ORIENTATION AND OVERVIEW

CHAPTER 1

Human Service Practice in a Diverse Organizational Landscape

IN THIS BOOK, we focus on the knowledge and skills practitioners rely on to professionally work and survive in organizations. *All* human service practitioners engage in organization practice, regardless of their focus. In this chapter, we want to impress upon the reader the importance of competent organization practice because most practitioners will work within, and with, many different organizations throughout their professional careers. We define **organization practice** as *working and surviving in organizational arenas by making changes that address the needs of multiple stakeholders and constituencies, strongly grounded in professional values, critical thinking, and self-awareness*.

One can find as many definitions of organizations as there are writers on organizations. Shafritz, Ott, and Lang (2005) define **organizations** as ''social unit[s] with some particular purpose'' (p. 1). They contend that ''the basic elements of organizations have remained relatively constant throughout history: Organizations (or their important constituencies) have purposes (which may be explicit or implicit), attract participants, acquire and allocate resources to accomplish goals, use some form of structure to divide and coordinate activities, and rely on certain members to lead or manage others'' (p. 2). These characteristics vary, depending on the environment in which an organization operates. We find Shafritz, Ott, and Lang's (2005) definition to be to the point and we agree with their assumption that there is something ''social'' about this unit or arena by the very nature of multiple people being involved. They also assume there is ''some particular purpose'' for this social unit to come together. *Purpose* is a broad, inclusive word that could include goals and objectives, but does not have to do so. And there may be multiple purposes, depending on the organization.

In this chapter, we provide a brief overview of the human service organizational landscape, including the arenas in which professional practice occurs. We make explicit our assumptions and biases, followed

by a focus on programs and services as well as types of human service organizations and their relationships. A brief historical review of organizational theory development is provided to whet the reader's appetite for a more specific focus on selected theories in subsequent chapters. Included in this section are theoretical assumptions held about different units of analysis in organizational settings—the organization itself, employees, and persons in formal managerial and leadership roles. The use of critical thinking and self-awareness for leadership in organization practice follows with special attention to the student or employee who is clinically, rather than organizationally, oriented. We end this chapter with attention to the kind of complexity and **diversity** that is found in multicultural settings, which leads to our second chapter, in which established frameworks for understanding the complexity of organizing human services are introduced.

AN ORGANIZATIONAL WORLD

To understand the role of organizations in professional life, it may be helpful for readers to think about how they view work. Many years ago, a worker in an agency might have aspired to remain in the same organization for years and to ''move up'' in that agency. Today's employment expectations are much different. It is more typical for people to change jobs frequently. It is also more typical for agencies and services to go into and out of existence, as well as to perform their functions across political, economic, societal, and ideological boundaries. Examining organizations as practice arenas must be placed within the broader global context of changing expectations of what one looks for in a position and how employees define themselves within the contemporary world of work.

Since the world is often viewed through inter- and intraorganizational contexts, composed of many different organizations that perform various functions within and across international boundaries, few persons are untouched by multiple organizations. Organizations are an integral part of a contemporary lifestyle, and they are arenas in which the exchange of resources occurs on a regular basis. They may be situated in defined geographical communities or they may transcend geography, connected by technological innovation, as with **virtual organizations**. Their purposes and structures are as varied as their numbers.

In addition, there are organizations that deliver no human services directly but perform support functions such as providing funding, planning for and oversight of human service providers, **advocacy** for special population groups, and/or education and training for those persons who do provide services. These organizations often have staff who review grant applications and determine who will be funded, contract for services with providers, set priorities among competing human service needs, formulate

and interpret policy, advocate for change, and influence technologies used in service delivery. They are very much a part of the human service landscape, even though they are not direct providers of human services.

We take an expansive view of human service work, encouraging professionals to recognize that there are no clear-cut, separate sectors in which human service work is conducted. Thus, we expose one of our many assumptions in writing this book that contemporary human service work occurs through traditional, alternative, and emerging auspices and that many organizations are involved in the formulation and interpretation of policy, in influencing provider agencies, and in the daily delivery of human services. Given the ever-changing landscape of human service delivery, mapping it is a challenge.

ORGANIZATIONAL PRACTICE ARENAS

Rothman, Erlich, and Tropman (2008) identify three large system **practice arenas**: communities, organizations, and small task groups. These arenas are anything but mutually exclusive. Communities, organizations, and groups overlap and interact and all are organized for a purpose. To add to the complexity, more and more organizations are operating across communities, states, nations, and international boundaries. When the world is one's practice arena, to be effective, it becomes a challenge for practitioners to be respectful of different cultures and contexts when enacting organizational work.

Practitioners, in both their personal and professional lives, by virtue of being a part of these complex arenas, are tied to numerous organizations that relate to and even formally affiliate with various communities and groups. Practitioners are professionally affiliated with an organizational structure or structures, whether they are private practitioners within the confines of a small group practice or public officials within a complex web of bureaucratically entangled relationships. Few professionals are free agents who can afford to practice without the support of an organizational base. The few who operate as independent consultants or solo practitioners create their own organizations that interact with and depend on a multitude of organizations for survival. Organizations may even be the object of their **interventions**. Even if an organization is not located in another part of the world, each organization will have distinctive cultures, requiring the use of multicultural skills for effective practice.

Organizations have been viewed by some theorists as situated in uncertain, turbulent environments in which they are constantly responding to **constraints** (things they can not change) and **contingencies** (things about which they have to compromise and negotiate). Yet, it is not just the environments in which organizations operate that are uncertain and turbulent. Organizations face internal uncertainties and turbulence as

well. Organizations are dynamic, changing entities that are situated in dynamic and changing communities. Given the nature of these settings, to be successful, practitioners must understand as much as possible about these dynamics.

Adding to complexity, organizations that support and deliver human services vary in how they are structured. It is important for practitioners to know the architecture of the organizations within which they practice. One often hears the term *formal* used to describe an organization. This implies that there are also *informal* organizations. It is not always easy to define clear boundaries between a formal and an informal organization. For example, a group of committed citizens may organize to provide services to persons in need. In the process of organizing they may develop a statement of purpose, rally the support of volunteers, and develop a process for their services. They are technically an informal group. But what happens when they decide to form a nonprofit corporation so that they can receive funding from outside sources? If they are incorporated, they are formally recognized as a nonprofit organization. They may still have the same purpose, continue to use volunteers, and deliver their services in the same way. Yet, they are no longer just a ''group''; they are an *organization*. Perhaps there are degrees of formality. We cannot tell you clearly when a group becomes a formal organization or when service delivery becomes formalized. Both the challenge and the opportunity in organization practice is that boundaries between organizational practice arenas are not always clear and distinctive.

SOME BEGINNING COMMENTS

Before we thoroughly examine the concept of organization and focus on those that engage in human service delivery, we would like to release the reader from some of the constraints of order, finality, and logic. You might be hoping that you will find some universals that you can apply to all organizations so that human service delivery systems will make sense once you've studied organizations. You might hope that practicing in organizations will be easier having read our material. If any of these thoughts sound familiar, we offer some alternatives to consider.

First, we, and others, will frequently refer to organizations as *systems* and to human service delivery *systems*. Do not be fooled by these references to *systems*. The word *system* may lead you to think of something that is logical, consistent, and definable as it works; however, you will encounter many organizations (perhaps most) that seem very unsystematic. This may not be because you ''just don't get it.'' It could be that these systems don't make sense without understanding the full context in which they operate. It could even be that they don't perform like systems at all. It could be that your assumptions about how things should work are so different from the

assumptions held about the organization by others, that you are experiencing a clash in cultures. Do not despair, for this presents an opportunity to learn about different cultures. Some organizations will have similar characteristics, but every organization will have its own uniqueness. Some will be so unique that they will be different from those you have previously experienced and unlike others you will know. Do not jump to any conclusions about what you are experiencing until you can fully understand the major aspects of the cultural context of that organization. Only then is appropriate assessment possible.

Second, we find that some people approach the study of human service organizations with the assumption (or hope) that the reason they don't quickly see how the whole service system works is because they haven't yet learned enough about how individual organizations work. As they learn more, they might discover that the human service system seems fragmented or hard to understand. Frustration occurs because there is a deep-seated assumption that someone, somewhere, conceptualized the system and understands the ''master plan.'' Let us assure you: There is no one overriding master plan. Sometimes there are few, if any, overriding plans at all. Other times there are multiple plans of how a system should work, plans that have not been coordinated or even articulated, plans that may even contradict one another. Some plans are rigidly scientific and others emerge (Netting, O'Connor, & Fauri, 2008). If you can't make sense of the delivery system, it is possible that the delivery system doesn't make sense. This is understandable when one thinks historically about how numerous organizations and groups emerged to address diverse needs in local communities. They did not arise simultaneously in a rational, concentrated effort to provide care. Some actually arose in protest of others that did not respond to the needs of invisible community groups. The landscape of human service delivery, therefore, is rich in diversity, offering you an assortment of perspectives. It is the exceptional situation that has a unified jointly held vision of human service delivery in a local community where organizations, though differing in structure and culture, mesh together to accomplish common goals in an apparently seamless responsive process. When organizations go global, the challenge of sense making grows exponentially. Imagine how potentially unattainable it is to find a jointly held vision across the borders of culture and geography. Without great care, some sort of superimposition of culture and norms about aspects of organization practice are inevitable. For us, mutual sensitivity and competence across cultures (whether those are local or international) is essential.

Third, no matter what we say, there will be exceptions to every rule. Any attempts to define, categorize, or classify organizations are only that: attempts. If you know of an organization that does not conform to what we say throughout this text, then it is because you know of an organization

that does not fit. It is probably not that you ''don't get it'' or that the organization in question should be made to conform in order to do it ''right.'' Let us be clear in our message: We are attempting to provide some manageability in examining this landscape when in actuality we know that disorder and chaos are the way many of our systems creatively solve the problems associated with human service work. Organization practice, therefore, requires one to constantly be assessing and reassessing situations. This is why you are here: to learn about organizations so that you will become knowledgeable and skilled in a highly complex arena of practice. Our goal is that you learn about and respect the many dimensions of difference in organizations in order to professionally survive and thrive.

ORGANIZATIONS AS COLLECTIONS OF PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Organizations that support and deliver human services address concerns about people and their needs, making them somewhat different from organizations in general, yet most of the organizational literature is not directed to these type organizations. We recognize that not *all* organizations delivering human services are full-time human service agencies, nor is *everything* a human service organization does focused on direct service delivery to clients. In our view, organizations that fund, plan, advocate, and/or educate are in the human service business, even though they are not direct providers of services. If such organizations are social units that come together for a purpose, then these organizations often find ways to pursue that purpose in the form of programs.

PROGRAMS

We are defining **programs** as structural containers for long-term commitments, services, and/or activities designed to directly or indirectly address human needs—a set of activities designed to fulfill a social purpose (Netting, O'Connor, & Fauri, 2008). Direct human service programs focus their activities on addressing specific client needs, whereas indirect programs support these human service efforts, focusing on such areas as fundraising, public relations, or advocacy. Sometimes, entire organizations will be devoted to these support functions. For example, a state human service department may be an oversight and planning agency for those providers who deliver services locally. Similarly, a foundation that funds a program initiative to provide case management for troubled youth is supporting direct service grantees who implement its program.

In order to fully support direct client-serving programs, human service providers may have a variety of other types of programs. For example, a human service agency could have **direct service programs** to assist clients, usually attempting to make their situations better in some way, and **staff**

development and training programs that focus on staff, the intention being that if staff have additional knowledge and skills they will be able to do better direct service provision. The agency could have **support programs** that may be program-, organizational- or community-based, with the intention being that their activities are processes that will lead to higher quality programming.

Obviously, there are organizations that do not deliver direct human services but still have programs and still hire practitioners. Roles that practitioners play in these organizations are reflected in titles such as *advocate, trainer, planner, policy analyst, administrator, monitor, evaluator*, and *program officer*. Other organizations, called **provider agencies**, hire practitioners in direct practice roles to implement programs through the provision of services.

Services

A **service** is a specific intervention. For example, a service could be counseling or receiving a mobile meal. Both are human services because they directly impact individuals in need. While one is less concrete (counseling) than the other (a meal), both services might be linked in a senior citizens' program designed to address the psychological and nutritional needs of older persons. Programs tend to be comprised of multiple services. Although organizations do not always conceptualize their activities as programs composed of services, it is helpful to use this framework in looking at how human services are delivered.

This conceptualization is also useful in separating what is occurring in a human service organizational context as it attempts to meet clients' needs. At times within the service system, funding sources and other persons in power do not immediately recognize the need for new programs and services. Even well-designed programs and innovative service technologies may require piloting within an organization before they will be embraced. Sometimes there are unpopular causes or population groups who are not served at all. In these cases, hopefully, programs, services, or even new agencies emerge in response to these unmet needs.

TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS THAT PLAN AND DELIVER HUMAN SERVICES

Public Agencies

Public or governmental agencies are mandated by law at some level of government. A **public agency** in the U.S. context is established through a local, a state, or the federal system with the purpose of that agency contained in legal statutes. Examples of public agencies are local, state, or federal departments of human or social services, health, education, and

aging. Public agencies are created through legislation and are charged with implementing public social policies. Since social policies are formulated, developed, debated, and eventually approved and enacted by public policy makers, public agencies inherit the controversies sometimes surrounding the social policies that mandate their programs and services. Their destinies as service entities are deeply imbedded in current and past political ideology.

Public agencies that deliver human services vary in how they are structured. For example, Ezell and Patti (1990) examined state-level human service agencies in Delaware, Florida, Minnesota, Oregon, South Carolina, and Utah. These six states were selected because they represented diversity in comprehensiveness (how many different services they provide), integration (how connected or interrelated their services are with one another), and centralization of services and decision making. Even though these researchers hoped to find ''what is best'' in terms of how public human services are structured, they reported that every state had something to offer and that each state's agency had strengths and limitations. In each state, various constituencies had different expectations, some of which conflicted. The design of state and local agencies represented compromises among diverse constituencies and the outcomes they would accept.

Public agencies are often large in size for reasons of efficiency because they are mandated to serve numerous population groups with multiple problems. However, this does not mean that they will look the same. In fact, given differences in regional and local resources and needs, it is questionable that they should look the same. We disagree when people say that if you have seen one public bureaucracy, you have seen them all. They may appear hierarchical in structure, but there are many different ways to design an effective public agency, just as there are different ways to determine effectiveness. Because of the political context of the public agency, it is the political process of consensus building that determines public agency design and the scope of its services. Therefore, there will be much diversity in terms of what and how many programs an agency will have from state to state. This is also the case for what services each program will contain, how its programs will relate to one another, how centralized or decentralized its decision-making and authority structures will be, and how many branch offices it will have.

PRIVATE AGENCIES

Private agencies are a broad category of organizations, including those that are called *nonprofit* and *for-profit*. Both nonprofit and for-profit organizations are part of the human service enterprise and are different from public agencies. Recently in the United States and elsewhere, new approaches are developing that in some ways combine non-profit and for-profit. Called

social entrepreneurs and social businesses, they often blur the lines in creative ways.

Nonprofit Organizations Nonprofit organizations are referred to as *nongovernmental, third sector, voluntary, charitable*, or *tax exempt agencies* depending on the nation in which they are located. They typically have uncompensated, voluntary boards of directors who cannot benefit financially from the organization's profits. Any profit made must be reinvested in the organization.

Lohmann (1989) points out that using the prefix *non* to describe an entire group of organizations is not particularly helpful. He compares naming a sector *nonprofit* or *nongovernmental* to defining lettuce as a mammal. ''Lettuce is a non-fur-bearing, non-milk-producing, non-child bearing, and non-warm blooded nonanimal. Further, as a mammal, lettuce is highly ineffective, being sedentary and not warm-blooded. All other mammals are much faster. Lettuce is also remarkably non-agile and fails to protect its young. On the whole, lettuce is a miserable excuse for a mammal!'' (p. 369). Lohmann's wit reveals the challenges posed by defining one sector (nonprofit) in light of another (for-profit).

Nonprofit agencies have been described over the years in numerous ways: as representative organizations of a defined body of the citizenry; as nonstatutory organizations; as nongovernmental organizations with an elected board of directors; as organizations supported by voluntary (nontax) dollars; and even as organizations that ''feel'' voluntary. We add to this laundry list the possibility that some voluntary agencies today do not feel voluntary at all. They are struggling to become more businesslike and in the process are having identity crises over what they really are. For us, what probably makes a nonprofit agency voluntary is that their board of directors must serve without compensation and, therefore, are volunteers.

As part of the complexity of the nonprofit landscape, and contrary to popular belief, nonprofit organizations can make profits. In fact, if they do not make profits, they may have little chance at stability and growth. The defining characteristic of a **nonprofit organization** is that it is barred from distributing profits, or net earnings, to individuals who exercise control over it. These individuals might be directors, officers, or members. Net incomes, if any, must be retained and devoted to the purposes for which the organization was formed (Hansmann, 1981). This means that any funds left over at the end of a fiscal year must be reinvested in the organization, not distributed to any constituency.

Another element that muddies the distinction between types of agencies in human services is the highly interdependent nature of the service delivery system. This interdependence is particularly notable between the governmental and the nonprofit environments. It is the rare nonprofit human service organization that does not count on a portion (sometimes

a large portion) of its funding from governmental sources. Whether an agency depends on food subsidies to keep its day care costs low or on social service contracts to provide foster care, the independent, community-based, voluntary nature of nonprofits is somewhat of a myth. Because of this apparent interdependence, services in the private sector seem to be almost as political as those in the government sector, just in different ways.

For-Profit Organizations For-profits are businesses, sometimes called *corporations*. They are part of the commercial or market economy. They must pay taxes. They have boards of directors who generally are compensated and they may have investors or stockholders, all of whom can benefit financially from the organization's profits.

For-profit organizations have always been part of the human service landscape, but have become more involved in service delivery since the 1960s. For example, ''between 1965 and 1985, for-profit centers and chains emerged as the fastest growing source of child care in the United States,'' increasing from 7% to 24% of the market niche serving the child care needs of employed parents (Tuominen, 1991, pp. 450–451). Another example is the nursing home industry, which is predominantly run by for-profit businesses. With privatization of human services, which has emerged as a cost-saving scheme at the national and state levels, the once-assumed distinctions between profit and nonprofit, governmental, and non-governmental entities are blurring. Many for-profit agencies are competing against nonprofits for governmental service contracts. In addition, non-profit organizations may even create for-profit agencies to generate income that can be contributed to their causes. For example, for-profit thrift stores are often a stable source of income for nonprofit groups that are highly involved in human service delivery.

Social Entrepreneurs and Social Businesses Starting with Muhammad Yunus, the Bangladeshi economist and winner of the 2006 Nobel Peace Prize, who started the Grameen Bank (see *Banker to the poor*, 2003), which provides microcredits to the poor, a newly developing human service approach focusing on social change is being established worldwide. **Social entrepreneurs**, using the ideas and methods of business entrepreneurs, are revamping the nonprofit sector around the world so that the nonprofit sector has become the fastest-growing segment of society (Bornstein, 2004). Using innovative ideas and determination, social entrepreneurs from the United States to Brazil and from Hungary to Africa are breaking established rules about how to enact human services. Social entrepreneurs use their own expertise, social and political connections, and sometimes their own money to leverage action toward positive change, ranging from tackling poverty, pollution, and inadequate health care, to lack of education. What seems to hold the organizing structures of the social

entrepreneurs together worldwide is a vision of what might be possible through the power of ideas, and the belief that through many means it is possible to make changes for the better. It appears that each social entrepreneur approaches the solution to the problem differently, so each organization that has been created is also very different.

Muhammad Yunus has moved beyond his role as a social entrepreneur to develop the concept of a social business. The idea is to use the power of free enterprise to solve the great social problems of poverty, hunger, and inequality (Yunus, 2007). Along with Danone, the French corporation, makers of Dannon yogurt, he has launched a purposefully designed social business whose purpose is to provide affordable yogurt for children in Bangladesh. From this effort has developed what Yunus calls a more humane form of capitalism, one that looks at human consequences, rather than the bottom line of profit. His idea goes beyond the idea of corporate social responsibility, where corporations modify their policies to benefit others as they do business, to the creation of ''another kind of business—one that recognizes the multi-dimensional nature of human beings . . . set up . . . not to achieve limited personal gain but to pursue specific social goals'' (p. 21). Several models have emerged that include social investors providing funds for social enterprises ranging from eye care hospitals to transportation infrastructures. The investors expect the return *of* their money at some specified point, while not expecting a return *on* their money. What profits are made after the return of the investments are reinvested into the enterprise, much like in the nonprofit world.

With all this diversity, a full picture of the human service landscape must include the linkages among and between organizations. To remain vibrant and relevant, for-profits, like nonprofit and public agencies, must make connections with various groups and communities. This network of relationships is probably most clear with the emerging social entrepreneurs and social businesses, but it is a necessary backdrop throughout the human service environment. We now turn to some of the ways in which organizations interrelate.

ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Whether they are public, nonprofit, or for-profit, organizations are often committed to or have allegiances with other organizations and with other arenas—groups, communities, and even nation-states. These organizations may represent or be affiliated with economically and politically disadvantaged populations who are not served or are underserved by other human service providers. **Affiliations** may be formed around ideologies, belief systems, values, or population groups. They may be formed when a particular group agrees to provide funding to a cause. Some of these relationships are more explicit or more formalized than

others. For example, a public agency's mandate may be very specific in defining the population group to be served, and the special-interest groups that advocated for the social policy that created the agency will likely have strong feelings about how the organization carries out its mandate. A nonprofit agency may have evolved out of an advocacy group that wants to address the needs of homeless people and has become a more formalized organization committed to continuing its cause. A for-profit organization with a high commitment to social responsibility may contribute to service delivery by donating a portion of its profits to a charitable agency with which an affiliation is formed.

Whatever the type of agency, some organizations are explicit in espousing their relationships for ideological, religious, legal, economic, and/or political reasons. It is impossible here to fully explore the many forms these connections can take or even all the terms used to describe them. Terms like *association, affiliation, linkage, coalition, alliance, allegiance, federation*, and a host of others are heard in organizational corridors as practitioners dialogue about interorganizational, group, community, and international relationships.

To illustrate the diverse external connections organizations can have, we briefly examine some typical ways of connecting through: (1) association, (2) ideological community, (3) franchising, and (4) host relationship. It is important to note that like much of the blurring related to organizations, these are not mutually exclusive categories, and are only examples of many of the ways organizations relate to other entities. Organizations may have multiple connections of different sorts with various groups and communities. We do not intend for these examples to be all-inclusive, but we want to spark the reader's interest in how diverse an organization's relationships can be.

ASSOCIATIONS

Kramer (1981) defines **voluntary associations** as ''membership organizations which usually have a social purpose—a 'cause'—and usually seek to benefit their constituency'' (p. 9). Billis (1993) called voluntary associations ''groups of people who draw a boundary between themselves and others in order together to meet some problem, to 'do something' '' (p. 160). This definition sounds very similar to the definition we gave earlier for an organization: There is a structure, participants, and a purpose. The difference is that the boundary in a formal organization may be recognized by a charter and bylaws approved by a public body. A voluntary association can technically exist without being legally formalized. On the other hand, voluntary associations can be highly formalized, such as the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA), the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP),

or the American Association of Homes and Services for the Aged (AAHSA). It can be argued that voluntary associations are so widespread that they are the ''authentic roots or core of the nonprofit sector'' (Harris, 1998, p. 144).

Voluntary associations may have individual or organizational members, sometimes they have both, and these members may pay dues. For example, NASW members are individual practitioners who identify with the social work profession. AARP members are older persons who wish to affiliate with one of the largest lobbying groups in the United States.

Umbrella associations are ''nonprofit associations whose members are themselves nonprofit organizations and it is estimated that one out of every five nonprofit organizations belongs to an umbrella association'' (Young, 2001, p. 290). For example, CWLA and AAHSA have organizational members. CWLA attracts organizations that provide services to children, whereas AAHSA's affiliates are an assortment of nonprofit long-term-care facilities and service providers for elders and others needing chronic care. These associations often have national meetings at which their members come together for professional enhancement, political action, or socialization.

It would be impossible to fully explore the nature of organizational associations in one chapter. However, it is important to note that multiple writers have developed typologies of **interorganizational relationships**: those situations in which more than one organization works in some way with others, thus cutting across formal organizational boundaries. For example, Bailey and Koney (2000) provide a continuum of associational types beginning with the concept of: (1) affiliation; followed by (2) federations, associations, and coalitions; (3) consortium, networks, joint ventures; and ending in (4) mergers, acquisitions, and consolidations. Bailey and Koney view affiliations as the loosest form of connection, in which two organizations relate with both maintaining total autonomy. Federations, associations, and coalitions are moderately autonomous relationships in which both individual organizational goals and the goals of the member organizations are important. Consortia, networks, and joint ventures assume minimal organizational autonomy, whereas mergers, acquisitions, and consolidations require the organization entirely to relinquish its autonomy.

Research on associational structure is found in the globalization literature as attempts are made to understand the emergence of **nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)** in developing countries and international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs) (Brown & Moore, 2001). For example, Lindenberg (1999) reports the results of an international practitioner conference in which five associational structures are identified: (1) separate independent organizations, plus coalitions; (2) weak umbrella coordinating mechanisms; (3) confederations; (4) federations; and (5) unitary corporate models. In this typology, independent organizations function on their own, but may choose to loosely collaborate with others when it is

convenient. These types of associations are transitory and normally focus on fleeting advocacy issues. Independent organizations with weak umbrella coordinating mechanisms are usually aligned with a central organization that has minimal power over the associated organization, whereas the confederation is one in which organizational members have ceded some degree of power to the central organization. **Federations** hold more centralized power, with the central unit actually making resource and other important decisions for subsidiaries as is the case in the unitary corporate model. Further exploring the federation concept, Foreman (1999) compares two U.S.-based organizations, World Vision International and Habitat for Humanity International. Both provide global relief services and both could be labeled as federations, yet Foreman illustrates how federations differ in their associational form. World Vision International is a donor-member-dominated federation, while Habitat is what she calls a ''global bumblebee federation'' because of differences in Habitat governance structures worldwide.

Many agencies are local representatives of national organizations. Prevent Child Abuse and The Alzheimer's Association, for example, operate in various relationships with national offices. It is important to explore just how strong these associations are and how much autonomy local chapters or groups have from central or national offices. Other organizations are associated with local groups, and may not be associated with a state, regional, national, or international body.

One often hears the term *grassroots* to refer to a movement or effort occurring in a local geographical area. Grassroots associations are one type of voluntary association, a type that is highly dependent on volunteers. Smith defines **grassroots associations (GAs)** as ''locally based, significantly autonomous, volunteer-run, formal nonprofit groups that manifest significant voluntary altruism as a group; they use the associational form of organization and thus have an official membership of volunteers who perform all or nearly all of the work done in and by the nonprofits'' (1999, p. 443). While the focus of much nonprofit activity has been on larger, more formal organizations having a wide scope of service, the grassroots association is comprised of local members who come together for a specific cause and are tied to a geographical community.

Never make assumptions about associations and what they mean, because no two organizations are exactly alike in their relationships with others. In many cases, it is the nature of the relationship that establishes not only the quality of the association, but also the structure of the organization that precedes or results from the association. We now turn to relationships that illustrate various ways and reasons organizations choose to connect or identify with a particular group for ideological, cultural, or religious reasons. Notice that in many cases there seems to be a communal rather than architectural understanding of organization in what follows.

Ideological Communities

Relationships with ideological communities may be more or less loosely constituted, but they add to the cultural identity of the organization and its reason for being. We now briefly explore three types of communities with which organizations might relate. Note that these types of communities are not always geographical or place related, but may be related to ''non-place'' communities (Fellin, 1995, p. 4).

Religious or Faith Communities **Religious affiliates** are social service organizations that publicly acknowledge a relationship with a religious group or faith community. Typically, they are separately incorporated as nonprofit organizations and have names like Lutheran Social Ministries or Catholic Charities. Nonprofits with religious affiliations proliferated during the late 1800s and early 1900s and are still very much a part of the traditional human service network. Over the years, these organizations have been called *sectarian agencies*, *church agencies*, *church-related agencies*, *church affiliates*, and more recently *faith-based agencies*. Few assumptions can be made about the meaning of religious affiliation, for it will vary by agency. Few religious affiliates today serve persons only from the faith groups with which they affiliate and many denominations have always served persons from any faith tradition. These affiliates often receive public dollars to carry out their mission and it is often hard to distinguish what makes them ''religious'' (Ellor, Netting, & Thibault, 1999). Yet they maintain an affiliation with a religious group, an ideological symbol that may hold different meanings for administrators, staff, and consumers (Netting, O'Connor, & Yancey, 2006).

Although faith-based groups have provided human services for hundreds of years in many countries, the debate over what constitutes a faith-based organization in the United States escalated in 2001 with the Bush administration's establishment of the White House Office of Faith-based and Community Initiatives. This initiative underscored the ''Charitable Choice'' provision in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (often called ''Welfare Reform''), which sought to reduce barriers to faith-based groups interested in accessing public funds to provide human services. It is important to recognize that with these policy changes, the concept of a faith-based organization expanded beyond traditional nonprofit religious affiliates to include community-based congregations and groups, many of which are not formally incorporated as nonprofit organizations (see, for example, Cnaan, 1999, 2002; Wineburg, 2001; Wood, 2002; Wuthnow, 2004).

Ethnic Communities Some agencies are related to ethnic communities. Thirty years ago, Jenkins (1980) began studying the ethnic agency as a

special form of social organization. She defined the **ethnic agency** as having the following characteristics: (1) serving primarily ethnic clients; (2) predominately staffed by persons who have the same ethnicity as the clients served; (3) having a majority of its board from the ethnic group served; (4) having an ethnic community and/or ethnic power structure to support it; (5) integrating ethnic content into its programs; (6) desiring to strengthen the family as a primary goal; and (7) maintaining an ideology that promotes ethnic identity and participation in the decision-making process.

Research on ethnic agencies continues, as illustrated by Cortes' (1998) study of Latino nonprofit agencies. He defines Latino nonprofits in the United States as those ''whose missions focus on Latino community members'' (p. 439). He adds that they are usually tax-exempt corporations with Latino boards of directors, led by Latino chief executives, or they are voluntary associations dominated by Latino constituencies.

Feminist Communities Ideological relationships may be based on a feminist perspective of service delivery. A **feminist organization**, according to Martin (1990), ''meets any of the following criteria: (a) has a feminist ideology; (b) has feminist guiding values; (c) has feminist goals; (d) produces feminist outcomes; (e) was founded during the women's movement as part of the women's movement (including one or more of its submovements, e.g., the feminist self-help health movement [or] the violence against women movement)'' (p. 815). Feminist organizations emerge in various sectors. They can be nonprofit or profit making, their structures can vary, and they can be local or national in their domain (Martin, 1990). Feminist organizations use paid and volunteer staff in different ways (Metzendorf & Cnaan, 1992).

Organizations that affiliate with a feminist group or ideology are often alternative agencies that have emerged because traditional service providers have not been sensitive to gender differences. Hyde (2000) elaborates on the nature of feminist social movement organizations (FSMOs), asserting that ''FSMOs are the embodiments of feminist theory and practice, and reflect varied missions, structures, issues, strategies and products. Examples include peace encampments, lesbian-rights networks, economic development and micro-lending institutions, cultural centers, displaced homemaker leagues, reproductive rights groups and credit unions'' (p. 49). She identifies three major ideological streams with which feminist organizations may identify: liberation (socialist or radical), liberal (women's rights), and cultural (woman-controlled) (Hyde, 2000, p. 50), underscoring the recognition that there are multiple feminist ideologies.

Having introduced multiple communities with their own ideologies with which organizations may relate, we now turn to another type of

relationship: the franchise. Though this concept is long established in for-profit circles, it now has relevance for both nonprofit and for-profit human service organizations.

Franchises

Many agencies are local representatives of regional, national, or even international organizations. Oster has defined such a connection as a **franchise** relationship in which local agencies or chapters conform to the following traits: ''(1) The franchiser transfers to the franchisee the exclusive right to use a trademark or sell a particular product. Often though not always, this right is given over a particular territory. (2) In exchange, the franchisee pays the franchiser and may have to agree to purchase supplies or new materials from the franchiser. Typically, the fee involves some initial lump sum and then ongoing fees keyed to the level of business. (3) The franchiser provides some assistance to the franchisee, typically on technical, operating matters, and maintains some control of the way in which the business is operated. (4) Any residual profits and losses from the business go to the franchisee,'' which means it can go into providing more service (1992, p. 224).

Nursing homes (e.g., Manor Care), assisted-living facilities (e.g., Sunrise), and day care facilities (e.g., KinderCare) are recognized trademark names of franchised for-profit agencies. They are also deliverers of human services. Consumers expect standard quality from franchised operations, just as they anticipate that hamburgers or milkshakes from a franchised company in any city in the world will be the same. Although nonprofit agencies may not think of themselves as franchises, there are numerous long-established exemplars where the franchised concept applies. Oster contends that ''more than half of the top 100 charitable nonprofits are franchise organizations'' (1992, p. 226). Goodwill Industries and Planned Parenthood, for example, operate in franchise relationships with national offices. Goodwill Industries has 179 affiliates in the United States, whereas Planned Parenthood has 171 (Oster, 1992, p. 225). Local affiliates may pay their national organizations a percentage of their operating budgets in exchange for the use of the logo and name, technical support, and various activities such as lobbying at the national level for policies relevant to agency needs. Some local chapters may engage in shared fundraising with national bodies, in which funds are distributed by a formula to local and national groups. Restrictions placed on franchisees vary greatly.

Host Relationships

Human services may be delivered by departments, programs, or individuals housed within host organizations. **Host organizations** are typically

large agencies that deliver human services or employ helping professionals as part of what they do, but whose primary purpose is not the delivery of human services. Therefore, host organizations can be health-care systems, school settings, the military, commercial enterprises, or various other organizations in which a unit or component delivers human services. In host organizations, practitioners are viewed as ''institutional guests'' (Auslander, 1996, p. 15). Clients do not generally come to a host organization for the purpose of obtaining human services since that is not the primary function of the organization. However, in the process of providing what clients need, host organizations may engage practitioners or social service units to assist in meeting needs.

Examples of host organizations cut across sectors. Large health-care systems host multiple helping professionals such as social workers and chaplains who work on interdisciplinary teams. Public utility companies may hire practitioners to assist low-income clients with billing issues. For-profit businesses may establish employment-assistance programs (EAPs) to provide support for employees who are dealing with child and elder care issues. Religious congregations may hire parish nurses or social workers to provide services to persons within their local community. Military bases may have family service programs designed to address psychosocial needs of military families. Legislators may hire practitioners to assist with constituency services. With the diversity that has been showcased here, it should be clear that a good portion of professionals are likely to find themselves practicing in organizations that do not always define themselves as human service agencies, but that definitely provide human services. Table 1.1 summarizes the types of relationships we have just highlighted.

THE ONGOING SEARCH TO UNDERSTAND COMPLEX ORGANIZATIONS

A growing literature is focused on trying to better understand how different assumptions play out in organizational practice (see, for example, Netting & O'Connor, 2003) and in management (Preston, 2005; Quinn, Faerman, Thompson, & McGrath, 2003). Evidence of this quest is found in recent studies, particularly in organizations dedicated to social change and radical reform that view themselves as having advocacy goals. For example, Minkoff (2002) talks about the hybrid organizational form in a study of national women's and racial and ethnic minority organizations since 1955. This hybrid occurs when a social change organization houses both direct service and advocacy programs. The direct service programs are typically more traditional in that they are geared toward finding ways to serve immediate needs within the existing system, all the while collecting information that will inform advocacy for structural change. Lewis

Table 1.1
Selected Types of Organizational Relationships

Types	Descriptions	Examples
Associations	People or organizations that voluntarily associate for a defined purpose; includes membership organizations and grassroots associations	National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) American Association of Homes & Services for the Aged (AAHSA)
Ideological Communities	Organizations that align with the ideologies and values of religious, ethnic, feminist, or other communities	Catholic Charities (religious affiliation) Latino Nonprofit (ethnic affiliation) Women's Shelter (feminist affiliation)
Franchises	Organizations that have a relationship with regional or national organizations and seek to carry out the same goals locally	Prevent Child Abuse America The Alzheimer's Association The United Way American Red Cross YMCA
Host	Organizations that house programs and services, but do not view social services as their only or primary mission	Social Services in Hospitals School Social Work Services Parish Social Work Programs EAP Programs Family Assistance Programs (Military)

(2002) discusses how there have been two streams of thinking about nonprofit organizations—one pushing them toward becoming more traditional and the other stream saying they can't become like for-profits or they lose their identity. Researchers are asking questions about how organizations that hold different assumptions survive in a very traditional funding environment (see, for example, Bordt, 1997; Gibelman & Kraft, 1996; Koroloff & Briggs, 1996; Lune, 2002).

By now, we hope you have a glimpse of the structural and sectoral variation that is possible in organizations involved in human service advocacy, planning, oversight, and delivery. This diversity makes generalizations and expectations about human service organizations challenging. **Diversity** (differences that represent fundamental and instrumental variations) has long been a challenge for those interested in understanding the best ways to structure organizations and to manage human behavior within them. This text joins in that effort.

Earlier in this chapter, we gave the reader permission to recognize that just because she or he ''doesn't get it'' does not mean that there is a logical order just waiting to be discovered. One of the authors is reminded of when she graduated from her master's program in social work with a concentration in planning and administration. She kept waiting to be ''found out'' because the service delivery system just didn't make sense and somehow she knew it must fit together in some logical manner. She discovered that she held deep-seated assumptions, based on organizational theories she had learned, theories that had espoused sets of universal rules to guide organization practice. For example, there *should* always be just one supervisor to whom a person reports. Didn't everyone know that? There *should* always be an organizational chart with clear lines of authority. How could an organization exist without a visible structure? She was perplexed and discomforted when she encountered organizations with matrix supervisory structures and agencies in which no organizational charts had been developed. She couldn't figure out why people didn't just fix these obvious flaws in their agencies when she pointed them out. Logic, based on her set of assumptions, just didn't always click with others who didn't seem to need this same kind of order. But from where did her need for order come? The assumptions that she brought to organization practice were literally tied to her view of the world and to the organizational theories she had embraced. She felt comfort in these theories because they supported her assumptions (or perhaps she got her assumptions from being taught the theories). Either way, the problem came when she saw effective real-world practice that contradicted all of what she had learned to expect, practice in which differences were rampant.

Almost since the inception of organization studies, the goal has been to minimize difference in order to create predictable performance. Daly (1998) asserts that the ''philosophical underpinnings of Western thought have resulted in . . . [seeking] order to end chaos and uncertainty, suppress contradictions, and find the one perfect truth'' (p. xiv). This drive for sameness and predictability viewed difference as a problem and standardization as necessary for an effective and efficient operation. There was a push to find the one best way to design organizations and to prescribe how people should act within them. Ironically, early organizations may not have been structured similarly (Netting & O'Connor, 2005), and even if they developed that way, people were highly diverse. The result of ignoring those human differences as our knowledge grew meant that some staff people were able to ''fit'' and others did not, that some people were viewed as deserving clients and others were not.

Assumptions about organizations, about the employees within them, and about strategies about how to manage and/or lead these complex situations are embedded in the practical and scholarly literature. It is important to know what these assumptions might be because they are rarely stated, but

are often part of the organization's culture. In the sections that follow, we quickly go over a few of those assumptions as illustrations of how they might influence thinking and acting within human service organizations.

Assumptions About Organizations

For many years, theorists have searched for ways to understand and to order organizations. Organizational scholars have even attempted to order and categorize the theories that have emerged. In 1961, both Scott and Koontz classified organizational theories, referring to a ''management theory jungle.'' Hutchinson (1967) categorized theories according to scientific management, environmental and human relations school, man (*sic*) as decision maker, and current theories of management. A bit later, Scott and Mitchell (1972) added neoclassical theory, systems concept, organization processes, and organization change. Bolman and Deal (1997) made sense of organization theories by categorizing them into the structural frame, the human resource frame, the political frame, and the symbolic frame. Farazmand (1994), on the other hand, cited three categories: instrumental rationality that includes classical and neoclassical theories; systems theories; and critical and interpretive theories. Shafritz, Ott, and Lang (2005) identify nine ''major perspectives'' on organization theory: classical organization theory, neoclassical organization theory, human resource theory or the organizational behavior perspective, ''modern'' structural organization theory, organizational economics theory, power and politics organization theory, organizational culture theory, reforms through changes in organizational culture, and theories of organizations and environments. Hatch and Cunliffe (2006) delineate modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives in their readable text.

In 1997, Morgan published the second edition of *Images of Organization*, the first version of which had sold extremely well because it touched a cord with readers attempting to define and understand organizations. Morgan demystified what was often seen as ''a kind of magical power to understand and transform the situations [successful managers and problem solvers] encounter'' (p. 3). His premise was ''that all theories of organization and management are based on implicit images or metaphors that lead us to see, understand, and manage organizations in distinctive yet practical ways'' (p. 4). Defining **metaphors** as ''attempt[s] to understand one element of experience in terms of another'' (p. 4), he proceeded to elaborate on the metaphorical images most frequently used when people try to define and understand organizations. Morgan's list of metaphors include: Organizations as Machines, Organizations as Organisms, Organizations as Brains, Organizations as Cultures, Organizations as Political Systems, Organizations as Psychic Prisons, Organizations as Flux and Transformation, Organizations as Domination. Morgan details each

metaphor, identifies theories that reflect each metaphor, and examines the strengths and limitations of each.

All of the typologies discussed here attempted to order very complex ways of approaching organizations. Sources such as Hatch and Cunliffe (2006), Shafritz, Ott, and Lang (2005), and Morgan (1997) are readily available if the reader is interested in pursuing their various theoretical perspectives. Our intent here is simply to plant the seed that there are many traditional assumptions and concepts that have dominated thinking about organizations in the previous century as well as more contemporary conceptualizations of organizational life. In subsequent chapters, we will be tracing efforts to understand organizational structure, organizational goals, and behaviors. The major theories and assumptions about organization will be placed within the frameworks that guide the book so that the reader can see how philosophical and theoretical assumptions are based within deeply held worldviews.

Table 1.2 summarizes some of the important contributions made by influential organization theoretical perspectives, most of which developed from a post-industrial business model. Keep in mind that each perspective

Table 1.2
Primary Contributions by Organizational Theoretical Perspectives

Theoretical Perspective	Primary Contribution
Classical Theory	Recognized the importance of formal organizational structure and productivity
Human Resource/Organizational Behavior Theory	Recognized the importance of individuals and groups, the informal "system," and their relationship to the organization
Neoclassical Theory	Acknowledged organizational complexity
Modern Structuralist Theory	Transcended traditional, naive approaches to formal structure and provided a more comprehensive, balanced perspective of multiple sets of factors that relate within organizations
Systems Theories	Viewed organizations as open systems within changing environments
Power and Politics Theory	Acknowledged the importance of influence, politics, and informal power within organizations, beyond traditional views of authority as legitimized power
Organization Culture Theory	Recognized that organizations develop their own beliefs, grounded in deeply held assumptions and values
Sense-making Theory	Pointed out the ways in which organizational players reconstruct or "make sense" out of what happens

reflects certain assumptions that may contradict others. The point is that with the development of both classical and modern organization theories that reflect the complexity of post-industrial and technological societies, understanding organizations also becomes increasingly complex. Added to the global nature of many organizations and the multicultural profile of most American work environments, the old ways of categorizing organizations may feel insufficient (even oppressive) to persons in organizations intent on creating a more socially just work environment in a more just society. Honoring difference requires honoring diverse ways of understanding, communicating, thinking, and doing. It is our assumption that categorizing perspectives into ways of thinking about organizations is only a beginning step. To fully engage in organization practice, one must get beyond recognizing different perspectives or worldviews (sensitivity) to actually being able to use different ways of understanding in one's work (competence).

Each perspective brings with it certain insights and emphasizes particular aspects of organizational life while overlooking other essential elements. Even though these insights are only possible as a result of applying a particular perspective, much has been left unexamined. To date, no one approach has been able to fully capture the complexity of organizational life. Organizational diversity includes elements like purpose, structure, type, affiliation, and location as well as values, beliefs, and assumptions undergirding agency culture. Staff and client diversity includes gender, race, nationality, sexual orientation, attitudes, religion, values, and cultural diversity. Staff members are often diverse in terms of the professions they represent. Individuals also reflect diversity within groups, including differences represented and covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act or the Age Discrimination Act. These multiple, and often overlapping, aspects of diversity are related to organizational behaviors and outcomes. It is no surprise that Cox (1994) makes the provocative assumption, ''**managing diversity** is among the most important management challenges of this decade'' (p. x).

Assumptions About Employees

Behavior of the people comprising organizations has also been categorized, particularly since the development of the human relations theories of organizational behavior. Historically, managers have been told to understand their subordinates by categorizing either their behavior or their attitudes. The idea is that through understanding, the manager can better plan, specialize, and use authority and leadership for organizing, controlling, and managing (Hutchison, 1967).

An alternative to this controlling approach is the very popular Myers-Briggs test (Myers, 1998), built on Jungian theory and developed by

Katharine Cook Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers to allow ''the constructive use of difference'' (as cited in Martin, 1997). The Myers-Briggs model of personality is said to provide insight into how and why people understand and approach the world in different ways. It is based on the assumption that there are four dimensions of personality preferences. The first is how one directs energy (**extroversion** vs. **introversion**). The second is how one prefers to take in information (**sensing** vs. **intuition**). The third is how one prefers to make decisions (**thinking** vs. **feeling**). And the fourth is how one is oriented to the outer world (**judging** vs. **perceiving**). These preferences are combined into 16 different types, combining *I* for *introvert* or *E* for *extrovert* with *S* for *sensing* or *N* for *intuitive* and either *T* for thinking or *F* for *feeling* and *J* for *judging* or *P* for *perceiving*. A particular combination of the four purportedly describes how one sees the world (Myers, 1998). A paper-and-pencil questionnaire is used to assess type, where there is no right or wrong answer or right or wrong types. The idea is that all types are good, just different.

The valid and reliable instrument seems to identify how the mind is used, and how the individual feels most comfortable, natural and, thus, confident. It shows how people have different interests, ways of behaving, and ways of viewing strengths and needs for growth. Isabel Myers believed understanding of differences is ''useful whenever one person must communicate with another or live with another or make decisions that affect another's life'' (Myers as cited in Myers & Kirby, 1994, p. 16). Since the 1980s, there has been a general public acceptance of the Myers-Briggs characterization of ways we perceive and relate to the outside world, leading to a level of acceptance that there is no one ''best style.'' It seems there is a growing acceptance that uniqueness brings strength, different styles are useful, and differing perceptions are assets. These attitudes are entering the organizational field with the recognition that personality type is related to career satisfaction and organizational competence (Tieger & Barron-Tieger, 1992), team members' types affect team building (Hirsh, 1992), and ways of describing and analyzing organizational situations set the stage for organizational change (Lawrence, 1993).

Although the Myers-Briggs is designed to respect differences, the tool has not always been used for that purpose. Management trainers have used the Myers-Briggs over the years to point out why different employees had different needs, but the message was often interpreted by managers as a way to understand why things were not working and to try to corral or manipulate employees to ''get with the program.'' Thus, the Myers-Briggs instrument can be used to control the behavior of subordinates, even though that was not necessarily its intent. Until recent developments by postmodern theorists (see, for example, Fox & Miller, 1995; Hassard & Parker, 1993), there was an assumption (or at least a hope) that there was a one best way of doing the business of organizing. Differences were

recognized, but they were viewed as liabilities rather than strengths. Some managers searched for order and conformity among subordinates, rather than focusing on the strengths that exist amid diversity.

Assumptions About Managers and Leaders

It has long been recognized that managers can hold, and act on, different assumptions about employees. For example, according to McGregor (1960), Theory X managers assume that workers inherently dislike work and have to be closely supervised. Conversely, Theory Y managers see followers as eager to work and capable of participating in decision making. Tannebaum and Schmidt (1958) identify a continuum between what they call the *autocratic* (boss-centered) and the *democratic* (subordinate-centered) leader, who hold different assumptions about managing employees. The idea underlying these categories is that managers and leaders tend to be consistent in how they interact with supervisees and that this approach is based on personal philosophy and assumptions about human behavior (Lewis, Packard, Lewis, & Souflee, 2001).

Using Koontz, Hutchinson outlines six schools of management thought (Hutchinson, 1967, p. 10): operational school, empirical school, human behavior school, social systems school, decision theory school, and the mathematical school. Pfeffer (1981), having a great interest in power within the organization, suggests four models of management theory: rational, bureaucratic, decision process/organized anarchy, and political power. Bolman and Deal (1991) suggest that theorists of leadership and management can be sorted into rational system theorists, human resource theorists, political theorists, and symbolic theorists.

Four leading schools of research on leadership emerged during the 20th century: ''trait, style, contingency, and the new leadership paradigm'' (Bargal, 2000, p. 305). Each approach was intended to explain the concept of leadership, and each had its accompanying assumptions. The *trait approach*, which predominated from the 1930s through 1950s, assumes that leaders are born rather than made. Leaders are assumed to have certain personal characteristics such as a need for power or achievement and these traits are viewed as making them successful. The style approach emerged as early as the Ohio State studies on leadership in the 1940s (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). Various scholars focused on leadership style and their work continues to influence contemporary views of leadership (Bales, 1954; Likert, 1961). The *style approach* assumes that leaders can be categorized according to patterns of behavior, such as how they show consideration for their employees, define tasks to be done, and monitor employees in carrying out responsibilities (Bowers & Seashore, 1966).

Later, Blake and Mouton (1978) categorized management styles according to the attitudes displayed by leaders, attempting to categorize

leadership behaviors on a grid rather than along only one continuum. Their widely cited managerial grid categorizes five types of leaders along two axes: concern for people and concern for production. Blake and Mouton believed that a leader who had high concern both for people and production was the ideal type for which managers should strive. Other writers used the terms *task* versus *relationship* for *production* and *people* (Reddin, 1970), and suggested that leadership is more situational than being one ideal type for all occasions.

The *contingency approach* to organizational leadership emerged during the 1960s. Theorists such as Fiedler (1967) emphasized the importance of context in determining what would work in any given situation. The assumption that context has to be taken into consideration is an important contribution. As theorists attempted to understand assumptions about leadership and its practical application to managing people within an organization, the concept of **situational leadership** emerged (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977), in which the fit between leader and follower has to be carefully assessed and then style has to be adapted.

We remember participating in the 1970s in very popular training exercises in which everyone tried to categorize one's assumptions about leadership. It was very typical for a trainer to come in, administer a tool, and then have everyone categorize themselves. In this particular event, the trainees were either vanilla, chocolate, or strawberry. As it was explained, vanillas had certain assumptions, chocolates had others, and strawberries had others, yet all were equally important and valued (some people might like different flavors more than others, but there was no one right way). The point was to recognize that the assumptions held are different and that individuals tend to lead with their preferred assumptions.

We use this example to illustrate that there is nothing new about recognizing that people bring different assumptions to organizational leadership and management. This has been in the management literature for years. The difference now is that some managers/leaders are beginning to seek ways to take advantage of these differences rather than seeing them as barriers to productivity. This changing perspective is reflected in the new leadership approach. The new leadership approach contrasts with the trait, style, and contingency perspectives, all of which are grounded in a social psychological tradition (Bargal, 2000). One of the framers of the **new leadership approach**, Burns (1978) views leaders as creators of vision, culture, and strategy. Terms such as *transformational* and *transactional leader* are used to portray an approach to leadership in which old assumptions are challenged and organizational cultures are created and changed. The overriding assumption in the new leadership approach is that change is inevitable and that a visionary leader can transform the workplace into a meaningful arena (Bargal, 2000).

LEADERSHIP IN COMPLEX HUMAN SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Practitioners in human service organizations (whatever roles they play) must think critically about their own and others' assumptions about organizations and organizational behavior. This includes recognizing major theories that have influenced and continue to influence their thinking about organizations. Critical thinking about organizations will inevitably lead to disagreement, because no two people will hold the exact same assumptions. Being aware of the potential for clashes of assumptions and the need to clarify one's own perspectives is key to future organization practice.

For those readers who just relaxed because they do not plan to be an organizational *leader* and who think the contents of this book do not apply to them, we have a clear message to convey. We assume that every professional has leadership responsibilities within any organization in which he or she works, because leadership is not just a title or position like manager or administrator, or something only full-time macropractitioners do. **Leadership** is an attitude about responsibilities in an organization based on professional skills and a set of values that compel an individual to act. Leadership may come from any organizational member, regardless of the formal authority and power structure in that organization. The clinician who knows what happens to clients on a daily basis has a responsibility to provide that information to others for targeting further service development. These actions demonstrate leadership skills. The line worker who visits clients in their home environments will know more about what really happens to the agency's clientele than will managers who may have ultimate programmatic decision-making responsibility. Sharing the information will shape the program. The line worker demonstrates leadership skills by carefully documenting what she is learning and is responsible for clearly conveying this information to others who have ultimate program or legal responsibility. The program director who is aware of low staff morale and who needs to find ways to promote teamwork will be a leader for her staff team even if it is primarily the agency director's responsibility to establish the staff tenor for the whole agency.

Leadership requires having vision about what information is important to share and when to share it so that change can happen in organizations. Leaders do not merely identify and assess a problem, but plan for and facilitate successful problem resolution. Problem identification and solution are skills and responsibilities of all practitioners. For us, this means that organizational leadership is a professional responsibility of every practitioner, no matter what position one holds. This approach to leadership and the change that can result is not new (Brager & Holloway, 1978; Kettner, Daley & Nichols, 1985; Netting, Kettner, & McMurtry, 2008; Resnick & Patti, 1980).

We are committed to this long-established tradition that every professional can be a leader in initiating change, regardless of organizational role. Our hope is that readers will see the importance of both direct practice skills and accompanying understandings of human behavior, and the specifics of organizational skills from which to develop successful leadership for change. Professional leaders must develop the skills necessary to flourish in the chaos that accrues with multiple perspectives that produce different ways of doing the work of delivering human services in a multicultural environment. Foundational organization practice skills include critical thinking and self-awareness.

THE ROLE OF CRITICAL THINKING IN ORGANIZATION PRACTICE

Gibbs and Gambrill say that ''**critical thinking** involves a careful appraisal of claims, a fair-minded consideration of alternative views, and a willingness to change your mind in light of evidence that refutes a cherished position'' (1996, p. 23). For us, critical thinking has some important dimensions, starting with the examination of assumptions, goals, questions, and evidence involved in the phenomenon under scrutiny. It requires the use of reasonable (nonreactive) and reflective thinking focused on what to believe and what not to believe (Ennis, 1989). Critical thinking is actually part of problem solving in that it is not just an appraisal of claims or arguments; it is not just a way of discovering the mistakes in thinking of others. Instead, when fully engaged, it allows for deep understanding of issues. At its best, critical thinking is dialogic. It requires reflective/analytic listening along with active pursuit of clarity of expression. To truly engage in critical analysis one must understand what is intended in order to actively pursue the evidence and reasons supportive and contrary to the position being studied. This means that alternative points of view must be elicited and fully considered.

Regardless of the writer about critical thinking (see, for example, Gibbs & Gambrill, 1996; Kroeger & Thuesen, 1988; Paul & Elder, 2002; Ruggiero, 2001), their thoughts on the important tasks in critical thinking appear similar. The critical thinker must deal with the differing opinions of experts and how those contradict or support one's own opinion. The critical thinker must generate multiple perspectives in order to evenhandedly assess costs and benefits even when the thinker holds little belief in the alternatives. Finally, and most important, the critical thinker must be willing to shift personal opinions and patterns of thinking. In Box 1.1 we have provided some straightforward guides for engaging in critical thinking.

In thinking critically, one's assumptions and those of others are examined carefully and could be changed, based on new or alternative information. The process is not an easy one if these assumptions are cherished, or tightly held, almost as immutable truths. Groups within organizations,

Box 1.1

BASIC QUESTIONS OF A CRITICAL THINKER

- What is the *reason* for my thinking? Why am I doing this (purpose/goal/objective)?
- What precise *question* (problem/issue) am I trying to answer?
- Within what *paradigm* (perspective/ideology/point of view) am I thinking?
- What *assumptions* am I making? What am I taking for granted (concepts/variables/ideas)?
- What *information* (data/facts/observations) am I using? What might I be overlooking? What is missing for a complex picture?
- How am I *interpreting* the information? What are alternative interpretations (from different paradigms/perspectives/ideologies/points of view)?
- What *conclusions* am I making? Given alternative conclusions, why do I prefer these?
- If I accept the conclusions, what are the *implications*? What might be the positive and negative consequences if I put my position into action?

Source: Adapted from Paul (1993).

even entire organizations, can cherish assumptions. Schein (1992) calls this pattern of shared basic assumptions the basis of organizational culture. When consensus is so great as to create a perspective resembling a culture, the assumptions of that consensus are tenaciously held. Basic assumptions in organizations can come to be so taken for granted that one finds little variation in thinking or performance within a cultural unit. In fact, if a basic assumption is strongly held in a group, members will find behavior based on any other premise inconceivable. If, for example, the culture in a foster care unit is one of blaming biological parents, it is unlikely that anyone within the unit would actively consider the parents' strengths. Regardless of data, it would not be part of the assessment considerations because it would not occur to anyone to even think about strengths.

People in organizations may discover that their cherished assumptions are not congruent with what they are observing. Recognizing this discrepancy poses a dilemma—suffer the anxiety of moving to another assumption or hang on tenaciously to avoid the pain that accompanies change. Either choice is uncomfortable in its own way.

Some of the challenges to self-awareness can be overcome through clear, critical assessment. In writing this book, we hold numerous *cherished* assumptions. We assume that professionals have no choice but to think critically; otherwise, clients will not receive the best services one can provide. We assume that human service practice will be fraught with conflicts, some intentional and others totally unexpected. We know disagreements occur when different cherished assumptions collide.

Box 1.2

BEGINNING QUESTIONS ABOUT ASSUMPTIONS

1. What are your assumptions about organizations and organizational behavior?
2. When, where, and how did you develop these assumptions?
3. If you think about an organization with which you are familiar, do all your assumptions hold up? If not, which ones don't and why?
4. Think about an organization with which you are familiar. What basic assumptions do you think drive this organization's culture?

Depending on one's personality and style, conflicts may be tempered or ignited, but they will not be avoided. We also assume that organizations are arenas in which the potential for assumptions to clash will be accentuated by the sheer numbers of people who interact. But we also assume that this sets the stage for the practitioner to engage in a challenging and stimulating work environment that will stretch one's ability to use professional judgment based on well-reasoned thought. In addition, we assume that all this stretching and reasoning is based on one's desire to do the best possible work one can offer clients. This may mean struggling with (and possibly even changing) some cherished assumptions along the way. We know this is not easy, but see if you can begin to address the questions in Box 1.2.

No critical thinking process will produce effective results without the self-discipline necessary to achieve a consciousness about how one uses oneself in the organizational context. Once conscious use of self is part of a practice vocabulary, then real critical thinking can begin.

THE ROLE OF SELF-AWARENESS IN ORGANIZATION PRACTICE

Just as in direct practice, **self-awareness** within an organizational context requires an honest appraisal of oneself. There are many worthwhile discussions of self-awareness in relation to direct work with clients (see, for example, Hepworth, Rooney, Rooney, Strom-Gottfried & Larsen, 2006), but few speak specifically to the need for this same level of self-consciousness within the organizational setting. We agree with Falck (1988), who believes that interpersonal patterns and perceptions within an organization are key to understanding organizational behavior.

The same level of scrutiny of reactions within the organization is necessary as with an individual client. The organizational leader must be aware of personal biases, habitual distortions, and personal behavior that might contribute to the organization problem being addressed. These personal or internal elements may be contributing to the problem assessment or its solution.

Another area requiring honest scrutiny is personal style. It is necessary to know that the style in use is the appropriate one for the selected problem-solving strategy. If the organizational leader is naturally domineering, it must be clear that this dominance will produce the desired results. If one's style is naturally more shy or passive, will that type of communication pattern create the level of attention in others needed for problem resolution? Is natural assertiveness, confrontation, defensiveness, or a withdrawn pattern of communication warranted? The point of this assessment is the realization that what is natural in one's style might not be effective in each situation. With consciousness of the preferred style, and critical analysis regarding what is necessary with the people involved, the practitioner desiring change can strategically choose a style that is more likely to succeed. If more assertive discussion is necessary in order to be heard, even if a more quiet approach is preferred, the more effective strategy can be implemented because of introspection and critical thinking, and with appropriate skill development.

In addition, the organizational leader cannot assume that anyone's life experiences have been left at the door of the agency. A frank assessment of how one's life experiences might influence perceptions and judgments is essential for drawing valid conclusions regarding personal reactions to organizational experiences. The goal is to achieve personal reaction and reality congruence, but this is not possible until and unless the people involved are clear about how personal history shapes the lens with which they attempt to understand a situation. For example, experience of personal pain from abuse or neglect as a child might cause overidentification with a client or colleague in pain, to the degree that accurate appraisal of a situation is impossible. If a worker has had a history with controlling and critical parents, then critical feedback from those whose role it is to evaluate may not be received in the spirit it is intended. Similarly, if an employee has had a bad care giving experience with an older relative, she may have difficulty working with older persons who remind her of that relative. An active effort to disentangle personal reactions from the current reality is essential not only for sense making in the organization, but also for effectiveness.

For Kondrat (1999), there are at least five types of self-awareness involving successively higher orders of consciousness skills and complex thinking skills. Though her work is linked to direct practice, it is also very relevant for organization practice. Our students suggest that there may actually be seven types of awareness, including pre-conscious and contextual types. Therefore, we combine these two types with the five identified by Kondrat.

Pre-conscious self-awareness is a transitional phase, in which a person may recognize that she is not self-aware. This pre-conscious type is important because it is the beginning of the insight that something needs to happen differently. It is a triggering stage, in which one accepts the possibility that

something needs to change in the way one looks at oneself. One recognizes that self-awareness is not present.

To be self-aware in an organization, a worker must first clearly experience awareness, and this is what Kondrat (1999, p. 459) calls *simple conscious awareness*. This type of self-awareness is when a light bulb goes on. *Reflective awareness*, a third type, requires distancing from the contents of an experience for observation and critique. It involves getting beyond the light-bulb experience and beginning to analyze why one has felt a certain way or acted in certain ways. A fourth type, *reflexive awareness*, requires attention to and understanding of how personal history and the actual personhood of the practitioner impact the situation under consideration. The fifth type, a more social constructivist version of reflexivity, is called *social constructive awareness*, and requires awareness of the mutual shaping that goes into meaning making within the organizational setting. The sixth level, essential for organizational leadership, is *critical reflectivity*. This requires asking reflective questions about bias and intolerance. For example, one might examine the biases that ''center on the relationship between seemingly unproblematic, everyday behavior and racially structured outcomes'' (Kondrat, 1999, p. 468). The idea in this type of self-awareness is to accept the responsibility and the power to act to change the structures that support and sustain unequal outcomes in vulnerable groups inside and outside of the organization. This type of awareness accepts the notion that organizational participants are not just passive recipients upon whom the organization acts, but also are active agents with responsibilities to challenge the status quo. This sounds remarkably similar to earlier visions of social work leadership within organizations (Brager & Holloway, 1978; Kettner, Daley, & Nichols, 1985; Resnick & Patti, 1980).

A critical reflectivity is essential in assessing not only personal beliefs and attitudes, but also how the social/structural environment of the organization may be continuing or extending majority power and privilege to the detriment of the more vulnerable. Therefore, there is likely a seventh type of self-awareness in which the full implications of one's reflective questions and actions are assessed. We call this *contextual awareness*, where self-awareness meets the reactions, resistance, and consequences of change, understanding and accepting the external results of articulation of individual consciousness. Table 1.3 summarizes the types of self-awareness.

CRITICAL THINKING AND SELF-AWARENESS IN MULTICULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS

As agencies become more diverse in populations served, in approaches to service delivery, and in addressing political, economic, and cultural challenges—there may be no resolutions or ''real'' answers about what constitutes the best structure or practice within organization. Consider,

Table 1.3
Types of Self-Awareness

Level of Self-Awareness	Characteristics
1. Pre-Conscious Awareness	The person begins to recognize that she or he is not self-aware.
2. Simple Conscious Awareness	The person clearly experiences awareness.
3. Reflective Awareness	The person is reflective, taking some distance from the experience so that he or she can observe and critique.
4. Reflexive Awareness	The person must pay attention to and understand how personal history and the actual personhood of the practitioner impact the situation.
5. Social Constructive Awareness	The person must be aware of the mutual shaping that goes into meaning making within the organization.
6. Critical Reflectivity	The person must ask reflective questions about bias and intolerance, accepting responsibility and the power to act to change oppressive organizational structures.
7. Contextual Awareness	The person recognizes the consequences of critical reflexivity and how her or his raising questions impacts others, and sees self in the context of others.

instead, that there may just be informed ways of acting without the expectation of closure, definitive analysis, and guarantees. Organizational leaders must, therefore, be open to considering multiple perspectives in which possibilities and opportunities can emerge from the chaos of uncertainty based on honoring differences.

From this standpoint, working in multicultural environments in ways that are *socially just* may mean that chaos and uncertainty will be the norm. We are giving you permission, as a future organizational leader, to stop fighting the chaos and instead relish the challenges it offers to use your best critical thinking skills to work toward needed change. We hope that the approach offered in these chapters will begin to equip you to practice in complexity and ambiguity, recognizing possibilities, accepting challenges, and overcoming obstacles.

As Resnick and Patti (1980) made clear, organizations are not just collections of personalities; they are much more complex phenomena. Imagine, then, that one enters an organization in which persons from diverse groups with different values and assumptions come together to achieve a purpose or purposes. Think about how the group and subgroup cultures will interact within an organizational culture to create their own set of values and assumptions. Consider that we have not even mentioned

the clients one serves and how they fit into this multicultural interaction, though it is for the purpose of serving clients that the human service organizational culture is established in the first place. Even if the teams and groups within this organization work well together and share certain values and assumptions, clients will bring their own values and assumptions to the interaction. Cox refers to the concept of cultural fit as ''the degree of alignment between two or more cultural configurations'' (1994, p. 170). Practitioners have to develop skills in assessing cultural fit in order to work toward organizational change when client diversity is not compatible with established organizational culture.

Self-awareness is essential in working with the complexities of a multicultural environment. Without awareness of prejudices and stereotypes regarding those different from oneself, organizational members may be deceived into thinking that biases and stereotypes are absent from their thinking and behaviors. Workers in a multicultural environment should have the honesty and humility to admit the limits in their openness to difference. With this admission comes the recognition of the level of care necessary in communication and judgments so that personal prejudices do not cloud the picture or alienate those with whom solutions must be forged. Self-awareness is a key to moving away from prejudices and stereotypical perceptions, but until full liberation from discrimination and oppression is possible, it is also the major tool for managing organizational diversity.

The multicultural competency for which self-aware practitioners should strive has been labeled in the direct practice literature as *ethnic-sensitive* (Devore & Schlesinger, 1991; Lum, 1992) or *cross-cultural* (Harper & Lantz, 1996) competence. Helpful guidance for practice with the multiple cultures within and outside of an organization can be found in this literature. However, even more precise guidance is provided regarding direct practice. Lum defines this practice as minority practice, ''the art and science of developing a helping relationship with an individual, family, group, and/or community whose distinctive physical or cultural characteristics and discriminatory experiences require approaches that are sensitive to ethnic and cultural environments'' (p. 6). For direct practice, most theorists suggest that practice must be shaped with a sensitivity to experiences of racism, prejudice, and discrimination as well as attention to the specific cultural belief systems and behaviors that might influence individuals' views of themselves, their world, and their possibilities. This same sensitivity is important to organization practice. But sensitivity is not enough.

Many more details about competent multicultural practice will emerge throughout the rest of this book. For now, it is important to develop some elements of the type of respect that comprises effective multicultural practice. For us, the first element of respect is self-respect. In order to risk the hard work of cross-cultural communication central to respect, it is necessary to feel good about oneself. It is impossible to respect the ''other''

Box 1.3

ELEMENTS OF COMPETENT MULTICULTURAL PRACTICE

1. Self-respect
2. Dialogue
3. Curiosity
4. Sense of safety
5. Recognition of worthiness

until people respect themselves. The second element of respect comes through dialogue. Real understanding, just like real critical thinking, is impossible without real communication. One can move beyond misunderstanding and anger through dialogue. Dialogue is possible only if all parties are fully present in the conversation. Attention to the conversation is essential. This attention sometimes will require vigorous conversation, sometimes called *dialectical conversation*. At other times, respect occurs through silently bearing witness to the personal narrative of a colleague or client. A third important element of respect is curiosity and being humble about one's knowledge. Paul and Elder (2002) call intellectual humility an important trait of the disciplined mind.

Multicultural practice requires true interest in the stories, experiences, and perceptions of others. Genuine respect is possible only when one knows people's real thoughts, feelings, and fears. The authentic communication of these basic aspects of human experience comes through a fourth element—sense of safety. Safety is created when one communicates a sense of the other's worthiness, which is the fifth element. Box 1.3 lists the elements of competent multicultural practice.

Lawrence-Lightfoot (1999) says that from these expressions of respect demonstrated through competent multicultural practice comes empowerment. We agree. Crossing the borders of difference through genuine understanding and respect allows everyone involved to gain more knowledge. This knowledge can be used to make decisions that will nurture self-confidence and self-reliance in organizations and social environments.

CONCLUSION

Organization leaders with the power and skills to effect needed changes in human service organizations must critically think about their own and others' assumptions about organizations and organizational behavior. Critical thinking in an organizational context will inevitably lead to conflict because no two people will hold the exact same assumptions. Being aware of the potential for assumptions to clash, managing the discomfort of lack

of agreement, and clarifying one's own perspectives are key to organization practice, particularly as one works in increasingly **multicultural organizations**.

We link leadership with critical thinking and self-awareness, encouraging readers to be mindful of their assumptions about types of organizations, approaches to working in increasingly complex organizations, and the compatibility of their work with professional values. Practitioners within human service organizations must examine fit between organizational and professional values and look for ways to link the two. This responsibility is equally important for the line worker and the manager whose practice is either enhanced or impeded by the capacity for reflexive, complex, critically analytical thinking in the organizational context. Critical thinking is needed to engage chaos, sustain creativity, and maintain and construct effective and just multicultural organizations.

In this first chapter, we have emphasized diversity as a major theme in contemporary organizations, reinforced in different sets of assumptions that different people bring to organization practice at all levels. In the following chapters, with the help of several practical and philosophical frameworks for identifying and understanding diverse organizational assumptions, we will interrogate why they may be embraced with such fervor. We will also look at how these assumptions impact organization practice.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Constraints are those things that an organization cannot control, whereas contingencies are negotiable. Sometimes it is hard to tell the difference between the two, and what might constrain one type of organization may be a contingency for another. Think about the landscape of human service organizations and identify situations in which constraints and contingencies might vary in relation to public and private agencies, distinguishing between nonprofits, for-profits, and social entrepreneurs and social businesses.
2. In this chapter, we defined programs as containing services of various types. In some smaller organizations, programs and services may be hard to distinguish. Identify a small organization and a large bureaucracy with which you are familiar. How are the concepts of program and service useful (or not) in explaining what these organizations do? Are there alternative concepts to programs and services (or even a metaphor) that you think would be useful in describing the way in which these organizations are structured?
3. Three types of programs (direct service, staff development and training, and support) were defined in this chapter. Can you think of examples of these three types? How do they differ in their goals? Do

you think they have equal value in human service organizations? Why or why not?

4. Associations come in many different forms. What are the differences between umbrella associations and grassroot associations? What would be the advantages and challenges faced by each?
5. Ideological communities may or may not be geographically bound. How would you define community beyond neighborhood for non-place-based ideological communities? Next, examine what religious/faith, ethnic, and feminist communities might have in common and how each might shape different types of agencies.
6. Franchise and host organizations may or may not be considered human service organizations, even if portions of their responsibilities include service provision. What special constraints and contingencies do these type organizations have? What are the advantages and challenges of working in these settings?
7. Write your assumptions about the ''right'' structure of an organization and the expected behavior of management and employees. How do your assumptions vary from those of your peers? (Keep this list handy as you read the rest of this book and see if they change in process).
8. Consider critical thinking and how you think it relates to leadership. Start a journey in self-awareness with a journal. As you read the text, make notes in your journal when you have reactions. Then analyze your reactions by trying to understand what the reaction is, why you are having it, where this came from, and what it might mean for you as a developing organizational leader.
9. Identify your comfort zone regarding different cultures. Where are you most comfortable and what makes you uncomfortable? What do you want to work on in your personal and professional life in order to be competent in multicultural environments?