drafting of their process, I present the data coding and
analysis that I undertook after the facilitated session using their draft process and all the participant data from the facilitated session. With this addition coding and analysis, I was able to enhance the SCO Development Process to be a more useable version. (See Figure 5.) However, as discussed earlier, this more useable version is also a draft, which requires implementation, feedback, and enhancement to become a final version. This implementation, feedback, and enhancement are the “Destiny – Sustaining” phase of the AI method, which are outside the scope of this research.

**Selecting and Describing the Participants**

With the research purpose of investigating the experiences of social justice leaders and the formation of social justice organizations to identify and define the work processes and work activities that these leaders used, I pulled a small group of leaders together into a room and led them through a series of questions that would enable them to share their individual experiences with the group and then work together as a group to identify the commonalities across their processes. The participants were purposefully selected and met all the selection criteria. A full description of the selection process is found in Appendix C, the Appendix description includes their narrative during the qualifying interview; however, I provide the following descriptions as a way to introduce you, the reader, to each participant and their organization.

**Introducing the participants.**

The first participant (P1) was an engineer and was very active in the community. Prior to leading the creation of a nonprofit community media outlet, he had been active in other community organizations as well as social movements. Through his activism he
became aware that mainstream media does not represent all voices, so he started the community media outlet as a way to transform and empower individuals and groups of individuals by giving voice through media. Although P1 described his communication style as “informal and dynamic,” he was a communicator as seen by holding “public meetings to gain and distribute information as to issues and progress.” His inclusiveness was also seen in his decision-making process; creating a community media outlet was new to P1, so he “formed a provisional board,” which had the experiences to start a nonprofit community media outlet. The purpose for forming this board was to seek their experience in decision-making. He stated, “We had a provisional board with four members and decisions were made on a majority basis usually.” P1 was not only positive thinking, but he enjoyed seeking solutions to difficult situations. “We dealt with this through delegation; however, we eventually moved our date back two months.” Of which he explained how the postponed launch worked for the best in many aspect. With P1’s engineering background, he was very familiar and comfortable with developing a process with different phases of work.

The second participant (P2) experienced homelessness as a youth and was on a personal mission to end youth homelessness. Her organization started in her own home where she would take in homeless youth. When she ran out of space, she decided to create an organization that could give a larger number of “youth a home and counseling to help heal the harm they have experienced. Many homeless youth have low self-esteem and confidence, so P2 sought to transform and empower them to create a better life for themselves. To help form her organization, “I communicate a lot; it’s so important and one of the things that make an organization successful.” She communicated both within
the organization as well as with community members including government official.
Another factor making her organization successful was whom she relied on when making decisions. “Although they call it my show, I really rely on my board and our allies to help make decision.” When faced with a set back, her communication and positive – “it will work out” attitude pushed her forward. For example, “when trying to get funding, we quickly realized that we had to differentiate ourselves, so the board members talked with and learn from existing homeless shelters which youth were not finding shelter.” P2 has a fulltime job and fights homelessness as a second fulltime job. Her understanding of a social injustice and the society that allowed it, gave her insight to how organizations for social change function.

The third participant (P3) was a retired pastor and had work in community organizations for many years. Although she hated to see any injustice, she experienced one in particular as she did missionary work abroad, racism. In this experience, she was the “different one” and was discriminated against, so she created an organization to create positive community change with respects to racism. The organization facilitated people to understand racism and create action plans to make change, wherein her organization empower and transform people to make change within their community. She described her communication style as “open and honest” as well as frequent with people both within and outside the organization. Her open communication also applied to accepting feedback, “it was brought to the attention of the committee by a member” that the organization had too many subcommittees. “She was right,” so her organization reorganized base upon feedback. This was also an example of how she made decisions, with the participation of others. As P3’s communication and decision-making styles
demonstrate her positive outlook on challenges as she worked with her committee to seek solutions, “The steering committee discussed it and determined that we would take a different tact.” P3’s experience with community organizations and social justice, had given her insight to creating and running organizations within a political context.

The final participant (P4) did not attend the facilitated session; however, this is her first community organization to lead, so she still wanted to share her experiences with others. We met after the facilitated session, and I walked her, individually, through the same questioning process (as describe in the Describing the Participants’ Process for Coding and Analysis) She had a strong desire to help others as seen in her organizations, which empowers and transforms underprivileged youth by mentoring them through physical, behavior, and educational programs. Her communication style was straightforward; however she “likes running [ideas] by the other two coaches to get their input” and she had learned ways to effectively communicate with the parents albeit “through trial and error.” Her desire to run ideas by others also showed that she sought input from others; however, she also described how the leaders of the organizations worked closely together and respected each other’s role within the organization. When faced with challenges, P4 sought inspiration from her fellow leaders and then sought ways to “make it work.” P4 was new to community organizing; however, her experiences helped to expand and validate the work processes and activities that were developed through the facilitated session.

Describing participant diversity.

Six participants were identified and confirmed for attending the facilitated session; however, due the storm the night before the session, this study is comprised of
three participants who attended the facilitated session and a fourth participant who shared her data and analysis at a later point. The four purposefully selected participants were the leaders of four different and diverse organizations seeking to transform and empower individuals from various social justice aspects including age, race, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, and income level (See Table 3). Participant 1 (P1) was the leader of a media outlet. Participant 2 (P2) was the leader of a youth homelessness organization. Participant 3 (P3) was the leader of an organization to promote conversations and actions to end racism. Participant 4 (P4) was the leader of an organization whose mission is to develop under privileged youths’ sense of self-empowerment.

Table 3.

*Participant Diversity.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Group at Risk</th>
<th>Religious Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>No/ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Race/ Low Income</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Low Income/ Race</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All four participating organizations fell within Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) SCO model’s Human Development of the Individual Quadrant; however, they were diverse with respects to their mission, field, age, and group at risk. Although P2 and P3 have a religious association, this association was about resource support. The religious association was not about defining the people they serve or missionary recruitment.

**Describing how participants’ selection data is used.**

The data gathered during the prequalifying interviews was not used to create the SCO Development Process, because this information was an interview between each
participant individually and myself, meaning the other participants were not privy to the selection data presented by fellow participants. To account for this, during the facilitated session, I asked each participant to introduce themselves and their organization. Therefore, the data about participants and their organizations gathered during the selection process is only used in the selection process and not in the creation of the SCO Development Process. In the next section, describing the participants’ process for data collection, coding, and analysis, I shift from the participants’ selection process to the data collection and analysis process, and specifically, I review the data collected, coded, and analyzed by the participants during the facilitated session.

**Describing the Participants’ Process for Data Collection, Coding, and Analysis**

With the participants selected, I turn to reviewing the study’s data collection, coding, and analysis by the participants during the facilitated session. The facilitated session was divided into three parts: (1) Participants identify and share their organization’s successful work processes, (2) participants find commonalities in work processes across their organizations, and (3) participants describe in more details the work activities and work products.

The participants conducted the first cycle coding and analysis in the facilitated session, during which they created the initial draft of the SCO Development Process. The participants’ first cycle method included two subcategories, descriptive coding and focused coding. During the first part of the facilitated session, “participants identify and share their organization’s successful work process,” participants performed a descriptive coding process, whereby participants individually brainstormed and captured on Post-its the successful work processes and activities their organization used in its development.
Then, each participant placed their Post-its on the white board and reported to the whole group a description of their organization and each of their Post-it notes. The second part of the session, “participants find commonalities in work processes across their organizations,” was where participants performed the second subcategory of analysis, focus coding. In this second part, participants searched for commonalities across the three organizations, defined five high-level categories of work activities, and moved all their Post-its to fall under the appropriate high-level Post-it. This third part to the facilitated session is what gave me the data to conduct the second cycle coding and analysis after the facilitated session. The second cycle coding and analysis that I perform after the facilitated session without the participants is discussed later in this chapter.

Participants identify and share their organizations’ successful work processes.

Participants were led through a descriptive coding process to identify the successful work processes and activities their organization performed. The facilitated session started with general introductions, the meeting purpose, agenda, and ground rules. Then, the participants were asked to introduce themselves and their organization to the group. Three questions were asked: what is your organization’s mission; what community need does your organization fulfills; and what successful work activities has your organization performed from the moment you, as the leader, recognized that something needed to be done about the said need to the present time? Each participant was given a different color of Post-it note pad and asked to take 15 minutes to brainstorm by themselves of their organization’s successful work processes and activities.
Each of the participants provided the following information. The participants’ wording is mostly verbatim both in their Post-it notes and verbal descriptions. However, there was a need to eliminate unique identifiers for vulnerable participants, their organizations, and the people they serve. To protect vulnerable subjects, not all the participants’ information is verbatim. For example, a participant provided specific names of programs the organization created to meet its mission. This information was generalized and referred to as “programs,” therein eliminating any unique identifiers for the leader and their organization.

Figure 3 represents participants’ initial definition of the work processes and activities that made their organizations successful. Each participant’s data (Post-its) were represented horizontally and in the sequential order presented. These Post-its are verbatim, except for a few where identifying data was restated generically to protect vulnerable audiences. For example, “construct facilities” is generalized from its original form, which included the specific type of media outlet, meaning the words stating the specific media outlet were replaced with a generic term, “facilities,” so the Post-it now reads “construct facilities.” Although Participant 1’s organization is not considered vulnerable, others organizations were as well as the people they all serve. Therefore, I must maintain anonymity for all participants, their organizations, and the people they serve. In the next section, participants’ share their individual data; participants’ describe their work process and activities that contributed to their organizations’ success.
Participants share their individual data. After taking 15 minutes to individually brainstorm and document on large Post-it notes the successful work processes and activities that they and their organizations performed, each participant shared their data. Participant 1 (P1) started his report, followed by Participant 2 (P2) and Participant 3 (P3). After the general introduction to their organization, participants described each of their Post-it notes. In the section that follows, I provide the nearly verbatim data of Participant 1, so you, the reader, can see an example of what was said; however, for P2, P3, and P4, I provide a summary of their report outs.

Participant 1 (P1) started by placing three Post-its on the whiteboard: (1) “public meetings,” (2) “digital communications,” and (3) “targeted outreach.” He then described
each Post-it note. Throughout the facilitated session, participants were encouraged to add additional Post-its with successful work processes and activities. Following P3’s report out, P1 contributed two additional Post-its: (4) “construct facilities,” and (5) “administer station,” which were not describe as in depth during the first cycle coding, but rather during the data gathering for the second cycle coding. The following is P1’s report out about his organization, he stated:

The mission of our media outlet is two-fold. The first part is to launch a community communication solution including tactical means and system set up, and the second part is to bring voice to underrepresented perspectives – opening up, diversifying, and democratizing the airways. The community needs is that media [in this region] could use more diversity and more representation of under represented and marginalized voices, thoughts, and music.

Successful activities so far, we have used three major tactics in developing the organization. The first two were how we engaged the public, which was important for listeners as well as people interested in producing content. The third was important for funding and running the station.

For his Post-it reading “public meetings”, P1 said:

For analysis meaning is this really a thing or is this a handful of us that have this abstract idea that this is really cool. From a simple Facebook post that asked who is interested in this – spread the word. From word of mouth we said we would have a public meeting. If
interested, come and quite a few people came. Many of us did not
know each other. A lot of diverse representation was there. The
consensus from that meeting was – yes. This is something that many
different people are interested in. Public meetings were used in the
analysis phase. We used public meetings to broaden engagement with
supporters hand-in-hand with digital communications.

The key success identified from this Post-it was reaching into the community.
Reaching into the community was seen as a common activity across all three
participants at the facilitated session as well as for P4.

Regarding his Post-it reading “digital communications”, P1 stated:

Digital communications is low overhead and a good way to reach a
good deal of people. Primarily used Facebook and email lists, so when
we have a public meeting we make sure new people to the meeting
sign-up for email list. We use the email list, as a heartbeat of what is
going on and provide notes incase people could not make it. Between
these two things, Facebook and email lists, there is very low overhead.
It is very important for use to have low overhead because we have to
save every penny for construction of the tower.

His last Post-it presented in the initial report out was, “target outreach.” P1
said:

We need to get people who are interested in listening to the station;
people who are interested in using the station; and people who are
interested in funding and running the station. For the last one, targeted
outreach was important, so when it came time to get a full-time board to fund and run the station, it would reflect diversity, reflect young people who saw the vision and mission of it, and had organizing experience. We had to put out feelers, which is tough, because finding people who are organizers and have the time to commit is a challenge. So we had to target and ask specific people: who might fit this role. Targeted outreach was used for funding as well. Please through us a few bucks is not really going to work when you need to raise $20-30,000. So, we used targeted outreach to certain organizations we thought would be sympathetic and support our mission. We met with labor unions, law firms, and organizations like that. We did get commitment when we could convey commonalities in our vision with their interests. We used these three basic tools [public meeting, digital communications, and targeted outreach] because of their success to bring a lot of other activities together, which has made this project successful.

As the conversation continued, P1 added two more successful activities. The first was “construct facilities,” which he noted, “Much discussion was had about whether to buy property or rent.” The second added Post-it was “administrator station,” which he provided no narrative.

P1 attributed his success to a three-step process: public meetings, digital communications, and targeted outreach. Whenever he encountered a work process or activity that required expertise or assistance, he employed the three-step process. He also
saw this three step process as overarching to the whole process he took, meaning to start his organization he used public meeting to get people’s excitement and buy-in, then communicated the progress of developing the organization, and finally reached out to specific people with specific expertise. He targeted specific people to come onboard.

After P1 reported out, P2 answered the same three questions: what is your organization’s mission; what community needs does your organization fulfills; and what successful work activities has your organization performed? She placed her Post-its on the whiteboard and reported out the following work processes: (1) Started conversations with state, county, and city leaders; (2) community focus groups; (3) giving victims a platform to tell their story; (4) calling people and organizations out for abuses; (5) partnering organizations; (6) making your organization attractive with branding; and (7) developing programs to meet our mission. Later during the session, P2 contributed two additional work processes: (8) nurturing grantor relationship building and (9) development of the building and its plans. What follows are highlights about her organization and the nine successful work processes that she identified.

From P2’s report out, I have four and a half page of transcript, so I present here a summary of her data. To summarize the mission of P2’s organization, I pull on one of her statements, “The mission of our organization is to advance and promote the dignity and wellbeing of youth experiencing homelessness and extreme poverty.” A key to her organization’s success was that they have differentiated themselves from other homeless shelter, because they did not discriminate “by race,” “by sexual orientation,” “by religion,” or “experience with the juvenile justice system.” She believed that with the limited funding for
community organizations, an organization must differentiate their mission by stating, “We separate ourselves from other youth housing programs, because we accept all youth.” She mentioned this key success factor several times throughout her report out.

Specific to her first Post-it, “started conversations with state, county, and city leaders” she talked about the importance of knowing and sharing hard facts with people. She stated, “We started with conversations about youth homelessness with the city mayor, county commissioners, senators and state representatives.” In addition to presenting the vision and mission of the organization, they had numbers showing a picture of youth homelessness by demographic. A key factor to her success was being prepared with facts; she said, “We went in with the numbers, which are hard to dispute.”

Regarding her Post-it “community focus groups,” she explained: “We started out doing focus groups by approaching community youth groups for at risk youth and asking questions such as, what would you like to see in a shelter?” From the many questions she asked during the focus group, P2 and her board gain a better understanding about the needs of homeless youth. She also felt that by seeking youths’ input they would feel apart of the process. She proposed, “We wanted to give youth autonomy, their own voice, and have input into what they need, when they need it and where they need it. It is important to engage youth in the processes to help them.” This is also why her organization fell within the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant.
To expand upon her Post-it “giving victims a platform to tell their story,” she said, “We are working with other area organizations to end homelessness and give the homeless a voice.” In so doing, her organization is pleading to the hearts of people who can stop youth homelessness. She says, “…using youths’ stories to put a face to youth homelessness without exploiting them.” She stressed throughout the session that this has to be done without hurting or exploiting the victims of homelessness.

In describing the Post-it “calling people and organizations out for abuses,” she explained that her organization publicly calls people out for hurting the people she serves by stating, “We made it our mission to make enemies of certain organizations by calling them out publically.” She also talks about being strategic when calling out.

For her Post-it reading “partnering organizations”, P1 said, “Partnership organizations have been pivotal to our work and success.” When partnering she proposed that several key success factors: (1) “Partnership organizations can go in both direction and play many roles.” (2) “We work with each partnership to identify how they can help: financial, advocacy, human resources, training, etc.” (3) “By attracting one large organization, we were able to attract others.”

For her Post-it with the successful work process of “make your organization attractive with branding,” she expanded by saying: Branding our organization so that there is no confusion about who our organization is and whom we serve.” One way they accomplished this was by, “creating elevator speeches.”
Regarding her Post-it reading “develop programs to meet our mission,” she said, “We defined programs and services that would help us meet our mission. These were defined through community focus groups and through partnering organizations.” She once again mentioned the need for allies and building partner by stating, “Another key to success is to create a program that uses resources from multiple organizations.”

Specific to the Post-it “nurturing grantor relationship building,” she stated, “For the long term, we work to nurture relationship with organizations that provide grants; however, we will not chase grants nor will we change our mission to win a grant.” And, pertaining to her last Post-it “development of the building and its plan,” she provided no narrative. These two Post-its were added later in the session, which will be discussed.

Similar to P1, P2’s discussion focused on defining a mission, communicating to various audiences, and reaching out to get community involvement. In addition, P2’s organization viewed branding the organization and developing programs to meet the mission as necessary and successful work processes. P2 attributed her success to communications with her board, the partnerships with other organizations, and the people the organization serves.

Following P2’s report out was P3’s report out. Similar to P2, P3 had five and a half pages of transcript, so I present her report out in summary. P3 placed her Post-its on the white board and proceeded to tell the group about the organization and the work processes and activities that made her organization success. P3’s includes discussion on eleven successful work processes: (1) Talk about positive experiences with the program,
(2) test groups, (3) forums with witnesses to the effectiveness of dialogues, (4) implement and publicize action plans, (5) utilize groups who have met to tell story, (6) develop steering committee, (7) good training, (8) talk to people face-to-face, (9) building allies, (10) simplify, and (11) grant writing and fund raising. P3 did not add any work processes based upon hearing the report out from others. The following is a summary of her report out for each Post-it.

To describe her organization’s mission she stated, “Our mission is to create a group of 12-15 people who will have conversation about racism.” Their organization held many of these conversations a year, and from each conversation, an action plan was created and the group was held accountable for its implementation.

Looking at the successful activities on her Post-its, P2 started by elaborating on “talk about positive experiences with the program.” She talked about the importance of advertising an organization’s successful experiences. She gave examples of how their organization was brought to the area as well as how shared experiences had created allies. She stated, “There were two of us in the room who had participated in these conversational groups,” so their success with this organization in the past encouraged them to start the organization in their city.

For her next Post-it “test groups,” she stated, “We set up a test group at the local newspaper and county housing organization. There were very successful, so what we had other forums.” This was the start of her organization.

Regarding her Post-it “forums with witnesses to the effectiveness of dialogues,” she said, “In the racism and education forums, we had people that had been in the test group who witnessed the life changing experiences they had with
the program. They sing our praise and attest to the benefits of the program.”

Again, she had a theme of marketing an organization’s successes.

Pertaining to the Post-it “implement and publicize action plans,” she presented, “At the end of each dialog people put together an action plan.” The conversation was in two parts: identifying specific issue around racism and developing action plans to eliminate those specific racism issues. The organization and the groups, “Publicize these action plans.” Her organization and their action plans have been in the local newspaper.

In describing her Post-it “utilize groups who have met to tell story,” she stated, “The people who have been apart of groups are now telling the story about the groups.” They used local public radio, town halls, and documentaries to tell their successful stories.

Pertaining to the Post-it “develop steering committee,” she said, “Be strategic.” Steering committees are there to help with the workload, but to be successful they require training, which led to her next Post-it “good training.” She elaborated on the importance of good training to both meet the mission and represent the organization.

In describing her Post-it “talk to people face-to-face,” she said, “We are now going face-to-face to groups. We went to the YWCA; their imperative is the elimination of racism. As a result of a face-to-face, they had a group at the last forum. They have become allies for us.” Again, her Post-its had linkages between them, as seen by this one and the next one, “building allies.” She proceeded to
discuss the importance of building partnering allies and the resources that their
organization has benefited from in so doing.

About her Post-it “simplify,” she discussed the importance of reevaluating
the organization once it is up and running. She proposed; when organizations start
they over complicate things, therefore organizations need to reevaluate their
missions, programs, and resources.

Specific to her remaining Post-it “grant writing and fund raising,” she
stated, “Do not chase grants; do not change your mission to win grants. Allies
provide for most of our needs.” The other participants, including P4, unanimously
agreed to the sentiment of not chasing grants.

P3 did not add any additional successful work activities when asked. She, like P1
and P2, discussed the importance of communication, reaching into the community, and
sharing successes. Although all the work processes added to her organization’s success,
she attributed her success to building allies and publicizing the organization’s success.
For example, her organization built a relationship with a community newspaper that then
shared the organization’s successes with the community through various articles. She
proposed that people want to be a part of a successful organization. In her report out, she
contributed a work process that was different from P1 and P2, which was simplify. With
the start up of an organization, leaders tend to over commit what the organization will
accomplish. After a year or so, she proposed that the board (or steering committee) must
reevaluate the organization’s mission, resources, and programs to streamline based upon
resources and what is truly needed.
Due to weather conditions, P4 was unable to attend the facilitated session at the last minute; however, she wanted to participate, so I met with her afterward and led her through the same process and questions as those who attended the facilitated session. She was asked the same three questions: (1) what is your organization’s mission; (2) what community need does your organization fulfills; and (3) what activities has your organization performed from the moment you, as the leader, recognized that something needed to be done about the said need to the present time? She was given time to individually brainstorm and write her answers on large Post-it notes. Once she had all of her Post-its written, she placed them on a whiteboard and reported out. Again, I presented her report out in summary format. She providing five Post-its: (1) “travel for the kids,” (2) “mental health programs,” (3) “tutors,” (4) “our hours, availability, and family atmosphere,” and (5) “food programs.” P4 started her reported out by describing her organization, “Our mission is to reduce childhood obesity, reduce gang violence, and promote self-esteem. It’s to produce a well-rounded individual.” Her organization formed out of necessity, because the schools stopped providing extra-curricular activities. After describing her organization, she started to describe her Post-its. Her first Post-it was “travel for the kids,” of which she said, “We started with 4-6 kids. When we started to travel, that started to attract a lot of kids.”

Critical to her organization’s success were the work processes of identifying programs that the youth needed, which included the next three Post-its.

Specific to the Post-it “mental health programs,” she discussed how the travel brought youth to the organization, which created more needs. A large national nonprofit organization was brought on board, which “helped us get our
501c(3), and they had a program that helped us paint, fix a bathroom, and just make the place nicer.” Her next Post-it was “tutors.” Tutoring with homework was seen as a big need for the kids. In describing her last Post-it about programs, the “food programs” Post-it she said, “We have partnered with Children’s Hunger Alliance; they bring food – a dinner at night and a snack during the day. I’m hoping Panera Breads will help too.” Through conversation within and between organizations, she identified programs that the children need. She states, “We just talk about what we are seeing in the kids and what might help the kids that are how our programs are created. It’s really a lot of work.”

Her last Post-it was also about meeting the needs of the children as well as a differentiating factor for their organization. To expand upon her Post-it “our hours, availability, and family atmosphere,” she stated, “We are open and available to the kids; we have long hours. We want them to have a place to go and feel like they belong and are wanted. You know a family.”

P4 was very similar to P2; both organizations’ mission was to directly help young people. They both based their success on developing programs that met the mission and the needs of the people they serve, and they both managed their boards. Their boards’ function was to help obtain resources; however, they had to remind their boards that the mission came before funding. Philanthropists often direct how an organization can use the donated resources, which can be in conflict with the mission. Like P2, P4 was operating for a couple years without a board or much outside support; however, a local philanthropy organization became aware of P4’s organization and helped them file charitable status, form a board, and reach out to partnering organizations. After her report
out of successful work processes and activities, I presented the participants’ initial process created during the facilitated session. P4 was asked if she wanted to add any additional work processes and activities; she did not. Her discussion about the similarities and differences between the participants’ process and her successful work process and activities focused on the building allies, and specifically, defining programs to meet the needs of the people they serve.

The next section continues with the participants at the facilitated session; however, they moved to the second part of the facilitated session that was looking for commonalities across their three organizations. The following section discusses the three participants’ creation of an initial draft of the SCO Development Process.

**Participants find commonalities across their organizations’ work processes.**

Following the initial report out of their organizations’ successful work processes and activities, the white board displayed the participant organizations’ successful work processes and activities in rows of Post-its. (See Figure 3.) After the identifying and sharing of successful work processes, participants were facilitated through finding the commonalities across organizations. This section describes how participants found commonalities and ultimately created the initial drafted of the SCO Development process. (See Figure 4.)
To identify commonalities across organizations’ work processes, I simply asked, “Do you see commonalities?” All the participants agreed that there were commonalities and started to identify Post-its that were in common. The following is the discussion that generated the five phases. This discussion is in four parts: (1) Defining the three core phases, (2) defining the fifth phase, (3) defining the first phase, (4) understanding P4’s experience with the five phases. As participant defined each phase, they moved their Post-its to fall under the appropriate phase. The participants drafted the initial process, which include five phases with subordinate work activities and steps. (See Figure 4.) The discussion to define the three core phases was long and deliberate; therefore, I present a summary of the discussion to define the five phases.

Figure 4. First Cycle Coding’s Phases and Work Activities.

CALLING PEOPLE/ORG. OUT FOR ABUSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining The Need</th>
<th>Engaging the Public</th>
<th>Telling Your Story</th>
<th>Building Allies</th>
<th>Taking Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for Action</td>
<td>* Public Meetings</td>
<td>* Digital</td>
<td>Targeted Outreach</td>
<td>Construct Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one was doing!</td>
<td>Started Conversations w/ State, County, City Leadership</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already Doing; Make Official</td>
<td>Community Focus Groups</td>
<td>Giving Actual Homeless Youth a Platform to Tell Their Story!</td>
<td>Partner Organizations</td>
<td>Administer Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Step Planning</td>
<td>Talk About Positive Experiences w/ the Program</td>
<td>Publicize Action Plans</td>
<td>* Building Allies</td>
<td>Programs to Meet Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Political Strategies (initial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Political Strategies (enhanced)</td>
<td>* Development of Building &amp; Its Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Allies</td>
<td>Test Groups</td>
<td>Utilize Groups who have met to tell the story</td>
<td>Allies help build the plan</td>
<td>Grantor Relationship Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding - Differentiating Self</td>
<td>Forums with Witnesses to the Effectiveness of Dialog</td>
<td>Talk to people face-to-face</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Simplify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research to What I Exists &amp; Best Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Money doesn’t drive mission</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Steering Committee (be strategic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do You Stick Around; Decision to Commit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good Training (Steering &amp; Facilitators)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implement Action Plans (ea. Dialog Group) | | | | Grant Writing/ Fundraising |

| (See Figure 4.) The discussion to define the three core phases was long and deliberate; therefore, I present a summary of the discussion to define the five phases. |
**Defining the three core phases.** I asked, “Do you see commonalities?” P2 claimed that P1’s “Outreach” was similar to her “started conversation with state, county, and city leadership, community focus groups,” and “test groups.” P3 said, “My ‘talk to people face-to-face’ is also similar”. So, I moved the Post-its together and asked if there was a name for this group of Post-its? P2 said, “Yes, it is the public engagement part.” I told the participants that I was going to write the phase names in actionable language, so if I miss represent what they say to correct me. I created a title Post-it, “Engaging the Public” and placed it on the white board above the three Post-its. As we reviewed the grouping of Post-its, P3 clarified, “building allies may be part of the public engagement, but I think, I hear public engagement is the reaching out to people, and there is a difference if you bring them on board, which is building allies.” I then asked, “is building allies another phase?” They agreed, so I created a title Post-it with “Building Allies” and placed on the white board.

I reminded participants that this is an iterative process, so nothing is permanent until they want it to be. The following discussion ensued as the participants identified commonalities, and moved the Post-its under these two phases, “Engaging the Public” and “Building Allies.” P1 started the conversations by stating, “I would put targeted outreach under building allies … targeted outreach is aimed at those people who should be involved but aren’t yet.” He continued by placing digital communication under engaging the public, because “digital communications as primarily used, in my case, as supporters who can’t always make the public meetings.”

To identify third core phase, P3 then added her thoughts by saying, “I think your “digital communications” and “calling people out” is also telling your
story. We used people who have been through groups to tell our story. You are using youth (P2) and you (P1) are telling your story through digital communications.” I asked if this small cluster of Post-its is another phase? They all agreed, so I wrote on a title Post-it, “Telling Your Story,” and grouped the two above-mentioned Post-its under it. Later in the discussion “calling people out” was moved to fall under both “Telling Your Story” and “Building Allies.”

The participants then discussed if creating a board was a part of building allies. No consensus was reached; I say this because many discussions started and stopped without resolution, but later in the session, the topic would see resolution. After the unresolved discussion about where they formed a board, the discussion moved towards sequencing the three phases: “Engaging the Public”, “Telling Your Story”, and “Building Allies.” P1 confirmed the sequence of the phases by stating, ““Building Allies” comes after “Engaging the Public” and “Telling Your Story”. That makes sense as a sequence for my organization.” I asked the other two participants, “Does this make sense for your organizations?” Both P2 and P3 agreed.

The participants proceeded to place the appropriate Post-its under the three title Post-its; however, several Post-its still did not have a home under a title Post-it, so I facilitated them through identifying more phases of work. Below is a synopsis of this discussion.

Identifying the last phase of the process, “Taking Action.” At this point in the discussion, the three core phases to the process were identified, so I asked if there were additional title Post-its or phases to the process they took to create their

As the participants made light of the ideas for this phase, I created a title Post-it, action, and added to the white board after “Building Allies.” P3 sarcastically made light of the phase by saying, “What? This is for real? We are actually doing what we say we are going to do?” And, P1 said, “How did we miss that; it is where everything comes together.” I asked, “What Post-its belong under this phase?” P3 started with the distribution of her Post-its by stating, “Under “Taking Action”, I would put simplify, developing steering committees, good training and implement action plans.” P2 moved her Post-it “programs to meet mission,” while P1’s original three Post-its had already been moved to the core three phases.

At this point, the process had four phases and the appropriate work activities (i.e., Post-its) had been moved under each phase, so I asked, “With these four phases, are there other work activities that fall under these phases of work?” It was at this time in the session that the P1 and P2 added Post-its. P1 added two addition Post-its to the “Taking Action” phase: “Construct facilitates” and “administer station.” P2 added three work activities under the “Taking Action” phases, “development of a building”, “its plan”, and “grantor relationship building.” P3 did not create any additional work processes; however, she moved
several of her existing ones by stating, “For me, put implement action plans and
grant writing/ fundraising goes under “ Taking Action”.”

With four phases defined, most of the Post-its aligned with one of the four
phases; however, there were still Post-its from their report outs that remained
uncategorized, so the discussion moved towards an additional phase, the first
phase of the process.

**Identifying the first phase, “Defining the Need.”** Post-its remained on the
white board unattached to a phase, so to start the discussion of where to place the
remaining Post-its, participants were asked, “Are there other headers? Did you
start with “Engaging the Public?” P1 started the discussion by what happened in
his organizations by saying:

When I was looking at this, I thought an analysis had to happen first.

What is our goal? Is this feasible? And, what is involved? And prior
to getting into super details, is there any interest? And, what are the
steps to get this going. We created a broad sketch and then we began
the organizing of engaging the public, telling your story, building
allies, and action. The first step, the need, gives you a pretty good idea
of what you are going to do, not to the tee but, it gives you a sense – a
plan.

So I stated, “I hear that there is another phase prior to “Engaging the
Public”? Is it just you in this “Defining the Needs” phase or is it you and someone
else?” With this question, discussion ensued to clarify the first phase of the
process, “Defining the Need.” After P1 outlined how his organization started, P2
did as well. The start to her organization was different since she was already
doing the work on a small scale out of her house. Discussion ensued about how all
three organizations started and the implications for the first phase, “Defining the
Need.”

The three participants agreed that they worked with others (i.e., co-leaders,
boards, community members, and so forth) to clarify and define the need that
would address the problem that they encountered. Throughout their discussion,
the remaining Post-its were distributed under the phase, “Defining the Need.” As
they completed this task, they merged existing work processes and generated new
ones. For example, political strategies were the culmination of several activities
(i.e., their Post-its). This work activity was placed under “Defining the Need” as
creating an initial political strategy, and then again, placed under the phase
“Building Allies” as an iterative enhancement work activity.

With a draft of the SCO Development Process by the participants who
attended the facilitated session, I discussed this process with P4 and added her
successful work activities to the process as described below.

Understanding P4’s experience with the five phases. As discussed previously,
after the facilitated session I led P4 through the same facilitated process. Wherein I asked
her to brainstorm and then report out her organization’s successful work processes. Now,
I want to discuss P4’s review of the process created by the three participants during the
facilitated session. I reviewed the process with P4 and asked if she could place her Post-
its (i.e., work process) into the five phases. A lengthy discussion ensued. A summary of
that discussion is that P4 saw individual work activities as overlapping with her
organization’s development; however, she did not see her organization as following these five phases. With their focus on developing and implementing programs, she believed that they only worked within the last phase, “Taking Action”. This may be due to their approach to leading and growing the organization. In P4’s organization the three leaders are working together everyday; they did not have to schedule meetings to discuss ideas rather they had a continuous state of discussion. In addition, their growth was based on an intervention by one of the larger local philanthropy organizations that filed for charitable status, formed their board, and introduced them to other organizations. The three leaders of this organization are focused on the day-to-day operations, which echoes the advice of the other three participants – form a board to help manage funding, charitable status, and allies. As a result of conducted the second cycle coding and analysis of her data, I propose that the work process and activities performed by the organization as a whole fit within the phases of the process.

Participants describe in more detail the work activities and work products.

At this point in the facilitated session, the participants identified five phases of work and within each phase, they identified subsequent work activities. Therefore, after the participants completed the process with their five phases and placing their Post-its under the appropriate phase (or phases), they were asked to further describe and explain many of the Post-its. (See the “*” Post-its in Figure 4.) Specifically, I asked them how they completed a work activity and who completed the work activity. Some Post-it notes were not further discussed, because they felt the previous discussion exhausted the conversation. For example, in the “Defining the Need” phase, participants identified step planning as a subsequent work activity. When asked to expand on what was done during
this work activity they discussed defining the vision and mission, organizing a board or steering committee, conducting a SWOT analysis, and drafting a program plans. Within each of these work activities, they outlined in more detail the work completed, which fed into the second cycle coding and analysis that I performed after the facilitated session on the data gathered from the whole facilitated session (i.e., but not including the qualifying interview data). This additional data from the third part of the facilitated session and the second cycle coding and analysis resulted in a more complete and usable SCO Development Process.

Describing How I Enhanced the Participants’ Draft SCO Development Process

While the study met its purpose to organize the work processes and activities into an overarching process, the participants’ draft of the process would be hard to use. For the process to be useable I performed a second cycle coding and analysis using data from all four parts of the facilitated session: Participants share their individual data; participants find commonalities across their organizations’ work processes; participants draft the initial SCO Development Process; and participants describe in more detail the work activities and processes. The additional data gathered included an in-depth narrative about the work processes: what, how, when, and why work was done. In addition, they provided examples of their experiences. To state it another way, after the facilitated session and without the participants, I conducted a second cycle coding and analysis on their process and the additional data to form a more usable and complete Social Change Organization (SCO) Development Process. The process is more useable in that the work activities and steps are more descriptive and in a sequential order with sample work products. The process is more complete in that through my coding and analysis, I
identified an additional phase, “Funding the Organization.” While the participants formed the board in the first phase, “Defining the Need,” they delegated the work of “Funding the Organization” to their board, maintaining their focus on the first five phases. In the remainder of this chapter, I discuss my process for coding and analyzing the participants’ data as well as provide a description of each of the SCO Development Process’s phases.

**Describing my process for coding and analysis.**

As presented in Chapter 3, I conducted the second cycle coding and analysis using two subcategories: axial coding and process coding. The second cycle coding and analysis included axial and process coding. Saldana (2013) proposes that axial coding enabled the formation of a hierarch of codes based upon “importance and dominance” of the codes and data, which created the SCO Development Process with sequential and hierarchical phases, activities, and steps. After axial coding, process coding expanded and formatted the participants’ codes by turning them into actions, therein making them more explanatory and understandable for users to apply in a process. In addition, process coding enhanced the timing aspect of the SCO Development Process. Meaning, process coding identified when work products were drafted, enhanced, and implemented throughout the six phases of the SCO Development Process.

To code and analyze the data, the participants used a linear process, while I used an iterative process, meaning I moved back and forth between axial and process coding to create the SCO Development Process. For example, as I completed the axial coding for the work product, program plan, it was identified that the plan was being implemented in “Taking Action” but was never developed. Rereading participant data identified that they
discussed its initial draft in “Defining the Need” when discussing resource requirements. Therefore, I used an iterative cycle between axial and process coding to account for the development and implementation of all work processes and products in the SCO Development Process. The following paragraphs provide a summary description of how I used the participants’ data to create a more useable SCO Development Process.

I would like to start with a reminder that the SCO Development Process consists of phases, work activities, work steps, work products, and guiding experiences. To create the SCO Development Process, I first summarized the objective of each phase and work activity as presented by the participants during the facilitated session. Then from the participant data, I looked for the work products that would support the work activities. Once I understood the objectives of the work activities and the work products, I was able to define the individualized work steps to complete the work activities and work products. Work products are knowledge-based documents and presentations that are used to gather, organize, analyze, and present information. Within the data was the participants’ advice to other leaders; these nuggets became the guiding experiences presented throughout the development process.

In the following discussion, I present quotes from the participants’ data to support my formation of the SCO Development Process; and specifically, I show how a few of the work products were created. Although I only provide a few quotes as support for the formation of work products, my coding and analysis to form these work products was based upon all their data and not just the few quotes presented below. Figure 4 shows that from the participants’ data, I identified five work products: Draft Mission Statement, SWOT Model, Resource Plan, Program Plan, and Political Strategy. The following
discussion and participants’ quotes shows how participant data supports the formation of the work products within the SCO Development Process. Usually a participant made a statement about a successful work they did, which gave the foundation and structure for the work product. Then, the other participants provided their experiences on the topic. I reviewed the participants’ data to extrapolate all other references that would create a more useable work product. I only provide two examples: SWOT Model and Allies’ Cost Model. (At this time, a quick review of Appendix E’s SWOT Model and Allies’ Cost Model might be helpful.

**Work product: SWOT model.** During the session, participants discussed how many times they heard the response, “no.” P3 said, “There is a famous line from *Princess Bride*, “get use to disappointment.” This is important with the public meeting and engagement. You don’t always get what you want.” P1 proposed that to better prepare for these encounters, the organization must create a Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunity-Threats (SWOT) model. A SWOT model “helps overcome barriers,” and he further clarified that preparation includes “understand[ing] the people and organizations you [your organization] impacts and the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, [and threats] of your organization. Use concentric circles to identify who you impact with your organization and the people you serve at the core. Take the time to map this out; [it] will prepare you for those tough conversations.” (See Appendix E, p. 11, Work Activity: Conduct a SWOT Analysis.) This conversation is where the work product, “Stakeholder Diagram” originated. Throughout the facilitated session, the participants frequently referred to their stakeholders (a.k.a., allies, non-allies, partners,
influential people and organizations, and so forth). All of these references and conversations led to the development of the SWOT Model work products: “Stakeholder Map”, “Strengths and Weaknesses” table, and “Opportunities and Threats” table. As demonstrated in this example, the work products were generated from the participant data. In the following paragraph, I provide another example, the “Allies’ Cost Model.”

**Work product: Allies’ cost model.** I chose to show support for this work product, “Allies’ Cost Model,” because to me it seemed very detailed and random. However, the participants saw mapping the cost of allies important, because allies often times have strings attached to the resources they provide. All four participants recommended that organizations walk away from allies that make requests that would change their organization’s vision and mission or cause some type of harm to the people they serve. P4 stated that resources from allies “are more work than what they are worth and they tell you how to spend the money. It was hard for our board to understand that grants didn’t help us meet our needs – the thing that is making us successful and differentiating us from other organizations. We had to say “no” to their [allies] help.” Although this work product may seem detailed or random, all four participants saw this advice as imperative; therefore, I present the data that supports this work product.

The purpose of building allies is to form connections with other people and organizations that in someway support the vision and mission of the organization. This support takes several forms: social-political, resources, or shared vision and mission to support the people your organization serves. P2 expressed that to build allies “I think part
of building allies is helping then to catch the vision both your partners and those you serve. So that you don’t beg for them to give...to your programs.” However, the participants then talked about the cost of allies. P2 further stated, “We had to check ourselves at the door… are the allies we are creating serving the people we serve first and us [the board] last, because the goal is to serve the people we serve regardless of our goals [of raising funding] and ourselves. If our allies have harmed the people we serve in some way then we should not be allies with them even if they can financially help us.” The participants then started to discuss a work step to evaluate the cost of allies. P3 stated, “Another thing is counting the cost. There are some allies you really need who are costly.” P1 proposed, “Costly outside of financials like social.” They then discussed the social and political cost of allies, at which time P3 said, “If you befriend and create an ally you may effectively alienate someone else.” Through these conversations, it became clear that understanding the benefits and costs associated with each ally must be specifically evaluated hence the work product, “Allies’ Cost Model.” (See Appendix E.) The “Allies’ Cost Model” compares the following: The vision and mission between the organization and the ally; the resource benefits and costs of an ally; and the social and political benefits and costs of an ally. While P3’s statement proposed this as a work step, the statements by all three participants provided the foundation and structure for the model. To identify this and other work products, I reviewed all of the participants’ data to extrapolate other references that helped create the detail of the work products as well as the work activities and steps.
Now, I provide a summary of each of the six phases of the final draft of SCO Development Process. For the more complete and usable Social Change Organization Development Process, see Appendix E.

**Figure 5: Social Change Organization Development Process**

**Describing the SCO Development Process.**

The Social Change Organization Development Process consists of a hierarchy of work: phases, activities, and steps. Phases are distinctive categories of work that the participants defined during the facilitated session. Within each phase multiple activities were identified. Activities segment the work of a phase into manageable efforts. Within each activity multiple steps were identified. Steps are a further breakdown of work into smaller work efforts. To direct the work activities and steps, work products were
identified. Work products are knowledge-based documents and presentation that are used to gather, organize, analyze, or present information. In addition, participants provided their advice, which was coded and analysis as guiding experience. The participants’ guiding experiences provide background as to why activities, steps, and work products are recommended and why these process components increase the likelihood of success.

The SCO Development Process has a general flow from left to right; however, the development of work products is iterative and may cycle back to activities and steps in previous phases. To develop an organization, a person begins by “Defining The Need,” and then moves to “Engaging The Public,” then to “Telling Your Story,” and so forth; “Funding The Organization” is pictorially placed across the bottom for two reasons. One, it can be started anytime during the first five phases, and second; all four participant leaders recommended forming a board to manage the activities of this phase. The board’s management of this phase enabled the leader to keep their focus on the other five phases. In general, the flow is from left to right; however, as the leader moves through the five phases, they engage people and develop allies. These allies contribute knowledge vital to the development of work products; hence the iterative approach to work product development.

**Describing the phase, “Defining the Need.”**

The purpose of the first phase, “Defining the Need,” is to create a high level plan to explore and understand the need, the level of effort to required meeting the need, and the interest people have in forming an organization to meet the need. In this phase, the organization drafts the following work products: Vision statement, mission statement,
SWOT model, program plan, and political strategy. The work products prepare the organization for discussions with other organizations, by encouraging the leader to ask questions about the need and the level of effort to meet the need. Many of the work products initiated in this phase require input from multiple audiences, which is ascertained in future phases; therefore in this phase, work products are initiated but not complete. For example, the leader initiates defining the vision and mission; however, finalizing the vision and mission statements occurs after they have engaged the public and built allies. While the purpose of “Defining the Need” is to explore and understand the need and effort to meet the need, the purpose of the next phase, “Engaging the Public,” is to solicit the community’s input as to the need and formation of an organization to meet the need.

Describing the phase, “Engaging the Public.”

The purpose of the second phase, “Engaging the Public,” is to communicate with the public, therein engaging people with a passion for the organization’s vision, and who wants to actively participate. This phase starts after the vision, mission, goals, and programs are refined with the board or steering committee. The goal is to engage and solicit the public’s input, support, knowledge, and resources. In preparation for engaging the public, the members (i.e., leaders and board) develop two work products: Meeting standards and public engagement plan. Defining the organization’s meeting standards ensures that everyone in the organization understands the organization’s expectation for meeting preparedness and conduct. Creating a public engagement plan ensures that the organizations has the required and timely input from the public and uses the public’s time effectively and efficiently. During the “Engaging the Public” phase, the leader and board
work with the community to further their understanding of the need and potential solutions as well as to solicit the community’s involvement. Understanding the perspectives of the community enables the organization to move into the next phase, “Telling Your Story,” which focuses on marketing and communications.

**Describing the phase, “Telling Your Story.”**

The purpose of the third phase, “Telling Your Story,” is two fold. First is to create a clear, concise, memorable, and transparent image of what the organization accomplishes and whom it serves. Second purpose is to keep the supporters of the organization informed. Supporters include people internal and external to the organizations as well as other organizations – for-profit, nonprofit, government, religious, and so forth. To meet this purpose, the phase develops two work products: Marketing messages and a communication plan. Marketing messages help gain the support by creating a clear understanding of the life stories of the people the organization serves and how those stories have led to the organization’s vision, mission, and programs. This phase gives victims and the under privileged a platform for telling their story and how they are transforming their life. Through telling their stories, the organization is empowering their voices. The communication of these stories must be strategic and well planned, and the communication of these stories cannot exploit victims or the under privileged. To be strategic and well planned, a communication plan is developed. The communication plan targets people and organizations both inside and outside the organization with the purpose to keep audiences informed of the organization’s activities as well as to make requests from audiences. The communication plan is different from the public engagement plan from the previous phase, “Engaging the Public.” The public
engagement plan targets communications with the general public that might be interested in the organization’s vision and mission, while the communication plan targets specific people and groups of people to keeps them informed about the organizations progress and activities. With the communication plan drafted and the marketing messages defined, the organization proceeds into the next phase, “Building Allies.” In this phase, the organization works to become an integral part of the community by making allies with other organizations and people.

**Describing the phase, “Building Allies.”**

The purpose of the fourth phase, “Building Allies,” it to form connections with other community organizations, the community’s influential people, and philanthropists. Creating a community organization is political in nature and the best way to manage the politics is to create a plan and gain support at both the individual and organizational level. At the individual level, each community has people of influence. These are people who have been around a long time, have worked to improve the community, and are respected by the community and community’s government. At the organizational level, organizations with like visions and missions work together to more broadly and completely meet the community needs. The goal is to align the organizations and share resources across organizations (i.e., networks, programs, human resources). After meeting with allies and gaining their feedback, all the previous drafted work products should be updated, where applicable. The work products that help meet the purpose of this phase are the political strategy, ally’s cost model, program and ally plan, and a resource plan.
These work products interlink to help the participant leader provide to the board the resource requirements that the board must obtain. In the first phase, a political strategy was drafted and has been enhanced as additional knowledge is gained. This work product outlines whom the organization sees as allies, how the organizations can work together, and why they should work together. The ally’s cost model helps gather and organize information as to the cost of each ally. Some allies are too costly in that they violate the organization’s vision for how the people are treated or they use too many resources. As a part of this work product the organization defines its breakaway point from an individual or organization. The program and ally plan links the programs required to meet the organization’s mission with the resources allies provide for each program. Each program may have one or more allies’ assistance. Both the ally cost model and the program and ally plan feed information to the resource plan. The resource plan outlines the resources required and the assistance provided by allies, noting, that resources are not always financial. An example of allies working together is a coalition, such as neighborhood coalition or coalition for the homeless (e.g. youth vs. adult shelters, east side vs. west side shelters, and so forth). However, allies can be from all types of organizations; thinking outside the box is essential.

“Building Allies” is formal; for organizations to be allies, a formal agreement or memorandum is established. Often to bring organizations into an alliance, a strategic and target outreach to people or organizations is required. In this phase, “Building Allies,” the organization gains information about itself from other community organizations as well as potential working relationships. The process’s work products are updated and these work products are implemented in the next phase, “Taking Action.”
Describing the phase, “Taking Action.”

The purpose of the fifth phase, “Taking Action,” is to implement all of the work products generated throughout the other phases. After the implementation of the work products, the organization must reevaluate the organization’s mission, programs, resources, allies and so forth. The program plan and resource plans are interconnected since the resource plan is the financial, people, and infrastructure required to support the program plan. Many considerations should be given to the timing of program implementation, such as need, resource availability, and what is happening with other organizations, to name a few. After implementation of programs, the leader and board should reevaluate the organization. The purpose is to simplify the organization by analyzing the current programs, the organization’s achievements, and the organization’s resources. Many times an organization wants to solve all the problems but either does not need to or does not have the resources to meet the plan. Leaders need to make adjustments to and scale back programs as necessary.

Describing the phase, “Funding the Organization.”

The purpose of the sixth phase, “Funding the Organization,” is two fold: filing for charitable status and securing funding to support the organization and its programs. In the first phase, “Defining the Need,” a board was formed whose role is to complete the work activities of this phase. All four participants recommended that the leader works on the first five phases and forms a board to manage this phase, “Funding the Organization.” Therefore, this phase starts after the board is formed.

To generate funds, the board uses the program plan and resource plan to define the funds needed to support the operations of the organization and each program. The
board will help develop allies as well as seek resources from them. Starting this phase is dependent upon the type and amount of resources needed to meet the mission and programs of the organizations. For example, an organization to help young people read may not require much funding because they leverage the infrastructures of libraries and obtain books from the library, so their purpose is to organize volunteers’ time. This organization may never complete the work activities and steps in this phase, “Funding the Organization.” However, an organization that requires more infrastructures may be operating in this phase as soon as the board is formed.

Although participant leaders saw this phase as vital, they recommend managing the board and not this phase’s activities. This ensures that the funding the board secures aligns with the mission and program needs. Many funding organization define how resources could be used, therein redefining the mission and programs of an SCO. The participant all agreed this is not acceptable. P2 stated, “Mission above all else.”

Conclusion

This is an initial useable draft of a SCO Development Process to create and manage a nonprofit community organization with the mission to empower and transform individuals. It was developed from the successful experiences of four leaders of community organizations with very different visions and missions, but the commonality between the organizations is that each organization sought to empower and transform individuals. The SCO Development Process has six phases of work that have a sequential and iterative flow: “Defining the Need”, “Engaging the Public”, “Telling Your Story”, “Building Allies”, “Taking Action”, and “Funding the Organization.” For the first five phases, work is divided into manageable activities and steps. To help organize the data
gathering, analysis, and presentation of work, work products are presented in draft form. Hopefully future versions of the process can provide examples of completed work products. The four leaders also provided guiding experience, which are explanations of the work products. The sixth phase, “Funding the Organization” is very light on describing the work activities and work products, because many resources exist to help with this phase. For more detailed work activities and products, see the resources provided in Appendix E.

Developing a SCO Development Process is an iterative method wherein data are gathered and formed into a hierarchy and sequence of work processes and work products. Then, leaders of community organizations with the purpose to empower and transform individuals apply the SCO Development Process, and the participant leaders’ successful experiences are incorporated into the process, hence the iteration process to develop and enhance the process.
Chapter 5
Discussion

Review of the Study

The purpose of this research study was to investigate the experiences of social justice leaders and the formation of social justice organizations in an attempt to identify and define the work processes and work activities that social justice leaders engage in when interrogating injustices and attempting to change the society’s institutions and structures. In other words, the purpose was to explore the various work processes and activities of successful social justice leaders and to determine whether commonalities exist in the activities they performed. If commonalities existed, another goal of this dissertation was to organize these strategies and processes into a grounded process that provides present and future social justice leaders with more specific action steps that would enable leaders to envision, initiate, and manage organizations that promote social justice.

The primary research question guiding this study was as follows: When social justice leaders create and manage organizations for social change, do enough commonalities exist to be formed into a process? To support answering the primary question, this research used three secondary questions. These secondary questions provided a path towards answering the primary questions:

(1) What are the stories that social justice leaders tell about their experiences while creating and leading social justice organizations?

(2) What are the common work processes and activities across their stories?
(3) What are the processes that social justice leaders engage in while creating and leading social justice organizations?

To answer these secondary research questions and ultimately the primary question, the research methods blended grounded theory with an ethnographic perspective. Grounded theory aligns with the research purpose, which was to generate a process of work based in the experience of the research participants, and which involved studying a group of people and documenting their culture and lived activities (Merriam, 1998). An ethnographic perspective enhanced grounded theory by prompting a description of how a cultural group, here, a community of social justice leaders, works by exploring their beliefs, language, behaviors and issues about community institutions and structures.

This blended methodology of grounded theory and ethnographic approach was paired with the research design of participatory action research (PAR) and the data collection and analysis method of appreciative inquiry (AI). PAR is an activist research design intended to critique and change fundamental social structures and process. This research used PAR to work with social justice leaders to identify the successful work processes and activities for creating and managing SCOs. The experiences of this community of successful leaders were gathered, analyzed, and formed into a process using an AI data collection and analysis approach. AI specifically gathers the successful experiences and formulates those experiences into a reproducible and systematic process of work. To do this, I gathered three social justice leaders into a room, and facilitated the sharing of the successful work process and activities as well as the lessons they had learned in the process of creating and managing an organization for social justice.
The community of successful SCO leaders was assembled using a three part participant selection process: (1) Prequalification was via prescreening through review of websites and brochures; (2) Qualifying Interviews were by phone interviews to ask questions pertaining to selection criteria; and (3) Analysis of Interviews was to identify qualifying participants. Qualifying participants met the following criteria: (a) participants were one of the primary leaders of an SCO; (b) the organization was successful in that it met the organization’s mission and goals; (c) the organization fell within the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant from the Chetkovich and Kunreuther model (2006), meaning their mission was to empower and transform individuals; (d) as leaders, participants demonstrated the three behaviors conducive to human development, as identified through the literature review, which included praxis based on shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-making; and (e) participants demonstrated AI thinking that is positive, forward, and anti-deficit.

An AI facilitated session with three successful leaders of successful community organizations was used to collect data followed by a fourth successful leader separately and individually. Also during this session participants conducted the first cycle of data analysis. Data coding and analysis was accomplished through a two-cycle approach adapted from Saldana (2013). During the facilitated session, participants were asked to document on Post-its and discuss with the group the work activities that made their organization successful. After this discussion, participants were asked to identify commonalities across their work activities. In so doing, the participants performed the first cycle coding and analysis. This first cycle included two subcategories: descriptive coding and focus coding. During the facilitated session and after the participants
completed the first cycle coding and analysis, they were asked to discuss and expand their descriptions of each phase, activity, and step. I used these expanded descriptions in a second cycle coding and analysis, which had two subcategories: axial coding and process coding. As detailed in Chapter 3, these two coding methods are used in an iterative process, where axial coding enabled investigating the relationships between the phases, activities, and steps presented by participants into a sequential and hierarchical process format, and process coding enabled both the actionable wording of activities and steps as well as defined the sequence of phases, activities, and steps.

Finding

The finding of this research is that a process defining what to do, when to do it, and how to do it was created to help current and future leaders create and manage a SCO. This process consists of work processes, work products, and guiding experiences that direct the work of creating and managing a nonprofit community organization. The work processes are a series of actions and instructions to be completed in a recommended sequence or iterative cycle. This process breaks the work processes into a hierarchy of phases, activities, and steps. Work products are knowledge-based documents and presentations, which are used to gather, analysis, and present information about desired organizational outcomes. Work products include, but are not limited to, the mission statement, SWOT Model, Political Strategy, Communication Plan, and presentation to the board or community. The guiding experiences are considerations and mindsets that impact what, how, and when work is accomplished. These guiding experiences are advice given during the facilitated session and are seen as increasing the likelihood of success.
The purpose of the SCO Development Process is to provide leaders with an overarching process of work processes and work products. To effectively use this process, the leader must realize that it is a basic structure for how to create and manage a nonprofit organization. This process is not a step-by-step recipe that will always produce successful results. The leader must have the ability to apply and extrapolate the process’s work processes, work products, and guiding experiences to the situation at hand as well as the ability to know what work processes and guiding experiences are most applicable to their organizations and community. It is recommended to read and understand the whole process prior to starting the first work phase.

To summarize this process, it has six phases each with subsequent work activities and steps (See figure 5) that have a sequential and iterative flow. As knowledge is gained and relationships are developed, the leader cycles back to previous phases and drafted work products incorporating the new knowledge and appropriate people. A summary of the six phases follows.

**Phase – “Defining the Need.”**

In this phase, the leader of the organization works to gain an understanding of the need, the level of effort required in meeting the need, and who is their core team of helpers. In this phase, the activities will focus the leader’s work effort on drafting the organization’s vision and mission statements, conduct initial strengths, weaknesses, opportunity, and threats (SWOT) model, and start development of the program plan, resource plan, and political strategy. The development of these work products is iterative, so as new knowledge is gained, these work products should be revisited. Through the initial drafting of these work products, the leader will gain an understanding of the level
of effort required to create the organization, and the leader will develop the basic knowledge needed for successful conversations. All four participant leaders worked to understand the needs of the people they serve, the level of effort required to meet those needs, and to develop a core team of two to four people to help manage the organization.

**Phase – “Engaging the Public.”**

This phase focuses on preparing the leader and their organization to reach out to the community, including local government. The goal of “Engaging the Public” is to involve people within the community to solicit their input, support, knowledge, and resources. The activities of this phase focuses on preparing the organization for encounters with people outside the organization through the development of work products such as the organization’s meeting standards and a plan for “Engaging the Public”. The input and knowledge gained from the public should be used to update phase one work products and provide a foundation of knowledge for the development of work products in future phases. All four participating organizations reached out to the community to solicit support; both the leaders and the board accomplished this role.

**Phase – “Telling Your Story.”**

In this phase, the organization develops a concise and memorable identity through marketing messages and personal stories that evoke an emotional response encouraging people to help the organization and people it serves. The development of the communication plan identifies and organizes the delivery of the marketing messages, personal stories, and other messages that the organization needs to push to various audiences. This phase’s work activities focus the work on the marketing messages and
communication plan. While all four leaders performed this work activity, the activity was accomplished in vastly different ways and degrees, but all viewed “Telling Your Story” as important to the success of the organization.

**Phase – “Building Allies.”**

Creating a successful community organization is political, so this phase targets bringing specific influential people and organizations into the mix of the organization’s allies. Allies will help define the organization’s programs and resource requirements; they will help identify sources of funding and resources; and the leader and board will work together (i.e. shared programming) to meet the needs of the people they serve.

It is important to clarify the difference between three of the work products from these phases: Public engagement plan, communication plan, and political strategy. The public engagement plan is broadly applied to the community to solicit involvement; the communication plan is more focused on specific audiences to convey information; and the political strategy targets specific people and organizations to become allies. These three work products have distinct purposes and audiences, which is seen in the process.

All four leaders stated how surprised they were with the political nature of leading a community organization and specifically, the importance of both relying on and supporting other organizations within the community.

**Phase – “Taking Action.”**

The emphasis of the phase is implementing the program plan and resource plan. In addition, as these plan are defined and implemented, the organization must reevaluate and simplify its programs and operations, because all too often, organizations try to
implement too many programs and over bureaucratize operations. This phase requires the leader to create work plans for implementing each program; how to create work plans is not discussed in this process but can be found in popular publications such as, Portney, S. E., (2013). Project Management for Dummies, 3rd Edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

All four organizations created programs to meet the needs of the people they serve, and all four leaders discussed the importance of not over extending the resources that an organization has. The developing and mapping of the two plans, program and resource, is a critical work activity.

**Phase – “Funding the Organization.”**

This phase is ongoing and typically begins with the formation of a board whose purpose is to generate funds for the organization and file for charitable status. All four successful leaders focused their effort on phases one through five and had a board whose focus was generating funding. The leader attended the board meetings to ensure that the funding did not compromise the organization’s vision, mission, or the people they serve.

The foregoing SCO Development Process was developed through the AI process of this research by successful leaders of successful nonprofit community organizations based upon their successful experience to create and manage their organizations; however, the process is not complete, and requires iterations of development involving the use of the process and enhancements based upon success experiences. This process is based on organizations that are diverse in purpose, race, religion, and gender preferences; however, the four organizations all had the mission to empower and transform at the
individual level. Additional work is needed to develop processes for organizations with other types of missions (i.e. political, charity, etc.).

Discussion

In addition to the main finding that it is possible to create a SCO Development Process for community organizations with similar mission, the following conclusions come from the comparison of this study’s finding and the literature on social justice leadership and SCOs. Prior to conducting the facilitated session with successful leaders of SCO, I researched various topics: social justice leadership’s definition, behaviors, and activities; social change organizations; appreciative inquiry; and grounded theory. From the comparison of literature and this study’s findings, four additional conclusions are drawn pertaining to social justice leaders’ work activities, social change organizations, and a social justice leader’s behavior, characterized as tenacious commitment. Each conclusion is outlined below.

Work activities.

Keeping in mind that most social justice leadership research has been conducted within the field of education, most social justice leaders studied were school principals. From this literature, I extracted five work activities that could extend to leaders from other types of organizations. These extracted work activities identified in the social justice literature included dialog, reevaluating the organization, conducting equity audits, building alliances, and forming support groups. This study’s primary purpose was to identify the work process and activities of social justice leaders as they create and manage social change organizations. I propose that in addition to the five activities
identified in the literature, this research identified three additional activities (networking, engaging the public, and political strategy) for social justice leaders regardless of the context (i.e. schooling or SCOs). Therefore, regardless of organizational context a social justice leader engages in several work activities: dialog, reevaluating the organization (Conducting equity audits is folded into this activity based upon this study’s finding), building alliances, forming support groups, networking, engaging the public, and political strategy.

The following is a summary description of the five work activities extracted from the literature: (1) Dialog was described as being a catalyst for all voices to be heard. (2) Reevaluating the organizations was about using praxis for evaluating systems of injustices. (3) Conducting equity audits is measuring if an organization is meeting its goal and mission statement. (4) Building alliances with other organizations, and (5) forming support groups to manage the emotional stress social justice leaders experience. In the next section is a comparison discussion about the work activities found in the literature and this research’s finding.

The four social justice leaders from which this research’s data were collected organized their work activities into six phases; within each phase additional work activities and steps were identified. The six phases included Defining The Need, Engaging The Public, Telling Your Story, Building Allies, Taking Action, and Funding The Organization. The phase, Defining The Need, is learning and defining an organization and how it fits within its community’s nonprofit sector. Specifically, a leader learns about the need or the injustice, learns about the community’s nonprofit sector, and learns the effort required to right the injustice as well as learns how their
organization fits within their community’s nonprofit sector. Within this phase of the research, participants created a step, “create a support group” within the first activity, exploring the felt need. This step is similar to the activity identified in the literature, forming a support group. In the literature, this work activity’s focus was to help manage the emotional stress of being a social justice leader; however, within this SCO Development Process, the step had two purposes: to help share the workload and to help provide emotional support. Also within this process, participants identified other support groups such as the organization’s board or steering committee, the engaging the public with like interest, and the allies with which they partner. This begs the question for future research: Do social justice leaders of SCO have more opportunity for building support groups than do principals, meaning are principals more isolated in their efforts to enact social justice? And, Why? However, within the literature another activity was to build alliances with the purpose to solicit assistance from other people and organizations. In the literature, it was not mentioned that these alliance would be a support group, whereas in the development of this process, alliances are seen as both organizational and political support, and therefore, I propose that within the SCO Development Process building alliances can also provides emotion support.

Another similar work activity found in the literature is dialog, wherein the leader acts as catalyst for all voices to be heard. Within the SCO Development Process, dialog has multiple purposes including establishing structures for two-way communications with the people the organization serves, the public, allies, and the people within the organization. Dialog is fundamental to the SCO Development Process and is seen in every phase. However, the dialog mentioned within the literature, a catalyst for all voices,
is most similar to the dialog within the third phase of the process, Telling Your Story, wherein the organization provides victims with a platform for telling their story.

The five activities found in the literature were in the context of education and school principals. This context may account for the differences in the last two literature work activities: Reevaluate the organization and equity audits. By title these could apply to the SCO Development Process; however, by description they do not align with each other. The SCO Development Process conducts a work activity equivalent to equity audits in the phase, Taking Action, in the subsequent work activity, reevaluating the organization. The literature’s and this research’s work activity, reevaluating the organizations, does not entirely match, because the literature’s activity used praxis for evaluating systems of injustices. As compared to this research’s participant leaders who used praxis in three forms: Is the organization meeting the needs of the people served, is the organization meeting its mission, and is the organization effectively and efficiently using resources to meet the organizations’ mission, and programs.

The SCO leaders call society and organizations out on the abuses of people; however, the focus of the organization is to meet the needs of the people served. The focus of the literature’s work activity is on identifying the injustices while the focus from the SCO Development Process is on the solution. The focus of the work activity may be different between the literature and this research, because I chose SCO leaders with an AI thinking process, which is positive, forward, and anti-deficit. I propose that through this think process, while recognizing the injustices, social justice leaders place more energy on meeting the people’s needs who experience these injustices, than on defining the injustice or laying blame for who caused the injustice.
The five work activities identified within the literature are in some form within this process; the difference in form may be a result of the organizational context: schools versus SCO. While the SCO Development Process identifies the phases, activities and steps of work that social justice leaders engage in to address society’s injustices, three pronounced work activity that crosses each work phase is networking, engaging the public, and political strategy. I propose that from both literature and this research, there are seven work activities that social justice leaders engage in regardless of organizational type: Dialog, define needs and solutions, forming support groups, engaging the public, building alliances, political strategy, and reevaluating the organization.

**Social change organization.**

According to Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) social change organizations are organized into four types based upon the organization’s mission. Two axes create the four quadrants of the model. The first axis is change at a group level verses change at an individual level. The second axis is transformation of individual verses non-transformation of individual. This dissertation had a salient assumption that social justice leaders who lead organizations that fall within the same quadrant can use the SCO Development Process created in this research. Two additional observations were made pertaining to this model. First, the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant can be further categorized based upon the organizations origin; however, this origin did not appear to have implications on the SCO Development Process. An observation was made about the four participating organizations within this quadrant and how these organizations were initiated. I found that the organizations could be further broken down into two categories, necessity-grown verses solution-implemented. Two of the
organizations were necessity-grown, meaning the leaders were meeting the community need on a small scale. Over time, the number of people served grew, which forced the leader to become a legitimate and official organization with charitable status, board, allies, and so forth. While the research showed these two participants following phase one, “Defining the Need” once they when legit, it is unclear what work processes they completed prior to going legit, meaning little is known about their work processes prior to going official, therefore future research is needed to understand if the SCO Development Process is initiated differently. The other two organizations started by implementing proven solutions from other organizations. The solution-implemented organizations would follow the SCO from the beginning. More research is needed to understand if there are differences between necessity-grown and solution-implemented.

The second observation about the SCO model (Chetkovich and Kunreuther, 2006) was with regards to its relationship to with the two dominant Western philosophical theories of justice: social contract theory and realization-focused theory. As I have pointed out, I have pulled upon both theories. The definition for social justice and social justice leadership are based upon the social contract theory of justice, while the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant from which participants are selected is from the realization-focused theory of justice. To further clarify, the participating leaders saw that a group of people needed help and these leaders chose to create realization-focused organizations, whereby the people the organization serves are transformed and empowered to help themselves. These organizations help the people they serve to realize their full human capacity (Nussbaum, 2004). However, during the facilitated session these leaders were adamant about the need for the leader, the board, and the staff of a
SCO to understand the political nature of a SCO within a community. This can be seen in the names of the phases of work. For example, Engaging the Public and Building Allies are two phases that specifically discusses the political nature of creating a SCO. In these two phases, the leader seeks input from the general public at it is made aware of the organization’s mission and activities. In addition, influential people and organizations are brought into the mix of the organization’s allies. These influential people and organizations include, but not limited to, the state’s governor, city’s mayor, state representative, corporate leaders, and so forth. Both of these phases require political strategy and networking. So while forming a SCO in the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant is a realization-focused organization, to support that organization the leader, board, and staff of the organization must employ political strategies, which fall under the social contract theory of justice. These leaders saw that to fully address the injustices to the people they serve they must not only care for the people but change the system which caused the problem. More research is needed to understand the relationship between Chetkovich and Kunreuther’s (2006) model and the theories of social justice, meaning how, when, and why are social justice leaders crossing quadrants?

**Social justice leadership behavior: “Tenacious commitment.”**

Although the purpose of this research was not to identify social justice leadership behaviors, behaviors were extrapolated from the literature to contribute to the participant selection criteria and are significant enough to repeat here. Ten behaviors were identified into two categories: intrapersonal leadership behaviors and interpersonal leadership behaviors. One of the intrapersonal behaviors was controversial. This was Theoharis’ (2008) “tenacious-commitment”. His description of this behavior was a rebellious and
resistant nature to society’s inequities. However, other researchers felt the description of leaders with this behavior was aggressive, intellectually superior, and self-righteous and did not represent a behavior of a social justice leader. Radd (2008) tempered this description by saying these leaders exhibit tenacious-commitment without rejecting the ideas of others. Although my behavioral selection criteria (i.e. praxis based on shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-making and AI thinking process) had impact on the behaviors observed among this research’s participants, the four participants discussed “tenacious-commitment” in the form of calling people and organization out for the abuses they commit towards the people the organizations serve. Participants warned not to burn bridges; however, they noted, there are times when calling people out for their abuses is strategic. They recommended calculating when, where, and how this is done. Participants proposed that a disagreement be made known without making it the end of a relationship. The participants of this research sided with tempering “tenacious-commitment.”

Implications for Research and Practice

Through the literature review, I uncovered a void in research. There was a lack of research on the work processes and activities of social justice leadership as they create and manage organizations for social change, which fell within the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant. To contribute research that would start to fill this void, this research sought to investigate the work experiences of successful social justice leaders. I argued that it is possible to create an overarching process of work phases, activities, and steps by exploring the successful work processes and activities used by successful social justice leaders as they created, managed, and led their successful social change.
organizations. By using a group-facilitated process known as Appreciative Inquiry (AI) to explore the successful work processes of successful social justice leaders. This research was not only able to investigate these work experience but also form these experiences into an initial draft of a SCO Development Process, which outlines the work phases, activities, steps, work products and guiding experiences of four successful SCO leaders as they created and managed their successful SCO. Four audiences directly benefit from this research and the initial draft of a SCO Development Process: social justice leaders, organizational development, social change organizations, and philanthropy organizations.

Social Justice Leaders benefit from this research, because they now have a roadmap of how to create a community organization for social change. Contributing to the origin for this research was my experience with community organizations, and specifically, passionate community leaders who were unsuccessful in creating community organizations as seen by the starting an organization, stopping it and starting another. These passionate community members wanted to right injustices within their community, but they did not have the knowledge or tools for creating an organization to meet the community need. Therefore, this research set out to create the tools they needed to be successful. The SCO Development Process outlines the work phases, activities, steps, work products and guiding experiences of four successful SCO leaders as they create and manage SCO. This process is a roadmap of the work processes and activities that current and future social justice leaders can use to increase their likelihood of success when creating and managing their SCOs.

The knowledge and SCO Development Process gained from this research contributes to the field of organizational development, which is the field of study and
application dedicated to the improvement of organizations. This study provides an initial understanding of the work processes and activities of social justice leaders as they create social change organizations, and therefore, provides the foundation on which to develop a competency model for social justice leaders as well as training specific to social justice leaders. This study is based on the assumption that to be a successful social justice leader, an individuals must possess not only a specific set of required competencies, but also, the leader must have a clear vision of the path for creating and managing an organization for social change. The findings of this research provide a path and the foundational knowledge of the work processes and activities enacted social justice leaders, therein providing the context for social justice leader’s competencies (i.e., the knowledge, skills, and attributes) and developmental training specific to social justice leaders of SCOs.

The next field of study that benefits from this research is social change organizations. For this research, I used Chetkovich and Kunreuther’s (2006) model, wherein they divide social change organizations into four quadrants based upon the organizations’ mission. This research focused on the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant, which had little research, the literature that was found focused on the dilemmas that leader would face as well as how to educate leaders of organizations within this quadrant. The findings of this research is the SCO Development Process and it provides leaders with a path and an understanding of the work processes necessary to create and manage organizations for social change, which seek to empower and transform individuals. More research is needed to validate this SCO Development Process as well as develop processes for the other quadrants.
Another audience to benefit from this research’s finding includes philanthropy organizations. During the participant selection process, I talked with many organizations including larger regional and national organizations. Upon several discussion, both social justice leaders and staff of these larger organizations pointed out that funding is often granted with the stipulation that funds will not be used for staff or administration or for the professional development of staff and administrators. One larger organization in this region took the role of providing training and development for community organizations; however, most of their training focuses one phase, “Funding the Organization,” meaning the five phases that the participants leaders manage were without training. This study provides the knowledge of the work processes and activities performed by social justice leaders, on which to define the competencies and training for social justice leaders of SCO with the mission to empower and transform individuals. In addition, the knowledge this research generated starts to create an argument that the leaders and staff of social change organizations is a complex role and requires professional development, which could be provided by philanthropist.

Limitations and Further Research

Prior to the start of the study, two limitations were identified. The first limitation was my positionality based on my professional (i.e. business consulting, facilitation, process improvement, etc.) and academic (i.e. social justice) experiences. The second limitation resided in the method for purposefully selected participants. Participants’ selection was not random, and therefore, the four purposefully selected participants may not be representative of all social justice leaders and experiences in creating and managing a SCO.
Two general actions were taken to manage the three study limitations. The first was to rely on the dissertation advisor for her observations and input. The second action was to document the limitations, thereby enabling future researchers to see the influence of these limitations on the study. Presented below are post-study thoughts about the two limitations.

During the first phase of my research, I observed my positionality changing as I talked with the 52 organizations. During these discussions, I learned new terminology and thought processes, which were dissimilar to my business experiences. An example of terminology is the use of the term, “programs”. In my business experience, programs were referred to as products, services, initiatives, or projects. As I talked with people from community organizations, my knowledge of terms and concepts used within community organizing was enhanced, and therefore, my positionality modified, which better enabled the facilitation of the AI session.

The second limitation is the purposefully selected participants, which includes the number of participants as well as the selection process. The research chose to include four participants; however, the weather caused only three participants to attend the facilitated session, and the fourth participant was led through the same facilitated questioning separately. The number of participant was chosen because it would enable the management of time allotted and supporting resources for the facilitated session. With four participants enough time was allotted that each participant was able to fully express his or her successful experiences. Four participants enabled the research to delve deeper into the successful work processes and activities; more participants would have meant less time per participant, and therefore, would have decreased the depth of the shared
experiences. The depth of the four participants’ shared experiences enabled the second cycle coding and analysis; therein a more fully developed draft of the SCO Development Process was created. As an exploratory qualitative analysis with four participants, this study provides an initial draft of a SCO Development Process. Future research is required to confirm the validity of this process based upon a larger number of successful leaders as well as leaders with a non-AI approach to thinking. The second part to the participant selection limitation participants pertains to who was selected to participant in the research. The participants selected in the research met several criteria. Two criteria pose limitations to the research: Participants with AI thinking and participant leaders of organizations between the age of one and five years.

In my professional experience with facilitating AI session, people’s thinking process, appreciative or not, impacts the group’s ability to meet the session’s objectives. In this study, the objectives were for participants to share successful experience, identify commonalities, and formulate a process. Therefore, to increase the likelihood that the group would meet these objectives, AI thinking was a selection criterion for participants. This choice impacts the finding, therefore more research is needed to identify if leaders can be successful without an AI thought process, and if so, what are the differences between the two SCO Development Processes.

The purposefully selected participants also included the life span of the organization with which they leader, between one and five years. The initial draft of the SCO Development Process spans the first five years of an organization’s life, therefore more research is needed to identify and formulate successful work processes and activities of organizations older than five years. In summary, additional research on the
work process and activities to create and manage SCO is required to validate the successful work processes from more leaders, by non-AI leaders, and for organizations at different point in their life span.

**Conclusion**

Prior to my doctoral studies, I worked for a global business organization developing managers and leaders. Originally, I wanted my academic focus to be on women and leadership; however, as I started working with my dissertation advisor in community organizing, I recognized that my competence in management and leadership development could be used to improve the management and leadership skills of nonprofit organizations. I believe this is only a slight change in focus since the majority of the leaders I encountered during the participant selection process were women.

While working in community organizing, I notice people trying to start organizations and that most these organizations would cease to exist within a year or two. The leaders of these organizations would move on starting another, but why did the first one fail? I believe organizations fail not for lack of passion but for lack of knowledge of how to create them. Therefore, through this dissertation I set out to generate a process for developing SCOs. From here, I hope to continually enhance the SCO Development Process and create a performance improvement system that helps current and future leaders grow their knowledge, skills, and abilities to create, manage, and lead community organizations.
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Appendix A

Outline of Qualifying Participant Interview

Social Change Organization (Human Development of the Individual Quadrant):

- How did the organization come to be?
- What is the purpose of the organization?
- Is the organization accomplishing its purpose?
- Can you provide examples of how the organization is meeting its purpose?
- What was your role in starting the organization?
- What is your role in the organization today?

Social justice leadership behaviors:

- Praxis based upon shared interests
  - How did the goals of the organization come about?
  - Who contributed to these goals?
  - Have the goals of the organization ever changed?
  - Why were they changed? How?

- Communal dialog:
  - How would you describe your communication style within the context of the organization? Please provide an example that best represents your communication style.
  - How do you communicate with people inside your organization? How frequently?
How does your organization communicate with those outside the organization? How frequently does this happen?

- Participatory decision-making:
  - How would you describe your organization’s decision-making process? Tell me of a time that best displays your organization’s decision-making process about the organization’s activities.
  - Who are involved in these decisions?
  - Who holds opinions contrary to your own? How often do you seek their input?

- AI thinking:
  - Has there been a time that you felt your organization was facing a major setback? What did you do?
## Appendix B

### The Snowball Technique and Qualifying Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Snowball Technique</th>
<th>Qualifying Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3a1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3a2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3a3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3a4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3a5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Snowball Technique</th>
<th>Qualifying Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A10c1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A10c2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A10c3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1f*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowball Technique</td>
<td>Qualifying Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fb1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fb2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fb3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fb4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fb5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fb6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fb7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fb8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fb9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fb10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fb11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One of the six well established organizations with the mission to primarily assist other organizations.
Appendix C
Qualifying the Participants

This section outlines the qualifying of participants. As outlined in the methodology section, the ideal number of participants for this study was four to six. It was thought that more than six participants attending the facilitated session might require more time than allotted for the session. The minimum number of participants was four. Six participants were identified and confirmed for attending the facilitated session. Six were confirmed with the hope that four would attend. Unfortunately, this Midwest region experienced a major snowfall the night prior to the session, and therein this study is comprised of four purposefully selected participants. Three participants attended the facilitated session and the fourth participant cancelled the morning of the session; however, I facilitated her through the session’s questions separately and her incorporated in data into the process. Participant 5 and 6 did not return their IRB documentation; therefore their data was not included. This section outlined the selection process for the four participants.

In summary, to qualify the participants this research used a mixed method approach integrating the snowball and “positioned-subjects approach.” As candidates were identified, they were vetted through a “positioned-subjects approach,” which consisted of three steps: prerequisite, qualifying interview, and analysis of interviews. The position criteria that candidates must have in order to become a participants of the study has three elements:

- The organization must be categorized into Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) SCO model’s Human Development of the Individual Quadrant, the organization
must be successful, the organization was in existence for one to five years, and the person attending must hold one of the primary leadership roles.

- The leader attending the facilitated session had the three social justice leadership behaviors: Praxis based upon shared interests, communal dialog, and participatory decision-making.
- The leader attending the facilitated session had appreciative thinking.

The following is the implementation of the qualifying process and the selection criteria. The notes from the qualifying process (i.e. electronic media, interviews, and emails) were used only in the qualifying process and not in the forming of the process, because the forming of the process used PAR and AI design based on collaborative data collection and analysis meaning participants worked together to form the initial version of the process. The qualifying notes presented here are paraphrased to protect confidentiality meaning all interview, Facebook, and website information was modified to eliminate information that could identify the organization or its leader. This was done not to protect the leaders as much as it is to protect the people the organizations serve of whom are considered a potentially vulnerable populations by the research review board. The following outlines the four participants’ selection data and analysis.

**Qualifying Participant 1 (P1)**

P1 was found through Facebook’s suggested pages to like. See Fb2 on Appendix B. After reviewing the organization’s Facebook page, I sent him a message through Facebook about the research project asking him if he would be interested in participating,
which he replied, yes. Through an email, I established a phone call to conduct the qualifying interview.

**Step 1: Prequalification.**

The prequalifying of P1 included reviewing the organization’s Facebook page and documentation about the organization and its mission. (Note, all Facebook and website information is paraphrases to protect the confidentiality of participants.) This information showed that P1’s organization has been in existence for more than a year and less than five; therein it met the organization’s age criterion. Also from this information, the mission of this organization was identified as launching a low-powered community radio station that promoted the voice of underrepresented perspectives. The Facebook page explained that mainstream media does not represent all the various perspectives within the community. From this perspective, this organization is working towards empowering and transforming both individuals and groups of individuals by giving voice through media, which provides communication, education, and dialog for underrepresented perspectives. Therefore, this community organization met the criterion of falling within the Human Development of the Individual Quadrant of Chetkovich and Kunreuther (2006) SCO model.

**Step 2: Qualifying interview.**

P1’s interview starts with confirming the organizations mission, which matched the description on the Facebook page and documentation. P1 was asked if the organization was successful meaning is the organization meeting its mission and goals. He responded, yes. The organization was meeting its goals and having success with
community involvement including large donations from large supporting entities. Also in this interview, I asked if he was the primary leader of the organization, which he responded,

Yes. He was the founder as well as the lead organizer and facilitator.

He did most of the initial legwork, defined the work to be done,
delegated to proper individual, and made sure work was completed.

Therefore, P1 met qualifications pertaining to the social change organization:
mission for Human Development of the Individual, the successful organization, and the primary leader criteria. P1 did not have time to finish the interview; however, he submitted his answers to a small subset of questions by email, presented as follows:

- How would you describe your style of communication within the context of the organization? Please provide a statement and then example.

I would say my style is informal and dynamic. Initially, a provisional board was created to identify issues and work steps. We [the board] set meeting to identify and resolve issues, create action planning, and distribute work. We stayed in contact through texting and other new decentralized technology communications. Our style was more conversational to resolve issues. We also held public meetings to gain and distribute information as to issues and progress.

By establishing a board and calling public meeting, P1 frequently sought two-way communications with people inside and outside the organization, therefore P1 met the communal dialog and praxis based on common interests criteria.
• How would you describe your organization’s decision-making process?

As I said, we had a provisional board with 4 members and decisions were made on a majority basis usually. For example, we wanted to create a membership program; so one person drafted the criteria and brought to the group for discussion and decisions. We had a lot of discussion about membership program and what to start the contributions by individuals at – what dollar amount. A couple wanted to start at $100 and others thought that would be too high. This contribution did not give you voting rights but rather just a donation. We discussed and debated this issue several time and finally came to an agreement. There were several issues that I would make a decision to move us forward; however, majority or consensus made most decisions especially critical ones.

In the majority of instances, this leader sought and implemented the input of others, for this reason, he met the participatory decision-making criterion.

• Has there been a time that you felt your organization was facing a major setback?

What did you do?

A major set back happened when I was swamped for two months and was sidelined with a political campaign. I was not able to make the calls for financial support or quotes such as quotes on the tower, construction, and so forth. We dealt with this through delegation; however we eventually moved our date back two months. We adjusted
our launch and kept moving forward. The board in the beginning set a date to get things started, but all along, we never committed to others to that date as hard and fast. This was a good thing, and it allowed us to take the time we needed; it gave us a cushion.

P1 showed an AI mindset by not seeing the delay as unsurpassable. Instead, he worked with his board and they together created a solution. Therefore, P1 met the AI mindset criterion.

**Step 3: Analysis of interviews.**

After reviewing the information from the Facebook, the interview, and email, it was determined that P1 met all the criteria pertaining to the organization, the social justice leadership and the AI thinking. P1 was asked to participate in the facilitated session.

**Qualifying Participant 2 (P2)**

P2 was identified through as a level three contacts (See B3a on Appendix B) meaning that one of my two initial contacts in the nonprofit world recommended an organization that did not meet the studies requirements; however, he then referred P2 and her organization. After reading newspaper articles, Facebook page, and website about P2 and her organization, I emailed her the study description and requested a qualifying interview.

**Step 1: Prerequisite.**

The prequalifying of P2 comes through a Facebook page, website, and a newspaper article. From these sources, the mission of the organization is to give
homeless youth a home and counseling to help heal from the harm they have experienced by seeing and working towards a future for themselves. P2 met organization’s mission criterion by helping youth heal and see themself with a future, therein empowering and transforming the youth. This media also sited P2 as the leaders of the organization; however, the organization was in its infancy, which raised concern about its successfulness.

**Step 2: Qualifying interview.**

During the interview, I confirmed the organization’s mission and P2’s role as one of the primary leaders. I also asked about the organization’s success and length of existence. She stated that,

> It is successful and I have been helping homeless youth for a while now although not formally. I have been helping youth for a couple years in my own house with the help from my church to feed and clothe people but I was paying all the bills. My friends said I had to go legit when I ran out of couch space.

Since P2 was already and successfully housing and helping homeless youth prior to going legit, I think she met the criteria of a successful organization, which had existed for a few years.

- How would you describe your style of communication within the context of the organization? Please provide a statement and an example.

> I communicate a lot; it’s so important and one of the things that make an organization successful. We (her and the board) are in constantly
talking and sharing, but also important is talking with other
organizations to understand how they serve people and how we can
work together; however, we have made it our mission to call out
organization for the harm they cause people. We also give victims a
platform for telling their story; we give them voice. It’s healing to be
able to tell your story.

The above excerpts from the interview show how P2 met the communal dialog
criterion by continuous two-way communication within and outside the organization.

- How would you describe your organization’s decision-making style? Tell of a time
  that best displays your organization’s decision-making process including who was
  involved.

  Although they call it my show, I really rely on my board and the allies
to help me make decisions. I started this organization because I ran out
of couch space and my friends told me to go legit and that is why we
incorporated. I am out in front but without them I could not do all this.
I have a lot of people that I reach out to.

  P2 met the participatory decision-making criterion, because she not only sought
input but also leveraged their input in making decisions.

- Has there been a time that you felt your organization was facing a major setback?
  What did you do?
I can think of a couple times that we had setback such as finding the building for housing the youth. It had to meet certain criteria but I know that it would happen, so I just kept talking with people and asking for help. When I walked into the one we found, I knew it was it. Another one is when trying to get funding, we quickly realized that we had to differentiate ourselves, so board members talked with and learned from existing homeless shelters which youth were not finding shelter.

Seeking solutions demonstrated that P2 saw the possibilities of a situation; therein P2 met the criterion of having AI thinking of positive, forward, and anti-deficit.

**Step 3: Analysis of interviews.**

After reviewing the information from the Facebook, documentations, and the interview, it was determined that P2 met all the criteria pertaining to the organization, the social justice leadership and the AI thinking. P2 was asked to participate in the facilitated session.

**Qualifying Participant 3 (P3)**

P3 was provided by multiple contacts. (See A8 and B1b on Appendix B.) After review of Facebook page and website, I initiated contacted by email with the study description and request for the qualifying interview.

**Step 1: Prerequisite.**

Information about P3 and the organization was found on both their website and Facebook page. The mission of this organization was to create positive community
change with respects to racism. The organization provided community members a format to discuss and create action plans for change. This organization empowered and transformed people by providing a space and process for creating change within their community therein met the Social Change Organization mission criteria of Human Development of the Individual by the empowering and transforming individuals.

**Step 2: Qualifying interview.**

The initial interview with P3 revealed that she started the organization and is the primary leader. She also thinks the organization is successful in that they have been around a few years and many action plans have been implemented or started to be implemented. With this said, P3 met the criteria of being the primary leader of a successful organization from Human Development of the Individual Quadrant. P3 did not have time to finish the interview; however, she submitted her answers to a small subset of questions by email.

- How would you describe your style of communication within the context of the organization? Please provide a statement and an example.

  I would describe my communication style within the organization as open and honest. We communicate mostly by email but we meet monthly face-to-face. There are persons assigned to five aspects of the organization’s work, so we will check-in periodically. We have monthly meetings of the steering committee and now work together on those five areas. We are in the process of rebuilding the steering
committee but have continued our work successfully with our small

core group.

As seen in her answer, she seeks the communication with those within the
organization and outside the organization; therein she demonstrated and met the
communal dialog criterion.

- How would you describe your organization’s decision-making style? Tell of a time
that best displays your organization’s decision-making process including who was
involved.

Our decision-making process is democratic with everyone
participating in the decisions if they are structural or have to do with
calendar{arrow}ing etc., for example setting up our next sessions, who we are
inviting to participate, etc. Probably the best example of how our
decision-making happens was when we determined that we were too
small to have subcommittees. It was brought to the attention of the
committee by a member, (who pointed out our history and what might
work best), and we determined that she was right. We determined to
work as a committee of the whole, with the exception of the logistics
person and the facilitator for recruitment and training.

P3 included others in the decision-making process; therefore, P3 was deemed to
have a participatory decision-making style and met this criterion. Through questioning
the organizations purpose and operations, she also met the criterion of Praxis based on
common interests.
• Has there been a time that you felt your organization was facing a major setback?

  What did you do?

  We came to a point about a year ago when we wondered if we should continue. The steering committee is small and the work was difficult. The steering committee discussed it and determined that we would take a different tack in recruitment, concentrating on organizations rather than individuals. This helped to reenergize us, and we have rebounded nicely.

  P3 and her committee identified an issue facing the organization and sought solutions. During the interview, she stated that “she has to do something and there is no giving up on ending racism.” Therefore, P3 has met the AI positive, forward, and anti-deficit thinking criterion.

  **Step 3: Analysis of interviews.**

  After reviewing the information from Facebook, the interview, and the email, it was determined that P3 met all the criteria pertaining to the organization, the social justice leadership and the AI thinking. P3 was asked to participate in the facilitated session.

  **Qualifying Participant 4 (P4)**

  P4 was identified through a level three contact (See B1a on Appendix B) meaning that one of my two initial contacts in the nonprofit world recommended an organization and that organization referred P4 and her organization. After reading newspaper articles,
Facebook page, and website about P4 and her organization, I emailed her the study
description and requested a qualifying interview.

**Step 1: Prequalification.**

Prequalification started with the organization’s website, which provided
the information needed to qualify the organization as one that empowers and transforms
underprivileged youth specifically by mentoring youth through physical, behavior, and
educational programs. The prequalifying process through electronic media and paper
sources gave insight to the organization’s mission and goals, which met organization’s
mission criterion. The website and Facebook page also showed that the organization
operated successfully for several years, meaning that the organization met this criterion
as well. These electronic forms and the local newspaper raised concerns about the
leadership role; however, insight to the leader comes through Step 2 of the qualifying
process.

**Step 2: Qualifying interview.**

Through the qualifying interviews, the mission of the organization was confirmed, and
based upon this confirmation her organization met the organization’s mission criterion,
Human Development of the Individual. Based upon the website and Facebook page, the
leadership role was in question, so during the qualifying interview, P4 was asked about
her role in leading the organization. She came to the organization shortly after it started;
it had a few youth and its focus was physical exercise. The organization had three people
who share in the leadership role and the number of youth and programs have
exponentially increased since her joining. P4 is responsible for the operations, which
includes daily operations, program development, and overseeing the youths’ participation at the organization. The other two leaders have responsibility for the programs that physically develop the youth and are the face to the organization; however, all three leaders work closely to define the direction of the organization. Therefore, P4 met the leadership role as one of the primary leaders.

- How would you describe your style of communication within the context of the organization? Please provide a statement and an example.

I’m pretty straightforward. If I have an idea, I like running it by the two coaches to get their input. We talk all the time through informal conversations, phone calls, and texting. We talk pretty much daily and it’s odd, because we are pretty much on the same page. With the parents, it is more difficult, because many do not care what the kids are doing when they are here or the fliers sent home get lost. Through trial and error, we have learned that Facebook is our best method for reaching parents. We have a very active page.

P4 not only sought to communicate with others inside and outside the organization, but she sought solutions to problems surrounding communications, therefore P4 met the communal dialog criterion.

- How would you describe your organization’s decision-making style? Tell of a time that best displays your organization’s decision-making process including who was involved.
We all have our roles, and we make decision on certain things based upon our role. It’s really role specific, and we go to each other when it crosses over into their role. It’s simple not to talk about or make decision for someone else’s job. Coach doesn’t make decisions that are my job and I don’t make decisions that are his job.

P4 met the participatory decision-making criterion, because she seeks the input of others as well as passes decision to others who are more qualified to make them.

- Has there been a time that you felt your organization was facing a major setback?
  What did you do?

  When we lost the mental health program it hurt, because they gave and donated to the organization. With them, we didn’t have to worry about basic costs. I was having a melt down, because we are broke, and the programs that we created for the youth would be impacted; however, the two coaches pointed out that we have been broke before, and we’ll get by. We are making it work. I am seeking out other sources of help, and we are making sure that our core programs are done.

  Although P4 was initially concerned about the elimination in resources, she quickly rebounded with a positive, forward thinking, and anti-deficit thinking, therein met the AI thinking criterion.

  **Step 3: Analysis of interviews.**

  After reviewing the information from the Facebook, newspapers, websites, and the interview, it was determined that P4 met all the criteria pertaining to the organization,
the social justice leadership and the AI thinking. P4 was asked to participate in the facilitated session.
## Appendix D

### Facilitated Session Agenda

### WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS
- Thank you for coming.
- Review housekeeping and logistics
- Introduce session workers and participants
- Review roles & responsibilities
- Review meeting expectations and process (high-level agenda, parking lot, good idea board)
- Review “now what” – What happens with the information after the session

### DAY 1 – 15 minutes
Large Group
Start time 9:30 AM

### NEEDS AND OBJECTIVE FOR MEETING
- Confirm need and drivers
- Review scope and purpose of meeting
- Discuss identified need for the knowledge to be created

### DAY 1 – 15 minutes
Large Group

### PROCESS OVERVIEW
- Review the research framework (Appreciative Inquiry)
- Review shared terminology (AI, Phase, Stage, Activities, etc.)
- Re-review medium-level agenda
- Define measures of success for the meeting (i.e. what would make this meeting successful?)
- Create group operating agreement

### DAY 1 – 20 minutes
Large Group
**PARTICIPANTS SHARE THEIR EXPERIENCES**

- Participants Brainstorm (30 minutes including break)
  - Identify and write on Post-its successful work processes and activities.
  - <BREAK>
- Participant 1 (20 minute + 5 Q&A/transition time)
  - Introduce the mission of your organization
  - Discuss how you identified the community’s need
  - Discuss how you identified the organization to meet this need
  - Discuss how you started the organization
  - Discuss the successful work processes and activities that has made your organization successful
  - Answer questions from group
-Participant 1 (20 minute + 5 Q&A/transition time)
  - Introduce the mission of your organization
  - Discuss how you identified the community’s need
  - Discuss how you identified the organization to meet this need
  - Discuss how you started the organization
  - Discuss the successful work processes and activities that has made your organization successful
  - Answer questions from group
- Continue with other participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BREAK – LUNCH</th>
<th>45 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**STRAW MODEL (FOR PHASES)**

- Review terms – phase, stage, and activity
- As large group discuss the commonalities in their experiences (10-15 minutes)
From their previous discussion and as a large group, identify phases using the point in time when the organization is defined (for example, the phase(s) prior to defining the organization, which might be brainstorming and initiating. The phases after organization is defined might be start-up, and maintenance.)

(This large group activities is also an activity to practice agreed upon group interactions and processes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINE EACH PHASE’S ACTIVITIES AND STEPS</th>
<th>45 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a group (use wall and large Post-it notes to help visualize model).</td>
<td>Large Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group the Post-its into activities or steps under the appropriate phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each group presents their model to large group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the established phases do they need changes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILL IN THE DETAILS</th>
<th>Day 2 – 75 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review the full model.</td>
<td>LARGE GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Post-its need expanding upon? Ask the group to expand upon these Post-its.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRAP UP</th>
<th>Day 2 – 30 Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review the model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What advice would you give leaders starting community organizations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the characteristics of successful community leaders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Parking Lot and Good Idea Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss next steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THANK YOU!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Social Change Organization Development Process

On the next page starts the initial draft of the SCO Development Process. This draft is based upon the participants cycle one coding and analysis as well as my cycle two coding and analysis. I consider this a draft because developing a process is an interactive process: data gathering from successful leaders; organizing data into work processes, work products, and guiding experiences; using the process; gaining feedback data for improvements; and reorganizing data into more effective and efficient work processes, work products, and guiding experiences.

The following Development Process is formatted for use by current and future leaders of Social Change Organizations as such it is written in second person plural, meaning that I and the research participants are directly instructing the reader, you. The formatting of this appendix allows the SCO Development Process to be printed separately from the dissertation and distributed to current and future leaders of SCOs.
Social Change Organization Development Process

Developed by Cynthia Knechtges
and the successful leaders of social change organizations.
CHAPTER 1
Introduction

What is a Development Process?

A process is a framework for completing work with a specific purpose. It defines what work needs to be done to accomplish the purpose, when the work needs to be done, and how to do the work. With a defined purpose, a process segments the work into smaller more manageable efforts, which are completed in a specific (sequential or iterative) order. For example, work efforts might be segmented into the following hierarchical levels: phases, activities, and steps. Work is segmented into phases each with its own sub-purpose, of which, contributes and leads to accomplishing the overall purpose. Activities segment the work with in a phase into even more manageable efforts. Within each activity multiple steps are identified, which are a further breakdown of work into smaller and even more focused work efforts. To direct the work phases, activities, and steps, a process provides work products. Work products are knowledge-based documents and presentation that are used to gather, organize, analyze, or present information.

For Whom is the Social Change Organization Development Process Intended?

The intended audience for the Social Change Organization Development Process (SCODP) is current and future leaders of community organizations with the mission to create meaningful changes at the individual level by transforming and empowering the individual to improve their own life. The process spans the first few years (i.e., 1-5 years) of an organization’s life. Additional research on the work process and products is required to validate this process and to expand the organization’s life (i.e., 1-10 years).

How was the SCO Development Process Created?

The Social Change Organization Development Process (SCODP) was created using an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach. (Cooperrider, Whitney & Stavros, 2008) The AI approach gathers successful experiences and formulates those experiences into a reproducible and systematic process of work processes and products. In following this approach, I gathered a small group of successful leaders into a room, and facilitated the sharing of their successful work processes and products as well as the lessons they learned in the creation and management of their community organizations. Therefore, the SCODP is based upon the successful work experiences of leaders for creating and
managing successful nonprofit community organizations. The experiences of these successful leaders were gathered, analyzed, and formed into this SCODP.

With this said, the SCODP is not complete. This is the first iteration of development for the SCODP, meaning that further development is required. This further developing involves an iterative cycle of using the process and enhancing the method process ology based upon successful experiences of additional leaders.

As a reminder, this process is based on organizations that are diverse in purpose, race, religion, and gender preferences; however, the SCODP is specifically created for organizations with the mission to empower and transform at the individual level. Additional work is needed to develop processes for organizations with other types of missions (i.e. political, charity, etc.).


Figure 1: Social Change Organization Development Process
What does the Social Change Organization Develop Process Offer?

This process offers a framework of work processes, work products, and guiding experiences that direct the work of creating and managing a nonprofit community organization. The work processes are a series of actions and instructions to be completed in a recommended sequence or iterative cycle. This process breaks the work processes into a hierarchy of phases, activities, and steps. Also this process identifies and provides templates for work products. In addition to work processes and work products, this process provides guiding experiences. Guiding experiences are considerations and mindsets that impact what, how, and when work is accomplished and are seen as increasing the likelihood of success.

How to Use the Social Change Organization Develop Process?

The purpose of this process is to provide leaders with an overarching framework of work processes (i.e., phases, activities, steps), work products, and guiding experiences. To effectively use this framework, the leader must learn basic work processes and work products for creating and managing a nonprofit organization. This process is not a step-by-step recipe that will always produce successful result. The leader must have the ability to apply and extrapolate the process’s work processes, work products, and guiding experiences to the situation at hand as well as the ability to know what work processes and guiding experiences are most applicable to their organizations and community. It is recommended to read and understand the whole process prior to starting the first work phase.

The Social Change Organization Development Process (SCODP) has a general flow from left to right; however, the development of work products is iterative and may cycle back to activities and steps in previous phases. To develop an organization, a leader begins by “Defining The Need,” and then moves to “Engaging The Public,” then to “Telling Your Story,” and so forth. As knowledge is gained and relationships are developed, the leader cycles back to previous phases and drafted work products incorporating the new knowledge gained from people and experiences. The phase, “Funding The Organization,” is pictorially placed across the bottom, because once the board is formed, this phase can be started at anytime during the first five phases based upon the funding needs of the organization.

The following chapters each outline a phase of the SCODP. Each chapter defines the purpose of the phase, outlines the successful work activities and steps, describes the work products and how to generate them, and provides the guiding experiences of successful leaders.
CHAPTER 2
Defining The Need

In this chapter, the successful work processes, work products, and guiding experiences identified by successful leaders are provided. Within this phase, Defining The Need, leaders identified the following work activities as necessary to perform:

- Explore the “felt need,”
- Draft organization’s vision and mission,
- Organize the board (or steering committee),
- Conduct a SWOT analysis,
- Investigate resources and infrastructure requirements, and
- Build an initial political strategy.

The purpose of Defining The Need is to create a high level plan to explore and understand the need, the level of effort required to meet the need, and the interest people have in forming an organization to meet the need. In this phase, you and your organization will create draft versions of work products, which prepare you and your organization for discussions with other people and organizations. Many of the work products require input from multiple audiences; therefore in this phase, you will initiate activities, steps, and work products but not complete them. For example, you will initiate defining the vision and mission; however, finalizing them is after you have completed the next two phases, Engaged The Public and Building Allies.
Defining The Need: Work Activities and Steps

**Defining The Need:**
- Activities: Explore the “felt need”
- Draft organization’s vision and mission
- Organize the board or steering committee
- Conduct a SWOT analysis
- Investigate resource and infrastructure requirements
- Build an initial political strategy

**Engaging Others:**
- Activities: Define meeting standards
- Create public engagement plan
- Initiate government contact
- Seek self-improvement

**Telling Your Story:**
- Activities: Develop marketing message
- Train on the delivery of marketing messages
- Create communication plan

**Building Alliances:**
- Activities: Refine and implement political strategy
- Implement strategy for building allies
- Refine program plan
- Update resource plan

**Taking Action:**
- Activities: Implement resource and program plans
- Reevaluate and simplify models and plans

**WORK PRODUCTS**
- Draft Mission Statement
- SWOT Model
- Resource Plan
- Program Plan
- Political Strategy

**WORK PRODUCTS**
- Marketing Messages
- Communication Plan

**WORK PRODUCTS**
- Political Strategy
- Program Plan
- Resource Plan

**Figure 2:** Social Change Organization Development Process – Defining The Need

**Work Activity: Explore the “Felt Need.”**

The “felt need” is when you can say, “something needs to be done and I am the one to do it.” In this activity reach out to friends, family, and people from community organizations to build your understanding of the need and the work required.

**Guiding experience: Having the felt need.** Creating and managing a nonprofit organization is challenging. It is imperative that you explore your “felt need,” because this feeling builds commitment to the organization and separates those who will quit and those who follow through.

**Work Step: Discuss the idea with others.**

Use others including friends, family, and acquaintances as a sounding board to verify that this need is truly a need within the community. If people cannot talk you out of pursuing this idea, then it may be a true passion. These discussions may help to find others with like passions and who is willing to partner with you.
Create a support group. A support group is the people that will help create the organization. These are the people on the ground with you and not just people who lend an ear. Before starting, find someone else to partner with who has the passionate about the idea and work too.

Guiding experience: Creating your support group. Support comes in three levels: core, doers, and loose supporters. The core team is the few people (i.e., 1-3) that are in on every decision, meeting, and work effort. The organization will be a major part of their lives. Doers are the people that want to help, but this is one of many facets in their lives. Loose supports come and go, but at times can still support the organization. Creating an organization is not only a lot of work but is also a lot of stress. Having a core team who will work with you helps to manage workload, and therefore stress.

Talk with leaders of other community organizations. Understand what you are getting yourself into by talking with leaders from other community organizations. They can give insight as to how they started and the challenges they face. They will also be an excellent source of support.

In your discussion, seek to learn about organizations with like purpose at the city, state, and national levels. Being able to “franchise” an organization into your community maybe easier than starting one on your own, because oftentimes, franchises have packaged information and training on how to get started.


Research the vision and mission of organizations with like purpose. Many organizations exist within your city, state, country, and world. Do your research to understand what exists. Examples of questions to ask are as follows: Can you join an existing organization? Can you join an existing organization and expand the mission? Can you franchise an existing organization to your area?

Guiding experience: Understand the limited resources. Resources for nonprofit organizations are limited; therefore, research what organizations exist at all levels prior to starting your own. By creating an organization, you are taking resources away from another organization. In the end, the division of resource causes a decrease in services to the community overall, since part of each organization’s resources go to infrastructure.

The search includes local organizations as well as state, country, and world based organizations. An organization is unlikely to meet all needs, so when researching look for the following.
• How and what is included or excluded from a successful organization’s Vision and Mission Statement.

Review the vision and mission of other organizations. Seek to understand what elements are important in good verses not good statement, what audiences they do and do not serve, who are and are not their allies, and so forth.

• Assess the gap between communities’ needs and needs met by other organizations.

As you research other organizations, read between the lines. Who is not being served by the organization and for what reason? Does the organization empower the people they serve and transform them to become self-sufficient and productive members of society. Or, does the organization trap people in a cycle of toxic charity.

**Guiding Experience: Understanding an organization’s belief system.** Be prepared that organization’s with like purpose narrow the people they serve by race, religion, gender, and so forth. Even charitable organizations may discriminate based upon a belief system. This belief system can be written into the mission; however, mission statements fail to include information that is not becoming. Belief systems can also appear in organizations through its culture. The organization’s mission may not discriminate, but the leader’s allows their beliefs to impact the organization’s culture therein discriminating based on religion, location, race, education, and so forth. It is important to understand the belief system of an organization to know who and how they serve people.

• Determine if a new organization is required or if an existing organization can be expanded.

Resources are limited for nonprofit organizations, which impacts an organization’s programs used to meet the mission. Contact and discussion with leaders of organizations with like missions about the needs you see in the community and how to meet those needs. Directly ask if their mission can be expanded to meet the additional needs you have identified.

**Guiding experience: Setting your ego aside.** People typically want to start their own organization instead of working with an existing. Creating another organization to meet the same mission and goals of an existing one uses limited resources. Your energy and resources are better spent helping to expand upon an existing organization’s demographic area, people served, and so forth. However if an organization is unwilling to expand their services or audience, then you should create a new organization. Philanthropy organizations tend to create a competitive environment for resources, so
remember the goal is to solve a problem in the community. Solving the problem may mean setting your ego aside and working with an existing organization.

**Work Step: Defining the organization’s Vision Statement.**

A Vision Statement creates a vivid mental picture of the organization’s desired outcomes, orients everything the organization does, and is a continuous point of reference. The Mission Statement concisely states what the organization is going to do and how the organization will do it. Both statements are big pictures, which orient and guide actions; however, the Vision Statement is meant to inspire a person to act while the Mission Statement is meant to guide the actions.


A Vision Statement is a clear vision of the future state, which draws people into its compelling and desirable picture of the future. A Vision Statement answers three questions:

1) "Why is the change imperative?" This question identifies what change is needed in the community. Describe the problem or opportunity that is driving the need to change and why the organization should pursue it.

2) "What's in it for me?" This component speaks to the self-interest of the people who support the change and explains why people and organizations should support this organization in its effort to make change.

3) "Why is the organization in existence?" This question identifies a compelling reason for people to support the organization; relates how addressing this change will make a difference in the community; offers the unique purpose or capabilities that your organization provides currently or futuristically to meet the community need.

The Vision Statement acts as a bridge between individual and organization, encouraging individuals to transcend self-interests for the sake of the organization’s purpose. Visions are clear, concise, memorable pictures of a brighter tomorrow. They encourage action and therefore are written in active language.

**Work Step: Defining the organization’s Mission Statement.**

A Mission Statement articulates a general description of what must happen to translate the vision into tangible results. A mission answers the following four questions:
1) What must we do today to meet our future vision?
2) To meet this vision, what values do we as an organization hold?
3) Identify whom the organization serves? And, what are our responsibilities toward them?
4) What are the objectives, human and technical, necessary to meet our vision?

Seek input from others using one-on-one meeting, focus groups, or open forums. When seek input, actively listen to their feedback and ask clarifying questions. Active listening requires a person to withhold judgment and defensiveness about what is being said. The listener seeks to understand the person’s position and ideas by asking questions that seek to clarify the person’s position and ideas. As you gain different perspectives, recognize and incorporate as appropriate into the vision and mission. At this point, the vision and mission expands and contracts as input is gained from others. Before incorporating people’s input into your Vision and Mission Statements, assess their belief system about such things as race and religion. These belief systems impact their ideas for your organization.

The development of the Vision and Mission Statements is an iterative process. Use the four questions to facilitate the development of the Mission Statement as you talk with family, friends, and leaders of other community organizations. The Mission Statement may have multiple parts meaning that “What must we do today to meet our future vision?” may require many activities; therefore, your Mission Statement may have multiple actionable and measurable statements.

**Work Activity: Organize Board or Steering Committee**

In this work activity, the leader defines the purpose for the board, identifies people who will contribute to the board’s purpose, recruits those people, and prepares the board for their role within the organization by reviewing and enhancing the organization’s vision, mission, scope, and culture.

**Work Step: Define the board’s purpose and member requirements.**

A board member brings their skills and resources to an organization. Defining a board based upon the organizations’ needs at any given phase of development is strategic. An organization may have multiple boards simultaneously or the board’s purpose and members may change over time. The purpose of the board defines the members based upon the skills, network, and resources they bring to the organization. With this said, three questions help to define a board:
• How can a board help the organization at this point in time? Restate the answers to define the board’s purpose.
• To meet the purpose, what skills, network, or resources do board members need?
• How do we find these people? Who’s network can we leverage?

**Work Step: Enhance the vision, mission, and scope of the organization.**

When new people are brought onto the board or steering committee, they need oriented to the organization’s vision, mission, and scope. At this point in the organization’s development, the orientation of the new board (or steering committee) is through meetings that enhance and create the work products in this phase, which include the mission, SWOT Model, Resource Plan, Program Plan, and Political Strategy. Focus groups and test groups helps the board put a face to the organization’s purpose, gain a better understanding of the true problems and solutions, as well as gain input from the people the organization serves for the work products.

With the board, clearly define what your organization will and will not do. Define how it will and will not help the people it serves. Define how it will and will not work with other organizations. Know the gray areas! Leverage your board and allies to help you formulate your plans.

**Work Step: Define and maintain the organization’s culture.**

Defining a culture starts with defining the vision and mission of the organization followed by aligning the organization’s values and practices with the Vision and Mission Statements. If an organization’s mission is to respect human beings, the organization needs to start with its own employees. The values and practices of the organizations must display respect to both the people served and the people doing the serving.

*Guiding experience: Aligning culture with practices.* Having a well-defined and maintained organizational culture increases the likelihood of success for the organization and its people. A culture causes an organization to not meet its goals by having a belief system contrary to the vision and mission.

**Work Activity: Conduct a SWOT Analysis**

The SWOT Model is a tool to strategically analyze an organization. This activity is best conducted in a group discussion or facilitated meeting. SWOT analysis is a three-step process, which includes defining the organization’s stakeholders, defining the strength and weaknesses, and defining the opportunities and threats of the organization.

Work Step: Diagram the organization’s stakeholders.

The following diagram helps to identify the organization’s stakeholders. A Stakeholder Diagram is a representation of the people, both internal and external to the organization as well as external organizations that play a role in fulfilling the organization’s mission or are impacted by the organization’s course of action. By creating a Stakeholder Diagram, you are able to pictorially identify the people and organizations that are involved in or affected by your organization, which enables more data collection, systematic analysis, and solution development during the SWOT Model analysis. This diagram is the foundation for other work products in this process including the Communication Plan and Political Strategy. The diagram uses concentric circles to show a relationship between categories of stakeholders with the people served at the core, your organization surrounding them, and people and organizations external to your own surrounding your organization. This model is updated as your organization’s environment changes; such changes include people, organizations, political environment, legislation, and so forth.

WORK PRODUCT: Stakeholder Diagram
Create a stakeholder map. The following table provides examples of stakeholders for each category. Modify the table to your organization’s situation. Stakeholders are people or organizations that are involved in or affected by the organization’s course of action. It is highly recommended to learn who the people with influence are within the community. This is done through the local news or by asking members of local philanthropy organizations.

**WORK PRODUCT: Stakeholder Map**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People Served</th>
<th>The Organization</th>
<th>Allies and Non-allies</th>
<th>Community’s Nonprofit Sector</th>
<th>Community’s Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Past</td>
<td>• Leaders</td>
<td>• Organizations with like missions</td>
<td>• Philanthropists</td>
<td>• Social Cultural Shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current</td>
<td>• Board</td>
<td>• Organizations with complimenting mission</td>
<td>• People of Influence</td>
<td>• Technology Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Future</td>
<td>• Steering Committees</td>
<td>• People or organizations that hurt the people you serve</td>
<td>• Local Government Support</td>
<td>• Political Winds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff/ Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>• Community Demographic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Step: Define the organization’s strengths and weaknesses.**

Conduct a focus group or meeting to explore the organization’s strengths and weaknesses. Knowledge of the organization’s strengths and weaknesses gives input to refining your Mission Statement, goals, and programs as well as your Political Strategy. A SWOT model highlights the organization’s gaps in capabilities, resources, and processes, so a plan is created to address the gaps. The SWOT Model is reviewed and updated as capabilities, resources, and processes change.

To explore your strengths and weaknesses, four categories of information help to gather and analyze the organization’s strengths and weakness; these four categories are your organization’s knowledge of needs, capabilities, resources, and processes. The following diagram helps to organize information for analysis and decision-making. The categories may be different base upon the type of organization; however, the sample categories provide help starting the discussion to identify the appropriate categories, the questions within each box, and ultimately, determine the strengths and weaknesses of the organization.
WORK PRODUCT: SWOT – Strengths and Weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Knowledge of Needs</th>
<th>Capabilities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction?</td>
<td>Organization’s Culture</td>
<td>Intangible?</td>
<td>Relationship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of meeting needs?</td>
<td>• Structure</td>
<td>Other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for Development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Knowledge of Needs</th>
<th>Capabilities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction?</td>
<td>Organization’s Culture</td>
<td>Intangible?</td>
<td>Relationship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of meeting needs?</td>
<td>• Structure</td>
<td>Other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for Development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Step: Define the organization’s opportunities and threats.**

Once the stakeholders are identified, an analysis of the opportunities and threats of the organization is completed. The next step of analysis is defining how your organization interacts with the external world. This step of the SWOT Model, opportunities and threats, identify the forces external to the organization that influences it’s success.
WORK PRODUCT: SWOT – Opportunities and Threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Allies &amp; Non-Allies</th>
<th>Area’s Nonprofit Sector</th>
<th>Your Communities Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your Organization’s Interface</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allies &amp; Non-Allies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area’s Nonprofit Sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Your Communities Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Opportunities with like missions?</td>
<td>Philanthropists?</td>
<td>Social Cultural Shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader(s)?</td>
<td>Organizations with complimenting mission?</td>
<td>People of Influence?</td>
<td>Technology Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/volunteers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Government Support?</td>
<td>Political Winds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/Steering Committee?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonprofit Organizations?</td>
<td>Community Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td><strong>Allies &amp; Non-Allies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area’s Nonprofit Sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Your Communities Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader(s)?</td>
<td>Opportunities with like missions?</td>
<td>Philanthropists?</td>
<td>Social Cultural Shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/volunteers?</td>
<td>Organizations with complimenting mission?</td>
<td>People of Influence?</td>
<td>Technology Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/Steering Committee?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Government Support?</td>
<td>Political Winds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competing Nonprofit Organizations?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Demographic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guiding experience: Being prepared for “no”**. The four categories of analysis – strengths, weaknesses, opportunity, and strengths provide a robust understanding of your organization and how it fits into your community. With the knowledge from this analysis, you are better prepared for the many discouraging conversations. Many people will tell you “no” and try to talk you out of putting your time and effort into helping others. This includes organizations with similar purposes; remember you are competing for resources. Some naysayers have legitimate ideas and arguments. Actively listen and seek to understand what others have to say; however, you must also be prepared to walk away and not waste your energy on unhelpful naysayers.

Work Activity: Investigate Resource and Infrastructure Requirements

Upon completion of identifying your strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, the group creates a strategic plan of how to take advantage of the organization’s strengths and opportunities while minimizing the negative effect of the organization’s weaknesses and threats.

Work Step: Draft Program Plan.

Programs are services an organization provides; a Program Plan links the programs of services to the organization’s vision, mission, and goals. All programs must link back to the Vision and Mission Statements of the organization; otherwise these untethered programs are using resources, which do not help the organization meet its vision or mission. At this time, you are generating a draft Program Plan with your steering committee or board. This plan is further develop during meetings with the public and allies. Leverage your public and allies to formulate your Program Plan and Resource Plan.

As a reminder, your mission may have multiple statements (i.e., part 1, part 2, part 3). Each row in the table below represents one of these statements; however, to meet a statement within the mission may require multiple goals (i.e., 1.a, 1.b, 1.c) and multiple programs (i.e., A, B, C).

WORK PRODUCT: Program Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>1.a, 1.b, 1.c</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>3.a, 3.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When defining programs keep in mind, do not reinvent the wheel! Seek out programs that already exist in other organizations and communities. Within your own community, identify ways to share programs across organizations. Organization can share resources such as transportation services; one organization alone cannot sustain a car service but several organizations together can.
**Work Step: Define resources requirement plan.**

The resource requirement plan organizes the resources required to define, implement, and maintain the organization’s programs. This plan includes defining the organization’s financial, people, infrastructure and other support resources required to meet the organization’s programs, which are based upon the organization’s Vision and Mission Statements.

The plan is further enhanced as you talk with stakeholders and allies. It will require refinement during the Building Allies phase.

*WORK PRODUCT: Resource Requirements Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Other Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Step: Learn the laws, regulations, and rules applicable to your organization.**

Knowing how to work within the laws, regulations, and rules applicable to your organization helps define and structure your organization’s resource requirements. Equally important is to know how to work within and around the laws, regulations, and rules. For example, by decreasing the number of people in a homeless home shelter eliminates the necessity to comply with costly regulations. Knowing the laws, regulations, and rules assists with defining the organization’s programs and makes compliance with laws and regulations possible.

**Work Activity: Build Initial Political Strategy**

The Political Strategy outlines how the organization identifies and nurtures the relationship with allies. Allies are influential people and organizations that can help your organization fulfill its vision and mission. Their support leads to coalition of efforts as well as financial or political support. It is important to realize the political nature of nonprofit organization; therefore creating a Political Strategy is required. Developing the initial Political Strategy during the Defining The Need phase is intended to start you and your board thinking about the development of allies. Creating a Political Strategy is an iterative process, which prepares for the Building Allies phase.
Work Activity: Define whom to include in the Political Strategy.

From the stakeholder analysis identify who can help your organization meet its mission, goals, and program. Stakeholders include government agencies, schools, community organization, businesses, and people of influence within the community. These stakeholders are potential allies. It is highly recommended to learn who the people with influence are within the community. This is done through the local news or by asking members of local philanthropy organizations.

As you identify the programs, document the stakeholders that can help, how they can help, and why they should help. Remember, creating alliances is a two-way process. To develop an ally is not only what can they do for you, but also, what can you do for them. What programs do they have that your organization could assist them with? Be strategic in developing relationships. An organization may not be able to directly assist your organization; however, they partner with another organization that can assist your organization.

WORK PRODUCT: Political Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program(s)</th>
<th>Stakeholders That can Help (Allies)</th>
<th>How can they help?</th>
<th>Why should they help?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding experience: Having a big name ally. Make sure your list of potential allies has at least one big name. Having a big name ally supporting your organization encourages others to take your organization seriously and increases the likelihood that others will support your organization.

Guiding experience: Knowing when help is not help. With the first development of the Political Strategy, start to identify which stakeholders are ally, non-ally, and nemesis. Understanding each stakeholder’s position saves a lot of future time and frustration. Frequently, an ally is not really an ally, because your missions, culture, or programs do not align or are not compatible or they commit abuses towards the people your organization serves because of intolerance or hatred towards people of certain demographics. It is not recommended to burn bridges; however, it can be a strategy to differentiate your organization and bring to light the abuses by the other organizations. If done, be strategic with respects to when, where, and how. Also, be willing to walk away from help. Help comes with strings attached that either modifies the vision, mission, or programs of the organizations, or too heavily burdens the organization’s resources.
Work Activity: Be prepared for your conversation and meeting.

In many cases, you only have one chance to make a good impression, so do your homework prior to having conversations with a potential ally:

- Be clear in your understanding of your organization’s vision, mission, and scope. Rehearsed sound bites help provide consistent messages and prevent making promises that cannot be kept.
- Research and know with whom you are talking. Know their vision, mission, programs, and organization.
- Use your network and connections to make introductions. Being introduced by a mutual friend increases the likelihood of getting an appointment.
- Be sincere and not contrived when trying to connect on a personal level.
- Disagreement does not have to end respect or friendship. Be careful not to burn bridges.

Conclusion

In this phase, Defining The Need, you explored and defined the need, the core group of people who will help create the organization, the organization’s Vision and Mission Statements, and how your organization will meet the community’s needs. By following the activities and steps within this phase, you developed a realistic picture of your organization and a path for moving towards that picture. As you complete the next phases, the work products drafted in this phase are enhanced with the new information gained in future phases.

In the next phase, Engaging The Public, you will solicit the community’s involvement to further your understand of the need, the community’s commitment, and additional potential solutions.
CHAPTER 3

Engaging The Public

In this chapter, the successful work processes, work products, and guiding experiences identified by successful leaders are provided. Within this phase, Engaging The Public, leaders identified the following work activities as necessary to perform:

- Define meeting standards,
- Create public engagement plan,
- Initiate government contacts, and
- Seek self-improvement.

The purpose of this phase is to communicate with the public, therein engaging people with a passion for your organization’s vision, and who want to actively be involved. This phase starts after the vision, mission, goals, and programs are refined with the board or steering committee. The goal is to engage and solicit the public’s input, support, knowledge, and resources. Example goals for the public meetings include: hold focus groups with the people you serve to understand their needs, confirm the community’s perspective of their needs and proposed solution, and conduct test groups to clarify the organization’s programs.

Frequently, members of the organization (i.e. leaders, board members, committee members, staff, and volunteers) are eager to meet and discuss the organization’s vision, mission, programs, and needs with people outside the organization; however, this may be disastrous if not planned. Planning to engage the public includes defining the organization’s standards for meetings and developing a Public Engagement Plan. Defining the Organization’s Meeting Standards ensures that everyone in the organization understands the organization’s expectation for meeting preparedness and conduct. Creating a Public Engagement Plan ensures that the organizations has the required and timely input from the public as well as ensures that all meetings use the public’s time effectively and efficiently.
Engaging The Public: Work Activities and Steps

Figure 3: Social Change Organization Methodology – Engaging The Public

Work Activity: Define Meeting Standards

Meeting planning is important. Public meetings gather information about the community, needs, people served, and solutions. Equally important, public meetings display your competence and seriousness as a leader and organization; therefore, your organization should define your organization’s standards and steps for good meeting planning. It is important to have a formal meeting with your board, steering committee, staff, and volunteers to define the Organization’s Meeting Standards and expectations.

The following are general topics to discuss and gain buy-in during the standards setting meeting. Based upon your organization, the audience, and the community, the following may other topics to discuss,

- Define the purpose, scope, and results for each meeting.
- Define the audience required to fulfill meeting purpose including defining the right people and right number of people.
Define how to deliver and gather information (i.e. focus group, town meeting, social media, emails).

Promote the meeting to get the right people in the room.

Create an agenda that starts with the end purpose in mind.

Understand the audience’s need and the background knowledge they bring to the meeting.

Communicate the agenda at the beginning of the meeting, and how this meeting relates to previous and future meeting to build interest for future meetings.

Have a backup agenda and plan; meetings seldom go as planned. Frequently more or less people attend or the key people do not attend. A back up plan can help gain and disseminate important information without wasting people’s time.

Have good meeting facilitators. They should have active listening skills, and encourage meeting members to also actively listen meaning to listening to understand as opposed to a responsive listener that talks to be understood. A good facilitator also reads and reacts to facial, body language and verbal.

People have different levels of professionalism and knowledge, so do not gloss over the discussion and assume people already know how to conduct meeting or themselves. Document the meeting standards to have as reference as well as to review with new people to the organization.

Work Activity: Create a Public Engagement Plan

A Public Engagement Plan outlines a sequence of meetings and focus groups for the next six to twelve months by breaking information gathering and delivery down by purpose, audience, delivery type, timing, etc.

The Public Engagement Plan starts by defining the purpose for Engaging The Public and then defining the audiences to help meet each purpose. For example, your first meeting may have the purpose to gain people’s involvement in the organization. The publics you invite are those people interested in the vision. Once your purpose and audience is defined, you define how, when, and where Engaging The Public takes place.

Work Step: Identify the purposes to engage the public.

The first step is to identify the purposes for communicating and Engaging The Public is a two-way conversation, meaning the goal is not only updating the public but also gain their input. The purposes for Engaging The Public may include but not be limited to the following:

- Confirm your understanding of the people you intend to serve,
• Generating excitement. This can be done through testimonials and positive experiences.
• Engaging audiences outside the organization to gather and disseminate information.
• Building a brand or image for your organization, so there is no confusion between your organization and other community organizations with similar mission.

**Work Step: Define your audiences for each purpose.**

Once the purposes for Engaging The Public are defined, map the audiences to the purpose. The audience includes people (and organizations) within your community that could and would want to see your organization’s vision become reality. It is important to have the right people and right number of people at meetings. The Stakeholder Map – Identifying Audiences is a starting point for identifying the necessary audiences for meeting the purposes for Engaging The Public. Additional audiences are identified through Facebook pages and websites of other organizations. For example, a developing youth organization, posts on the Facebook or the webpage of another organization in that community. Social media is a way to identify audiences with specific interests.

**Work Steps: Define how, when, and where to engage the audience.**

While completing the Public Engagement Plan, answer questions such as: How should you communicate: through one-on-one conversations, focus group, and so forth? When is the optimal time to communicate with an audience? Where should we meet that is convenient in location and that provides the necessary venue including space, amenities, etc.

**WORK PRODUCT: Public Engagement Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose for Engaging</th>
<th>Required Audiences</th>
<th>How to Engage</th>
<th>When to Engage</th>
<th>Where to Engage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Activity: Initiate Government Contacts**

With a drafted of the vision, mission, goals, and programs of the organization, it is time to reach out to your local government agencies including the mayor, congressperson, board of education, and so forth. Define the audiences within the community, city, county, and state that needs to know your organization is in the startup phases. Leading a
community organization is political and it is important that government officials know that your organization exists, how you differ from other organizations, and how they can help you. Their input can help you refine your mission, programs, Political Strategy and so forth. Be prepared to support your vision, mission, goals, and programs with facts about the people you serve, competing and ally organizations, and so forth. Numbers are usually shocking, hard to argue against, and show that you have done your homework.

**Work Activity: Seek Self-improvement**

Self-improvement takes many forms; however, it starts with feedback from others. When receiving feedback put your ego aside and listen for improvement opportunities. Then seek development opportunities. Some larger, national nonprofit organizations provide training classes. You will have to seek out what is available in your community and online.

**Conclusion**

In this phase, Engaging The Public, you engaged and solicited the public’s input, support, knowledge, and resources about the community’s need and how the organization can meet those needs. With the information gained from this phase, you were able to enhance the previous phase’s work products such as the Program Plan, Resource Plan, SWOT Model, and so forth. These first two phases of the process help build a solid foundation of knowledge about the needs and solutions. This foundation of knowledge is used in the next phases.

The next phase, Telling Your Story, you will create a clear and concise image of your organization. This clear and concise image should help to create the power of emotional response from community members, organizations, government officials, and so on. In so doing, care must be taken not to exploit the people you serve or the emotions of others.
CHAPTER 4

Telling Your Story

In this chapter, the successful work processes, work products, and guiding experiences identified by successful leaders are provided. Within this phase, Telling Your Story, leaders identified the following work activities as necessary to perform:

- Develop marketing messages,
- Train on delivering marketing messages, and
- Create communication plan.

The purpose of this phase is to create a clear, concise, memorable, and transparent image of what the organization accomplishes and whom it serves. For community organizations to be successful, they need the support from people internally and externally to the organizations as well as other organizations - for-profit, nonprofit, government, religious, and so forth. A way to gain support from people is through their understanding of the life stories of the people you serve and how those stories have led to the organization’s vision, mission, and programs. This phase gives victims and the underprivileged a platform for telling their story and how they are transforming their life. Through telling their stories, your organization is empowering their voice. The communication of these stories must be strategic and well planned, and the communication of these stories cannot exploit victims or the underprivileged. There are many different ways to deliver these stories: Local newspaper, POD casts, film documentary, forum or meetings with allies, and so forth.

A clarification is required. The work product developed during this phase is the Communication Plan, which is different the Public Engagement Plan. The Public Engagement Plan targets communications with the general public that might be interested in your organization’s vision and mission. The Communication Plan targets people and organizations both inside and outside the organization with the purpose to keep these audiences informed of the organization’s activities as well as to make requests.
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Figure 4: Social Change Organization Development Process – Telling Your Story

Work Activity: Develop Marketing Messages

In this activity, Marketing Messages are developed. These messages, both visual and verbal, create a vivid image of the organization’s vision and mission. These vivid images are tools used in your organization’s communications. The purpose of a Communication Plan is to concisely convey the organization’s vision and mission and to gain buy-in from people and organizations. The plan outlines the organization’s communication effort for the year – to whom, what, when, and where. The Communication Plan as described here has an element of marketing by including the organization’s definition of concise and consistent messages that portray a vivid image of the organization. After the vision, mission, and programs are defined identifying the images used in both internal and external marketing material and the scripted verbal sound bites used to describe the organization to develop the Marketing Messages.
Work Step: Put a face to the need.

Putting a face to the need creates opportunities for victims to tell their story as well as create opportunities for the organization to leverage the power of emotional response. Do not exploit victim or the underprivileged!

- Identify the life story of victims, key turning point that put them there, and how they are turning their life around.
- Identify the best media for recording: written, video, audio, etc.
- If appropriate, identify the abuses perpetrated against the people you serve by other individuals and organizations.

Work Step: Define your Marketing Messages based on usage.

Everyone inside and outside the organizations should have the same understanding of the organization’s vision, mission, goals, and programs. To make sure this happens, consistent messages need to be delivered. Defining these messages are important; equally important is teaching and practicing the delivery of these message with the organization’s leaders, board, staff and volunteers. When possible teach allies the key Marketing Messages. Many of the messages are developed from the organization’s vision, mission, goals and programs; however messages are also developed from frequently asked question meaning if you are asked the same question more than once, a standard answer needs to be developed. The following are examples categories of Marketing Messages:

- Vision statement
- Mission statement
- Definition of people served
- Sample stories of people served
- Statements (with statistics) countering incorrect social beliefs about the people you serve.
- Programs the organization provide
- How your organization differs from other organizations
- The budget’s breakdown (e.g. less than 10% administrative costs)
- Statements by large supporters
- Importance of their support
- Frequently asked questions about the organization, its leadership, etc.

These messages need to be clear, concise, memorable, and transparent. Transparent messages do not encourage the listener to conjure misleading or false images or ideas. For example, when communicating about funding, message should be
transparent about what percentage of donations is used for administrative purposes. Transparency requires consistent and concise messaging. In addition, different audiences need different information; however, the images and message should align to convey a consistently vivid image of the organization.

**Work Activity: Train on the Delivery of Marketing Messages**

It is important that the same concise and consistent messages are heard both internally and externally to the organization. When someone from outside the organization talks to anyone from the organization, they should walk-a-way with a clear and consistent message. Ideally, they would be able to deliver the same clear and consistent message. Therefore, all people within the organization as well as allies (i.e. board members, employees, volunteers) need training on what the message are and how to deliver the message.

**Work Activity: Create a Communication Plan**

The purpose of the Communication Plan is to identify the communications required for the various audiences that impact your organization, currently or prospectively. Prospective audiences are people or organization that you target to bring into the fold of the organization through their buy-in and support (i.e. political, financial, program, etc.). Current audiences my require communications to keep them informed of the organization’s progress or to make specific requests.

Equally important as the messages is their delivery. Define whom, when, and how messages are delivered both internally and externally to the organization.

**Work Step: Define the audiences.**

The audiences may be numerous including both internal and external to the organizations. Examples of audiences to include in the Communication Plan are current and targeted – staff, community volunteers, donors, people served, government contacts, and other community organizations. Audiences may be analyzed individually or grouped based upon needs or purpose of communications. Use the stakeholder map to help identify the audiences to which to communicate.

The Communication Plan might look similar to the Public Engagement Plan; however, the purpose is different. The Communication Plan has the purpose to disseminate information to specific audiences both internal and external to the organization, while the Public Engagement Plan solicits involvement by members of the community external to the organization. The Public Engagement Plan starts with defining
the purposes for Engaging The Public, while the Communication Plan starts by defining the audiences to which the organization should communicate.

**Work Step: Define the purposes for communicating.**

After identifying the audiences requiring communications, define what each audience needs to know about the organization and group the content and audiences to form specific communication work products (i.e. presentations, letters, emails, phone calls, etc.). By starting with identifying the audiences, you will ensure that all audiences are accounted for; however, developing a communication plan is an iterative cycle between who to communicate to and the purpose of the communication. A communication (i.e. letter, POD Cast) has a specific purpose and may be written for one or more audiences. Audiences may receive a communications on the same topic but with different focus based upon the purpose for that audience. The following are some examples of purposes for communicating:

- Update about or soliciting funding.
- Promoting the organization’s successes.
- Presenting new programs to meet needs of people served.
- Recognition of those who have helped the organization

*Guiding experience: Promoting successes.* Promoting the organization’s success is important. People and organizations surround themselves with success, so seek ways to promote the successes of the organization in printed, electronic, and social media. Inform the public of your successes; this can have a positive snowball effect. Specifically, people are more likely to volunteer their resources (i.e. time, money, network) to organizations that are successful.

**Work Step: Formulate the timing and deliver method.**

After defining the audience and purpose for communicating, take time to understand your audiences. Often time’s people receive more communications than they can review or process; therefore, know your audiences and what delivery methods and timing are most effective (i.e. emails, social media, in-person, texts phone calls, Facebook, etc.) given each audience. Below are sample questions to ask when defining the timing and delivery method for communications?

- What and when are key events within your organization, your community, and the nonprofit community? Take advantage of these events to delivery your messages.
- When is your audience the busiest? If your audience is busy (e.g. with their work outside this organization) on Monday morning, then do not send them messages on
Monday, because your message may be put onto the “do-later” pile and then forgotten.

- How many times and by what types of delivery method should an audience receive communications on a topic?

   Guiding experience: Using time wisely. Use peoples’ time wisely; over communication can cause people not to open messages; however, oftentimes people internal to the organization require multiple communications and in different formats. Keep messages short, concise, and complete.

**Work Step: Identify who should deliver the messages for optimal effect.**

Identifying “the who” will deliver the message is a separate step, because its importance is often overlooked. After defining the audiences and purpose, the next two steps are an iterative process between formulating the time and delivery method with identifying who will deliver the message for optimal effect. Some messages are better received from one person versus another meaning different people impact each audience differently.

**Work Step: Consider prerequisites to your communications.**

Prerequisites to communications and marketing opportunities are both internal and external happenings. Internal events include such happenings as work to be completed, communication, and meetings or forums. Prerequisites external to the organization include such things as award ceremonies, funding dates, and meetings with other organizations or government contacts. Make a calendar of events both internal and external to the organization that increases the success of a communication.

**WORK PRODUCT: Communication Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who (audience)</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Delivery Person</th>
<th>What Content</th>
<th>When and How Often</th>
<th>Delivery Method</th>
<th>Prerequisite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

In this phase, Telling Your Story, you created a communication plan, developed marketing messages, and trained your board and staff to deliver a consistent message.
This consistency tries to ensure that everyone in the community has the same understanding about what your organization does and does not do.

The starting of the next phase, Building Allies, creates a political strategy, which helps to build allies. The relationships with allies and the resources you share are important in implementing your program plan as well as building your standing within the community.
CHAPTER 5
Building Allies

In this chapter, the successful work processes, work products, and guiding experiences identified by successful leaders are provided. Within this phase, Building Allies, leaders identified the following work activities as necessary to perform:

- Refine and implement political strategy,
- Implement strategy of building allies,
- Refine program plan, and
- Update resource plan.

The purpose of the phase, Building Allies, is to form connections with other community organizations, the community’s influential people, and philanthropists. It is important to realize the political nature of nonprofit organization and to not shy away. Building Allies is at both the individual and organizational level. At the individual level, each community has people of influence. These are people have been around a long time, have worked to improve the community, and are respected by the community and community’s government. At the organizational level, organizations with like visions and missions work together to more broadly and completely meet the community’s needs. Organizations are aligned and resources are shared across organizations (i.e. networks, programs, human resources). An example of allies working together is a coalition, such as a neighborhood coalition or coalition for the homeless (e.g. youth vs. adult shelters, east side vs. west side shelters, and so forth). However, allies can be from all types of organizations; think outside the box.

Building Allies is formal; meaning for organizations to be allies, a formal agreement or memorandum is established. Often time, to bring an organization into the alliance of your organization’s allies, a strategic and targeted outreach to people or organizations is required.

During this phase, Building Allies, refine and implement the Political Strategy. As you implement the Political Strategy and meet with allies to gain their input into your organization’s Mission Statement, Program Plan, and Resource Plan, refine the work products from this and previous phases.
**Figure 5:** Social Change Organization Development Process – Building Allies

**Work Activity: Refine and Implement the Political Strategy**

In the first phase, Defining The Need, your organization drafted a Political Strategy. This draft outlines whom your organization sees as an ally, how they you can work together, and why they should work together. Since then you have talked and gained input about potential allies from your board, government agencies, and whom ever you would listen, all these conversations contribute to refining the Political Strategy.

**Work Step: Refine the Political Strategy.**

By this time, you and your board have met with and talked with a lot of people who have knowledge and influence in the community (i.e. government agencies, board member from other organizations, your board, etc.). This knowledge is applied to update and refine each column in the Political Strategy: Programs, Allies, How They Can Help, and Why They Should Help.
**WORK PRODUCT: Political Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program(s)</th>
<th>Stakeholders That can Help (Allies)</th>
<th>How they can help (and you help them)</th>
<th>Why they should help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Step: Draft Ally’s Cost Model.**

Allies are influential people and organizations that can help your organization fulfill its vision and mission; however, allies also come with a cost. The benefits to an ally should outweigh the costs. In the table, list the allies you have identified. Then brainstorm their benefits and costs. Example categories of benefits and costs are as follows:

- Vision and Mission – Does the potential ally help you meet your vision and mission? Do you have to change your vision or mission to obtain their allegiance/assistance? Does the potential ally serve the people your serve or does the ally harm them?
- Resources – Resources include such assistance as financial, staff/volunteers, coalitions, and shared programs or services. Does the ally provide resource benefit? Does your organization have to change your vision, mission, or programs to have access to resources?
- Social and Political – Is public support for your organization demonstrated? What are the interpersonal and organizational politics associated with this ally?
- Other Allies – By creating one ally, have you alienated another ally? What are the cost benefits to each ally?

**WORK PRODUCT: Ally’s Cost Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allies</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vision/ Mission</td>
<td>Vision/ Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social/ Political</td>
<td>Social/ Political</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If an ally’s cost is too high, look for other allies that can fulfill the need with lower costs; however, some allies might be costly and your organization has to adapt to the costs. Define your breaking point prior to meetings with costly allies.

*Guiding experience: Defining your breaking point.* Your mission and the people you serve come before allies. Make this clear to your board and donors. If you budge on your mission for one donor, you may lose others, because they may question your organization’s integrity to your mission and the people you serve. Your organization’s integrity toward your mission helps build trust with people both internally and externally.

**Work Step: Define how to engage each ally.**

With the cost model completed, refine your list of allies that your organization targets to bring into the fold of your organization’s support system. Using the refined list, define how your organization will engage or target each ally. When targeting, think about the following:

- Who in your network knows someone in this potential ally organization?
- How will you help potential allies catch the vision?

**WORK PRODUCT: Political Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program(s)</th>
<th>Stakeholders That can Help (Allies)</th>
<th>How can they help?</th>
<th>Why should they help?</th>
<th>How to Engage Allies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Activity: Implement Political Strategy**

This activity is about how your organization engages and creates relationships with potential allies. Use the Political Strategy plan to create an agenda for your meeting with potential allies. Review the agenda with others and discuss ways to improve it. Remember to set your ego aside, you may only have one chance to engage this person or organization, and you need to be prepared. Following the meeting, send an email recounting the discussion and agreements. Also after the meeting, send a thank you note. Thank you notes do not ask for anything; they just say, thank you.
Work Step: Creating a relationship memorandum.

Creating relationship memorandums is important. A relationship memorandum outlines how the organizations will and will not work together. By putting your work agreement in writing, it gives both parties the opportunity to be clear and discuss the relationship. In addition, members of organizations change and the memorandum can create continuity as members change.

Work Activity: Refine Program Plan

A Program Plan links the programs of services to the organization’s vision, mission, and goals. When working with allies refine the programs' description of service and how to fulfill the program. Outline how each ally can support the organization as a whole, all of the programs, or one of the programs. As important, how can your organization support their organization? Cooperation in both directions creates strong allies.

WORK PRODUCT: Program and Ally Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Ally’s Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work Activity: Refine Resource Plan

The Resource Plan organizes the resources required to define, implement, and maintain the organization’s programs and infrastructure. While the programs are the services required to meet the needs of the people served, the infrastructure is the resources (building, personnel, etc.) required to support the organization and its programs. Refine the organization’s financial, people, infrastructure and other support resources required to meet the organization’s programs and infrastructure. Outline the contributions by each ally for each program or infrastructure. Also, outline the costs associated with supporting the programs of other organizations.
WORK PRODUCT: Resource Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs (Structure)</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Other Support</th>
<th>Ally</th>
<th>Assistance Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

In this phase, Building Allies, your organization became political and linked into the community’s network. Therefore, you identified allies as well as refined the programs and resources required to meet the needs of the people you serve. Once again, the knowledge you gained from your allies must be incorporated into the previous work products.

In the next phase, Taking Action, you will implement your plans and programs as well as continuously reevaluate and simply the operations and plans of the organization.
CHAPTER 6
Taking Action

In this chapter, the successful work processes, work products, and guiding experiences identified by successful leaders are provided. Wit in this phase, Taking Action, leaders identified the following work activities as necessary to perform:

- Implement resource and program plan, and
- Reevaluate and simplify models and plan.

In this phase, Taking Action, you will implement the your plans and reevaluate organization. You will implement the Program and Resource Plans, which are interconnected since the Resource Plan is the financial, people and infrastructure required to support the Program Plan. This phase requires the ability to create project plans. Project plans break work down into a manageable sequence of steps and work products similar to this process.
Taking Action: Work Activities and Steps

**Figure 6**: Social Change Organization Development Process – Taking Action

**Work Activity: Implement Resource and Program Plans**

This work activity groups the implementation of these two plans together, because the Program Plan and Resource Plan are closely linked, meaning the purpose of the resource plan is to identify resources required to develop and implement the programs necessary to meet the organization’s vision and mission. The resource plan is based upon the program plan and visa versa.

**Work Step: Prioritize implementation.**

Prioritize implementation by reviewing the Program Plan and determining the sequence in which programs will be implemented. This sequence is based upon need for the service and resources available. Think of each program as separate but interconnected to all the other programs. Funding may be a factor in the sequence of implementing programs.
Work Step: Create and implement project plans.

For each program create a manageable project plan, which includes the Resource Plan elements for that program. A project plan outlines the series of steps and work products required to implement to program and corresponding resource requirements. A step for one project might have a prerequisite step from another program’s project plan, which means you have to complete the prerequisite step first.


Work Activity: Reevaluate the Organization

The purpose of this activity is to simplify the organization by analyzing the current goals, the organization’s achievements, and make adjustments as necessary. This activity reevaluates how the organization operates, and how the programs meet the needs of the people served. The organization’s reevaluation must be a purposely-planned activity throughout the life of the organization. This reevaluation has two steps: evaluate the organization’s programs, and evaluate the operations of the organization.

Work Step: Evaluate the organization’s programs.

When people create community organizations, they want to solve all the ills for people they serve; however, this is seldom possible at this early stage of an organization’s development. After conversations with the people you serve, people in the community, and allies, you will have a more realistic understanding of the problems, solutions, and resources, needed and available. Seek feedback from the people you serve; are you meeting their needs? Gathering this feedback can take many forms such as focus groups, questionnaires, or phone calls. Analyze the feedback objectively putting your ego aside. If the programs do not meet the needs of the people you serve, then a strategic planning meeting may be required to realign goals, programs, and resources.

Work Step: Evaluate the operations of the organization.

Evaluating the operations of the organization has two sub-steps, which are to determine if the organization operates effectively and efficiently as well as seeking training and development for the organization’s board, staff, and volunteers.

Evaluating operations. Seek feedback from staff, committees, and board with the goal to determine if the organization is effectively and efficiently functioning and using resources. Resource constraints might require an organization to eliminate a struggling program, so that resources can be used to strengthen other programs. If after analyzing
feedback, the operations of the organization require simplification or improvement, conduct a planning meeting with the board and staff. This is not a strategic planning meeting, but rather, a planning meeting. Example questions to ask are as follows:

- How costly is our operations? What is the average administrative cost for organizations like ours?
- Are we using our board and steering committee(s) effectively and efficiently?
- Does the staff and board/steering committee work effectively?
- Are we meeting the needs of the people we serve, administratively?

_Evaluating staff development._ This next sub-step is to define the developmental and training needs of the board, staff, and volunteers. Seek to understand the gaps in people’s skills and what is needed to meet their job requirements. Some national charity organizations have free or discounted professional training for staff. Additional sources are free online training courses that you can modify to meet your organization’s developmental needs. However, some training may not be available and you will have to create for example, understand the people you serve. You might have a staff with the required reception-bookkeeper skills, but they know very little about the people you serve, which impact their ability to serve the people the organization serves. Specific training may be required.

_Guiding experience: Understanding simplification._ We have a tendency to over bureaucratize, so there are too many committees and subcommittees. This same tendency can cause too many strategic planning meetings. Strategic planning meetings should happen every 3-5 year to evaluate the mission, goals, and programs. Annual strategic planning meetings encourage annual changes to the organizations mission, goals, and programs, which can create a crisis model of operating.

**Conclusion**

In this phase, Taking Action, you implemented your plans and set your organization into a culture of reevaluating itself to ensure it meets the needs of the people you serve effectively and efficiently.

The starting of the next phase, Funding The Organization, happens during anyone of the first five phases. The starting of this phase is dependent upon your organization’s needs for both funding and charitable status. All four successful leaders who provided their successful experiences in the making of this process, spent most of their energy in phases 1-5, and create a board whose purpose was to pursue funding to support the operations and programs of the organization.
CHAPTER 7
Funding The Organization

In this chapter, the successful work processes, work products, and guiding experiences identified by successful leaders are provided. Within this phase, Funding The Organization, leaders identified the following work activities as necessary to perform:

- Funding programs and operations, and
- File for charitable status.

In this phase, Funding The Organization, you will work with the board to generate funds to support the organization’s programs and operations as well as file for charitable status. This phase starts after the forming of the board and definition of the organization’s vision, mission, and programs. The final definition of programs and resources required was completed during the Building Allies phase. Funds can be raised prior to this phase; however, it is unlikely that you will know the full cost of the programs prior to working with allies.

This phase is not fully developed because the successful leaders who helped develop the process did not spend much time working in this phase. They created a board and the board completed these work activities. However, as provided below, they recommended several reference books.
Funding The Organization: Work Activities and Steps

**Figure 7:** Social Change Organization Development Process – Funding The Organization

**Work Activity: Generate Funding Programs and Operations**

In the first phase, Defining The Need, you created a board or steering committee whose role is to raise funds. The development of the Program Plan and Resource Plan helps define the funds needed to support the operations of the organization and each program. Some allies will provide resources, so your funding-needs will be what your allies do not supply. As the leader of the organization, you will have to delegate some activities, and this might be a good one to delegate; however, it is your role to make sure the board operates within the vision and mission of the organization.

If your organization requires extensive funding, it is recommended to create a board or steering committee whose sole purpose is to generate funds for the organization.

*Guiding experience: Chasing funding.* Grants and some donors want organizations to serve people in certain ways, which can cause an organization to change its mission or even victimize the people they serve. Keeping in mind the organization’s mission and the people you serve are unwavering to the board’s function to raise funds.
Meaning, at times the board may have to pass on funding. The board’s goal is to raise funds within the context of the organization’s mission and people it serves. Do not chase the grants; do not change your mission to win grants or funding.

Work Activity: File for Charitable Status

Organization’s seek charitable status, because donors what a tax charity write-off, or the organization and its members want liability protection. Obtaining and maintaining charitable status requires a lot of paperwork. Find a qualified person (accountant, lawyer, etc.) to be on your board who will complete the filing for the organization. There are other ways to gain charitable status such as finding a parent organization with charitable status such as a church or other community organization.

Guiding experience: Seeking references. Most nonprofit and community organization books spend most of their text on two topics: funding and file for charitable status. Refer to these books for these topics,


Conclusion

In the phase, Funding The Organization, you worked with the board to generate funding for the organization and sought out a qualified person(s) to file for charitable status. This phase started when you form the board and draft your vision, mission, and programs; however, it could also start after your discussions with allies and solidification of programs.
CHAPTER 8
Conclusion

The first draft of this process has six phases that have a sequential and iterative flow: Defining The Need, Engaging The Public, Telling Your Story, Building Allies, Taking Action, and Funding The Organization. Within each of these six phases, work is divided into manageable activities and steps. To help organize the data gathering, analysis, and presentation of work, work products are presented in draft form. Hopefully future versions of the process can provide examples of completed work products. The four leaders also provided guiding experience, which are considerations and mindsets they deem necessary to increase likelihood of success.

This is an initial draft of a SCO Development Process to creating and maintaining a nonprofit community organization with the mission to empower and transform individuals. It was developed from the successful experiences of four leaders of community organizations with very different visions and missions, but the commonality between the organizations is that each organization sought to empower and transform individuals. Developing a process is an iterative process wherein data is gathered and formed into a hierarchy and sequence of work processes and work products. Then, leaders of community organizations with the purpose to empower and transform individuals apply the process and their successful experiences are incorporated into the process, hence the iteration process to develop and enhance the process. As you implement this process and learn of additional successful work processes, work products, and guiding experiences, please contact the developer of this SCO Development Process, so your success can be shared with other leaders.