Organizational Development: The Case of Conflicts in a Social Service Agency- Theory to Action

Kevin F. Quinn

University of Massachusetts/ Boston

Dispute Resolution Department

David Matz

University of Massachusetts/ Boston

August 1, 2007

Acknowledgments

I would first and foremost want to recognize myself in this venture. It has been a hard and arduous journey. David Matz will tell you so. I want to thank David for his many sit-downs and emails as he guided me through this journey. Without his perceptive proposals and suggestions, I would not have gotten here.

I want to next thank the professors of the department: Darren Kew, Susan Opotow and Eben Weitzman for carrying me through to this place. Their teachings in Dispute Resolution were invaluable.

I want to next thank the staff of The Dispute Resolution Program: Amy, Roni, Kelly, Teresa, and Ann for their help, concerns and attitudes during this hard and arduous journey- did I already say that?

I would like to thank the workers of the APEX company for allowing me into their work world and helping me to better understand theory of action.

I would like to thank Beth Boynton who agreed to be an outside evaluator with short notice.

Finally I would like to thank my friends both at work and at home for their help, especially my best friend Jorgette Theophilis.

And finally, finally I do not want to thank Jerry Seinfeld for his contribution to my headaches and this hard and arduous journey. I think Mr. Seinfeld would find that funny.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT

This paper will look at the conflicts of a client social service agency. These conflicts can be either organizational or personal within this client agency and affect how the agency is run. This paper will look at an organizational development department of a social service agency, which is mandated by a state department to oversee the correction of these conflicts in the client agency. It will be the focus of this paper to see how this organizational development department's espoused theories relate to their theories-in-use in working to better the progress of this client agency.

Preface

Do people talk a good game when they talk about the theories they use or do they inflate their use of these theories? This paper introduces Don Schön's and Chris Argyris' ideas of espoused theory, which people talk of, and theory in action, which people actually use. These two perspectives of theories are theoretical themselves. The main question is: Is there a difference between what people say and what they do? The answer is yes. I want to study one organization's difference between what they say they do and what they actually do to answer the following question: Why do people say one thing and do another? There is the obvious philosophical answer that it's not possible for people to do exactly what they say. This paper wants to see if there is a large difference between the two in one organization. Barring our philosophical question, I imagine that there is a difference in some respects and not in other respects. This is what I want to discover. I also want to look at when are espoused and theories-in-use different and when are they the same and why? This will not satisfy our philosophers but may satisfy psychologists.

Introduction

The Organizational Development (OD) Department and Process Consultants (PC) are part of the APEX Company. There are five O.D. workers and they graciously allowed me to work as an intern, to question and to interview them and to observe them interviewing members of the client agency.

The client agency (WASP) is a large agency with six offices. They have several senior staff including a senior manager, junior managers and clinician and more than several on-line staff. All staff were interviewed to get an idea of how the agency was structured. This organization was explored to see how staff were ranked- hierarchically and vertically and to see how communication was between workers at each of the six offices.

At the interview with both managers (see Data Sheet A), the junior manager mentioned communication and organization as being the primary problem. This junior manager, it was discussed during this initial meeting, has a hard time delegating and having a hands-off managing style. The senior manager had a lot to say and was enthusiastic that he would be receiving consulting services without having to pay for it. He seemed very open to the idea of having APEX working with his agency. Later, in the next set of individual interviews, the junior manager said that the senior manager felt it was a ‘slap in the face’ having the APEX team there. The junior manager, however, was happy to have a new perspective and help with the structure of the agency.

The senior and junior managers were interviewed separately. I attended the interview of the junior manager. (See Data Sheet B). She again said that there needs to be more communication and organization. She also said that staff are good at interpersonal skills. She is flexible and available as a manager. She is supervising too many people- 13 in all.

One subject that was later found out to be a problem for line staff is the fact that reports go from one person to another and then come back to on-line staff. It is inefficient, one on-line staff person said. There is also a Communications person who is involved in reporting. E. has on-line staff do a monthly report, which they do not have to do. Department does not require this monthly report. B does not see the reports.

Another sensitive subject is that E. does not get support from the senior manager, B. E. was very forthright with this information. She didn't say he was a poor manager per se, but did insinuate it. She said that B does not bring an agenda to supervision. She has her agenda but only has an hour of supervision to discuss it. Also, B changed the makeup of WASP, it was insinuated, to make his position more powerful. B, however, said that it was because of financial constraints.

I next attended the interviews of two line workers – (See Data Sheets C & D). The first was someone who had worked at WASP for 15 years both as a volunteer and as a full-time staff person. He had many things to talk about changing at WASP. Specifically, he thought that the goal of reaching people who were French was not an effective goal. The French, he said, were already well established, whereas Haitian-Creole people are not. He felt it was a waste of resources to target so much money toward the French since they are not a population needing services. He was saying that the number of French compared to the number of Haitian-Creoles was significantly low. Therefore, they did not need services, and service dollars should not be targeted toward them.

The second line worker had been working at the agency for less than six months. He had a much brighter view of the agency and of his job. He was very excited about the agency, but did find some faults. He, like the other line worker, specifically mentioned the difficulty of writing reports. This line worker said that he finds them repetitive, because the Department wants them written a certain way and with certain verbiage. He mentioned that it was boring and repetitive several times. He also commented on the Department's need for every little detail of outreach and what he did. He did not complain about the calendars because they were more general, but the monthly and quarterly reports are very 'complicated,' he said.

There have already been discussions between the APEX workers and myself about trends we see in having interviewed twenty people. Some of theses trends have to do with reporting and financial concerns as already mentioned, but some have to do with the overall running of the agency. For example, in one office, which caters to the French and Haitian-Creole population, out of all the times the six of us had been to that office, we did not see one client. In addition, in this one office there was not one flyer, brochure or poster, except one in the bathroom, about HIV. In addition, I discovered the mission statement of the agency written in poor English without a French-Creole translation. The other offices did have these, but not this office. It might be an interesting fact in this office that the junior manager says she gets the most amount of work done; perhaps because there is no client traffic. I will be maintaining an internship position with the APEX company well beyond the scope of this thesis. I look forward to finding out how the complete process of consultation works and how Schein's and Block's consultation stages are implemented.

Literature Review

Argyris, Putnam & Smith (1985) exclaim "Do as I say, not as I do" (p. 82) describing theories of action: espoused theory and theory-in-use. They continue saying that espoused theory is what people say they do and theory-in-use is what they actually do. The authors more specifically define espoused theory and theory-in-use by writing, "Espoused theories are those that an individual claims to follow. Theories-in-use are those that can be inferred from action." (p. 81-82). Argyris & Schön (1996) agree by saying that espoused theories are announced to the world. Theories-in-use are directly inferred from observable behavior.

The authors are jesting when they say, "Do as I say, not as I do," because they are saying that there is no connection between what people say they do and what they do. Instead, they are saying what people say they do is often better than what they do. But, this is not always the case as we shall see in an example of teachers looking at the communication of Black children. Argyris & Schön (1974) are the authors of these theories, and although they have been lauded for their insight, it is clear that people cannot do exactly as they say they do. For this reason, there are not any scholarly references refuting this theory.

Theories

Argyris & Schön (1974) say, "Theories are general, central and specific (p. 10)." Their theory of action is general, central and specific. It is general to incorporate all human interaction. It is central to the interaction of all humans. And, it is specific for each human being. The theory of action can account for any human interaction. Argyris and Schön (1996) call both the espoused theory and the theory-in-use as parts of their theory of action. Do not confuse theory-in-use and theory of action. The former is part of the latter. Espoused theory is also a theory of action. Theories of action belong to us. They are indeed part of us. We espouse them and we use them.

Does an espoused theory have to be spoken in order for it to be an espoused theory? No. However, it does have to be owned by the person using it. Argyris, Putnam & Smith (1985) do not call these action steps, but instead call them theories in and of themselves: “Our distinction is not between theory and action but between two different theories” (p. 82). Senge (1994) defines theories for us as a fundamental set of propositions about how the world works- subjected to repeated tests in which we have gained confidence. Theories of action are then propositions about how people espouse their actions and how they follow through on these actions. People will act in certain ways and will say they act in certain ways, but these are not always the same. In fact, they are always not the same. But, we know from the definition of theory that tests of theory-in-use are repeated so that we gain confidence in them. However, our theory-in-use may not be our espoused theory.

Congruency

Argyris, Putnam, & Smith (1985) say that one reason for insisting that what people do is congruent with the theory-in-use, even if it’s incongruent with their espoused theory, is to emphasize what people do is not accidental. They do not ‘just happen’ to act in a particular way. Rather their action is designed. However, Argyris and Schön (1996) are saying that the closer the theories of action are to one another the better for people both the subject and the object. Otherwise, they continue, there is not a connection between these two theories and this does not bode well for the two people.

Masterson, Olian & Schnell(1997) say, “The congruence or incongruence of the organization’s espoused theory and theory-in-use will have effects at the individual and organizational level (p. 196).” They go on to say that incongruence will have a negative effect on job performance, employee turnover and goal setting: “Incongruence between espoused and practiced theory results in internally inconsistent messages, hampering the goal setting performance cycle because goals are misunderstood (p. 199).” They are saying that if what one does and what one says they do are not in sync, then there is a mixed message and that this mixed message will have negative consequences. Not only are goals misunderstood, but also incongruence results in goal incongruence. “Goal incongruence detracts from organizational performance because different individuals in the same organization may end up pursuing competing goals (p.199).” Not only are their problems on the organizational level, but there can be problems at the individual level as well.

Irving & Williams (1995) discuss reflective practice of counselors. Kane (2002) talks about the reflective practice of teachers and says, “Reflection is considered to be a critical component of the development of teaching expertise at all levels (p. 218).” To be a good teacher, a person must reflect on their practice by comparing their espoused theory to their theory in practice. Irving and Williams (1995) feel that in individual counseling a person’s “behavior may be governed by diametrically opposed values (p. 112), “ because one’s espoused values are not consistent with one’s practicing values. For example, they say an individual in counseling might have the competing goals of, “it is all right if ‘everyone wins as long as I don’t lose!’” (p. 113). In addition, they feel that without reflective practice or discovering a counselor’s theories-in-use it is “counter-cultural or inappropriate for counseling philosophy, or, for that matter, any professional activity (111)." Reflective practice- ensuring that a person's espoused theory is close to his theory-in-use is a practical application for everyone.

Another problem that occurs when espoused theory is out of sync with theory-in-use is that people are likely not to understand what is the root of a problem. For example, Argyris, Putnam & Smith (1985) talk about a group of teachers who thought that the difference in communication of Black children was due to how they were being taught to communicate at home. This was their espoused theory. In fact, the theory-in-use would have told them that this was not the case. The Black children were being taught how to communicate the same way as the white children. The teachers did not look at the theory-in-use so were not able to tell their was not a difference. What then was the reason for the difference? Discrimination, segregation and race relations. If the theory-in-use was explored then there may have been discussions around these three subjects.

Certainly theories-in-use are routine, because we do not always and often do not think about what we are doing, we just do it. This is why theory-in-use and espoused theory can be so incongruent. We say we are going to do one thing and then it is as if an auto-pilot takes over and we do what we do without thinking about it. We have thought about it as our espoused theory but not as our theory-in-use. Why is this? Argyris, Putnam & Smith (1985) argue, "…human beings can be understood to act according to rules they cannot state" (p. 82).

Argyris, Putnam and Smith (1985) go on to say that what people do is not accidental. People do not just happen to act in a particular way. Rather their action is designed. This design is already programmed based on what we have done in the past, what we have tested repeatedly and in which we have gained confidence. This confidence is so complete that again we do not test its validity in use. In addition, Irving & Williams (1995) say that "we may unconsciously choose to keep our theories-in-use tacit, refusing to bring them into awareness for critical examination, thus making behavioural change difficult if not impossible (p. 108)." This then makes anyone's job difficult, for me as well. I'm asking these APEX workers to make their theories-in-use explicit for critical examination. Time will tell if the APEX workers' behavior will change based on this report.

Nature of Theory of Action

Argyris & Schön (1996) say that theories of action inform human actions. They add that one takes his action and reflects on this action to learn from it. This suggests the cyclical nature of theories of action. The manner in which Argyris and Schön discuss theories of action often sounds like it is linear. However, they are saying here we can learn from our theories-in-use; essentially, getting our espoused theories and our theories-in-use parallel to one another. However, if these theories are not congruent, there exist "questions about the extent to which behavior fits espoused theory; and whether inner feelings become expressed in actions" (Smith, 2001, p. 3). Argyris, Putnam and Smith (1985) say that, "…human beings can be understood to act according to rules they cannot state. " (p. 82). However, Argyris (1980) makes the case that effectiveness results from the two theories of action being congruent. Smith (2001) says that "Much of the business of supervision ,,,, is concerned with the gulf between espoused theory and theory-in-use or in bringing the later (sic) to the surface." He continues, "This gulf is no bad thing. If it gets too wide then there is clearly difficulty. But provided the two remain connected then the gap creates a dynamic for reflection and for dialogue" (p. 3).

Theorists adopted by APEX workers

The following theories and theorists are adopted by each of the APEX workers. When asked what theory or theories they adhere to, they came up with the following. This is a list of theorists, not necessarily espoused, as we're defining it, by the APEX workers, but nevertheless their espoused theories do follow the theorists. I thought it would be useful to look at the seminal books and main theories with respect to espoused and theory-in-use.

There is a great gap between what Peter Block, Edgar Schein, Paulo Freire, and William Ury and Roger Fisher espouse and what they suggest one uses in theory. Their espoused theories are often what people should do and their theory-in-use is what people should not do, but what people naturally do.

Peter Block (1981) says that people often espouse to act as consultants of change but in-use they act as managers of change. Line managers can affect change whereas consultants cannot. Edgar Schein (1988) gives the theory-in-use example of a process consultant helping from without not within, which makes the client oppose the intervention. He says that people espouse to work with a client from within so that the client trusts the consultant and the client needs "to be helped to know what kinds of help to seek (p. 10)."

Paulo Freire (1999) says that one's espoused theory is to teach democratically so that the teacher does not condescend to the student; the teacher teaches the student, but also learns from the student, and the student learns from herself. One's theory-in-use, says Freire is often to teach "authority dependence" (1999, p. 1). This is the natural way that people teach. William Ury and Roger Fisher (1981) say that people espouse to negotiate one's interests but that their theory-in-use is to be positional. William Ury (1991) might say that an espoused theory is joint problem-solving when a theory-in-use may be a hard negotiation style.

All of the books written by these people tell you what you should do as an espoused theorist but it is not often the case that we naturally do what we say we do. Instead, our theory-in-use takes charge and may compel us to do what is natural for us.

Flawless Consulting by Peter Block

Peter Block (1981 has written the book *Flawless Consulting* for many reasons. He describes the theme of his book as client line manager, who has direct control versus the consultant, who has no direct control. The line manager changes the organization not the consultant. He says that line managers are the people who work in the client organization such that they are the ones to do the work that the consultant guides them to do. Managers are on the line and have control over change, he says; whereas consultants have no direct control over change. The line managers will stay with the client organization so only they can continue the recommendations of the consultant once the consultant has finished the job she was asked to do. It is the consultant's downfall when they espouse to do this, but then they do something all together different like helping the client with his one task. It is natural for us to want to help people in need and just to tell them what they should do. This could be a theory-in-use. Helping in this way seems the easiest thing to do; however, it does not follow the saying: Teach them to fish and they eat for a lifetime, give them a fish and they eat for a day. It is a consultant's responsibility, Block says, to give his expertise, but the client knows more about the problem than the consultant does.

It is entertaining to hear Block say this is what my book is about….and then pages later he says this is the central theme of my book…. I shall go over some of these themes in the paragraphs ahead.

-"Leverage and impact is what this book is about, Block (1981) says. Leverage is having the ability to influence the client so that the client works to help himself. A consultant must have a great impact on the client or the change will not be effective.

-His goal in any consulting job is change. This change might be great or small, but it is change that consultants are looking for. Hopefully, this change is for the better. Otherwise, we will not be called as a consultant again.

-He says that his book is about what to do when there is resistance from a client-either push harder or let go. One's espoused theory may be to push harder but their theory-in-use should be to let go. He says that trusting client is what works for him and increases the chance that our expertise will be used again and again.

-A consultant works on two levels: the substantive or cognitive side and the affective or the feelings side. He does not directly state which one to espouse and which to use, but highly recommends concentrating on the affective side. He says that discussing and working with the affective side is the major objective of the book.

-Today, Block says there is more of a collaborative/participatory role of the consultant. He goes on to explain that some of the consultant's goals are to establish a collaborative relationship in which both the client and the consultant maximize the use of resources. With this collaboration the consultant is imparting her 'consultant knowledge' not her technical expertise as in an expert role or her pair-of-hands role. These terms he borrows from Edgar Schein.

-He discusses 12 stages of a client's involvement step by step.

a. **Defining the initial problem**- He says he adds his 50 cents even at this early stage.

b. **Deciding to proceed with the project**- A negotiation (50/50) about whether of not this project will succeed.

c. **Selecting dimensions to be studied**- His expertise is ok, but the client knows more about the problem.

d. **Deciding who will be involved in the project**- Client and consulting team. The client's involvement helps the implementation stage.

e. **Selecting the method-** Client will have ideas about collecting data or making a questionnaire. Involve them in the process.

f. **Data collection**– Have the client do it with you, he says.

g. **Funneling the data**– Compiling the data. He says this takes a lot of time.

h. **Giving a data summary**- Summarizing the data. He says this is hard.

i. **Data analysis**- Analyzing the data. He says this is easier than summarizing.

j. **Feedback of results**– Client presents data analysis in feedback meeting. He describes this is the moment of truth.

k. **Making recommendations**- What would client do with the information, having heard the results of the inquiry?

l. **Deciding to act**- The client often wants to take over the process at this point, Block says. He cautions to resist this, because the decisions to be made are based on the consultant's work.

-His main theory, Block says, is to engage the client, reduce resistance, and thus increase the probability of success. Too much control in either the client or consultant results in no internal commitment.

Process Consultation: It's Role in Organization Development by Edgar Schein

With Schein's (1988) book *Process Consultation: Its Role in Organization Development*, he defines process consultation as "a set of activities on the part of the consultant that help the client to perceive, understand and act upon the process events that occur in the client's environment in order to improve the situation as defined by the client (p.11)." The function of the process consultant, he continues, is to help the client diagnose and manage their own problems.

-Managers espouse to not know what kind of help they need, so the process consultant must take his theory to guide them.

-Process consultants cannot know the culture of the place until they have talked extensively with the client. Like Block, Schein also tells us that any attempt to use one's theory from without will meet with the client's resistance.

-Unless the client sees the problems, he cannot help if it recurs. Apparently one of the management staff of WASP do not see any problems. Because this is the senior manager it is of great concern.

Schein at first in *Process Consultation* feels it is imperative to know about group dynamics. The first part of his book is defining process consultation. His second part of this book is titled, "HUMAN PROCESSES AND HOW TO INTERVENE IN THEM (1988, p. ix – x)." These processes are of group dynamics. I shall go through them one by one.

I. Human Processes in Organizations- Schein tells us that how people behave in an organization may not be how the formal organization tells them how to behave: "how people actually relate to each other bears only a limited similarity to how the formal organization structure says they should behave (p. 18)." Like espoused theory and theory-in-use, Schein is telling us what is espoused is not an organization's theory-in-use.

Schein then lists for us Phase I. The most important processes for a process consultant to know about:

A. Communication process- this is not only verbal communication (who talks to whom, etc), but also non-verbal communication.

B. The process of building and maintaining a group- here Schein breaks this category into phases:

1. Problems in entering a New Group- This process goes from initiation to acceptance and intimacy of the group to coping with emotional issues of the group and the resolution of these emotional issues.
2. Task and group maintenance functions, which he defines as boundary maintenance. These functions are further broken down.
    a. Task functions- what one does in a group.
    b. Building and internal maintenance functions – Schein tells us these are such functions as gate keeping – such as taming overactive members, prodding passive ones and encouraging members.

c. Boundary Management functions – keeping the boundaries of the group; including and excluding members from the group.

3. Schein says that the basic mission of this process is "to get the group to share in diagnosis and to help the group to learn to diagnose its own processes (1988, p. 56)."

C. Group problem solving and decision making – decision by majority, minority, consensus, etc

D. Group growth and development – external and internal processes.

E. Leading and influencing - group definitions of leadership, management, power and authority.

F. Appraising performance and giving and receiving performance feedback to group members. This includes looking at inter-group and intra-group processes and formation of groups.

A more important phase for us in the context of this paper is Phase II. which is the consulting process in action. This phase is more important because we want to see if the person who adopted this theory follows this theory. Schein defines this phase concisely as helping others to help themselves.

A. The first process is the initial contact with the client and defining the relationship with that client.

B. The second is to be open about the process consultant's work.

C. Perform diagnostic interventions

D. Confrontive intervention to affect the process- such as agenda management.

E. Confronting through the process of feedback

F. Coaching, counseling and giving structural suggestions

G. Evaluating results and disengaging or reducing involvement with the client. Schein says to always keep the door open to more process consultation in the future

In these steps of process consultation, the person adopting this theory espoused using all but one of these steps; such that their theory-in-use very much mirrored their espoused theory in this case.

The second worker with whom I sat in on an interview espoused the theories of Paulo Freire. During her interview she was very astute at naming the senior manager as an oppressor. Her espoused theory was very close to her theory-in-use.

Pedagogy of The Oppressed, Theory of Transmission and Theory of Consensus by Paulo Freire

Pedagogy of The Oppressed by Paulo Freire

The theory for *Pedagogy of The Oppressed* fits in nicely with the process consultation of WASP, because one can see that in many ways the WASP management oppresses the WASP workers. This oppression is found in the way that the senior manager speaks to the staff and how one manager micromanages her workers. Perhaps micromanagement is needed at this point, because the workers are not completing reports well or on time, but this same manager complains that she has too much work to do. Perhaps, if she did not oppress (if oppress is the right word) her workers, they would find their own humanistic qualities and show her that they can do their job effectively. Showing her the effective qualities of her workers, I believe, is one of the challenges for the process consultation team.

Freire points out many themes in *Pedagogy of The Oppressed*. He says that the justification for a pedagogy of the oppressed is dehumanization. This act of dehumanization, he continues, engenders violence in the oppressor. However, the great humanistic vocation of the oppressed is to free themselves and the oppressors. At the beginning of this phase, which Freire calls liberation, the oppressed become "sub oppressors" because they want to be "good" oppressors. At WASP this can be seen in the way that one worker in one department oppresses another worker – see Data Sheet C.

Freire says that the tragic dilemma of the oppressed is that they become oppressors whose consciousness they have internalized. Pedagogy of the oppressed cannot be practiced by oppressors, he says. "A" objectively exploiting "B" or hindering his or her pursuit of self-affirmation as a responsible person is one of oppression and constitutes violence. "Oppressors have a possessive quality of the world," he says. This possessive quality is also seen in the management of WASP. The senior manager somehow does not see his oppression of the front-line workers. One example of this oppression is the fact that the senior manager speaks for almost two hours to the workers in their staff meeting. The oppressed are reluctant to resist, and totally lack confidence in themselves, Freire says. Here oppressed will turn against oppressed to produce a duality of oppressor and oppressed. Action- not just intellectual action is needed with reflection, Freire posits. The management of WASP truly needs to reflect on the deficits of the organization. True reflection leads to action, Freire continues. Workers must be owners of their work, (for) any purchase or sale of labor is a type of slavery, he says. The WASP workers also must see the deficiencies in their work. In Data Sheet C, one worker admits to his deficiency in writing English.

Theory of Transmission by Paulo Freire

In Freire's *Theory of Transmission*, he discusses how "teaching is a political process. (Freire,1998, p. 1)." This is his espoused theory. Freire's theory-in-use is that, "it must be a democratic process to avoid teaching authority dependence. (Friere, 1998, p.1)." In the case of WASP, the senior manager is teaching dependence upon his authority. In addition, he is not allowing workers to tell him what they do. He has never visited their workplace and has often not spoken with them. Freire (1998) says that "Educators need to know what happens in the work of the children (people) with whom they work. (p. 72)." He adds that "Teachers must have humility, coupled with love and respect for their students (p. 1)". "Humility helps us to understand this obvious truth: No one knows it all; no one is ignorant of everything (p39)."

The senior manager of WASP portrays himself as knowing his whole agency, but it is his workers who are not ignorant of the deficiencies of it.

Theory of Consensus by Paulo Freire

In his *Theory of Consensus*, Freire answers the questions, Why do people disagree? and How is consensus achieved? "Disagreement is normal and something to expect." he says, "Disagreement can be an impetus to reflection and a source of growth. (Freire, 1998, p. 2)." The senior manager of WASP seems to disagree with this statement. He has rose colored glasses on, ignoring the disagreements of his workers, the agency, and the funders of the agency- A Department. He tries to escape conflict and in "trying to escape conflict, we preserve the status quo (Freire, 1998, p. 45)." The senior manager of WASP not only escapes the conflict of his Directors – See Data Sheet B, but also those of his on-line workers. In the same way, the manager of this department ignores the conflict between her on-line workers – see Data Sheet C.

Another APEX worker says she sees the ideas of *Getting Past No* and *Getting to Yes* as primary in her work as a process consultant. The connection between her work and these two books will become clearer in the results section.

Getting Past No: Negotiating Your Way from Confrontation to Cooperation by William Ury

In Ury's book *Getting Past No: Negotiating Your Way from Confrontation to Cooperation* he posits an espoused theory of joint problem solving and a theory-in-use of a hard negotiation style. He says that people often chose a hard negotiation style when they ought to jointly problem solve. Your greatest opportunity as a negotiator, he says, is to change the game, from theory-in-use to espoused theory. He continues that the result of the espoused theory is that we have agreement, whereas the result of the theory-in-use is stonewalling, attacking and using tricks. Using tricks such as manipulating data, saying a negotiator does not have the authority to make a decision when at first it was understood he did, and when the negotiation is over, a negotiator pointing out just one last thing to negotiate hinders the negotiation.

Ury (1991) suggests some of the following to deal with these tricks. He says, "step to their side (p. 52)," "And agree with them whenever possible (p. 54)," and "Change the frame, (p. 78)." He says, "Negotiation is not just a technical problem-solving exercise but a political process in which the different parties must participate and craft an agreement together (p. 111)." He describe five steps of a breakthrough negotiation, 1) Go to the balcony, which means not to get into the fracas of a negotiation and to watch the negotiation as an outsider would; 2) Step to their side, which can also mean not to get into the fracas, but may mean work together with them not against them; 3) reframe the negotiated items; 4) build them a golden bridge, meaning find common interests and highlight them; and, 5) use your power to educate the other side.

Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving In by Roger Fisher and William Ury

Fisher and Ury (1983) suggest a four-part method for getting to yes. They first say to separate the people from the problem- this means to treat the negotiator as a person with perceptions and emotions first. Second they suggest focusing on interests and not positions- this means to focus on the negotiator's wants, fears and other emotions not on the negotiator's side of things. Third, they say to invent options for mutual gain. In doing so, you will have options which are beneficial to both negotiators. And finally, to insist on using objective criteria or standards when deciding on what's to be negotiated. Thus, there will be a clear understanding of what you're basing the negotiation on.

Fisher and Ury (1983) also set up different stages for the negotiation. They first say there's an analysis stage where a negotiator can diagnose the problem by gathering information, organizing it and thinking about it. The planning stage, they say, is their four part method stage detailed in the above paragraph. And the final stage is the discussion stage where two negotiators will actually negotiate the issue at hand.

They then suggest some negotiation tactics to use when the other negotiator is in some way delaying the negotiation or using "dirty tricks." They first caution to establish your BATNA or your Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement. This will give you a better position from which to negotiate, because you'll know whether or not you can get a better deal by not negotiating. They also say to consider the other side's BATNA. Second, they say to counter a negotiator not playing they suggest to employ a third person or to use negotiation jujitsu. They explain several methods of this jujitsu.

The first jujitsu move is to focus on only one part of the negotiation. The second is to point out that the negotiators' concern is fairness, and have them buy into that fairness. Third is to insist on independent standards. Remember that trust is a separate issue from the issue being negotiated is the fourth. The firth, sixth and seventh are to ask a few questions to see if you're understanding the facts of the other negotiator, to ask what's the principle behind their actions and to ask them if you can get back to them. Another jujitsu move is to tell them you're having trouble following their reasoning. Finally, they suggest that you propose one fair solution to the problem at hand.

Next, they caution against the other side using dirty tricks. With all these dirty tricks, they suggest to negotiate on the rules of the game. They bring to mind several dirty tricks. The first is the other negotiator using deliberate deception. The second is them using psychological warfare such as creating a stressful situation or personally attacking you. The third dirty trick is a negotiator using positional pressure tactics, such as refusing to negotiate; making extreme demands; escalating those demands; or locking-in their position such that they effectively are not negotiating. Other positional pressures are telling you they have an outside hard-hearted partner who will not let them negotiate an issue; using a calculated delay or saying, “Take it or leave it.”

Finally, Ury and Fisher say not to be a victim. They say to assess whether or not the person negotiating with you would act this way with a friend or family member. To be transparent you could ask them the question: Would you act this way with a friend or family member? If the answer is no, you know that you must negotiate the rules of the game. Ury and Fisher have packaged for us a neat and tidy way to deal with negotiations. They first tell us to follow their method of negotiating. Next they tell us to follow the stages of analysis, planning and discussion. Finally they suggest ways to deal with deception.

Method

The method by which I got my data was observation. I observed four interviews of the APEX workers – See Data Sheets. The first interview, Data Sheet A sets the stage for what the client was focused on and where the client organization needed help. Before observing the interviews of each APEX worker, Data Sheets B through D, I ascertained the espoused theories of each worker, by questionnaire and by interview. The questionnaires were four pages asking each APEX worker to imagine or remember when they interviewed a client. They then were to tell how, by their interviews, they engendered characteristics or emotions to the client. The interviews of the APEX workers lasted approximately forty-five minutes with a fifteen-minute post-interview from which I received additional information the particular APEX worker may have forgotten. After the interviews I compared the espoused theories of each APEX worker to their theories-in-use – this is from which I got my results.

Data

Data Sheet A

Interview with senior and junior manager of WASP 6/7/07 9:00 – 11:45 a.m.

In attendance: B, E, F, O and Kevin Quinn

F began by telling WASP representatives about the expectations WASP should have of APEX-

F explained

- that WASP becomes our client

-the benefits of Motivational Interviewing.

-introductions of everyone working on the APEX team.

-that it is WASP agenda which will foster this team project.

-that the information is confidential but not anonymous

-and perhaps there will be other team building with the staff

-the process is:

-an assessment phase can take up to one to two months

-a talk with the Board of Directors

-some strategic planning with the stakeholders

-to compile information and a report goes to WASP not to DEPARTMENT.

-Perhaps an all-day retreat

-Team building exercises with staff, which will be mission driven.

-Could include coaching

He further explained that it's hard to find people to manage programs and that tuition assistance and this special educational opportunity are one way to get those managers. It is good for staff moral and building from within. By having staff at the Master's level, it's easier to get funding he said.

We next spoke about the roots to the recent turnover at WASP.

E began very succinctly be telling us that the reason turnover started was an emergency situation, a list of problems she has to deal with and the budget which any social service agency has to go through. She said that there was a communication problem (and mentioned this several times during the interview-see below). There were people who spoke Portuguese but didn't write well in English in reporting to DEPARTMENT.
In addition E hears a lot of times that employees don't want to complete ALL these reports anymore.

To combat the writing problems, there was a writing group, B said. E said that there is a communication problem and that staff don't have to report monthly but that she has them do this just to keep up with the reporting. The staff have to be more organized (she also mentioned this several times during the meeting). E meets with all staff and said that staff, but especially new staff, do not answer their emails; that she has a perfectionist staff who does CMARs (reports) in nine hours when it should only take two hours: and that staff must be more organized.

We then spoke about the Outreach efforts of WASP toward the community but especially workers who go to bars and illicit areas. There was one person who liked reporting but not doing outreach; others who don't like reporting but like outreach. B explained that Outreach is targeting not just those who are at risk, but those who test positive.

E said she has staff meetings, where she shares her information for 45 minutes to 1 hour. These meetings rotate on a monthly basis to each program, have an anonymous evaluation, are there to discuss client work and team orientation. She says to staff, "I can't help you if you don't want help." Again she mentioned communication as a problem. She then discussed the specifics of reporting- SDRs, CMARs, bubble forms. She has staff who document using one sentence and another who writes 20 pages. She said that she has a staff member who intimidates the other workers, by seeming to say, "I'm so great." This staff person has high standards, which others cannot meet.

F commented on E's style of work saying that she does too much direct work. She was a health educator.

B then spoke for some time about E saying she is wonderful. He then spoke about using J as an E.D. coach when WASP was downsizing, going from a budget of 2.5 M to 1.7 M, restructuring, and when there were morale issues. The Board of Directors was very involved during this downsizing.

F said that the major function of any BOD in a social service agency should be to fundraise.

B said that there is an 18 member board with 14 currently serving. They are involved with financial matters mostly, he said. There are several professionals on the BOD. B is clear about what the board should and shouldn't do There are subcommittees on the BOD and they were very involved in a Gala event. Some of the BOD who worked with staff got to know staff better and vice versa. BOD was very involved with the Gala as a PR event, a place to say "good job" to people and as a fundraising event. It raised $30,000 for WASP. All BODs came to the event.

F brought up the history of staff turnover again and that it impacted the goals and objectives of the program. Some programs B said, had the goal of meeting clients, including high-risk individuals, such as MSM, youth and women. He said that WASP was not reaching the at-risk of the two latter groups.

This was a segue way into discussing the PR disaster, which lasted from January to August. Some of WASP workers involved WASP clients in. B went into detail about how the scheme works. He said that those staff who recruited clients were initially put on suspension without pay and then finally dismissed. He didn't know what charges or legal action was brought against them. Staff who were in on the scheme but did not recruit clients were allowed to stay as employees, but he said by today they have all left

WASP's employment. Again he doesn't know what charges or legal action was brought against them.

B and other E.D.s of social service agencies, involved in this, came together and helped the AG's office. The A.G.s office confiscated all of the materials that were in a cabinet in the WASP's office. B had all the locks changed so that the AG could do this. At first the A.G.s office was not allowing WASP to call it illegal. B seemed to think that this fact of not calling it illegal hurt the WASP PR. situation. WASP's Development office is now in Dorchester because the scheme took place there. WASP had a letter campaign to see how many were involved in the Portuguese speaking community. They expected there to be some 150. There were over 400.

During the meeting it seemed that B and E were saying that the PR disaster story was not such a PR disaster. They handled it by communicating, sending letters to the community, and television and newspaper promos to reassure the community that WASP was upstanding. This is because the game was called the WASP game. Some of the scheme was ringleaders saying some money was going to a church or to help poor people.

F then asked about assessing systems, but B wanted to talk about the turnover caused by the PR disaster. He said they lost 5 people all at once and that they had to get relief staff, who did not know the program's policies. He said it made five women at risk, there were three people who got a month suspension, that they fired some and that they then had to post jobs. He was commenting on the length of time of the aftermath of the PR Disaster.

They came back to assessing the system: there is a new men's program which lost 2 employees recently. It is fully staffed now. Staff is doing reports. There is some resistance, from other employees, toward one employee, V, because she does such a good job.

F then asked E and B, "What would success look like in WASP.

E said that getting monthly, quarterly and biannual reports on time would definitely be a success and an easier way to complete the CMAR would too. She then said that one employee was good at reporting but was not well versed in English.

B twice said that he would like to have E work with him more, but that she's running five programs- two MSM programs, one youth program, and a women's program, and an efficiency program. He said this because he wants E to work more with PR. and Development. They then said that there would be greater staff retention to increase morale. He also said that if there was a Coach for the Communication Assistant that would be helpful. Additional staff to do supervision: E supervises 18 staff: 12 staff, 4 consultants, and 2 office managers.

E said her staff would <u>communicate</u> better. They would also know how to use computers better and learn daily <u>organization</u> skills. They would learn to write letters and might prepare a brochure, said B.

F then turned to the idea of how APEX is going to do their work and how staff will buy into APEX's interviewing. F will type up a mock letter to send to employees and submit it to B.

There will be interviews of all staff. 4 people per program to tell history of program and who have expertise in the program. 8 people who are new. 4 consultants. And 2 office managers. The people that E wants interviewed especially are A, V, N and E. The clinical MSW, P, will be interviewed by F along with B and E.

Data Sheet B

Initial meeting of F interviewing E. with Kevin Quinn observing

<u>F's dialogue is in boldface and underlined</u>. F. is the APEX worker and E. is the junior manager.

6/21/07 2:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m.

E, at the very outset of the meeting said that she may have to fire someone. This was an outreach worker who had not performed his duties. Instead, he had smoked for 1 ½ hours during his shift. This worker has just less than 3 months on the job, which is within the probationary period, which bodes well for E since she doesn't have to give a reason for termination.

You have a little amout of time to take action to terminate without having to give a reason.

(E takes out an evaluation form)

<u>Can you send me a blank evaluation form by email?</u>

F began with the management questions first explaining the three categories of Program Management, Supervision and Reporting and Writing.

Explanation that captures or not captures some of these three categories.

She asked, **<u>"What works well regarding this program?"</u>**

E answered: The email communication had become easier for some staff. The staff keeps in contact with her, and if something is urgent, staff will tell her and that day she will meet with them. Getting monthly reports from staff. In terms of program concerns she said at facilitation meetings – there is teamwork.

<u>Facilitated by 2?</u>

2 people. Facilitation meeting: I pass out an evaluation but no one knows whose it is. I pass out one question, which I change on a monthly basis. At the next meeting, I get everyone's comments. Management may not think this is important but I do.

Goals of Program/Outreach

E continued: New staff have a 3 month probationary period. She said she could never do outreach, outside of the office, but "This is what it is," she said. The older people know their jobs and the newer staff have to get their feet wet.

There's not enough training on how to do reports. There were two meetings to discuss what's important. **<u>Don't have a sense of good trainings</u>**

<u>Not training</u> Some staff say, "I never got that" (referring to what's important)

N is the Specialist , but there is something missing there (she was referring to reporting).

<u>Strengths/ What's going Well in the Progam?</u>

-People are bilingual, bicultural **<u>Right</u>** and they are part of the community. Strengths of the staff include: **<u>Bilingual/ Bicultural</u>** N writing. **<u>Reporting</u>** They are naturals in interpersonal skills. There are challenges, I believe, where some people are not fit for the job. There are 3 people I think of in particular and one person whose communication and writing skills aren't up to par. **<u>Three people not fit for the job and one whose communication skills aren't up to par.</u>**

Organizational skills have gotten better. But, Department was able to see that it's not me- that the reports are not written well. I have met with every staff person to discuss organization. **What's improved?** What's improved: **We're talking about a list** There is an assistant for 20 hours per week, communication and paperwork required. N works 14 hours per week, **N not in her role** not including 2 hours supervision with me. **32 you said** The concern is N has a problem with communicating well. **Oh, She's** She's not diplomatic and you can tell when she's upset. Other staff can too and they're not comfortable with her.

I have 3 contracts and 2 non-Department contracts **That's right** in different cities. There was the PR disaster and I was put over in the D office. **You're really** I can't do my work there so I go over to the A office where I'm more effective and efficient. Every two weeks I meet with staff. But I've been working until 10 p.m every night and then on weekends.

F asked: How long have you been doing this?

E: Two years, one year after the disaster. **Doing stuff for how long?** Help O who has too much on his plate. Help him with development. **More improvement?** There is a domino effect in terms of E's busy-ness with her work affecting her staff. The structure needs to be looked at. O is a good community organizer, but there has to be a full-time director doing development. The communication's department also needs some re-vamping. **T.A.** I started with 3 departments now I have 5. It's too much. **You've grown** I'd be more effective or someone needs to be more effective.

With the program about women in the L Office, there is a staff person who oversees two other staff. (E was referring to E's lack of control of these staff since they have another boss). When the supervisor is not there it's waste less. **Out of your purview? for supervision.** Talking teamwork there is none, if she's not there. The girls who work there get confused. Who's the boss, me or her. I ask N How is her supervisory role in the program. She's always late (with reporting). **A more direct line would be better? Communication. On the Prevention and Education side, what are your concerns?**

N does a lot of work of theirs. The director of development works with me on proposals. It's hard. It's redundant. **It's hard. It's redundant. Duplication of services?** There has to be a change in the budget. **Pay department perhaps.** It's been addressed. **Redundant** Someone (????) is not needed **Careful** because there's already a person doing that job. **Not doing it for Prevention and Education.**

F: What are your strengths as a manager? Roles and responsibilities.

E thinks for a prolonged amount of time, then she says: I'm open-minded, diplomatic, organized for all the work that I have. **They value you** I speak 2 languages- though I'm not so comfortable with meetings in (a language).. I'm very committed. When staff ask me about a problem, I often tell them to relax and reassure them that we'll get it done. I present a good support system. They can count on me. I'm very personal, very flexible and understanding. There's always room for improvement. **There always is.**

<u>**F: What are your weaknesses as a manager?**</u>

E: My supervisor knows. I can't talk now. I'm stressed out. It's too much work for one person. <u>**Too much for one person**</u> I would like to take a vacation. <u>**Taking time**</u> I work weekends. What's important today? A bomb went off (referring to her work load). <u>**yes**</u> I don't feel I have a system in place.

<u>**F: What about your supervisory skills?**</u>

E: I supervise 11 staff and 2 consultants. There are program teams in place. Monthly-now- I meet with ----------- and his team members. The women's program. They have a lot of teamwork. They meet on their own. I have an open relationship with ---------, I talk to her and tell her to address it <u>now</u>. N and I communicate through email and talking. <u>**Updates or whatever**</u> The two office managers are a lot too. O knows I have a lot on my plate.

The Office Manager in D, I tell her she is the operations manager. N can't do it. N trusts in me and is self-sufficient. I supervise every other Friday. <u>**You said that before**</u> There are junior manager's meetings and there are emails throughout the agency. <u>**Is that throughout the agency?**</u> For 3 weeks we had a computer skills class for 3 hours per week. <u>**Very time consuming. Doesn't teach them anything.**</u>

F: What about O's supervision of you? Does O have an agenda?

E: No, I do. O has a few things. I talk with O to approve things. **Right**

PAUSE

F: What would be a success for you- for your program to be successful? You supervise 11 people. What has improved? What would be your ideal situation?

E: O has me supervising 11 people and 2 consultants. A close communication structure/ rhythm. To get O's point of view. He supports me in any decision I make.

There's so much going on. Meetings run short. It's difficult to chose which agenda items I'm going to discuss off my list, if I only have 1 hour of supervision.

PAUSE

O coming to meet people in the six sites. For him to see my work space. **Has he visited other offices?** O saying, "I hear that." It would be nice. D- why can't he go there? **I totally hear you** Do as you preach. It's all I can do. **He wouldn't be missed?Walk the walk.**

F: What tools do the staff use to report data about what they're doing? Reports. Every other week.

E mentioned how reports go from the staff person to Q who writes the report then sends it to Q **Give her that ?** who does editing then sends it to me for editing. They send me monthly reports. The necessary reports go from Q to me and I clean them up. **Give her that** I need to change doing this. **What you do? Reports?** N will take the final edit before it comes to me. **Final edits…N will take the final edit before it comes to you.**

F: What do they put in the chart?

E: The reports mirror the D reports. **Great** In my opinion, it's easy. Two to three times, check it and they get organized D report is a pain. It takes me 10 hours to organize it.

F: Who looks at the report?

E: It goes to N then me and then to staff. It's a 6 month report

F: Does O see it? - No

Who signs off on it? - I do

Does O get a copy of it? - No

E: It's from a monthly report. It's good that it's monthly because staff can't remember what they did 6 months ago.

F: Tell me about grant writing, development and communications.

E: L looks for possible grants.

F: What do you think?

E: She needs to make her timeline. In terms of goals and objectives, I do all the work. You can't involve the staff. They're busy too. L cleans it up. She has so much on her plate. It's last minute so she changes her schedule- the way she organizes herself. She'll say that B hasn't gotten back to her. **B hasn't gotten it back to her.** Well, B did it two days before the deadline. **Communication/Development. 1 person or assistant V- She says yes go for it- you and her ?**I have to write it. She makes it pretty. **Meet and hammer it out.**

F: There's a lot of pressure for you. So much going on.

E: If O could do more in development but he has no time. It's Development's job, but -- -- do it yourself. Get staff involved. It would be nice with a different setup. For example, if the Director of Development could spend a little time at the programs. **Director of Development** They should meet at the programs, so they can see what the grant is all about. **Good thought. Recommendations- good for organization**

F: Now tell me about the program goals and how they were not met- What's the work plan? Both of them?

E answered that they were not met because staff didn't meet them. She gave warnings and sent out memos. Something really went wrong. So I met with the team- not to put someone on the spot, but to discuss timing of the report. It was a difficult year. In August there was the PR disaster. F went to another social service agency- I wish her well. Another person moved to Ohio.

F: So there was a lot of turnover?

E: There was a reason for it. Otherwise the D report would have looked wonderful. N also was on maternity leave. It affects the program. **Action plan**

F: What is your relationship with Department like?

E: I have a great manager. I haven't had a contract manager who is not supportive. **Department Contract Manager**

F: How does your team strategize when work goals aren't met? When you don't reach it- the program goal. How do you look at patterns internally?

E: We need to meet. Use our website more and do more outreach. We can use post-its to post our strengths and weaknesses: Constructive criticism and professionalism.

F**:** **Does any other person do it**

E: Me. I do it. N tries and has potential but she talks to us as if we're her family. **Make everything work** She can't do this I tell her.

F: How do you gather information about client satisfaction?

E answers that the staff have great stories in terms of reporting. **Narratives** We than have return visits. We take them to Boston Medical Center. Client comes into the office - C and T, P and Z is at an individual level of intervention not at the group level.

F: How do you record information?

E: The monthly report is crucial. We must record drop-ins. **Staff have any questions?** I'm very specific (about the reports).

F: Tell me again about Supervision with O. It's every other Friday? Are you o.k. with that? Tell me about your own development?

E: O is very supportive of trainings. He could critique better. In my evaluation, he had nothing to say. No challenges. He wants me to give more time for proposals. If I want to do something he says, if there's money in the budget and you can find it…**He puts it back on you.** He says the year is going very well. It's stupid. **Belittle** He picks on the little things. He asks, next year, how -----------? **13 people. Too many people** I can't -----------

F: What are your aspirations?

E: I told O Friday. I'd like to learn more about finances. I go to trainings. I don't necessarily know where things go. O gives me a budget 1 time per year. I told him I need the monthly or at least quarterly budget. F: **What did he say?**
He said it's not part of my responsibility. I've been here 11 years. There's been no room to grow. There are too many challenges.

F: How are you in relation to staff? What are your strengths? Do I see your growth?

E answered that N has been there 2 years but there's no infrastructure- I wish I did more talking than writing. The new staff need to verbalize more.

F: Does staff have…

E: O does the evaluations.

F**: Do you get to see it?**

F: What about your own learning?

I learn best by doing. **Experiential** With this D thing- I was making it a positive. With BAC (a place for trainings like APEX). I've studied financial budgeting. **Look for you're a** training for Executive Directors and Cultural competency with BAC. (E takes out a brochure) **I want to see it (takes brochure)** The cultural competency wasn't very good. It was about Puerto Ricans and Zambians.

F: What about the trainings of other staff?

E: I like staff to take the basic trainings every two years. **That's good you're doing trainings** A and N I'd like them to take training on supervision. There have been no trainings in organization.

F: What would be truly successful if it happened in 6 months and what would make it happen? Operationalize?

E: Technical system with writing. **wording** Restructure division of P and E **sell to board** to flow better. **Work with other clients. Streamline.**

Improve writing skills. Collecting information. **Create a structure that truly supports work …and staff** Organizational schedules for work. **What does that mean?**
One thing you'll hear from people, at least I hope you hear this, **You?** is that everybody is good at criticizing but no one has suggestions. **Information worth?** There are emails blaming people. **Part of work**

There was a day at Six Flags Amusement Park. **Retreat?** There were meetings in the morning and then the amusement park. **Getting team to prioritize- expertise in field**

Staff in all locations-6. D is N. My home used to be in A. I'm supposed to have 5 days in D, but I did 3 days this week in A. In D more than any office, I'm not able to do my work. **Administration- visit including P and L.**

F said she would meet with L. She would include L. L is great. K too.

F and E discussed who we would be meeting with and what the schedule is like. F is leaving until July 26th. E asked if we were going to meet with everyone each week and then asked if there was an agenda. F answered that there would be similar questions to the ones E were asked**. E you have lots of work and need a structure to help with grant writing. Maybe Jorgette could help with that.**

F asked if Kevin had any questions.

Kevin said that he wanted to know a little more about E's relationship to O. Kevin said he didn't know what I wanted to know specifically but wanted to hear more.

F: You are supervised by O. Why don't you get more direction from him?

E answered that O restructured WASP. **A different time?** To the senior manager, **Shifted 4 years ago.** Director, **before WASP** L is the Director of D and there's a Director OF F and the Director of S. F. Now there's no Deputy Director, 3 Directors for S. F. and a part-time Director in L who works 20 to 25 hours per week. H, the MSW, works 2-3 times per week. She does clinical supervision once a month. **Does it monthly?** There needs to be a Deputy Director of Community Outreach and Budgets. It seems like they are patching things- **Care and Treatment** counseling and testing and HIV Case Management. O wants me to supervise the HIV Case Managers. **Fix it. You didn't get supervision. Not received with openness** It's been 4 years under O. **Structural** I'm diplomatic. **Level of supervision. You like supervision**? There was no technical assistance- and this affected my evaluation.

Data Sheet C

July 11, 2007, O meeting with A. with Kevin Quinn observing

O is the APEX worker and is in boldface, *A is an on-line staff and is plain*

Kevin will be observing only and we will take a break 5 minutes before the end of the interview to see if he has any questions of me to ask you. So do you have a clear understanding of what we are doing?

A said Yes. This will be confidential right?

O gave an explanation of how this is anonymous but not confidential- your name will not be used in supplying information, but your comments will be used in a report, again, not identifying you as the person who gave the information. No names will be used.

A wanted assurance again that WASP Directors will have no access to what's said by him.

O continued to explain that we are giving technical assistance to WASP and that we are interviewing to find out what are the program's strengths and weaknesses. We'll look at Program Management, Reporting and Writing, Supervision, and Training and Professional Development. We want to know about Counseling and Testing, the Hotline and your responsibilities here at WASP.

A: I work with MSM – Men who have sex with men- I've done HIV Counseling and Testing for the past year and I was a volunteer for six years.

So you work in Prevention and Education, The MSM Program, Counseling and Testing. Tell me more about your responsibilities.

I work with the MSM Program doing outreach to bars and the streets. I do presentations and worked at the Gay Pride Parade.

(We took a break so that A. could move his car).

Did you park on the street? You do presentations?

Yes. With groups of 6 – 10 people about HIV education and concerns. We work with MSM from Brazil and Portugal.

And you work with the Portuguese (from Portugal)? And counseling and testing?

I work in counseling and testing 5 hours per week or whenever they want to get tested. The hotline at AIDS Action Committee gives Portuguese speakers our phone number. (A. had the hotline phone with him to answer in case a call came during the meeting). I do testing.

O.K. O.K. yep. Great.
With Counseling and Testing (C + T) walk-ins or by appointment?

Walk-ins and by Appointment, including Saturday and Sunday. But I never give results on a Friday, Saturday or Sunday.

Because there's no services? (no follow up services for people to get counseling about their test results).

And no opportunity to participate in support groups**.**

That makes sense. What are the program objectives? You work in 3 programs – 2 programs. 2 programs. MSM and C + T?

The objective of the MSM program is to reach out to newcomers 15-35 years of age. I work with the Brazilian MSM. I do reach out and testing.

And you work for the hotline?

I test them, look at their risks and do a risk assessment and discuss harm reduction. If someone tests positive I refer them to a WASP Case manager.

What are the challenges of the 2 programs? Are you able to meet your objectives?

With the Brazilians, there were 400 people behind our float at the Pride Parade who were Brazilians. They wanted us to play Portuguese songs. They insist on MSM from Portugal. There is the MSM Brazilian population and the MSM Portuguese population. He (the person working with the Portuguese population) has challenges.

What about the entire program?

The quarterly reports and the Portuguese MSM. They are not receiving services**.**

Because they're not out?

Not out? It's a waste of time. There aren't many gay Portuguese. I see men who are 18, 19, 20, 21. The Portuguese are already settled and they speak English well. They don't belong with WASP**.**

Are the numbers low?

The guy (who is working with the Portuguese Community) has to struggle with the numbers. There aren't any Portuguese who test and who are infected. WASP needs a reality check. They don't seem to go that way. Why fund a population that is non-existent?

Yep. (Shakes head in agreement). Uh-huh. Are there challenges with C + T?

For Brazilians to have an HIV test, it's easy. We should only look at people who are really at risk. Sometimes though the person doesn't want to know the results. They don't want to be educated.

Those with the highest risk aren't tested because they're scared?

Scared. We have 3-4 who test positive each year out of about 100 people.
The national average is 2 per 1000. Last year we had 90 tests and there were 3 that were positive. All of them MSM Brazilians and under 30 years old. One 21, one 26, and one 28**.**

You remember them?

It's horrible to give a positive result.

What are the strengths of your team. You and Junior. All of your program?

The population is open-minded and easy to talk to. We have a volleyball game and we have Pride.

Just bringing in for C + T?

Plus a Halloween party.

o.k. Any other strengths of C + T or all of the programs?

Everyone in the program knows what he's doing. We work more hours than you're paid (he says this twice). Saturday, Sunday, night times. We are willing to help the community no matter the day of the week. I'm scheduled to do 30 hours per week. I do 40-50 hours per week- almost everybody does this. It's impossible to do it in 30 hours.

O.k. and you do 5 in C + T?

Yeah. The bad stuff is DEPARTMENT doesn't know this. A quarterly report. – SDR- Much more paperwork. Additional hours in the office. It needs to be shortened. We have the bubble forms. The quarterly report is over 80 pages- it's unreal.

Do you have means to develop yourself and the team?

I'm not young anymore. I have to have plastic surgery. I've been working here 12 years. I'm old. I do outreach with 21, 22, 23 year olds. In supervision I'm giving ideas. We need more money for another MSM Health Educator. The numbers are unbelievable for Brazilian MSM.

Uh- huh (x3).

They're doing drugs. We need another MSM Health Educator for this part of the population. If I were coordinator of the program, I would increase the numbers for MSM for Brazilians.

Who oversees you? E?

E. I have 30 hours and J has 30 hours. There are a lot more hours. There are many Brazilians in Massachusetts. I've heard that 1% is 15,000, including MSM.

E. does the Administrative stuff. Frontline staff is you and J.

I work with the Brazilians.

How do you stay current with the information needed for your job?

Trainings. We have a monthly meeting. Every two years you have to go to a series of trainings. What agency does this?

Us. How many years?

Every two years.

Every two years.

There's an Mpowerment project. We went to a training in San Francisco. Any new news and new thing, we get involved in. Most trainings are related to White Americans. They don't work at Dunkin' Donuts all day.

How do you adjust?

The Mpowerment project

Mpowerment project.

It's a good project. 15 – 35 year olds hang around a house. They play volleyball (??????). On weekends. We had a Halloween party.- all this stuff.

On weekends?

4 or 3 a.m. no problem on Saturdays.

How do you get rid of barriers?

I suggest to do things (to people who are at risk). They have too many partners (????), drugs and all. I suggest reducing these.

And after they test positive?

People tend to have greater risk after they test positive.

I understand you have to do reporting. There are quarterly reports. Only these?

No there are BCRs (reports) which are done monthly. Then the quarterly reports. There is a summary, which the coordinator is supposed to do it, but we do it. It's so annoying. It's time consuming. The bubble form. It's too much and a waste of time.

All are Department regulations ?

Probably.

What are some challenges of the program?

WASP doesn't have any good computers. They're very slow. Sometimes I can't get into mine. It's very slow. They're outdated and very limited- like a home computer.

Makes everything slower?

I had to redo my work. It was lost.

What kind of supervision do you have?

Clinical supervision 1 time per month. There's really no need for this. Yes. I'm stressed but there's no need.

One time per month? And administrative supervision?

E. is always here. We have staff meetings. It's not required? One time per month I have 1:1 supervision. She's very supportive. The only thing stupid is the quarterly report.

The questions she asks in the reports. Does she review the reports?

For example, I put (in the report) 3 Brazilian MSM about 30-31 years old. They're negative for Syphillis, Chlamydia, and Gonnorhea. If they're already positive, we don't count them.

What does she mean?

It's hard for her not to bring up questions. Stupid questions. Age, name, and race.

No more details are needed?

Negative and Positives- Hello? If I go to BMC (Boston Medical Center). It's unknown. E asks how come it's unknown? Unless they get tested, it's unknown.

Unless they come back.

She needs to learn this.

She doesn't understand the system?

She doesn't understand the process.

So you meet with the Program Manager for Administrative Supervision?

And we also meet for clinical supervision and we discuss what's going on in the program. For example, I might have her (the clinical supervisor) stay in a different room when I have to give a positive result.

E is asking for things we're doing in the program. Website is annoying to maintain. The website has to be redone. She's scared to do it.

????????? (I found out later that E. contracted her boyfriend to do work on the website)

He does it?

He does. It's like you selling a house for your boyfriend. The ABCs are you look for a house. Especially in a non-profit, everything has to be private. Her boyfriend also remodeled a kitchen.

He's receiving a contract from WASP to do the website?

Both WASP and P + E (Prevention and Education- the department that A and J. work for).

WASP's and your program's website.

We've had two meetings. We tell him what we need and he shows us what he can do.

Who invited the boyfriend to that meeting?

E. O.K.

Do you get supervisory support for the work that you do?

Things need to change direction. Change things because they're not going right.

They happen. Is there any additional support you need to do your job well?
I was a supervisor 3 or 4 months ago. **Uh- huh**

I'm bad at giving directions and orders. As Coordinator, I asked people to do things. If no one does it, I do it. I don't seek any position in this agency in the C + T or P + E programs. I didn't like being a Coordinator. I like working with the community.

What would be different if this program was the best it could be?

(There was a break at this point for A. to move his car. A left and O. asked me if there were any questions I had. I said I was wondering why WASP's number of positive results were above the national average).

A asked if we needed more time. We answered in the negative.

Why is the average of Brazilians testing positive greater than the national average?

Because the Brazilians come here and want to sleep with blue eyed, blond, green-eyed guys who are young. They don't speak English so they don't know how to talk about condoms. They drink a lot and are newcomers to this country.

Are there trainings and professional development opportunities for you here?

There are computer trainings. Computer learning skills. I can't go. There are so many other things to do. Training and going to classes with this much to do? The training is 15 days, twice a week, 2 hours per class.
I need help with my writing skills. I'm better at speaking.

How do you learn best?

By doing. At WASP staff meetings, This is IMPORTANT. There's too many monologues. There is one person talking 9 to 11 a.m. Dominates the meetings.

Is this the all staff meeting?

98-99 % of the time.

Is this O? I'm being frank and open with you.

Yes. It's the senior manager. A half hour would be enough. Other people should talk without interruptions. My body is at this meeting but my mind is not. In fact, there are too many meetings. WASP's one time per month; S +T Program's one time per month; and the program meeting.

There can be a better use of time?

People have to be clear. I talk one to two minutes at most and I say what I need to say.

People … you say what you need to say. Is there anything else you want to share? I'm finished with all my questions.

Well, I've worked here 12 years and have seen 2 Executive Directors and 2 Coordinators. It's hard in a non-profit. There's not enough money. The target population of Portuguese is a farce. They are 4th or 8th generation. There were 2 – 4 Portuguese. The money can be better invested- used in anti-violence programs; Youth MSM Programs

Looking at emerging social issues?

Look. If someone is in the closet, there is very little risk of contracting HIV. There were not many positive tests. One to two Portuguese returned but they were negative. In the Brazilian population there were 3 or 4 people who tested positive. Who is having unprotected sex should be who gets the help. The Portuguese are not at risk. There are at least 500 Brazilians in Massachusetts, 54 Portuguese in Massachusetts.

We can look that up in the state lab.

There can be a better use of money serving the community. See the numbers. DEPARTMENT is not blind. Men's program is at high risk. We shouldn't be forced to find numbers that aren't there.

Who is your contract manager?

E. There is no people from another country who work there (at D department). The foreigners get infected from White Americans. Then they're infected and can infect other people.

I really appreciate you taking this time to meet with us. You've been both candid and honest. We're here to look at areas that aren't working so well.

Data Sheet D

Interview of W by **T** with Kevin Quinn observing 7/20/07

T. is the 3rd APEX worker and is in boldface.
W is a health educator and is in plain face.

We're doing a project with WASP which consists of an assessment of how WASP is doing. I'll ask you questions about WASP in the following categories, Program Management, Report Writing, Supervision and Training and Professional Development. This is anonymous but not confidential in that your name will not be attached to what you say. We'll have a feedback session with the entire agency and give our recommendations then. Kevin is observing the interview. What are your roles and responsibilities?

Framingham is a new office. We deal with men at risk (of getting HIV). We follow objectives as put out in our work plan. Outreach at Public Sex Environments (PSEs) and with the Siliga Program (a social activity and website for men who speak Portuguese). Like the Allston Team we want to have a receiving room where men , who are not out, can hang out and watch t.v. My main focus is outreach and to get as many people tested (for HIV) so they are not spreading the disease. Sixty percent of my target population is Brazilian and the other Cape Verdean. I target Men who have sex with men (MSM). Often times they want to have sex with men younger than themselves. This is Married Men who have sex with men. This population is hard to get. We, however, have good numbers with the health awareness. And we also target Marlboro as well.

Refer to get testing?

We do (HIV0 tests like the work in Boston.

Depends on what location?
They do counseling and testing (C + T) in 3 cities near Boston?

We do counseling and refer people to Health Awareness in Framingham or if they prefer to go to Boston- Boston Medical Center.

Is it hard to reach Married MSMs? What are your strategies?

We thought of putting a sticker with our name and number on it on a condom. We then talk about getting tested. Give out condoms and gum with our name on it. There's no information about HIV.

Where do you pass out condoms and gum?

We pass them out at Public Sex Environments (PSEs). Give condoms to the guys.

O.K. I'd like you to tell me what you do when you go out. What's a typical day for you?

What we do with outreach or WASP as a whole?

Everything.

We work either 12-2, 1-3 or 2-4 and you can see different people on the streets at those times. I stay in the office 5 – 6. We have clients coming in and that is our main thing- the client. I do outreach on Tuesdays. If there's a 12 o'clock appointment in Framingham and I get out of Boston at 11:30- I'm not going to make it to Framingham. A risk assessment is also my objective. It depends on how long an interview takes. We also have meetings we go to.

I want to have clarity on that?

On the 26th of July I need to have a calendar of August handed in to out Director. The Director approves it. We discuss ILIs (Independent Level Interventions).

ILI?

Independent Level Interventions

We have WASP meetings and meetings with other agencies. Everything has to be on the calendar. My calendar in July I filled out in June. If I work till seven, I email my boss and let them know.

Do you get comp. time? Is it flexible within the structure?

Outreach you cannot cancel. If you get there between 10 and 11:30 you're not on time.

Outreach is your number one priority.

Number one.

Tell me about the prescribed ILI? What do you do for outreach? Break down the hours for me**.**

My schedule is 35 hours with 5 hours. I have an organized schedule with the calendar as I said.

What is that? 5 hours per month?

No. 5 hours per week for report writing and other meetings.

Do all the different locations (where they do outreach) meet?

The director schedules them for 3 hours.
5 hours per week. What about ILI?

We have office hours and reports to do, but the clients come first. The result is I might spend 10 hours with clients.

What about Group Level Interventions?

2 –3 hours

And what about reporting?

I do it during office hours.

During office hours.

You've talked about the objectives of the program. What I understand is you do outreach with at risk men, ILI, GLI and reporting.

And I go to WASP meetings. Including with other agencies.

You are cooperative and so there's a network for you guys.

What works well in terms of meeting your objectives?

If there's a time for a meeting and we can't make it (because of working with clients), the Director allows us to miss it. However, with an all staff meeting she comes and finds us. There's flexibility with the hours. There's the same objectives. Outreach. I have a co-worker who is creative like myself. We have the same objectives but not necessarily the objectives of the Department. I have cultural competency. I understand the Brazilian and American cultures.

You're saying that you have other objectives- what are they?

For example, we want to form a core group. We follow the Mpowerment model (a curricula for empowering the client). One objective is to within the year to meet with a core group for 2 hours and then get the same core group together again. In the Brazilian community, that's hard to do. So we make up a party instead. We had a party in Allston, we talked about HIV and then they come back another date for a game or something.

Think about it- what a great outreach worker you are.

The objectives are really hard.

Tell me about the challenges of the program. The way it's formatted. You make a game around it (the objectives). You don't make it (the reporting) a barrier to what you're doing.

Reports are very hard. I do weekly reports so that I can then do the monthly reports. It's very complicated.

What's it like? What is the format? What are you capturing?

It's boring. The description. Have you ever seen one of our reports?

No.

It's repetitive. It's what the Department wants. The way the Department wants it.

The way the Department wants it. You write what you did? Not just the number of condoms you gave out? A narrative.

Yes we write a story about what we did. We have to follow the calendar for that month. I saw 8 people, 5 were MSMs. How do I know that? They dressed that way.

[LAUGHING by interviewer and interviewee.]

I've seen them in a club. I like dressing up.

Did they specify how to do reporting- using Excel?

Yes

They want it computerized?

They want every little detail.

How long does it take?

Five hours on reporting. There's a woman in Allston who's been working with WASP for two to three years. She does her own. It's boring.

Making her own format in a way?

A risk assessment in a club. It's the same thing each month. They ask specific questions. It's very repetitive.

How is that information used?

It goes from the Director to the Department and I don't know what they do with it.

Not just information? They want a narrative?

It could go into an archive. Later they find out what MSMs are doing. They keep a report for all of us.

Does it take away time from doing other things?

Yes and No. You can offer to drive people to BMC (Boston Medical Center) or do the reporting.

And you can't take it?

My boss is expecting everything. I don't have all the time. I have to do counseling- like on the van

Oh, the mobile van.

Saturday nights I go to Machine or Wednesday nights to Vapor (two gay bars that cater to Latinos on those nights). 10 p.m to 4 am. once. (Non sequitor). With the computer I have no more time.

What percentage of your clients have risk for IDU (Intravenous Drug Use).

It's very low. Brazilians like to drink. They don't do drugs- X- tacy maybe.

So it's not injected. So that's not big.

If your program could be the best it could be- what would it look like?

I don't know. I guess I don't understand the question.

If it was functioning at it's highest possible level?

[T. is responding to W's needs**-]** **The best program it could be.**

Help me to understand.

The pluses are the person I work with. This is the first year in Framingham. We've let them know that we're there. Flexibility. To make it even better? The B. program has already reached all it's goals. I want Framingham to do the same. Reaching everyone in our area. The newer people would put the word out to other people. The people would show up at the same time.

Same time. What kind of supervision do you receive?

A lot from my Director.

Who?

Anabela.

She's your supervisor?

Yes. She really understands how to do the reporting. She's taken all the trainings. She knows it all, considering she's a woman working with a lot of men. She dresses very professionally.

OK. How often do you meet with your supervisor?

One per week. Sometimes every other week. If we're busy.

In what ways does her supervision help you? Writing reports. Support?

I told her I wanted to buy gum for these ads with our name on it. Put our name with a sticker on the piece of gum. She said go ahead and buy them. There's not a lot of money. I bought a thousand. It cost $100.

She encourages you to be creative?

She encourages trainings. She dresses professionally. We can wear sneakers for outreach, but when we're in the office, we have to put shoes on.

[T. laughs]

Are there any other additional supports that you need to grow in the program?

Extra days of vacation and an evaluation- I think.

I'm really asking you would you want your supervisor to help you grow in your position?

Yes I do. What E does is really good. She lets me do many things.

You take the initiative.

My co-workers tell me I am bossy.

[T. laughs].

We talk about something we want to do. I'm the only one saying anything, so we do what I want to do. I come up with the idea. We get along.

What on-going educational opportunities are there for you to grow?

The training I took with you.

I remember.

I used to not be tolerant of stupidity- like safety having sex. When my friend said he had HIV, I slapped him and said, “It’s the 90s” You’re training calmed me down.

That’s so great to hear.

I’m now more respectful of how other people live their lives. I slapped my friend but I wouldn’t do it again today. The training with you. Gay men say that transgendered people are bad for our community. We don’t respect them. I’ve learned that we are alike. I took your workshop.

{At this point, T started reaffirming what W was saying with 3 great!!s, 3 yeahs, and 2 wows and 1 cool]

That’s great. You’re so open. How did you find out about these trainings?

It was what other people were doing.

That’s so cool. So great. You’re such a good networker.

Are there other additional trainings that you need?

I don’t think so. There’s flexibility. The calendar. If it’s approved, you can fit it into your own life. If I do outreach at Vapor 10 – 12, they’re never there.

I know that. Right.

They start to come in around 10 or 11

Maybe 12.

My community comes in 15 minutes before I’m supposed to leave. 11:45. I work 12 to 2. Then I go have a nap with my partner at home. Then I do more outreach**.**

Are there any areas that you know you need work in? Outreach?

I’m terrible at computers

Computers.

There were computer classes.

That will help on the job.

There's a network of WASP. We get about 50 emails a day. People are educating one another about what they do.

Is there anything else you want to tell me?

I'm very happy with my job.

You're so committed.

I have everything I need. The past couple of months though. We haven't been organized. We've all overbooked. We have to schedule meetings with other people in WASP.

You keep networking.

There's not anything I need to add.

[VERY LONG PAUSE]

I'm going to Chicago for an Mpowerment training.

That's so great.

I don't like to travel, but I do like meeting others.

Oh yeah. I know. I have one more question. With outreach and people who have STDs. Where do you refer them?

We refer to Marlboro for HIV testing and STDs. In Framingham we do HIV testing only. Or I bring them to Boston Medical Center. I live in Boston, so I give them that choice.

So you talk to them about STDs or you wait for them to talk about it?

The gum and condom cards. HIV has such a big stigma that STDs do not.

[Several right and yeahs from T]

HIV is an STD

I know what you mean.

What percentage of people come back?

I don’t really know. I’ve been doing this since February. March I started on the streets. It’s taken a year to establish.

Oh, in March. It’s taken a year to establish. You have a long-term perspective. It’s an evolving situation. You do A risk and health assessment on the street.

Yes**.**

The quick 5 question one?

Yes

At the end of the interview, W mentioned that he had to get his passport taken care of …

T said it takes so long.

W said that he has both a Brazilian and American passport.

Still, it’s a very long wait. ***She walks him down, not before giving him a hug and a kiss in a European/Latino way.***

RESULTS

This researcher's results only look at the worker's espoused theories and their theory-in-use. The espoused theories and theories-in-use are frameworks that Donald Schön and Chris Argyris authored, and that they say are models people use in saying what they say they do and what they actually do. It is when the espoused theories are not like the theories-in-use where there is trouble says Argyris. What people say they do is often much superior to what they do or just different from what they say they do. Who has never inflated or changed their own accomplishments by saying they did something that they actually didn't do? It might even become, for that person, their reality. I shall remind people the main ideas of each adopted theory, but again, the most important part for this study is to compare a person's espoused theories to their theory-in-use.

Edgar Schein's theory from <u>*Process Consultation*</u>

Block says that people should study an organization from within the organization not from "without" the organization. Instead of looking into a fishbowl and answering the question what's going on there, wouldn't it be easier to swim with the fish to discover what's going on here? In the same way, Schein wants us not to be the client, for as Schein says the client knows more about the problem than the process consultant does; instead, Schein wants us to discover with the client, what's going on here. To discover that, Schein tells us that it is necessary to know about communication, group dynamics and also to know how decisions are made. Most importantly, however, Schein wants us to know how to do process consultation in an effective way to help change an organization wanting help. He has a set routine on how to do this. He says there is a sequence of events, which must happen, to effect this change.

Peter Block's theory from *<u>Flawless Consulting</u>*

Block also has a listing of steps for consulting. These are the following:

1. Entry and contacting –
2. Discovery and dialogue
3. Feedback and Decision to Act
4. Engagement and Implementation
5. Extension, Recycle or Termination

I bring up Schein's *Process Consultation* and Block's *Flawless Consulting* because the first worker, F. has adopted these consultation styles. F loosely follows the twelve stages that Schein notes for us. In data sheet A, we see that F mentions only seven stages and all do not coincide with Schein's stages; only two do. Schein's stage of selecting dimensions to be studied coincides with F's assessment stage and F.'s stage of compiling information and reporting to WASP not to Department coincides with Schein's funneling the data stage. To look at Block's steps of consulting, F. follows the steps closely and adds two. These two steps F. almost always follows are a retreat with the client and the client's workers and a talk with the Board of Directors.

F is very adept at his job. Most everything he said he does, he does, but not necessarily with the finesse he says he does it. I believe in his interview, Data Sheet B, what he says serves to promote the person he was interviewing. This is a bias. He said that when he's interviewing one of the members of the client agency, he is only focused on that person. However, if you look at the rough, not word-for-word transcript of the interview, you will see that he affirms most of the positive statements that E- the interviewee makes about herself and most of the negative statements that E makes about O. O is put in the dungeon, so to speak, when E is put on a pedestal. F does not affirm the negative statements E makes of herself and does not affirm the positive statements made about O. I believe there is a bias there. You can read the non-taped transcript yourself and decide.

Espoused Theories and Theories-in-use of Worker F (see Data Sheet B)

When this worker wants an interviewee to be patient, he says that he waits for responses to this worker's questions. This not only models for the client the idea of patience but also helps the client to be patient through the process. F. writes, "I approach the client generally through a client centered framework of starting where the client is (that allows for patience). If the client isn't ready to change they may need time to get ready … to take a look at the potential changes they might want to make." There is only one place where F waits for a response. This is between the two **PAUSE**(s) on the transcript- Data Sheet B. However, this is not to engender patience in the interviewee, but to let her speak her mind. To let her speak her mind is a good thing to do, but not for the reason F says he does it. F espoused that he waits for a response to engender patience from the client, but in this case it is to let the interviewee let off some steam.

F. says that he redirects people to make them followers, saying, "I might redirect to help focus the client on why they have shared a particular issue with me at this time." F does redirect E but again not for the reason he says he does. Instead, the redirection is to get E back on the subject of what has improved. It's interesting that E does not get back to the subject of what's improved but continues in a negative way. F does not redirect again, but allows the client to go where the client wants to go- perhaps as part of the client-centered framework he discussed earlier.

F. says he collaborates with the client by asking questions which show genuine interest about his situation. This genuineness, from this observer's point of view, is demonstrated not only by the questions asked by F, but also by his demeanor with the client. Scripted questions to be asked are prepared before the meeting, but F asked questions in addition to these. He asked questions off the script and for this reason I knew that he was interested, because he's obviously following the interview. He seemed genuinely interested in what the client had to say and in the essence of what the client had to say. His espoused theory is reminiscent of his theory-in-use. There is a connection between his two models. In this instance, what F says is what F does.

"I need to contract with them." If I understand the procedures of process consultation, this contracting should be more formal than this contract made between the client and F. However, if we talk about an informal contract then F.'s espoused theory was in sync with his theory-in-use. "You become our client," is what F. said. "You're agenda" is what will be our starting point. F. then talked about the process that will happen. She talked about the process of the assessment, which may take one to two months; strategic planning with the stakeholders; possibly an all-day retreat and coaching. This is client or mission driven, F said. It is clear that F. took over the contracting process, more telling the client what would be done than asking them what was to be done. The contract seemed one-sided, but after some weeks it was clear that the process was client driven.

"I often ask question (sic) of the client that are 'observation' questions: what did you observe in a given situation? What did you notice? How did you perceive that situation?" is what F. said of his interviewing skills. However, many of the questions asked, even the off-the-script questions asked weren't observation questions. One off-the-script question was asking to see a brochure of an organization doing trainings, but that was more of a statement that F. wanted to see a brochure- not really an observation question *per se*. I must say that, although many of the questions were not observation questions as F. defines them, most are questions about one's perceptions of things. Perhaps in this situation, there was not any opportunity to ask observation questions. The question I asked of F. was what would engender you to make a client observant? I ask observation questions, F. said.

Next, I asked F. what would they say or do that would make a client deny or distort things. Like all the other APEX workers, F. did not answer the question directly, perhaps feeling that she doesn't ask questions that make a client deny or distort things. F. discussed building a safe environment for the client to share. He then puts it on the client by saying if the client denies or distorts things, then, he finds that there is always a little bit of truth to what the client is saying: "I have often found that even the greatest distortions have a perspective or piece of reality that is playing itself out in the organization…" I believe this is some type of defense mechanism where F. and the other APEX workers do not want to admit that their questions may produce something other than the truth or something negative. The same question about making a client feel competitive resulted in putting the affectation on the client: "Clients may feel that they need to be the 'best' client when engaging in OD work with a consultant." Again, F. does not answer the question directly. Instead, he refers to what the client does.

Finally, however, when asked when does he make a client feel open, F. refers to himself and what he does. He has to model this for the client. Like the question about genuine interest, F portrays that he must be open in order for the client to be open. This is a case of monkey see, monkey do. Do as I do, not necessarily as I say. The reverse of "Do as I say, not as I do." This modeling for the client shows the client what they should do. I found that F. was open in her questions and in her sincere effort to be frank with the client. F.'s espoused theory in this case was very close to her theory-in-use.

F. does not make someone patient nor redirect them for the reasons he says he does. Instead, he makes someone patient, he says, by waiting for responses, but he does not do this. Instead, he waits for his interviewee so that the interviewee can let off steam. And F. redirects the person he's interviewing to get them back to the issue they are discussing not to make them followers of his questions. F. clearly shows his genuineness by the questions he asks and by his demeanor during the interview. He contracts informally with the client, not as a formal written contract but in a general non-threatening way. He does not ask observation questions per se, but instead, the questions are of a general interest in the client organization. F, like all of the APEX workers, does not answer the questions of engendering negative emotions directly, but attributes it to the client. Finally, F. is open to his clients and to the interview altogether. This models for the client what he or she is to do. About half of F.'s espoused theories do not fit together with his theories-in-use. However, if one looks at the overall way that F.

interviews, you can see that there are only good intentions in his questions and a genuineness in his demeanor.

Espoused Theories and Theories-in-use of Worker O (see Data Sheet C)

O's interview was one of the longest; not because it was particularly comprehensive, but seemingly because O wanted to make sure she was getting all the information needed. She had a great number of follow-up questions, which were questions not on the script – see Table A. O said that she asks a client how she can support them; lets them know she knows about the agency; asks about their learning style; and that if she ever makes a client feel self-conscious it's because she does not validate nor normalize the situation for that client. In addition, O. said she listens and validates what the person is saying by repeating what they say. She asks what are areas of growth and strength for them. She explains that in the future she will meet with them for focus groups. She will give someone an assignment to make them feel dependent on her. She will ask questions about roles and responsibilities; how are they functioning and whether or not their needs are getting met. To make a client observant she gives them tools needed to learn- she checks in before her observations begin. To make a client talkative she gives open-ended questions. She asks for someone's interest in learning or else provides factual information to the client. Finally, if she wants a client to feel something is concealed or hidden, she becomes non-transparent. Similar to all the other workers, worker O. denied she did anything to produce a negative effect on someone she's interviewing- such as being non-transparent and effecting a concealed or hidden attitude toward the client.

O. said that she lets a person know of her knowledge of the agency before the interview, but she did not do this before this interview. She did, however, later in the interview by filling in some of the information for A., such as when she confirmed that A doesn't give out HIV positive results on Friday, nor Saturday nor Sunday, because there are no services to support the person getting a positive result on the weekend. O showed A that she knew this information and could surmise the reason for not giving a positive result on a weekend.

O. also did not give a general question of how she can help or support A. She alludes to it at the beginning of the interview by saying, "… we are interviewing to find out what are the program's strengths and weaknesses," but she is not explicit about the level of support or help. When I interviewed O about making a client feel open, she espoused that she asks a general question of how she can help, but at a very individual level not at a systematic level as she does here.

On the other hand, O. does ask someone about their learning styles to find out if they are teachable. This question, however, is one of the scripted questions and seemingly not one that O would normally ask. When I interviewed her, she was using one of the questions the APEX team now asks of all their interviewees. In her defense, she does bring the topic to mind. The APEX team wants to know each client members' learning style to see if one is predominant for everyone. It seems as though many on the outreach team, which A is a part of, learn best by doing.

As mentioned earlier, all of the APEX workers denied bringing up or even thinking they bring up what could be considered a negative reaction from a client. When asked what would she do to make a client feel self-conscious, she answered what she would do NOT to make a client feel self-conscious. She said that she would validate or normalize for the client what they were doing so that they would not feel self-conscious. Does this then mean that to make a client feel self-conscious that she does not normalize nor validate what the client is doing? That is not so clear. In addition, O said that she gives someone an assignment to make them feel dependent. She does not do this at all during this interview. Perhaps this is a good thing. A process consultant does not want to make a client feel too dependent on him, because it is ultimately the client who will need to effect a change not the consultant. Almost at the end of the interview O validates A.'s using a short amount of time to get his point across in a meeting by saying, " People… you say what you need to say." She does not invalidate nor un-normalize what A is saying. It would be very noticeable and would offend the client if she were to do so. O. is too much of a professional to do that.

The things that O said she does and did do were to ask what the client needs help with and what are their areas of growth and strength. She also said that she would ask about how roles and responsibilities are divided. She does this when she questions a second time his hours and what he does with each hour he works. O said that she asks open-ended questions to make someone talkative. All of the scripted questions are open-ended questions, so of course she asks them. Similar to the teachable questions, O always does this because they are scripted as open-ended questions. O also said that she often provided people with information about HIV trainings and she did do this when she brought up trainings that APEX gives.

O, however, did not mention in this interview what would be the result of this investigation. She said she usually mentions that there will be a retreat, but she did not do so during this interview. Perhaps the possibility of a retreat was not mentioned because this will naturally occur later in the process so that the client does not need to know about a retreat at this point.

O. also did not ascertain whether or not A's needs are getting met at the agency. This is implied by asking what other training opportunities do you need to fulfill your job, but O is not explicit about this as she said she would be. O also did not "give them tools needed to learn." She does not impart knowledge to A in this way. This and some of the additional information and things that O said she does will occur later in the consultation process.

It was very astute and quite frankly forthright of O. to bring up that it's the senior manager of WASP who is the person who is "oppressing" his workers. There are several indications that he does this as reported in Paulo Freire's theories in the "Theories Adopted by APEX workers." section. Not only does the senior manger oppress his workers but also he is not a very good teacher as in Freire's *Theory of Transmission*. O. does not mention the senior manager as a teacher during the interview, but she has alluded to it in discussions after the interview. Additionally, in bringing up the senior manager of WASP, O does admit that there is disagreement as in Freire's *Theory of Consensus*, which she espoused to follow. There is also disagreement between the interviewee, A, and his manager. O probes A to discover the nature of the disagreement and to see how much this disagreement maintains the *status quo*. O is the APEX worker that keeps her espoused theory close to her theory-in-use. She should be commended for doing so, because, as Argyris and Schön discuss it's most important for the espoused theory to match the theory-in-use.

*Espoused Theories and Theories-in-use of Worker T (*see Data Sheet D*)*

Worker T has the most relaxed interview style of all the APEX workers. She interviewed a health educator who does outreach at Public Sex Environments (PSEs), bars and clubs, does HIV testing and counseling and Individual Level Intervention and Group Level Intervention. The person she interviewed was very verbose and seemed to enjoy the interview. In fact, there were times when the two of them laughed together. These were also times when they shared something in common or else genuinely felt something was funny. T also has the most cheerful disposition of the APEX workers. She asked me after the interview why she didn't get hidden information like O. This may be due to the cheery atmosphere of the interview. T had a very positive interview and gives positive reinforcement for non-hidden information. This may hinder her getting the hidden information she wants. This may also give the message to the person she's interviewing to provide only positive information about the agency, and thus, she does not get a true picture of the client.

T had an extensive list of things she does when interviewing and why she does them. She said she asks thoughtful questions, tries to identify a person's learning style to find out if he's teachable, and chit chats to "break the ice." She also emphasizes anonymity or confidentiality, discusses what works well and what could be improved, and as she put it, "praises or acknowledge positive things, and validate and focus on the strengths." She discusses micro and macro issues to engender observation in the person. To make him talkative, she establishes a rapport with him, chit chats and asks follow up questions and examples to get clarity. It is important she says to explain the reason for the interview and to let a direct service provider know about her case management experience “to build some common ground.” Finally, she says she tries to concentrate on the positives but acknowledges any challenges if the interviewee does.

T did chit chat to break the ice and asked thoughtful questions. She was able to follow the interview well and was the worker who asked the most questions off the script. She also discussed challenges and improvements. During this interview, she discussed macro and micro issues, obviously developed a rapport with the person and asked follow up questions for clarity. She also told the person the reason for the interview. This is nine out of the twelve things she said she does. She is the APEX worker whose espoused theories most match her theories-in-use. Perhaps this is because a lot of what she said she does is part of the scripted questions. She was one of the people who designed the questions, so she may have been referring to them. The scripted questions are thoughtful ones and are follow up questions. Challenges and improvements are also questions on the script. For example, “What works well in terms of the program meeting those objectives?” and “What are the challenges the program has in meeting those objectives?” These questions are macro ones, but there’s also some micro ones on the script that ask about the person: “How do you learn best?” This is also a question where she said she tries to identify a person’s learning style to see if he’s teachable. And as already mentioned, she chit chatted with the client to develop a rapport with him, praised positive things and validated and focused on the strengths. She also said she explains why the interview is taking place. This is not part of the script but is an understood part of the interview. She also brought up the issue of anonymity and confidentiality.

This issue of anonymity and confidentiality is also not on the script, but the way T brought it up was not the way to introduce it. She at first said the interview was confidential but not anonymous. The actual case is the opposite: that the interview is anonymous but not confidential. The difference being that a person's name will not be attached to what they say, but that what they say will be used in the final report, barring any identifying information. T. did explain it correctly but did not say it correctly. Finally, T did not let this direct service provider know that she had case management experience. In this way, she did not develop any "common ground" with the person. Contrary to her colleagues, when T was asked a negative connotation to her interview, she put the onus on herself. She said, "Overall, I'd try to take the heat for it and diffuse the situation." And similarly, she said if she caused a person to be impatient, "I would want to probe to identify (sic.) underlying issue."

T says she adopts the theories of William Ury and Roger Fisher in the books *Getting to Yes* and *Getting Past No*. Following *Getting to Yes*, I did not perceive T confusing the people and the problem during her interview. She was very astute at focusing on the interests and not the positions of the person being interviewed. You can see that her questions were probing questions to get at the interests of the person. She, however, did not invent any options for the person. She did not go out of her way to conjure up alternatives for him. Ury's and Fisher's objective criteria, T would most certainly say, is the use of a standardized question format. All the questions for all the client workers were the same.

Ury and Fisher talk about an analysis stage where one diagnoses the problem. Certainly, T espouses this stage. She agrees with Ury and Fisher that the steps in diagnosing the problem are to gather the information as she was so doing in the interview, to organize it, which she has been doing all along and to think about it, which is already happening, given the talks that she, O, F, and I have had. Then there is a planning stage, which I have not yet seen. And finally, there will be a discussion stage where the client will note our findings.

Ury and Fisher then talk about a person not playing the game or using dirty tricks. This interviewee did play, as Ury and Fisher would say, by completing the interview, and he did not use any dirty tricks in doing so.

From *Getting Past No*, Fisher suggests "Going to the balcony, stepping to their side, reframing, building them a golden bridge and using power to educate (pp. 169 – 170)." Although T did not need to step to the side of W nor build him a golden bridge, she did not have to reframe anything either. She, however, did use her power to educate. In fact, just in opening the interview, T was using her power to educate W about why the APEX team was there. In addition, in some of T's questions she uses her power to educate. T asked W whether or not he receives compensatory time for the extra hours he works. Subtly, she was letting him know that he is allowed comp. time for those extra hours. T gives W feedback about the job he is doing. She is somehow educating him on how to do the job correctly.

Conclusion and Future Research

The theories that the APEX workers adopt can never correspond to those they actually carry out, and neither can their espoused theories as compared to their theories-in-use. The actions that people say they do cannot be the things that they do. One worker adopts the consultant stages of Edgar Schein and Peter Block. With Block's stages, her espoused theory is very close to her theory-in-use, not so with Schein's stages. Another worker adopts the theories of Paulo Freire; her espoused theory and theory-in-use correspond more than the first worker's. And finally, the third APEX worker has the most congruence between her espoused theory and theory-in-use.

The gap between what these theorists espouse and what they tell someone to do are almost polar opposites. Peter Block (1981) says that people often espouse to act as consultants of change but in-use they act as managers of change. Edgar Schein (1988) gives the theory-in-use example of a process consultant helping from without not within. He says that people espouse to work with a client from within.

Paulo Freire (1999) says that one's espoused theory is to teach democratically. However, his theory-in-use is to teach "authority dependence." William Ury and Roger Fisher (1981) say that people espouse to negotiate one's interests but that their theory-in-use is to be positional. William Ury (1991) might also say that an espoused theory is joint problem-solving when a theory-in-use may be a hard negotiation style. These action theories do not correspond as these authors say they should.

Rather than look at what individuals say they do and actually do, for future research, one might look at what WASP says they do – their espoused theory and what they actually do – their theory-in-use. It would be interesting to look at what their policy and procedure manual says they do and then to look at what they actually do. For additional research, one might want to look at a larger organization and see what is its theory in action. Finally, one might want to look at a different or larger organizational development company and see what theories they use and what espoused theories and theories-in-use they explore.

References

Argyris, C. (1980). *Inner contradication of rigorous research*. New York: Academic Press.

Argyris, C, Putnam, R., & McLain Smith, D. (1985). *Action Science*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Argyris, C. & Schön (1996). *Organizational Learning*. Thousand Oaks : Sage Publications.

Argyris, C. & Schön, D. (1978). Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Argyris, C. & Schön, D. (1974). *Theory in Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Block, P. (1981). *Flawless Consulting.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeifer.

Fisher, R. & Ury, W. (1991). *Getting to Yes*. London: Penguin Books.

Freire, P. (1999). Teachers as Cultural Workers- Letters to Those Who Dare Teach, translated by Donoldo Macedo, Dale Koike, and Alexandre Oliveira. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, www.new foundations.com/GALLERY/Freire.html

Irving, J. & Williams,D. (1995). Critical thinking and reflective practice in counselling. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, Volume 23 (1). pp. 107 –114.

Kane, R. (2002). Telling half the story: A critical review of research on the teaching beliefs and practices of university academics. Review of Educational Research. Volume 72, (2). pp. 177 – 228.

Masterson, S. S., Olian, J..D. & Schnell, E.R. (1997). Belief versus practice in management theory: Total quality management and agency theory. *Advances in the management of organizational quality*. Vol. 2, pp. 169-209.

Schein, E. (1988). *Process Consultation, Volume 1, It's role in Organization Development, Second Edition*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Schein, E. (1999). Process Consultation Revisited, Building the Helping Relationship. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley

Senge, Peter M. (1994). *The Fifth Discipline Field Book*. New York: Currency.

Smith, M.K. (2001). "Chris Argyris: theories of action, double loop learning and organizational learning', *the encyclopedia of informal education*, www.infed.org/thinkers/argyris.htm.

Ury, W. (1993). *Getting Past No: negotiating your way from confrontation to cooperation.* New York: Bantam.