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ABSTRACT

This study examines the degree of occupational ghettoization of Spanish speaking staff members in a North San Diego County non-profit agency. This quantitative study follows a qualitative study that found clients and staff members of all organizational levels feeling an unequal allocation of resources existed within the agency. This perception of unequal distribution of resources was negatively impacting client and staff members’ satisfaction. A survey instrument was constructed, delivered, and results were analyzed. The overall pattern of results substantiated the initial qualitative findings, some significantly, indicating lower morale among Spanish speaking staff members and high staff turnover. However, there were many organizational changes that impacted the reliability of the survey. The findings of this study illustrate the need for further evaluation of cultural competency and reconceptualization of a survey instrument, in order to effectively address the desire of this agency to increase its cultural competency within its organization.
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INTRODUCTION

In 1996, a North San Diego County non-profit social service organization (NSDCO), commissioned a research team from California State University, San Marcos (CSUSM) to evaluate the degree of cultural competency within their organization. Interested in improving the quality of services rendered to the community, the NSDCO collaborated with CSUSM in a qualitative evaluation of the cultural competency of their service provision. In the Spring of 1996, several focus groups were conducted with clients, line staff, and management of Spanish speaking and English speaking programs, in order to identify barriers to culturally sensitive service provision. Throughout these focus groups, clients, staff, and administration consistently identified insufficient access to information and low solidarity among staff as barriers to quality service provision. Various recommendations for increasing the cultural competency of the organization were presented to the NSDCO Executive Team. In the summer of 1997, this team commissioned a subcommittee to implement the recommendations of the cultural competency study.

I conducted a quantitative evaluation of the degree of intra-group solidarity and information flow among staff members serving monolingual, Spanish speaking clients at the NSDCO and its impact on the quality of service provision to monolingual, Spanish speaking clients. This evaluation furthers the prior qualitative cultural competency study by providing the NSDCO with generalizability and representativeness of the results. This assessment may serve as a baseline assessment of dimensions of both cultural competency and Occupational Ghettoization at the
NSDCO and their impact on quality service delivery to monolingual, Spanish speaking clients. A quantitative assessment that can easily be replicated by in-house staff can be established, thereby establishing an on-going process of evaluation of the NSDCO's efforts towards cultural competency. This study attempted to assist the NSDCO in creating a more culturally competent and diverse work environment that enhances and increases access to information and partnership building that can lead to ease of service delivery to monolingual, Spanish speaking clients. Thereby, improving creativity, increasing productivity and reducing staff turnover. A goal of this study is to assist the NSDCO's efforts to improve staff relations in order to provide quality service delivery to clients. Furthermore, this research addresses the needs of the agency in its desire to improve the cultural competency within their organization. By comparing intra-group solidarity and access to information of programs and agency sites serving monolingual, Spanish speaking clients with those serving English speaking clients, barriers to culturally competent service delivery to Latino clients may be identified. Thus, this study performs the dual purpose of assessing cultural competency and Occupational Ghettoization at the NSDCO.
PURPOSE

During the 1996 cultural competency study, focus groups conducted with Spanish speaking clients and staff identified the following as areas for growth; low quality of service delivery and language barriers, high staff turnover, the need for increased communication among staff, and increased understanding of all types of diversity among programs at the NSDCO (Pina et al. 1997). Focus groups conducted with management personnel identified separation of programs, the need for increased social contact among staff, and increased discussion about diversity among staff (Pina et al. 1997). Clients expressed the difficulties arising from arriving to a session only to discover that the staff they had come to trust was replaced with a new staff member. The lack of an adequate transition left some clients feeling they received services lacking in quality from the NSDCO, as well as feeling undervalued. Cultural Competency Subcommittee discussions identified the physical segregation of programs that serve monolingual, Spanish speaking staff from their counterparts that serve English speaking clients, as contributing to low staff morale and a communication gap among staff regarding shared clients. This communication gap can lead to a disjointed delivery of services, in effect lowering the quality of services delivered to clients.

The purpose of this quantitative assessment of the quality of staff relations at the NSDCO is to further inform the NSDCO Executive Team and the Cultural Competency Subcommittee's efforts to increase cultural competency by assessing the degree of Occupational Ghettoization of staff members that serve monolingual,
Spanish speaking clients. In reviewing the prior study, several dimensions of staff relations were identified as areas for improving cultural competency. A need to increase communication and contact among staff across programs and agency sites that serve monolingual, Spanish speaking and English speaking clients and improve the flow of information among staff members who serve monolingual, Spanish speaking and English speaking clients (Pina, et al 1996).

The NSDCO's attempts to effectively serve the needs of its outlying communities are seen in its various programs. The NSDCO consists of seven major programs that provide a variety of outreach, prevention, and treatment programs to families in crisis in North San Diego County. The NSDCO's primary goal is to support families and children and is operationalized by the parenting classes, drug treatment services, domestic violence counseling, and counseling for families with sexually abused children (for perpetrator, victim, and families) provided by the approximately 500 employees and volunteers. The NSDCO programs include a youth diversion program with anger management and substance abuse intervention with a youth diversion group for Spanish speaking males. Another program is in place to provide support groups and therapy for English and Spanish speaking domestic violence offenders and victims and Latino Network meetings. There is a program, which includes parenting and group therapy for Spanish and English speaking individuals and families who have been involved in intra-familial sexual abuse. Other services include sexual assault group therapy for women. Residential treatment for English speaking clients and day treatment services for English and
Spanish speaking substance abusing parenting and/or pregnant women is provided. A program is in place to provide services to English speaking youth who are sexual perpetrators. Programs for English speaking juveniles involved in gang and drugs are also in place. Currently, the demographic profile of clients served throughout these various programs include 47% Latinos, followed by 36% Caucasians, 8% African-Americans, 4% Native-Americans, and 2% Asians.
Diversity Management

Historically, White males predominantly staffed most professions in the US workforce. As demographic and social changes occurred, an increasing number of new entrants into the workforce included women and people of color. These demographic changes in the US workforce are rapidly increasing. It is estimated that by the year 2005, only 15% of new entrants into the workforce will be White males, with the other 85% consisting of women and people of color (Bond & Pyle 1994). This phenomenon has created a new "Diversity Management" industry aimed at helping organizations maximize staff relations by creating an organizational culture that promotes working with people of diverse backgrounds, valuing differences, and minimizing the potential disadvantages.

There are many reasons for aspiring to effectively manage diversity. Some emphasize a workforce that accurately reflects the social and demographic composition of the general population that will in turn promote equal opportunity for social and economic advancement to all members of society in a fair and equitable fashion (see Equal Employment Opportunity legislation, EEO). Others promote a diverse workforce to adequately meet the legal requirements established by the EEO. While others emphasize a diverse workforce will create better decision-making, greater creativity and innovation, increase productivity and competitiveness, and reduce turnover of organizations (Kossek & Zonia 1993; Stephenson 1994). The
need for cultural competency is not limited to for-profit organizations, but has ramifications for non-profit social service agencies as well.

Symbolic Interactionism

It is important to recognize how individuals contribute to the cultural competency of an organizational culture. Individuals inherently feel more comfortable with, and are attracted to, people whom they view as similar to themselves. Symbolic Interactionism promotes the theory that reality is constantly created and recreated by human beings, with the individual's sense of "self" developing through this interaction. Group characteristics, such as size, sex, demographic profile etc., of a social structure help define an individual's sense of "self". Groups are collectives of people who share a system of symbols comprised of beliefs, values and norms, which the group has personally internalized, making them a social fact (Durkheim). "Organizational culture typically refers to the basic values and assumptions underlying all activities of an organization, and is a product of experiences over time (Bond & Pyle 1994)."

Organizational culture relates to cultural competency in as much as the degree of shared meaning between the organizational culture and individual cultures has important implications for how well people will work together.

Research indicates that people who are different from others in their work group (in a broad variety of ways ranging from age, race, gender, sexual orientation, physical and mental abilities, etc.) engage in less work-related communication with co-workers, and are less socially integrated into the work group (Bond & Pyle 1994).
By assessing certain dimensions of Occupational Ghettoization, such as intra-group solidarity and information flow, awareness for the current quality of interactions among NSDCO staff members can be determined. During the focus group discussions and the Cultural Competency Subcommittee discussions, the physical separation of programs based upon the clients served (monolingual, Spanish speaking versus English speaking clients) was identified as a barrier to creating solidarity among groups. This obvious ghettoization of staff members minimizes the amount of shared meaning among staff, thereby contributing to decreased communication and staff morale among staff members. This minimal amount of shared meaning leads to fragmented service delivery, which ultimately diminishes the quality of service delivered to monolingual, Spanish speaking clients. Organizational culture relates to cultural competency in as much as the degree of shared meaning between the organizational culture and individual cultures has important implications for how well people will work together.

**Occupational Ghettoization**

Occupational Ghettoization involves an "unequal distribution of power and resources" that is due to ascriptive differences among workers (Xu & Leffler 1996). Ascriptive characteristics are those a person cannot change, such as race or ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, culture, age, physical or mental disability. Dimensions of Occupational Ghettoization may include the following: decreased authority, lower earnings and wages, decreased valuation of the work performed by an employee,
decreased job mobility, decreased autonomy, decreased job security, decreased occupational prestige, lower fringe benefits, decreased interaction between groups, and decreased allocation of resources, encountering cultural bias and different values due to differences a person cannot change. These dimensions can exist independently of each other or in a variety of combinations with the same result: the inequality of resources and power among workers due to difference. Extensive research has been done on Occupational Ghettoization due to gender and racio-ethnicity. Research on decreased job mobility and decreased wages due to an employee's gender has produced the infamous term "glass-ceiling". Job performance can be devalued when compared with the White-male biased job performance values (Long 1995). Women report more job changes with fewer promotions than men, indicating decreased upward mobility (Long 1995).

Some researchers have noticed the demographic composition and the allocation of resources within the work unit as key variables reflecting the quality of relationships among various work groups (Kossek & Zonia 1993). This is evident in the physical ghettoization of programs based upon the clients they serve. The staff members serving monolingual, Spanish speaking clients were physically segregated from their peers, leading many staff to feel marginalized and undervalued. Furthermore, this physical ghettoization led to a communication gap among staff members regarding clients across programs. Staff members identified a need for increased shared discussion among programs and agency sites regarding shared clients, feeling this would facilitate an improvement in the services delivered to
clients by enabling NSDCO staff members to coordinate their efforts and services delivered to clients.

Past research shows that people gravitate towards people similar to themselves. In social interaction, this tendency to associate with similar people often leads to the formation of cliques or "in-groups" and "out-groups". Often, there are high levels of conflict between diverse groups at work. Because people who feel different from their peers have lower levels of communication with them, there is little information being exchanged among these groups (Bond & Pyle 1994). This can be related to the different clientele staff members serve. During focus groups, staff members that serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients expressed low levels of social interaction and communication with staff members that serve English speaking clients. These staff members felt socially isolated, undervalued by management, and expressed low staff morale. Working in an organization that is experiencing high conflict and low access to information can be very stressful to workers, which may cause many workers to leave the organization and seek work elsewhere (Bacharach & Bamberger 1992). These factors may contribute to the high rate of turnover at NSDCO. Conversely, where there are high levels of solidarity or "team spirit" among groups at work, there are high levels of communication exchange. Staff is informed of their role, as well as the role of their peers, in promoting the goals and objectives of the organization. This environment is characterized by trust, support, high morale, and quality job performance (Bacharach
& Bamberger 1992). A workforce with these positive attributes is the goal of most organizations.

NSDCO consists of several programs targeted at supporting family and children. This brings some very unique characteristics to this study of Occupational Ghettoization, because social service is an occupational field dominated by White women (Kossek & Zonia 1993; Xu & Leffler 1996). This creates a challenge for the researcher, because most of the existing research on Occupational Ghettoization is predominantly characterized by studies that measure how Occupational Ghettoization relates to gender and ethnicity in academia and/or highly structured for-profit industries. The results of the previous study conducted at the NSDCO mentioned racio-ethnic issues. Gender inequality was not identified in the prior NSDCO study, perhaps due to women's domination of social services and/or the preponderance of women and children in the NSDCO clientele (Xu & Leffler 1991). Therefore, this study of the degree of Occupational Ghettoization at the NSDCO is related to racio-ethnic issues rather than gender issues. Furthermore, this research addresses the needs of the agency in its desire to improve the cultural competency within their organization. Measuring staff morale, absentee and turnover rates of staff members, understandings of job descriptions, and group identity across programs and agency sites may indicate the degree of intra-group solidarity among staff. The amount of information about clients shared among staff members, the amount of social interaction, the level of collaboration among staff members, and the level of awareness about clients' multicultural issues, may contribute to staff member's ability
to provide quality services to their clients. By comparing intra-group solidarity and access to information of programs and agency sites serving monolingual, Spanish speaking clients with those serving English speaking clients, barriers to culturally competent service delivery to Latino clients may be identified. Thus, this study performs the dual purpose of assessing cultural competency and Occupational Ghettoization at the NSDCO.

**Intra-Group Solidarity & Access to Information**

The dimensions of the Occupational Ghettoization assessed include intra-group solidarity and information flow. The degree of intra-group solidarity reflects the amount of interaction among peer and program groups and is defined as "common membership in a shared coalition, shared members, or the undertaking of joint ventures (Meyer & Scott 1992)." With increased communication frequency, there may be an increase in information sharing, which will increase role clarity, trust, social support and job performance (Bacharach & Bamberger 1992).

By increasing the amount of interaction between programs that serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients and English speaking clients, an increase in the access to instrumental resources may occur (Meyer & Scott 1992; Stephenson 1994). Increased access to instrumental information may enable staff to increase the quality of services delivered to clients. When staff members regularly discuss the needs and issues of clients they share, they are able to coordinate their efforts in meeting the needs of their clients. This will increase the efficient use of resources
and result in higher quality of services provided to clients. When staff members are clear about their roles and the roles of their peers in furthering the goals and objectives of their individual programs and overall agency goals, service delivery can be characterized by "team effort". Increased quality of services can promote program and organizational goals (Stephenson 1994). By increasing the amount of social and occupational interaction between programs and agency sites, the clearer the individual and collective roles of staff members will be, which in turn will facilitate more concerted and synchronized efforts in promoting program and overall agency goals. Furthermore, diverse work groups have increased creativity and productivity by capitalizing on all the different vantage points of a problem (Kossek & Zonia 1993).

The degree of diffusion of instrumental information among staff members includes the amount of formal and informal communication among staff members that allows peers to perform their occupational duties (Breaugh 1980). Instrumental information can be distinguished from expressive information, in that expressive information is communication among staff members that may not be job related (Breaugh 1980). Shared communication and understanding among staff members can promote higher quality of services and accuracy of information delivered to clients in a consistent manner. Furthermore, if staff members are working in an environment that increases the ease of job performance, there may be an increase in staff morale and esprit de corp. When staff members feel at ease and competent in their occupational performance at NSDCO, a decrease in staff turnover may occur (Kossek
& Zonia 1993; Stephenson 1994). Having access to a written policy describing job responsibilities can help employees understand how the performance of their job responsibilities and the job performance of fellow staff members promote organizational and program goals. Having access to the identified goals and objectives of the program and organization can improve the quality of service provided to clients.

This quantitative evaluation provided individual staff members with an opportunity for increased discussion and social interaction, thereby fomenting partnership building among programs and agency sites. This quantitative evaluation attempted to assist NSDCO in creating a more culturally competent and diverse work environment that enhances and increases work morale and ease of service delivery by directly assessing the degree of Occupational Ghettoization within the organization. This measurement of Occupational Ghettoization can provide NSDCO with a quantifiable measurement of their progress towards the goal of creating culturally competent staff member relationships and service delivery.

The existing research focuses mainly on gender issues and race issues in highly structured organizations, such as academia and for-profit industries. Race issues discussed in current research study Occupational Ghettoization between workers of African-American and Caucasian descent. This study involving a non-profit agency that is predominantly staffed by women will address issues that involve dimensions of Occupational Ghettoization that relate to staff members who service monolingual, Spanish speaking clients and those staff members who serve English
speaking clients, thereby expanding the existing literature by providing another view of the concept of Occupational Ghettoization in a non-profit agency.
METHODS

This study is building upon prior qualitative research that has previously identified certain themes related to cultural competency and Occupational Ghettoization, which affect NSDCO's quality of service provision to monolingual, Spanish speaking clients. The two Occupational Ghettoization themes identified in the prior cultural competency study, intra-group solidarity and degree of information flow, are researched in more detail to determine the extent of the problem across agency and program sites in a standardized and quantifiable manner.

This research used a quantitative approach to explore previously identified issues in order to quantify the degree of generalizability of these issues in the organization. In order to obtain generalizability, a survey questionnaire was constructed to obtain feedback from as many staff members as possible. The survey contained approximately fifty questions, yielding over 240 closed-ended responses, using a 5-point Likert scale. The survey was constructed so that the data provided from each site could be compared to identify certain programs or agency sites that require priority intervention from the Cultural Competency Subcommittee. In applying a quantitative approach to this study, employees were assured of their anonymity in order to increase the reliability of the responses.

Sample

Respondents who designated themselves as Professionals, Technician/Skilled, and Service Workers were reclassified as “Service Providers”. While respondents
who designated themselves as Clerical and Other were reclassified as “Other”. For the purposes of this study, the subject population consisted of all paid staff members. There were approximately 252 employees, of which 202 responded to this survey, resulting in a response rate of 80%.

Procedure

A proposal for this project was presented to the NSDCO Executive Team for authorization to proceed. The Executive Team consists of, the Executive Director, the Associate Executive Directors, Director of Finance, Director of Human Resources, Clinical Director, and the Director of Development. Once authorization from the Executive Team was obtained, the project and survey questionnaire were presented to Program Directors from all agency sites at a Team Management Meeting. Appointments were scheduled with each agency site Program Director to administer the questionnaire to their agency site staff members.

Prior to administering the survey, the staff members were informed of the overall purpose for this research. They were told the goal was to assist NSDCO in establishing an organization-wide standard of cultural competency by assessing the quality of relationships among staff, and how it specifically relates to the delivery of services to monolingual, Spanish speaking clients. It was explained to them that the survey is part of an ongoing process to increase the quality of services delivered at NSDCO. The staff members were then asked to fill out the questionnaire and provide their perceptions about the quality of their relationships with other staff at NSDCO.
At this time the staff members were assured of the confidentiality of the survey results as well as their anonymity within the organization by explaining that all data would be reported in aggregate form. Staff members were asked to answer the questions candidly and to classify the degree of impact within the primary and secondary programs in which they work, as well as within their agency site and among other agency sites.

This survey took approximately 20 minutes to complete. Afterwards, there was an open forum for any questions that may have arisen from the survey questions. Staff members were thanked for their participation and were reminded of the Cultural Competency Subcommittee's efforts of implementing staff and client suggestions for promoting cultural competency at NSDCO. Staff members interested in further discussion of these related issues were encouraged to participate in the Cultural Competency Subcommittee's efforts and/or call the investigator, whose telephone number was provided to staff members, should they have any additional comments or concerns they would care to share. Data was compiled and analyzed by program and agency sites. A summary of findings will be presented to the Executive Team and the Cultural Competency Subcommittee, who will be responsible for communicating the findings to all program staff.

**Measures**

The dimensions of Occupational Ghettoization are several, however the two identified in the prior cultural competency evaluation findings as relevant to the
NSDCO will be the focus of this inquiry. The ghettoization of programs that serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients, decreased access to information, and diminished communication among staff members that serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients was clearly identified in the prior study. Experts in the fields of psychology, business administration, human resources, gender and race issues have all mentioned these themes as dimensions of Occupational Ghettoization (Kossek & Zonia 1993; Breaugh 1994; Bond & Pyle 1994; Xu & Leffler 1996; Meyer & Scott 1992).

**Analysis**

Analyses were conducted using the Service Providers, serving both English speaking and monolingual, Spanish speaking clients within NSDCO organization and the constructed scales that relate to intra-group solidarity and access to information. The independent variables are the staff members that serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients and English speaking clients (Language Spoken with Clients). The dependent variables are the constructed scales (Scales 1 through 9), that relate to intra-group solidarity and access to information.

**Hypothesis 1:** Staff members who serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients are likely to experience more occupational isolation than staff members who serve monolingual, English speaking clients.

**Hypothesis 1a:** Staff members who serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients are likely to experience more social isolation than staff members who serve monolingual, English speaking clients.
Hypothesis 2: Staff members who serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients are likely to have less access to instrumental information than staff members who serve monolingual, English speaking clients.

Hypothesis 2a: Staff members who serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients are likely to have less access to expressive information than staff members who serve monolingual, English speaking clients.

The data was coded into MS Access and then analyzed using Statistical Program for Social Services (SPSS). Using SPSS, staff members’ job classifications were recoded into two response categories, “Service Providers” and “Other” to highlight those staff members who work directly with clients. “Primary Program Language” and “Secondary Program Language” were recoded to discern those service providers who speak Spanish to their clients and those who speak English to their clients. This was done with the supposition that clients who are monolingual, Spanish speakers are paired with a Spanish speaking service provider and monolingual, English speakers are paired with an English speaking service provider. Frequency Distributions were run on all data to discern patterns of responses between service providers based upon language spoken with clients.

The hypotheses indicated four independent variables, Occupational Isolation, Social Isolation, Access to Instrumental Information, and Access to Expressive Information. A Factor Analysis was performed to assess how well these four dimensions of the research were imbedded in the data. The results of the Factor Analyses indicated three scales not four. The scales are Face to Face Communication, Social Integration Communication, and Perseverant
Communication. Face to Face Communication reflects communication that occurs when parties are in face to face groupings, such as formal and informal meetings. Social Integration Communication reflects social cohesiveness and the resultant expressive information that accompanies social integration. Perseverant Communication reflects communication that surmounts social and physical barriers, such as broaching sensitive cultural issues or leaving a message on a colleague's voice mail when the person is unavailable. The scales were constructed for each section of the survey. Each survey section relates to different levels of the agency organization, such as, Primary Program, Secondary Program (if any), Agency Site, and Other NSDCO Sites.

It was thought that a cross-tabulation of each scale by Language Spoken might produce more telling results. Therefore, each scale was divided into three equal response ranges, creating an orderable-discrete variable suitable for Chi-square analyses. The three response ranges for each scale were categorized as Low, Medium or High, based on the respondent's total scale score, with the lowest thirty-third percentile being Low, the mid thirty-third percentile being Medium, and the top thirty-third percentile resulting in High. The Low response range reflects diminished social integration and diminished face to face and perseverant communication. Medium reflects a moderate level of social integration and moderate face to face and perseverant communication. The High response range thus reflects high levels of social integration and face to face and perseverant communication.
Section I: Evaluating Staff Members' Primary Program.

Scale 1: Face to Face Communication.

1) How often do you talk to other staff about the treatment issues of clients/customers you share: In informal meetings? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

2) How often do you talk to other program staff about developing collaborations: In informal meetings? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

3) How often do you talk to other program staff about making client/customer referrals: In informal meetings? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

4) How often do you talk to other program staff about general program issues: In informal meetings? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

α = .9534

Scale 2: Social Integration Communication.

1) Program staff talk freely and openly with one another.

2) Program staff of different backgrounds work together cooperatively.

3) There is little friction among staff of different cultures within my program.

4) Program staff make an effort to help newcomers become a part of the team.

5) Others within my program understand my job description and the tasks I am responsible for performing.

6) There is high morale within my program.

7) There are no cliques or in-group/out-group divisions among staff within my program.

α = .8802
Scale 3: Perseverant Communication.

1) How often do you talk to other staff about the treatment issues of clients/customers you share by phone?

2) How often do you talk to other program staff about developing collaborations by phone?

3) How often do you talk to other program staff about making client/customer referrals by phone?

4) How often do you talk to other program staff about general program issues by phone?

8) How often do you talk to program staff about multicultural client/customer issues: By phone? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

α = .9118

Section III: Evaluating Staff Members’ Agency Site.

Scale 4: Face to Face Communication.

1) How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about the treatment issues of clients/customers you share: in informal meetings? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

2) How often do you talk to staff within your agency site about developing collaborations: in informal meetings? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

3) How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about making client/customer referrals: In informal meetings? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

4) How often do you talk to other program staff about general program issues: In informal meetings? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

α = .9631
Scale 5: Social Integration Communication.

1) Staff within your agency talk freely and openly with one another.

2) Staff of different backgrounds work together cooperatively within your agency site.

3) There is little friction among staff of different cultures within my agency site.

4) Staff within my agency site make an effort to help newcomers become a part of the team.

5) Others within my agency site understand my job description and the tasks I am responsible for performing.

6) I understand my agency site co-worker’s job description and the tasks they are responsible for performing.

\( \alpha = .9020 \)

Scale 6: Perseverant Communication.

1) How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about the treatment issues of clients/customers you share by phone?

2) How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about developing collaborations by phone?

3) How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about making client/customer referrals by phone?

4) How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about general program issues by phone?

5) How often do you talk to staff within your agency site about multicultural client/customer issues: By phone? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

\( \alpha = .9360 \)
Section IV: Evaluating Other Agency Sites.

Scale 7: Face to Face Communication.

1) How often do you talk to staff at other NSDCO sites about the treatment issues of clients/customers you share: In informal meetings? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

2) How often do you talk to staff at other NSDCO sites about developing collaborations: In informal meetings? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

3) How often do you talk to staff at other NSDCO sites about making client/customer referrals: In informal meetings? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

4) How often do you talk to staff at other NSDCO sites about general program issues: In informal meetings?

$\alpha = .9839$

Scale 8: Perseverant Communication.

1) How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about the treatment issues of clients/customers you share by phone?

2) How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about developing collaborations by phone?

3) How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about making client/customer referrals by phone?

4) How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about general program issues by phone?

5) How often do you talk to staff within your agency site about multicultural client/customer issues: By phone? In formal meetings? In supervision? In program meetings?

$\alpha = .9658$
**Section V: Evaluating the Constraints Staff Members Feel Impact the Quality of Service they Provide to Clients.**

How often do each of the following restrict the ways you would like to help your clients/customers?

a) External grant contracts that fund your program.

b) County agencies

c) Child Protective Services (CPS) workers

d) Agency policies

e) Ethical rules and guidelines of your profession

Cross-tabulations were performed on all questions to determine the existence, if any, of a pattern of responses based upon language spoken with clients. Reliability analyses were performed on these scales to determine their alpha reliability. To compare the independent means of each scale between service providers based upon language spoken with clients, t-tests were performed.

Field investigation revealed an organizational pattern whereby many of the programs set to serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients relied exclusively upon Spanish speaking staff members incorporating the added responsibilities to their existent job description. This often occurred without the benefit of an official change to their job description. Initially, all English speaking programs that had a Spanish speaking counterparts were to be compared. However, many Spanish speaking programs were eliminated during the course of this investigation. Another planned comparison that was eliminated was between staff members who worked for more
than one program and those who worked one program only. Field investigation revealed a pattern of splitting the job description of Spanish speaking staff members, officially and unofficially, in order to provide staff for fledging programs serving monolingual, Spanish speaking clients. However, the low numbers of survey respondents indicating a secondary program did not support this endeavor, thus this comparison was also eliminated.
RESULTS

Approximately half of the survey respondents were “Service Providers”. Most of the respondents were new to their position, with 82% of the respondents holding their current position less than 3 years and, more significantly, 48.5% holding their current position less than a year. Approximately 76% of the survey respondents had been with the agency less than 3 years. Half were people of Caucasian descent, while the rest of the respondents were people of color, this includes African-American, Native-American, Hispanic, and Asian descent. 71% of the survey respondents were female, while 27% were male. 82% of survey respondents indicated English as their primary language, while 40% of survey respondents indicated speaking Spanish with Clients. A more detailed description of the respondents' demographics is outlined in Appendix 1.

Table 1 illustrates the means of the English and Spanish speaking service providers for Section 1, Within Primary Program. The results of the analysis show that the Spanish speaking service providers had lower averages on all three of the scales, demonstrating that Spanish speaking service providers have diminished social integration, face to face communication and perseverant communication with other staff members. Face to Face Communication yielded a mean of 50.49 for English speaking staff members, while Spanish speaking staff members’ mean was 47.96. Social Integration resulted in 26.32 for English speaking staff members and 24.15 for Spanish speaking staff members. Perseverant Communication scale resulted in a mean of 18.91 for English speaking staff members and 18.61 for Spanish speaking
staff members. Face to Face Communication, yields the largest difference in scores between Spanish speaking and English speaking service providers within their primary program (50.49 vs. 47.96, NS). However, the only scale to yield significant findings is Social Integration. English speaking service providers scored an average of 2.17 points higher than Spanish speaking service providers within their primary program (26.32 vs. 24.15, p < .05).

Due to the significance of these findings, a cross-tabulation of Language Spoken with Clients and Social Integration, is presented in Table 2. While 28.7% of English speaking staff members’ responses fell into the Low response category, 47.3% of Spanish speaking staff members could be classified as scoring Low on the scale. The Medium response range was comprised of 39.8% English speaking staff members and 31.1% Spanish speaking counterparts. For those respondents who fell in the High range, 31.5% were English speaking staff members and 21.6% were Spanish speaking staff members. The higher scale scores result in a decrease in percentages of Spanish speaking respondents. Approximately half of the Spanish speaking service providers fell into the Low response category (47.3%), indicating diminished social integration. Spanish speaking service providers scored significantly lower on the scale than their English speaking counterparts [$\chi^2 (2, N=182) = 6.66, p < .05$].

Table 3 reflects the results of Section III, Within Agency Site. Although statistically there was no significance between the English and Spanish speaking service providers, a different pattern of responses emerges than in Table 1. Social
Integration, shows lower scores for the Spanish speaking service providers within agency site consistent with the findings in the previous table. However, Face to Face Communication and Perseverant Communication yield an inverse response pattern among the respondents within agency site. Face to Face Communication within Agency Site yields a mean of 51.48 for English speaking staff members and a mean of 53.75 for Spanish speaking staff members. Social Integration shows a mean of 22.05 for English speaking staff members and a mean of 21.24 for Spanish speaking staff members with agency site. Perseverant Communication shows a mean of 21.54 for English speaking respondents and a mean of 25.23 for Spanish speaking respondents within agency site. Face to Face Communication shows the average for Spanish speaking service providers to be 2.27 points higher than that of their English speaking counterparts (53.75 vs. 51.48, NS). There was an even greater difference in the averages for Perseverant Communication. The Spanish speaking service providers had an average score which was 3.69 points higher (25.23 vs. 21.54, NS) than that of their English speaking counterparts within agency site.

The results for Section IV, Other Agency Sites, can be seen in Table 4. These results are inconsistent with previous data, whereby Spanish speaking service providers scored higher than their English speaking counterparts on all three scales. English speaking staff members scored a mean of 42.74, in Face to Face Communication, while Spanish speaking staff members scored a mean of 45.95. Perseverant Communication shows English speaking staff members scoring a mean of 20.58, while Spanish speaking respondents scored a mean of 22.15. Face to Face
Communication shows the average score of Spanish speaking service providers to be 3.21 points higher than the English speaking respondents (45.95 vs. 42.74, NS), although the findings for this scale are not statistically significant. Perseverant Communication shows Spanish speaking respondents have an average score of 1.57 points higher than the English speaking respondents across agency sites (22.15 vs. 20.58).

Table 5 shows the results Section V, Bureaucratic Constraints to Quality Service Provision. One hundred-six English speaking staff members, and 72 Spanish speaking staff members responded to this series of questions. The higher scores of Spanish speaking respondents indicate higher bureaucratic constraints from county agencies, Child Protective Services (CPS), agency policies, and ethical rules that adversely affected service delivery to their clients. The only category within the variable Bureaucratic Constraints that Spanish speaking service providers scored lower on than the English speaking respondents was External Grants (3.64 vs. 3.74, NS). Regarding the impact of County Agencies, English speakers scored a mean of 3.47, while Spanish speakers scored a mean of 3.64. English speaking respondents scored a mean of 3.18, while Spanish speaking respondents scored a mean of 3.61 when responding to CPS. Agency Policies on the quality of service provision yielded a mean score of 3.21 for English speaking staff members, while Spanish speaking staff members scored a mean of 3.81. Finally, Ethical Rules of Profession showed English speaking respondents to have a mean score of 2.92, while Spanish speaking respondents had a mean score of 3.26. Bureaucratic Constraints does not show
statistically significant findings. However, the differences show that the Spanish speaking service providers scored higher than those service providers who spoke English in four out of five categories in this variable.
DISCUSSION

Approximately fifty percent of the respondents were of Caucasian descent, 40% of the respondents speak Spanish with clients, and 71% percent of the respondents were female. Approximately fifty percent of the respondents have been in their current position less than one year. Approximately fifty percent of the respondents have been with the agency less than one year. Although social services are characterized by high staff turnover, the data indicates a higher than normal degree of staff turnover within this particular agency. Symbolic Interactionism proposes that reality is constantly created and recreated by the interaction among groups, where an individual's "self" identity is defined and redefined by the quality of this group interaction. High staff turnover inhibits the establishment of social integration of individual staff members, thereby decreasing morale and diminishing communication among staff members. This high staff turnover results in diminished quality of service provision and reduced cost effectiveness of programs.

This quantitative evaluation validated many of the findings of the qualitative study as demonstrated by the pattern of responses within primary programs, within agency site and relative to bureaucratic constraints. Specifically, Spanish speaking survey respondents' lower scores indicate diminished face to face communication in formal or informal meetings, communication that overcomes barriers such as broaching sensitive cultural issues or utilizing telephone voice mail systems, and significantly diminished social integration within their primary program.
Survey scores of respondents who speak Spanish to clients demonstrate diminished social integration with their peers, but increased face to face communication and communication that broaches sensitive issues within their agency site. This response pattern indicates the formation of cliques; where the group’s solidarity is bracketed by the language staff members speak with clients. The existence of in-group/out-groups presents the potential for fragmented service delivery. Conversely, Spanish speaking service providers indicated higher levels of face to face communication and communication that surmounts barriers and social integration across agency sites than their English speaking peers. This reflects an established team identity among staff members who serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients within the greater organizational level. Spanish speaking staff members across agency sites know and speak to each other regularly, providing an organizational environment that allows the synchronization of service delivery to monolingual, Spanish speaking clients. It contrasts sharply with the lack of these qualities at the primary program level.

When discussing any bureaucratic constraints to service delivery, English speaking staff members indicated constraints to service delivery frequently arising from external grants. Conversely, Spanish speaking survey respondents rated county agencies, CPS, agency policies, and ethical rules of profession as more frequent constraints to service delivery to monolingual, Spanish speaking clients. This response pattern reflects exogenous factors that affect the cultural competency of service delivery to English and monolingual, Spanish speaking clients at NSDCO.
Recommendations

This quantitative evaluation attempted to assist NSDCO in creating a more culturally competent and diverse work environment that enhances and increases work morale and ease of service delivery by providing an accurate assessment of the quality of relationships among staff. Continued quantitative assessments can be useful to NSDCO by providing a quantifiable measurement of their progress towards the goal of creating culturally competent staff relationships and service delivery. However, due to the many programmatic, staff, and theoretical changes that impacted the research design of this study, the creation and implementation of a new survey is recommended.

A review of the allocation of resources to all programs is advised in order to determine if programs and staff members are receiving the resources (staff, paper products, funding, building space, etc.) necessary to perform their job responsibilities; with an emphasis on staff members that serve monolingual, Spanish speaking clients. Providing appropriate access to resources ensures that all NSDCO clients are receiving quality service provision, thereby ensuring clients and staff members’ satisfaction with the organization. Increased satisfaction among staff will increase staff retention, thereby increasing the cultural competency within staff relationships and service delivery.

Measures to address the high staff turnover are highly recommended. Chronic under-staffing (due to high staff turnover or lack of funding) leads to inconsistencies
in the quality of service provision. The application of staff feedback procedure, perhaps with comment boxes, would allow Program Directors at agency sites to address concerns of staff members have within their primary program, and in this manner ensuring anonymity of the staff member. The exploration of other pertinent efforts at team building is strongly urged as increased team spirit will result in lower staff attrition.

Establishing a standardized transition procedure that all programs within the organization can adhere to, for the purpose of informing staff members and clients of any changes within the organization is recommended. The implementation of an improved and standardized transition procedure would allow clients to maintain trust established in a therapeutic relationship, ensuring that the client continues to feel valued and respected.

Having access to a written policy describing job responsibilities can help employees understand how the performance of their job responsibilities and the job performance of fellow staff members promote organizational and program goals. Therefore, posting job descriptions of all positions within an agency site is suggested. This would allow staff members to be informed about everyone's job responsibilities and how they interrelate, thereby allowing staff members to synchronize their work and increase team spirit. Having access to the identified goals and objectives of the program and organization can improve the quality of service provided to clients. Posting the mission and goals of each program within an agency site is also encouraged. This would allow staff members to synchronize their work efforts to
promote the goals of the "group" identity of the organization and increase group solidarity and morale. In turn, increasing the quality of service provision to clients.

Increasing access to technological resources, such as the installation of telephone systems with voice mail capability and networked LAN/WAN computer systems throughout all agency sites would increase staff members' access to information. The increased access to instrumental and expressive information will ease the performance of tasks, thereby increasing staff morale and esprit de corp.

Posting in each agency site the minutes and next meeting for the Cultural Competency Subcommittee (CCS) would provide an appropriate venue for increased discussion about cultural issues, as well as ensuring the CCS' recommendations are presented to the Executive Team. This would promote staff members' awareness of NSDCO's efforts to increase the cultural competency of their organization and service delivery, as well as staff members awareness about clients' multicultural issues and how they contribute to quality service provision.

Caveats

The implementation of this research was impacted by many factors that this study attempted to evaluate. The high staff turnover and frequent programmatic changes within the organization led to the elimination and restructuring of some facets of the original research design, including the cancellation of the planned comparison of all programs that serve English speaking clients that had a counterpart serving monolingual, Spanish speaking clients, the elimination of the comparison
between staff members that work with more than one program, and the reclassification of staff members' job tasks into "Service Provider" and "Other".

Other organizational changes that may have impacted the results of this survey relate to the differences in access to technological resources. The installation of telephone systems with voice mail capability in some, but not all, agency sites, impacted the access to occupational and social information among some staff members. The installation of LAN/WAN computer communication systems in some, but not all, agency sites allows some staff members to communicate via e-mail within an agency site and across agency sites.

**Impact and Significance**

This quantitative evaluation of Occupational Ghettoization within NSDCO attempted to measure how well NSDCO is serving the Spanish speaking clients and staff and validate some of the qualitative evaluation findings. This quantitative evaluation provided individual staff members with an opportunity for increased social interaction and discussion about cultural competency, which may have encouraged partnership building among programs and agency sites. This study measured staff morale, absentee and turnover rates of staff members, understandings of job descriptions, and group identity across programs and agency sites. Recommendations were presented in order to develop internal strategies for improving intra-group solidarity and information flow may decrease chronic staff turnover within the agency.
and improve morale among staff members that serve monolingual, Spanish speaking
clients.

The existing body of research has focused on organizations that employ a
higher preponderance of White males. The literature is characterized by studies of
organizations that are highly structured, such as for-profit organizations in industry or
academia. The focus of this study is a social service non-profit agency dominated by
female workers, thereby providing an opportunity for expanding the area of
knowledge about the dynamics of Occupational Ghettoization and its link to
culturally competent service provision in a social service non-profit organization.
Concurrently, any focus on diversity in the existing research has been primarily
constrained to a Black/White dichotomy, ignoring other ethnic communities. This
research looks at how the degree of culturally competent services in a non-profit
agency affect monolingual, Spanish speaking clients, thereby broadening the existing
research by providing another view of the concept of Occupational Ghettoization in a
non-profit agency.
Table 1. T-Tests of English and Spanish Speaking Service Providers within Primary Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face Communication Scale</td>
<td>50.49</td>
<td>47.96</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Integration Scale</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>2.302*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverant Communication Scale</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Table 2. Cross-Tabulation of Language Spoken with Clients and Social Integration Scale within Primary Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² (2, N=182) = 6.66, p < .05
Table 3. T-Tests of English and Spanish Speaking Service Providers within Agency Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face Communication Scale</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>-.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Integration Scale</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverant Communication Scale</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>25.23</td>
<td>-1.506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. T-Tests of English and Spanish Speaking Service Providers Across Agency Sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken</th>
<th>English</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face Communication Scale</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>45.95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-.547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverant Communication Scale</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-.552*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. T-Tests of English and Spanish Speaking Service Providers for Bureaucratic Constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Grants</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Agencies</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Policies</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Rules</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Demographic Profile of Survey Respondents

### Language Staff Members Speak with Clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff Members’ Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff Members’ Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff Members’ Job Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Description</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Staff Members' Time in Present Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 Year</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 Years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff Members' Time with Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 Year</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 Years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2
Maricela Elizondo, as a member of the NSDCO Cultural Competency Subcommittee, is conducting a study to find out about staff relations and service delivery at the NSDCO. As a NSDCO staff member you are being asked to take part of this study. The overall purpose of this research is to assist NSDCO in establishing an organization-wide standard of cultural competency. This survey is part of an ongoing process to increase the quality of services rendered at NSDCO.

If you agree to be in this study, the following will happen: You will be asked to fill out a survey questionnaire. You will be asked to provide your perceptions about staff relations and service delivery at NSDCO.

Participation in this study will involve about 10 minutes of your time. Participation in this research is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate in whole or in part or withdraw at any time without any penalty. The actual surveys will be maintained by the researcher and will not be presented to NSDCO. So, confidentiality of your research records will be strictly maintained. The information received will be reported collectively in aggregate form. For example, the final report may say something like "78% of staff felt...". No names or any identifying characteristics will be attached to the final report presented to NSDCO. Your participation in this survey will further NSDCO's efforts of obtaining and maintaining a standard of cultural competence that will ensure quality service provision to all members of the community.

If participating in this survey leads to any level of discomfort, respondents are encouraged to contact the researcher. Should you be interested in participating in the Cultural Competency Subcommittee, please speak to your Program Director. The researcher has explained this study to you and answered your questions. If you have others, or wish to report a research-related problem, you may call Maricela Elizondo at (760) 555-1212, extension 14.

You have received a copy of this consent document to keep. Your signature below indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this research.

_______________________________
Respondent's Name (please print)

_______________________________
Respondent's Signature Date
DATE: __________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY PROGRAM:</th>
<th>HOURS WORKED/WEEK:</th>
<th>SECONDARY PROGRAM:</th>
<th>HOURS WORKED/WEEK:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

LANGUAGE SPOKEN WITH CLIENTS IN PRIMARY PROGRAM: ________________________

LANGUAGE SPOKEN WITH CLIENTS IN SECONDARY PROGRAM: ________________________

This questionnaire should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Upon completion, please wait until the researcher requests that the survey questionnaires be returned before doing so. If you have any questions or comments relating to this survey or research project, please feel free to call the researcher at (760) 439-6702, extension 14.

INSTRUCTIONS:

The statements on this questionnaire are about various issues that may impact the quality of services provided to NSDCO clients/customers. Some questions refer to clients/customers. Customers/clients refer to the population you serve. If you do not serve clients directly, then use the "not applicable response (8)" and move onto the next question.

The statements discuss events that may occur within your program, agency site, and other NSDCO sites. Program refers to the department in which you work. Agency site refers to the geographic location in which you work. Other NSDCO sites refers to other agency sites that are different than where you work. Some questions ask you to rate the frequency of these events, while other questions ask you to rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement.

The response selections are as follows:

| 1 -- never | 1 -- strongly disagree |
| 2 -- less than once a month | 2 -- disagree |
| 3 -- monthly | 3 -- uncertain |
| 4 -- weekly | 4 -- agree |
| 5 -- daily | 5 -- strongly agree |
| 8 -- not applicable | 8 -- not applicable |
SECTION I:

Thinking about the staff within the **PRIMARY PROGRAM** where you work:

1--never  2--less than once a month  3--monthly  4--weekly  5--daily  8--n/a

1. How often do you talk to other program staff about the treatment issues of the clients/customers you share:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings

2. How often do you talk to other program staff about developing collaborations:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings

3. How often do you talk to other program staff about making client/customer referrals:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings

4. How often do you talk to other program staff about general program issues:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings

5. How often do you talk to program staff about multicultural client/customer issues:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings
1. strongly disagree  2. disagree  3. uncertain  4. agree  5. strongly agree  8. n/a

6. Program staff talk freely and openly with one another.  
7. Program staff of different cultural backgrounds work together cooperatively.  
8. There is little friction among staff of different cultures within my program.  
9. Program staff make an effort to help newcomers become a part of the team.  
10. Others within my program understand my job description and the tasks I am responsible for performing.  
11. I understand my program co-worker's job description and the tasks they are responsible for performing.  
12. There is low staff turnover within my program.  
13. There is low absenteeism within my program.  
14. There is high morale within my program.  
15. There are no cliques or in-group/out-group divisions among staff within my program.  
16. The written job description of the tasks I am responsible for performing accurately reflects my current job responsibilities.

Skip to SECTION III, if you do NOT work in more than one program.
SECTION II:

Thinking about the staff within the SECONDARY PROGRAM where you work:

Frequency:

1--never  2--less than once a month  3--monthly  4--weekly  5--daily  8 n/a

17. How often do you talk to other staff within your secondary program about the treatment issues of the clients/customers you share:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings

18. How often do you talk to other staff within your secondary program about developing collaborations:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings

19. How often do you talk to other staff within your secondary program about making client/customer referrals:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings

20. How often do you talk to other staff within your secondary program about general program issues:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings
21. How often do you talk to other staff within your secondary program about multicultural client/customer issues:
   a. by phone
   b. in informal meetings
   c. in formal meetings
   d. in supervision
   e. in program meetings

   1-strongly disagree  2-disagree  3-uncertain  4-agree  5-strongly agree  8-n/a

Response:

22. Staff within my secondary program talk freely and openly with one another.  

23. Staff of different cultural backgrounds work together cooperatively within my secondary program.

24. There is little friction among staff of different cultures within my secondary program.

25. Staff within my secondary program make an effort to help newcomers become a part of the team.

26. Others within my secondary program understand my job description and the tasks I am responsible for performing.

27. I understand my secondary program co-worker's job description and the tasks they are responsible for performing.

28. There is low staff turnover within my secondary program.

29. There is low absenteeism within my secondary program.

30. There is high morale within my secondary program.

31. There are no cliques or in-group/out-group divisions among staff within my secondary program.
SECTION III:

Thinking about the staff within your **AGENCY SITE** where you work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1--never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--less than once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about the treatment issues of the clients/customers you share:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. by phone</th>
<th>b. in informal meetings</th>
<th>c. in formal meetings</th>
<th>d. in supervision</th>
<th>e. in program meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about developing collaborations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. by phone</th>
<th>b. in informal meetings</th>
<th>c. in formal meetings</th>
<th>d. in supervision</th>
<th>e. in program meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about making client/customer referrals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. by phone</th>
<th>b. in informal meetings</th>
<th>c. in formal meetings</th>
<th>d. in supervision</th>
<th>e. in program meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about general program issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. by phone</th>
<th>b. in informal meetings</th>
<th>c. in formal meetings</th>
<th>d. in supervision</th>
<th>e. in program meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. How often do you talk to other staff within your agency site about multicultural client/customer issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. by phone</th>
<th>b. in informal meetings</th>
<th>c. in formal meetings</th>
<th>d. in supervision</th>
<th>e. in program meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-strongly disagree</td>
<td>2-disagree</td>
<td>3-uncertain</td>
<td>4-agree</td>
<td>5-strongly agree</td>
<td>8-n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Staff within my agency site talk freely and openly with one another:  

38. Staff of different cultural backgrounds work together cooperatively within my agency site.  

39. There is little friction among staff of different cultures within my agency site.  

40. Staff within my agency site make an effort to help newcomers become a part of the team.  

41. Others within my agency site understand my job description and the tasks I am responsible for performing.  

42. I understand my agency site co-worker's job description and the tasks they are responsible for performing.
SECTION IV:

Thinking about the staff from OTHER NSDCO SITES:

1--never  2--less than once a month  3--monthly  4--weekly  5--daily  8 n/a

Frequency:

43. How often do you talk to staff at other NSDCO sites about the treatment issues of the clients/customers you share:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings

44. How often do you talk to staff at other NSDCO sites about developing collaborations:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings

45. How often do you talk to staff at other NSDCO sites about making client/customer referrals:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings

46. How often do you talk to staff at other NSDCO sites about general program issues:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings

47. How often do you talk to staff at other NSDCO sites about multicultural client/customer issues:
   _____ a. by phone
   _____ b. in informal meetings
   _____ c. in formal meetings
   _____ d. in supervision
   _____ e. in program meetings
SECTION V:

Thinking about the quality of services you are able to provide:

1--never  2--less than once a month  3--monthly  4--weekly  5--daily  8 n/a

48. How often do each of the following restrict the ways you would like to help your clients/customers?
   ____ a. external grant contracts that fund your program
   ____ b. county agencies
   ____ c. Child Protective Services (CPS) workers
   ____ d. agency policies
   ____ e. ethical rules and guidelines of your profession

ETHNICITY: ___________________________ GENDER: ______________________

PRIMARY LANGUAGE: ________________________

SECONDARY LANGUAGE: ____________________________

PLEASE CIRCLE THE CATEGORY THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOU:

JOB CLASSIFICATION:
Administrative/Management Professionals Technician/Skilled
Service Workers Clerical Other

TIME IN PRESENT JOB:
Less than 1 Year 1-3 Years 3 - 5 Years More than 5 Years

TIME WITH AGENCY:
Less than 1 Year 1-3 Years 3 - 5 Years More than 5 Years
BIBLIOGRAPHY:


